Int. Instituut
Soc. Geschiedenis
Herengracht 262
Amsterdam

# Berkeley, Stanford, and BLACK POWER

John Saari
Stanford SDS

Word has reached me thru the amazing SDS grapevine that the Black Power Conference at Berkeley has upset some of our brothers and worse, our financial contributors out East – too bad. It is surprising after the countless times the press has misrepresented SDS, SNCC and every other radical group in the country that it is still uncritically accepted by some of our members.

Okay. If it is necessary to explain why Berkeley SDS called its Black Power Conference and why the newly formed Stanford chapter chose to support it by having its own Black Power Day the day before, I will. First, it is SDS's position *nationally* to support SNCC and SNCC's concept of Black Power. Both Stanford SDS and Berkeley SDS concur with this *national position*. What does it mean to say we support SNCC and Black Power? Passing a statement at an N.C.? People at Berkeley and later people at Stanford thought not. We thought we should do more. We thought that the least we could do was to raise money for SNCC and give SNCC a forum to explain Black Power to the white community. More than that, we thought Black Power had something positive to say to the white community and to white radicals in particular. The too often forgotten part of Black Power is its call for whites to organize whites. Thus, the purposes of the Black Power Conferences were threefold: (1) to raise money for SNCC, (2) to explain what Black Power means, and (3) to motivate whites to organize whites. In the rosey afterglow of the conferences, they seem so successful on all three counts.

But of course, the Black Power Conference at Berkeley had statewide, perhaps national, political consequences. Rightist Ronald Reagan is running for governor against "liberal" Pat Brown, and horrors!–Regan looks like a winner. Berkeley is an issue in the campaign, and thus the Black Power Conference became an issue. Worst of all, it was an issue that could only help the "fascist" Reagan. Naturally, Berkeley SDS knew this: and to some of its members, this made the conference even more attractive. For they knew that gas Chessman–jail the Auto Row demonstrators and the FSM students–can Si Cassady–pass the riot law–ignore the farm workers–question the Rumford Act Pat Brown was no different and no better than Ronald Reagan would be. They also knew that the California left had called for a boycott of the gubernatorial election at the state-wide Conference on Power and Politics and that the organized poor and blacks agreed with this position: The case in California is that the lesser of the two evils is too evil. However, while it is necessary to know the political context of the Berkeley Black Power Conference, it is equally important to ask who defined this context? Who made the Berke-

(Continued on page 5)

SNS
new left notes
an internal newspaper of students for a democratic society
1608 w. madison, rm. 206 chicago, ill. 60612
Vol. 1, No. 42 let the people decide November 4, 1966

# NATIONAL POLITICS

by Gerald Markowitz
Michael McCropool
Stephen Rankan
Madison, Wisc.

If the left is united in any desire, it is united in the desire for radical change. The greatest obstacle to radical change in this country is the strangle-hold that the power structure maintains over the minds of the vast majority of the population. Discontent may be widespread but at present it is unconscious and voiceless. The main task before any radical movement is to articulate all discontent, both latent and manifest, and to create understanding of the corruption of our society. From this will come groping towards solutions. We must emphasize, however, that the all-important first step must be taken. Discontent must be mobilized and a radicalized population must be achieved.

Because of the regional and other diversities of the United States combined with the federal system of government, the only way to really achieve radicalization on a national level is first to radicalize the community. There are problems facing almost every community in the United States which demand radical analysis and radical alternatives. City, state and regional issues must be faced to demonstrate the relevance of a radical approach to the problems of today. Radicals should advance solutions to such problems as air and water pollution, and urban transportation. The work-a-day issues that seem irrelevant to radical politics are basic preludes to more radical activity. A perfect example is the development of a strong radical sense among students at Berkeley and recently in the population at large in the Bay Area. First, there was a long struggle about the basic American right enshrined in the First Amendment, Free Speech. Because the Free Speech movement challenged the University bureaucracy, the people who participated learned the truth about our "democracy." The next step was the large Vietnam Day Committee. The radical spirit that made the VDC as large as it is was conceived during the Free Speech Movement's struggles. The next step in radicalization has been the enthusiastic support for Robert Scheer's campaign among the rank and file radical students. They have taken the campaign's messages into the Oakland ghetto and, in fact, produced a majority for Scheer in that section of his district. The Bay Area is on the way to being radicalized, and it all started with the unblushingly unradical demand for Free Speech.

This example illustrates a point that can be demonstrated again and again from the history of American radicalism. The American people have only responded well to radicals when the issues appeared close at hand. Radicalism that has succeeded in capturing the hearts and minds of many people has been rooted in American experience and dealt with the local and regional issues which were important to people every day of their lives. Examples such as Populism, Industrial Unionism, and today's Freedom movement are good representatives. Thus, we are left with a proposition with which all people seriously interested in radicalizing America (not reforming it) must agree: The only hope for success by American radicals is a start at the grassroots by presenting intelligent solutions to local problems and organizing around these issues in the community. From small issues will come larger issues; as the community radicalizes

(continued on page 2)

## letter to the Chapters:

NOVEMBER 4, 1966

This morning's *Chicago's American* carried a major attack on SDS under banner headlines reading:

*Leftist Students Planned to Hurl Paint*
BARE PLOT AGAINST LBJ HERE

A plot to spatter President Johnson's car with paint during a Chicago parade scheduled for today, was uncovered by police intelligence officers.

*Chicago's American* learned today that a hard core of about 20 demonstrators from Students for a Democratic Society and other left-wing groups planned to throw paint when Johnson's limousine passed State and Madison Streets.

etc.

Johnson did not come to Chicago after all. The following statement was released to the press. We are sending it to you so that you will be informed of the situation and will be able to reply locally to the charges.

November 4, 1966

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

This morning's *Chicago's American* accuses Students for a Democratic Society of being involved in a "plot to spatter paint" on Lyndon Johnson's car during his projected visit to Chicago. The National Office of the organization has consulted with chapters in the Chicago area and has found that the story is based only on vicious rumors. The story is an obvious attempt to smear SDS and the anti-war movement by portraying anti-war demonstrators as conspirators. It is an attempt to discredit those who oppose American aggression in Vietnam and to win sympathy for the Johnson Administration's policy on the eve of the elections. Students for a Democratic Society is not a conspiratorial organization and will not be intimidated by red-baiting tactics. We are a democratic organization of radical youth committed to fundamental social change in America. As such, we are determined to oppose the reactionary foreign policy of the government. We will not stand by while dissent is stifled; we will continue to demonstrate against Lyndon Johnson wherever he appears.

*Greg Calvert*, National Secretary

## Jeff Segal gets 4 years

An organizer for Students for a Democratic Society was sentenced Monday to four years in federal prison by U. S. District Judge James B. Parsons for failure to report for draft induction Feb. 8, 1965.

Jeffrey B. Segal, 23, of 1103 E. 63rd, was found guilty in a bench trial. He is a former Roosevelt University student, and former member of the S. D. S. National Office staff.

When Segal's attorney, George Harries, remarked that the term was too severe, the judge noted that he had had twice as many draft violation cases this year as last.

Judge Parsons added that he found half of his current call in Freeport were draft cases. As a result, he said, this year he is giving four-year sentences where he gave three last year when a trial is demanded. If a defendant pleads guilty, the sentence is two years, he said.

He pointed out that the majority of those sentenced, having no prior record, will serve only a third of their term.

A former federal prosecutor who handled draft cases, Parsons said the Justice Department will not prosecute a second time if a youth is released from jail before age 26 and drafted a second time.

Records of the U. S. attorney's office show there have been 32 persons indicted in 1966 in Chicago. Last week, the Federal Bureau of Investigation arrested three alleged draft violators here as well as five alleged deserters from the armed services.

it will attain a new level of consciousness and will begin to see the connection between what is denied to it and what is denied to other people. Thus, the Negro people in the South can make the connection between their struggle and the struggle of the Vietnamese people as some woman did with these words, "Maybe they can't register, too."

### A NATIONAL CAMPAIGN

We propose to link this idea of local organization on local issues to the national political arena. We propose a national campaign in 1968, not for the purpose of winning the election but for the purpose of facilitating organizing work on the local level. We suggest that every local organization that so desires, and especially local groups who have already run peace candidates, attend a convention to be held in 1967 to nominate a national slate. The coalition supporting these candidates may be as diverse as the New York Parade Committee. We should not expect to win power through these elections; that time we need not be united on all counts. Since the national campaign should function primarily to enhance and coordinate the efforts of the various groups operating at the local level and because the left is still divided on fundamental questions we propose that the convention skirt the stumbling block of ideology. Instead, it should ignore the radical differences and reach agreement on broad (short-run) demands. Only basic agreement in this respect is required. Three possible ones would be immediate withdrawal from Vietnam (Bring the Troops Home Now, Alive), Jobs or Income Now, and an explicit support for Black Power. These demands should be broad enough to attract the Du Bois Clubs, the WSP, SNCC, CORE, SWP, etc. together while being radical enough to keep SANE and Bobby Kennedy out. The principle in the campaigns should be local autonomy though local groups should probably (tactly at least) support the three demands. The positive proposals dealing with these demands will be sufficient to indicate the importance of radical change. Therefore, there is little need for the national campaign to be unified upon a broad and encompassing ideology.

The purpose of this campaign will be to let local movements join each other, giving their own efforts in their own communities a national focus. It will provide for communication and exchange of ideas between local movements. It will also provide publicity and help the education campaigns so vital to building the movements. For instance, the presidential or vice-presidential candidate (of national stature) might provide much needed publicity and drawing power for local groups' meetings where they will expound their local radical alternatives. Even without the presence of the national personalities, the enthusiasm and interest generated by a national campaign could help stimulate concern with local issues on the part of people who might otherwise ignore them. In other words the group that is responsible with a radical critique will be expanded by the heightened political interest which surrounds a national campaign. Each local group should, of course, have complete autonomy, and it goes without saying that they should stay together after the election and keep working, organizing, and educating.

The recent meeting of California groups (*National Guardian*, Oct. 15) seems to have followed this prescription on a regional level. It is not surprising that California should have produced the Stoneground and the Scheer and other campaigns though nominally for democratic nomination were really directed towards establishing strong bases within the democratic party. Had it been been elected, his main job would have been to continue organizing his community and to use his office in Washington to spread the radical message to other Congressional districts. The Connecticut campaigns of Bob Cook and Fred Harris are on the verge of achieving this kind of unity that Scheer brought to his Oakland-Berkeley campaign. One is also struck with the resolution of peace candidates in other areas to continue organizing after the election.

# NATIONAL POLITICS

The national campaign should in no way detract from other forms of protest and education, be they Teach-Ins, demonstrations, civil disobedience, rent-strikes or door-to-door canvassing. All radical people in any area of the United States will have an opportunity to devote time and energy on any level of activity they care to. The way to victory, given the American federal system and the divergence of regions, is the grassroots up, separately. There will be unity for certain actions or on certain issues only; but there should always be contact. If it is done correctly, the national campaign in 1968 could be an important beginning. It could result in many well grounded local organizations and a vast amount of publicity for the movement.

### THE POSITIVE PROGRAM

The three issues we have suggested as the basis for the national campaign are not the only three possible. We believe in total flexibility as far as this program is concerned. We do feel that certain modifications of these demands to make them more acceptable to a broader group of people might be dangerous.

For instance: the demand to withdraw from Vietnam immediately. The war is not the root of all the evil in the United States; it is a result of the great rottenness of our society which is why a radical change is necessary. Staughton Lynd has summarized the "contradictions" of American society aptly:

> "American capitalism is not a permanent or stable system. It cannot provide constructive and remunerative work for all its citizens. It refuses to support those without such work at a level of life consistent with human dignity. The technological progress to which it is driven by corporate competition for profits puts more men out of work by automation. The only public works it is willing to undertake which alleviate unemployment significantly are war and the preparation for war. . . ."(*National Guardian*, April 16, 1966, p. 8).

In his speech to the *Guardian* dinner last year Professor William A. Williams said succinctly: "We cannot dismantle the empire abroad until we dismantle the empire at home."

Our job as radicals is to constantly attempt to increase the number of people who desire a basic change in American society. A demand for immediate withdrawal meets the basic phenomenon of American society as it functions in the international sphere: international anti-communism leading to anti-nationalism and military and paro-military adventurism. We must show the average American that foreign revolutions will not be Communist, that Americans are fighting one such revolution, and that contrary to the President's hypocritical intonations there is nothing to negotiate since the Geneva Agreements of 1954 already have stated that Vietnam is to belong to the Vietnamese. All more compromising approaches to the Administration will run the risk of cooptation.

Jobs or Income Now is something the economy is physically capable of providing for everyone. The over-haul in the politics of priorities that is needed before this will occur is nothing short of a radical revolution. The trade unions' demands for shorter hours with the same pay do not touch our most basic problem: people who are unemployed and often unemployable. The local movements of welfare recipients indicate how timely this political demand would be in some community organization projects.

The support (either tacit or active) for the Black Power demands of SNCC and CORE is a must for any radical movement serious about itself. We support Professor Genovese's observation that

> "For American Socialism, the black revolt opens an opportunity for relevance that has been missing for decades. What we do with that opportunity, as the leaders of SNCC have rather rudely reminded us, is our problem, not theirs." (*National Guardian*, October 1, p. 2)

The national campaign must get the support of SNCC and CORE both for the local political support this will give it in places like Alabama and Mississippi, and because Negroes are the most immediate constituency of a radical movement bent on organizing the community. Following the advice of Stokley Carmichael, the national party should be the place where Negro and white community organizations can meet as equals and share experiences. We are not opposed to integrated community organizations but they must be in integrated communities. Scheer's campaign solicited votes both from the ghetto Negroes in Oakland and the white middle class intellectuals in the Berkeley area. Here as always, local autonomy should be the rule. The largest possible radical constituency for the campaign will be generated by keeping to this rule and accepting the three suggestions as the lowest common denominator for the attendance at the convention in 1967.

### THE CONVENTION AND AFTER

The convention itself can produce, through the sharing of the experiences of different local organizations, a massive well-documented indictment of the Johnson administration. The "war" on poverty can be exposed on the testimony of expert opinion, people who have worked in it, and its own publications. The fact can be driven home to our future constituents that the war on poverty has systematically excluded the communities it is supposedly aiding from any direction of the program. The experiences in Syracuse and elsewhere can be cited in support of this well-known fact among radicals. The fact that a true war on poverty is impossible within the political economy of the United States could also be driven home. Each local organization can lay down a challenge to the power structure in the form of a demand that each local community have to make the war on poverty a reality. The specific proposals will almost certainly step on the toes of many vested interests and the communities will be taught important facts of life about what is possible in America. the illusion of Civil Rights "progress" can be shattered once and for all with special documentation of the half-hearted moves made in the integration of schools, and to mention the decidedly unequal opportunities that persist for southern and northern ghetto-dwelling Negroes. The power structure's fears of Black Power can be explained in terms of the apprehension on their part that they will not be able to buy off the new leadership. The results of the War Crime's Tribunal run by Bertrand Russell can be used to full advantage re Vietnam. Also, we can publish new material about the course of the war, the "elections" in South Vietnam, and the growing disaffection within the armed forces. The manifesto can be an island of truth in a political mainstream of lies.

The national headquarters that will coordinate the national campaign can remain in existence after the election just as local organizations should remain in existence. The headquarters can act as a clearing house to provide local groups with reports on various problems and as a focal point of communication to share experiences. it should have at its disposal a pool of willing specialists. These might include such planners, economists, agronomists, lawyers, etc. These people would be available as consultants for community organizations to aid in the pursuit of well thought out practical solutions to whatever problems may exist in the community being radicalized. This pool need not consist of a paid staff. Interested specialists would inform the national headquarters that they are willing to serve local organizations desiring the specialist aid they are capable of giving. Requests from local organizations will be sent through the national headquarters to the kind of specialists requested . It is hoped that the numbers will be great enough to guarantee that at least one will have enough time to answer the call. At a later date, the national headquarters might want to maintain a staff, but at the present time that is not necessary. As time goes on, through these contacts and their own experiences, local communities

(Continued on page 8)

## to the editor:

It seems to me that Marc Lendler's questions in your issue of October 7 may be fairly reduced to one: will democracy work? Marc is quite right about one thing — the belief of SDS in democracy as a viable social system is just that, a "belief." Democracy, except in rare isolated instances, has never been tried. We have no basis for determining whether people will make the "right" decisions until we have the opportunity to observe democracy in practice. The necessity for democracy as a primary goal of a radical movement, however, does not depend upon any proof that it will succeed (whatever that may imply), but on the fact that it is the only just means for organizing society. Any other system must result in the domination of one man by another whether by overt tyranny or by more subtle methods of manipulation. In other words, democracy and equality are wholly interdependent. One can not exist without the other. So long as some hold political advantages, they will attempt to reap the economic benefits of society in an unequal measure and so long as some hold excessive economic privilege, they will continue to dominate others politically. If, after being granted the most exhaustive tests, democracy should fail, then maybe we should all join our local Jaycees and work for clean one-dimensional society with a full community chest, for radical hopes will be forever doomed.

SDS, however, has good reason for believing in the efficacy of democracy. But only if by democracy we mean an egalitarian-decentralized, participatory form. (It is my conviction that these concepts are implicit in any real democracy.) The example of Marler cites of strip miners making a decision inimical to the interests of others would not be so likely if the citizens affected adversely by the stripping of the land also took part in the decision making processes. This, of course, would not prevent decisions to prohibit the teaching of evolution or to wage unjust wars, but it would preclude state or nationwide decisions to do so and it would at least allow those opposed to such decisions an opportunity to state their case rationally, whereas at the state or national level their arguments would be smothered by pious platitudes and demagoguery.

It is also the hope of most of us, based on some empirical observations of man interacting with man, that when people cooperate in reaching decisions which affect their own lives, they will come to have a better understanding of the forces at work in society and to have more compassion for their fellow men. In other words, their is a reasonable faith that a loving, humane community is possible and that this community can and will make wise decisions.

This vision, of course, is premised on a complete restructuring of society with an emphasis on economic equality as the primary requisite of a functional democracy. No democracy can be just unless each participant is on a reasonable equal basis with all others. This requirement underscores the desirability of 'Black Power', organizations of the poor and other movements designed to redistribute power more equitably in this country.

New Radicals are also on solid grounds in advocating democracy as a means for creating a just society as well as a necessary component of that society. In addition to the questionable truism that the means always condition the end it seems to me that democracy is a difficult art which must be learned and experienced by all those participating, cannot be successfully handed down from above. A democracy worth aspiring towards, as differentiated from a quasi-democracy like that created here by the Adams-Hamilton-Madison aristocracy, must be developed by all the people cooperating on an equal basis.

Despite any implication to the contrary in the above ruminations, Marc Lendler is right: we should constantly question our faith in democracy, holding its every tenent up to the most scrupulous examination. But, unless it should finally prove to be a fraud, democracy must continue as a basic premise in all SDS programs and ideology (such as it is) if SDS intends to remain a truly radical organization.

Fraternally,
Peter Schanck
Rockville, Maryland

# R.E.P. MEETING REPORT

The first joint meeting of the Radical Education Project Directors and Staff took place on October 9th and 10th in Ann Arbor. Response to the REP prospectus and to REP information forms disseminated by mail and through *New Left Notes* had been enthusiastic. Discussion at the meeting therefore, centered around the problems of making good on most of the expectations that had been generated. Participating were Mike and Evi Goldfield, Jim Jacobs, Steve Johnson, Steve Weissman and Peter Henig of the REP staff; Kathy McAfee, staff member at large; Greg Calvert and Jane Adams from the National Office, and REP directors Paul Booth and Dick Magidoff.

Having achieved a preliminary inventory of interest and resources and with a mandate for internal education from the SDS National Convention, it was possible to evaluate REP functions to date and to lay plans for future development in the areas of service to SDS chapters and organizers, catalysis and communication between radical scholars, a publications program which will hopefully serve both of these ends, and to make certain technical decisions about staff and office.

Highest priority was assigned to getting some REP materials into the hands of SDS people as soon as possible. Three study guides will be available shortly, but it was decided that before going ahead with very largescale printing the National Office would locate chapters willing to use the materials on an experimental "pilot project" basis and then report on their usefulness at the December N.C. It was felt that this meeting with chapter people and field organizers would provide the "feed-back" necessary to insure that the study guides and "how-to-do-it" pamphlets are getting as usable and relevant and to perfect existing study guides. It is assumed that new ideas for materials will be secured at that time.

Between now and the December N.C. REP internal education work will, in addition to the 'pilot projects," entail a mailing to chapters for the purpose of identifying "REP reps"-individuals who will take responsibility for leading educational program, and the production of a packet of periodical reprints on the subject of "Black Power" (again on a trial basis), and the publication of a small monthly REP NEWSLETTER which will have as some of its functions, the reporting of news about chapter educational programs, interim publication of suggested readings, announcement of conferences, and lists of speakers available to groups in their respective areas of the country. Publication of a full-scale REP magazine awaits the coming of an "entrepreneurial-type" person who can take the initiative in raising the considerable sums of money needed and in recruiting a staff. However, the first REP book, now being prepared by Steve Weissman, should be on sale across the country by September of 1967 at the latest.

In addition, it was decided that it would be worthwhile for a member of the R.E.P. staff to devote some time to the development of new educational techniques, among them tape recordings, photography and film, strips, motion pictures, and printing processes. And in recognition of the fact, that, away from big cities and universities with good libraries and book and magazine stores, people may very well have difficulty obtaining books and periodicals, it was decided that a long-range program to develop a national distribution network would be undertaken.

There was some concern that through regular and organized direct communication with chapters, REP might develop into something of a "parallel hierarchy" for SDS, opening the way to confusion and competition in fund-raising, duplication of effort, and to political involvement by REP which might interfere with its legitimate functions. Procedures established to avoid such difficulties include an exchange of visits by R.E.P. and N.O. functioning staff and the forwarding to Greg Calvert of carbon copies of all correspondence between the chapters and the REP chapter contact person.

In one sense, however, it may be good that some REP functions, particularly in the area of communication and coordination, parallel those of the N. O. As Steve Weissman observed, it is desirable for us to develop multiple entities through which individuals can be brought into contact with the national movement. One trend which has clearly emerged is that most of REP's contacts have been with those who have been reached through other than SDS organizational channels. They are graduate students, faculty, professionals of various types, and independent radicals. They are sympathetic to our ideals but, because of personal preferences and life situations, have found no way to be active in the movement.

It is apparent, from the responses to the REP information forms, that many such people not only have ideas but have formulated and pursued problems that are of vital interest to the movement. They seem eager to be put in contact and to engage in dialogue with others with similar interests. At the time of writing, it has already been possible to initiate twenty study groups composed of individuals who will eventually be in regular communication with one another for the purpose of coordinating research, exchanging ideas and criticism, and holding conferences. Undoubtedly a number of the study groups will soon be setting up discussion bulletins of their own. Some of the study groups are forming are in the areas of Urban Economics; Foreign Policy; Ethical Basis of Social Theory; Radicals in the Professions; Theories of Work; Labor; Educational Theory and Reform; and Counter-curriculum. Initial coordinators for study groups will be identified in *New Left Notes* and in the *REP Newsletter* as individuals agree to work in the coordinating role.

In the course of the meeting, it became obvious that if the study group idea lives up to half of the potential it is now displaying, the REP office desperately needs help out with problems that would face anyone attempting to function as catalyst of an intellectual process without coming to preside over that process. It was finally decided, for example, that in the case of a local REP conference, the organizers should be encouraged to formulate problems and agendas on their own. The REP office would help out with resources and suggestions as requested.

With respect to the publication by the REP office of materials originating in study groups, it was decided that study groups would naturally exercise a self-editing power, thus sparing the REP staff the immense task of reading all of the material likely to be developed, and reducing the danger of excessive centralization of control over editorial policies. As study groups develop "competence" and criteria of their own, the safeguards will be strengthened still further.

Although REP will be engaging in dialogue with new constituences through its study groups, conferences, and publications, it was decided that at least one staff member would serve as a contact man with groups and organizations that are not part of "the movement" but which nevertheless share many concerns with us. There are a number of religious, professional and labor groupings in this category which could and should be approached for the purpose of engaging them in the radical education process. Allocation of staff resources toward this end will be regarded as long-range "seed-work" which should be evaluated by its effectiveness in changing the intellectual atmosphere of the country and not by its ability to produce immediate and specific political returns. It is hoped that in this way, resources will be tapped in the future and that we will be less likely to become isolated from sources of ideas and potential allies.

The REP meeting also arrived at an interim policy on the hiring of new staff. In the interests of continuity and in recognition of the fact that it takes new people some time to orient themselves, it was decided that new staff would not be taken on unless the individual involved was prepared to make a commitment of at least six months of his time. Rare exceptions will be made when someone is needed to implement a clearly defined project of limited duration.

## CANADIAN border TIGHTENED

It has recently been brought to the attention of the National Office that immigration controls on Americans entering Canada have been tightened by administrative decision. According to Canadian sources, the new situation involves two innovations in policy.

First, Americans have traditionally been able to enter Canada as visitors, find jobs, and then apply for and receive landed immigrant status. Now, Americans are being treated as any other immigrants would be. Chances of gaining landed immigrant status in this way seem slim at this point. This means that prospective immigrants must either apply via Ottawa while still in the United States or be judged at the border. Not only are young men being quizzed at the border about their draft status, but, in addition, we know of two instances of a student having been refused entry into the country.

Secondly, it appears that draft age Americans may no longer be able to gain landed immigrant status-not because they will be refused, but most likely because their applications will not be acted upon. There will probably be some sort of security check involving draft boards.

The above information is tentative and the National Office will keep you informed on new developments in *New Left Notes*.

–The National Secretary

The Staff was mandated to secure an office of its own and a satisfactory office has just been found. It is located near the University of Michigan campus in downtown Ann Arbor. The REP mailing address will remain unchanged until further notice.

Because time ran short, a detailed set of procedures for the internal administration of the Radical Education Project corporation, submitted by Al Haber, was tabled until the next meeting of the R.E.P. Directors and Staff.

# A MODEST PROPOSAL

by Kim Moody
New York

In a Convention paper entitled, 'Toward the Working Class', I urged SDSers to begin considering organizing in the working class, the emphasis being on rank and file blue collar workers. Even before the paper was written a number of SDSers had been doing just that, while others were giving serious thought to organizing blue collar projects. Although I still feel that this is the most important things SDS can do, I realize that not everyone is cut out for, or even should do this sort of organizing. A number of student radicals, when they graduate, are likely to go into fields that are not usually thought of as working class, the semi-professions. Given this fact, it seems to me to be worth while to discuss the radical possibilities of at least one area of semi-professional employment, public semi-professional work – particularly teaching and public welfare.

As most people are aware, there has been a dramatic change in the structure of the working class since the end of World War II. It is now a fashionable liberal shibolith to point out that the industrial working class is disappearing and being replaced by unorganized white collar workers. The force behind this transformation is, of course, automation and the new technology. Although the notion that the industrial working class is rapidly disappearing is untrue, there is no disputing the relative growth of the white collar sector. White collar and blue collar working class the fastest growing sector is public employment on the state and local level. In April, 1947 there were 3,682,000 state and local employees, by March, 1966, this was up to 8,204,000. These figures include blue collar public employees, but this fact only emphasises the importance of public employment in the white collar working class. Employment in private manufacturing, on the other hand has risen only slightly above the 1950 level. Within the public employment sector, the largest single group of employees are those in education, mostly teachers. In April, 1947, there were 1,483,000 employees in state and local education, by March, 1966 this was up to 4,298,000. In 1966, education accounts for more than 50% of all state and local public employment. The numerical significance of public employment is obvious, but what is even more interesting for our purposes is that something is happening in public employment.

Most of the history of public employee unionism is pretty dreary. Virtually all of the public employee unions before 1960 were conservative in style. All of them, including the Communist-run United Public Workers (UPW), officially discouraged strikes. Until 1960, these unions had very few written contracts – the minimal life-line of any real trade union. After 1960, however, the two surviving public employee unions, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), began to fight for contracts and other trade union issues. I will discuss AFT later. The AFSCME seems to have raised itself to the level of functioning as a genuine trade union, in the not too exciting American sense, and halted its development there. The first really militant upsurge of aggressive public (non-educational) employee unionism has come from public welfare workers. In the last two or three years, independent unions of public welfare workers have sprung up around the country. Some of them were formed by rank and file groups that revolted against the conservative policies of AFSCME or of the Building Service Employees International Union (BSEIU) and others grew up where there had been no union. In all cases, these new unions reject both the conservatism of the old unions and the 'professionalism' of the social work associations. These independent welfare unions, now united in the National Federation of Social Service Employees, have rejected the old political pressure tactics of AFSCME in favor of direct action for a contract and demonstrations and job actions for contract enforcement. What is even more interesting from a radical point of view is that most of these unions have been striving to build an alliance with welfare client organizations in order to transform the welfare system. Socialists and radicals can play an important role in making sure that this alliance is built on a radical basis by working in these unions. In almost all of the welfare worker unions, client organization is a hot issue and in the New York Social Service Employees' Union, independent socialists together with other radicals have done a lot to fight for a militant alliance with clients. Welfare unions also inevitably become embroiled in other important local political fights, so that the immediate political possibilities are greater than in most other unions. Furthermore, as most of the leaders of these young unions are somewhat political radical in their thinking and more or less New Left in style, the political atmosphere is more free swinging. The advantage of working in these unions is that they are alive with action right now – three of the welfare unions have struck within the last six months and more strikes are likely this Fall.

Although the action possibilities of welfare unionism are more immediate, in some ways public school teaching offers more serious long range political work. For one thing, a young graduate, especially radicals, who are not interested in social work *per se*, and that is most of us, will probably not work in welfare for more than a couple of years. Teaching is more likely to be a long range career. People who go into teaching have to have a special desire to work with kids and, therefore, are more likely to view it as a career. For another, teaching represents more people in our society, nearly 4,000, 000, and education a more central institution than welfare. Indeed, there is a tremendous struggle to be waged in many urban, and particularly Ghetto, schools and

(Continued on page 6)

# letters to the editor

Dear Ed.,

I read The Calculus of Improbabilities (NLN Oct 7) with interest. I am not sure that SNCC would agree that SNCC Plus SDS Equals New Left, we ought to ask them about that some time. I am also not sure why you lump the Young People's Socialist League with PL, WEB, DuB. and YSA. The latter are all offshoots of the Communist Movement while the YPSL derives from the Socialist Party one day we shall have to discuss the calculus involved in that distinction.

Did it come to your attention that we had some contact with the Susskind situation on this end? The show also called the League For Industrial Democracy (LID) for a person to appear on the program. One of the LID staff did go down and after a short conversation was also told that they wanted a really dramatic type of person and sited the example of a guy from Watts whom they had contacted and liked because he started shouting over the phone.

The LID staffer told them that they wanted to assemble an unrepresentative fur out show and pass it off as the New Left. The reply was that they had discussed the matter and wanted to do it their way.

Later on the New York Regional Office of SDS was contacted and having been forwarned by the experience of the NO and the LID asked if the program would accept whoever was sent. Again they were told to send several people and one would be chosen. The REGION DECLINED+

What I can't fanthom is how SDS people can show such good sense on an occasion like this and then turn around on a picket line or public demonstration, and through unusual ignorance, ill chosen slogans or Viet Cong flags provide the national TV with precisely the spectacle that the Susskind people tried to stage. The problem is We should want to avoid being held up to mass media not for the sake of being cooler than they are, but because no one knows better than they how to isolate us even from the majority of the student community. But still it seems that we will 'bare our teeth and snarl into the cameras', every chance we get unless we are requested to so so in which case we refuse. Thats not a political approach. It's pure contrariness.

Steve Max
N.Y.C., NY

*Dear N.O. People,*

In view of your continuing financial crisis, may I suggest that dues be raised to *ten dollars* a year. Furthermore, to insure that every member pays, the N.O. should bill members directly, allow 30 days for a response, and then remove from the files the names of all those who fail to reply. Instead of billing all 6,000 members at once, you might mail dues notices (at bulk mail rates) to 500 members a month to insure a continuous inflow of funds. Assuming that a third of the membership is so lacking in seriousness that it cannot come up with ten dollars a year, you would still have 4000 paying a year from the membership with which to operate the N.O., publish N.L.N., and keep in stock the priority literature (basic brochure, Port Huron Statement, SDS Constitution, America and the New Era).

The *REP* is a great idea, but attaining tax exempt status is essential. It should publish a *quarterly journal*, a monthly I. F. Stone sized newsletter, and pamphlets as funds permit. For the present, *N.L.N.* should go to a *bi-weekly* publishing schedule (26 issues a yr.), 8 pages an issue, occasionally expanding to 12. This more leisurely schedule would help to conserve scarce funds, and allow for improvements in editing and composition.

Meanwhile, since a non-member subscribing to NLN at $5 a yr. is of more assistance to the organization than is a member at $4 dues a yr., I'll become a non-member until you adopt my $10 a yr. proposal! A check for $5 is enclosed. It is not intended to further the pattern of deficit spending. Reform ye sinners in the N.O.! Return to financial responsibility!

Peace, Gary Smith
North Conway N.H.

To the Editor of NLN:

Three comments on Edward Jahn's letter, "MDS or What?" in NLN, October 1.

First, agreed that SDS as it stands is an inadequate vehicle for expression and action by ex- and non-students. The discussion of MDS and other possible remedies is the objective reflection of this fact: whatever solution is correct, the problem does exist, or people wouldn't be proposing solutions.

Second, creating "a separate adult organization . . . bound to SDS by fraternal ties" seems to me a bad idea for two reasons. (1) Our experience with LID indicates, what you back off from the specific politics, that organizational independence leads to increasingly divergent political courses and hence to eventual splitting. An ideology in favor of cooperation is inadequate; cooperation must be hammered out in practice, i.e. within some sort of integrated structure, or it will wither. (2) John believes that "adults and students quite properly belong in separate organizations." Why? There is a get-ontocratic assumption here. A national election in which a 40-year-old veteran ran against a 20-year-old student would not necessarily create insoluble problems; it might create productive ones. Good for 40-year-olds to be led by 20-year-olds and for 20-year-olds to avoid youth-arrogance. It seems to have worked in Cuba. I think it is desirable to bridge the generational split rather than emphasize it, and to break the isolation of the student movement.

Third, on structures. Given that chapters should reflect an objective constituency (e.g., college chapters: organization based on place of work), largely-student and largely-adult chapters would probably result. Integration would occur representationally at the level of conventions and NCs, programmatically in national programs. Such an arrangement would reflect the differing orientations, needs and social lives of adults and students; would provide the basis for a split if divergence made one inevitable; but would avoid conceding one in advance.

Fraternally,
Christopher Hobson
U. of Chicago SDS

To the editor:

I found Marvin Mandell's article, "Against Paranoid Politics" (NLN, 9/23) revolting. It was revolting not so much because of the political position it advocated (although I disagree with that too), but because of the speed and assurance with which he dismissed intelligent radical leaders and some of the most important radical achievements in modern history, and because of the facile analogies he drew between phenomena quite apart.

I do not agree completely with the direction of the black power campaign, and I don't like the Chinese proletarian cultural revolution. But both are led by people who have basically the same goals as S.D.S., and discussions with those people must be carried on with that huge fact in mind. Likewise, I agree to a point on chapter and verse, but it must be clear to anyone who has read SNCC literature and Communist ideological writings that both are working to achieve a free, decentralized society in which people can control their own destinies.

I think there is a slight racist tendency in SNCC now (disliking whites because they are whites)+ But it is more emotional than intellectual, since racist statements are often counterbalanced by statements making it clear that what SNCC and black radicals dislike is functioning in a basically white racist America can not escape involvement themselves. One may agree or disagree (I disagree), but that is not a racist opinion. It is an opinion about the effects of white racism.

But there is also an immense difference between the most racist black radical and a white racist: no racist black radical wants to exploit whites or keep them in an inferior position in society. To equate the actions of the oppressors with the angry reactions of the oppressed is certainly a great leap although not forward.

Despite Mandell's statement, no news service has reported that red guards have raped peasant women. On the other hand, a great many peasant women were raped by Chiang Kai-chek's armies. And red guards tying someone to a lamp post and cutting off his Western hair cut are qualitatively better than Nazi hoodlums murdering helpless Jews.

Mandell's one sentence dismissal of the Russian revolution left me almost speechless with indignation. Fortunately, not quite. I would like to point out to him that no one starves in the Soviet Union, or in China, and that that is very important. Furthermore, if Mandell has ever walked around downtown New York, he has probably seen more beggars there than there are in all of China.

Beyond that, the socialist experiments, despite many horrible and condemnable things that have done in carrying them out, have created new cultures involving new patterns of interpersonal relations and new values. I do not think it is yet clear that they are evolving toward a quality of life better than that of the comfortable members of capitalist societies. But there are many indications that they are, and that is well worth looking into.

Sincerely,
Alan Jehlen
Cambridge, Mass

To the Editor:

We are writing this to inform the other members of SDS of some of the projects and progress we have had in the past few months.

Having acquired at last an office in July of this year we were able to set up with greater efficiency programs; the office serves not only as the headquarters for SDS but also as a Community Action Center. As such, it houses our library from which free literature is available and other books and pamphlets are for sale; in addition, it is the auditorium for speakers. To date we have had several speakers including James Boggs from Detroit speaking on Black Power; recently the Center was used by the local ACLU for their meeting and was offered to but declined by the John Birch Society for the speech of Senator Alabama's sheriff James Clark sponsored by the Society's series of speakers in Toledo. (This after was made immediately after we learned that the Knights of Columbus retracted their offer of their hall for Clark when they learned that we would be there to demonstrate.) As it is at the time of this writing, Clark will still speak here, but the new location has not been made public.

For the past few weeks we have been leafletting churches on Sunday morning, after the services, with such literature as Senator Fulbright's 'The Vietnam Fallout', 'Insights into the Problem of Viet Nam', and anti-napalm leaflets. As a result of this and other actions, there is in the process of organization a Toledo area high-school SDS.

We are hoping to set up some debates (possibly on the Toledo University campus) between SDS and the Young Americans for Freedom, the meeting of whom several of us attended and engaged in a dialogue of sorts.

At the SSS draft test in the spring of '66 we formed a small picket line holding on high such signs as "War Erodes the Great Society" and that old favorite "Make Love Not War". We coupled this with the distribution of the SDS Vietnam issue.

Future services will include more speakers and further demonstrations wherever and whenever necessary, plus the publication of The Toledo Free Press, which has had three issues, so far.

from,
Toledo SDS
1013 Adams Street
Toledo, Ohio 43624

NLN,
Concerning Marc Lendler's Question (NLN 10/7):

There should probably be a great rush to get, not a new ideology, but a New Man to fulfill the finer aspects of old ideologies (do we ally with Dr. Leary?).

It seems to me that an underlying assumption of "Let the People Decide" is that if this political approach were to become general rule, we would ipso facto have a social order in which the heightened sense of community would give rise to a moral awareness and social consciousness on man's part, which would in turn lead to the humanistic decisions for which we hope. There is of course no way of verifying this faith, but retain it we must. The question that concerns me is the chicken-and-egg one: to save ourselves from possible destruction at the hands of irrationality must we suspend democracy until the New Order is established (where is that copy of "On Contradictions?") or do we struggle for large-scale democracy as a condition for achieving the New Order, in which case we risk a great deal, if not our lives?

Doug Chaudron
New York City

# N.C.N.P. DIALOGUE

by Jonn Maher
Boston, S.D.S.

When it comes to the NCNP (National Conference for New Politics), Paul Booth's facts and my own may not square for some time to come. Let the reader decide. My source for the 50-50 split between Chicago CIPA and the Morgan campaign was Clark Kissinger. Bob Scheer's first words at the Ann Arbor Institute was that he had not been invited. Most people at the Institute blamed the NCNP staff for the poor showing there, perhaps because Paul was considerably more reticent then than now about assuming his share of the responsibility. So much for fact. My article was in response to a report from Paul, which while giving a fairly glowing account of NCNP's contributions to the movement, discussed its problems in Aesopian language such that one had to be an insider already to understand them. I found the discussions at Ann Arbor with Paul, Clark Kissinger, Ivanhoe Donaldson, Steve Max and myself much more frank and to the point. Properly, these discussions belong to a meeting of the National Council, but the next best thing is to continue them here on the pages of NLN.

SDS is not simply a collection of interested individuals; at present the Board of the NCNP claims to be. This difference in organizational form may have posed a painful dilemma for Paul and Lee. Nonetheless, in retrospect (and I say in retrospect because if I'd been as smart then as I think I am now, I would have attempted to force the issue at the June NC) it seems clear that the only basis on which a National Secretary or any other individual who uses the name SDS in an enterprise like the NCNP "for purposes of deaffiliation" can do so is as a representative responsible to and removable at will by some democratic body within SDS (something for hotshots to consider now that some individuals are proposing a national strike to a December conference to plan a student strike for the spring). Like Paul, however, I think that for the NCNP to suceed, the relevant constituency for the Board must become local community-based organizations and organizing efforts rather than national organizations, in which case the members of the Board would be responsible to the local groups who sent them. This perspective is by no means universally accepted within the NCNP. Furthermore, a reorganization along the lines which Paul has suggested would tend to eliminate some of the national figures from the Board, which would create problems for the fundraising. In our Ann Arbor discussions we proposed a division between the fundraisers and the Board. I would like to see some concrete proposals from Paul and Lee which speak to this point, for unless the NCNP grounds itself soon in real organizing work, there is a real danger that it might become an organization which goes no further than funding "peace campaigns" at election time and "national events" in between.? think we will find that these are fast becoming relatively useless and terribly boring.