

# anti-huac emergency call

(The following call was issued in response to the subpoena of twelve peace activists by the House Un-American Activities Committee.)

**CALL FOR NATIONAL PROTEST AGAINST THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND HUAC'S ATTEMPTED REPRESSION OF THE ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT**

Thus far 12 persons active in the radical peace movement have been subpoenaed to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee beginning August 16. The 12 subpoenaed to date are:

- Jerry Rubin, co-founder of the Vietnam Day Committee;
- George Ewart, VDC; Progressive Labor Party; May 2 Movement;
- John Windrin Smith Jr., PLP
- Steve Hamilton, chairman, M2M; chairman, VDC Anti-Draft Committee
- Steve Cherkoss, Students for a Democratic Society; VDC; PLP
- Anatole ben Anton, co-founder, Committee for Medical Aid at Stanford; M2M
- Steve McCrae
- Stephen Schmale, Mathematics professor at Berkeley; VDC
- Harold Cipriano, DuBois Clubs of America
- Walter Teague
- Alan Krebs, Free University of New York
- Jeff Gordon, PLP

All are involved in organizing campus activities against the war, all are involved with organizations seeking basic changes

throughout the entirety of American society.

As the US Government continues to escalate the war in Vietnam, at the cost of lives of thousands of both Vietnamese and Americans, the repression of the domestic movement to end the war correspondingly increases. **THE WAR MUST BE STOPPED!!!** Its continuance, at a cost in excess of \$16 billions for this year, precludes the possibility of ending poverty in this country; its continuing enhancement of the military establishment increases the militarization of the society; the government's attempts to legitimize it and quell opposition to it reinforce an irrational foreign policy and further concentrate more and more power in the hands of fewer and fewer people. As long as this war, and the assumptions behind the foreign policy it is resultant from, continue, it is not possible to create an American society, the resources of which are directed toward the ending of material want and the development of a truly democratic and libertarian society.

This subpoenaing of members of the anti-war movement presents a grave threat to the possibility of bringing a rapid end to the war and to the right of all Americans to dissent. HUAC, and all other government instruments of repression, must cease to exist.

**JOIN IN DEMONSTRATIONS IN WASHINGTON, D.C. AND ACROSS THE COUNTRY AUGUST 16, 17 & 18, TO PROTEST THIS IMMORAL WAR AND END GOVERNMENT ATTEMPTS TO CRUSH OPPOSITION TO IT!!!**

# proposal: anti-draft militancy

Anti-Draft Proposal for SDS Convention

Chicago, Illinois

On this important matter SDS has been largely screwing around since last October, when the press discovered that we had a more coherent and subversive plan than any of us knew about. On paper our accomplishments are not negligible: there are the various sit-ins, the Vietnam test, etc. But these are not part of any coherent plan, and, more important, few of us would claim that they even begin to relieve us of the burden of being, vis-a-vis Vietnam, merely white liberals: they are not serious enough.

Let us examine some of the possible consequences of an obstacles to a really militant anti-draft program, leaving the definition of "militant" vague for the moment: something like the French resistance to conscription for Algeria.

Possible responses to a militant program

The U.S. Government

a) Repression--

Obviously, the threat was there last October. It has effected every discussion since and has forced SDS to confront very basic and difficult questions about its existence and its radicalism. For a militant anti-draft program might very likely lead to the smashing of SDS. It has happened before to some organizations and has stunted and distorted the program of the others; perhaps SDS has

been too quick to attribute the failure of earlier radical organizations to flaws in their programs, too little aware of how ruthlessly they were being treated by power.

b) Co-option--

There is a direct continuity between SDS' response to the furor of last October and Macnamara's (and others') recent calls for more kinds of alternative service. If they have any brains, they can cut the ground from under us - especially our liberal support - by setting up a few more peace corps. Do we want that? If so, we may find ourselves saddled with a "victory" next June when they revise the draft law. In accepting such programs aren't we simply giving legitimacy to the garrison state? We must think clearly: although our tactics may oppose other, lesser evils, we should work within a philosophical context of opposition to any draft for any purpose. Just as it is a risk for any society to have free speech - but a risk basic to democracy - so it is a risk to hope that a society will be able to function without coercion, but we should think of the willingness to take that risk as definitive of our view of the democratic society.

Draftable People

We have worried about the problem that our program might become too sectarian, alienating possible support and participation by demanding that people act against what (continued on page 2)



Gainesville SDS members leafleted and picketed to protest the invasion of their campus by TRICAT, the government's program for training personnel to run the imperial administration once the Pax Americana has been established. (See NLN, July 22, 1966.)

## gainesville sds pickets govt. counter insurgency

Gainesville, Florida

On Thursday, July 28, 1966, Gainesville SDS staged a mock revolt on the University of Florida campus. The attack was not against the Administration, but against two civil affairs units "innocuously" studying Greece on the Florida campus. The units appeared to be part of the TRICAT program which was described in NEW LEFT NOTES, July 22.

After leafletting for the entire week, we decided that the political counter-insurgents needed some insurgents during their training. There was much discussion about taking over radio stations, blocking roads, etc., but with a careful assessment of our army, we

decided to place a large Greek flag on the roof of their lecture hall, hold a large banner (reading in Greek: "By whom are they ruled, is their government a democracy") on that same roof, and "surround" the hall with pickets wearing peace arm bands. After about ten minutes of silent picketing, a sound truck arrived, and the words, "Attention, Attention all military personnel..." blared all over the area. (The speech, given by Alan Levin, is enclosed.)

The picketers then marched through the lecture hall with no major reaction (the army seemed terrified of protest and publicity). (continued on page 2)

# new left notes

an internal newspaper of  
students for a democratic society

1608 w. madison, rm. 206      chicago, ill. 60612

Vol. 1, No. 31      let the people decide      August 19, 1966

## fast for peace in stockholm

A Warm Protest Summer

Upsala, Sweden      30 July 1966

It was the Fourth of July in Stockholm, the afternoon was hot and humid and 230 police set up road blocks to protect the American embassy. By 7 o'clock in the evening most of those Americans who had attended the afternoon garden party had gone home. The president of the Swedish-American Foundation had earlier in the day said:

"The strong ties between Sweden and America are among the best in the world, not only in science but in the feelings of the people."

But the police remained.

A quarter of a mile away a Vietnam protest rally was being held. Among the protestors sat a 30 year old artist, Sfen Fransson, who would make a decision that later in the evening to starve himself for Vietnam. Sfen had welded together a sculpture of "Uncle Sam" in the image of death. He had covered the strong, rugged, 8-foot tall "Uncle Sam" with red, white & blue paper which he set on fire about 10 o'clock.

After a rather short and quick blaze, the sculpture was again bare revealing the skull and crossbones underneath the Libertarian hat of the American 19th century figure. Then Sfen paused, reflected upon the long and drawn out war in Vietnam and thinking his protest all to short, decided: "I'm going to sit here and starve. I'm going to refuse food until they carry me away. And then they'll take some notice of these protests."

He was sitting in the middle of a field, filled with dry grass (that kind people are allergic to), on the edge of the capital city overlooking the American embassy. Beside him was his "Uncle Sam". Someone brought up a Vietnamese Liberation flag and sat it next to him. The long Scandinavian day was just ending and a new one was already on the way -- the blue, yellow sky gave reflection to a man, a sculpture, and a flag in the field -- and the starvation had begun.

Sfen was alone now, the others had left. But soon they were to come back and help

him over his seventeen long, hungry and then painless days. Stockholm, too, with its Christian and pagan traditions of over 1500 years, had its own hunger strike protestor. Sfen was to become the most well publicized event in town, visited by over 20,000 people in the later weeks. There were hundreds of things which made this a noteworthy event in this otherwise quiet northern city of lovely girls and lonely people.

The first days were still, and few people except the police and the protestors, knew what was going on out there. But then the press began a series of articles on the "starving artist" which launched Sfen into his famous, sometimes infamous martyr role. Soon the radio and TV came out, and reporters took pictures. They came from Oslo Copenhagen and Helsinki. The flag was a symbol everyone could see, and soon people began to come, until by the first weekend there were hundreds -- many tourists and travellers, many came to cheer him, some to jeer him.

On the fifth day an American Marine, dressed in civilian clothes, upon seeing the NLF flag became enraged and with several swift strokes fell the flag, "Uncle Sam", and Sfen to the ground. The press photographers had gotten some exciting pictures.

Then came the tourist buses. A group of young American girls came up to see what was happening. The first thing they said was, "At least they're all ugly." "What is this all about?"

"This artist is on a hunger strike to support those who oppose the American war in Vietnam. He is supporting the people of Vietnam. He has now not eaten anything for six days."

"I hope he starves to death," said one as they went back to their European tour bus. Then came the French tourists. A family came up -- with two teenage girls, long brown braided hair. The father didn't need to ask, seeing the NLF flag, the "Uncle Sam", and the artist -- he welcomed the group, (continued on page 2)



## peace fast

(continued from page 1)

said that there were 3,000 who protested the previous week in his home town. He stayed to discuss with others who kept coming. More Americans came. Two boys from SDS who were hitch-hiking around Europe came up and stayed for three days. Another SDS member stayed until Sfen ended his ordeal.

Many times, in fact, Americans made up the greatest number of people around debating and fighting about Vietnam and the U.S. government in general.

Sfen decided to put up a small tent. The police came and tore the tent down, as they said it was illegal to have a tent in that particular field. The police, the tent, and Sfen made front page news in Stockholm's *Expressen* on the seventh day, which launched the second week. Now there would be daily major news coverage. Freelance reporters flocked out to sit with Sfen in the field all day and all night—What for? Why? How? Vietnam was replaced from the front pages by Sfen the "starving artist," as the more cynical continued to call him. Poems were written to him; letters started coming. At 9 and 3 o'clock each day the postman would ride up on his brightly colored blue and yellow bike, get off and go over to Sfen to ask him how he was. He then gave him his mail and left down the hill between the onlookers.

One letter said:

You starving artist on the field. What do you know about Vietnam or anything? You are just lazy and dumb, and what you are doing has no meaning, just as your life . . . Damn."

Another telegram, from far to the north of Sweden, said: "Congratulations on your actions. All here support you. Best of luck. Continue on."

In the evenings the crowd would grow. Hot dog men went around selling. People would be asking Sfen if he could still speak while stuffing candy, ice cream and hot dogs in their mouths all at the same time. Stockholm had gotten its circus—without elephants and tents.

There were plenty of girls. Girls who wanted to care and watch over Sfen. Girls who wanted to meet people. Girls who wanted to get in the news and girl reporters who wanted to get out the news. Girl supporters and girl dissenters—but not many. There was a strong feminine felling for a starving, idealistic man; for freedom fighting guerrillas in Vietnam; and for the exciting intellectual group which had gathered out in the field. It became the young girl and woman would time and time again sympathize with the protestor. They identified with this whole fight against America's war and public silence as part of their own fight against a sterile masculine society which kept themselves in an inferior position, tightly bound. It was a fight against the same set of traditions. They were struggling against the very same massive, pompous, male power structure. If males exploited these poor jungle people to the same extent that they felt exploited, then they could easily see the reason for revolt. Hand

in hand went the "Vietcong" jungle guerrilla and the sensitive intellectual Swedish girl.

It was the unfair structure of society that they were fighting against: the male hypocrisy of power. Wonderful discussions went on all night and into the next mornings.

In the middle of the second week a doctor gave Sfen a blood test and found that he was holding up fine. He had felt better since his low point on the sixth day, after which his body began to become accustomed to no food.

Sfen became quiet, kind and considerate. His restlessness continued, particularly in the middle of the day, and he would only sleep 4 to 5 hours a night. We began to tell jokes about the people who would come up asking: "Can he talk?"; "Can he walk?"; "Can he move?"; "Is he conscious?" He was the liveliest among us.

Bulletins and pamphlets on Vietnam were sold, flyers were distributed in all languages, money was collected for the NLF fund, and some continued to buy hot dogs and ice cream. It had now been 13 days. Sfen, red, parched, seemingly happy and calm, but depressed sat in the middle of the large mass that would gather in the evenings. Tape recorders were throughout the group, photographers were everywhere, and now plainclothes police were always in the group. The political importance of the protest was beginning to be felt. For 14 days the NLF flag had been flying in clear sight of the American embassy.

There were talks about turning the place into a Hyde Park area, as in London. (Stockholm has no public debating place.) It is what so many had wanted in this quiet imposing capital. When discussing these ideas with the police they said thumbs down: "The Swedish people don't want such a place. They aren't like foreigners, they don't like crowds and such things. What is this field for? For people to go with their dogs."

"Don't you need someplace where just people can go?" I asked. "No, the Swedish people don't need anyplace to go." The official view of Swedish national character was presented by the Stockholm police in defense of their attitude. And Stockholm would again be forced into silence.

On the 21st of July at 6 o'clock in the evening, after a trying, dry day, Sfen walked down to the road while TV and news cameras were shooting, slowly got into a car and under the barrage of onlookers, drove quietly off.

It had been 17 days, 17 wonderful, worthy days. He had chosen the 21st of July because it was the anniversary of the signing of the Geneva Agreements putting an end to the slaughter in Vietnam just 12 years before. Sfen has eaten nothing from the Fourth of July until the 21st, the commemorative day of the Geneva Agreements. Perhaps he wanted to show that they need not be so far apart as the U.S. government had put them.

After a few spoonfuls of baby food, Sfen paused, felt somewhat refreshed. All had happened so fast, and again as before, thinking his protest all too short, he mumbled: "Well, what are we going to do next?"

In any case, Stockholm could go back to sleep for a while—now there was a place to go with the dogs again.

Allen J. Anderson

## gainesville picket

(continued from page 1)

The press the next day either didn't cover the activity or made it seem that it was "protest for protest's sake."

This was the reaction of the press even though, 1) a reporter trying to take pictures was badly beaten (and later fined \$50 in Gainesville Municipal Court) by one of the University janitors guarding the doors to the lecture hall, 2) we explained in detail the reasons for our protest in a leaflet, a press release, and the speech over the sound-truck.

The moral? Ingenious, creative, new protests (well, it was clever!) attract movement people and make great stories in movement press. But if we want to reach people, we must make our own media. Each locality must have either a libertarian newspaper that reaches a large segment of the population or a movement with its own printing press and the troops to do extensive leafletting.

--Bonnie Greenspan

SPEECH DELIVERED BY ALAN LEVIN AT GAINESVILLE SDS' ATTACK ON UF GREEK INSTITUTE

Attention! Your attention Please! Your attention Please! Everyone stay calm. No one

will be harmed. Civilians may move about freely but please do not interfere with the Liberation Army. All military personnel stay where you are and listen.

Listen carefully! You are now really in enemy territory. You have invaded our territory and used our facilities. You have done this on the assumption that all institutions and individuals in this country are subservient to your activities, (activities which you claim to be in *Our* national interest) You make your decisions behind closed doors, and keep all information and news secret (for *our* national security). We can no longer tolerate this situation.

In our name you have made deals with supposedly governments (again behind closed doors—again in our national interest). You have arranged for the suppression of genuine social revolutions and propagandized for dictators and monarchs against the wishes of the people (again, for our national security). The people of the underdeveloped world can no longer tolerate this situation.

We, in solidarity with the peoples of the world who are struggling to shake off the shackles of colonialism and neocolonialism, protest the involvement of American military and para-military agencies in the affairs of other nations and the affairs of our

## anti-draft proposal (cont.)

seems to be their interest, renouncing privilege, endangering themselves. Our struggles against 2-S seem only to make our constituency more draftable. And yet we must oppose 2-S as vicious discrimination based on class or eugenics. Any meaningful program involves risks and sacrifices: can a militant program be devised which requires less lonely heroism than is required of the draft resister today?

Action

Of course SDS must have a strong program of draft resistance. There is really no choice in the matter. The horrors of Vietnam necessitate draft resistance in America, and regardless of the complexities of the issue, SDS must undertake it: not because it is good or bad for the organization but simply because it must be done and SDS is the only organization which can do it. In the face of this absolute imperative, what can we say about the problems outlined above?

Repression: SDS' relative freedom from repression so far is a measure of the significance of its programs (speaking in regard to the draft). On Vietnam we have not yet confronted the power structure. We must do so as a national organization, and in so doing, risk being smashed. This is not said in any spirit of tough-guy exhortation. It seems a sombre truth. If we bring ourselves to the brink of destruction, there may still be the possibility of guerrilla-like retreat: perhaps this is what happened in October (although I doubt that we were really in such immediate danger). At any rate, we must force ourselves always to operate much closer to real peril that we have in the last year. (Nor do I feel that it is adequate to say that we can not go ahead simply because Johnson's brand of McCarthyism increases the peril even while we stand still.)

Draftable people: here, of course, is the meat of the problem. SDS must undertake aggressive organization of draft resistance. This means more than putting out informational pamphlets: it means recruiting draft resisters. The very act of such recruitment puts us into conflict with the government: we may be smashed at this point, but we must try it and hope that liberal forces will help to preserve our right to speak, if not our program.

I cannot bring myself to renounce the teacher deferment which I obtained some years ago. If they changed the rule and I had to re-apply, I might not do so. I am as confused (and perhaps weak in my principles) about these situations as I am certain that I would refuse to be drafted: I do not have the courage to renounce my privilege, but I feel deeply enough about my alienation from the government—or rather, its alienation from me—so that I could not possibly accept induction. I believe that this is pretty much the situation in which most people in SDS find themselves: fearful and unwilling to renounce present privilege and positive that, when it comes right down to it, they will not join the army. Can we help more people to feel at least this strongly and some to do as well as the heroes among us who have done better?

The heart of the proposed approach is a multi-stage campaign. Although we welcome people who take a strong stand from the very beginning, we do not focus on urging them not to request 2-S or to renounce 2-S. But our program is coherent, honest and root-and-branch: it educates them to the immorality of the deferment and the entire system. We educate them all along the way, urging them to resist at every point, making it clear that we think their deferment gives them only a short-run advantage, that Vietnam and Vietnams will continue to escalate, and eventually they will be called. And when

they reach the end of the line, we will be there. If we have succeeded in educating them, many of them will then be ready to refuse induction: at no point have we demanded that they make an immediate sacrifice, but at every point we have told them that there is no escape from decisions and so involved them that the moral contradiction of accepting induction is overwhelming. They will be all the more ready to refuse induction if your energy is focused at this point and they see some prospect of real assistance. Under present circumstances it appears that a notice of induction can be only one step in a struggle which can go on for quite a while before all legal remedies are exhausted. Those remedies must be widely publicized and solitary individuals in out-of-the-way places must be supported. Many of these functions are presently performed by AFSC and CCCO. This proposal is that we put wheels on these organizations, using our resources positively to organize such programs rather than simply being available for those who ask.

Thus, a rough schedule for a resister might look something like this:

Freshman year: student takes out 2-S.

Wars continue; he is educated to oppose them; perhaps he renounces his 2-S.

Sometime before graduation: applies for CO.

CO is rejected.

He appeals to?

Rejected.

He appeals to?

At the physical: some form of non-cooperation.

Induction: refuses.

Any of these steps require simply a knowledge of the legal remedies available, and not a lawyer. At the more advanced stages we must confront the atomization which results from isolation, the differing policies of local boards, and the fact that people are not all called at the same time. We would want to explore the possibilities of pooling cases on geographical or chronological basis.

*Tie-In with International War Crimes Trial*

The trial, to be conducted in the fall in Paris by Bertrand Russell, Jean-Paul Sartre, Peter Weiss, Isaac Deutscher, et. al., will produce a judgement. If we are revolutionaries, we will act as if that judgement were law, superseding "laws" and wars made by governments which we no longer recognize. Thus we must implement the new law, and one way of doing so is through the kind of anti-draft activity described above. SDS should invite the judges to deliver their judgement before the accused, here in America. (The prospect of militant anti-draft action might induce Sartre to reverse his earlier refusal to come to America. A kind of congress should be held in which a report on American war crimes would be issued; immediately it would begin to be implemented by our program and some dramatic act of draft resistance, to be tied in with such events in other countries. In essence this proposal, which can be independent of any particular draft program, asks that the next international days of protest focus on implementation of the court's decision.

\* \* \* \* \*

The proposals made above suggest a general approach. They are weak on specifics and uninformed on technical aspects of draft resistance. They need further discussion. In summary, the proposals urge that SDS undertake a militant program of recruitment for draft resistance focusing on refusing induction.

Jessee Lemisch  
University of Chicago SDS

university. We come to tell you that you do not belong here and that we do not approve of what you are doing.

To claim that you are not doing the shooting and bombing does not absolve you of responsibility. You cannot perform your function without consideration of its relation to your surroundings and the movements of history. Agencies like yours are being used by our government to perpetuate reactionary, neo-fascist regimes across the world. You can no longer ignore this. The responsibility of the horrors of the war in Vietnam falls as heavily on the shoulders of those who worked to impose the Diem regime on the people of that country as on those who now defoliate the countryside and bombard the villages.

We of SDS insist that individuals be permitted to play a part in making decisions that effect their lives. We hold this for the people of Vietnam, Greece, Harlem, Selma, and the University of Florida. Agencies which

decide for others and suppress the wishes of others by force, have no place in a democratic society. This applies to the CIA, FBI, Civil Affairs groups and Tiggert Hall, as well as the KKK. We come with picket signs. The people of Greece desire independence for all with no fear of American interference, we lift their flag above the heads of those who would conspire to decide their future for them.

The "game" is now over. We have tried to bring our message in a light spirit to get our ideas across. We hope you will consider what has been said. The Liberation Army will regroup and send a delegation forward to discuss the problems facing us. The function of a university is not to fit people into the status quo, but to analyze and criticize existing policies and institutions and the assumptions on which these are based. We extend to you the opportunity of enjoying a free, critical, exchange of ideas and will withdraw the liberation army—for now.



# the crisis of the ncc

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

In Pittsburgh on July 30 and 31 I attended -- as a member of the Pittsburgh Committee to End the War in Vietnam -- a conference of independent committees to end the war in Vietnam. Originally, a member of national SDS had been asked to attend the meeting, but at the last minute the invitation was withdrawn, the explanation being that representatives from national organizations might inhibit discussion on the part of local independents, etc., etc. Though I was in Pittsburgh primarily for other reasons (to set up alternative service arrangements there and to see some close friends) I had the chance to get the feel of the conference and would like to try to pass on my impressions.

## The Purpose of the Conference

Officially this was an informal conference of independent committees which were affiliated with the National Coordinating Committee (NCC) to End the War in Vietnam and which wanted to discuss past experiences and present realities and to formulate ideas on the future course that should be taken by the anti-war movement, particularly by the NCC.

People who were involved in the anti-war movement but who had no other organizational affiliation were there. People involved in SDS and in SDS-dominated committees were there. DuBois Club members who were involved in anti-war committees were there. A few pacifist types were there. Key people from the national office of the NCC were there. Who was missing?

The Trotskyists (members of the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance) involved in anti-war work and members of Trotskyist-dominated committees (those committees belonging to the Independent Caucus within the NCC and whose position is represented by *The Bring the Troops Home Now Newsletter*) were consciously and purposely excluded from the conference, first by general consensus and finally -- when two representatives of *The Newsletter* appeared and requested permission to attend -- by majority vote of the participants.

Anyone who has been involved in the anti-war movement for the past year is aware of the deep resentment and distrust that many people have for the Trotskyists. It is felt that they were a disruptive influence in November 1966 at the National Convention of the NCC in Washington, that they were willing to risk the fragmentation of the anti-war movement to advance their own organizational interests. People working for a strong anti-war movement and a new unity within the American radical movement saw their hopes torn to pieces by political maneuvering and in-fighting set into motion by what was interpreted as organizational chauvinism and opportunism of the Trotskyists. It was here that the Trotskyist-dominated Independent Caucus was formed. Since then the Trotskyists have been accused of doing similarly nasty things in Detroit and elsewhere and of being a real disruptive element at various NCC standing committee meetings.

The reason for excluding the Trotskyists from the informal conference in Pittsburgh are two-fold and actually overlap. One, some people have pretty bitter political resentments. Two, people wanted to get together to talk about where they were and where they were going "without having to worry about the Trots." (A question posed in a private discussion with one of the participants: "Are the independent committees so weak and inarticulate that they've got to exclude the Trots?" The reply: "Of course. We don't want to face them until we are stronger and more articulate.") In many ways this was the final crystallization of a new Independent Caucus, a new faction, within the NCC.

A minority element was dubious about the exclusionary nature of this conference. Certain SDS people, of course, felt that this raised serious questions about democratic exclusionary nature of this conference. Certain SDS people, of course, felt that this raised serious questions about democratic practices and reversion to old left factionalism. Many of the DuBois Club people felt that 1) such exclusion was unnecessary because the Trotskyists, if present, would "talk themselves to death," would isolate themselves by alienating others, and 2) they were upset because they thought they might be blamed and smeared for the exclusion of Trotskyists ("DuBois Club-dominated Popular Front, the NCC, showed its true colors . . ." "Stalinist's and Trotskyist's manipulations

within NCC . . ." etc., etc.).

## How Independent?

Since the NCC Convention in November national SDS has played an increasingly less active role within the NCC. This was happening as the Trotskyists were increasing their involvement and their attempts to gain more influence within the NCC. The absence of SDS left the friends and members of the DuBois Club and certain pacifists as the only nationally-organized groupings present to offset this highly-organized Trotskyist machine. Since the nationally-known pacifists weren't too organized to begin with and have recently become increasingly dis-involved in the workings of the NCC, the NCC has been seen by many as now being, for all practical purposes, a DuBois Club front.

What I saw at the Pittsburgh conference fails to confirm this analysis. The groups which initiated the conference are not DuBois Club fronts. In the Pittsburgh committee, for instance, a true pluralism exists with SDS, the DuBois Club, a couple of campus peace groups, and a number of independent individuals involved. The Detroit committee is most greatly influenced by a local SDS group. As a matter of fact, members of local SDS chapters (in some areas a committee to end the war and an SDS chapter are one and the same) outnumbered other participants.

## What Happened

This was a conference of about fifty people representing anti-war groups around the country, though I'd guess that twenty groups were represented at most. There was no representation from either coasts with the exception of one SDS girl from Washington, D. C. Ohio, Pittsburgh, Syracuse, parts of the Great Lake and Mid-Western areas, one guy from Arizona and a girl from Texas -- this is where the people were from. The orientation seemed to be white middle class student and ex-student, though there were some non-student adults present and even two working class Negroes from Youngstown.

Discussion revealed that almost all of the groups had grown in a number of ways in the past year, reaching more adults, reaching more "respectables," having bigger demonstrations and nicer seminars, etc. Of course, there were many, many people who hadn't even been touched yet, and the war was still going on, as a matter of fact was expanding. "Where do we go from here?"

Much discussion centered around what the NCC should be doing and what form it should take at this point to avoid disruption (Trotskyists) and to be more effective. There were arguments that it should now become a national membership organization to make the national office more answerable to those it services (and more answerable to those in whose name it speaks) and also to further unite anti-war activists throughout the country and give them a greater sense of identity with a national organization. Others felt that the NCC should continue to coordinate anti-war efforts throughout the country . . . somehow. With the profound disinterest of national SDS, the ever-increasing independent-mindedness of the Fifth Avenue Parade Committee in New York, and the grim reality of the Independent Caucus, however, this seemed somehow impractical.

A former SNCC worker came up with the most dynamic suggestion which was, in effect, to develop a SNCC-type structure for Northern anti-war work. An organizing committee, a purely staff (as opposed to a membership) organization should be formed, he argued. Organizers would travel around throughout the country and help concerned people organize anti-war committees, then move on to let the self-functioning local committees grow naturally and to organize more committees. A national office would provide services and resources for the established committees and, with the organizers, would decide where the next organizing attempts should be. This would provide a vehicle with which to organize greater numbers of people and unlike a membership organization (or semi-membership organization, which is what the NCC might be called now) would be almost impossible to infiltrate or disrupt. This concept won the enthusiasm of what seemed to be a majority of the participants and will probably be argued for at future NCC standing committee meetings.

## The Disintegration of the NCC

The NCC was born in August 1965 at the "Congress of Unrepresented People" in Washington D.C. Every element on the left (with the probably exception of the Socialist Labor Party) was in some way represented

at that congress and in the NCC. The NCC reached its zenith in November 1965 when it brought 1000 anti-war activists to Washington. It was at that point that its disintegration began, with in-fighting which polarized elements within the NCC and which drove many others out of the NCC altogether.

This Pittsburgh conference is a sign of its final stage of disintegration; it felt so weak that it practiced exclusionary politics. And in truth, compared with what it was last November, it's a shadow. A number of people within it clearly recognize this and feel that the NCC, in its present form, has served its function, that the new reality demands a different organization, a different type of organization. Whether the organization of a SNCC-type structure applied to the Northern anti-war movement is possible and whether it can succeed where the NCC failed (building a strong anti-war movement, stopping the war) remains to be seen.

As for the possibility of "stopping the war" my own feeling is that the National Liberation Front, by continuing to struggle, will cause the United States military to deepen its involvement in Vietnam; that this ever-increasing involvement will create strains within our own society (sons, brothers, husbands being drafted and killed, inflation, restrictions on labor, increased tabling of necessary social reforms, etc.) and that -- remember post-World War II and Korea? -- certain decisive elements in our society will come to feel that they don't want to pay the

price, that they do want to bring the troops home, that they'll elect someone who will bring peace. The anti-war movement can help articulate such feelings as these, but let's recognize that we won't be ending the war. The resistance of the NLF will be a drain on our society and on the American people. That and not the agitation of the anti-war movement, I think, will bring the war to an end.

I feel that a radical *multi-issue* approach is necessary if one wants to relate the war to people's day-to-day lives and in this way involve more people in this movement which can at least articulate the doubts and dis-sension of growing numbers of Americans. One of the greatest weaknesses of the anti-war movement -- and this is clearly reflected in the NC -- is the single-issue approach to the war, the short-term and naive objective of ending the war without considering it in the larger context of the structure of American society and the basic workings and needs of that structure at home and abroad.

By making the war a moral abstract we isolate ourselves from large numbers of people who haven't the time for moral abstracts. By cutting the war off from related issues we cut ourselves off from people who are directly affected by those related issues and we become less effective in our efforts to help build a movement strong enough to alter those institutions responsible for wars in Vietnam.

--Paul LeBlanc

## NEW LEFT NOTES

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago, Ill. 60612. 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, Greg Calvert.

## STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Carl Oglesby, president; Jeffery Shero, vice-president; and Jane Adams, national secretary.  
National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312) 666-3874  
New York City: 49 West 27th St., NYC, NY 1001; (212) 889-5793  
Niagra Region: 107 Dryden Rd., Ithaca, NY  
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif; (415) 362-7922  
Southern California: 1347-1/2 Riviera Ave., Venice, Calif.  
New England: 2076 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass. (617) 547-5457  
Chicago Region: 2059 N. Larrabee, Chicago, Ill. (312) 944-3624  
Radical Education Project: 510 East William, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Vol. 1, No. 31 let the people decide August 19, 1966

# reply to booth

DURHAM, N.C.

Paul Booth's generally well documented position paper in the July 29th issue of NLN should serve as a valuable basis for debate at the convention. I have several brief comments to make, however, concerning his analyses.

China has much more at stake in the Vietnamese struggle than a simple acceptance of American-style Great Power confrontations. As Edgar Snow puts it, from the perspective of China "An American victory in Vietnam for want of aid from Russia or China would not only impose a profound loss of prestige from which the whole world socialist movement might never recover, but conceivably it could lead to wars between socialist nationalisms." China's influence throughout Asia, as well as the Third World, will be greatly damaged if the U.S. gains a permanent foothold in Vietnam (perhaps even from a "deal with Russia") by destroying a peasant liberation force. Thus it is quite unclear whether China can permit intensified aggression without response: the peace movement must consider the specter of devastating widescale war as an imminent possibility.

American capacity for brutal destructiveness is not static. Officials as well as citizens are increasingly hardened to inhumanity in Vietnam and elsewhere. And the power of racist, self-righteous men who are guardians of a nation's holy interests can be a profoundly dangerous thing. Thus the *Times* writes of spokesmen for the administration barely "concealing their glee" at the horror of Indonesia. And it seems increasingly possible that not only are Americans reticent in condemnation but also that our government may have played a major role in that slaughter (which the London *Times* estimates

may be as high as a millior dead). James Reston in the *Times* of June 19 wrote:

"There was a great deal more contact between anti-Communists in that country and at least one very high official in Washington before and during the Indonesian massacre than is generally realized. General Suharto's forces, at times, severely short of food and munitions, have been getting aid from here through various third countries, and it is doubtful if the coup would ever have been attempted without the American show of strength in Vietnam or been sustained without the clandestine aid it has received indirectly from here."

I have a difficult time comprehending the implications of such complicity for the future of the country I have always been told to respect and honor.

Finally, if we survive the dangers and brutalities of this war, it remains doubtful, to me, that New Leftist organizing among the minority groups of America -- the poor and unemployed and black (where we're wanted) -- can effect a significant counterforce to the "American Leviathan." With several reservations, I agree with Tom Condit that American workers are concerned about factory democracy. A potential exists that has been largely unexplored, I think, for working with local unions to decentralize union authority. One possibility for instance, is the creation and/or strengthening of multi-union area councils, which are basically more responsive to grassroots labor. Particularity in the future, with the acceleration of cybernation, as workers face unemployment, militant pockets of grass roots union power could be vitally important in challenging the power dynamics of America.

Harry Boyte



# sds and the japanese new left

POSITION PAPER  
FOR THE SDS CONVENTION  
WITH A RESOLUTION ON OUR  
RELATIONS WITH THE JAPANESE NEW LEFT

Allan Greene

The organizational methods of the New Left differ from those of the old in this way: the New Left is trying to get people to reassert their control over institutions that have become far too centralized and consolidated in their power. To do this, SNCC and SDS activists feel, people must interact together from below, they must get at the bases of institutional power. Coalitions of leaders working to get one more bill passed or one more economic reform law are not going to change the basic order of social priorities, the framework of corporate capitalist society. To do this would require revolutionary economic action in industries by those who must produce goods without being paid the full equivalent of the value that they put into the products they make — the working class. Established unionism is not where the New Left should work. Besides continuing our organization of the poor and unemployed, we should begin to reassert the importance, by our actions, or independent union activity, as, for example, in the Mississippi Freedom Union, militant caucuses within local established unions seeking more basic change than mere wage hikes—as job security, better conditions, and, ultimately, workers' control, etc.'

In the American New Left, many people have recognized the basic truth of this analysis, as Tom Condit's position paper showed. However, other student movements in other areas of the world are also moving toward these conclusions. Perhaps the most promising of the movements is the militant Zengakuren, All-Japanese Federation of Student Governments. Zengakuren arose pri-

marily through the actions of students in struggling against government measures deemed oppressive by them. This group is militantly opposed to nuclear testing by either bloc in the Cold War.

Zengakuren was founded in September 1948 during the fight by Japanese youths against the plans to raise tuition at government universities. "From its inception," writes Kenichi Koyama, former president of the organization, "this student movement was directly involved in general political events in keeping with its basic slogans, 'peace, democracy, democratic education, and better student life.' . . . Zengakuren has always tried to act in concert with other political and cultural organizations, such as Sohyo (Japanese General Council of Labor Unions), the Socialist and Communist Parties, while maintaining its autonomy." (*New Politics*, Winger 1962). The organization has fought for "the removal of American military bases, against nuclear bases in Okinawa, for prohibition of atomic and hydrogen bombs, against nuclear armament of Japan, against imperialist intervention in Korea, against British and French aggression in Egypt, in support of the war for Algerian national liberation, for restoration of diplomatic relations between Communist China and Japan and against the U.S.-Japanese security treaty. In addition to anti-imperialist and anti-war demonstrations, Zengakuren has fought for democracy and democratic education, opposed the 're-purge' in the universities, fought for increased scholarships, improvement of campus facilities, against raising tuitions, as well as opposing other laws that would have denied academic freedom and curtailed the freest expression of democracy." (*Ibid.*)

The political evolution of Zengakuren away from, and in opposition to, the Communist Party stems from 1950, when the C.P. considered American occupation armies as a "liberating force" within which a "bourgeois revolution" could develop. The result was

that the C. P. opposed strikes by the Japanese workers, who happen to have a significant revolutionary tradition. The C. P. leadership and adults called industrialized Japan "semi-feudal" and tried to lead the C.P. in the direction of a Chinese-type revolution. Young C.P. members attacked the program and were kicked out of the Party. Instead of organizing actions to involve large groups of people, and especially the workers and poor, the C.P. called workers in isolated areas to commit sabotage or bombings. Such actions led to these workers' certain defeat by the policy, and such defeats led, in turn to the undermining of the C.P. as a significant anti-imperialist force in the eyes of the Japanese people. In 1955, the Party reasserted its bankrupt program as having been right all along, instead of reevaluating it. In 1958, Zengakuren met, attacked the Party and unanimously passed a resolution calling for dismissal of members of its (the Party's) Central Committee.

From 1959-1960, Zengakuren fought against the U. S. - Japan security treaty "as the reorganization of the alliance between Japan and the United States resulting from the strengthening of Japanese monopolies which could demand more favorable terms from the United States, and American hopes to integrate these new monopolies within the sphere of an American-controlled world market." (*Ibid.*) The C.P., on the other hand, merely concluded that the treaty was an attempt to make Japan dependent on the U.S., and that the struggle against the treaty should be a broad-based and national anti-American struggle; they, therefore, actually opposed strikes by workers against Japan's monopolists (which Zengakuren advocated and helped organize) because they (strikes) could keep some of these very corporatist elements from participating. Throughout the period, when workers and Zengakuren students held militant strikes or public demonstrations, the C.P. condemned them and attacked them. Such betrayal of radicals by a supposedly "radical" group happened many times, and can only be compared to the labeling by American liberals and right-wing socialists of SDS and SNCC actions and pronouncements as "irresponsible". Like the Japanese C.P., the American realignment "left" are more in favor of a broad "united front" approach that basically appeals to the power elite to make the decision; or else an attempt to work through coalitions of liberal "leaders" to effect basic change that would, logically, undermine these leaders' very ruling positions. In opposition to this approach, radicals should and do organize those forces whose objective interests are opposed to the war into a multi-issue movement that uses the war to indict U. S. corporate capitalism as a whole. The Zengakuren recognizes, first of all, that if there ever were a significant peace movement to challenge just the immediate issue, it would fall flat on its face were the issue to be resolved in its favor. So Zengakuren attempts to involve people in concrete class struggle situations, while relating the immediate issues to a broader ideological framework—a framework *outside* that of conventional Japanese politics.

After the Japanese C.P.'s efforts to sabotage the struggle by the radicals of Japan and the workers, numerous principled members and often whole Party cells left the Party to strike out on their own. The result has been that many new independent revolutionary groups appeared in Japan, and, like Zengakuren especially, and like SDS in America, these groups have been grappling with problems of ideology. Marxism, of

course, has played a substantial role in the thoughts of such groups; yet increasingly, the Japanese New Left is examining Marx's earlier writings, the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, and is discovering in the abstract what many had already sensed in their conscious actions of struggle: how alienation is overcome, how man reappropriates that which is originally his, but which becomes lost to him through alienation. Like the American New Left, Japan's radicals are grasping for the roots of their actions. In opposition to traditional vulgar materialism of the old left and the C.P., which made man nothing more than a creature pushed now this way and now that, which made him entirely a being directed by his environment without any self-initiative, the new radicals are increasingly seeing in man a *human* being who creates in his mind as well as with his hands, and who definitely acts to make his history. Thus, the new radicals see that the consciousness of the poor, the workers, the alienated middle class and the radical intellectuals of their real common interests, the roots, the reality, the "nitty gritty" is prevented from coming to the fore in their minds because of the framework of hypocrisy which the world's two power blocs have forced them to work in. Moving *outside* that framework is the *mind's* action, first; it is an action in which the mind goes from a merely liberal critique to a *profoundly basic* critique, a critique *at the roots*, a radical critique of society. And such radical *thought* leads to radical *action*, action at the social roots of capitalism, action among the people, the human beings who are hurt physically, emotionally, psychologically by the system and by the system's authoritarian framework.

SDS and SNCC are radical *precisely* because they have moved in the direction of consciously tying up issues. They have shown the relationships between, for instance, American imperialist adventures abroad and the poverty and suffering of people at home. They have made stinging critiques of the government's euphemistically labeled "anti-poverty war," especially because of its failure to involve the poor in the decision-making process as controllers of the program. They have especially related themselves to the problems of alienation by acting where such actions counts—in the urban ghettos of the North, in the rural areas of the deep South—to organize people *locally* to overcome the power structure. The new trends of the Japanese Left back toward basic thinking, the actions of Zengakuren (mass sit-downs at anti-war rallies, where the C.P. and Socialists condemn such actions as "provocative," and likely to alienate people—like our own liberals) and its militancy make it vitally necessary for SDS and SNCC in America, and Zengakuren in Japan to be able to compare experiences, common problems and issues, differences and theories of change.

Therefore, I propose the following:

- 1) That SDS establish fraternal relations on an international level with Zengakuren;
- 2) That SDS and Zengakuren together publish an international bulletin in Japanese and American editions. The bulletin would go to all SDS and Zengakuren members free, unless finances preclude such an arrangement, and to all others who subscribed. The bulletin would tell what each was doing, have political and theoretical writing, news, opinion-exchange, letters from members, etc. It would come out two or three times a year, or as often as possible.

Allan Greene, Baltimore SDS

## National Convention CLEARLAKE, IOWA

August 27th To Sept. 1st

## staff positions open new england syracuse

The New England S.D.S. Regional Office needs the following staff people for fall '66:

1. Office staff person: to co-ordinate a speaker's bureau, an entertainer's bureau, literature sales, chapter correspondence, planning and organization of conferences and regional council meetings, relations with other organizations, office work, and so on, with the office manager, Mary Buscher.

2. Treasurer-fund-raiser: to raise about \$400 per month and to keep the books.

3. Campus traveler: to travel to chapters throughout scenic New England.

Wages will be subsistence plus travelling expenses.

Anyone interested in any of these jobs, or in working for the New England S.D.S. Regional Office in any other capacity, write:

Mary Buscher  
S.D.S. - New England  
2076 Massachusetts Ave.  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

or, call: (617) 547-5457

or, contact at the National Convention: Mary Buscher or Jim Kaplan.

Fraternally,  
Jim Kaplan

Here's the information for NLN: we badly need a campaign manager-organizer for Norman Balabanian's peace candidacy in Syracuse. We'd be willing to pay \$120 a month plus room with some board. Syracuse is a very hard place to organize and activate as it has had no history until the last 2 years or so of any radical activity whatsoever. Therefore we really need a person with some experience in organizing either in peace, civil rights, poverty or student movements and who also has had some experience in running an office staffed by volunteers. There's not much else to say. Syracuse is a very hard place to organize and activate. The few activists there have already been overburdened and just can't take on the fulltime responsibilities of the campaign. There are real problems on the campaign but they are not insuperable or immobilizing. If anyone wants to come to Syracuse to see what the situation is he should call the campaign collect (and during the day) at 315-422-1444 or write to Norman Balabanian, 165 E. Onondaga St., Syracuse, N.Y. Or I guess they could also call me, when I am not working in the office phone, at 478-2309.

Denny Blouin

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

Second-Class postage rates paid in Chicago, Illinois

Jim ANDERSON  
1843 Vernon N W  
Washington D C