snccsds joint draft statement

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE STUDENT NONVIOLENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE AND OF THE STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY ON THE CONSCRIPTION LAWS BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITEE ON THE ARMED SERVICES

by Stokely Carmichael, Chairman SNCC and Carl Oglesby, President, SDS

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Committee on the Armed Services: We have observed with regret that thus far this Committee has seen fit to hear testimony only from members of Congress and from representatives of those who presently make the decisions under the conscription laws: officials of the Selective Service and of the Department of Defense. None of those directly affected by these decisions has been called to testify. We believe that such a selection of witnesses is detrimental to the democratic process; we are submitting this written statement so that the Committee may have before it in its considerations a minimal presentation of the views of some of those who will be most immediately affected by its actions.

Permit us to make our position quite clear. We are opposed to the draft, and believe that it should be abolished. We are opposed to a system under which a group of men can compel another man who has had no voice in their decision to renounce his liberty and risk his life-blood for a cause which is not his. No man need be coerced to defend what is in his interest, and no one should be forced to kill for what is in another's interest.

In a supposedly "free society" conscription is a form of legalized enslavement of the worst kind: a slave had to serve his master's economic interest with labor and sweat; but a draftee must serve the "national interest" with murder and his own blood. Black men in the United States are forced to kill their colored brothers in Vietnam for 95¢ a month and the risk of death, injury and disease; this is why we oppose the draft. The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, with the full sympathy and support of the Students for a Democratic Society, is presently calling for the black people of America to organize for power, so that the young black man will find his living conditions so dire that he will become a mercenary to escape them. We abhor a system which takes as slaves those who do not go as mercenaries.

We abhor a system which sends young black men into Armed Forces which are not responsive to their interests. It is not in the interest of the black people in America to fight in Vietnam for the United States' deceptive claim of interest in the "freedom" of the Vietnamese; it is in their interest to receive the protection of federal troops when the exercise of their civil, constitutional and human rights is fraught with peril to their very existence. But black men in the United States Army are ordered to napalm Vietnamese villages, and not allowed to protect the black citizens of Mississippi from tear gas and clubs.

We note a number of the more blatant inequities in the operations of this inherently immoral Selective Service system: discrimination against the young, against the poor, against the less well educated. We observe too, General Hershey's testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Manpower, that throughout the South there is hardly a black draft board member, and that apparently the entire states of Mississippi, Alabama and Louisiana have only white Selective Service officials. However, the real evils of the system are so intrinsic that they cannot be dealt with by correcting some of the more obvious superficial injustices; conscription must be abolished.

It is our belief that the draft injures our whole society, and we are in sympathy with and support of all young men who refuse to equate their responsibility to a free society with obligation to assist in military aggression. Those who work for a new society in this country should not be sent to destroy incipient social workers in other nations.

Suggestions made recently concerning a scheme for "universal national service" are threats to the personal freedom of young Americans. Any such system would give the federal government enormous power over our whole society and all the individuals within it. It would be an instrument for stifling whatever social change the government opposed and for controlling the destinies of millions under the guise of humanitarianism. We are consequently strongly opposed to any such scheme of "universal national service."

In conclusion, we urge this Committee to seek testimony from those who are affected by the decisions of the Selective Service as well as from those who make those decisions. We reiterate our position of opposition to the draft, and our belief that the only correction available for the conscription system is its abolition.

discuss role of sds

What happened at Nashville last month will have implications for The Movement far beyond what any of us can perceive. The questions raised by Ivanhoe Donaldson of SNCC at the recent National Council meeting go beyond the issue of what is black power and may force white radicals to examine once again their role in the Movement.

The job of radicalizing and organizing the black ghettos is enormous. While black radicals will in all probability not be able to do the job alone, white radicals who have been involved in ghetto projects are keenly aware of the severe limitations placed upon them. White radical community projects by their very political nature cannot and will not be perceived as a threat to the concept of black power. For the object of these projects is to get people to mobilize their own power resources. In black politics this comes out as black power and, hopefully, even more: a heightened sense of personal worth and political efficacy, a new balance of political forces in the larger community and psychological rejuvenation for all those involved. Is this not part of what SNCC means by black power? When people in The Movement, white and black, use the concept "power" they generally mean independence, autonomy, and a personal sense that things *are* possible and that one *can* affect one's environment and destiny. Any contribution white radicals can make to this should be welcomed by all radicals. The SNCC reaction to NCUP's limited successes is a favorable indication.

But all this repeats the obvious. The question of the role of white radicals must be discussed. First, those white radicals who see and desire a role for themselves in the black ghettos may have to be a special breed of cat, i.e., more resilient, tougher, and with a special and natural feel for working-class and poor people, and with an adult commitment that they have signed up for the duration. Radicals who stay and fight have very few and far between at any level of political life. Such people may be even scarcer when it comes to the frustrating and unromantic life of a ghetto organizer.

Secondly, we must ask ourselves the larger question of how radicals can most effectively utilize their time, education, and personal resources and energies to carry their ethos and work into every sector of American life. The job of ghetto organizing is but one part of the radical strategy, essential as it may be. Many in the Movement may not be temperamentally, physically, or in any other way suited for work in the black ghettos. Their work may be to construct part of the essential white/black coalition that must eventually be formed. To undertake that task the same fundamental commitment is in order. A lifetime commitment to radical politics in professions, communities, local school systems, universities, and local political organizations. Each must think of how his career, job, or professional commitment can relate to his radical intent. It is not difficult to imagine. Much is already taking place: university professors working for university reform, doctors practicing medicine that is socially oriented, lawyers practicing civil liberties law and working with poor people, social workers organizing themselves and affecting the role of the welfare institutions. And all radicals working together for radical candidates, integrated communities, peace activism, and devoting much of their thoughts and intellectual activity to problems, ideological and tactical, that the Movement will encounter.

Working in the middle class is not just a project but a way of life. It may involve much soul searching for those who have repudiated the middle class and have seen the Movement as some kind of escape. It may involve a re-examination of one's roots and may bring about a dialogue with one's parents and friends out of the Movement. It will involve making radicalism more than rebellion and protest and will eventually

(continued on page 4)

new left notes

an internal newspaper of students for a democratic society

Vol. 1, No. 25 | let the people decide | July 8, 1966

1806 w. madison, rm. 206, | chao., ill. 60612

Wayne State Pres. Rejects Draft Ranking

On June 16 President William R. Keast of Wayne State University announced that the university would not rank male students this fall for the draft. As the first university to adopt this policy, Wayne is in the difficult position of resisting pressure not only from Selective Service but from students eager to keep their deferments.

The decision not to rank was the result both of a liberal administration and protest by students and faculty.

On May 13 approximately sixty students began a sit-in to protest university policy on the draft. They accepted the invitation of Vice-President James McCormick to meet the administration to discuss the matter. From the first conference a letter was drawn up by the new group, The AdHoc Committee on the University and the Draft; with seven points, principally that ranking be stopped and the draft tests not be held under university auspices. The letter was signed by a committee of thirteen. A press release was sent out announcing an open forum on the university and the draft, and a petition was circulated opposing university cooperation with the draft tests.

A delegation of four students and three faculty members was chosen to negotiate for the group. President Keast replied to the first letter in general terms expressing a desire for greater discussion.

A second letter of four pages was prepared by the group explaining their demands more fully. The negotiating team met with the administration to express their point of view. Letters were sent to all state representatives and state senators opposing the use of university facilities for the draft. A number of favorable replies were received.

The reply to the second letter was embodied in Keast's statement of June 16. It outlined the need for university independence and recognized the inequities of the draft system.

Following the Wayne statement, the University at Michigan and Michigan State University announced they would continue to rank students. Selective Service announced a major shift in policy that received little press notice: the Selective Service will not request information from individual students any longer, but directly from the university. Colonel Holmes in reference to the Wayne statement proclaimed that if the university could not provide adequate information on a student's standing, he would become libel for he draft. This was, of course, a direct reference to ranking.

As of now Wayne students are alone in their position and the university is under pressure. Pressure will continue for an end to university cooperation with the draft tests. We urge continued pressure on university administrations to end their marriage of convience with the draft.

Copies of letters, press releases, petitions, and the replies of the university are available from the Detroit Committee to End the War in Vietnam, 1101 West Warren, Detroit, Michigan 48201.

James Lipson

National SDS New Address is

1806 W. Madison, Room 206, Chicago, Illinois, 60612

june 3 nac minutes

Members present: Jane Adams, Gregg Calvert, Bob Speck, Paul LeBlanc, Mike James
Members absent: Paul Lauter, Aerlin Weissman (both at AFSC conference)
Alternate present: Tom Condit; Others: Art Rosenblum, Eric Chester, Steve Kindred, Sandra Wilson, Honey Black, Jerry Einstandig, Barb Mitchell, Dave White, Harry Goldstein, Roy Dahlberg.

1. Printing. MOTIONS CARRIED: To ask voters for Peace to pick up their mimeo from our office; To check with Monroe Sharp on trading SNCC an offset for one of their Gestetners, and get rid of our present mimeo; To hire Dennis Grubb as apprentice printer; To charge $3 per hour plus paper for printing for JOIN, CIPA, chapters, etc; To continue to exchange labor on printing for use of the Freedom Drivers truck.

2. Discussion of move to new office, painting, etc.

3. Convention booklet. LeBlanc presented a proposal for a printed convention program with ads from book publishers and periodicals, contributory greetings from friends, etc. It was generally agreed that such a program booklet should be in tabloid newspaper form to minimize costs, and should be distributed free to all members.

4. Finances. Kindred and Condit presented fund-raising ideas (see elsewhere in this issue). They were instructed to write them up for *New Left Notes*.

LeBlanc reported that SDS had outstanding major debts of $2,733.89, and our current bank balance stood at $132.79.

MOTION (LeBlanc): No money shall be spent which is not authorized by the NAC. Allocations of money shall be made once a week at the NAC meeting. The person in charge of finances shall make a report at each NAC meeting on the financial condition of the N.O. (specifically, the amount of money in the bank and outstanding bills & debts). Those who wish to have money allocated for something should be at the NAC meeting to make the request.

Discussion followed, focussing on the need for a contingency or petty cash reserve in the office. Speck moved to table until we have some money to do all this allocating with,

(continued on page 4)

Notes on Money & SDS

Dear fellow SDS members,

It is always extremely difficult for me to understand why SDS is in debt. Surely with three to five thousand members, a dollar contribution every two months would be enough to keep our organization out of debt. Unfortunately, we "radicals" are so often making fun of the 'liberals' for their lack of real dedication to the movement, that we overlook the fact that we cannot cough up enough money to pay the really few dedicated people in the national office and the regional organizers a living wage.

It is time that we took a good look at ourselves. Surely we could find the money somewhere. How about the money we save on clothes? After all, there should be some left over, since we buy only two pair of dungarees a year. Or from the money we save on haircuts and shaves? Or cutting down the number of signs at a demonstration? Or having one less beer a week?

Or how about this radical suggestion? Every member save up his pennies and nickels and contribute one dollar a month. Surely, the movement is worth one dollar a month.

Enough of the b.s. about concerts, parties, lectures, and movies or fundraisers. Anybody who believes in the idea of SDS digs down into his dirty dungarees and sends in a little of that hated commodity--money.

Victor Goldman

(Brother Goldman included his monthly $3 contribution with this letter. If you'd all do the same, we'd be rich--or at least, out of debt.)

SDS is broke. For that matter, we are not only broke, we are badly in debt. $8,000 worth of debts. We are living off borrowed money and NLN is about the only thing we are able to pay for. After this issue we may not even be able to pay for NLN.

What does this mean? Does this tell you (the members) that we have over 250 literature packages which are filled but which we cannot send to the people who ordered them because we have no money to pay postage? Does this tell you that the staff has not been paid in over a month? Does this tell you that we are unable to print new pamphlets because we cannot buy the supplies? Does it tell you that our phones and lights are about to be cut off? Does it tell you that the staff is so discouraged that we are not sure that the office will be able to survive over the summer?

We need your money! If we don't get it you may not get another issue of NLN. This is not an appeal, not a threat. This is just a statement of hard reality.

Please send us some money. Send it soon. Our new address is: SDS, Room 206, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago, Ill.

Speck

convention program rates

New rates for advertisements and contributory greetings in the SDS National Convention Program are as follows:

Full page	$300.00
1/2 page	175.00
1/4 page	100.00
1/8 page	75.00
Parent's greeting	10.00 per set
Greeting from movement childre	5.00

I wish to place a contributory greeting in the 1966 Convention Program of Students for a Democratic Society. I am purchasing the following:

___ Full page -- $300

___ 1/2 page -- $175

___ 1/4 page -- $100

___ 1/8 page -- $ 75

___ Parents' greeting -- $10

___ Greeting from children of movement people $ 5

I would like my greeting to read as follows (print name and message as you would like them to appear in the Program):

The new rates are due to the change in format of the Program. Instead of the projected 8" by 11" size, we have found that it would be considerably more practical to put out a 11" by 16', thirty-two page program. Also, it has been decided to use a good quality, though non-glossy paper.

ORDER FORM

to be sent to SDS National Office

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

DATE _____

LOCAL OR NAT.'L SDS REP. _____

RECEIPT

of

_____ _____
(name) (address)
has had a $ ___ contributory greeting placed in the 1966 Convention Program of Students for a Democratic Society.

_____
(Local or National SDS Representative)

printing presses available

We have some very special bargains available in offset printing presses which we are able to offer to any regional office, chapter, or individual SDS member on a first-come, first-served basis.

(1) Model 80 Multilith with automatic friction feed. Complete and in excellent condition but requires some adjustment. Prints 75 copies per minute from typed paper plates or photographic metal plates. Weighs about 200 lbs. Cost when new: $1,200. Sold to us by a friend and for sale for $50.

(1) Multilith model 1000. Similar to model 80 but has air-suction feed system which can handle 1200 sheets of paper without stopping. Complete and in excellent condition. Weighs about 400 lbs. Price when new, about $2,000. Our price: $151.

(1) Multilith model 1227. Similar to popular model 1250, most parts identical. Davidson air-suction feed system feeds 500 sheets per hour without stopping. Lacks two 1/2 h.p. electric motors (cost about $20 each). Generally good condition and should run for years once set up. Two parts, total weight 600 lbs. Price: $100.

(1) Davidson 221. One of the best presses on the market, and will run steadily for years. 5000 sheet air-suction feed. Weighs about 800 lbs. Price when new: about $3,000. SDS give-away price: $200.

All the above machines handle 10" by 14" paper (or smaller). They can do high-quality two-side printing on any type of paper. Can print photographs, commercially set type, hand-lettered or type-written copy. Cost of paper is less than $2 per 1,000 sheets (8-1/2" x 11"). Paper cost, aside from labor, is major cost of any printing job. Metal photo-plates cost $2.35, and are good for 20-30,000 copies. (These are, of course, Chicago prices --paper in particular may run somewhat higher in smaller cities.)

It is important to have a trained operator for running the machine. People interested in receiving training as part of a package deal with purchase of a machine by a chapter or region should write to Art Rosenblum, c/o SDS National Office.

NEEDED

One reliable and dedicated young radical interested in working with Barbara Dane to set up folk concerts for SDS. Must live in (or be willing to live in) the East. For more information, write to Paul Le Blanc in the National Office.

NEW LEFT NOTES

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1103 E. 63rd St., Chicago, Ill. 60637. Phone (312) 667-6050. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Illinois. Subscriptions: $1 a year for members; $5 a year for non-members. Signed articles and letters are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the Editor, Speck.

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Carl Oglesby, president; Jeffry Shero, vice-president; and Jane Adams, national secretary

National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill.60612 (312) 667-6050
New York City: 49 West 27th St., NYC, NY. 10001; (212) 889-5793
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif; (415) 362-7822
Chicago Region: 2059 N. Larrabee. Chicago, Ill. (312) 944-3624
New England: 830 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.; (617) 547-5457
Radical Education Project: C/O Voice, SAB, Univ. of Mich., Ann Arbor, Mich.

Vol. 1, No. 25 **let the people decide** **July 8, 1966**

Current SDS Lit. List

General SDS Items

SDS Bulletin, December 1965 (25¢)
Basic Brochure (free)
December Conference Working Papers ($2.00)
SDS Constitution (free)
Al Haber, Non-exclusionism: The New Left and the Democratic Left (10¢)
Freedom Draft Cards (1¢ ea.)
Jack Kittredge, Chapter Organizer's Handbook (15¢)
Sidney Lens, The New Left and the Establishment (10¢)
Staughton Lynd, The New Radicals and Participatory Democracy (10¢)
Mademoiselle, New Voices on Campus (10¢)
Call to the March on Washington (10¢)
Paul Potter, Speech at the April 17 March on Washington (10¢)

Peace and Foreign Policy

Theodore Draper, Roots of the Dominican Crisis - LID (25¢)
Todd Gitlin, Deterrence and Reality - Where Movement Comes From (10¢)
Todd Gitlin, Notes on Arguing about Vietnam (5¢)
Lauder, Guide to Conscientious Objection (10¢)
Chris Hobson, Vietnam - Any Way Out (10¢)
Information on Involvement of U. S. Corporations in South Africa (10¢)
Peace - In the College Curriculum, a resource kit (10¢)
Toward an Effective Peace Program on Campus (10¢)
U.S.A. vs David Henry Mitchell (10¢)
Viet-Report, Vol. 1, Nos. 1, 4; Vol. 2, Nos. 1, 2 (30¢ ea.) (Circle issues wanted)
Lee Webb, Churches and the War (10¢)
Killing the People of Vietnam (large poster) ($2.50)

Domestic

Thomas Brooks, To Build a New World, Hist. of American Labor - LID (10¢)
ERAP Prospecti (64-65) for Newark, Chester, Pa., Chicago (10¢)
Tom Gish, This Is the War that Is: Failure of the Poverty Program in Eastern Kentucky (10¢)
Arthur Gorson, Road to a Voice for Jobs and Justice (10¢)
Michael Harrington, The Politics of Poverty - LID (30¢)
Bob Heifitz, Eastern Kentucky, A Draft Program -----
High School Reform, Toward a Student Movement (10¢)
What is JOIN? (10¢)
JOIN Community Union Poster ($1.00)
Clark Kissinger, The Bruns Strike -
A Case of Student Participation in Labor (10¢)
SDS Labor Bulletin Vol. 1, No. 1 (10¢)
Top Priority Programs to Reduce Unemployment -- Conference on Economic Progress (50¢)
U. of Chicago sit-in poster (25¢)
Mike Zweig, Eastern Kentucky in Perspective (5¢)
Huelga - Story of the Delano Grape Strike (25¢)

Chapters have 50% discount on Bulk Orders. Please indicate Chapter.

NAME _____

SCHOOL ADDRESS _____

HOME ADDRESS _____

COMMENTS? _____

___ **I wish to join SDS and enclose $4.00 ($3 for dues and $1 for NEW LEFT NOTES).**

___ **I am ordering the literature checked and enclose ____ in payment.**

___ **Please send me information on SDS.**

___ **I am ordering the literature checked and enclose ____ in payment.**

proposed convention agenda

The following is a rough draft of the Radical Education Project proposal for the National Convention agenda. The next issue of New Left Notes will carry a refined and expanded version. This one is included to spur discussion of the purpose and format of the convention.

The Convention is seen as a resolutions committee of the Whole. It will try to define tentative positions and direction to be further discussed between it and the December meeting, leading to the drafting of a new SDS document, as per the resolution of the June National Council. The debate on the issues of the document, between now and its final drafting, is seen more as being important to stimulate internal dialogue and as an educational tool than the actual existence of the document.

The Convention itself will prepare and refine position or working papers on topics it will define as specifically relevant to SDS program and direction. REP will, and others should, prepare a "workbook" containing an analysis of the analyses put forth in the *Port Huron Statement, America and the New Era,* and the Economic Research and Action Program (ERAP), Political Education Project (PEP) and Peace Research and Education Project (PREP) works, attempting to view historically the direction of SDS and the analyses and programs it should adopt in the future.

The Convention should be divided into two basic sections:

I. First 2-1/2 days: General presentations to plenary, policies & issues workshops.
   A. Discussion of general analysis included in PHS; the relationships and dynamics put forth in PHS.
   B. Changing emphasis within SDS: change from discussions of cold ideology and world order to more realistic view of US relationship to the third world, revolution and counter-revolution.
   C. Policies & issues workshops: what

(continued on page 4)

communist convention report

by C. Clark Kissinger,
member of Large of the SDS NC

It began with the singing of the Star Spangled Banner and ended with a Russian-style loud tumultuous (with foot stomping) acclamation of the election of Gus Hall and Henry Winston as the party's top officers. And for anyone politicized in the free wheeling movements of the sixties, it was like another world.

It's almost a truism to say that Communists have a different way of doing things. Yet often our notions of what those different ways are, are shaped more by the myths of the cold war and our own folk lore of the left than by any real experience with the subject. Hence in this report I will concentrate more on how the convention actually functioned than on the political content of its various resolutions. I do this, first, because the texts of the resolutions will appear in a future issue of Political Affairs (the party's theoretical journal); second, because it was impossible for me to attend all the workshops, or even hear all the floor debates; and third, because I feel the kinds of questions asked by most young people today about the party have to do with its internal functionings and democracy more than its politics.

Let me begin by answering a few questions:

Was the Convention open? Not very. To pass from the street to the floor of the plenary one had to produce credentials two or three times. Besides delegates and alternates the major categories of participants were observers and press. Observers were prearranged guests of the party or of local delegations, and were admitted to the floor of the plenary and into committees at the discretion of the the individual committees. Although observers were enough, some observers were more equal than others in terms of access to committee and workshop meetings. As the principal observer from SDS, I received more courteous treatment and was given complete access to every phase of the Convention except meetings of the presiding committee. Everyone was very friendly and open and I experienced no difficulty in being able to sit down and talk to anyone at length, including party leadership. The press didn't fare so well and were confined to a room in the basement except for that evening when they were allowed upstairs to film Gus Hall's opening remarks (they were not allowed to film the faces of delegates). Most news coverage of the Convention (e.g. daily in the NY Times) was totally unrelated to what was actually going on in the convention and was the result of daily news conferences held in the basement in which different aspects of the party's work were emphasized each day (civil rights, youth, etc.)

Although the party made a sincere effort to insure a large number of non-party observers from selected organizations in the movement and the new left, almost none materialized. The number of observers attending the daily sessions dropped off precipitously after the opening night. Besides myself and a couple of people from the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, I saw no other organizational representatives.

The openness accorded selected observers substantiates (at least for me) the party's claim that its secrecy is sometimes imposed unwillingly by a desire to protect individual delegates from loss of job and other harassment, and to prevent the disruption of the convention by the radical right or by local left groups. The only secret business transacted by the convention was the election of the National Committee. Here the nominations were circulated in writing to delegates only and no one was allowed to make a copy.

Was there real discussion in the convention sessions? Not of the kind the new left has come to know. The beginning of each session (in the larger committees and in the plenary) every one wishing to speak so informed the chair. His name was then placed on a speakers list and he was called in turn. No one could speak a second time until everyone who wanted to speak had done so. The result was that instead of give and take discussion, the sessions tended to become a series of disconnected speeches. This aspect was reenforced by the fact that most speakers did in fact attempt to deliver prepared remarks, and finally, every single speaker was thanked.

This is not to say that real discussion did not go on. People were conversing around their tables constantly while the speeches were going on, and informally and constantly in small groups and over dinner to argue and rewrite resolutions. But what debate did go on in the formal sessions was often difficult for an outsider to follow (especially if one was not familiar with ongoing intra-party debates). Since all the resolutions coming before the plenary tended to be encyclopedic in nature, having a little gripe with everybody's point of view, the debates were most frequently in terms of "strengthening" one section or another of the resolution.

Was the convention democratic? Not by standards the new left would accept. But to understand this one has to understand democratic centralism both in theory and as practiced by the CPUSA. Principally it must be understood that the convention was seen by the party not as the place where deep disputes were to be debated and settled by majority vote, but rather as the place where concensus arising out of discussion at the local level was to be ratified. Thus, for example, the rules of plenary specified that all motions and amendments were to arise out of committees and all other motions would be accepted only atthe discretion of the chair, and that after a number of speakers had spoken "on" the resolution that if there was any objection to the resolution there would be two speakers for and two against and then the body would come to a vote. Although there was vociferous discussion and much reworking of resolutions in the committees, once a resolution reached the plenary floor the chairs (which was regularly rotated) showed incredible antipathy to any attempts to alter the resolution. Some amendments were accepted from the floor, but were almost always voted up or down immediately without discussion. On one occasion the chair flatly refused to accept a substitute resolution, and on several occasions delegates made amendments with the expressed purpose of having the convention vote on them, only to have them accepted without vote into the main resolution as "friendly:" by the mover of the main resolution. In general, the chair (Gus Hall) seemed more concerned with keeping to the time limits of the agenda than in expositing and resolving conflict. The general feeling among the delegates was that this was not undemocratic, and that if disputes still existed by the time the resolution reached the plenary floor, it was symptomatic of the fact that there had not been enough preparatory discussion in the committee and before the convention.

Does the Convention really make policy? Although the Convention is nominally the highest authority in the party, I think it can more accurately be described as the final step in a decision making process that begins in the party ranks to final ratification by the convention. Undoubtedly the convention affects policy--one need only compare the draft resolutions with their final passed forms to see this (and on some occasions the convention returned resolutions to the party for further discussion). On the other hand, the convention does not drift far from the guidelines set down by the leadership. For example, it was understood by all before the convention that the convention was not going to pass on the new draft program. The presiding committee (made up of the top party leadership) seemed to meet in almost continual session at some unknown location, and from time to time would render up suggested agenda changes which were always accepted by the body. Gus Hall and other prominent leaders were almost always absent from the floor of the plenary.

Typical of this style of operation was the election of the new National Committee. State delegations were asked to submit suggestions for nominations to the presiding committee. The presiding committee then considered the names available and recommended to the plenary that it elect a National Committee of eighty members (the size is set by the Convention, not the constitution) and presented to the plenary a list of 86 nominations. The plenary voted for the figure of 80 and several additional nominations were accepted from the floor. The election was then conducted by secret ballot. Each delegate was required to vote for at least 60 nominees, preventing "bullet" voting and insuring the election of the bulk of the presiding committee's slate. No one nominated from the floor was elected. On the other hand, the slate presented by the presiding committee was a very balanced and representative one. Approximately one third of the nominees were women, people and all geographical areas and political viewpoints were represented.

Let me say just a few words about the committee and plenary debate on the youth resolution and on the state of communist youth in general. Far anyone from the new left it is an unsettling experience to sit down with a group of young people who consider themselves to be, in fact, the vanguard, and listen to "the line' being hammered out. Yet that's just what happened. In many ways I think most SDSers would have been impressed with the high theoretical level of the discussion. Freed from the problems of the management of an organization (the party bureaucracy does that) and freed from a certain type of organizational chauvenism (the party youth work in dozens of different organizations--not as Young Communist League) they were able to talk about analysis and directions for the student movement as a whole. Yet at the same time it was depressing to hear contemporary young people seriously attempting to explain the problems of young people in America by quoting Engle's "Origins of the Family", looking to the writings of "Comrade Dimitroff" for guidelines on a youth program, and assuring themselves that the youth problem

letter from the right

ED. NOTE; *The following letter was sent to Carl. We thought we should include it because it touches on many topics which are of interest to many of our members.*

Dear Mr. Oglesby:

Unfortunately, I have only a small quantity of articles by you, including your speech "Let Us Shape the Future" in the August 1966 issue of *Liberation*. Needless to say, I am not the only person on the Right to applaud your basic reassessment of so-called "liberal" values. Finally, you and the organization for which you speak has come to the conclusion that the government of the United States is a neo-fascist corporate state whose leaders' only purpose is to gain power, an an ever increasing power over the lives, the welfare and of therefore, the property of the individual. As an advocate of laissez-faire capitalism, I, of course, am forced to include you still within the clutches of those people who would substitute their wills, by physical force, for the will of the freely-choosing man. What you seem to be searching for is a way or means to guarantee wealth to everyone, while only a few produce it, and at the same time maintain integrity to the rights of man. At least, such is the conclusion one must reach, considering your views on the War on Poverty (translated: War on Property, ergo War on the Individual), the Wagner Act (which parallels many of the fascist inanities perpetrated in Italy and Germany), and your general economic egalitarianism.

More specifically, the central philosophical essence of your attack on corporate statism seems to emanate from the dictum that "...it is a crime that so few should have so much *at the expense of so many*." (my italics). Were we to take an economic pie and divide it up between the major power blocs on our economic model, surely that portion reserved to entrepreneurial expertise must seem disproportionate to that given the great "masses". But upon closer examination of the mechanics of a voluntary market, the most singular, central, all-encompassing, elemental fact that can hardly escape the astute observer is that voluntary exchange is predicated on the assumption of mutual advantage. Otherwise why would anyone ever trade? To sacrifice his material desires? Surely not. The most crucial concept necessary to the understanding of laissez-faire capitalism and its ethic is that wealth is *created*. Are factories, skyscrapers, bridges, automobiles, electrical appliances all "natural" resources to automatically fall into the grasping hands of deprived humanity for the wishing? They must be created and produced by the most exhaustive and fluid functioning of the human mind. Reason created every material benefit known to man, and human reason is the basis if progress is to be a central characteristic of human life (and it is clear that life is progress; where there is no progress there can be no life) private property is the only means to the attainment of that progress.

Why do you add your, not wholly irrational, voice to those whose only desire is to banish the possibility of such progress, in declaring that "free enterprise" is identical to mercantilism? You seem to belie your trust when you fail to see through the glibe, but frail attempts on the part of neo-mercantilists, fascists, socialists, communists, utopians and the hundreds of other myriad groupings whose only point of agreement is that statism is good, and that if we can just confuse the issue we might succeed in making

(continued on page 4)

supa lit list

ED. NOTE: *The following list is the list of publications put out by SUPA. In coming weeks, we will also print the lists of the SF Regional Office and of SSOC. If you wish to order any of the items on this list, do NOT send the order to the NO. Send it instead to SUPA.*

Coming to Canada?? (draft-eligible guys)	.15
Radicalism and Conservative American Society, Irving L. Horowitz	.15
The American System -- John Graham	.25
An Open Letter to the New Left from C. Wright Mills	.10
Scarce Resources: The Dynamic of American Imperialism -- Heather Dean	.10
What is Equality of Two Nations? -- Jacques-Ivan Morin	.10
The Primacy of Peace -- A. J. Muste	.10
Toward a Non-Violent Political Philosophy -- J. Harding	.10
Economic Problems of Confederation -- Alfred Dubuc	.10
Raymond Aaron on Separatism (1 pp. reprint)	.10
Quebec. A Double Revolution -- B. Roy Lemoine	.10
Canada's Indians: A Powerless Minority -- Jim Harding	.10
Notes on Poverty in Canada, exerpts	.10
The Power of the Poor -- Warren G. Haggstrom	.10
Hard Tlak on Organizing the Ghetto -- Nicholas von Hoffman	.10
Student Syndicalism in Quebec -- Serge Joyal	.10
How the University has Survived -- Matt Cohen	.10
Ideas on the University -- Matt Cohen	.10
The Student Syndrome -- Dimitrios Roussopoulos	.10
How the University is Run Society -- Arthur Pape	.10
Education & Political Values, the Dilemma of Liberal Democracy -- Leslie Dewart	.10
An Approach to University Reform -- Ken Drushka	.10
The Facts About the War in Vietnam -- World Federalists	.10
The Significance of the State Department White Paper on Vietnam --M2M, Harvard-Radcliffe	.10
The U.S. System & Vietnam -- Carl Oglesby	.10
U.S. White Paper on Vietnam -- State Department	.10
The Vietnam Lobby -- Robert Scheer & Warren Hinckle	.10
The Geneva Agreement on Vietnam	.10
Norman Mailer -- LBJ -- Berkeley Teach-in speech)	.10
What is Our Role in East Asia -- D. F. Fleming (Western Political Quarterly)	.10
On the Canadian Involvement in the Vietnam War: An Open letter to the 27th Parliament of the Government of Canada	.10

Order from: SUPA, 658 Spadina Avenue, Toronto 4, Ontario CANADA

(SUPA is Student Union for Peace Action, sort of our brother or sister organization in Canada)

I am ordering the literature checked and enclose $ _____ in payment.

NAME _____

SCHOOL ADDRESS _____

HOME ADDRESS _____

COMMENTS? _____

The SDS Convention Will be in Clearlake, Iowa on the 28th of August through the 1st of Sept.

proposed agenda...

(continued from page 2)

kinds of issues and tentative positions SDS should be taking. General areas of position and program should be crystallized at this point, with only minimal discussion of precise programming.

II. Second 2-1/2 days: Specific program workshop, adoption of program... nd policy directives, elections.
- A. Program workshops leading to specific resolution suggestions, policy direction, affiliation (programs to be carried on with other groups).
- B. Decision making plenaries: putting program workshop conclusions into concise resolutions, election of officers, etc.
- C. Special workshops: presented by people with special areas of interest, relations with Communist groups, participatory democracy, women, etc.

The policies and issues workshops will be divided into 3 distinct areas: World Reality, the American Scene and Constituencies, Agencies of Change and Strategy:

I. World Reality
- A. SDS's change from concern with the cold war and world peace to concern with third world revolution raises questions in the following areas: (1) our political relationship to movements in the third world, are we agents of the Vietnamese National Liberation Front?, should we have opinions about democracy; industrialization techniques, violence and civil liberties in underdeveloped countries? If so, what should they be? How should we act upon them? What impact will they have on our attitudes and values? on our position toward building a domestic movement?
- B. Intervention, neo-isolation: are we against all military intervention? only American intervention? What if South African blacks ask for troops? Is it intervention to invest, trade, loan? to withdraw investments?
- C. Imperialism as theory: if we reject viewing the world as conflict relations between great powers; how do we explain conflict between non-Communist revolutionary movements? What effects on the economy would a pro-revolutionary policy have? Are the ideological and geopolitical causes of American foreign policy related to economic necessity?
- D. World Peace: Are we opposed to nuclear testing and development by Communist China? Can we support the UN while it excludes China? Is world revolution incompatible with world peace? Is talk about world law counter-revolutionary?
- E. Domestic ramifications: What constituencies are adversely affected by the war? which are benefited? How does the war spur radicalism? How does it deter it? What are the sources of opposition in the Senate? Where can we work that opposition? where not?

II. American Scene
- A. Black power and the inter-racial movement: How has our focus changed? Is black power racist? Where will it converge with white groups? where destroy the possibility of convergence? What evidence is there that it will create momentin the ghetto? Do we agree with its assumptions? How can we work with it?
- B. Liberalism: Are we resurrectors of the best of corporate and/or humanist liberalism or do we fundamentally disagree with even the best of liberal philosophy? What about competition? private property? individualism? consensus vs. conflict? private enterprise? initiative?
- C. Reform, rationalization, revolution: What effect have we had on the growth of the welfare state? Is the welfare state really bad. Do we agree with any part of its assumptions? which? Do we work for reforms that strengthen the corporate state? Do we fight within the welfare state for autonomous, decentralized power? Do we prefer participatory error to managerial rationality. Do we support the guaranteed annual income? should we push for income ceilings as well as floors? Should housing and transportation be free? What would be the ramifications of that?
- D. Politics: What opportunities within the Democratic Party exist for SDS for SDS influence? Should we avoid electoral activity, organizing for non-electoral change? Should we support only independent campaigns? Should we support or oppose good liberals to make our positions felt? Should we support the "lesser of two evils"?
- E. Social control: What do we do about increasing police power used in protecting us? Does monopoly control of the mass media make free speech a cover for dictatorship? How do we combat more subtle forms of control such as schools, narcotic leisure, advertising, popular trash culture? Do drugs and hallucenogics serve to destroy social control?

III. Constituencies, agencies of change, strategy
- A. Violence, do we want to use it? how should it be used?
- B. What are the agencies of change: Unions? churches? other voluntary organizations? What is the potential of poor people, the university community? the middle class peace movement? What potential exists in the civil rights movement, broadly and specifically? What of radicals in the professions?
- C. Coalition: Should we enter into coalition with mass liberal organizations? What will that mean? What are the chances for and meaning of political realignment?
- D. Independent politics: What are the potentials and pitfalls of third party organization?

letter...

(continued from page 3)

capitalism (no only economic system allowing the full implementation of man's economic right to exist for his own sake) a realistic impossibility? There are not conflicts of interest among rational individuals; the fact that a great many individuals are actually irrational in no way justifies the state giving them legal sanction to use armed force in coercing or influencing a beneficial circumstance which could not be had by way of voluntary cooperation. Many of your published words indicate sympathy for the downtrodden masses. One would have to be blind not to condemn those moral cannibals who victimize the gullible; but there is not enough outrageous phrases to express what moral indignation, what barbaric horror the rational man feels against those who victimize the best, the most efficient, the most productive individuals of a particular society. Only the man who realizes that defense for the *individual*, as opposed to the common man, the farmer, the businessman, is defense for humanist values. Only the man who proclaims, in shameless glory, his moral right to the exist for his own sake, can speak with integrity to the same right of others. And, I might add, this moral right transcends the petty allegiance to one economic grouping over another.

Finally, as you might guess, I am one of those growing few who believes the possibility exists for a genuine rapport between the Libertarian Right and the New Left. After reading a great deal of incredible misinformation and an almost overwhelming flood of gross sentimentality by the New Left, I still find myself urgently hoping that this projected rapport will be consummated. Why? Simply because I cannot abide the hysterical dogma of "anti-communism" and its fascist manifestations both in the liberal as well as the fascist Right camps. I may be quite deluded, as may be Murray Rothbard, in anticipating a basic political re-alignment in America. I have at least seen a glimpse of a possible realization by many of the New Left, that only laissez-faire capitalism can fulfill the many laudable, albeit vague, objectives which they seek. That they are searching for an answer one can applaud; that they utilize fully their respective rational free wills, waits to be judged.

Thomas V. Anderson
Executive Secretary,
Michigan Young Americans For Freedom

proposed mail ballot

ED. NOTE: *The following is a proposed NC resolution. Peter Orris would like to have it as a NC ballot sent out from the N.O.*

RESOLUTION: The National Office will have as a high priority for the immediate future to coordinate a boycott of Saran Wrap and other actions against Dow Chemicals and other producers of napalm.

REASONS: (1) This is a national action that is extremely flexible and can be adapted to each area; (2) Students (Dow produces scientific supplies) and housewives, etc., would be involved; (3) This is a very educational action as to who is making money off the war, namely the large corporations, etc.

NOTE: This boycott was called by Citizens Comm. Against Napalm in NYC and endorsed by WSP. I would like to urge if possible that actions taking place around August 6-9 be directed at large corporations and chemical warfare. This is not important enough for a resolution – perhaps just a footnote. The NYC 5th Ave. Parade Comm. is doing this.

Peter Orris

discuss role of SDS

(continued from page 1)

help many to develop their radicalism as an integrated part of a mature life-time commitment.

By challenging the radicals who may have looked to work in the black ghettos as both a cause and an escape from a middle class education and home, the new leadership in SNCC should force those in SDS and all white radicals to think long and hard about their future role in the Movement.

The role of SDS should be crucial. It can, indeed it must, be the organizing agent for the radicals of our generation over and under 25. In addition to the tough work in the ghettos, it can start with older SDS people organizing in the professions, universities, peace campaigns, integrated projects, PIA and so on. SDS chapters in middle class communities could be the vital centers of much radical activity that is now disparate and only rarely, if ever, effective. In short, radical political movement cannot be a repudiation of the middle class whose members hold a crucial balance of power in American political life and who are, in the words of C. Wright Mills, "up for grabs."

Sincerely yours,

Robert Bresler
Delaware SDS

nac minutes

(continued from page 1)

with the understanding that the NAC was in general agreement with the proposal. Motion to TABLE carried.

5. Budgeting. Adams and Speck moved to make staff salary first priority after *New Left Notes*. CARRIED.

6. Staff. A discussion was held on allocation among the staff of those tasks formerly done by Walt Kelly. It was decided to hire no new staff at this time other than the printing apprentice noted above.

LeBlanc moved that his time allocation for the summer be: (1) work on convention program booklet; (2) preparing fund-raising brochure; (3) convention proposals on dues system; (4) training Aerlin Weissman to take over finances. He proposed that he work mainly at home, with scheduled time in the office, and attempt to complete all projects by mid-August, at which time he hopes to leave the staff. Motion PASSED with the instruction to give letters about the Convention booklet first priority.

Fraternally submitted, Tom Condit

communist report

(continued from page 3)

flows from "the oppression of youth under state monopoly capitalism' and hence there would be no youth problem under socialism!

The major theoretical questions debated were 1) is there in fact a youth problem distinct from the problems of minorities, workers, women, etc., 2) although youth will be one of the two main allies of the working class, can it continue to play the vanguard role in all struggles as it has done in the sixties, and 3) how can the need for a mass organizational expression of the youth potential be realized?

There are currently about 600 young people in the party. Those present at the convention (by and large the leadership) appeared to be overwhelmingly "red diaper babies" (children of former communists). They seemed to have little or no experience in the movements of the sixties, having been recruited directly into the party out of apathy. Militant Negro youth were conspicuous by their absence in spite of the party's intensive recruitment efforts. All party youth seemed very dedicated to the party, enjoying the discipline and being "part of something bigger". Their only gripes centered around not being able to play a larger role in the party as a whole. There is not really a national youth structure within the party, so that communist youth do not function nationally as a whole, and youth leadership is appointed from above. Youth leaders tend overwhelmingly to be those who have been around a long time, have gone to all the party schools and summer classes.

As for the convention as a whole, it was almost 1/4 young people. A good percentage of the delegates were Negro but most of them were older. Although most of the young people were of middle-class campus origins, a large percentage of the older delegates were honest to God working class folks. One by product of the enforced closeness of devisive debate was a deep sense of camaraderie which filled the hall. For most of the older delegates, this convention, the first since 1959 was an exciting and moving event.

I would like to thank the Communist Party for inviting me to attend, as I consider the experience a valuable one. My hope is that such invitations will continue to come and that many more SDSers will have the opportunity to see other organizations at work.

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

Second-Class postage paid in Chicago, Illinois

9471 Lombardo
Sporting mich 48348

Jim Anderson
88 1/2 Edwards St.
New Haven, Conn. 06511