

# NEW LEFT NOTES

SDS · 1608 W · MADISON · CHICAGO · ILL.

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 20

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

MAY 22, 1967

## Cleveland Erupts project needs staff

In recent months national news media have publicized the growing crisis in Cleveland. During the last 3 years that SDS has been organizing in poor communities here, we have felt the need to have people who share our values and our politics living here and engaging in other kinds of work. But it is only within the last few months, when enough has changed so that we feel the possibility of actually building something, that we have begun trying actively to recruit people to come to live and work in Cleveland.

### CLEVELAND IS A CITY THAT IS ERUPTING

Within the black community there has been continuous and growing violence, some organized, some sheerly chaotic. Looting and firebombing have increased: within the last 3 weeks there have been 25 "reported" incidents of vandalism against Eastside (Negro) schools.

The breach is growing between the so-called "responsible" Negro and white leadership, and the poor and powerless whose unorganized cry for decent housing, employment, welfare, and education goes unheeded. The growing anarchy in the city has been met with increasingly repressive measures. The current plans are to call in the National Guard, while Negro and white City Councilmen alike announce that "the only good hoodlum is a dead one," and the city should "shoot 'em dead."

### WHY DOES THE CITY RESPOND THIS WAY?

City Hall: It is totally inept in meeting any of the needs of a racially torn and impoverished urban center. Recently, for example, the federal government cut off

all urban renewal funds until the city proves it has the competence to complete a program. City Hall also exercises virtually no control over important city agencies. As a result, departments like police and housing operate autonomously.

**Business Community:** There is no "enlightened" or "liberal" business community which is even interested in offering meaningful solutions to inter-city problems.

**Intellectual Community:** The liberal intellectuals at the Western Reserve - Case Institute of Technology center have refused to become involved in the affairs of the inner city, although recent attempts to expand this educational complex may result in increased concern and involvement by both students and faculty.

**Labor:** The local labor movement is uninterested in city and state politics and is very bread-and-butter oriented. However, there have been a series of local insurgent strikes recently, as well as some attempts to organize previously unorganized workers such as hospital workers. This area seems ripe for organizing.

**Clergy:** There is no strong liberal Negro church leadership. There are a number of fine white clergymen who have a deep interest in and commitment to changing Cleveland.

### WHAT IS HAPPENING?

So far, the picture we've painted is very grim.

But the other side of the picture is that we see the city as really wide open. There is enough flux and enough action so that there is room for many people to come work in a variety of ways, to have influence on whatever may happen.

There are a number of small, but growing, exciting things happening:

\*\*A Council of Churches-sponsored Headstart program with 13 centers is organizing parents in several areas around issues of education, recreation, and medical care, and has recently formed a city-wide group.

\*\*The Welfare Grievance Committee, mostly mothers on welfare, is beginning to expand in new areas of the city by organizing local committees.

\*\*The Inter-City Medical Research Committee is mounting a campaign against a hospital which discriminates against Negroes, and is challenging medical services in the city that discriminate against poor people.

\*\*Tenant council organization in public housing projects is growing.

\*\*A group of young, militant black guys have been organizing . . . though it's too early to predict the effect and direction of their work.

In addition, the Council of Churches is trying to spearhead Negro mass organization within the city, although no definite steps have been taken in this direction yet.

Most of the action in Cleveland has been on the East side (Negro). There have also been some people working both around education (through Headstart) and urban renewal on the West side (white).

There are several other things which deserve mention:

\*\*There is draft organizing, mostly on the campus, but moving towards a city-wide focus.

\*\*There has been some campus organization (SDS, peace groups) although the level of activity has varied a lot.

\*\*Two liberal church-related groups are developing programs for suburban communities.

### WHAT IS NEEDED?

In addition to working with any of the above groups, we need:

\*\*Teachers: for public schools or for Headstart, to relate to parent organizing around education; and possibly for an independent community school.

\*\*Caseworkers: to organize the growing number of sympathetic people within the Welfare Department, and to relate to the Welfare Grievance Committee.

\*\*Lawyers: to help build up a Legal Aid program which has excellent leadership and a great need for competent staff.

\*\*Labor organizers: to work in a field that is wide

(Continued on page 8)

## National Guardian Now Run By Staff

Reprinted in large part from the  
National Guardian, May 6, 1967

"With the resignation April 29 of Editor James Aronson, the National Guardian becomes 'an independent radical newsweekly' wholly owned and cooperatively produced by its staff." Previously, the National Guardian was a "progressive weekly" which printed news and commentary on the Left in America for a readership of about 28,000. The change was precipitated by a continuing discussion by the staff of the question "What is a radical newspaper in the United States today?". The staff was concerned that the paper had been reluctant and slow to respond dynamically to the increasing activity of the movement for social change in the U. S. Differences between the staff and editor Aronson arose partly over their perception of the current Left movement, and therefore how a radical newspaper should relate to that activity.

In his statement of resignation addressed to the staff, Aronson said: "I cannot agree that the Guardian is in a crisis...that is, that the Left is growing, but the Guardian is not. On the contrary, I believe that the Guardian's prestige remains remarkably high at a time when the Left still shows little sign of maturing in any meaningful fashion. I am sure that it one day will; but it is not happening yet."

"The staff view is that the Guardian's effectiveness in this period depends in large measure on the paper's editorial relevance to the growing American anti-war, student, freedom, and ghetto movements. The Guardian intends to raise and seek answers to the issues they face, give on-the-spot information about their activities, discuss the social and cultural developments that concern them, report and analyze frankly events and questions that affect radicals throughout the world."

### GUARDIAN HISTORY

A statement from the Guardian in the first issue under the new system of production (May 6, Page 2) stated: "The Guardian was born during the presidential candidacy of Henry A. Wallace on the Progressive Party ticket. Its first battle was an expose of the trial and convictions of six young Negroes known as the Trenton Six on a murder charge. It covered another battle, the Peekskill riot that developed around Paul Robeson's concert appearance there, from the ground and from the air. It analyzed the 'suicidal' concept of preventive war directed against the Soviet Union; showed how trade with the new China could result in more than a million new jobs here; gave its readers some handy do's and don'ts for dealing with FBI agents.

"As hopes for the immediate realization of post-World War II peace, freedom, or abundance faded, the Guardian became a voice of protest. It continued its involvement in independent politics: its general manager ran twice for New York governor on an American Labor Party ticket led, in 1950, by the

(Continued on page 8)

## view from the cove SDS and SSOC

Nik Levin (Gainesville, Florida)

In the midst of the beautiful mountains and streams of North Carolina sits Buckeye Cove, the perfect spot for a student convention. Perfect because there are such wonderful places to go while boring discussions and meetings are carried on. Despite the many temptations, however, the Southern Student Organizing Committee (SSOC) folk from all over the South, plus a few Northern infiltrators, were able to stick together and pass a whole mess of resolutions and programs that envision something beyond a white SNCC and a Southern SDS.

The agenda of the convention, which was designed to talk about the structure of SSOC and its relationship to other Left organizations, provided for a full morning of speakers from Progressive Labor, the Young Socialist Alliance, the DuBois Clubs, and SDS. Except for Mike James (of JOIN SDS), the speakers were received politely, with only isolated heckling. James, after a ramblin' speech about SDS activities in the North, institutes for organizers, and resistance to imperialism, received an ovation and a series of questions on SDS's relationship to the South.

The argument was made that the South has unique problems and a unique constituency, and so needs different analysis and different programs to bring about radical change. In addition, the different objective conditions cause the level of awareness to be different, and so the South requires a different style and rhetoric than the North. Mike said that this would have to be empirically demonstrated for him to accept it, and that he was inclined to believe that the industrialization and urbanization of the South would soon make most differences between North and South irrelevant. He added, however, that it was not important to him that SSOC be absorbed by SDS. He felt we were the same kind of people and only wanted to see radical movement—not necessarily the same organization—in the South. There was general consensus that SSOC should work closely with SDS, especially on internal education, but no further structural or formal ties with SDS were seriously discussed at the convention.

(Continued on page 6)

TOWARD A THEORY OF SOCIAL CHANGE  
IN AMERICA p. 3

REPLIES TO THE NEW YORK  
TIMES p. 2

~ Nihilism ~  
THIS IS  
COMING INSIDE SOON  
AND ISSUE  
SDS

REVIEW OF CONTAINMENT  
AND CHANGE p. 5

RADICALS IN THE  
PROFESSIONS CONFERENCE p. 7

## NEW LEFT NOTES

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 W. Madison St., Chicago, Ill. 60612, except July and August, when publication is bi-weekly. Phone (312) 666-3874. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Illinois. Subscriptions: \$1 a year for members, \$10 a year for non-members. Signed articles are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the editor, Cathy Wilkerson.

## STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Nick Egleson, president; Carl Davidson, vice-president; Greg Calvert, national secretary  
National Office: 1608 W. Madison St., Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612, (312) 666-3874  
New York City: 49 W. 27th St., New York, N. Y. 10001, (212) 889-5793  
Niagara Regional Coordinating Committee: PO Box 57-31, River Campus Station, Rochester, N. Y.  
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif., (415) 362-7922  
Southern California: PO Box 85396, Los Angeles, Calif.  
New England: 39 Lee St., Apt. 3A, Cambridge, Mass.

# SUMMER IN THE GHETTO

HOT OR COOL?

WILL GHETTO PROBLEMS

BE KNOCKED OUT WITH CRACKED SKULLS?

BOUGHT OFF WITH FEDERAL FUNDS?

OR ANSWERED WITH AN EMERGENT

## GHETTO POWER

IN ITS ISSUE OF MAY '67

THE INDEPENDENT, RADICAL NEWSWEEKLY

# NATIONAL GUARDIAN

BRINGS ON THE SPOT REPORTS AND AN

ANALYSIS OF THE AREAS WHERE THERE

MAY BE TROUBLE THIS SUMMER.

FREE COPY OF THIS ISSUE AVAILABLE

WITH EACH

10-WEEK SUBSCRIPTION ENTERED NOW FOR \$1.00.

Write: National Guardian, 197 East 4 Street,

New York, N. Y. 10009

# Response to the Sensational Press: Divide and Rule

The following is a brief summary of the New York Times article: Today's New Left, Amid Frustration and Factionalism, Turns Towards Radicalism and Direct Action: "The New Left Turns to Mood of Violence in Place of Protest", by Paul Hoffman (May 7, p. 1). The article is long (11 9-inch columns) and discursive, so this report will try to convey the mood.

Hoffman builds history around the dual theme of violence and factionalism, dealing with attitudes (expressed by brief quotes out of context) rather than action: the rhetoric tends towards Time magazine rather than the New York Times.

The first paragraph reads: "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment," said the national secretary of the left-wing Students for a Democratic Society, Gregory Calvert, one day recently. "We are actively organizing sedition," he said.... The threat of violence in his words characterizes the current radicalization of the New Left.

"A maze of factions with a penchant for verbosity and a hankering for action, the New Left wants emphatically to be different from the old left...."

Hoffman speaks of the New Left identification with Che Guevara, but then moves back to the theme of violence: "The New Left's current infatuation with direct action". The quotes he uses show not an infatuation with violence, but an understanding of the causes of rebellion and of the human and moral

## SDS NATIONAL SECRETARY

The front page of the Sunday, May 7, edition of the New York Times carried two stories side-by-side — "Rifle Club Urges Antiriot Posses" and "The New Left Turns To Mood of Violence in Place of Protest" — plus an editorial, "The Spirit of Lawlessness." The following day the Times published another story, "Trends of the New Left Alarm Intellectuals of 'Old Left' at Conference Here." The juxtaposition of these items could hardly have been accidental. Clearly the intention was to raise the spectre of violence on the part of the "radical" movement in order to advance the "liberal" cause. The whole effort was expressive of the irresponsibility of the liberal press and its willingness to use "scare" tactics, "extremist" baiting, and distortion of its own purpose.

The question of "guerrilla" forces was raised in my office when I walked in one afternoon to find Paul Hofman talking with SDS assistant national secretary Dee Jacobsen. Hofman explained that he was traveling around the country gathering material for a major article on the New Left. Conversation quickly moved to topics beyond the frontiers of the U.S. Hofman talked at length about his experiences in Cuba when he was the Times Havana correspondent. I asked him about Che Guevara. He talked for several minutes about Che, describing his last public appearance in Havana. Che was, apparently, very tired and quite discouraged, especially by what he had observed in the Soviet Union. "When a regime begins to offer material incentives, rather than moral incentives, to the people, it is no longer revolutionary," said Che, according to Hofman. I asked him for his personal impressions of Che: "The purest of the pure," was his reply. Hofman expressed his belief that Che was dead — a belief based on what he called "circumstantial evidence" and, incidentally, controverted by the recent story in the Times. I replied with the often repeated phrase: "Even if Che is dead, he still lives in the hearts of the people."

Hofman asked whether I could be called a "Guevarite." I said "No" — that I did not believe such a term would mean much to people. I added, however, that I felt that young Americans who worked for the radical transformation of this society were similar in many respects to guerrilla organizers in the Third World. They both work against tremendous odds and with severely limited resources; their effectiveness depends on winning the respect and support of their constituencies; their enemy is the same, whether in the ghetto, the university, or in a peasant society — aggressive, expansive American capitalism which uses human and material resources of the earth for creative rather than exploitive ends.

We talked for a while about the decentralist and radically democratic faith of the New Left with its slogan of "participatory democracy." Hofman said, "you should like my Spanish anarchist friends, always insisting on workers control," and went on to describe what he knew of the Spanish freedom movement.

The attempt to use that conversation in order to paint the New Left as a terroristic movement places the Times in the worst tradition of yellow journalism. Even TIME magazine gave a fairer portrayal in its recent essay on "The New Radicals." To raise the spectre of violence is to fail to deal seriously with the problems which the New Left, the new radicals, are trying to confront: the problems of a growing American Imperialism and militarism which oppresses peoples abroad and increases poverty, social injustice, and powerlessness at home.

When I argue that the liberal analysis is wrong, that

dilemmas involved. However, the connecting text twists the content of the quotes.

He then discusses some of the history of SDS (non-exclusion of Communists, ghetto organizing, and the current leadership of "prairie guys"), the condition of the National Office ("headquarters" — "drab orderliness"), the composition of its members, and SDS activities, such as "assisting young men to evade military duty" and organizing "draft resistance unions".

Hoffman goes on to describe splits within SDS and the left. He depicts the current leadership as being "romantic and out of touch with reality", and speaks of "infiltrators from the pro-Peking Progressive Labor Party (gaining) control of at least one SDS chapter in Chicago". "Other New Left moderates suggested that the verbal militancy in SDS headquarters might mask an inferiority complex vis-a-vis Negro racists who had already made up their minds that violence was necessary to attain black power".

The reporter mentions that the Justice Department is "following closely the activities of some of these groups'...". He further implicates the New Left as being a "potential threat to public order...in areas where racial disorders this summer are feared...."

The last section of the article gives "A more sanguine assessment of the New Left's political possibilities", in a discussion of electoral politics, NCNP, the King-Spock candidacy, and the Mobilizations.

Dear Sirs: SDS NATIONAL PRESIDENT  
(letter to the NYTimes)

Paul Hofman's article (New Mood of Violence.... Sunday, May 7, 1967, p. 1) gives an inaccurate picture of the current mood of the New Left. This year I have travelled to over sixty chapters of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) the major New Left group cited by Mr. Hofman. I found less violence in those places than the violence to truth committed by Mr. Hofman in his article.

No individual speaks for the New Left, or for SDS. That goes equally for Mr. Calvert and myself. Chapters of SDS have complete local autonomy; they do what they want whether or not the national organization has passed a policy statement. National Officers speak for the organization only when they communicate to the press the substance of programs passed by the National Convention of the National (executive) Council. No SDS national program calls for violence. Mr. Hofman makes his first mistake with his implication of official spokesmen.

Had Mr. Hofman thought to report what SDS or the New Left is doing, instead of reporting what he could get some members to say, his picture would have been markedly different. From my travels I gather that almost every one of the more than two hundred SDS chapters has demonstrated for peace. In addition they have held teach-ins, conferences, and seminars on the war, because they maintain that the university exists to educate citizens capable of constructive criticism of both government and society, many chapters have acted to get greater separation of campus from both government and war machine. Chapters have uncovered and removed secret and germ warfare research projects. They have challenged the accuracy of propaganda distributed by armed forces recruiters. On several campuses they have abolished ranking for the Selective Service System. Still other chapters have worked to abolish the draft, and to resist it. Most chapters have fought for increased student control of those aspects of the university which affect mainly students. This they have done out of a belief that one can learn to make collective decisions (as citizens are supposed to do in a democracy) only by beginning to make them.

I find this picture quite at variance with Mr. Hofman's report, which conjures up only nightmares of molotov cocktails. (Continued on page 8)

the problem is not in Vietnam or the Dominican Republic or Guatemala, but is deeply rooted in America, I also argue that the problem must be met with a "radical," not a liberal solution. Radical implies "getting to the roots of the problem." Radical does not mean "conspiratorial violence." I believe that killing is wrong as strongly as does Che Guevara, who wrote: "Killing is evil... All countries are different and progress should be achieved by peaceful means whenever possible." I also live in what is rapidly becoming the most violent society in the history of mankind. Though I oppose and will continue to oppose with my whole weight the use of repressive force, while it is used to maintain men in bondage. I also support the right of men to fight for their own liberation. That is not because I believe in or advocate violence, but because I believe that men should be free to determine the course of their own lives and that they must struggle together to eliminate the bases of the violence which oppresses them.

And although I speak and spoke only for myself, I believe that my feelings are much closer to the spirit of the New Left than the scarecrow caricature of it in the New York Times.

# TOWARD A THEORY OF SOCIAL CHANGE IN AMERICA

The following paper is the first of three position papers for the National Convention. The other two will appear in next week's issue of New Left Notes.

This essay is a condensation of a 120-page paper already completed. As such, it provides only a sketch of an overview of American society. We hope to publish the full paper in the fall.

Robert Gottlieb  
Gerry Tenney  
David Gilbert

## CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH

Corporate wealth lies at the heart of control and power in American capitalism. This wealth is immense and growing at a tremendous rate; from 1960 to 1965 corporate profits increased from \$27 billion to \$45 billion. It is concentrated in a small number of huge corporations: about 1% of all manufacturing corporations account for almost 90% of all net profits, while the remaining 99% get only 10% of the total (1). These mega-corporations involve the key control areas of the economy. Within them, a small group of men, through concentration of stock ownership, control the decisions affecting and directing the American economy. These men, through interlocking directorates, coordinate corporate interests and facilitate the multi-dimensional control of the corporations over all aspects of American life.

## COMMUNICATIONS

Communications, including education, is a key to power in a stable society, since it is a means through which ideology is formed and reinforced. There has been a tremendous trend recently toward centralization in this field. "The boundaries between the different forms of mass communications are breaking down.... As things stand now, television-set makers publish books, magazine publishers own TV stations, and educational research organizations and book publishers own schools." (2) And the Defense Department invariably has contracts with at least one firm in such a chain. Universities also are becoming increasingly dependent on the government, particularly the Defense Department; and even individual professors must keep their inquiries "safe" in order to get research grants.

Large-scale commercialism thus becomes the major force in communications. Advertisement, culture, and news get blurred together; mass sell avoids the controversial and the inciteful; education is primarily socialization; social science becomes hyper-empiricism. A dominant notion of "responsible" news, "popular" culture, and "worthwhile" scholarship develops out of this confluence of interests. Thus the ruling class controls the terms and assumptions under which social questions are perceived and discussed.

However, modern technology is opening up the possibility of reaching large audiences with low capital investment. Such technological advances as laser beams and miniaturization allow a real potential for decentralized communications, in which previously marginal groups, e.g. SNCC and SDS, could creatively participate, and thus receive a more equitable hearing. But within the current socio-political context, bureaucratic control will probably be used to prevent such decentralization; decentralized control over the means and content of communications will occur only as part of a larger political process.

## A NOTE ON MASS SOCIETY AND THE ALIENATION OF LABOR

Capitalism subjects society to the service of private accumulation in the form of individual consumption and taste. It extends itself into every sphere of public and private life: work, leisure, the home, schools, news, and even human relationships. Capitalism defines and creates the type of personality that can accept and perform the activities most beneficial to the system, i.e., the passive consumer. The other side of Marx's dictum of 19th century capitalist society—accumulate! accumulate!—now holds true—consume! consume! consume! The passive consumer is none other than the "mass individual" manipulated, brutalized, and addicted to the needs of capitalism: production for production's sake and the manipulation of society into a state of compulsive consumption, all to meet the needs

of profit and accumulation.

The other aspect of the mass individual, as Marcuse has brilliantly analyzed, is the debilitation of all forms of critical thought. Whether in the world of intellectuals and scholarship, or in our general activity generated by leisure time consumption, capitalism allows only for an acceptance of the assumptions of the system; critical examination of the system and exploration of the potential for change and liberation cannot be encompassed within this restricted framework.

Social manipulation, tied to the needs of consumption, essentially develops the need to escape and hides the social character of the production of those needs. The need to escape in leisure time, as most critics of mass society forget to point out, is the need to escape from the pressures of industrial organizations and from work in general. This escape is a distraction from the very nature of the need itself; alienated labor equals, in capitalist society, alienated existence. To escape into the consumption of leisure time, i.e. to distract from alienated labor, does not let men question the basis of the system itself, the capitalist control of the means of production and thereby of the quality of one's life. "Capitalism civilizes consumption and leisure to avoid having to civilize social relations, productive and work relationships. Alienating men in their work, it is better equipt to alienate them as consumers; and conversely, it alienates them as consumers the better to alienate them at work." (3)

## POLITICS

"Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." — J. F. K.

Politics in American society involves the creation of an American public; at the same time, it involves the impotence of such a public and its disenfranchisement. The formally elected centers of power, the President, Congress, and state officials, are the backbone of a political system of representation which wishes to call itself democratic. An abstracted American public casts votes at various periodic intervals on the range of policies and decisions which are impossible to reduce to one set of attitudes, but are primarily embodied in specific individuals.

With the introduction of all-encompassing media techniques sophisticated and rationalized by technological growth, the imposition of party labels which have become symbolic of only the vaguest kinds of ideological values and attitudes, and the growth of a Cold War emphasis on political program which has even further circumscribed the range of ideological division, this American public has become completely removed from feeling even the smallest direct share in the government of its affairs. Politics in America seems far removed from the presentation of coherent political program. Elections are increasingly tied to campaign costs, effective advertising techniques—to the extent that advertising concerns are becoming the *sine qua non* of political electioneering—and, in general, the professionalization of politics in its every aspect. This political model of democracy is lauded as the most notable and impressive distinction between the American forms of government and those of the socialist or Third World (Democracy vs. Communism).

Consensus, for the most part, comes out of the accepted range of ideological beliefs and values. The private (corporate) control over the means of production, the narrow base of decision-making power, and the priorities involved in the allocation of resources are all assumed and accepted in the political (parliamentary) context. In the national Congress, especially since 1948, maximum consensus has been reached in the area of anti-communism, both domestically and externally, in defense spending, space expenditures, and finally, in the capitalist or non-socialist character of the American ideology.

However, a liberal-conservative dispute exists in the U. S. The U. S. has only recently begun to set out on the rationalizing and integrating routes toward neo-capitalism, a capitalism that has found its expression in Western Europe. Western Europe has achieved this form of capitalism primarily because of the presence of a strong left-wing labor movement, the shattering experience of World War II, and the rise of a technically competent elite.

The liberal-conservative dispute in this country concerns the development of neo-capitalism. In foreign policy the beginnings of this struggle primarily concern disarmament-arms control mechanisms and accommodation with the Soviet Union. In domestic policy debate

centers around social legislation (social welfare services and the extension of the public sector).

The politics of American capitalism, then, is essentially one of consensus and dispute; consensus that delineates the area of confrontation, and dispute that develops only within the limitations of the capitalist system.

## IMPERIALISM

### The Structure of U. S. Imperialism

The extreme anti-communism of the American ideology is maintained because of the need to keep the countries of the Third World within the world-wide market system and division of labor dominated by American interests. The structure of U. S. imperialism involves a complex set of relationships with the Third World.

Gross figures may be misleading as to the economic importance of the Third World for American capitalism, for while only "between nine and ten per cent of all the durable good produced in the United States is sold abroad... these sales provide the margin between profit and loss for a large segment of American industries." (4) Also, foreign sales include output resulting from direct and indirect U. S. investment abroad. Thus, total foreign sales come to ca. \$110 billion, or about 40% of the \$280 billion output of total domestic movable goods. (5) Foreign investment, with its wide market outlet, returns profits at a higher rate than domestic investment; and in both sales and profits, the foreign sector is growing much more rapidly than the domestic.

To see U. S. imperialism at work, foreign investment figures must be broken down. Between 1950 and 1965, direct U. S. investments in Europe and Canada totaled \$14.9 billion; in the rest of the world, \$9.0 billion. But income on this capital transferred to the U. S. was \$11.4 billion from Europe and Canada, \$25.6 billion from the rest of the world! (6) Similarly, the U. S. maintains a very favorable balance of trade with the Third World countries. We are becoming increasingly dependent on them for our import of raw materials, so important that there are "27 strategic imports... without which our industrial economy would collapse." (7) At the same time, our "over-production" economy needs to export manufactured goods, and the Third World provides the greatest potential market, provided its consumption rate increases faster than its industrial productivity.

U. S. foreign aid is arranged to meet this need. 90% of such aid is tied to the export of U. S. products; 70% of the "liberal" Alliance for Progress aid is in the form of loans. (8) Most foreign aid is used to purchase military equipment, and military expenditure provides a tremendous stimulus to our economy.

### The Conflict of Interests

The interests and needs of the Third World conflict with those of American corporate capitalism in many ways. The Third World countries need to generate capital through foreign exchange, while the U. S. wants, and through its control of the world market gets, raw materials at favorable prices. In countries where there are large foreign investments, the profit from these is taken out, rather than being used to meet the needs for balance and integration in the economies of these countries. The U. S. effectively prohibits meaningful land reform in countries where American corporations hold large areas. The U. S. opposes such industrialization as would compete with American exports; however, it will sometimes invest in manufacturing when that will be useful for controlling local markets in accordance with the interests of U. S. capital. A rise in the standard of living in the Third World, especially the development of a wealth elite, provides a larger market for American goods. Finally, military expenditures in the Third World both provide a market for U. S. exports and drain off capital that could otherwise be used for economic development within those countries. At the same time such expenditures strengthen a military elite favorable to U. S. interests. Given this conflict of interests, Third World revolution becomes the only real alternative and thus threatens U. S. economic stability.

American foreign policy has dealt with this conflict of interests in many different ways, from C. I. A.-led coups (Iran, 1953; Guatemala, 1954) to "exiles"

(Continued on page 4)

# Toward a Theory

(Continued from page 3)

invasion (Cuba, 1961) to outright U. S. military invasion (Vietnam, Dominican Republic). The conflict is expressed through close C. I. A. contact with reactionary elements (Indonesia), or simply through the widespread knowledge of right-wing elements that certain policies will be rewarded by the U. S. (a significant factor in the eleven coups in Africa in the past three years). Imperialism does not always take the form of overt military action; it frequently assumes more subtle and potentially more rational forms (economic control, Chile; establishment of liberal anti-communist labor unions with C. I. A. money, British Guiana, France).

American capitalism offers the rhetoric of revolution and the reality of blood. Domestically, American capitalism offers the rhetoric of the free individual and welfare for all and the reality of corporate control, socially compulsive though unnecessary labor, and a permanent under-class. This situation exists in a society with the greatest potential for human liberation in history.

## How Long Can This Go On?

Will the U. S. be able to avoid more costly imperialist wars? The factors working against revolutionary challenges to the U. S. include the following: 1) the creation within the Third World countries by the U. S. of intermediary elites, especially well-financed military establishments, to oppose revolutionary movements; 2) more sophisticated counter-insurgency techniques; 3) greater flexibility of U. S. capitalism through limited aid and more investment in manufacturing in these countries; and 4) the threat of U. S. military intervention.

On the other hand, population is increasing as fast as or faster than food production in the Third World. (9) The economic growth is just keeping pace with the population growth, both ca. 2.1%, a growth rate only half that enjoyed by the industrialized nations. (10) At the same time, improved communications are heightening the Third World's perception of Western wealth. And the socialist countries provide relatively appealing alternatives, both in the example of China's economic development and in the more favorable terms of their foreign aid.

If the U. S. can avoid future Vietnams, the economy will be strengthened, and a transition to neo-capitalism will become possible. If not, however, the U. S. will be faced with serious economic problems.

## POST-SCARCITY

### The Surplus

The problem of the surplus describes one of the most important crucial contradictions within capitalist society. Its importance can be seen by breaking down surplus into two parts, actual and potential surplus. Actual economic surplus is "the difference between society's actual current output and its actual current consumption." Potential economic surplus is "the difference between the output that could be produced given natural and technological environment with the help of employable productive resources, and what might be regarded as essential consumption." These concepts of actual surplus and potential surplus differ in that the former deals with only that part of the surplus that has been accumulated. It does not include the consumption of the capitalist class, administrative government spending, the military, advertising, unemployment and underemployment, or misemployment of productive resources.

The concept of potential surplus contains the ability to transcend the categories and to see the degradation and cost of human lives in this society, by looking from what is to what can be. This is the first step toward working out a real alternative to contemporary society.

### The Quantity-Quality Gap

The ever-increasing G. N. P. of the U. S. is not evidence of a constant rise in the quality of life under American capitalism. On the other side of waste consumption lie the concrete human needs unfulfilled by this society. One major reason for this is that approximately 2/3 of our prime technical research talent goes into high-paid, specialized, military-oriented work. "The ability of a society to enlarge its capacity for money spending must be differentiated from limitations on a number of people with special talents." (12) At the same time, the government allocates far more money to defense, far less to fulfilling human needs. Health, education, welfare,

housing, and community development expenditures accounted for 42.5% of the federal budget in 1939, 7% in 1965. (13)

This richest country on earth has six tons T.N.T. equivalent deliverable nuclear explosive power for every person on earth; it can "afford" the war in Vietnam; it spends \$15 billion a year on advertising and employs countless other techniques to absorb the surplus. But basic human needs are not met. If we could calculate the death and injury caused by inadequate medical care and research; air pollution and cigarettes; substandard housing and food; lack of needed safety devices, especially on automobiles; and socially produced violence, we might find that a large percentage of present deaths and injuries are socially unnecessary. Thus American capitalism, which has stabilized itself at the expense of the impoverishment of the Third World, proves even domestically to be a violent system.

### Post-Scarcity

To discuss the concept of post-scarcity is to discuss, in the profoundest sense, the liberation of men and the creation of a socialist society. In Marx, the concept of socialism and human history develops out of the liberating potential of industrial wealth. Men have always been engaged in a struggle to control nature and transcend the conditions of subsistence; nature limits men's capacity to create their own conditions of fulfillment and to control their own lives. These conditions are always modified by the permanence of history: men make history, but only under the circumstances handed down and defined by history.

With the advent of capitalism and the industrial order, man took the first step toward technological control over nature. But overcoming the problem of scarcity still involved the long process of rationalization of technological growth. This process is impossible under capitalism, which is based on man's exploitation of man and which aims for accumulation and profit, rather than for the total fulfillment of human needs. In a capitalist system of production surplus is squandered to meet the needs of compulsive consumption and profit maximization; the condition of post-scarcity can be created only through the use of available potential surplus. The technical development needed for a post-scarcity condition may be achieved, but the political, social, and economic reality of corporate capitalism precludes the realization of this potential.

Waste production takes its most irrational form in military expenditure, which at the same time creates ideological values and social aspirations contradictory to the fulfillment of social needs and individual potentiality. The creation and production of the means of violence has no place in a society that has realized post-scarcity. As Engels once said, "In a socialist society, violence would be relegated to the museum of antiquity."

A related problem is that realization of post-scarcity can develop only when the inter-national, as well as the national, division of labor and inequitable distribution of wealth are abolished. As long as U. S. imperialism keeps the people of the Third World in poverty and starvation, as long as there is poverty amid affluence, nationally or inter-nationally, post-scarcity cannot be achieved.

Post-scarcity is participatory democracy as the *modus vivendi* of societal organization and interaction. It frees men from the needs of centralized organizational imperatives, the real embodiment of a decentralized society. This, of course, contradicts the political and economic needs of contemporary corporate capitalism, thus laying the groundwork for a critique of that society. This critique comes through in the demands of the new left for control, participation, and decentralization; a new left that could become the true children of Marx by fulfilling his vision of a society

...when the enslaving subordination of the division of labor, and with it the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; when labor is no longer merely a means of life, but has become life's principal need; when the productive forces have also increased with all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of cooperative wealth flow more abundantly—only then will it be possible to completely transcend the narrow outlook of bourgeois right, and only then will society be able to inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. (14)

## TECHNOLOGY AND THE LABOR FORCE

Modern American capitalism is characterized by rapid technological change, with scientific knowledge growing at a logarithmic rate. The current stage of automation has caused neither the much-feared mass unemployment nor the total elimination of unskilled jobs. Actually there tends to be a polarization of job skills, as automation creates both more skilled jobs involving the supervising of a complex system of machines and very boring jobs of simply tending and feeding machines. These newly-created unskilled jobs, however, are not keeping up with the elimination of unskilled jobs. Further, as technology provides the potential to move from automation to cybernation (i.e. the joining of physical and mental equipment into a system of production) many of these unskilled feeding and tending jobs can be eliminated.

Technological extension of man's mental capabilities will tend to eliminate many clerical jobs, and the rate of increase of such jobs has already slowed down. Clerical jobs that remain will probably be low-paid work, increasingly tied to machines, resembling factory conditions. However, as technology increases productivity, the problems of absorbing the surplus with non-productive consumers and of asserting bureaucratic control over a society with increasing potential for decentralization would imply the need for more clerical jobs. This tension will probably be resolved by a slight relative decline in clerical workers manning an ever more comprehensive bureaucracy with the personnel slack picked up in service, sales, promotions, and other non-productive areas.

The growth of technology also greatly increases the demand for scientists, engineers, and professionals. The following figures, comparing the composition of the (white) labor force in 1950 and 1965, provides a general indication of the trends: (15)

| OCCUPATION GROUP  | % LABOR FORCE |      |
|---|---------------|------|
|   | 1950          | 1965 |
| Laborers  | 5.0           | 4.5  |
| Operatives  | 20.6          | 18.2 |
| (a total decline of semi- and unskilled jobs from 25.6% to 22.7%) |               |      |
| Craftsmen and foremen   | 13.7          | 13.5 |
| Clerical  | 13.8          | 16.3 |
| Sales   | 6.9           | 7.1  |
| Non-household service   | 6.9           | 8.7  |
| (middle sector white collar has grown from 27.6% to 32.1%)        |               |      |
| Professional and technical  | 8.0           | 13.0 |
| (the sector with the fastest rate of growth)                      |               |      |
| (other groups: farm, managerial, private household)               |               |      |

A change that will affect the entire labor force will be increased educational requirements. The general trend already outlined is toward an increase in jobs that require high degrees of education and training. However, educational requirements will apply even to unskilled workers. Since new technological developments can unpredictably eliminate such jobs, these workers will need a great deal of flexibility. Further, managers seem to understand the value of the socialization process that occurs in schools and therefore want workers with high school education for even the simplest jobs. Thus, unskilled and clerical workers will be increasingly more "educated" to obtain increasingly simple and unchallenging jobs. This problem will be just one aspect of increased alienation as workers become further and further removed from their products. In sum, the overwhelming tendency is toward an increasingly more educated labor force, with the most educated (technical and professional) becoming the most essential to the productive process.

## CENTRALIZATION AND PLANNING

Technology is one of the factors influencing further centralization of control in American society. The best

# of Social Change

example of this process can be found in our earlier section on communications: just as past technological developments linked makers of electrical equipment (R.C.A.) with radio and television (N.B.C.), current developments lead to a merger with education and publishing (Random House). And, of course, these are all linked up with the technological vanguard industry, defense contracts (R.C.A.). Technological breakthroughs will continue to link up diverse industries. Further, rapid technological change provides an additional incentive for management to achieve control over diverse industries since it is possible for any single industry to become technologically obsolete. This consideration is behind the development of such a complex as Textron which actually includes 40 different companies, from men's perfume to helicopters. Technological change also increases the incentive to control more diverse possibilities of material supplies and market outlets.

The problem of centralization of control does not result simply from diversification by large corporations. Another crucial factor is the so-called managerial revolution. Given the current situation, where 75% of corporate capital is internally generated (reinvested capital) (16) while close to 1/4 of corporation stock is held by bank-administered personal funds (17), the overwhelming percentage of investment decisions are made by managers who do not necessarily own the capital they employ.

These new managers, of course, do not fulfill their idealization as "non-statist civil servants" since they still operate out of the profit motive, both because their salaries are tied to profit levels and because they themselves are likely to be stockholders. Nevertheless, the partial separation between ownership and control has profound implications.

The internal financing of the corporations, the larger percentage of managed stock funds, and the fragmentation of outside stock ownership (the "democracy of the stock market") provide the new managers with immensely increased power. Since stock funds invest in a range of companies, since large corporations are diversifying through mergers, since managers buy stock in other companies, the new managers have interlocking interests throughout a continually wider range of the economy. This new multi-dimensional control implies a shift in the locus of power away from narrow, sectional interests to men who will be more concerned with the long-range stability of the system as a whole.

This change in the perspective of the key men of power provides the base for a potentially much more rational and flexible capitalism. The logical extension of a rational and flexible capitalism is a planned economy and a welfare state. The neo-capitalist countries of Western Europe have already taken this path (best described in Andrew Shonfield's Modern Capitalism).

Despite possibly protracted political conflicts, the United States is moving in this direction. Counter-cyclical government spending is now generally accepted, while greater planning within the private sector is indicated by new groups such as the National Planning Association.

The U. S., of course, is more involved in imperialist ventures than Western Europe and as such Defense spending has served as a substitute for other forms of public investment. Defense spending not only sustains demand but also provides research and development funds essential to maintaining the dominant world market position of U. S. corporations in the crucial area of highly advanced producer goods. Further, the technical rationality and coherent planning Robert McNamara has brought to the Defense Department, America's largest enterprise, has been imposed on all related corporations, the most dynamic in the economy.

## AGENCY AND CHANGE

Change in modern America must come from a protracted and prolonged struggle. Conflict arises out of the degree of consciousness which each social group develops with regard to its practical collective experience.

The rapid technological development and the increased economic integration that characterize modern America serve only to intensify the primary contradiction of this collective experience within Capitalism: the contradiction between the increasingly socialized means of production and the anti-social relations and uses of production. Concretely, as the productivity of workers increases, so does the uselessness and wastefulness of their work; as technical competence increases, so does the remoteness of the control and

definition over the work process. Consumption also becomes a sphere of exploitation as the means of life become manipulated and controlled ends of life become necessary to the economic maintenance of the system.

In America, work and consumption are alienated from the worker and consumer: alienated from the purpose, use, and direction of labor and free time. Work and leisure become things-in-themselves in which no creative satisfaction can develop.

Social divisions which lead to conflict are class divisions. The two generalized classes are those that perform the work necessary for economic growth and social development and those that control such growth and development. Class can be defined as the social relations of control or non-control over production as well as over the quality of one's life.

In America, four main classes are identifiable; a ruling class, petty bourgeoisie, a working class (which can be broken down into three main sectors: new working class, middle sector, and traditional working class), and finally the poor or underclass.

## THE NEW WORKING CLASS

Although we can broadly define the working class as those who neither control nor own the means of production, but sell their labor time, any analysis for social change must take into account the differences within the working class itself. These differences should not be seen in terms of statistical differentiation of wealth, but rather in terms of various groups' relations to the means of production. For example, in the emerging industrial capitalism of the 19th century the industrial proletariat was at the vital center of production. However, with the advent of advanced industrial capitalism which increasingly relies on technological inroads and processes, a new kind of worker has become key to this production: namely, the highly skilled or technical worker.

Concretely, an automated, technized plant can function without the traditional industrial worker, but not without the technical worker. A recent strike at an oil plant at Port Arthur, Texas was broken because

the non-striking technical workers ran the plant at 80% of capacity for more than a year.

The need to train such workers makes higher education structurally crucial to the functioning of the system. Therefore, in addition to technical workers, teachers—who alone comprise 3 million members of the working force—have become indispensable in their capacity of producing the commodity of labor power. It is these two groups, the teachers and the highly skilled technical workers, that constitute a "new working class".

The new working class is best able to comprehend the total processes of production, yet it is still subject to the control of managers and owners, government and corporate bureaucrats. The new working class achieves increasing rates of productivity only to have that product appropriated for increasingly wasteful and destructive purposes. The automotive engineer, controlled and directed according to the requirements of corporate profit, must employ his productive skills to develop a product that will become more rapidly outmoded and dysfunctional. The teacher finds activity directed toward discipline and training rather than toward the creative development of individuals. This is labor in its most alienated form, for not only is the product appropriated through external control, but so too is the self-conception and life-activity of the worker.

Radicalism has emerged within these groups in Western Europe, where working conditions are not so different from those in the United States. One of the first groups to introduce the concept of workers' control in England was the technicians union (ASSET). In France, West Germany, and Italy the petro-chemical and metallurgical unions are in the forefront of the formulation of demands for control.

One of the reasons for the present non-radical nature of the technical and highly skilled workers in the U. S. is a particular structural feature of American capitalism: 2/3 of our technical personnel are connected with the military. This situation leads to a short-run identification with the system even though it heightens the

(Continued on page 6)

# Containment and Change

## — a review

by Neil Buckley

CONTAINMENT AND CHANGE, by Carl Oglesby and Richard Shaull. Macmillan, New York, New York, 1967. 248 pages. \$5.95 hardback; \$1.45 paperback.

Containment and Change, composed of two essays which are rather loosely connected, is the first analytical statement on politics and motivation from the New Left to appear in book form. Carl Oglesby's "Vietnam Crucible" is brilliant in political awareness and analytical method and written with a clarity that only a poet with a developed political sensitivity could sustain. Richard Shaull's "Revolution: Heritage and Contemporary Option" is less brilliant and written in the traditional difficult style of theologians.

Some people argue that the war in Vietnam is only one more attempt by America to limit the advancement of communism—in this case China—into the Western world. Further, some argue that after the War is "completed" there probably will be other Vietnams—the wars now underway in Guatemala, Peru, Bolivia, Brazil and other South American nations—that will require a massive American presence to halt and destroy. Yet Carl Oglesby, former president of Students for a Democratic Society, argues that "the Vietnam war is a revelatory Cold War crisis, and the Cold War itself is a terminal crisis of Western identity. It is not really the East that the West encounters in Vietnam; it meets itself." A seemingly strange thesis, on the surface.

In the first chapter of his essay Oglesby easily dismisses the Washington rationale for being in Vietnam—"These reasons are so bad there must be other reasons"—and arrives at the conclusion that "If the Chinese did control Hanoi and...the/NLF/, that the situation in Vietnam would look exactly as it does." "China is the threat," Oglesby writes, "not because she is in Vietnam, but because she isn't." Again, a seemingly strange thesis.

Both points depend heavily on an analysis of the Cold War and what the true function of the continued confrontation of America and Russia, and now China, is.

Traditionally America has been an expansionist power; from the time of Turner's pioneer to Teddy Roosevelt America has pursued both an inter- and intra-continental policy of expansion. At the end of WWII, America—the Strong faced across Europe the military power of the Red Army and the potential economic power of a reindustrialized Russia. Both powers had their eyes on Europe as a source of trade and capital investment. But since both could not have Europe, and since both realized that a war over Europe would be ultimately destructive for both, America created the Cold War. The prospect of a highly industrialized and therefore competitive Russia distressed America; she had to saddle Russia with problems until American interests could be solidified in Europe (through the Marshall Plan, NATO, etc.); further, by making Russia the keeper of satellites, America could force Russia to assume a "responsible role" in world affairs, to make a stable peace through confrontation, to buy time for each to feel out the other and establish lines of communication, and to share in the economic benefits of their respective spheres of influence. Because of this, Russia would become a stable community bent not on the export of revolution but on the export of the products of her industry. This has become a reality.

When China became a world power after the 1949 revolution, she was not considering the assumption of a "responsible role" of a good citizen of the world; further, attempts by the West to force China into a responsible role have failed utterly. China has no interest in forming a stable satellite system as the Russians did but in fomenting the Revolution throughout the Third World. It is apparent, however, that China does not control either Hanoi or the NLF; yet it is "essential, in the name of peace," Oglesby writes, "for China to commit the expansionist crime of which she stands accused" by directly controlling the economic and military situations in the sphere of influence which America has designated for Chinese control.

Thus, argues Oglesby, the containment of Russia and the attempted containment of China, although

(Continued on page 7)

# Social Change

(Continued from page 5)

long-range contradiction between the workers' highly productive capabilities and their anti-social uses. This contradiction will become particularly acute through the political and economic dislocations caused by the disintegrating U. S. imperialist role, but it will be the basis for radical organizing only if the left can articulate real alternatives to destruction production.

## THE NEW WORKING CLASS AND STUDENTS

The major area of radical consciousness related to the new working class is the development of the new student left. The tremendous expansion of higher education is related to the need to train (both technically and socially) people for the new crucial jobs in the economy. The student is a human commodity in the factory of the university. But unlike a car, students are not inert objects. The student rebellion stems from a variety of factors, primarily developing out of the manipulative training of students to fit them into American society. Students perceiving both the productive potential of society, and the social uselessness of the jobs for which they're being trained, are alienated from a system that offers no socially meaningful work. The organizing of students on the campus around the questions of student control, the draft, and the universities' servicing of the military can develop a radical consciousness concerning the role and nature of their future work positions. The starting point for radical consciousness is the sense of student powerlessness revealed by these functions of the university.

There are several problems in realizing the radical potential of the new working class: 1) the need for the new left to articulate a class critique of society relevant to the work and consumption situation of workers, 2) the need to avoid the dangers of reformism inherent in such an economically comfortable stratum, 3) the need for the new working class to relate to and identify with other sectors in situations of non-control over production and the quality of life.

The issue of control contains the potential for linking the disparate elements of the working class as well as the underclass. In the previously mentioned Port Arthur strike the practicality of an alliance between the industrial worker and the technical worker is obvious. In a school situation, a movement based on teacher-community control of the educational system is clearly in the self interest of the groups involved; both have an interest in smaller classes, more individual help, better facilities, and more money to education.

The new working class, because of its central role in advanced industrial capitalism, can become central to radical politics, in an alliance with the traditional workers, students, and the underclass, unified around radical demands for decentralized control. We can begin to build the movement for a socialist America where "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

## THE TRADITIONAL WORKING CLASS

The traditional working class has become tied, through the media of its bureaucratic organization, the A.F.L.-C.I.O., to the ideological mainstream of American society. However, the same lack of control,

powerlessness, and degrading life-styles apply to them as well as to everyone else exploited in a class society. Also, new factors have been added. In the last six years there has been an absolute rise (in quantity and by percentage) in the number of industrial strikes (18) and in wildcat strikes in particular. While statistics on the nature of the strikes do not point to any one single trend, factors of job security, plant reorganization, and non-wage benefits—i.e., those concerning the control over one's livelihood—are becoming increasingly important. The major distinction between wage disputes and disputes concerning claims for security and control must be understood.

Wage claims are much more frequently motivated by rebellion against working conditions than by a revolt against the economic burden of exploitation borne by labour. They express a demand for as much money as possible to pay for the life wasted, the time lost, the freedom alienated, in working under these conditions. The workers insist on being paid as much as possible, not because they put wages (money and what it can buy) above everything else but because trade union action being what it is at present workers can fight the employer only for the price of their labour, not for control of the conditions and content of their work. (19)

The absolute increase in the number of strikes plus the introduction of non-wage claims that could lead to the demands of control are a significantly important dimension in the direction of the traditional working class. These strikes are also tied to the rate of the introduction of automation, which is directly tied to the control of one's work experience.

Certain groups within the working class are receiving higher levels of technical training. But greater technical responsibility has not been matched by any kind of control over the conditions to which the worker is subjected. "He (the worker) is responsible for his work, but he is not master of the conditions under which he works. The company demands that he show imagination in his job and that he submit passively to the discipline and standards prescribed by the management." (20) This is the central contradiction in the nature of work in contemporary society; also, this can lead to the creation of radical demands for control, demands that can link the working class with the most economically deprived group, the underclass, as well as with the new working class.

## THE UNDERCLASS

The underclass roughly refers to two groups: the blacks and other racial minorities, and the permanently unemployed and under-employed. That which unites the class as a whole is its deprivation—economic, political, social, and cultural. The underclass, as the most deprived class in America, is one of the centers of radicalism in this country and has been the first to bring forth demands for control and radical change. Since the underclass is still removed from the sources of power—the centers of production—it can by itself be at most only a disruptionist force. An alliance of the underclass with the working class, with the radical demand of control as the unifying factor, is required.

## footnotes

1. David Michaels, "Monopoly in the United States," *Monthly Review*, April, 1966, p. 48.

2. *Forbes*, Jan. 1, 1967, p. 118.

3. Andre Gorz, "Work and Consumption," (from *Strategie Ouvriere et la Neo-Capitalisme*) in Perry Anderson, ed., *Toward Socialism*, p. 349.

4. Rockefeller Panel Reports, *Prospect for America*, p. 202.

5. Harry Magdoff, "Economic Aspects of U. S. Imperialism," *Monthly Review*, Nov., 1966, pp. 14-15.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 39.

7. Cited in Edie Black, "A New Look Into U. S. Investments in Latin America," *Christianity and Revolution*, Nov., 1966.

8. David Horowitz, "The Alliance for Progress," in Ralph Miliband and John Saville, eds., *The Socialist Register*, 1964, pp. 130, 138.

9. *The New York Times*, Jan. 20, 1967.

10. Seymour Melman, *Our Depleted Society*, pp. 250-253.

11. Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy, *Monopoly Capital*, pp. 22-23.

12. Melman, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

13. *Ibid.*

14. Karl Marx, *The Critique of the Gotha Program*.

15. U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the U. S.*, 1966, p. 229.

16. John Scanlon, "How Much Should A Corporation Earn?" *Harvard Business Review*, Jan.-Feb., 1967.

17. David Bazelon, *The Paper Economy*, p. 341.

18. *Herald Tribune*, *The U. S. Book of Facts, Statistics and Information*, pp. 249-251.

19. Gorz, *op. cit.*, p. 319.

20. Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*.

# SSOC conf.

(Continued from page 1)

There was a change in the agenda for the rest of the convention, and instead of discussing SSOC as an organization it was decided that programs would be proposed and discussed with the statements by the other Left organizations kept in mind. Tom Gardner (who was later elected chairman) initiated a series of proposals on anti-war and anti-draft activity on the campuses which were passed unanimously. The proposals would link SSOC up with the Vietnam Summer, initiate Southern anti-war groups, coordinate draft objection, and sponsor caravans of peace agitators to tour Southern states. Cooperation and co-sponsorship with the Southern Conference on Education when possible was encouraged.

One of the most controversial proposals (at least in terms of how much of its resources SSOC should invest) was the Southern Labor Action Movement (SLAM). The proposal called for a \$100-a-week commitment by SSOC for the support of a "free-wheelin' revolutionary band of organizers" who would attempt to "organize the unorganized, support wildcat strikes, take jabs at the AFL-CIA, and try to involve students in radical new-unionist organizing with workers' control as object". The idea was romantic, the rhetoric Wobbly-like, the cost ridiculous (over half of SSOC's remaining budget), and most of the old-timers and fund-raisers opposed it (on financial grounds). It passed.

SSOC has a big year ahead. If it fails to build up its campus-based membership, it might as well fold and become a weak region of SDS. The question is whether it can build up its base without a social-action movement—besides peace—to relate to. SLAM people claim that SDS grew out of Friends of SNCC, and that since we no longer have a civil rights movement, SSOC must create the new movement before it can grow with it. Campus organizers urge that the crucial issue is the War, and that we must relate to our constituent students "where they're at"—the university and the induction center—in combatting American imperialism. Many SSOCers undoubtedly feel that both are essential and in fact are interdependent. For those of us who feel this way, the problem of limited resources bites hard.

One structural program that may bear fruit for the resource problem (especially if SSOC loses its foundation support) is the formation of a Florida region of SSOC. The Florida region hopes to support its own staff and office within six months, and will initiate a coordinate anti-war, anti-draft, and student-power activities on the Florida campuses, and try to relate students to SLAM projects.

With all the conferences, institutes, and research and resistance groups that are planned for the summer the movement is beginning to really dig in. If even part of SSOC's plans are successful, the South will play no small part in the revolution.

# BERLIN

## WEST BERLIN'S U. S. CAMPAIGN

American residents of West Berlin sent a letter to Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey in advance of his April 6 visit to West Berlin, expressing their opposition to current American policy in Vietnam and their support of the neutralization of that country as an alternative to the present war.

"We disassociate ourselves," wrote the Americans, "from the destruction by the United States of Vietnam." Spelling out a five-point program which includes the withdrawal of all foreign troops from North and South Vietnam and the neutralization of North and South Vietnam, the writers declared that they will support all executive and legislative national office-holders in the United States, and all candidates for office, who commit themselves to such a Vietnam policy.

"We will speak for a growing number of Americans," continues the letter to the Vice-President, "when we begin, on Saturday, April 22, a series of weekly one-hour walks through West Berlin. One hundred loyal Americans, walking in an orderly column, will carry a sign demanding the neutralization of Vietnam."

Calling itself the U. S. Campaign, the non-profit, non-partisan organization stated that it will repeat this walk every seven days, until America makes peace in Vietnam. "We hope that the weekly one-hour walks through West Berlin can cease immediately," said the Campaign, which includes church workers, students, teachers, musicians, and other American citizens living in West Berlin; "but we will continue them until late in 1968 if necessary, and until any date thereafter, if required."

Signed by Peter R. Standish, Secretary of the U. S. Campaign, and by Francis H. Fuller, Librarian, the letter was sent to Vice-President Humphrey in care of the American consulate in West Berlin.

SEND YOUR GREETINGS TO THE NEW RADICALS

in the 1967 CONVENTION ISSUE of NLN

PLACE A CONTRIBUTORY GREETING:

FULL PAGE \$200, \_\_\_\_\_; 1/2 PAGE \$110, \_\_\_\_\_; 1/3

PAGE \$75, \_\_\_\_\_; 1/4 PAGE \$60, \_\_\_\_\_; 1/8 page

\$35, \_\_\_\_\_; 1/16 PAGE \$20 \_\_\_\_\_; and GREETINGS

from MOVEMENT CHILDREN \$1.00 per name, \_\_\_\_\_.

SEND AD COPY BY JUNE 17 to the National Office

# conference on Radicals in the Professions

Dick Magidoff

The March 13 NLN article proposing a conference on "Radicals in the Professions" has gotten a very positive response. Plans have gone ahead to hold the conference, with this writer as coordinator, working in cooperation with the staff of the Radical Education Project. The conference will be held during the weekend of July 14 to 16 (Thursday evening to Sunday afternoon) in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The local SDS chapter is helping arrange for the use of campus facilities.

Conference participants will range from radical students, who are concerned with finding long-range occupational roles for themselves, all the way to those people already settled in their work who are seeking ways to make that work more relevant to the building of a movement to change America. There will be many people in in-between situations. All of these people are bound together by a common quest for alternatives to the traditional practice of the "professions" of their choice. They want their work to be personally satisfying, and at the same time consistent with, and effective in implementing, their values.

An assumption underlying the conference is that we, as radicals, must develop concrete work roles to supplement and sustain the social protest movements of the past several years. We have taken part in the civil rights movement, the anti-war movement, organized against poverty and against campus repression. Such protest has not been sufficient to produce the change we desire. It is now time to confront in a more systematic way the problem of transferring these concerns into our day-to-day activities; to integrate our values and our work so that we may be more whole people, and live more effectively radical lives.

The "professions" are areas of work that many of us from middle-class backgrounds, with middle-class training and inclinations, are drawn to. But the professions as currently structured are a part of that very system that we hope to change. They support it, do its work. Hopefully this conference will be the beginning of a long-range dialogue toward defining new life roles for us, consistent with our backgrounds and inclinations. But also toward challenging those definitions of and those functions played in society by the professions, which we find abhorrent.

For the purpose of the conference, the "professions" are defined simply as "kinds of work" that are usually thought of as "professional"—independent of the institutional milieu in which they are done. In this way, the conference can embrace and be enriched by a wide range of views on how one ought to practice a given "profession". Thus, "Social Work" will include professionally trained social workers, public aid workers, and independent community organizers. "Journalism" will include reporters on daily newspapers, free-lance magazine writers, people in the "underground press". There will be people involved in white-collar unionism, and those relating to professional organizations. But at the conference, the emphasis will be on evaluating the effects of concrete experiences and proposals people bring concerning attempts to be "radical in their profession". There should be less abstract theorizing about which approach, a priori, is better.

In addition to giving individuals a chance to consider alternative long-range "career" goals for themselves, the conference should also be a generator of specific projects and program ideas that might be undertaken by people in the various "professions". Any follow-up to the conference will depend largely on the ability of participants to develop projects that they want to do. The conference will have a problem-solving orientation based on discussion and evaluation of experiences and proposals—what are we to do? But this cannot be done without a framework, of course, so there will also be opportunities to discuss questions of general relevance to all the "professions", questions relating to life and work style, and the relationship of "professionals" to the movement as a whole.

These remarks are a brief synopsis of conversations and correspondence I have had with people who have taken an active interest in the conference up to now. There is as yet no firm agenda, and even our tentative agenda has a lot of open space which will be filled by the undeterminable dynamic of the conference itself.

The tentative agenda has three main parts: "single-profession" workshops, "general" workshops, and "free time" in which people can form into more concrete project-oriented working groups to discuss specific follow-up program. In each of the "single-profession" workshop a list of questions peculiar to the "profession" is being drawn up to provide a framework for discussion. The focus of the discussions, however, will be brief presentations by four or so people per workshop. They will critically evaluate some experience they have had

in attempting to be radical in their field for response by the others. These people will represent the different approaches to the "profession" suggested above. The "general" workshops also will start off with a brief presentation by someone with a distinct point of view on the question to be discussed. After their brief presentations, these "resource" people will simply become co-discussants. These workshops will include people from each of the "professional areas".

The following is the tentative agenda: we solicit your comments and suggestions.

## THURSDAY, JULY 13

6:30 p. m. on: registration; housing arrangements; informal mingling.

## FRIDAY, JULY 14

9:30 to 10 a. m.: general assembly: conference introduction; description of final agenda.

10 a. m. to 1 p. m.: "single profession" workshops (so far arranged: law, education, health, journalism, planning, social work, the ministry, the technical fields).

1 to 2 p. m.: lunch.

2 to 6 p. m.: "general" workshops: 1) "Professionals and poor people's movements"; 2) "Middle-class radicals: the question of 'career'"; 3) "Radicals in the professions: the institutional pressures toward conformity, conservatism, and unfreedom"; 4) "Toward a general definition of being 'radical in a profession'"; 5) "The New Working Class: Are professionals a part of it? What is its relationship to society?"; 6) "Is 'professionalism' inherently conservatism?"; 7) "Professionalism: the relationship between expertise and democracy". (These are not exhaustive, and obviously overlap. Better formulations are sought. We hope that people will remain in the same workshop throughout for the sake of continuity. Probably each will eventually touch on all of the questions.)

Evening: open.

## SATURDAY, JULY 15

10 a. m. to 1 p. m.: continuation of "single profession" workshops.

1 to 2 p. m.: lunch.

2 to 6 p. m.: continuation of "general" workshops.

Evening: open.

## SUNDAY, JULY 16

10 a. m. to 3 p. m.: breakdown into specific project workshops, which will hopefully have been generated by earlier discussions.

3 to 4:30 p. m.: final assembly; reports from workshops regarding follow-up activity; goodbyes.

We are looking for "resource" people in some of these areas, also for people who will write working papers. These will hopefully parallel the content and arrangement of the agenda. There are also plans to keep records of important ideas that come up in workshops. These will be developed into papers after the conference: a sort of compilation of conference proceedings. They could be more important than the pre-conference papers, and effective distribution networks will be sought.

Those of you who have substantive comments on the agenda, paper suggestions, "resource people", and so on should write to Dick Magidoff c/o Boudin, 3118 Lorain Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio 44113.

Those of you who want to pre-register for the conference, receive more general information, distribute publicity materials, or receive working papers even if you cannot attend should write to "Radicals in the Professions Conference" c/o Radical Education Project, 510 East William, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

We anticipate that registration will cost \$5 and will include cost of meeting facilities, room, possibly box lunches, and working papers. Working papers for non-participants (including those printed after the conference) will cost \$2. Any extra funds will go toward the mammoth printing bill we will probably incur if people really do their writing. Hopefully, these papers will be a valuable addition to SDS's pool of internal education material.

Further details will be sent out to all those who express an interest in the conference. We urge you to write as soon as possible, and hope that many of you will be there.

# tycoons consolidate

TYCOONS PUSH STUDY OF DATA CENTER FOR CHICAGO IN NEW YORK; SPECIAL STATE INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM BEGINS HIRING

Pete Henig (New York)

According to a report in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle (March 30), a discussion of the possibilities of a common computerized data center for Chicago has been sponsored by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. News of the Chicago meeting follows revelations that the city of New Haven has been working with the Advanced Systems Development Division of IBM to bring a centralized data system into operation. The New Haven center would make coordinated social and economic data on the people of New Haven, both collectively and individually, available to government agencies and business.

Participants in the discussion of a data center for Chicago included Kenneth T. Larkin, director of information systems of Lockheed Missile and Space Company; Anthony Downs, senior vice president of the Real Estate Corporation of Chicago; and A. Arthur Charous, manager of the economic research division of the Chicago Police Department. Other participants represented state and federal agencies that already employ social data systems.

In a related development, the New York World Journal Tribune ran a story (April 11) inviting people qualified in criminological analysis and research to "get in on the ground floor of the first agency of its kind in the nation—the New York State Identification and Intelligence System".

The story describes NYSIIS as a "technological system that will serve the entire criminal justice community in the state as an information-sharing center. More than 3,600 agencies, including local and state police; prosecutors; criminal courts; and probation, correction, and parole agencies will share this service."

## review

(Continued from page 5)

(c) which would quite naturally be dominated by China. This is the 'threat' /of Chinese domination/. Fourth, and most important, Vietnam is the concrete example of imperialist America's destructive dedication; the world cannot ignore what America does in Vietnam for the world recognizes and fears the real motive for American involvement; revolutionary movements in the Third World watch America at her work in Vietnam and are solidified and strengthened in their determination for revolutionary success. Further, Oglesby writes, "there is a revolution which is international...in some less than technical sense, this revolution is communistic...the revolution does aim itself at America.../and/ the widespread acceptance of this view of revolution may forecast a bitter future for us all." If Oglesby's thesis is correct, and I think it is, and America continues to use military power to oppress revolution, as I know it will, then the "awesome consequences of this is that any struggle that is rationalized in the well-being of a nation rationalized in terms of anti-communism (derived from the Kennan thesis), is really a mask for the imperialist urge of America. By widening the spheres of influence of communist countries and thereby limiting the effectiveness of their power, America can widen her spheres of influence and reap the full economic benefits of "containment."

Yet the fatal contradiction between Cold War policy vis-a-vis China and the economic necessities of capitalist America makes itself terribly apparent in the context of Oglesby's total argument—America cannot force China to assume a "responsible role" through the control of Vietnam and thereby limit China's power, nor can America lose Vietnam without the destruction of American capitalism. "We shall find that America's Vietnam policy does not merely illustrate American imperialism...and that in its fusion of imperialist motive and anti-communist ideology, the war is not only exemplary, it is climactic."

Oglesby lists four reasons in "The Vietnam Case" for America's involvement in Vietnam. First, a direct commercial interest exists which is in the first stages of development. Second, the American military economy needs war to thrive and prosper—"Vietnam, as conflict colony, helps to turn this wheel." Third, "the strategic heart of the matter," America must hold Vietnam to secure her domination of the Pacific Economic Community, necessary for the continuation of American capitalism. Put simply, "what the West faces in the Pacific is the formation of a regional economic system (a) whose potential and power are inherent in the Pacific situation itself, (b) which must include Japan /China and America's major trade partner/, and

# national guardian

(Continued from page 1)

senatorial candidacy of Dr. W. E. B. DuBois; it reported and supported ALP Rep. Vito Marcantonio's lone voice of opposition to the Korean War, then became the first American publication to print names and messages from GI prisoners held in North Korea. It also challenged and fought through to the final unsuccessful appeal the conspiracy charges against Ethel and Julius Rosenberg and the jailing of Morton Sobell.

"By the mid-1950s, the Guardian's pages were filled with investigations, trials, and jailings of American radicals who refused to bow to the hysteria of the times. Among the victims was British-born Guardian editor Belfrage. Aronson and Belfrage were investigated by Sen. Joseph McCarthy for efforts, as members of the U. S. military forces, to establish a democratic press in post-war Germany. The clear implication was that the Guardian itself was out of order. Belfrage was jailed and deported to become the paper's editor-in-exile, while Aronson replaced him as editor...."

## WITH THIS ISSUE...

"The National Guardian reaffirms its journalistic and political commitment to a growing American Left, and sets a radical perspective for fulfilling that commitment.

"The Guardian acknowledges that the people of the United States face a power system increasingly impervious to their will and confront a government that conducts an arrogant and vicious war in Vietnam without so much as a by-your-leave from its citizens.

"The Guardian believes that the scope and the depth of these problems can best be understood if we go to the roots of the news, as the term 'radical' implies, to get at the facts; if we open the pages of the Guardian to controversy which can aid in the exploration of the radical solutions called for by our times....

"(Currently) Guardian policy will be determined by its entire staff. Specific areas of responsibility and precise job descriptions have been established to facilitate the actual production of the paper. Within this structure, an acting coordinating committee has been elected to carry out managerial responsibilities. Departmental coordinators have been selected to handle day-to-day operations.

"First-hand reportage from staff writers and from present and new correspondents will be emphasized. Areas of news coverage will be expanded and presented in more readable style and format. Top editorial personnel will be added to the present staff. These improvements will be implemented as rapidly as possible and represent the same kind of response to the conditions of the 1960s that the founding of the paper itself offered to the late '40s and continued through the '50s...."

# Containment and Change

(Continued from p. 7)

is one from which we cannot withdraw."

The consequences of America's killing and plundering go far beyond the reactions of our "allies" or even the Third World revolutionaries. The blood-stained hands of Americans who fought in wars of oppression, the hands with which "children are soothed...friends greeted, poems written, love made" will form the final, tragic shape of Americans' reactions to the Vietnam War and future conflicts. A human being faced with the reality of death he has caused in the name of something in which he has no belief can do nothing but accept it for what it is or rationalize it in terms of the cause which caused the killing. From the rationalizations of a frustrated, alienated, powerless and blood-stained people, Oglesby alludes, comes fascism, the highest state of imperialist capitalism.

"Revolution," Oglesby had written in an earlier chapter of the book, "is the collective free enterprise of the collectively dispossessed." In "The Revolted," the most beautiful and moving chapter in the book, Oglesby analyzes the conditions which create the revolutionary from a normal man, "much like myself"; the chapter makes painfully clear that in real terms "injustice and society are only different words for the same thing." The same thing is America.

"The revolutionary is someone who is nothing else in order to be everything else," Oglesby writes, and that he is "an irresponsible man whose

# ON THE TIMES

(Continued from p. 2)

Had Mr. Hofman thought to report the content of what he termed 'sedition', the case would have appeared thus: SDS has adopted as part of its national position a call to all men to resist the draft. SDS has helped to form many of the more than forty 'anti-draft' unions and 'we won't go' groups around the country. The organization maintains that free people do not need a draft to make them fight in their own defense. And it further holds that the orders US soldiers are now given—to commit genocide in Vietnam—can only be the orders of madmen bent on a nightmare mission. As the draft makes the mission possible, so it must be fought particularly vigorously at this time. An American revolutionary, 'Patrick Henry', put it well: "If this be treason, make the most of it."

Had Mr. Hofman not done violence to all standards of violence, he would have seen the New Left's mood in its proper context. What is this mood next to the acts of violence this society daily commits in Vietnam, in its own South, in every ghetto? What is this mood next to the aura of violence universally created by police with guns, billy clubs, and tear gas? What is this mood compared to the violence perpetrated against the youth of the country by undertrained, overworked teachers in lousy school systems competing with a mass media whose lifeblood is violence? What is it next to the violence of an army that every day, by its own figures, maims or murders over one hundred forty civilians?

The New Left has not turned to violence—although it has learned to defend itself. If the occasional talk hardens into violence, it will do so because a society bent on violence creates a tragic left in its own tragic image.

Then it will little benefit those who countenanced the original violence of the society to shake a finger or a gun.

Nick Egleson  
National President  
Students for a Democratic Society

# Cleveland Movement

(Continued from page 1)

open for organizing.

\*\*Newspaper reporters and editors: to help develop a "truth and muckraking" publication for the city.

\*\*Actors: to staff a radical theatre, which is being developed.

\*\*Organizers: to work in poor communities around issues of health, welfare, education, housing, and other urban problems.

## WHO WE ARE...

We are primarily engaged in political organizing to build a broad-based movement for change in Cleveland. Part of that movement, for us, means creating a "community" within the city. "Community" means a number of things to us:

\*\*It means people who share common values.

\*\*It means people doing work he or she believes is personally important and rewarding.

\*\*It means people being supportive of each other's work.

\*\*It means being able to live in different ways. (During the past year some of us have lived alone, others lived as couples or families, and still others lived communally.)

\*\*It means, for some people, pooling financial resources and maintaining an economic cooperative; it means, for others, being self-supportive.

\*\*It means people who enjoy spending time together they are not working: music, sports, camping, vacationing.

\*\*It means, finally, people who provide moral, physical, and spiritual support for each other in all the things that make us happy!

## WILL YOU JOIN US?

If you are interested, or would like more information, or would like to talk to someone about coming to Cleveland, write to 2070 W. 26th, Cleveland, Ohio 44113, or call one of these numbers (area code 216): 781-3719, 631-8089, 281-4615

Sharon Jeffrey FOR A NEW CLEVELAND,  
Carol McEldowney  
Paul Potter Kathy Boudin

If you are planning to attend the convention, June 25 to July 2 notify the N.O. at once. (Include \$5.00 registration fee) Chapters send credentials for convention

# 1967 convention

and NC delegates! See NLN 5/15, p. 2 for details. It is essential we receive this information soon soon.

Second-Class postage rates paid in Chicago, Illinois  
Entered at Chicago

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

Saul Wellman  
15354 Monica  
Detroit MICH 48238

irresponsibility has been decreed by others." Faced with the powerlessness of his condition, having tried all methods of change within the structure of his society and having found no way out, the revolutionary takes the leap from disfunctional powerlessness to concrete revolutionary action. His conversion to revolution is his freedom; in his conversion lies the freedom of others. He is not the tragic figure Official America would make him; he is the man whom Dostoevski's Inquisitor feared most; the one free man who exists in and resists a world of peace through oppression, a world of happiness through manipulation. He is "the man for whom it has been decreed that there is only one way out." That way, the Revolution, makes him "the man whom America now claims the right to kill."

When I read T. S. Eliot's *Christianity and Culture* I was sickened by the thought of a "Christian" approach to political problems; Richard Shaull's essay has not dissuaded me that Eliot may have been substantially correct in his appraisal of the potential Christian roots of a political society. Shaull attempts in his essay to establish lines between Christian theology and the revolutionary movement both in America and the Third World. I find Shaull's approach less satisfying than Oglesby's for several reasons.

First, as Shaull makes clear, he is not a member of the Movement generation in this country and is detached and in some ways alienated from the Movement; his experience in South America makes him more a part of

that tradition than the contemporary American experience. Second, his insistence on making the Movement both here and in the Third World a search for messianic order in society seems to ignore the basic question of what causes social injustice. This seems to be a failing of most "socially oriented" theological arguments; while it is true that the messiah represents freedom and justice, it is not clear from what section of the world the messianic follower is to be freed. If it is from man himself, as some theologians have argued, then Shaull ignores the motivation of revolutionary movements—the creation of a community of men who work for the common good. If it is from the world, as other theologians have argued, then the messianic drive has some validity in today's struggle—as symbol—and given, of course, that the world is seen as potentially changeable. Third, Shaull does not deal with real political problems as Oglesby does. While in several of the chapters of his essay Shaull has some perceptive and important insights into the personalities and motivations of Movement people, he really says nothing to us that we do not already know.

As an approach to an analysis of the Movement and Third World revolutionary struggles, the essay is interesting; but as a thing of value, the essay is of less interest.

(NOTE: the paperback edition is available from the SDS Book Service, 1608 West Madison, Chicago, Illinois 60612, for \$1.45 plus a 5¢ mailing charge.)