

on Organizing the Poor in America

by Todd Gitlin

Copyright © 1966 Todd Gitlin



This paper was originally written for Democratic Nouvelle, a French left-wing publication, as an attempt to clarify the form, purpose, and hopes of Community Organizing in America.

While the international reputation of the New American Left rests on its antiwar activities, our greatest chances for a lasting political transformation probably lie elsewhere. And despite all our confused ideological thrashings, it would be fair to say that the activities that have best characterized our approach, our questions and our hazily emerging answers, have been our undertakings in the organization of the poor. When the rhetorical glow fades and we stand judged by our own lights, as activists, this is how, so far, we must be judged—as organizers of the poor.

(Continued on page 4)

new left notes



1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

Volume 1, No. 49 let the people decide December 23, 1966

national secretaries report for the National Council "THE TWO-FOLD TASK"

"What I have been wondering is whether the dual role of SDS, on the one hand a large student organization, and on the other a group of people striving to build a political left in America has become a handicap. This dualism may have outgrown its effectiveness. I wonder whether a student organization can independently staff, finance, and structure a national organization. It would seem that the problem of staff and membership turnover, the instability of chapter organization, limited financing available (especially when the student movement is no longer the only exciting left activity requesting funds), the problem of conducting the most serious political and economic debates in such an unstable environment have gotten out of hand.

If we look at SDS's last two years from this perspective, perhaps we can understand our organizational problems (and crisis, to my mind) a little better. SDS, as an organization, ie members, chapters, projects, offices, newsletters, may have outstripped the resources in staff, money, resources, commitment, available to it as a student organization. I doubt for instance whether there has ever been a student organization as large as SDS that was not financed by the State Dept. (NSA, USYC, etc) or by political parties (YCL, SLUD, ISS, YPSL).

"To my mind, the solution to many of SDS organizational and structural problems rest not in centralize-decentralize, all power to the NO, or regions, or chapters, increase

the dues, more internal education (!!!) or any other internal solution. Instead it rests in SDS going through the process (which will be very painful and confusing) of becoming a mature political organization with loose affiliates specializing in students (Council or Organizers?), labor, education and agitation (REP?), community organizing (ERAP) etc.

"To begin that process should be the major personal responsibility of all those ex-students (ie Calvert, Webb, Haber Egleson, Shero, Rothstein, Gitlin, etc etc etc.) in the coming year. Specifically, the President should appoint a committee to draft a new constitution for SDS as a way of beginning discussion of what MDS will become. Furthermore, amendments to the present constitution that would provide for representation at the NC, Conventions for the many non-student sections of SDS as a way also of beginning the discussion of the future.

"I think that the 'Future of SDS' might well be the focus of the June Convention that we should start organizing and preparing for at the December NC."

Response to Nat'l Secy's NIC consultation, October 31, 1966

"The gulf between the rank-and-file and the leadership in the organization once again has failed to be narrowed. That is the

anti-vietnam and the YOUNG DEMS.

The College Young Democratic Clubs of America (CYDCA) have learned that dissent from the Great Consensus is not taken lightly by the senior party. It started last Labor Day weekend when the National Executive Committee (NEC) of the YD's, at a meeting in Nashville, passed a resolution critical of the U. S. policy towards the war in Viet Nam. When College YD officials attempted to use the facilities of the Democratic National Committee (DNC) to mail out these resolutions, which is usually done as a routine matter, they were prevented from doing so. CYD chairman Dale Wagner then circulated a letter to DNC chairman John Bailey protesting this action; but to no avail. (The resolution and Wagner's letter appear in the October 28 New Left Notes.) The resolution, although it received little press at the time it was issued, was publicized in connection with the DNC's attempts to suppress it. In addition, DNC members suggested to the national executive committee of CYDCA that they reverse their stand. In Illinois, Mayor Daley reportedly intervened personally to get the Illinois Young Democrats to repudiate the NEC stand.

Things stood at an impasse until November 30 when the DNC acting treasurer, John Criswell, gave notice to CYDCA officers that they would no longer be permitted to use DNC facilities, that CYDCA director W. Gary Winget was being fired on two weeks notice and his position was being abolished, and that henceforth CYD activities would be coordinated through the Young Democratic Clubs of America (which permits anyone up to the age of 40 as members). Winget was the only full-time CYDCA officer and was paid by the Democratic National Committee. Two days later Michael Ferri, a member of the DC Teachers College YD's who was working at the DNC headquarters as a part-time mail room clerk, was fired for photocopying a Washington Post article on the DNC actions against the College Young Democrats.

Meanwhile Dale Wagner called an emergency meeting of the NEC in Washington for Saturday, December 3. Abortive negotiations with DNC officials were attempted in order to get the National Committee to reverse the actions taken by acting Treasurer Criswell. Officials promised that if the NEC (of the College YD's) would keep quiet, and

not make a statement to the press, then Dale Wagner would be invited to the White House to "talk things over". (One of the officers of the, non-college, YDCA, who was denied admission to the NEC meeting was going around the lobby of the Staller Hilton charging that Dale Wagner and the Executive Committee were trying to turn the CYD's into a 'crypto SDS'.) However, the NEC members, some of whom had flown in from the West Coast and wanted to get back, saw this as a stalling tactic to sweep the episode under the rug and minimize publicity until after everyone had gone home, when they would proceed to bury the CYD's.

A press conference was held on Sunday December 4 at Georgetown University before three TV networks, the wire services, the Washington papers, and scattered papers from other cities. Chairman Wagner read a statement saying the CYD's would continue to exist in spite of the attempted suppression by the DNC. (Wagner had wisely incorporated the CYDCA in the District of Columbia before this incident.) Wagner left the door open for re-establishing relations with the DNC, if it could be done "without the forfeiture of our freedom of expression on issues of vital concern."

Congressman Don Edwards, national chairman of A.D.A., attended the press conference and expressed his "shock and disbelief" at the action of the DNC, while offering support for the CYDCA. Also present, and supporting the CYD's, were Congressman John Schmidhauser of Iowa, and representatives of the U. S. Youth Council. Support has also been offered by the Democratic Study Group in Congress.

(Continued on page 2)

inside this issue

Mac blows his cool page 3

DECEMBER CONFERENCE page 3

REP page page 7

N.Y.U. sit-in page 5

Publications Received page 6

NAC minutes page 5

our Man on the Draft page 6

most clear lesson of the December conference. But I think that we set our sights too high — that we shouldn't expect third year graduate students with one whole set of priorities in their personal lives to enter into communities of love with people six years younger... especially if all they have in common is social class (they have that in common with 60% of the society) and some shreds of political perspective and something called 'alienation.'

"What I learn from the gulf is that we should proceed precipitously to forming a new national political organization on the left — that some people should be sprung loose to be organizers of it. A dozen people should see themselves in such a role in a dozen cities in the fall."

Letter, NO Files
January 16, 1966

"SDS AND THE AMERICAN LEFT: The success of SDS is crucial to the future of the American left if we assume that the attitudes of the middle classes toward radical social change will ultimately determine the outcome. I believe that this assumption is justified. While the movement cannot succeed without the support of poor and working class people, middle class people have been

(Continued on page 2)

national secretary's report

the first to articulate and generalize their discontents, and now as in the past (since WWI) are playing the leading role in creating the institutions through which working class and poor people can articulate theirs. Thus SDS can and must play two complementary roles in building a relevant left movement in the US.

(a) As a national radical student organization SDS is uniquely suited to the role of transforming the attitudes of students on the campus through education and action on a variety of issues ranging from sustaining and developing the integrity of our educational institutions to opposing the war. On the issue of the war in particular, but on other issues as well, the best way to reach the middle class may be through their children.

(b) Furthermore, as a national radical educational and action organization SDS brings together and develops the cadre organizers necessary to build a radical movement with roots in the community at large. Since for the foreseeable future these cadre organizers will be drawn primarily from the middle classes, the success of the movement depends in large measure on the success of SDS. In contrast to SDS the role of the NCNP will be presumably to impart certain skills to these organizers and to coordinate and fund their community efforts at the national level. While this role must be fulfilled if the movement is to develop beyond its present base on the campus and in the intellectual community, to ignore SDS is to ignore the foundation on which an organization like the NCNP must build. Without cadre organizers even a relatively successful electoral mobilization cannot develop a grass-roots movement capable of sustaining itself and developing over a long period of time.

(c) While at any given period of time there may exist considerable tension between these two roles, they must be combined in the same organization for some time to come, perhaps indefinitely. An organization which deals with issues only from the campus perspective will soon degenerate into the class selfishness and mickey mouse of student politics; a community movement without a campus base cuts itself off from the source of fresh cadres. For all its problems no organization combines these roles as successfully as SDS.

Fundraising letter for SDS National Office, November, 1966

"Strong Enough and Free Enough
— to have the strength to build
freedom."

The most important question facing SDS and the movement in general is not simply a question of structure or finances or ideology. It is not a question of values, which most movement people share. It is not a question of vision or commitment which most movement people feel. It is a question of serious discipline and the reconciliation of that necessity with the values and the hopes of committed people whose strength is sapped and whose energies are dissipated by the ineffectuality of the organization to which they give their time.

Let's face it. It is, to use the crudest psychological terminology, a sick, sick, sick society in which we live. It is, finally, a society which approaches collective insanity — a system of authority-dependency relationships which destroys life and health and strength and creates debility, dependency, and deathliness. SDS and the movement are, at one and the same time, products of and reactions to that sick society. That is what makes SDS, at its most honest points, both the healthiest and the sickest organization around. It is healthiest where the reaction to the sick society affirms the values of and the hope for health and life and freedom. It is sickest where those needs, instincts, desires, values, and hopes are warped and destroyed by the ineffectuality which so often plagues it. Let me insist that the primary pathology is in the society, i.e. the given system of relationships. But, there is a second level of 'movement sickness' which is symptomized by despair and the eventual dysfunctionality of many of the movement's most dedicated activists — that is, the inadequacy of the system of relationships into which activists enter when they become part of the movement. In short, in reaction to and as a product of authority-dependency conditioning, the movement substitutes an unstructured freedom which is sooner or later unable to sustain the very

existence of its devotees and ends by destroying them as effectively as the society which they reject and seek to change.

The movement seeks to destroy 'politics' and 'power relationships' and to substitute freedom and strength — the only meaningful structure for a truly human society. In the end, it substitutes doubt, confusion, and weakness. That reality is probably truer of SDS than of any other political grouping in America today. Whether it be at the chapter level or at the level of the National Office, good people with creative human instincts and values are ground into an ineffectual pulp by their experience of work in the movement, 'the movement reality', the system of relationships between people and between people and their work which often predominates in chapters and offices throughout SDS.

Discipline. The word itself provokes anger, fear, resentment, political demunciations. It evokes the memory of everything we reacted against. It is what our (sometimes) brothers of other left-wing groupings are structured around. It is 'old-left' — it is totalitarian — it is anti-freedom.

Interestingly, discipline in SDS is equated with 'manipulation,' 'factionalism,' 'sectarianism,' 'ideological narrowness or messianism,' 'Stalinism,' 'Trotskyism,' and 'Maoism.' It is 'bureaucratic,' 'centralist,' 'pushy' and nobody with any decency in this society enjoys being pushed around (masochism) or pushing others around (sadism). The real problem is that discipline has been the province of the authoritarian left which strikes most people in SDS as being at least as sick as the dominant authoritarian society. Discipline has meant 'receiving orders from the central committee' and, gawdknows, that resembles General Motors, IBM, The Pentagon, and the multiversity enough to nauseate even the least sensitive human psychology.

That is why the best of SDS sensitivity reacts strongly against the 'ideological and disciplined left.' With its deep psychological insight into the relationship between politics and personality — its refusal to divorce the two — SDS is rightly suspicious of anyone who is attracted by authoritarian organizations. Abandoning corporate-liberal authoritarian America in favor of a centrist organization is like converting from Jesuitism to Stalinism.

The SDS movement sickness does not manifest itself in an attraction for authoritarianism — the left-ideological counter-part of the authoritarian society — but rather in disfunctionality, debilitation, and an inability to restructure relationships within the movement in a way which reconciles ends and means, values and implementation, freedom and discipline.

For the past six months, most of my waking hours have been absorbed in the work of that phenomenon on West Madison Street known as the NO (a Japanese play? a negative response?). With the best will in the world and the outpouring of energy at a rate which has often left me at the point of physical collapse, I must admit that the results have been less than dazzling. There are many factors which enter into that. Some of those factors will remain constant; for instance, the fact that the needs of the movement and of the organization far surpass the work capacity of any ten people in any office in the country. Some things can and must be changed — but they require greater discipline and a greater sense of responsibility on the part of all of us, both those who work full-time in the NO and those who are involved in chapters across the country. Otherwise, we will not have the energy, foresight, and clarity necessary for the vitally important organizing and political work which alone can build the movement.

The following agenda proposals are designed to focus our attention first on those organizational questions which require our disciplined responses in order that, secondly, we will have the structures and resources for dealing creatively with whatever program we adopt.

PROPOSED AGENDA

- I. THE STATE OF THE ORGANIZATION -
Chaired by National Secretary
1. ORGANIZATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES—
REPORTS: Regional Offices
Regional Travelers
National Office - The State
of the Membership
- VERIFICATION OF DELEGATIONS
2. FINANCES
Financial Report of the National Office
Financial Report of Regional Offices
'O Budget Proposal for 1967
Indraising discussion
3. STAFF
REPORT by Assistant National Secretary
Discussion of problems of staffing the organization at both national and regional levels.
Proposals for dealing with staff situation and needs.
4. NEW LEFT NOTES
REPORT by Editor of NLN
DISCUSSION of role and function and future of NEW LEFT NOTES
PROPOSALS for New Left Notes
5. LITERATURE PRODUCTION
REPORT on Production of Literature by NO.
DISCUSSION OF Literature Production in the next quarter.
PROPOSALS for Literature Priorities

II. THE STATE OF INTERNAL EDUCATION - Chaired by National Vice-President

1. THE PROGRESS OF INTERNAL EDUCATION
REPORT by National Vice-President
REPORT by Delegation of Radical Education Project
2. REP and SDS
DISCUSSION OF RELATIONS OF REP AND SDS
PROPOSALS from REP and Delegates on Internal Education

III. THE STATE OF THE MOVEMENT - Chaired by National President

1. NATIONAL PRESIDENT'S REPORT
2. SDS, THE PEACE MOVEMENT, THE STUDENT STRIKE, AND THE DRAFT REPORT on results of Membership Referendum on the Draft and Draft Resistance
DISCUSSION - Relationship of SDS to Anti-War Movement
The Question of National Mobilizations Should Draft Programming and Draft Resistance Be Policy
How Do We Deal with The Student Strike Proposal
How do We Deal With The April 15 Mobilization
PROPOSALS for National Actions and Programs or Lack Thereof
3. THE FUTURE OF SDS
DISCUSSION on the Future Role and Structure of SDS
PROPOSALS
The Nature of the National Convention.
Change of Name and Structure
Where Should We Organize?
Student Radicalism and Social Change - What is our future role?
SPRING NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING.
Where, when, what?

Young Dems.

Since funds have been cut off from the National Committee the CYD's have to seek outside financial support since their internal funds do not provide enough to run the organization. However, the NEC agreed that in the next weeks the most important task facing them is mobilizing student support on campuses throughout the country in favor of the CYDCA, thus refusing to recognize the action of the Democratic National Committee. A resolution in support of the CYD's was unanimously passed by the 300 delegates from 30 colleges attending the convention of the Massachusetts Federation of Student Democrats. Similar resolutions should have been passed by this time by the CYD groups in New York, California, Minnesota, Oregon, and other states. Indications are that CYDCA will be successful in getting grass roots support. Many students who did not agree with the Viet Nam resolution, or had no opinion one way or the other, are outraged by the arbitrary action taken by the Committee. These same students should also be in a more receptive frame of mind to talk about the war itself.

On the whole, then, the reaction of CYDCA has been encouraging. There are several possible conclusions to draw from this episode. Many SDSers will say that this simply indicates again the futility of working within the Democratic party because you'll get stamped on every time, etc. However, there are many people within organizations such as the CYD's who should not be written off by SDS as unreachable. A less negative attitude toward entering into coalitions with groups, like the YD's may help to build opposition to the war.

— James Klebba

U. of Iowa PRESS

The anti-war message was brought to over 1,000 students at the University of Iowa, and they paid to hear it. Admission was \$1.00. Lawrence Ferlinghetti was invited by the Radical Arts Project (RAP) of the local SDS chapter to present his latest work and some selections from his book, "A Coney Island of the Mind."

It was decided by the SDS members that the profit from the concert would be used to help solve the national problem of the shortage of literature by buying a printing press. Hopefully with this press we will be able to supply the national organization with and literature by buying a printing press. Hopefully with this press we will be able to supply the national organization with any literature that needs publishing. The press will be run by local members. We will print as often as is necessary as much literature required by any SDS chapter, within the limits of the capabilities of the press, and us — as newly inducted printers.

Chapters will be notified through NLN when the literature printed is to be available. At the moment, we have decided to print first articles that are no longer in stock at the national office.

Another project of RAP is the publication of the penny paper. This is a small booklet containing a collection of radical poetry including works from across the country, and poems from the poetry workshop here at the University. If any chapter would be interested in obtaining Penny Papers, we would be willing to exchange them for yours, at a bulk rate. Individuals can obtain them by sending a self-addressed envelope to Everett Frost, 1217 Pickard Street, Iowa City, Iowa.

The Radical Arts Project was developed by our SDS chapter to give poets, artists, writers, dramatists — anyone with a creative ability who is willing to give of it to the movement, a chance to speak.

report from Harvard

MacNamara Blows His Cool

by Jon Wiener

When Harvard announced that Secretary of Defense MacNamara would come to Cambridge as the first honorary fellow of the Kennedy Institute of Politics, Harvard-Radcliffe SDS began a campaign to get him to appear publicly to answer war critics. Since MacNamara was coming the same weekend as New Left candidate and Rumparts editor Bob Scheer, a debate was proposed. Richard Neustadt, head of the Institute, refused for MacNamara; SDS got 600 signatures on a petition demanding a debate. Neustadt again refused, saying MacNamara was being brought for "informal contact with the academic community." The issue thus became whether public officials had an obligation to face the public. SDS announced it would demonstrate outside Quincy House, where MacNamara was meeting with 50 students, and attempt to "physically confront" the Secretary when he left, asking him either to agree to debate Scheer or answer questions right there.

Initially, it was not clear whether SDSers would turn out in large numbers on Monday after a weekend that was to include appearances by New Left culture heroes Lyndon Johnson, W. C. Fields, Timothy Leary and Bob Scheer. But Monday the weather was good, and, in anticipation of a big demonstration, Quincy House patriots hung sheets out their windows bearing the slogans "Kill the Cong," "Back Mac," "Napalm SDS," and "Black Day for Gorden Linen." Loudspeakers blared "Mack the Knife" across the courtyard.

By 4 p.m., close to a thousand demonstrators (The Crimson said 800) ringed Quincy House, covering virtually all the exits. SDS heads ran a James Bond-type operation, with walkie-talkie equipped spotters on all sides of the building. After several false alarms and one attempted decoy maneuver, MacNamara emerged in a police car on a narrow back street. While a dozen SDSers sat down around the car, others passed the signal over the walkie talkies around the block, and the thousand began running toward MacNamara. Within moments, he was surrounded by what must have looked to him like a mob of howling beatniks; they were actually normal Harvard people, including faculty like Michael Walzer, delighted to have trapped the Secretary.

The rest is now history, although the New York Times garbled it a bit. What MacNamara said was, "I spent four of the happiest years on the Berkeley campus doing some of the same things you're doing here. But there was one important difference: I was both tougher and more courteous." After laughter and shouts, he shouted vehemently. "I was tougher then and I'm tougher now!"

The audience loved it. Mac was blowing his cool - unable to handle himself, quite possibly scared. The first question was about the origins of the Vietnamese war. "It started in '54-'55 when a million North Vietnamese flooded into South Vietnam," Macnamara said. "Goin' home!" someone shouted. Mac countered "why don't you guys get up here since you seem to know all the answers?"

The next question asked for the number of civilian casualties in the South. "We don't know," Mac said. "Why not? Don't you care?" came the shouts. "The number of casualties..." Mac began, but was drowned out by cries of "Civilian! Civilian! Napalm victims!" A few PL-types in front were jumping up and down screaming "Murderer! Fascist!" Mac tried to regain his composure and said "Look fellas, we had an agreement..." A girl shrieked "What about your agreement to hold elections in 1956?"

Things seemed to be breaking up. The police moved in and whisked MacNamara into Leverett House; an SDS leader, fearing violence in the streets, took the microphone and ordered all SDS people to clear the area. The disciplined shock troops of the revolution turned and dispersed quickly, MacNamara was hustled out through steam tunnels, and everyone went home to watch themselves on TV.

Official Harvard was unhappy. MacNamara's "I'm tougher" remark made all the 6 o'clock news broadcasts and the TV films looked violent. Deans were "apalled" and "amazed that students at Harvard would use tactics like this." Neustadt said that MacNamara had no obligation to answer SDS questions - "I see no reason why an educational experience should be changed just to suit someone else's convenience. It's like saying to me I should change the curriculum of my course because students don't think it makes sense."

SDS leaders replied to the Deans by emphasizing the alternatives they had pro-



posed - speech, debate, petition. "When a public official reneges on a responsibility, and when all other avenues are closed, it becomes necessary to do what we did," one said. SDS noted that MacNamara was never in physical danger, that the TV films had been edited to give the impression of maximum chaos, and that MacNamara hadn't helped by taunting the crowd.

Finally, official Harvard apologized, and an SDS head commented, "We had a feeling that the war was slipping back from people's thoughts... Now, everybody's arguing, and that's just the way it should be."

from the Dis-Center
Princeton SDS

DECEMBER CONFERENCE

The following agenda is the final format for the December conference as outlined by the Conference Planning Committee.

Defining The Student And His Institution

STUDENTS AND SOCIAL CLASSES

Are students an economic or political interest group, a social caste, or do they reflect economic and sub-cultural differences in the society? If students are a class, what are the distinguishing characteristics? What is the "student mentality," and how much of it is imposed by the society? How should students relate to working youth? Are students a catalyst for change or an agent of change? Why do students seldom act in their self-interest? What is the Hippie revolt and where does it lead?

THE ECONOMICS OF THE UNIVERSITY

What are the likenesses between the campus and the business organization? What is the role of funding in determining educational policy? Who benefits from research funds, contracts, departmental and administrative allocations, and student social services? Can teachers' unions and student employees' unions progress beyond collective bargaining to questions of basic resource allocation?

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Can either the Free University model or the campus-based Experimental model be effective in promoting educational change in the Junior college? Is it possible to organize student syndicalist movement for basic educational change on a two-year campus? If not, are there certain "crisis issues" which could mobilize students for short durations and achieve accumulative change? What is the pattern of economic control in the junior colleges? How can the junior college be used to radicalize working youth and expand the campus left community beyond university-bound students? What organizational problems are posed by the *in loco parentis* fiat? Should the vocational training role of the junior college be abolished?

THE HIGH SCHOOL

How has the change in the public conception of the "college student" provided high schools with an alternative behavioral model? Assuming that college students serve as role models for high school students, how can this relationship be utilized to strengthen the high school left (tutorials, educational counselling, organizational aid)? What can be done about *in loco parentis* and docility-training in high schools? What form should anti-draft programs take on the high school campus?

Appraising the Campus As an Agency of Change

WHITE RADICALS AND NEGROES ON CAMPUS

Is there a danger that white radical support for "Black Power" will act to reduce their dialogue with Negroes on campus? Should a student syndicalist movement be built on an inter-racial basis? Are white radicals suspicious of most college Negroes as "bourgeoisified"? What are the attitudes of Negroes and white radical groups to Negroes who participate in predominantly white radical groups? How should disagreements between campus radical groups and black nationalist groups be resolved? Is there a campus solution to racial prejudice within a racist society?

PROGRAMS FOR EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

How effective are free universities and other educational counter-institutions in effecting change? Do campus-based educational innovations serve as catalysts to institutional change or do they merely co-opt dissent? What are the limits to educational change in a system where nearly all post-graduate careers serve the status quo? Is abolition of grades a "revolutionary" demand?

THE CAMPUS, THE DRAFT, THE MILITARY

What have been the relative merits of campus draft protests (eg. Examination of Conscience, Draft Referendum, Abolish the Rank, etc.) as opposed to organizing potential draftees to resist conscription? What demands (if any) should the campus raise regarding conscription (abolition of II-S, democratic draft, abolition of conscription, alternative service, lottery, university non-compliance)? Does present campus organizing make it more difficult to build an alliance of student and working youth to resist conscription? How do you deal with the military and the ROTC on the campus? How do you abolish military research?

THE POLITICAL ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

In what ways is the university the vanguard of the status quo? What is the relationship between the educational and political bureaucracies? In what ways could intellectuals serve as agents of social change that would not strengthen the bureaucratism of American society? Is it true that the government "needs" a certain amount of dissent in the university?

Implementing the Goal of a Student Movement

STUDENTS AS CATALYSTS

Should students view their major role as being one of catalytic organizers of other contingencies? Should students organize within or white communities and labor unions? As a major program? How effective are issue oriented organizations in building a radical constituency? Should organizers attempt to politicize young people or work with older people with more immediate demands (eg. better welfare administration)?

STUDENT POWER

Should students organize within the administrative structure of the campus or promote student associations which are financially, politically, and administratively independent? Should the basis of student organization be issue orientation (eg. ad hoc groups like FSM) or a long-term commitment to basic educational change (eg. groups exercising Student Power on a continuing basis). How can an organization serve immediate student interests (housing, jobs, etc.) implement basic educational change, and better engage students in community organizing, electoral politics, etc.? Can student and underground newspapers serve to build a community concerned both with the campus and social change? Can students build a community concerned both with the campus and social change? Can students build to defend their organizations?

Personell Needed

A person for at least six (6) months to help develop and install a carrier-current radio system in the poor section of Newark.

If you know radio electronics, have at least six months, and are interested in using your technology towards the creation of a movement, contact: Steve Block, NCUP Radio, c/o Newark Community Union Project, 444 Clinton Avenue, Newark, New Jersey 201-242-9329.

ORGANIZING TOWARD STUDENT SYNDICALISM

What would be the efficacy of a national student union? What activities would it engage in and promote? Would it deal with larger social issues as well as power on the campus? Would it be only a lobby or a real political force? How would it act as a political force? Would it be an all left coalition? Would it be exclusionary? Would locals be autonomous? Would it be organized from the bottom up - rather than the top-down as in NSA? What relations would it have with international groups? Labor unions?

STUDENT RADICALS AND ELECTORAL POLITICS

Should radicals participate in electoral politics? If so, under what conditions? If not, what alternative should they offer to those concerned with social change? Should radicals support the move toward a third party? If so, should they organize themselves as a constituency or as catalysts? In those leftist campaigns where students have been particularly important (such as the CNP campaigns) what effect has the campaign had on the campus? What effect could a student syndicalist movement have on the move toward independent or third party politics?

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, \$3 a year for non-members. Signed articles and letters are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the editor, Thane Croston.

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Nick Egleson, president; Carl Davidson, vice-president; and Greg Colvert, national secretary.
National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312) 666-3874
New York City: 49 West 27th St., NYC, NY 10011; (212) 889-5793
Niagra Region: 107 Dryden Rd., Ithaca, NY
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif. 94115; 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.

on Organizing the Poor in America

(continued from page 1)

Why the poor? It is not simply that the poor are most brutalized and most powerless in the society. Most radical students in the early 1960's had fixed, in fact, on the university campuses as the sites for their political work. There were notions of the strategic location of the university in the corporate-militarist web of power; of the student as proletarianized victim of liberal authoritarianism who is capable of taking history in his own hands. But underlying these notions was, for the first time in America in 25 years, a mood of possibility and urgency: for the outbreak of the civil rights movement had proved that mass organized dissension from the American nightmare was practicable, and that large numbers of students could be galvanized (at however far a remove) in its wake. In this new dawn, by 1963, the confines of the university had begun to frustrate our political desires. At the same time, our developing seriousness about fundamental social change implied a revamping of strategy.

Our reasoning then was something like this: that the civil rights movement was numerically in need of allies; (1) that the situation of Negroes was primarily economic and required economic solutions; that the more radical people in the Negro movement were becoming aware of these facts; that the most natural allies for Negroes, therefore, were whites whose condition closely resembled that of Negroes—not middle-class, professional, and academic whites, not co-opted (if disgruntled) trade union whites, but poor whites; and that in fact unless poor whites were organized into coalition with Negroes, it was unlikely that they would continue to turn, hideously, against their natural allies and their own self-interest, or organized instead with Negroes into a new, quiescent, integrated base of power for the Democratic Party, the tokenist shadow of change and the further entrenchment of the liberal elites. These notions, distilled out of much furiously exciting discussion and but a few shreds of experience, had jelled by the summer of 1964 into the strategy of "an interracial movement of the poor."

In the space of a few months "community organizing" became the watchword of the student movement as a whole. A hundred or so student members of SDS, largely inexperienced, were channeled into eight or nine "organizing projects" in black and white slums in the North. At the same time, SNCC projects in the deep rural South were shifting in emphasis, from mass sit-ins and demonstrations to attempts to build permanent, autonomous organizations of and for the very poor. And other organizations and clusters of individuals began to look for potentially radical constituencies among the dispossessed—in the black ghettos and among the unemployed miners and their families in the Appalachian mountains.

The idea was—and is—for radical organizers to create local movements of poor people by raising those issues most salient, day-to-day, to the people concerned. By articulating the felt needs of the people, no matter how minor, we would be able to show our good faith (after all, why otherwise should they trust us when ideologies have always left them stranded and when middle-class promises, whatever their politics, have usually been cheap and empty?) We would demonstrate that problems were not personal but rather systemic and historical, and show through confrontations that united action could bring concrete improvements in living conditions. We would seek to build democratic organizations, to prove democracy a viable proposition (not an easy job in a hierarchically-organized welfare state), to draw out the best capabilities in people, and thereby to let people feel their own strength collectively. And we hoped that experiences and education would clarify the limits of effective action within the present social structure and begin to raise questions about the distribution of resources within this system; of the class nature and values of American society; and of the types of institutions necessary to transfer social power to common people. Though most of us considered ourselves nonsectarian socialists, we carried no social blueprints in our hip pockets; rather, we believed that an ideology based on democracy, if it were not to become brittle and abstracted, must be rooted in concrete struggles against precise institutions.

On these principles we evolved the concept of the *community union*—a local movement of the poor oriented not to the workplace but rather to oppression outside the job. Implicit in this approach was a sense of the declining salience of the workplace for the American lower classes. The reasons for this shift in orientation might have to do with automation, with the progressive division of labor and routinization of blue-collar work, with the growing entrenchment and pervasiveness of "welfare" institutions, and with the bureaucratization and quietude of most American trade unions. Thus we began to see the development of a more-or-less permanent underclass whose abrasive contacts with the ruling elites were less at the point of production than outside it—with slum-lords, government bureaucracies, police, etc. At the same time, a parallel idea, that of an economy headed for a crisis of mass joblessness, has been discarded. Our theory now pays grudging respect to the efficiency of war, imperialism, and the Keynesian devices in buttressing prosperity, and our practical experience verifies that jobs are either relatively plentiful (for whites) or else not the best issue around which to organize. (2)

Of the community-organizing projects spurred by SDS, only about half are still in motion, but the ones that have survived have largely transcended the difficulties that brought the others down—problems of inexperienced staff; flabbiness of conception; failure to tap those sources of dissidence and ferment already present in the community; or reliance on white organizers in Negro areas. We have made mistakes, but perhaps the first major hurdle has been passed. Those projects that remain and go forward are no longer experimental "projects" (that is, mere mental projects of radical imaginations) but *organizations* with roots in their communities, a substantial measure of local support, and a fairly stable kernel of hard-core community people who share a radical analysis and organizational power with the ex-students.

These organizations—and I shall be talking mainly about the Newark (New Jersey) Community Union Project in a black ghetto, and JOIN Community Union in a largely white area of Chicago—proceed by articulating and generating issues in an ever-widening circle, patiently drawing in new people issue by issue. Long dead is the speculation that any one issue will be the key that unlocks the local structure of power. Among the pivotal issues and organizing tactics have been these:

(1) *Housing.* The ownership of slum housing is a traditionally lucrative source of profits. While the poor tend to pay higher rents than some of the more affluent, the buildings deteriorate as landlords milk them for immediate gain and then sell them. Community unions have tried rent strikes with varying success, and recently have created tenant unions to force landlords to bargain collectively. In Mississippi, SNCC has organized displaced Negro small farmers into cooperative building enterprises. Any great substantive success, though, rests on the ability of tenant unions to accumulate the power to force rent control and decent low-cost housing upon unwilling real estate interests and public authorities. This lies in the future. Now all that can be said is that the seeds have been planted.

(2) *Urban renewal.* This is the process by which the Federal government subsidizes the clearance of slums—not to improve the housing of the poor, but almost always to promote business and supply housing for the affluent. The poor are dispersed, only to be exploited elsewhere. As Bob Ross of SDS has pointed out, urban renewal is probably the major arena of class struggle in America today. The issue is a stark representation of the fundamental powerlessness of the poor against the interlock of Federal and local governments and business interests. In this showdown, community unions are fighting, first, to make this confrontation

clear and visible, second, to stop the city in its tracks and insist that the residents of a neighborhood control its fate, and third, to amass the power to substitute a plan that the residents choose.

(3) *Welfare and income.* At least eight million people receive public funds—welfare—because the society has grudgingly, since the New Deal, conceded to Americans the right not to starve even if they cannot work. Armed with the Protestant ethic in an economy and culture that belie it, and with great humanitarian breast-beating, government institutions have gone on to make only the most minimal allotments and, at the same time, to degrade and intimidate welfare recipients by confining them in a network of punitive, Kafka-esque regulations. Here, our approach has been in two phases: first, to organize recipients into "unions" that attack not only the adequacy of the allotments but also the authoritarianism of the entire system; and second, to challenge the very assumption that income should be tied to jobs, particularly when "low skill" jobs are being eliminated by automation. As modernizing elites also come to adopt the idea of a guaranteed minimum income regardless of work, we shall have to keep ahead of them by continuing to raise questions of class and of democratic control which income alone will not solve.

(4) *Police brutality.* In the urban slums, the police do not protect—they are an occupying army, and needless to say an occupying army sooner or later generates a resistance, frequently a violent one. In American circumstances, the sporadic violent revolts—"riots"—are usually fruitless, though they have proved at least embarrassing. But it is not at all clear that the community unions' nonviolent mass demonstrations will be any more effective in controlling police brutality. The most promising ideas have concerned the setting-up of indigenous police forces and patrols to deprive the police of even their remaining shreds of legitimacy. In the deep South, where the situation is even more intense and sharp, some Negro movements have already abandoned non-violence and taken up arms in self-defense. But the future of all these approaches is cloudy, and the issues fester—as middle-class America grows more hysterical and the colonized poor more restive.

(5) *The "war on poverty."* Lyndon Johnson's program is the conjunction of several strands of elite thinking about the poor. In varying degrees, depending on locality, it attempts to channel social protest into relatively harmless channels; to co-opt the natural leadership of the poor; to provide certain elemental services; and, decreasingly, on the part of the more sophisticated and far-sighted elites, to permit the extension of liberalism to its logical boundaries, in order more efficiently to make the poor over into the American image. (3) Almost everywhere, despite the intentions of the better bureaucrats, the "war on poverty" has left untouched the essential problem—that of the overall allocating of resources—while encouraging the forms of participation without its substance. (4) But there has been enough local variation to permit radical organizers different approaches—outright opposition in some instances, wary participation (as gadflies and organizers) in others. As the war goes on and the "war on poverty" delivers less, however, the opportunities for even this alternative will shrink.

What has all this produced and where does it lead? On the one hand, a relatively small number of inexperienced organizers have demonstrated that indigenous, relatively democratic, relatively stable, politically radical community unions of the poor can, in fact, be formed. In the stifling American context, it is no mean achievement to have threatened the thesis (shared alike by social-democrats like Michael Harrington and Marxists who have the classical view of the *lumpenproletariat*) that the poor are too disorganized to come together in their own interests. On the other hand, that thesis still carries considerable weight when applied to poor whites, particularly to the Appalachians and Southerners who have migrated to Northern cities in search of jobs but for whom, unlike the Negro migrants, the city is not (yet) a home for the soul. Among the whites, migrant or not, there is also not the sense of solidarity that suffuses the Negro community. And yet, if JOIN is any indication, it is still possible to develop that sense—slowly and with difficulty, to be sure. We find it possible to dismantle, or at least submerge, the racism and privatism of the poor white by citing the civil rights movement as a model for the effectiveness of united action. Among the poor whites, in varying degrees, there may not be class consciousness in the traditional sense; but there is certainly a *populist* consciousness—of "little people" vs. "big people," poor against rich—which may be compelling enough to overpower even Southern-white racism. This is a tentative judgment and one that requires a great deal more organizing to be firm, (5) but we find some comfort in knowing that the "interracial movement of the poor" is still a live idea.

Some Marxists and others grant all this but are still critical of the community unions, on four grounds: First, they argue that the poor are, numerically, marginal to American society. Second, that really all the poor want is to be middle-class—to send their children to the prestige colleges, live in the suburbs, drive fancy cars, etc. Third, they insist that they have "been through this before," that American history is nothing but a series of rounds of protest after each of which capitalism makes limited material concessions to secure the allegiance of the protesting group. And fourth, that the institutions the poor perceive as oppressive (landlords, welfare, police, etc.) are only marginal to the dominant institutions (the corporate economy interlocked with the military and the Federal government).

Our answers here too are incomplete, like our experience. In the first place, yes, the poor are a minority, though a substantial one. But we believe they are likely to be the main thrust behind any broader movement for radical change—partly because their needs are more crude and insistent, and partly because they seem most insulated from some of the more deadening shibboleths of "the American dream." We believe in coalitions, but in coalitions of equal partners, when the poor are organized well enough to stand as a force to be reckoned with, not shunted aside as quaint but junior objects for others' manipulations. We see and welcome the chance for such alliances in the emergence of organizations of radical doctors, lawyers, and other professionals, as well as some of the less entrenched trade unions. On the second point, we do not deny that middle-class possessions and life-style are attractive to many poor people, but this seems less true than our critics think. The culture of poverty contains much of merit besides the humiliating aspects, and one can organize to strengthen the resistant, communitarian trends. Painfully aware of the pervasiveness of the ethic of individual success in America, we are careful to intertwine structural with material goals, democratic organization with militancy. This may have been tried before, but in an earlier and vastly different America; and we refuse to have history made for us by crude analogy. As for the reputed marginality of slum institutions: it is not a question of which elements of the American system are central and which auxiliary, but a question of which elements are at this point in time most vulnerable to the movement that lies within our means. In fact, the critics who make these points are unable to recommend any more promising direction.

The same is true of some pacifist critics who argue that our first responsibility is to take action directly against the war. I think there is not one of the community organizers who would not agree instantly—if there were any direct strategy commensurate with the urgency of the need. The point is not just to be against the war, but to be effective in stopping it. Here we see no alternative to what we are doing. We are beginning to exert palpable pressure for a redistribution of resources from the military to the civilian sector—pressure, in effect, against the war

on organizing the Poor

which thwarts that redistribution. Some poor people's organizations have already moved into electoral politics, and others plan to. The impact on the base of Democratic Party power might be very great in the next ten years. But in any case, we see no short-cuts to this slow and agonizing process.

It remains to be seen whether a self-conscious national movement will emerge from these scattered beginnings. Given the overpowering need to change America, for everyone's sake, we can only—in the words of a civil rights song—"keep our eyes on the prize," and "hold on."

Footnotes:

- 1 - Negroes constitute 11% of the population, and Negro families, while disproportionately poor, are "only" about 21% of all the poor families in the United States.
- 2 - For example: According to U.S. government figures, in the last quarter of 1965 about four-fifths of all new jobs were directly or indirectly attributed to the war. The question of low wages in some sectors of the economy (migrant farm workers, hospital and laundry workers, many industrial workers in the South, etc.) has recently become the subject of some discussion and activity in the radical student movement. Unfortunately there is no space for any description, let alone analysis.
- 3 - To characterize this last aspect another way: advanced Federal values of modernization through limited concession and assimilation have in some cases been imposed on retrograde local elites, though with declining success.
- 4 - How clever the Administration has been in perverting the meaning of the radical vocabulary is also seen in Henry Cabot Lodge's euphemistic use of "community organization" to describe "pacification" in Vietnam; and in the Peace Corps use of the term to justify attempts to bring Latin American peasants into collaboration with businessmen. To prevent misunderstanding, let me emphasize that numbers of people in both the "war on poverty" and the Peace Corps take our ideas seriously and regard themselves as "radicals," but most of them, after some period of time, are forced to leave, or hamstrung, or end up exhibited as court jesters.
- 5 - SNCC and SDS both have been affirming the importance of organizing poor whites, though SNCC adds that there is no alternative to "black power" as long as poor whites lag behind. Properly, SNCC also insists that the responsibility is that of white radicals, and certainly not enough is being done.

N.Y.U. Sit-in

— by Walter Kelly

New York University is symbolized by its student center — ten stories of arty engineering that effectively block the sun from Washington Square. Inside, cocktail music and "folk" songs play just loud enough to prevent thinking; proto-businessmen at the candy counter refuse to change anything larger than a single; guards tell you not to have your feet (or lie) on the indestructible plastic furniture. Form follows function at this university.

On Wednesday, December 7, I went into the Center to get a campus newspaper and found that a new form of life had been discovered at NYU. President Hester, the day before, had reasonably — unilaterally — announced a tuition increase of \$200 a year and had been answered by a 1000-student demonstration called by the Ad Hoc Committee to Oppose Tuition Increase (Composed of student government, frat, and left-politico types. Most of the radical leaders were from the New Student Union and SDS.) The administration had lost its cool and Dean Whiteman had verbally promised that NYU would open its books to inspection by a student-chosen accountant. But Wednesday morning, President Hester announced the school's real position: there will be a delay in increasing dorm fees and we welcome student cooperation in reducing these expenses. However, it's simply not possible to hold off on raising tuition.

All afternoon the ad hoc committee used a PA system to inform students of the issue, invite them to a meeting Wednesday evening, and call for a boycott of classes on Thursday. That night, 800 people showed up to see a wax-museum illustration of pop-frontism. As with beggar's costumes in *Three Penny Opera*, there were four basic types. The business school student: "The purpose of the boycott is solely to prevent a tuition increase." The student government careerist: "The ad hoc committee should concern itself only with tuition. All other matters can be handled thru the usual constitutional channels." The radical: "The real issue is student power. What's more, we've had no discussion of the relationship of the university to the rest of society." The NSU guys running the show tries to keep attention on money and cut off discussion of

"political" questions: "There's been a lot of discunity here tonight. Let's hear an affirmation of the boycott." Cheers and meeting dismissed.

On Thursday several hundred people picketed and the boycott was 50-80% effective. Signs and PA chatter emphasized the need for a moratorium on tuition increases. Not until the afternoon rally did an NSU person say that "We're going to the meeting (with Hester) to begin a dialogue about student power in this university. That's the issue. We want to be in on the decision before it's made."

At 5:00 P.M., President Hester, followed by ad hoc committee and student government leaders, entered the Center auditorium to reason with a thousand students. Torn between his normal deference and the need for dramatic acting, a government representative almost collapsed as he reported to Hester that "All Square Congress is vehemently opposed to the increase in tuition and to the fact that neither students nor faculty were consulted in the decision."

The President (who resembles Hubert Humphrey) replied: "I want you to understand that NYU welcomes the opportunity to receive suggestions from students . . . there's been a breakdown in communication here which we regret very much. Why didn't we ask the students about raising the tuition? I find this very hard to understand and if you think about it I think you will too ha-ha. The trustees can't relieve themselves of this responsibility. While we welcome consultation . . . there is no responsible basis on which I could ask the student to determine how much tuition will be. This question is nonsense in the philosophical sense."

Constant PA breakdowns (which only began after Hester had finished) turned the response by NSU leaders into an lonesome dialogue. The gist of it was: The administration says it will talk with students in good faith. But "in good faith" doesn't mean you make a decision and then justify it. Hester won't declare a moratorium on tuition increases or let us see NYU's financial records. He's defending his actions in terms of the existing structure — which is what we want to change. And now he's showing his opinion of us by leaving the students who pay 2/3 of the school's expenses to go eat with the

NAC Minutes

NAC Minutes — December 15, 1966

Members present: Greg Calvert, Dee Jacobson, Steve Kindred, Tom Condit, Earl Silbar, Rich Berkowitz.

Members absent: Jean Tepperman, Brent Kramer, Paul Lauter, JOIN.

Others present: Sasha O'Reilly, John and Jean Veneziaie, Thane Croston, Jane Adams.

Agenda: (1) New Left Notes (2) Finance (3) Student Strike (4) REP Report (5) December Conference (6) Office Cars (7) Membership Referendum.

1. New Left Notes. (a) We have acquired a printing press that can print paper measuring 17-1/2 x 22 inches. We will be able to print NLN on it, thus, saving \$100 per week. We will be getting our own composition equipment in March, thus, cutting present NLN costs by 60%. (b) Distribution. We will attempt to place NLN in as many college and public libraries as possible. Attention SDS chapters: it would be helpful if you got your college libraries to subscribe. Subscriptions cost \$5 per year.

2. Finances (a). National Secretary Greg Calvert has proclaimed December as National SDS Fundraising Month. (b) We have acquired the mailing lists of the Adam's Campaign in Massachusetts and of the Greater Illinois Faculty Committee on Viet Nam. A fund-raising mailing will be sent to them. (c) A fund-raising mailing will be sent to the 100 financial supporters of the SANE March on Washington, for the express purpose of raising money to conduct the SDS draft program, by Earl Silbar (SDS Draft Coordinator). In the letter, Silbar will describe the program (as determined by the Clearlake NC). Checks should be sent to SDS Draft Program, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago. (d) We will run a 1/3 page advertisement in the National Guardian next week. (e) John Maher and Mike Ansara will spend some time fund-raising for us in the near future. (f) There is some confusion about what's happening with the New York Parents and Supporters of SDS. Calvert to try to clarify situation. (g) We will attempt to recover a fund-raising pamphlet that was lost during the summer. (h) \$20 granted to Silbar for his expenses at the Cleveland conference as SDS representative. (i). Mechanics for an exchange of ads with Sing Out magazine have started. Berkowitz to negotiate terms. (j) We now have about \$2000 in the bank, but this figure does not merit financial comfort. \$2000 is just a fraction of the projected 1967 budget, and besides, who knows what will happen next week?

3. Student Strike. The Clearlake NC mandated the NO to send an observer to the Planning Conference for a Student Strike in Chicago on December 28 and 29. The NAC has defined the role of the observer as follows: "That observer to student strike conference on 1st day express general re-

alumni that contribute 1/3.

Following the president's departure, discussion led to a split between student government and the ad hoc committee over whether to stage a sit-in. Government kids left to start their own meeting. Eventually, most of the remaining 400 people voted to sit-in in the Main building. But many people were hung-up about the need for a "duly-elected" leadership and NSU leaders spoke about how we "should sit down and talk with one another and get united again." A committee of fourteen — half each from the sit-in and student government — was formed and at 2:00 A.M. we got the news that "Student government will respect our right to sit-in and maintain unity in opposition to the tuition increase."

By noon Friday, it was evident that the government leaders were trying to co-opt the sit-in. In the language of the pop front it was reported that, "The representatives of student government are meeting with Dean Whiteman now to discuss whether or not the 14 man committee we set up last night will take part in negotiations." Late in the afternoon a government person came to announce the result of these discussions: There would be no moratorium but duly elected representatives would consult more frequently with the administration in the future. "You acted in bad faith, man" said Jerry Barnstein (NSU). The sit-in rejected the compromise and adjourned itself until Monday morning.

At the Monday meeting, ad hoc committee leaders asked the 350 people attending to endorse the idea they'd had in mind from

(Continued on page 8)

servations about specific demonstration organizing orientation, about the vague and apolitical content of the alienation motif, about the hurriedly and too frequently planned succession of International Days of Protest. That he express our willingness to cooperate on a program which has a clear political focus of organizing against the draft and the war both on and off campus with a secondary, but clearly stated, position against the 2-S and which has a sufficiently long range perspective to allow the development of real, solid organizing programs which might culminate in a national action. That he relay his impressions of the strike discussions of the 28th for the benefit of the NC discussion on the evening of the 28th and convey any resolution of the NC to the student strike meeting on the 29th." Steve Kindred and Fred Kushner were appointed co-observers and Kindred will be responsible to the NC.

4. REP Report. Calvert has returned from Ann Arbor being very optimistic about REP. He feels that REP is returning into the realm of SDS. REP will present its own report in next week's NLN.

5. December Conference. (a) The NAC had registered its shock at the news of a \$15 registration fee and recommended that it be changed to \$5 to the West Coast committee. Our complaint has been filed and the registration fee has been changed. (b) Travel — Berkowitz has been put on staff for one week to coordinate national travel to the conference.

6. Office Cars. (a) We've got problems. The cars cannot be registered in Illinois without the Massachusetts title and train bill of sale. We do not have the Mass. title. We have received the invoices and they are in Calvert's name. We have received notarized Bill of Sale, but that is not enough. Calvert or a person representing him must get a photostat of the Mass. title. Our first step will be to have Calvert assign Power of Attorney to a Boston SDSer to get photostat. If that doesn't work, Calvert will have to go to Mass. himself and get a copy of the title. (b) Insurance. Business-auto insurance for the two cars will cost \$520 per year. It turned out that business insurance only costs \$7 more than personal insurance, but only persons over 25 will be covered.

7. Membership Referendum. Even though we have reprinted the referendum, the response remains very poor. Because of constitutional inadequacies, the referendum will become official, even though less than a majority of SDSer's bothered to vote. It's not a question of Brown vs. Reagan; it's a question of yes or no. But if you want SDS to initiate a policy or program of national significance without having your voice heard, whether you favor draft resistance or not, then that's your business.

submitted by Rich Berkowitz

CANADA

It is not quite true that applying by mail is better for all persons than applying at the border. This is particularly true on the West Coast, where more people get turned down on the basis of written applications than do in the East.

The synthesis we've worked out is this: Applicants who are highly attractive have smoother sailing on paper but those who (a) have not got a trade, a skill, or have not completed their B.A. degree, and (b) have not got a considerable amount of money, are likely to do better at the border—if they read carefully the supa pamphlet and write to get last minute information on crossing. This information changes all the time, so people should write SUPA Draft Project, 658 Spadina, Toronto 4, Ontario, Canada before coming.

IRONS Loses

SDS member Peter Irons, a graduate student in political sociology at the University of New Hampshire & former coordinator of the SDS chapter there, begins a 3 year sentence for draft refusal this week, having lost his appeal before the Sixth Circuit Federal Court of Appeals by a 2 to 1 margin. Pete is a longtime activist in the peace movement, former Antioch student, and member of the national legislative staff of the United Auto Workers.

Arizona SDS

Yes, there is an Arizona State University chapter of SDS. Up until the last week or two we have not been extremely active, but we have existed for about two years. We have about 30-40 members, and we are making slow but steady progress. Jim Snyder and myself were elected co-chairmen of the chapter. We have held several speeches, (Tom Hayden and Frank Emspak), and staged a very successful sympathy march for the Tempe city employees striking against an inept city management.

SDS is still not an officially recognized group at ASU, but has continued to operate with no trouble at all. Up until last Friday we have had speeches, set up tables, organized rallies and marches with no opposition from the university, but that was until last Friday.

On Friday, the 2nd of December, SDS put up its table, (illegal by university standards), and proceeded to pass out leaflets, etc., including a poem, "i sing of Olaf," (see below - ed.), by e. e. cummings. The dean of students advised us to take the poem off of our table. We stated that we would not, and that we had been passing the poem out for two months, and that we knew that he had knowledge of this during the entire period. The reason seemed to be that the "John Birch" Arizona legislature was on campus. The legislature saw what a rats nest of "subversion" the campus had become and pressured the administration to crack down. At any rate the dean advised us that we would be brought before the disciplinary committee. John Livingston and myself were the only two picked upon as they wished not to recognize the SDS, but to act as if it had only been individual students. The ACLU has been contacted and has agreed to help with the legal end of the question.

Another interesting thing happened that Friday afternoon as the administration was showing the legislature what a model conservative campus ASU was. Joel Korff, an SDS member, but without SDS sponsorship, held a napalm demonstration in front of the library. Joel built a dummy, poured napalm on it, and burnt it to the ground. He wished to show the students the effects of that chemical on women and children in Vietnam. This also tended to make an angry administration furious.

At any rate, SDS has been active these last few days, and more will happen in the next week. We will keep in touch with you on further developments.

Peace and Freedom,
Richard Dillon

i sing of Olaf

i sing of Olaf, glad and big,
whose warmest heart recoiled at war,
a conscientious object-or

his well-beloved colonel (trig
west pointer, most succinctly bred)
took erring Olaf soon in hand,
and - though an host of overjoyed
noncoms (first knocking on the head
him) do through icy waters roll
that helplessness which other stroke
with brushes recently employed
anent this muddy toilet bowl,
while kindred intellects evoke
allegiance per blunt instruments--
Olaf, being to all intents
a corpse and wanting any rag
upon what God unto him gave,
responds, without getting annoyed,
i will not kiss your fucking flag.

straightway the silver bird looked grave
(departing hurriedly to shave)

and though all kinds of officers
(a yearning nation's blue-eyed pride)
their passive prey did kick and curse
until for wear their clarion
voices and boots were much the worse,
and egged the first-class privates on,
his rectum wickedly to tease
by means skillfully applied
bayonets roasted hot with heat--
Olaf, upon what once were knees,
does almost ceaselessly repeat:
there is some shit i will not eat.

our president, being dually notified
of such assertions, threw the yellow
son-of-a-bitch into a dungeon
where he died

christ (of his mercy infinite)
i pray to see; and Olaf, too,
preponderatingly because
unless statistics lie, he was
more brave than me, more blond than you.

e. e. cummings

Publications Received

The November issue of *Sanity* (10 issues for \$2.50 from 3837 St. Lawrence Blvd., Montreal 18, Quebec, Canada) illustrates once more the trend which is making this former organ of the now-defunct Canadian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament one of the best radical papers in North America. The meat of the issue is two long articles on the relation of human beings to society - one ("Men and Supermen") on the crisis of the masculine self-image in today's world, and one ("Women, the Family and Peace") on the changing role of women. The reduction in "peace news" of the old type has turned off many *Sanity* readers, but the new content is increasingly relevant to those interested in serious thinking about the world we live in.

The Student Union for Peace Action's quarterly, *Our Generation* (\$5 per year, same address, unless you prefer "boul. St. Laurent") displays the same seriousness which distinguishes the publications of the Canadian "new left." The November issue concentrates primarily on the problem of Quebec and the necessity of creating a bi-national state in Canada. There is a long editorial analyzing the importance of the struggle for national identity in Quebec, and articles on *Quebecois* history and social classes, the recent elections, and the impact of Catholicism, as well as a selection of poetry in French with English translations. The last third of the magazine is taken up by articles on the Dutch "Provos" and Canadian complicity in Vietnam, plus book reviews. All in all, a fat \$1.25 worth.

While I'm praising things, let me mention two other publications, both put out by the San Francisco SNCC office (449-4th St., San Francisco, Calif. 94103). *The Movement* is a monthly newspaper, carrying news primarily of civil rights and farm labor struggles, with a tertiary emphasis on peace news. The editors are involved in a serious attempt to create a "revolutionary newspaper," which remains seriously concerned with long range goals while building on the

basis of immediate activities. The November issue has a 4-page supplement on "black power" (from which the Malcolm X article in a recent NLN was reprinted), and articles on the DiGiorgio elections, a political street theatre, a 1951 mass execution of Negroes in Virginia, the situation in Watts, community organizations in California and Chicago, and the Berkeley SDS "black power conference". You can get *The Movement* for \$2 per year, or bundles for \$5 per 100.

The *Key List Mailing* (fortnightly, \$10 per year) is important in a different way. It reprints (as the logo says) "documents of current and lasting interest for the civil rights movement." A recent issue has a reprint of Stokeley Carmichael's "What We Want" article from the NY Review of Books, documentation on the Atlanta "riots" and the Bond campaign, and the text of Adam Clayton Powell's "black position paper." Other recent issues have similar timely articles from hostile as well as friendly sources, reports from SNCC field people. The articles are frequently grouped to give several viewpoints on a single topic - recent topics of this sort were agribusiness in California, the Mississippi Child Development Group, Police Review Boards (with a bibliography) and the Harlem schools. Each chapter should get at least one copy of KLM to keep up on what's happening, and not have to rely on the lying commercial press.

There are three papers well worth getting at least one copy of into each chapter. *I.F. Stone's Weekly* (\$5 per year from 5618 Nebraska ave NW, Washington, D.C. 20015) is the best current reference source available for activists. Stone has an unfailing eye for apparently unimportant facts, casual slips at press conferences, and obscure statements with explosive content. His demolition of the State Department white paper on Vietnam was a beautiful example of the kind of thing you can expect in this weekly.

The *National Guardian* (weekly, \$7 per year, 10 issue trial sub for \$1. from 197 E. (Continued on page 8)

our MAN on the DRAFT

Submitted by Earl Silbar

Report on the Cleveland, Nov. 26 meeting
of the Nov. 8 Mobilization Committee

About 120 people from various peace and left groups gathered to evaluate the election time demonstrations and in their light, to plan future actions. (Maybe 6-10 SDS'ers.) The group heard reports from three travelers, Frank Emspak (NCC), Peter Buch (YSA) and Robin Maisel (Ind.-YSA). All three noted a reduction of press coverage, local desires to effectively relate to local electoral, inflation, draft type issues, a shortage of documented literature and a few instances of anti-demonstration feeling. An open discussion period brought out feelings from such diverse experience and political views as Irv Beinen of LEMPA & YAWF, that anti-draft work was or should be just about the first priority of the peace movement. After support from other quarters, Dave Dellinger addressed the conference on his impressions of his recent 19-day visit in the DRV.

Essentially, Dave said that he went with sympathy for their cause and went with a need to actually document and challenge his bias. Speaking of the fight over who they look to ideologically, Dave reported from his conversations with Uncle Ho and others that they primarily depend on the efforts and understanding of their own people, on their strength and will to resist foreign attack in defense of the benefits they derived and saw in NVNese Socialism. Thus, while they recognize the danger that "friendly" Soviet aid may be used as a lever to bring them to negotiate, they have fought without outside help and are prepared to do so again. Dave's feeling was that their ideology

comes from no one's formula but truly from their collective experience and that this experience and that of their brothers in the South leads them to believe that there is absolutely nothing to negotiate except the manner of total U. S. withdrawal.

Dave reported them very surprised that the American left was divided over the differences of Presidential candidates since their relevant experience went back thru hawks and doves, Republicans and Democrats - a single policy of attempted domination of S. E. Asia by America with only tactical differences. Dave reported their feelings as hopeful that we wouldn't expend too much vital energy with "lesser evilism". On the topic of the U. S. peace movement, they showed an accurate understanding of our relative strength (weakness) and didn't expect miracles from us, but were encouraged that we exist, according to Dellinger.

Dave spoke of the effects of the bombings that he witnessed in the DRV. All the evidence supported the argument that U. S. bombings were designed to terrorize the civilian population. Evidence and reports showed a pattern of heavy bombing followed by fragmentation bombs which are only "good" for killing and maiming people, with thousands of tiny steel pieces coming from delayed fuse Lazy Dogs. These catch rescue teams and are followed by machine gun and rocket strafing to "clean up" any survivors in the open. He reported that transportation was relatively slow (9 miles per hour outside Hanoi) but that (thanks largely to the active support of the peasantry in the form of road repairs) roads were rendered passable right after bomb damage. Watching

(Continued on page 8)

CALL for BLACK MOBILIZATION

by Clarence Major
Omaha, Nebraska

I think black power should be useful to black people in the thousands of poverty stricken ghettos of America. Black power could be an answer to a mass problem of hopelessness. And through it Afro-Americans could mobilize and make strong units of each neighborhood toward a collective stronger black community controlled by black people.

When this is accomplished then America will be a better country for everybody, because - for example - the majority's racism would not hamper the black man who is independent, and the racists' guilt for historical and current crimes would be reduced to his own advantage.

The government's civil rights have failed because black people do not have power. How can we get power? It will be necessary for Afro-Americans to draw closer together, work as a group and think as brothers and sisters in areas of social and political concern.

One of the principle things we must overcome is the cancerous effects of having been exploited and psychologically colonized. The way to accomplish this is through grasping what is called black power.

I think a revolutionary consciousness and a sense of nationalism are the quickest answers to the black man's plight in America. No government can give us these qualities - they must be born out of our heart. And they will be. We see signs of their conception already.

I realize that the majority of the so-called Negroes in the civil rights movement are struggling toward the mainstream of America, and have made almost no progress. I believe that one day a great many of these men and women will become disillusioned and will begin to see the light. The black man needs money and the power to fight off aggression.

If the bricks black kids are throwing into windows are driving white business men out of black neighborhoods then it must be time for black business men to answer the cry of their own children by helping now to build a nation wide black business community so that black people might gain more control economically over our own destiny.

Listen to this quote from *The Nation*: "Just what does the white man want? For a century he urged the Negro to stay in his

place; but now when the Negro says, all right, that's just what I'll do, and I'll make it a better place to be - he is called a 'black nationalist' . . . the whites . . . when they complain about black nationalism, they're not complaining about anything new; but now they are tacitly admitting fear of it, and that is new."

And another thing - the downtrodden people of the ghetto see government programs and private do-good groups as simply more tricks and concessions.

A great many of the black intellectuals today have strong black patriotic feelings and believe in a spiritual black nation right here at home. These men will soon reach the heart of the black masses who no longer look to the power structure for justice.

A truly strong black community will enrich American life and whites have nothing to fear from it. In fact, whites would do well to try to understand why black nationalism is necessary.

Civil rights legislation in America seems to be dressed in legal trickery and by this I mean the measures seem not meant to accomplish the goals the people are told they are for. In any case, the Federal Government is becoming so powerful that the nature of America seems to be almost totalitarian. I don't propose to know whether or not this is good; but I do know this: Today it is very difficult to believe anything an American President says and it is also very hard to believe the words from the mouths of other leaders. The only people we have confidence in today are those who are among us, suffering what we suffer.

Finally, I must say that black people are not the only ones who have been betrayed in the land of promise. The country as a whole has betrayed itself in allowing human rights and honesty to die as idealistic goals.

The Chinese nationalist use the phrase AMERICAN IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION to refer to this country's dealings with non-white nations. Some of the most compassionate and objective men in America will admit that there is some truth in the charge that the United States has become very ugly in the world's eye.

And the brutal part of it is the horrible plight of the black man struggling to get into the ugly American mainstream.

I think when the black man establishes his independence in America the country will become truly beautiful for the first time.

16 Plagues

THE SIXTEEN PLAGUES OF PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY AND THEIR INSIDIOUS VARIATIONS. Catalogued by Dr. Vitreous Humor who hath cum to complete this work after the studie of manie a corpse.

(or "Physician, Heal Thyself.")

Surregionalism

Of which the substrains are:

- subway power
- prairie power
- cowboy power
- surfing power
- pussy power
- NO power

The Berkeley Analogy Syndrome

Symptoms: Victim tends to ignore small campuses, rhetoric sometimes resembles that observable in the *Confrontation Syndrome*. Argues for or against a tactic on the basis of that it either happened at Berkeley or failed at Berkeley. In the critical phase the victim reads Lipset. Death is incipient when the victim confuses Hal and Theodore Draper.

Resurrectionism

Of which the substrains are:

- historical resurrectionism; The infected will make counter-productive association with one or more of the following; Wobblies, Hitler, Spanish Civil War, Eleanor Roosevelt, Stokely.
- Part Huranism; Victim will display total ignorance of the contents of the Port Huron Statement.
- Indigenism; Victim clings to a mystical belief that the Truth will be discovered by the unerring actions of the Poor.

Staffele-caucus: An occupational disease for which there is no known cure. The infected will be extremely defensive and display a puzzling tendency to make the implausible plausible.

Cooptanoia

Symptoms: Neurotic compulsion to warn SDS members against going part of the way with RFK.

In-groupism

Symptoms: Writing things like this

Positionism

Symptoms: The victim will always be prevailing upon the body to establish fraternal relations with the Good Witch of the South. If not restrained will try to break into the mimeograph room at 3:00 A.M.

Humorlessness

Symptoms: The afflicted believe that this has a secret political purpose

Luce's Disease

Symptoms: Victim will display a marked ability to hold down a good steady job.

Agendaism: Spread by a virus which is invariably found in the presence of ob-
structuralism.

Anti-agendaism

Symptoms: During the second day of a meeting the afflicted will stand up and ask who the hell wrote this agenda after the agenda debate has closed.

Irreledelicism

Symptom: Victim believes that his opponent in debate has been taking drugs and says so.

Tautologism

Symptoms: Patient believes that, if given enough time, the people will decide on an ideology for SDS.

REPatitis

Symptoms: Patient believes that we can get McGeorge Bundy in the movement if we would only write more grant proposals for the Ford Foundation.

Corporate Literalism

Symptoms: Characterized by careful scrutiny of all National Office statements except fund appeals.

Theoretical Literalism

Symptoms: Patient is continuously searching the Media for a Message. To be found at the Flying Saucers Workshop.

REP PAGE

"sixty minute hate"

by Steven Johnson
REP Staff

On December 16, NBC television carried a special documentary called "Thailand, Our New Front". The enemy of course is communism. The game is war. The Thailand front is the scene of a massive buildup in military equipment and supplies. And the documentary was an overt example of using a news story to carry a heavily loaded propaganda line.

The "news" interviewer asks the Foreign Minister of Thailand what he thinks of controversy in the U. S. surrounding the U. S. military buildup in Thailand. "It is very difficult for Congressmen who have never set foot in our country and for professors who stay in their ivory towers to understand the threat we face." This is the gist of the Foreign Minister's answer, spoken in good English. Written by the State Department? Quite possibly.

The "news" interviewer also reports to his television audience that Asia is torn by a heritage of ancient feuds. The Cambodians hate the Thais and the Vietnamese. The Thais hate the Cambodians. The Vietnamese hate the Cambodians. - How irrelevant these feuds, the documentary assures us, when they should be united against the common enemy of communist aggression.

The United States, obviously more far-sighted than the neutral Cambodians, has shipped in enough supplies of some kinds to serve a U. S. army contingent of 100,000 men. But other supplies are needed. A heavy construction program is under way, turning the heretofore temporary "Friendship Base" into a permanent military base in Thailand. New dock facilities are being built in order to relieve congestion in shipments of ammunition, jet fuel, and building equipment.

The Thai, of course, are a free people, the documentary assures its audience. Their constitution has been suspended for seven years, they have had no elections, and they are ruled by a king. But they "seem to like it that way" and they have the good sense to recognize that America is their friend.

(Continued on page 8)

Following a severe drain on South African reserves in 1960 after the debacle at Sharpeville, more than \$100 million was raised or renewed for South Africa. In addition to these loans and credits, the South African government was forced to take measures to cut imports and deny repatriation of capital to foreign countries. At one point the gold reserves dropped below the \$2.8 million mark despite these checks, although eventually the protective policies and credit extended by the International Monetary Fund and private individuals and institutions had their effect and the South African economy again revived and made a tremendous comeback. Between 1962 and 1964 the revival reached boom proportions, and only in 1965 has the boom begun to slacken.



CHASE MANHATTAN BANK

The far-flung offices affiliated with Chase Manhattan Bank now total 142 and are located in 28 countries of the world. Five of these are found in Africa: one each in Lagos, Nigeria, and Monrovia, Liberia, and three in the Republic of South Africa.

Chase Manhattan opened Chase Manhattan (South Africa) Ltd. in 1959, as a wholly-owned subsidiary of Chase Manhattan Overseas Banking Corporation, which is a subsidiary of Chase Manhattan Bank in New York. There are now three branches in South Africa with the main office in Johannesburg. Total liabilities to the public as of May, 1961, were \$3.28 million and by October, 1964, had climbed to \$16.8 million.

Loans to South Africa:

1. July, 1959: CMB granted a \$10 million loan to the South African government, a three-year loan at 5%.
2. July, 1959: CMB(So. Africa) Ltd. granted a revolving credit of \$8.5 million to the Industrial Development Corporation. The money was to be used to finance industrial development by private enterprises.
3. December, 1959: 11 banks in the US (including Chase Manhattan) made arrangements with the government of South Africa for a revolving credit of \$40 million for a two-year period, the money most likely to be used to buy transport facilities in the U. S. The arrangements were made through Dillon Read & Co., Inc. and superseded a \$20 million loan which would have expired in January, 1960.
4. 1961 and 1963: Renewals of the 1959 \$40 million revolving credit with the 11 U. S. banks reported; again negotiations were made through Dillon Read & Co., Inc.

REP financial report to National Council

The following figures are taken from the report submitted to the IRS as part of REP's request for status as an educational tax-exempt organization. The reporting period for this report was July 14 through November 30, 1966.

RECEIPTS

Small contributions (prior to July 14) (16 items)	\$ 389.00
Small contributions (July 14-Nov. 30) (146 items)	1528.96
Large contributions (7 items)	641.47
Anonymous contributions (2 items)	1200.00
Book advance from Doubleday	512.00
Literature sales	70.00
Pre-publication advance for CAW	35.00
Total Receipts	\$6376.43

EXPENDITURES

Printing of prospectus	\$ 731.00
Other printing	626.00
Office equipment and furniture	164.44
Office supplies	364.32
Office rent	450.00
Project House Rent for summer,	
Weissman, Goldfields	650.00
Office Telephone	93.09
Shipping Costs	174.30
Postage	461.00
Mailing Services	45.00
Travel	260.70
Salaries:	
Evelyn Goldfield	375.00
Michael Goldfield	375.00
Stephan Weissman	78.94
James Jacobs	90.00
Peter Henig	135.00
Michael Locker	60.00
Barry Bluestone	125.00
Jerry Badanes	120.00
Total for Salaries	1358.94
Miscellaneous	135.50
Total Expenditures	\$5514.37

MERRY CHRISTMAS

FROM THE STAFF OF THE

NATIONAL OFFICE

REP

ERAP PROJECTS

our MAN on the DRAFT

such repairs and talking with villagers who had been attacked as well as Hanoi residents who expected their capital to be leveled, Dave judged that the effect of the bombings has been to increase the desire of the people to resist such enemies.

Another point was that while in Hanoi, they listened to reports of a great U. S. victory in SVN over the Voice of America. Apparently this was a big joke, because when he mentioned it to Ho Chi Minh, Ho almost bust a gut laughing. They said that just the opposite was true and that NLF forces had crippled practically a whole U. S. division. Dave made a note of the division and when he returned Stateside he saw a N. Y. Times story that the division commander had been replaced. He told this story while relating their conviction that the liberation forces were winning.

Putting together all of this lead him to believe that the Vietnamese, North and South, were determined to fight on, were strategically confident, and had the active support of the masses, on whom the leadership was solidly based.

Now the meat of the Conference began, for its Steering Committee had drawn up a proposal to sponsor mass marches on San Francisco and New York City in mid-April. Somewhat surprisingly (at least to a veteran of NCC Steering Committee and Convention fights), the Socialist Workers Party and the CP were both for the proposal. The major argument of the SWP was: that mobilizations build local areas by forcing people to expend efforts to bring in new people to make the effort a success and that the anti-war movement needed a large, visible show of opposition for its own morale. The CP representative argued that mass mobilizations were: effective ways to get national and therefore local visibility, that they were particularly important in 1967 (since it precedes and influences the 1968 Presidential election), and that they were an effective means of influencing mass organizations in this country (like AFL-CIO and the Democratic Party).

Possibly an even more improbable combination spoke in opposition to the proposal. Hugh Fowler, national secretary of DuBois Clubs, spoke against it on the grounds that such a national effort would necessarily detract from community organizing, which is their primary focus since they have failed to develop a college base outside the Northeast. Speaking of the need to build around people's problems where they live, Fowler

stuck to his guns. Paul Booth spoke against the proposed mobilization on the grounds that it would detract from vital local electoral work. Beinen challenged the evidence to support the defenders' contention that anything like 500,000 would turn out or that they would get sufficient media coverage to make an impact on anyone who didn't attend and reminded those assembled that all reported experience pointed to just the opposite conclusions. Bob Parker of Oberlin SDS and I formed the other corner of this unlikely crew when we spoke in opposition. We argued that while demonstrations are not necessarily bad, they only have meaning insofar as they are the visible expression of local organizing, that a national mobilization would take limited energy and money away from such work on the campus, with trade union groups, housewives, prospective draft resisters, etc. I argued that mobilizing to "influence mass organizations" was a questionable political action and should be thoroughly debated, that many people had a different perspective than the CP on the nature of the Democratic Party and didn't care to expend our limited efforts trying to "influence" capitalist parties. I also felt it necessary to challenge the Cow Palace and the UN building as the proposed points of concentration.

The proposal was adopted by those present, 90-16. They agreed to continue the previous forms wherein signatures of individual sponsors are the basis of the Steering Committee. A.J. Muste, the chairman and four elected vice-chairmen. While the Stoney Brook (N.Y.) and possibly other SDS reps voted for it, and I certainly didn't vote or speak as the official voice of SDS, I think that we should carefully examine the Committee's Call when it comes out. We should seriously question whether such a "movement" can begin to deal with the necessity of building local bases, independent of establishment institutions and leadership. I do not propose that we oppose or necessarily ignore such a Call, but that we establish our own priorities and programs, attempt to make them go, develop our own politics, and cooperate whenever such cooperation doesn't interfere with our resource allocation. Ironically enough, organizing local bases capable of struggling with oppression and preparing for "the long haul" was everyone's password from which their vote and arguments were quite divorced. For most there, their rhetoric diverged sharply from their acts. For us too?

"sixty minute hate"

And, lo, a captured "terrorist" is interviewed. Through an interpreter, we discover that he has been especially trained in Hanoi, along with 130 other Thais, in the techniques of subversion and terrorism. He is infiltrated to North Vietnam and infiltrated back to Thailand by the communist Pathet Lao, the narrator of the documentary tells us in a voice heavy with menace.

And so now we know, because an NBC documentary has told us, that the most significant political forces now operating in Southeast Asia are communist subversion, communist terrorism, communist aggression. "The people of Asia" need our help in "fighting communism".

The message is simple, powerful, and loaded. It gives a handle on reality to the average guy. And the average guy, ahistorical to the core, has no intellectual immunity against this crap. Insulated all our lives against confrontations with reality that might give us an actual understanding of historical processes and historical change, it is only by accident student radicals have discovered that "America's stand against communist aggression is a slogan that steadily twists the truth and loads the facts."

In television land, they have an equivalent to Agent 007 and his "license to kill". It is the "license to lie". When television tells lies in the interests of the public and the interests of national security, no court has jurisdiction, no law touches them, and no voice protests that the spirit of justice has been violated.

How does a radical individual get at the emotional underpinnings of a documentary like "Thailand, Our New Front"? The basic message is that "Communist China is our enemy". A student has a distinct advantage if he knows the history of U. S. - China

relations.

An example. In early '950, the U. S. State Department was begrudgingly saying to itself that the U. S. would have to recognize the new communist regime in China. Then in June, 1950, North Korea attacks South Korea. Truman sends MacArthur in. Within three months the troops behind MacArthur have pushed the North Korean army back to the 38th parallel. "Shall I drive to the Yalu?" MacArthur in effect asks Truman. Go ahead, the reply.

Following this decision, four fifths of the casualties of the Korean war. This was the decision that brought China into the hostilities, which led to the UN resolution denouncing China as an aggressor, and which assured the foreign policy victory of the pro-Chiang China Lobby in the U.S.

NBC may say that China is the enemy, but there is a history behind this claim that NBC does not reveal to us. In the realm of public opinion, the "China is our enemy" view has great legitimacy. And if we student radicals do not know the history behind this, we are helpless in the face of public opinion. But when we can argue from history, no matter who we are, we have a deeper legitimacy than any hour-long television documentary or any Pentagon spiel. Our fellow students and the public in general, who will not listen to abstract ideology, will I think listen to us when we are willing to discuss questions with them on the basis of the historical record.

Thailand is not the only front. For us student radicals, those history books on our library shelves and in our bookstores are the only place we can go for the weapons we need to tear about the fabricated justifications by which the public media are steadily promoting Pax Americana.

N.Y.U. sit-in

the beginning: the creation of a tri-partite commission composed equally of student, faculty, and administration representatives which would be "empowered to initiate, review, amend, abridge, and abrogate all policy affecting the university community (e.g. tuition, curriculum, use of funds, and university services)" This was approved by a good majority of those present.

Mass meetings are scheduled for Wednesday and Friday of this week in the Main building corridor. Leaders will meet with Hester on Friday. It's possible that another sit-in will take place to protest NYU's refusal to consider these meetings as binding negotiations rather than just discussions. About the only things clear right now are that the university will not agree to a moratorium or accept the tri-partite commission proposal as long as it includes the word "abrogate". So far the most obvious effect of the sit-in has been a change in the thinking of the 2-300 active participants. Thursday evening many students were troubled about the split with "duly elected" leaders. Monday, there was great applause when an NSU person said: "Hester started talking about responsible leadership and I told him that there were more people sitting on the floor of the Main building right now than ever voted in a student government election" Similarly, if you asked people about student power on Thursday many responded, "But what do we know about choosing faculty?" Monday they voted for the tripartite commission.

What about the rest of the 40,000 NYU students? Convassing has been going on in the dorms but few kids are residents. So the main source of information for students has been the ashes and oatmeal Washington Square Journal. While the Journal supported the original boycott, its post-sit-in coverage has been largely irrelevant-factual minutiae and reprints of student government resolutions. Editorially, it has opposed the students having power "since it is obvious that they cannot take the obligation of meeting the university payroll and paying its bills, they cannot have the privilege of setting fee rates... the leaders of the sit-in spoke as if paranoid about the alleged treachery of student government."

The leaders of the ad hoc committee are almost all leftists - members of the New Student Union and SDS. Yet they deliberately avoided identifying themselves as such and kept things strictly within the planned boycott-to-tripartite-commission trajectory. So what's the connection between tuition increased, the First National Bank on NYU property and the war research being done by the engineering department. Members of NSU are active in protests against all three and could have told us.

Maybe sticking to a single issue was a good tactic at first. But by Thursday nite there were 200 people sitting on the floor of Main and no sense "speaking thru the windows" because everybody else was home asleep. An NSU person took out an SDS paper on Who Controls the Board of Trustees, decided against reading from it and shaved the paper back in his pocket. Pop-frontism at its most absurd.

Perhaps the true potential of the NYU sit-in was indicated by somebody Friday morning while he was talking over the PA about how we had used the library tables for beds: "If we sit here long enough maybe we'll find out what this building should really be used for."

NEW LEFT NOTES
Room 205
1608 W. Madison
Chicago, Ill. 60612
Return Requested

Publications Received

4th st., NYC 10009) gives more of a "news-paper" style coverage of the peace and civil rights movements, and has important recent articles on SDS and "student power".

Finally, *Peace News* (trial 8 week airmail sub \$), from 5 Caledonia rd., London N1, UK) has a fantastic record of 30 years continuous publication, during much of which time it has been the only public organ of the American peace movement as well as the British. It gives a broad coverage of the international antiwar movement from a radical pacifist position.

The *Seattle Group Mailing* #29 & 30 (irregular for voluntary contributions, 1815 18th ave., Seattle, Washington 98122) contains a 2-part article on the "fish-in" movement and the fight for Indian treaty rights by two Indian militants.

The *Bulletin of International Socialism* (fortnightly, 50¢ for 10-issue introductory sub to 339 Lafayette st, rm. 305, NYC 10012) has switched from mimeoed to tabloid newspaper format. The Dec. 5 issue covers the threat of anti-strike legislation, the CCNY ranking referendum, labor news, the part-European trotskyist demonstration in Liege, and a faction fight in the Minnesota Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

The *November Labour Worker* (monthly, \$1.50 per year from Fred Lindop, 8 Malvern rd., London E8, UK) has articles attacking the wage freeze and Wilson's deal with Rhodesia, dealing with the threat to the British working class of "redeployment", and commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Hungarian revolution.

The *November Speak Out* (5 issues for \$1 from Facing Reality, 14131 Woodward ave., Detroit, Michigan 48203; write for free samples) has a short commemorative on the Hungarian revolution, and longer articles on the student movement in Mexico, the independence of Guyana, and mass aesthetics, as well as some notes on the role of Louis Fraina (Lewis Corey) in American socialist history by Paul Buhle.

The Oct. 15th *Freedom* (\$3 per year, \$1.50 for 6 months, from 17a Maxwell rd., London SW6, UK) contains a fierce set of anarchist denunciations of the Labour party, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the Communists, Scotland Yard, and assorted other bureaucratic institutions.

Finally, the Nov. 28th issue of *The Rag* (11 issues for \$1.50 from 2506 Nueces, Austin, Texas), that Sterling Organ of Texas SDSishness, smashes censorship, Alabama justice, motorcyclists who don't wear helmets, public "education," mortuaries, TV, LBJ, fish, and the minds of unwary readers. Beware it. Read it.

- Tom Condit

THOSE WHO TAKE THE MEAT FROM THE TABLE

Teach contentment.
Those for whom the taxes are destined
Demand sacrifice.
Those who eat their fill speak to the hungry
Of wonderful times to come.
Those who lead the country into the abyss
Call ruling too difficult
For ordinary men.

- Bertolt Brecht

sds, 1608 w madison, chicago, ill 60612

(This is the text of SDS's first agitprop sticker, available on gummed paper - 100 for \$1. Be the first to bring poetry to the people in your neighborhood!)

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