

NEW LEFT NOTES

SDS · 1608 W · MADISON · CHICAGO · ILL.

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 23

let the people decide

JUNE 12, 1967

THEMIS on Campus

Submitted by
STEVE HALLIWELL

American military planning has developed a new program for using the nation's universities for its own purposes. The Defense Department's new program, Project Themis, plans to begin operation this year with awards totaling \$20 million on 50 campuses. According to an article in Science magazine, the project is designed in terms of a small number of large projects in order to have some "impact on the general quality of the institution". In each project, the Pentagon seeks a "critical mass" of 8 to 10 faculty members with 16 to 20 graduate students working on related projects.

The wave of protests against university complicity with the war in Vietnam has had an impact on the project, for the prospectus distributed to universities indicates that the research projects undertaken must be within the long-range plans of the university, and an explicit endorsement is required of university officials before a project can be undertaken.

As might be expected, the Pentagon has had little trouble finding university officials glad to submit to these requirements in order to get in on the gravy—the same article in Science reports 479 applications from 171 institutions for a grand total of \$400 million in contracts. The criteria for contracts, however, are limited to projects "in specialized areas relative to the defense mission", and specify in the introductory brochure projects such as "the detection of small military targets" (guerrillas?). Only those universities that sense the burning need for knowledge of how to put down the countryside of the world will be able to engage in this essential service.

At the same time, there are rumblings of discontent within social elements that have usually had little concern with selling themselves to the government for the right amount. At the University of Montana, the chapter of the American Association of University Professors published a statement that branded the military as an unsuitable source of funds for the university: "Military activities have traditionally been shrouded in secrecy and half truths. The tradition of academia is just the opposite. Universities have always been one free agent in society.... The military would seem to be the worst possible source of funds for academic research—the source most inimical to the academic goal of free and independent research."

The university professors are apparently responding to the recent disclosures about the role of the government in the universities—the CIA issue is not raised, but the bacteriological warfare research at the University of Pennsylvania is specifically mentioned. Unfortunately, the professors' solution to their dilemma fails to transcend the liberal solutions to the CIA problem—Science reports that the AAUP chapter "would like to see... the transfer of basic research funds from the military to a civilian agency and the support of departmental or institutional centers of excellence by civilian agencies alone." Presumably the civilian agencies would have no scruples about funneling funds into the same kind of research

zengakuren action

(Hitoshi Nemato, the vice-president of the Zengakuren, and another Zengakuren member recently spent two days in Chicago with the people here at the National Office. They were traveling through the United States gaining a knowledge of the anti-war and radical student movement in the U.S. As we exchanged observations about what was happening around the world and about the people of the Zengakuren and SDS, we were made aware of the similarities of the two organizations. The following letter to NLN is indicative of many of the thoughts and activities we discussed during their visit to Chicago. ---Jean Venezia)

Dear Friends,

We Japanese students rallying around ZENGAKUREN extend our greeting of solidarity to you, who are fighting against the aggressive war in Vietnam waged by the Johnson administration.

Your powerful demonstration on April 15 in New York and San Francisco was very impressive for us. We would be very glad if you could send us detailed information about the struggle. Here in Japan, the demonstration was described as one of the greatest events in the anti-war movement in that negro civil rights fighters joined in overwhelming numbers together with considerable numbers of workers. But we are very eager to know how the demonstration was organized and what the feelings and content of the struggle.

This year we are faced with the governmental attempt of expanding the U. S. air base in Sunagawa, neighboring town of Tokyo City. Among many U. S. bases

essential for the "defense mission".

The administration of the University of Montana has risen to the occasion by issuing a statement referred to by one of its officials as the "motherhood statement" that proclaims that "the University of Montana cannot be partisan to any special position other than the discovery of truth, and its professors, while fulfilling their obligations to the institution, can represent no more narrow interests than the interests of humanity." The implications of this humanitarian stance on the issue of Project Themis, however, is that, according to one university official, "the project is innocent until proven guilty".

And in fact three groups of professors have already submitted proposals and if accepted, Science reports, "the terms of the research will have to be worked out." Faced with a fait accompli, the university will seek ways to comprehend the Defense Department's latest sallies into the problems of destroying insurgent movements in terms of the "interests of humanity".

It is not known at present how many Project Themis contracts have been awarded, but it can be assumed that the major beneficiaries will be state universities bent on developing graduate programs and expanding faculty—the introductory brochure speaks specifically of involving young faculty—on the government dole. Though the program does not have at present the scope of the Institute of Defense Analyses, it will undoubtedly attempt to establish major programs in the near future on many university campuses. Fifty SDS chapters will probably be faced with a major issue during the coming year.

in Japan, the Sunagawa base is playing an important role in the aggressive war in Vietnam and many U. S. military planes are flying directly to the battlefield of Vietnam every day. The recent attempt of expanding the base is no doubt closely connected with the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

ZENGAKUREN has decided to fight against this plan with all its power, and on February 26 2,000 students of Tokyo held a protest meeting in front of the runway of the base. Young workers of the Sohyo (General Council of Japan Trade Unions) who form the Anti-War Youth Committee together with ZENGAKUREN and several peace movement organizations joined the meeting in large number. The peasants in the area around the Sunagawa base welcomed us all. Japanese police were very nervous about our demonstration in front of the U. S. base, and attacked the students and workers very brutally, arresting 10 of them, and wounding almost one hundred.

This struggle was actually a first great protest action in front of the Sunagawa base since 1956 and 1957, when the governmental plan of expansion of the base was completely smashed by thousands of workers and ZENGAKUREN's students through continued demonstrations and sit-downs.

On May 26th and 28th, we are planning to wage a powerful struggle in front of the Sunagawa base to give a strong blow to the attempt of the Sato government. Moved by the successful struggle of February 26th, the trade union conference of the Sunagawa and other neighboring towns together with the Tokyo Trade Union Council decided to mobilize tens of thousands of workers on May 28th struggle.

As you may know, the victory of the Socialist candidate in the recent election of the Tokyo City governor was a blow to the ruling class of Japan. When the workers and people in the Tokyo city materialize their power in the actual struggle which was shown by the votes

against the governmental candidate in the election, the attempt of the Sato government would be smashed in the Sunagawa base. The political tension of Japan is becoming more and more intense, as 1970 approaches, the year when the Japan and the U. S. government intend to resume and amend the Japan-U. S. A. Mutual Security Treaty after ten years since 1960 in which we ZENGAKUREN fought against the same issue with all its power. The planned amendment of the Mutual Treaty is intended to complete the nuclear armament of the Japanese army. In this context, our struggle against the expansion of the Sunagawa base bears considerable significance to show the power of the workers and students of Japan to smash the Japanese and U. S. alliance against the Asian people. We are firmly determined to strengthen our rank arm in arm with the workers and people, and also develop international solidarity with the friends overseas who are fighting in the common cause, especially in the U. S. A. against the most powerful suppressor in today's world.

In the election of the Tokyo Municipal Assembly over one absent seat in the Sugunami district (most popular part of Tokyo city), which was simultaneously held with the governor's election, Satoshi Kitakoji (ex-president of ZENGAKUREN in the period of the 1960's struggle) was raised as a representative of the new left tendency, and got the following result: Liberal Democratic Party 99,290; Socialist Party 60,877; Kitakoji 40,814; Communist Party 22,728. It shows the demand of the people for the renewal of the left wing movement of Japan.

With best wishes,

Tadashi Yoshiba
International Secretary of ZENGAKUREN

Toru Kurokawa
responsible for the international affairs of the ZENSHIN weekly

COLUMBIA ends class RANKING

Karl E. Klare (Columbia SDS)

On March 23, 1967, Columbia's University Council, a body composed of faculty and administrators, voted unanimously to withhold students' class-rank from Selective Service System draft boards. The rank in his class of a male student is requested by draft boards, who may use it as a criterion in deciding to grant draft deferments. The Council's action, ratified a few days later by the Trustees in a slightly different form, thrust Columbia into nation-wide prominence as the first major university to buck the policy set down by the draft system.

The decision of the Council marked the culmination of a months-long struggle, led chiefly by the Columbia chapter of SDS, which raised the demand for "student power" within the broader context of radical political demands (e.g., that the University should deny facilities to the CIA for the purpose of recruiting pro-

spective employees). The abolition of class-ranking, by all accounts, was a triumph for Columbia SDS and its coalition partners. Indeed, the Columbia Daily Spectator, the official college newspaper, said: "Student power is no longer an issue; it is a fact. Within the last 12 months, student organizations—enjoying the general sympathy of the student body as a whole—made demands on the University which are of an unprecedented nature. And, in turn, the University has given unprecedented responses to these demands. The confrontation between the two has developed into what may be a revolution in the role of the student at Columbia... Whether Low Library (i.e., the Administrative Center) admits it or not, however, the moving force behind such changes was the pressure of 'student power' and not the gratuitous largess of administrators." (March 17, 1967)

(continued on page 4)

Stanford anti-draft union

Early in winter quarter, following the resolution of the NC, Stanford SDS decided to organize an anti-draft union. After a long period of uncertainty, the ADU has finally jelled, with strong student, faculty, and community support.

In the beginning there was a good deal of interest, stimulated in part by then-student body president David Harris, an anarchist with charisma who had sent back his II-S. Unfortunately, none of the founders knew what they wanted out of the ADU. The new people drifted away. We did, however, manage to formulate a "We Won't Go" statement, separate from our wishy-washy membership statement, which was circulated by the SDSers who organized the ADU.

The statement, as finally worded, was in two simple parts. "I will not fight in Vietnam" and "Furthermore, I will not allow myself to be conscripted into the military." We received about fifty signatures to at least the former part in over a month of circulation. We let the statement sit till mobilization week, when we decided that the names were ready for release, for our number compared favorably with other schools. We announced on April 13, in an article in the Stanford Daily, that we had fifty-five signatures, and decided, upon sensing renewed interest, to collect more signatures. In the next week or two we collected over 110 more signatures, and we published the names in an ad in the daily April 25, and held a press conference. Sixty more signed in response to the ad, and 74 names were released by students at the Stanford

Med School, which initiated a similar statement early winter quarter. That made 300 who "won't go", out of 8,000.

It is difficult to assess what caused this revitalization, but I will briefly list here four possible contributing factors: Hubert Humphrey's visit last quarter radicalized a number of students; SDS's accusation of Stanford's complicity in the war polarized opinion as we recirculated the petition; continued escalation in the face of mass demonstrations frustrated several young men to the point of commitment; and David Harris's continued calls for non-cooperation have broadened the perspective of all draft-age men at Stanford.

The upsurge in "We Won't Go" led the ADU to reorganize around the statement, forgetting the original membership statement. We invited all signers to our next meeting, and because the ad had further stimulated interest, thirty or forty new people came to our next meeting to discuss new projects. Below is a brief summary:

Demonstrations—The idea of an anti-draft union is to protect all members. An injury to one is an injury to all. One member goes to Oakland for his physical May 25. He plans to leaflet and disrupt. We will demonstrate in his support. We also took part in a mill-in and sit-in at the San Francisco draft boards.

Anti-ranking—we mishandled a hasty petition campaign to set up an anti-ranking referendum, but the student government, left in orientation, got the following referendum on the ballot. "Be it resolved that the University should cease to supply for draft boards information related to the academic standing of students, such as class rank or grades." Men only, including grad students, were allowed to vote. We held a poorly attended rally, but

received excellent coverage from the Daily, which also supported us editorially. We also publicized that a representative faculty body had come out against ranking. And we circulated two leaflets. One was a standard ideological and educational leaflet, which got limited distribution, and the other was a propagandistic one which pictured a Gaussian distribution with many intercepting vertical lines, asking, "Where do you draw the line when you kill on the curve?" The turnout was light, and few grad students voted. Nevertheless, we won a strong victory,

(Continued on page 3)

letters

Dear Fellow People:

Eric Prokosch's article about "Guerrilla Tactics in Anthropology Classes" reaches a new nadir in pop politics—I mean I didn't think that the barrel could be scraped so low. He doesn't have to inflict everyone who reads NLN with his anti-intellectualism. He keeps mixing up anthropology with anthropology, confusing a system of ideas with men. There are great anthropologists and lousy ones; radical anthropologists and reactionary ones. So what? Does that mean that there is no sense in studying anthropology?

If you are having trouble relating what is said in anthropological monographs to your own life, then I suggest you try harder to do so; it's a strenuous act of the mind. If you do that, then the notion of the revolution of underdeveloped peoples against colonialism and neo-colonialism might really come home to you. For instance (as Prokosch writes) "when your instructor is boring you with details of the settlement pattern or kinship terminology of some tribe" try this: try thinking of the "settlement pattern" of the Bantu tribes in Transkei in South Africa, or the "kinship terminology" of the Vietnamese people to show how there are true ties of blood between the northern and southern peoples of Vietnam—and see how outraged you get by it all. And try even to learn some things that aren't directly related to radical protest against South Africa or the Vietnam War, because you might find that seemingly unrelated facts in anthropology are related and help to show you where it's at.

And if the doctrine of 'cultural relativity' is an excuse for avoiding moral issues, then it can also be a tool for appreciating some of the things happening in underdeveloped Africa and Latin America—how colonialism has destroyed tribal life, culture and art, why countries such as the Congo fall into chaos when the super-dominant political and economic social structures of the colonialists disappear, what some of the basic problems of economic and political change in the underdeveloped but independent countries are, and so on. And the anthropologist who really employs the method of 'cultural relativity' as an excuse for avoiding

national guardian

On May 6, the National Guardian became "an independent radical newsweekly". What does that mean for SDS people?

1) It means that we can stop bitching about not reaching a larger public with some of our ideas. The Guardian has a circulation of about 30,000, and can be expected to grow as the Left grows. As it invites controversy (and recently printed Greg Calvert's Princeton speech), we can utilize its pages to make our position clear and to appeal for help, for money, for understanding. (Let me add that it is no longer fair to say, if it ever was, that the Guardian just gets around to "old lefties"; it gets around to a lot of people who can't find any other decent weekly newspaper.)

2) It means we can have a better communication system ourselves about what's happening on campuses and in communities. The Guardian is looking for on-the-spot reportage, and we should be able to supply it. I think we need to reach further in our ranks than the 5-6,000 circulation of NLN, and be able to dig further into the roots of local situations than NLN writing often offers. I hardly think it will hurt us in any way.

3) It means we have a job to do; and if we do it right, a tool to utilize. If we do writing and reporting for the Guardian, it will come more and more to have our flavor, and will be more and more useful as a well-written, "slick" weekly analysis by which we can make ourselves known better to students and adults. If we fail in this, we have only our own negligence to blame.

I hope people will take this seriously; this is a situation in which our own financial and time pinch will not noticeably effect a significant piece of work we can do.

If any NLN readers still don't subscribe, they should immediately, as earlier recommended by Carl Davidson: \$1 for a 10-week trial subscription to the National Guardian, 197 East 47th Street, New York, New York 10009.

Fraternally,

Paul Buhle

moral issues won't really be a very good anthropologist, because he won't know what the moral issues of the foreign peoples consist in—which is part of his job.

Actually if Prokosch has read much ethnography—anthropological fieldwork—he will find that often the anthropologist has more sympathy than anyone else for the hatred of indigenous peoples of "all these white people who moved in and started telling them what to do..." for the anthropologist can see exactly what has been destroyed in the process.

Yes, Mr. Prokosch, 'values are relative': obviously the majority of the Vietnamese people don't see the situation in the same way as a majority of the people in this country do—those who are doing or helping to do the napalming, poisoning and shooting. And you know that because, in a way, you can't help doing some anthropology. Not, that is, if you're committed to radical action in this world.

Don Nonini

Marcuse

The N.Y. regional office of SDS plans to sponsor a conference on Marcuse's thought and writing during the early fall of 1967. The idea for the conference grew out of an awareness of the importance of Marcuse's thought for the new left and the lack of any systematic criticism of his writings by young radicals.

The conference will seek to examine Marcuse's thought from two directions: one set of papers will examine the critical framework that Marcuse has developed in his writings and test the viability of some of the constructs that have emerged; another set of papers will treat Marcuse's writings in terms of the actual problems of organizing, testing the relevance of Marcuse's ideas for the practice of radical politics.

Both approaches will have to face the central questions that Marcuse has raised in his writings, most notably in *One-Dimensional Man*: what are the terms of a radical movement in a society that seems capable of buying off groups in the society traditionally open to radical demands? What is the relation of radical demands to a society with a politics and communications system that is all-pervasive and capable of completely excluding radical pressure? What is the effect of the technological revolution on the relationship between the worker and the means of production? Is it possible to build a political movement out of psychological disaffection with a whole system of social relations?

At present there is still room for the presentation of three to five papers in the course of the weekend conference, depending on the degree of doubling up that is possible. Anyone interested in presenting a paper should send a brief precis to: Marcuse Conference, New York SDS, Room 436, 41 Union Square West, New York, New York 10003. This must be done immediately since all papers are due August 1 in order to allow reproduction and distribution to participants before the conference. It is hoped that Professor Marcuse will be present himself and will respond to the papers.

Those interested in being kept informed about the conference should send a note to that effect to the same address.

SNCC raided

SNCC SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE RAIDED

(San Francisco) The Bay Area Regional Office of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee was raided in the early hours last Monday morning by unknown parties. The Regional Office, at 449 14th Street, houses the SNCC office and the national office of The Movement, the West Coast monthly newspaper affiliated with SNCC.

The raiders entered by an outside window and broke the lock on a door to enter the office. They stole the subscription list of the newspaper and escaped with confidential files containing SNCC reports and correspondence. During the raid they strewed the address stencils of The Movement over the floor. Also taken was a list of international contacts and the names and addresses of persons working for SNCC and The Movement in the Bay Area.

On the previous Friday, two volunteers for a church group with offices in the same building reported that a "middle-aged man" had tried to enter the building through a window. Their screams drove him off.

"We are sure," said Terence Cannon, Field Secretary for SNCC and an editor of The Movement, "that the same person waited until Sunday evening, when no one was around, to enter and raid our offices."

"SNCC has come under extreme attack from the FBI and the House Armed Services Committee for its opposition to the Vietnamese War," Cannon explained. "Representative Mendel Rivers wants to do away with the First Amendment in order to put Stokely Carmichael in jail. J. Edgar Hoover is trying to link us with so-called insurrectionary groups. This climate of oppression has led directly to this raid. It was clearly carried out by persons who want to know who we are, fear what we are doing, and wish to intimidate who we know." (submitted May 25)

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. 90072
New England: 39 Lee St., Apt. 3A, Cambridge, Mass.

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 23

let the people decide

JUNE 12, 1967



Nuremberg C.O.

John Gerber Univ. of Minn.

Draft resistance when stripped of all militant sounding verbiage has all too often come down to merely applying for C. O. status. This in itself frequently tends to evade the vital issues pertaining exclusively to the Vietnam war. One alternative has been to apply for C. O. status on the basis of the special nature of the war in Vietnam. Unfortunately, these attempts have invariably met with failure; and for some (at least the braver ones) jail. Yet attempts of this nature are far from futile, for in my particular case such an appeal yielded a rather surprising result. In what certainly appears to be an interesting precedent, I have just received a C. O. classification exclusively on the basis of my opposition to the war in Vietnam, as it pertains to the Nuremberg judgments. Some of the more important facts related to this development might be generalized as follows:

Things began in September of 1966 when I received a rather obnoxious form from my local board requesting me to send in grades and class ranking. I declined, and within three weeks my student deferment was revoked. A month later I received a notice to report for a pre-induction physical. At this juncture

Race Wars and White Radicals

Earl Silbar (Roosevelt SDS, Chicago PL)

The government and the mass media—at all levels—have been preparing to instigate race wars this summer. Widespread, superficial and misleading coverage was given to last year's rebellions in which young blacks fought cops, bayonets and tanks. (This is a race riot? Yes, if cops are a separate race!)

The recent invasion of Jackson State and Texas Southern Universities by hundreds of heavily armed and firing cops is just the beginning. As I'm writing this, the local rulers in Boston are sending in submachinegun-armed cops to terrorize Black people in Roxbury after smashing a sit-in of 50 Black mothers protesting the degrading welfare system. Cleveland's "democratically elected" officials, businessmen and cops are preparing for a prolonged tour of pacification in the Hough ghetto. "Hit 'em on the head, that's what they understand" is the guideline. Here in Chicago the papers reported that unknown quantities of submachineguns and other goodies were just distributed to local police stations. No doubt brothers on the West Coast and points south could report similar stories and worse.

In fact, local cops are being equipped and trained for killing Afro-Americans as part of a federal response to "crime in the streets". Weapons, communication systems and special squads are component parts of this pre-planned war on poor people.

WHY? Actually, these are new tactics in an old game—Divide and Rule. By whipping up the race fears of white workers, the government hopes to divert their energies and pent-up hatreds from their worsening job conditions, bosses, trade union mis-leaders and the strike-breaking government itself. The necessity for this tactic is increased because of organized workers' evident determination to fight for decent wages and human conditions in the face of a huge patriotic anti-communist campaign to get their support for and sacrificial acquiescence in the war in SE Asia. At the same time, consciously pitting white against black worker, our rulers hope to crush the militant opposition of black people to this war, its draft and oppressive ghetto conditions in a sea of blood.

Surely we cannot just stand aside—

I had a crucial decision to make. I could easily take the physical and, since I was assured of a 4F classification, leave my worries behind. Yet such a course, I felt, would be a complete abnegation of my moral responsibilities. I had to take a stand. My first inclination was to refuse induction (a la Dave Mitchell) on the basis of the Nuremberg decisions and fight it out in the courts. Yet the more I thought about it the prospect of jail became increasingly palatable. After consultations with my lawyer on the implications of any course of action that I might take I decided to apply for C. O. status on the basis of the Nuremberg decisions insofar as they formed a religious parallel and leave open the question of jail until the appeal process was exhausted. Accordingly, a statement was drawn up carefully articulating my position. I also secured letters of reference from various professors (including Mulford Q Sibley) which further elaborated on my position.

I began my statement with a discussion of the notion of a higher law and obligation and pointed out, somewhat parenthetically, its relation to the Judeo-Christian traditions. "It is my belief that there are certain principles and laws operating outside the realm of human experience... Indeed, this notion of a higher obligation which plays such a prominent role in the Judeo-Christian tradition permeates both the Old and New Testaments." I then suggested that these beliefs involved certain moral obligations as well. "Furthermore I believe that it is morally incumbent upon each individual to act in accordance with these obligations, accepting full personal responsibility for his actions. To state 'I only follow orders' as Eichmann did is morally inexcusable." My next step was to tie this concept directly to the Nuremberg decisions in order to add a legal underpinning to it. "Moreover, there is more than merely a moral obligation; these principles were institutionalized and embodied into law by the International Conventions Against War and the judgments of the International War Crimes Tribunal at Nuremberg Germany." And finally getting to the basis of my claim I stated explicitly:

My claim, therefore, is based on my belief that the U. S. government is, by its actions in Vietnam, acting in overt violation of the International Conventions Against War as expressed by the Nuremberg judgments. These judgments which sentenced twelve leading Nazi officials to death clearly affirmed the principle that each individual has certain obligations "which transcend national obligations imposed by the individual state.

I continued with a fuller explanation of the Nuremberg judgments quoting relevant portions from them interspersed with quotes from both the prosecution and the defense. I concluded with a rather generalized paragraph on U. S. atrocities.

At the time I submitted the statement I had few illusions about any chances of success. For nearly five months I heard nothing from my board and then rather unexpectedly I received my classification in the mail. Given the independent structure of the local board system the functional nature of this precedent would be rather limited. Yet it does serve to further legitimize the Nuremberg judgments and could possibly further buttress other such appeals.

watching horrified and bemoaning the unjust and evil system in which we live. We can act. Tens of thousands of radical anti-racist/anti-war leaflets are being prepared by the initiators of the Vietnam Work-In and Summer Program (See NLN Volume 2, Number 21). Local people are planning regular mass distribution of these leaflets to white workers. Door-to-door canvassing projects are being set up by local people. Even if for any reason you cannot take a full-time manual labor job, you can leaflet or canvass, bringing relevant radical politics to a key section

organizing inside

J. H. Ehrenreich

We are entering a period when it seems clear that a considerable number of radical young men may be drafted. I think that the individual radical faced with the prospect of military service should realize that among the alternatives he can consider, organizing in the army deserves careful consideration. From the point of view of a commitment to building a radical movement, though not, perhaps, from that of one's individual desires, the army could be a worthwhile experience. Perhaps a radical can do more toward ending America's imperialist foreign policy and toward building a new America than he can do underground, in jail or in Canada.

The goals of radical agitation and organization in the armed forces are significant and, I think, realizable. It is necessary to recognize two characteristics of service in the armed forces. First, among many groups of Americans, military service is undertaken as an unwelcome obligation and is endured as a constant source of gripes. Second, the armed forces are used, and used effectively, as a way of brainwashing young Americans, of brutalizing them and dehumanizing them. As to the first point: Just as a radical labor organizer works on the specific gripes of a group of workers to create a more generalized critique of the whole work relation which is imposed on them, so the radical armed forces organizer works on the specific gripes of his fellows-in-arms to create a radical critique of the army experience and what it stands for in our society. What is an army all about? What functions does it serve other than the mythical "defense"? Whose interests does it serve? How and by whom is this mythical power of life and death over the recruit wielded?

As to the second point: In the army men are taught to hate and to kill on command. They are taught to regard those who dissent from the grand design of American imperialism as traitors and cowards. This is the raw material and the process out of which come SS troops and Gestapo officers. By example, by discussion and agitation, and by organization among members of the armed forces we must counter this brainwashing, this dehumanization. The army provides the visual educational aids—the jungles of Vietnam, the cruelties of the sergeant, the harshness of the barracks. We provide the commentary. It should be stressed that organizing in the armed forces need not be only around grand issues such as the war or around abstract issues such as brutalization and authoritarianism. The road to these concepts may be via immediate issues. Just as garbage collection may be an issue in radical organizing of the poor, so pay scales, particularly insane regulations, intolerable officers, etc. can be a basis for agitation and organizing in the armed forces. Not only do such issues potentially lead to more radical understanding, but the act of raising such issues itself helps to negate the authoritarian, dehumanizing structure of the armed forces. A democratic army in which men are treated like human beings is, like a democratic draft, impossible in an imperialist state. Our commitment to democracy by itself makes us radicals, in the armed forces even more than in our society as a whole.

So the goals of armed forces agitation and organizing are to counter the brainwashing of a great proportion of American youth and to counter it with a radical

of America—the white working class.

CONTACT: New York City: Vietnam Work-In, 149 W. 108th St., New York City 10025, 212-773-3855, 212-222-1763; Ann Arbor: Bill Sachs, 313-668-8813; Baltimore: Tom Bowers, 301-732-8990; Washington, D. C.: Wayne Horman, 301-474-6479; Boston: Dennis DeCoste, 617-868-6614, or Debby Levenson, 617-354-7730; Los Angeles: Jim Dann, 213-399-6819; San Francisco: John Levin, 415-282-5827; Rochester: Alan Strelzoff, 716-325-4773; Chicago: Kathy Fisher, 312-548-4503.

education that grows directly out of their experience in the armed forces. In the long run, we can dream that potential resistance by members or potential members of the armed forces, the enforcers of imperialist policies, may impose serious restrictions on these policies. But long before that stage is foreseeable, dividends are paid in the form of radical roots among all parts of the population.

Needless to say, any such activity is difficult alone. For the movement, and for SDS in particular, this suggests several needs:

1) It is necessary to investigate the legality of various forms of radical agitation and organization in the armed forces. I have little idea as to the limitations that legally or quasi-legally exist on the rights of free speech, or organized dissent, etc. in the armed forces. The Levy and the Petrick cases will help clarify this. It is certainly necessary to know this before exposing ourselves to

(Continued on page 4)

STANFORD

(Continued from page 2)

863 to 589, 59.4%. Further action is yet undetermined.

Information and counseling—we are securing information and writing leaflets for both on and off campus, and we are participating in an on-campus C. O. conference.

Legal aid—we are in contact with lawyers and have received promises of financial backing from the community (Palo Alto and Stanford).

Non-cooperation—David Harris, former student body president, is doing anti-draft work in loose cooperation with us. He is working to coordinate nationwide non-cooperation, with public announcements in October. David and about six or seven others at Stanford have already sent in their draft cards, and have made contact with several others across the country who wish to do the same.

We Won't Go—we continue to collect names, and we hope to publish them in the San Francisco Chronicle, in an ad, with names from other schools like SF State and Cal.

Summer—SDS plans to have a summer project on the war, in Palo Alto, and we will do anti-draft organizing, hopefully with youths who will not go to college.

High schools—The ADU is working with a strong local high school organization which SDS has been advising all along. The United Student Movement comes, in force, to demonstrations, and is an efficient group for distributing information which we provide. Another high school group, informally organized at a local conservative high school, is forcing their high school administration to allow a permanent C. O. counselor on campus. We are providing aid and advice. (High school organizing will be discussed in a future report.)

Women—men and women of all sexes are welcome in the ADU. Several girls have just begun circulating a petition supporting the guys who won't go.

Faculty—the Stanford faculty, which we have kept in contact with all along, is beginning to do beautiful things. They have not only donated money, but they are organizing two things. They are circulating a petition, with SF State and Cal faculty, advocating draft resistance, and they are circulating a pledge to mass civil disobedience against the draft and the war.

The sudden emergence of faculty, female, community, and high school action has convinced me that we have initiated the momentum which can lead to effective anti-draft action.

For info on non-cooperation, write David Harris, 2269 Cooley Ave, East Palo Alto, Calif.

For info or to join faculty support, write Jay Neugeboren, 939 Cowper, East Palo Alto.

columbia

(CONT. FROM PAGE 1)

we feel that SDS's campaign has had an enduring impact on Columbia students, and that the "coalition technique" can be employed in a variety of situations.

The demand that the University withhold class-rank from the draft board was not a new one at Columbia. Several times in the past few years SDS or the Vietnam Committee has thought of using it as a basis for a major campaign on campus. The response was not very encouraging. Moreover, serious questions were raised about the issue as a whole. If class-ranking were abolished, draft boards would rely solely on the Selective Service examinations. One's score on this type of aptitude test is related to one's socio-economic background because young students in the college-oriented high schools of suburbs are specially prepared for such tests. Thus, it would seem that the result of a successful ranking struggle would be to divide students in the prominent private college from students in public or less-famous schools; i.e., to divide students along quasi-class lines. Moreover, it was feared that on such an issue it would be all too easy to suppress arguments about Vietnam in favor of arguments related to the question of University reform.

ATTENTION:

PHOTOS NEEDED IF YOU HAVE PHOTOS OF CHAPTER ACTIVITIES FOR THE PAST YEAR PLEASE BRING COPIES TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTION!

NAC minutes

June 1, 1967

MEMBERS PRESENT: Calvert, Canavan, McCarthy, Silbar, Veneziale, Wilkerson

AGENDA: 1) REC Center; 2) Insurance; 3) USSR trip; 4) Convention report; 5) Wages of war.

1) REC Center: Negotiations are underway to get a 10-year loan from SDS friends at 5% per year to pay for a house which will be the headquarters for the Radical Education Center and the NO print shop. Renting out one floor would bring payments within reason. SDS needs another \$3,000 for the down payment. The NAC okayed these plans.

2) Insurance: Another 3 items have been purchased for the print shop. NLN operations must be insured: cost—\$45 per year; okayed by NAC.

3) USSR trip: A trip to the USSR has been paid for by a Soviet youth group in honor of the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution (the good old days). All expenses will be paid. We go as an observer only. Jeff Shero, ex vice-president of SDS, will make the trip. Jeff speaks Russian, and has previously traveled in the Soviet Union. He goes with the understanding that he is to observe and come back with written reports which he will present to various chapters of SDS.

4) Convention report: Much static from Ann Arbor. Causes difficult to pin down. Convention Coordinator Neil Buckley going there to check things out. (Convention still on.)

5) Wages of war: "The cost of Imperialist wars to the working people", or "SDS staffer comes down with infectious hepatitis and Health Department can't give normal free serum since all (most) supplies go to Vietnam". Shots for those working in close proximity will cost \$10 each for 10 NO staffers (okayd by NAC). NO staff to publicize this atrocity.

(lovingly submitted this day of the American Revolution—Earl Silbar)

As the war escalated, however, interest in the issue was revived among students and faculty. SDS was later able to use this fact to prove that, contrary to University Administration spokesmen, ranking was not a purely educational question with no relation to Vietnam. Columbia, a traditionally liberal campus but with strong apolitical or right-wing elements, had originally supported the Johnson administration. However, some people began to have doubts, and Columbia was able to send one of the largest contingents to the SDS March on Washington in April, 1965. Despite this show of force, however, the bulk of students were either committed to LBJ's war policy or hopelessly apolitical.

FACULTY VOTES

However, by the time school opened in September of last year, the mood on campus was tense, even despairing, but clearly anti-war. Still, the ranking issue was not launched by SDS until we woke up one morning to discover that the faculty of the College had voted overwhelmingly to instruct the Registrar to cease sending

organize!

(CONT. FROM PAGE 3)

retribution. Equally important is the question of how to deal with the informal means of reprisal the army has—from the sergeant giving you a rough time to beatings by unfriendly soldiers, etc.

2) Discussion and analysis of issues of relevance for armed forces organizing are needed. From the vague notions I have presented to developing a workable radical program for use in the armed forces is a long road.

3) Methods of informing radicals on the possibilities of radical organizing in the armed forces must be created—e.g., pamphlets on your rights as a soldier, on radical issues for radical soldiers, etc. Perhaps we should consider the possibilities of developing a network of armed forces radicals, with a mechanism such as a newsletter for exchange of ideas and problems, with a means of getting radicals in the same post or same unit together, etc. In the long run perhaps we could even conceive of a magazine directed to members of the armed forces in general.

This is all still certainly a very preliminary proposal, more in the nature of a request for discussion than of a proposal for a project to be set up immediately. Reactions from those with legal knowledge or experience in the military would be particularly interesting. If interest is sufficient, perhaps we could begin to develop the idea more concretely.

more nac

June 8, 1967

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Buschel, Greg Calvert, Dee Jacobsen, Tim McCarthy, John Veneziale, Cathy Wilkerson, Don Canovan

OTHERS PRESENT: Marilyn Buck, Neil Buckley, Jim Fite, Bob Pardun, Dave Singer, Jeannie Veneziale

AGENDA: 1) New Mexican Guerrilla Force; 2) Stockholm Conference; 3) U.C.M. Annual Assembly; 4) C.B.S.; 5) Literature; 6) REC Center House; 7) Convention; 8) Staff

1) New Mexican Guerrilla Force: Recent activities in New Mexico were reported and discussed. The question of appropriate SDS action was referred to chapters.

2) Stockholm Conference: There will be a Peace and Freedom Conference in Stockholm this summer called by a large number of European peace groups. They have asked SDS to send someone. The NAC agreed to send a delegate to the Peace and Freedom Conference if we can find someone who will already be in Europe so it doesn't cost SDS anything.

3) U.C.M. Annual Assembly: U.C.M. wrote to ask that SDS send a delegate to their annual conference June 11-16. The NAC decided to send Tim McCarthy, Neil Buckley, and Dave Singer.

in class-rank to draft boards. The vote came after what appeared to be a long struggle within the faculty and the threat by some professors to give "A's" to all students. The matter was taken under advisement by University President Grayson Kirk. To us this meant that the whole question was just being conveniently filed away. When it was learned that the Student Council would hold a referendum in February on the question of class-ranking, SDS determined to make this the focus of a major appeal to the campus. After considerable discussion it was agreed to leave until after the referendum the matter of which tactic to use to make the referendum binding on the University.

However, an important decision was made at this time. SDS decided that the question of the relation of the draft to the Vietnam war should under no circumstances be pushed aside by the obviously more popular question of democratizing the decision-making powers within the University. The ranking struggle was seen by SDS from beginning to end as a tool for organizing and recruiting on Vietnam. SDS never succumbed to what at Columbia was the obvious opportunistic potential of running a "student power" campaign without raising radical issues. Having taken a gamble like this, SDS could rightfully claim after the voting was over that people had Vietnam on their minds as they cast their ballots.

SDS members began canvassing dormitories, holding rallies, and hawking to students during change-of-class breaks. We argued that class-ranking destroys the proper academic atmosphere of free inquiry by setting students against students in the competition for top grades. SDS was greatly helped by the disclosures occurring just at that time on the extent of CIA infiltration into such organizations as the NSA. These revelations had a shattering impact on the campus, partly because the affiliations of some Columbia officials were dubious and partly because the evidence on the CIA was brought up at the disciplinary trial of several students who had sat-in to prevent the CIA from

recruiting at Columbia. We also raised the entire spectrum of "student power" issues, pointing in particular to the blatant actions of the University in ignoring the faculty resolution on ranking. Above all we stressed that the referendum offered students a chance to strike a blow at Johnson's policies; that in the long run the only way to save our lives would be to do whatever we could to end the war.

After knocking on dormitory doors night after night the results began to come in. Somehow SDS had articulated the fear and terror in which Columbia students, indeed all of us, are living. Somehow we had said something that spoke for the campus. When the ballots were finally tabulated Columbia College had voted by a two-and-one-half to one margin to withhold class rank. The "no" votes obtained similar overwhelming majorities in referendums held at other undergraduate institutions within the University.

The University Administration still took no action, despite these clear manifestations that students and faculty were united on this issue as never before in recent years. SDS demanded that the results of the student and faculty votes be immediately binding on the University. To back this demand it was agreed to call for a two-day boycott of classes. The option of holding a sit-in, which was used at the University of Chicago and City College of New York, was rejected. The priority always was to use the ranking campaign to organize a mass-movement on campus and not merely to win the specific concession from the University. A sit-in would have violated our commitment to organize the campus because under the circumstances it would have been merely a testimony to the dedication of the hard core and in no way an action that could have mobilized the College. When the CIA recruiter came a small faction within SDS had held a sit-in with disastrous results.

(CONTINUED: Next week's issue of NLN will carry the second and final article in this series.)

NEW LEFT NOTES
Room 206
1603 W. Madison
Chicago, Ill. 60612
RETURN REQUESTED

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

Jim JACOBS
21 St James pl apt 18D
Brooklyn N Y 11205

4) C.B.S.: C.B.S. has notified the N.O. that they are doing a documentary (C.B.S. Reports) on the New Left. They indicated that they would like to film the N.O. The NAC decided to allow the filming and an interview with the entire staff. Three weighty considerations supported this decision. One: C.B.S. was going to do the film anyway. Two: The quality of C.B.S. Reports documentaries in the past (e.g. "Harvest of Shame") has indicated an apparently honest intention to deal accurately with the subject matter. Three: The NAC made explicit the fact that an interview would be granted only with the entire staff, not with any particular member or SDS officer. Individuals on the staff would speak personally, not in any way for the organization.

5) Literature: Marilyn Buck and Jane Adams have been compiling a series of articles from NLN to put together for use at the summer institutes. They collected a representative sampling of articles on news, theory, and points of strategy debate. The NAC decided that anything that was printed in this size (30 to 40

large pages) should be of good quality so that it could be printed in large quantities, not just for the institutes; the expense was not justified on the basis of the institutes alone. Therefore, they recommended that parts of the pamphlet be redone, pictures and drawings added, and parts reset.

6) REC Center House: We are still unable to get a loan totaling \$5,000 to help us buy the REC House. It is becoming apparent that we will not be able to get it. This leaves the summer institutes in Chicago without a place: no place to start an SDS library; no place for travelers to stay when they are in Chicago next year; no room for decent NLN layout facilities and so forth. If any of you have large savings accounts, why don't you invest your \$1,000 someplace which will give you a 5% return as well as being a crucial help to SDS and the radical movement. 7) Convention: Steve Halliwell will go to Ann Arbor to deal with Convention arrangements.

submitted by John Veneziale