

Florida Peace Tour

CAMPUS TOUR SPEAKS TO
MANY, BUT FACES FIRE AS WELL

The 1967 Florida Peace Tour, sponsored by The Southern Student Organizing Committee and Operation Open Debate (Southern Conference Educational Fund) has sent people to speak at college campuses all over Florida to challenge various aspects of U. S. foreign policy. They have also been raising the questions concerning the responsibility of the individual regarding the draft and the role of the university in the U. S. global military involvement.

The tour has spoken at Florida State University, University of Florida, University of Southern Florida, New College, University of Miami, Florida Atlantic University, Rollins College and Jacksonville University.

The tour has tried to spend two to four days in each campus area with varied activities including the four-person panel, the showing and discussion of films, tapes such as "Report from Saigon", seminars, debates, CO counselling, setting up of literature tables, and taking opinion polls.

The program at each campus was formulated by the sponsoring groups in each area according to the local situation. The tour wanted to contribute to local organizing efforts as well as to get their own ideas across.

Many of the sponsoring groups have been SDS chapters.

On March 9, Nancy Hodes, one of the members of the tour wrote the following impressions of the tour:

"The biggest crowd was at the University of Southern Florida, about 100. The audiences for our speeches have been composed mostly of people who agree with us to some extent. However, we have spoken to a wide variety of individuals at our literature tables, in classes to which we have spoken, and after showing the films. Of course, even at the speeches there are some people who oppose us so discussions have been lively.

"One main problem is how to reach more people. We were on T.V. in Tampa, and the T.V. people told us we should contact more T.V. and radio stations to spread the word -- a suggestion we plan to act on. We might be on radio here in Tampa in a few days. For the next two days we are going to speak at highschools, which should be very interesting.

"We've sold a lot of literature, though in many places authorities have denied us that "privilege." Unfortunately, the groups that we have worked with locally, and who helped set things up for us, such as the SDS chapter here in Miami, have not been strong enough to test the rules forbidding the sale of literature: We had a near riot here today, before we were told to leave, as we argued with

The ACTIVIST -- under fire

THE ACTIVIST, the SDS publication at Queens College is still under fire from the University powers that be. The Student Association President Ben Fein announced last week that he will prosecute SDS in student court for violation of the Redbook regulation on campus publications. (the Redbook says that there shall be no campus publications except the official student newspaper. They are now four.)

The Student Senate at Queens had previously instructed the court to rule the Redbook unconstitutional. In the resolution, the Senate voted also to break with Fein and recommend that the Student Association take no punitive action against SDS, "and stand up for principle." The resolution went on to say that:

*The President of SA should in no way support or encourage punishment of SDS or any campus groups violating College press regulations.

*The Administration, recognizing that student government has the right and responsibility to govern student organizations, recognize that student government has decided, in this case not take any action to punish SDS."

The SDS chapter is currently on disciplinary probation for publishing issues of the ACTIVIST last Spring. The chapter has decided that they will continue to publish the ACTIVIST regardless of the decisions of the student court. Beryl Epstein reports that SDS seems to have pretty good campus support in its struggle.

Cuban refugees and ROTC people. One ROTC guy tore up an article on American atrocities in Vietnam and autographed various shots of these atrocities to give to his friends -- sickening. The Gainesville people had a nice wagon set up advertising the tour, and left it on campus one night; it was burned to the ground.

"The tour has been gratifying in its ability to foster greater unity among those who question or oppose our involvement in Vietnam. In several cases, the war opponents in our audience had never seen each other before. Thus, students, faculty and towns people were able to meet and talk with each other. Hopefully, this will contribute to the formation of stronger groups in the future.

* * * * *

The Florida Peace Tour was organized partially as an attempt to further The Florida Days of Protest. The Florida Days of Protest will involve demonstrations in Gainesville on March 18; Tampa on March 19; and a walk for "love, sun and Peace in Vietnam" from Ft. Lauderdale to Miami on March 24, 25, and 26. The people in the tour will help out on the planning of the demonstrations in whatever way the Florida people can use them. For further information, and to receive a copy of the post-tour report, including the results of the opinion survey, write: FLORIDA PEACE TOUR, SOUTHERN STUDENT ORGANIZING COMMITTEE, BOX 6403, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37212.

New Mexico

GENTLE THURSDAY PERMEATES CAMPUS

On March 9, the University of New Mexico joined the Gentle Thursday experiment and found, once again, that it was a success. Phil Nicholson reported that "over 500 people were somehow actively involved, with the entire campus indirectly included. Everybody had a good time except for some right wing affectionados who recognized the essentially subversive quality of niceness and gentleness."

The following is reprinted from an editorial from the student newspaper, the *New Mexico Lobo*.

GENTLE THURSDAY came to UNM yesterday in the form of music, relaxation, balloons, sidewalk artistry, and just plain, old-fashioned be kind to thy neighbor, be he a kook, beatnik, sorority snob, a frat rat, an athlete or a just plain, ordinary, nondescript college student.

The idea for Gentle Thursday originated at the University of Texas, and it was picked up by the UNM Students for a Democratic Society chapter. Roy Swanson, spokesman for the group, said that all students interested in promoting peace, fellowship or the like were invited to participate.

WHAT DOES PARTICIPATE MEAN?

The action centered mostly around the mall which borders the Education Complex, Mesa Vista dorm and the Union. A resident of Mesa Vista took part by fling a kite from the window, some form of music sprang from everywhere in the area it seemed. Whoever had the musical instrument spontaneously started playing wherever he happened to be, and the people around him stopped and listened.

Sidewalk drawings were the thing of the moment as students simply sat down and drew for a while. When they stopped, someone else came along and continued the drawing as they visualized an idea in their mind. There were enough balloons around the area of the mall to remind a passerby of a county fair or a circus. Even several classrooms were permeated by the feeling of Gentle Thursday as students carried their balloons and good nature with them to their classes.

"IT WAS JUST LIKE being in kindergarten," remarked one student who was a participant. "It was such a relaxing change after the tension of school, day-to-day living, and the international crises that are forever in the front of our minds."

This may not have been the opinion of

new left notes

1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

VOL. 2, NO. 11 let the people decide MARCH 20, 1967

Protests Bring Pentagon Action

Michael Klonsky
Valley State SDS

Recent SDS demonstrations at the Van Nuys Air National Guard base have stimulated the Pentagon to take nation-wide precautions against any more such actions.

The Southern California base has been the scene of demonstrations by college students, mostly from Valley State and UCLA, for the past several months. The demonstrations led to the arrest of thirteen people who took part in acts of civil disobedience or direct action.

On March 8, the Pentagon sent Gen. Winston P. Wilson, head of the National Guard Bureau, to the base to review films of the demonstrations and to issue new policies on "crowd control" which will be instituted at bases throughout the nation. According to base commander Col. Richard Dennison, "guardsmen are not trained specifically for such demonstrations."

The Van Nuys base, which is used to

transport supplies directly to Vietnam, has been the only Air National Guard base in the country to be picketed Dennison said.

Gen. Wilson termed the policies as "minor" but would not elaborate on them at his press conference for what he called, "security reasons."

According to reliable sources however, the new policies will include tactics designed to make the demonstrations appear to be blocking military vehicles from entering the base thus creating an easy arrest situation.

At previous demonstrations, guardsmen made arrests with loaded weapons and fixed bayonets pointed at the demonstrators who stood in witness. This raised considerable controversy in the community because of the many small children who watched or took part in these actions.

All of the students tried so far have been convicted under the Military and Veterans Code (398), which says it is unlawful for persons to trespass on military property. They have received fines from fifty to two-hundred dollars and one of them has been put in jail. Danny Jorgensen was sentenced to forty days in Los Angeles County Jail where he was badly beaten by other prisoners.

SDS members at Valley State planned the demonstrations at the base because they felt this was where the war reached the people in the community the most. They attempted to enter the base for the purpose of speaking to guardsmen about their responsibility for war under the provisions of the Nuremberg trials.

Future actions at the base on a more imaginative level are presently being planned at Valley State with consideration being given to the pentagon's new policies.

Funds may be sent to:
Valley Defense Fund
7105 Hayvenhurst Ave.
Van Nuys, California

Recently, Valley State also staged a demonstration against Dow recruiters. SDS people talked for 20 minutes, trying -- unsuccessfully -- to get the college president to ask Dow to leave. They then had a short sit-in, which provoked the unprecedented arrival of L. A. cops on campus -- and then moved to a sing-out outside. The Valley State College President called it the "worst" demonstration in the school's history.

DOW FOILED AGAIN

Reprinted from The Northern Star

By BARB SAUER
Assistant News Editor

Protesters picketing the Dow Chemical Co. recruiter Monday marched eight hours in front of Lowden Hall in protest of the company's production of napalm for the Defense Dept.

More than 25 pickets who assembled throughout the day included NIU students, and members of the Students for a Democratic Society and the two DeKalb women.

The protesters carried signs saying "Don't let Dow Make War Criminals out of You," "Dow Sells Death for Dollars," and "Dow gives Draft Deferments to Killers."

Between classes, students gathered near Altgeld Hall and exchanged insults with the marchers. One protester yelled to an observer, "How would you like napalm dropped on your back?" The answer was "Go home Commies!"

TWO SDS members met with Dr. Martin Bartels, director of the placement office. They asked him to ask the recruiter to leave. Bartels refused.

The representative from Dow, Lee Borellis, interviewed 12 persons while the marchers carried their signs and passed out literature describing napalm. Most of the literature contained quotes from national magazines and newspapers.

A statement was released by Dow saying in part: "Our position on the manufacture of napalm is that we are a supplier of goods to the Defense Department and not a policy maker. We do not try to decide military strategy or policy." The statement did not deal with the matter of napalm's effects and the way it is used or the question of the enormous profits Dow is making from the sale of napalm to the government.

everybody who witnessed the most friendliness among so many students of all sorts in a long time, but it created a healthy atmosphere and a satisfying feeling of having done something good in those students who exchanged lunches, patched up old quarrels, or just said 'hi' to a silent person walking by.

No decision has definitely been made yet whether this idea of a Gentle Thursday will continue at UNM, but the LOBO feels that it should. For once something worthwhile is going on campus in which every type of student can play a part and benefit. And by the way, the cost in minimal in dollars but a little more in terms of time and thoughtfulness.

inside this issue

SPECIAL PRIVILEGE CHALLENGED	P. 2
TO BE OR NOT TO BE	P. 3
FILM TIPS	P. 3
RESISTANCE AND THE MOVEMENT	P. 3
WHAT REALLY HAPPENED AT WISCONSIN	P. 2
ON THE POLICY ADVISORS	P. 3

surge of shame

MILITANT WOMEN PROTEST IN WASHINGTON

More than 300 New Jersey women joined a protest in Washington Feb. 15, organized by Women Strike for Peace. They were joined together to protest the genocide and scorched-earth policy, as symbolized by the napalmed children, which the United States is employing in Vietnam to cover its defeats and bring the nationalists to a bargaining table.

When New York and New Jersey women arrived at the Pentagon, a group of about 1,000 women bearing large photographs of the napalm-burned children were already there facing the entrance shouting, "We want McNamara!", and "End the War in Vietnam, bring the boys home!" On the Pentagon steps, facing the demonstrators, were uniformed police, plain-clothes men, photographers, a few brass-hats and office workers. As the women, now numbering about 2,500, moved slowly forward, the police yielded the steps to them. They locked the big front doors as the women pressed forward, crying "Shame! Shame!"

As the women beat against the locked doors, two plain-clothes men arrived with bull horn which they handed to Cora Weiss of New York, wife of Democratic Councilman Peter Weiss. She told the demonstrators that Secretary McNamara was not at the Pentagon and that it was time to take their protest to the Congressmen. It appeared to this participant that the Defense Department police had achieved through Mrs. Weiss what they could never have accomplished themselves: the dispersal of the most militant demonstration ever held at the Pentagon. However, Lyla Hoffman of the New York WSP office said that the demonstration had been ended on the initiative of WSP, later rather than earlier than planned.

Northern California Conference Regional

APRIL 8-9

CONTACT
N.C.R.O.

NOW

Nebraska

Submitted by,
Linda Kierstead

The University of Nebraska chapter of SDS in Lincoln is planning a *teach-in on the draft* scheduled for Sunday, 30 April. We are structuring the panel so as to provide for a wide variety of viewpoints. Central topics of discussion under consideration are:

1. The validity of the 2S deferment
2. effect of the draft upon modern American society
3. the legality of the draft
4. non-cooperation
5. President Johnson's new draft law proposals

A regional conference is also tentatively scheduled for that same weekend. Interested chapters are invited to send their comments and suggestions to:

George Olivarri
President, U. of Nebraska SDS
720 So. 16th, Apt. 302
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

We hope to educate the student body at the University and other local interested groups as to the many divergent opinions on the draft. Because of the large involvement of U. S. youth in military operations in Vietnam and the revision of draft statutes, this seems a most vital issue.

Special Privilege Challenged

reprinted from *Daily Nebraskan*

By Mick Lowe

The right of non-student groups to Union privileges was questioned for the first time Tuesday afternoon.

Diane Hicks, a sophomore in Teacher's College, posted signs reading "Join the Army -- Kill Children," and "Draft Beer Not Boys" above the Army recruiter's table in the basement of the Union early Tuesday afternoon.

Unapproved Signs

The recruiter, Capt. Ivan Mills, immediately

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED AT WISCONSIN

In the recent action at Madison, Wisconsin, no one seemed able or willing to submit a report for NLN. So the harried editor prevailed on a non-indigenous bystander to recount the events as he understood them (2nd hand). Subsequent indigenous disagreement with the report has provoked the following 1st hand, though belated report.

Mike Meeropol

Wednesday dawned after a late-night meeting in which SDS had reversed its original decision and decided to "obstruct" by sitting in at the Dow interviews. The first action was to meet on Wednesday at the appointed place and vote to have a discussion meeting instead of sitting in immediately. So, we had a two and a half hour meeting. The decision was the same. The voice of moderation said that in fact a good point had already been made. The previous day's events had caught the administration on the "wrong side" of a free speech case, the student newspaper had come out partially on their side but warned against a disruptive sit-in, and general opinion was poised on the fence. The answer to this view can be a reasoned, rational and effective radical action which compensates for the alienation of "liberals." Unfortunately what followed was a caricature which permitted the establishment to obscure the main issue completely and, in the end, expell SDS from the campus.

The "crafty administration" far from holding clandestine interviews, actually TOLD the demonstrators where they were being held. They were being smart, however, in a different way. By shifting the interviews they moved the demonstrators off the main campus area. The group of 500 walked to the designated building and crowded inside. Once inside, it was discovered that all major offices did not have Dow interviews. A locked door near the main entrance to the building was pointed out by the administration representative as the one leading to the "Dow room." Over the next few minutes, a few individuals came out of that room. Each time this happened there were cries of "go in, go in!" but nobody did. The fact that the door was locked stimulated the group to decide that Dow was not there. Despite the reiteration by the administration spokesman the group elected to disbelieve him and decided to vent their frustration by sitting in at the administration offices. So, back we went to the main campus. I might add that it was not SDS sleuthing that discovered the interviews but merely the end of the original disbelief in the word of the administration spokesman. When the twenty-five *did* sit in at Dow, it was in that very same room behind that very same locked door.

Meanwhile, at the administration building, the 500 or so blockaded the Chancellor and the Dean of Student Affairs in their offices. The demands were: drop charges, throw Dow off the campus, etc. The dialogue that ensued looked very bad for our side because the administration officials could pose as being on the "right side" of freedom of speech, etc. and did to great effect. Finally, to top the absurdity, when the news came that the cops wanted bail money, the Chancellor wrote his own personal check for the required amount and received a standing ovation from the people who were sitting-in in his office demanding he change the nature of the university overnight. Needless to say, the group let him go with none of the demands being satisfied. The upshot was a counterdemonstration that drew more people than our side, the student senate's expulsion of SDS, the alienation of most of the student body (including many leftists!), and grist for the mill of the local dinosaurs.

ly took the signs down. A spokesman for the Nebraska Union, Daryl Swanson told Miss Hicks that her signs had not been approved, and could not be posted on a Union bulletin board.

Miss Hicks retaliated by taking down the signs of the Army recruiter, on the grounds that they had not been approved, either.

Union Official

Robert Barnes, another Nebraska Union official, told Miss Hicks that she "shouldn't have done that. Only I can remove such posters."

"But these have not been approved," Miss Hicks replied.

"You're right they haven't," Barnes answered, and they shouldn't have been put up without approval."

Mills was given the signs, with the explanation that they would have to be approved by the Office of Student Affairs.

Posted

Both Miss Hicks and Mills succeeded in having their respective signs approved, and finally posted.

Miss Hicks said she removed the Army signs because "the Union is obviously remiss in it's duties."

During the Mills-Hicks confrontation, George Olivarri, president of the Students for a Democratic Society started to distribute anti-war literature beside the army booth.

SDS

He then proceeded to ask Allan Bennett, director of the Union if SDS could establish a booth beside the Army booth, in light of

UNIVERSITY COMPLICITY WITH ARMY RECRUITERS SHOWN UP

the fact that SDS is a student organization, and the Army is not.

"I can't grant you permission," Bennett answered, "because that area was specifically granted to the Army."

"You seem to be granting those people special privileges," Olivarri replied, "and they're not even a campus organization."

Bennett explained that he considered the presence of army recruiters a service to the students, since they must face the draft.

2nd Booth

Bennett said that another consideration was the traffic flow in the basement, and that a second booth would probably cause congestion.

"I have the power to let you sit down there, but I don't think it's proper," Bennett concluded.

Proper?

"But you think it is proper to let non-students occupy that booth?" Olivarri questioned.

"I'm not about to express my personal philosophy," Bennett responded, ending the conversation.

SDS was later told that they were "perfectly welcome to have a booth upstairs," but they remained near the recruiter, handing out literature.

Similar Situations

Mills said that he encountered similar situations at the University of Iowa and Iowa State last week.

"I respect their right to demonstrate," Mills remarked, "as long as they respect my right to talk to people."

"The important part of all this is Union discrimination," Olivarri concluded.

to the editor

To the Editor, NLN

I had thought of my letter as personal, for Greg Calvert himself, rather than for SDS as a whole; but since NAC and NLN have ordered it printed, I hope it may help ventilate a problem. Not the problem of substance -- the issue of voluntarism, national service, and the draft; nor the problem of how individuals who are in the movement but not now officers of SDS can speak publicly for themselves without seeming to speak for SDS; but the problem of the quality of political debate inside SDS. I'm happy (though surprised) to hear that Greg was trying to be satirical; but I was not the only SDS member to think he meant the "Booth-McNamara" bit literally.

Our reaction probably reflects some defensiveness and discomfort over the way political debate is frequently carried on among SDS. After all, the Build-Not-Burn statement has been made the focus of a lot of disagreement -- even the symbolic reference point of some factionalism -- within SDS. That's perfectly reasonable, in itself; but the National Secretary probably bears some special responsibility to disengage himself emotionally from the group or the opinion he feels closest to, and to try to feel out -- empathize into -- the way another group thinks or the way another opinion "works." In the absence of this deliberate self-distancing and empathy, groups with other views will time after time "overreact" to the National Secretary's comments. He does, after all, hold some power within SDS -- at least that of a special podium -- and those whose views differ from his can hardly help but

be sensitive to the way he expresses his and discusses theirs. This is not to say that he should abandon or neutralize or swallow his own views -- he was elected because he held them -- but that he should make a deliberate effort to be more open, not less, to those of others.

On national service: imagine a system in which the U. S. government offered a private's pay to any citizen between the ages of 18 and 25 who volunteered to work for two years for either 1) any agency he chose of the Federal or any state or local government (including the military); or 2) any non-profit private organization he chose (educational, political, religious, etc.). Would we think this legitimate, pending the abolition of war and the army? What if high veterans benefits were offered for military service, but not for other forms of service (to attract people into the Army but also encourage them to leave instead of making it a career)? Or is all nationally financed public service a danger to liberty?

If we think it important at all for SDS or its members to hold views on what should be done after the draft is abolished, we should be discussing questions like these. If we think it not important, we should be talking about why. My own hunch is that our opposition to the current system would be both less cooptable and less ignorable if we were fairly clear about what we regarded as a decent way for America to deal with its youth. Once we had such a "provisional vision" in mind, we could much more effectively organize the kinds of social action and energy necessary to achieve it.

Arthur Waskow.

NEW LEFT NOTES

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago, Ill. 60612. Phone (312) 666-3874. 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, Cathy Wilkerson

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Nick Egleson, president; Carl Davidson, vice-president; and Greg Calvert, national secretary.

National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312) 666-3874
New York City: 49 West 27th St., NYC, NY 10001; (212) 889-5793

Niagra Region: 107 Dryden Rd., Ithaca, NY

Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif; (415) 362-7922

Southern California: 4319 Melrose, Los Angeles, California, 90019

New England: 138 River St., Cambridge, Mass., 02139

Radical Education Project: 510 East William, Ann Arbor, Mich.

VOLUME 2, NO. 11 let the people decide MARCH 20, 1967

Resistance and the Movement

provoked by Greg Calvert's
"From Protest to Resistance"

—Todd Gitlin

All very well that SDS thinks of itself as a resistance. The word itself takes account of the murderous situation we are up against. But it should come as no news that there's a difference between self-image and substance. It is one thing to recognize that there's "something out there" we want to resist. But must we stop there, choosing to struggle only as the spirit moves us, against whatever at any given moment whirled us into opposition? If we do, we end up a huddled resistance, smug with our raging honesty, doomed to be small voices in a thunderstorm, without testing our full potential. In the end, such a mood will hold very few people — others may learn from resistance and applaud from a distance, but their lives will not be changed, nor will America. Organizers will not be trained that way, only followers. Yet we believe (I hope) in a movement that imparts to students a sense of what it means to be an organizer, and leaves a lasting imprint on American power. —But it is within our power to refuse to let resistance be consigned to oblivion; we can insist on a *maximum* resistance. To do this we must couple our will to a *strategy*, so that resistance becomes a *movement*.

Most of us would agree that a serious movement, as opposed to isolated outbreaks, would include these components (among others):

1. Projects and activities spread out over time, each feeding into others, so that progress can be gauged. We identify a goal that has an importance according to our values, and along the route we locate short-range and middle-range steps, so that at each point we can say, "We've come this far, we have that far to go. We may never get to the end-point, whether of necessity or choice; but we have a *momentum* which attracts people and generates further commitments from each step. "Success" is not necessarily in achieving a concrete goal,

but also takes account of the state of the movement, the quality of its thinking, its spirit, etc. The main points are that, at least some of the people involved feel a sense of *continuity* that links disparate activities; and even more people gain a sense of momentum, a sense that their activity connects to their values and goals — and thus that their commitments matter.

2. A way of generating radical questions and making them generally controversial. We begin with the immediate environment, and plan strategy so that its actions ask, "How are these frictions hooked up to major issues? What is this institution for? What would be necessary for liberation (not just a liberated feeling)? Since the big issues are at least national in scope, and since small clusters of radicals get lonely, a strategy should ideally reach farther than one vicinity.

3. Engaging people in new ways (as Greg says): finding and instigating challenging work for the widest range of people. This means finding new purpose for existing skills while creating new ones. It also means that having defined a constituency we try to involve the largest number of constituents at whatever level they are prepared to commit themselves. Let people define themselves out of the movement if they wish, because they differ with us; but let them not be shut out because we become an exclusive club.

Maybe the thrust toward student power meets these criteria; sitting at some remove from the campus, I don't know. But judging from the interest in draft resistance, anti-rank, sit-ins against the CIA and Dow, the University of Pennsylvania movement against chemical-warfare research, etc., it seems that SDS people are caught in a serious tension: on the one hand, they want to do something about the war and the garrison state; on the other, they have a

commitment toward transforming the institution at hand, the university. It might make sense, then, for SDS to consider a strategy that joins the two concerns.

The natural synthesis would be a *national movement to expel the military from the campus*. Local movements in this direction would continue, but self-consciously in the context of a national objective. SDS would announce that it is absurd to talk about a free university as long as militarism is linked to learning; through direct action, research, and education, locally and nationally, chapters would take on the task of depriving the military of every shred of legitimacy on the campus. They would engage faculty as well as students in a here-and-now confrontation between our vision(s) of education and the obscenity of Pentagon contracts and recruitment. Needless to say, questions of student control and the uses of the university would flow directly out of such a strategy; so would larger questions of the functions of learning in a repressive society.

There would be several advantages to posing this as a *national* strategy. First, chapters at different levels of solidity and commitment could all identify with the same momentum, could gain strength from a knowledge that success in one place had national importance. Second, a national campaign could generate concerted activity on campuses hitherto untouched by more diffuse activity. Third, by naming national targets, the campaign could win victories more resonant in proportion to the amount of work put into them. (In other words, a whole national military program could be expelled more easily than could the sum of its parts; just as, say, national NSA was punctured without much more work than it would have taken to puncture a few campus student governments.) Without succumbing to a kind of centralist mystique, neither should we ignore the fact that the dominant institutions

(Continued on page 4)

to be or not to be

Peter Blood
Scotland, U. K.

The National President has raised some important issues concerning the role of the radical professional in his "Report" (NLN, vol. II, no. 4). I am only surprised these have not been raised sooner, considering that the overwhelming majority of SDS members either are now or were previously engaged in some kind of study oriented toward entry into the professions. But before considering the comparatively simple question of what you should do given that you have decided to enter a specific profession, I feel we need to deal with the much more basic question of *whether* you should become a professional in the first place. This is the central dilemma which many radical undergraduates are pondering today — and many more should be. Here are a few of the arguments, as I see it, for and against choosing such a career:

1. "PRO'S: Clearly some professionals are needed in the Movement. The National President has outlined some of the crucial roles which they may play (as lawyers, teachers, etc.) The excellent, in-depth analyses that frequently appear in NLN testify eloquently to one type of contribution. And we are not concerned here with the degree of commitment to social change, but rather how the individual can best make his contribution. A large number of radicals are found among the highest academic ranks of high school and college students. These students will naturally ask themselves whether they could not contribute most by utilizing their intellectual resources; and they will be under heavy pressure from respected professors, parents, and class-mates to do exactly this ("Don't just throw away your talents!") Consciences can be eased to a degree by "occasional" radical work (protest marches, financial contributions, appropriate part-time and summer jobs, etc.) — but aren't many "liberals" simply such occasional radicals?

2. "CON'S: The main argument against stems from an underlying belief that what the Movement really needs is a large number of people committed to making radical social change a *full-time* life occupation — as opposed to being a 5% radical and 95% de facto member of the Establishment. With

all due respects to the NAC resolution, would we have actually been able to find 500 full-time organizers or properly utilize 500 printing presses even if we had the money that is going into the Spring Mobilization? Today the unwillingness to make a full-time commitment is justified by the statement, "I don't want to interrupt my studies" — tomorrow it will be the job, the family, the mortgage.*

But equally important, a professional career seems the "easy way out". American society has a carefully-prepared road laid out for any youngster who shows academic promise early in high school, and most of them follow it (with minor deviations) whether or not they consider themselves radicals. The Establishment seems to be saying at times, "We don't really care much what you think or say, just so long as you stay right there in middle-class suburbia." If we believe that our job is equivalent to that of a community organizer in the slum, how can we accept a salary five or ten times as big? Isn't it about time we started taking this "counter-system" business seriously?

Finally, if a professional career is rejected, what are the arguments for and against completing four years of undergraduate study?

Partial answers can be found in "organizing the professionals to relate their work more directly to Movement needs, persuading a higher percentage of students to spend two or three years in direct Movement work before embarking on their careers, and utilizing more retired persons in such tasks (and persons who wish to "retire" early for this purpose because they are dissatisfied with their present jobs). Perhaps, in addition, doctors, lawyers, university professors, and so on could commit themselves to giving up 60-80% of their incomes to support several "professional activists" at something near comparable salaries.

We cannot, however, avoid the need for some *collective* searching on the basic questions of whether too many of our ranks are being "co-opted" into the professions (and so diverted from jobs where a greater quantitative need exists at the moment) and what criteria the individual should use in choosing one of these two paths.

ON THE FOREIGN POLICY ADVISORS

by Earl Silbar
Chicago

Paul Booth (NLN 2/20/67) notes the State Department's creation of civilian panels to advise on foreign policy. According to the State Department, the purpose of these panels is to organize "... new ideas designed to enhance the formulation and conduct of U. S. foreign policy". So what, one is tempted to ask? Just another group of Morgenthau, Rostows and Kennans to help formulate Imperialist policies in terms of "realistic" anti-communism.

"Given the Executive Branch's tendency to make foreign policy with only perfunctory reference to Congress nowadays", Booth advises us, "SDS members should be aware of the names of these advisors as they are of the names of members of Congress." But Congressmen are people dedicated to getting the biggest piece of the pie for themselves, see themselves as defenders of the "American way of Life" and primarily act according to the interests of their particular sector of capitalist institutions. It follows that radicals should pay them little attention, except for exposure and attack. And if genteel professors have become official voices for and advisors to foreign policy, our actions towards them should be exposure and attack of their liberal defense of U. S. foreign policy.

Unfortunately, Booth is far from clear as to the significance of these men for us. He implies that the way to attack foreign policy is to influence or even attack these garbage heads in our academic midst. This is tantamount to

(Continued on page 4)

*Note that our priorities are different from the liberals', who believe that government policies can be changed by simply developing convincing enough demonstrations of their irrationality. Radicals, on the other hand, assert that such intellectual arguments will remain irrelevant so long as power remains the monopoly of persons and groups whose interests diverge from the people's. The latter view makes the existence of a large number of "full-time activists" essential if social change is to take place.

FILM TIPS

ABOUT CITIES Ubiquitous Henig
N. Y. C.

Cities are ideal subjects for motion pictures. The pace of their life is quick and great diversity of social relationships and physical surroundings are to be found within a narrow expanse. For this reason some of the most strong and important films are about cities. SUNDAY

16 minutes B & W. Distributor: Contemporary Films

Remember the time the New York City Department of Parks tried to put an end to folk-singing in Washington Square Park? Well, this is the film which documents the successful popular resistance which ensued. Although the film is humorous, the essential seriousness of officials attempts to suppress the right of people to assemble to peacefully enjoy one another's company is illustrated by abundant shots of mass arrests and head-knocking. Directed by Dan Drasin.

THIRD AVENUE EL

11 mins. color. 1957 Distributor: Contemporary Films

The camera records the doughty and majestic Third Ave. El on one of its last runs. As it traverses rivers and slums and weaves among great skyscrapers, catches its breath at stations with stained-glass windows, there are glimpses of a New York City in which drying clothes stream in the breeze and horse-drawn peddlars' carts still ply the streets. Produced by Carson Davidson. Harpsichord accompaniment by Wanda Landowska.

A VALPARAISO

30 mins. color and B & W. Distributor: Contemporary Films

An outstanding social commentary on the Chilean port city which is built on the steep side of a mountain. At the top of the hill is incredible squalor and human misery. Down below is wealth and the majestic antiquity of "buildings which look like ships." The levels of the city are bound together by forbidding stairways for the very poor, inclined elevators for the more affluent, and by history. We travel it with the camera, accompanied by a beautiful musical score. CHILDREN ADRIFT

26 minutes. French. Sub-titles unnecessary. Distributor: Contemporary Films

Film poem about the tragic existence of bands of little children who roam among the huts, alleys, and litter-yards of the Paris slums. Only two words are spoken in the film.

CITY OF GOLD

22 minutes B&W. Distributor: Contemporary Films. Produced by the National Film Board of Canada.

This is an exhilarating social history of the great Klondike gold rush of the 1890's accomplished with still photographs, old prints, and banjo. Most of the colorful seekers either did not find gold or did not become rich because of it. Many perished, many suffered, and at one point in time there is an awareness of common experience and of the splendour of human undertakings.

DETROIT MURAL

10 mins. Color. WSU \$2.40. available from: Audio-Visual Center, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

A musical interpretation of the huge Diego Rivera murals in the central hall of the Detroit Institute of Arts. The artists' impression of an industrial city is given added strength by the use of music and camera techniques.

GOODNIGHT, SOCRATES

34 minutes B & W Distributor: Contemporary Films

Through the eyes of a ten-year old boy we see a Greek community and its culture assimilated into an American city. The poetic documentary shows how Greek traditions fade away when the community becomes part of an urban renewal project. A bit pretentious, but worth seeing nevertheless.

MARCH 25 MOBILIZATION

The Chicago Peace Mobilization will be held next Sunday, March 25. Speakers will include Martin Luther King, Dr. Spock, and Mike James (from JOIN). The March Mobilization has been endorsed by the Illinois Regional SDS Conference. For more info, call the Chicago Peace Council.

Response to G.A.I.N.

Sven Lundgren

I would like to comment on John Rossen's proposals for a guaranteed annual income (GAIN) as outlined in the February 20, NLN.

Rossen advocates a negative income tax plan administered by the federal government to guarantee \$2,500 yearly to each adult and \$1,250 for each dependent child. College and graduate students would enroll in the school of their choice and receive tuition plus a \$2,000 yearly stipend.

The question that recurs to me each time I read a variant of the guaranteed annual wage plan is, what motivates the writer to propose such a scheme? If I were such a proponent, I would be interested in satisfying some immediate needs of very poor people. But what about Barry Goldwater's economic advisor Milton Freedman who proposes a negative income tax very similar to that proposed by John Rossen? Can it be that Freedman is concerned with the lot of the poor? What of the large group of mainstream corporate liberal economist including Gunnar Myrdal, Emile Benoit, John Galbraith, and Robert Heilbroner who favor some form of the guaranteed income? The ineffable H. H. Humphrey is also reportedly in favor, while Mayors Wagner and Lindsay both see its possibility for the future (it is too early to endorse it). On the left wing of the corporate liberal assemblage, the social democrats of labor, (Leon Keyserling, I. W. Abel, Walter Reuther) of civil rights, (Bayard Rustin, M. L. King) and of social work, (Richard Cloward) are organizing the poor for the "step beyond welfare".

Certainly their concern for the poor is not

Policy Advisors

(Continued from page 3)

mount to thinking that one attacks foreign policy when one writes vicious letters to Congressmen (who these advisors have functionally replaced). By now, we should have passed this elementary stage of emotional responses aimed at lightning rods. A million people could yet their heads off at these advisors for a hundred years and policy wouldn't change. Moreover, those involved would maintain and foster illusions about the democratic or pressureable nature of power in our society. Thus, even if Booth directs our attention to these intellectual prostitutes for the sake of exposure and not pressure (an assumption hardly warranted), focusing attacks on them should only be made with a view towards exposing the bankruptcy of liberal assumptions and the domestic interests which foreign policy consistently serves.

"One key problem we have faced in attacking foreign policy," says Booth, "has been the remoteness of the decision-making process. But now," he continues, "right on campus, we can find a select group of faculty who have been formally charged with a share of the responsibility for making foreign policy". The clear implication is that formerly, remoteness from power was based on geographical distance or individuals hidden in secrecy! and that now... LBJ has identified for us the men on campus to whom we should direct our feelings on American foreign policy." Aside from the absurdity of attempting to change foreign policy by directing our feelings at State Department advisors, most people's remoteness from the decision-making process is very real. However, very good reasons exist for this powerlessness; reasons which Booth ignores.

A quick look at Moody's Manual would give us the names of individuals who wield tremendous power, power based on their control of huge aggregates of capital. *Africa Today* (March, 1964) documents the increasing U. S. financial investment in and control over The Republic of South Africa. Here lies real power. Andrew Gunder Frank documents U.S.-Brazil economic relations ("Exploitation or Aid", *The Nation* 11/16/63). Foreign policy is demonstrated to be made for the benefit of American corporations' investment, regardless of the individual advisors. Harry Magdoff (*Monthly Review*, Oct., 1966) presented an economic analysis of

recent changes in overseas involvement of U. S. capital which leaves little room to doubt that foreign policy is made first and foremost to protect a worldwide economic system which increasingly requires stable areas for profitable export of capital. Power is exercised from Guatemala to Indonesia, from Brazil to South Africa, from the Dominican Republic to Vietnam and from San Francisco

the same concern that motivates radicals. Their interest stems from their desire to maintain their own positions in the existing social order. The non-partisanship of the guaranteed income group shows that, like all non-radicals, they are primarily concerned with the vitality of the economic system from which they benefit. They work together to maintain the social system in hopes of reforming it a little bit in their direction, left or right.

For them, the guaranteed annual wage is primarily designed to enhance the economy by increasing the consumptive powers of the poorest Americans. In a society where over production-under consumption is chronic, in which the economy is in permanent depression, every possible means must be considered to increase consumption. Without consumption there is no profit; without profit there is no reemployment of capital; without capital there is no capitalism; without capitalism there is no Bayard Rustin, Milton Freedman, Walter Reuther et cetera et cetera.

Gunnar Myrdal, in an economic symposium several years ago, pointed out that one of the greatest underdeveloped markets in the world consisted of the 50 millions of Americans living in or near poverty. Since the poor cannot save, money given to them is immediately spent. Above a certain income, money is no longer allocated for food, clothing or shelter, but may be spent on durables, perhaps even a down payment on a car or a house. The Departments of Commerce and Labor have extensive data on the consumption capacities of various income groups and could accurately predict the spending pattern resulting from a federally administered guaranteed annual wage.

The secondary aspects of the guaranteed annual income are politically very important. The amelioration of the chronic poverty of the under class, the opening up of the multiversities to the poor and the political allegiance vowed to the establishment by benefiting poor and guilty liberals alike are nearly as valuable as the economic benefits. Andy Kopkind (*New Republic* Feb. 25) sees the new theories of social accounting and the guaranteed annual wage as, "serving the ideological needs of the 'corporate state' to maintain itself by the manipulation of reform: not so much to change basic economic and political relationships, but enough

to New York in the task of maintaining and increasing the hold of American capital. Exposing this fundamental feature of our system should be a primary job of radicals -- not expressing our feelings on foreign policy to State Department advisors on campus. Remoteness from power exists and it is based on the fact that most Americans are remote from the machinery they work at for a livelihood and with which they create wealth. Until we take control away from the privileged, owning few, we shall always be remote from power. We will have to contend with the power of the Federal Government to eradicate minority control from our lives and the lives of oppressed billions across the globe. This raises a basic question: Is the domestic system of parliamentary democracy a sufficient vehicle to take control away from that class who own the basic sources of wealth?

Throughout U. S. history, the government has intervened on the side of owners, no matter which party happened to be in power. Military solutions to Black peoples' disgust with poverty and racism begin under "the party of the people", can we expect better from "the party of Big Business" or any party which is for the maintenance of capitalism? Would the Federal Government allow a socialist party to gain control and enact laws dispossessing the present ruling class by destroying their control over the basic industries?

History suggests that such a feat is unprecedented. Nowhere has a ruling class permitted its source of privilege to be taken away without a bloody fight--without using all the tools at its disposal to maintain itself. While American history shows increasing government activity in behalf of lower classes, this activity could well be classified as tokenism, since for most people, their fundamental situation has hardly changed. Job security is more mythical now; the necessity of having to work for others who see working people as mere parts of the production process; the dehumanization of being treated

on resistance

(Continued from page 3)

are indeed centralized and must be treated as such.

It would not be farfetched to envision tangible victories at the national level. Take, for example, the Pentagon's unpublicized Project THEMIS, "A Program to Strengthen the Nation's Academic Institutions," announced in January. (A brochure is available from the Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Washington, D. C. 2031.) THEMIS begins by recognizing that military contracts have been overly concentrated in a relatively small number

of universities, and proposes to correct the imbalance by funding new "centers of excellence" on "no more than 50" new campuses just within its first year. One criterion for eligibility is "The willingness of the college or university to assist in (a) coupling the output of the research program to the potential users of such knowledge by publishing suitable reports, data, and handbooks; (b) providing occasional advisory assistance to the Department of Defense and its agencies; and (c) participating in joint seminars and symposia." The attempt, clearly, is fully to penetrate every corner of the academic world, to hedge the military-intellectual complex against future instabilities. Because of the insistence on "coupling mechanisms," there can be no pretense that the money will come without strings.

I cite THEMIS as a possible first target because it has not yet been set into operation and therefore could possibly be stopped in its tracks by a concerted national campaign. (We would need to know more about its details and weak points; chapters could discover whether their schools have applied. Project CAMELOT of the Army's Special Operations Research Office at American University was stopped cold in 1965 when the Chilean government complained that CAMELOT researchers were showing too much interest in the potential stability of the regime.) I also cite THEMIS because I happen to have read a release on it; there ought to be a much more concerted attempt to keep abreast of new programs of this sort. Clearly a victory over something like THEMIS could launch the total campaign in a big way.

This is not to say that the Pentagon could not survive and conduct wars without Project THEMIS. The point is rather that such a marginal victory could impart a certain momentum then applicable to steadily more important objectives. (The campaign could be thought of as a sustained rollback, over a period of time, perhaps with a tentative time table.) Simply to demonstrate to ourselves that we can have a tangible effect on a national abomination would be a major victory for our own morale, and hence for our future possibilities as a resistance facing outward.

New Issue -- SPARTACIST!

features--FACING 1967, After the Elections
--A SINISTER COALITION, Report by a German Student Socialist
--BERKELEY STRIKE, "Student Power" or Workers' Power?
--WELFARE UNION CRISIS
single copy 10¢ -- 12 issue sub., \$1
from SPARTACIST, Box 1377, GPO, New York, N. Y. 10001

(Also available: free copy of Spanish language ESPARTACO from above address, and free copy of SPARTACIST WEST from Box 852, Main P. O., Berkeley, California 94701.)

to take care of immediate needs."

The question that concerns us as radicals is what position radicals should take on this particular issue. Preservation of the existing economic order need not be the concern of radicals. In fact, I think just the opposite is true: we must gain our freedom regardless of the system and probably in negation of it. That is why we are radicals and not social democrats or liberals.

Our activity should be radical activity, our program should be a radical program. We should analyze each reform measure offered to us by asking who is proposing it, and why they do so. What is the establishment's purpose, and who benefits in the end? Any proposal whose intent is primarily to strengthen the hand of the liberal corporate state should never be the principal program of radical activists.

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

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

Mike KINDMAN
Box 367
East Lansing, MICH 48823

as a mere tool -- these and many other oppressive factors remain or increase.

A radical vision and a radical analysis must not shrink from exposing patterns of behavior; it must search out and scrutinize such order. To be radical means to go to the root. Our job is to understand the nature of our society and to organize around programs of common interest to the oppressed which best expose the nature of the system and at the same time attack that system at its weakest points. It would help if Booth would clarify how expressing our feelings to faculty foreign policy advisors meet these criterion.

Let's get rid of illusions. Clarity as to the class nature of government is not a luxury. It is a necessity without which we cannot even begin to fight. Already, many "radicals" are getting hot for the Bobby Bandwagon. Let's be realistic and push the lesser of two evils to the left, we'll be told again. After all, he hates Lyndon's guts, supports Civil Rights and is sensitive to the alienation of youth (*New Republic*, 3/11/67). He even came out for model cities reconstruction and for stopping the bombing of North Vietnam as a tactic to get negotiations. Has he come out for the right of people to collectively control their destiny? Has he come out in support of the NLF-lead liberation movement, or for

the right of 190,000,000 Americans to decide their economic, political and cultural directions thru participation in democratic processes? Hell no, cause he's for the continuation and expansion of a system based on minority control--he's for American monopoly capitalism with its domestic and international imperialist system of exploitation and racism, and we'd better be damn straight about it or we'll find ourselves co-opted into a bullshit bag of liberal humanist rhetoric. We'll have lots of company. Everyone will welcome us -- Jay Lovestone (AFL-CIA) to Norman Thomas (dean of American Social Democrats).

Speaking of such realism, especially applicable to potential campaigns to pressure or advise State Department advisors, Carl Oglesby puts it well in *Trapped in a System*: "We are dealing now with a colossus that does not want to be changed. It will not change itself. It will not cooperate with those who want to change it. Those allies of ours in the Government--are they really our allies? If they are, then they don't need advice, they need constituencies; they don't need study groups, they need a movement. And if they are not, then all the more reason for building that movement with a most relentless conviction."