

# NAVY RESPONDS

ANTI-WAR MOVEMENT  
GOES TO THE NAVAL ACADEMY

Karl E. Klare (Columbia SDS)

The anti-War movement had an unusual opportunity to make its voice heard recently at the very heart of the United States military establishment.

Every year the Foreign Relations Club of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, sponsors a conference on a particular aspect of U. S. foreign policy. These conferences are run almost entirely by the midshipmen of the Academy. This year's conference, on "Problems of United States Foreign Policy in Europe", was attended by students from over a hundred colleges throughout the country. Also present were college professors, State Department observers, and representatives of the diplomatic services of several European nations. The delegates were divided into ten panels to discuss various aspects of American policy with regard to Europe (NATO, Franco-American disputes, economic problems, and so forth) and to formulate policy proposals.

What looked like a relatively unobtrusive conference suddenly exploded on the first night after a televised keynote speech by Arthur Goldberg, U. S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Goldberg, who cautiously avoided a detailed reference to Vietnam, spoke at length about the United States commitment to the U. N. charter, international law, and de-colonization. This writer, a delegate to the conference, took the opportunity offered by the "question period" to harangue Goldberg and accuse Johnson of violating international law, suppressing a de-colonization movement, and committing war crimes. As this all took place at a plenary session, several hundred midshipmen and top Navy brass were present in addition to the conferees. The response was, to my surprise, very encouraging. After the session many midshipmen came over to me and earnestly desired to discuss Vietnam. It immediately became obvious to the few radicals present that despite all of the indoctrination the midshipmen are undoubtedly subjected to, the Navy has been unable to prevent doubts about U. S. policy in Vietnam from creeping into the minds of its future officers. The midshipmen showed themselves to be well-informed, attentive listeners. Several expressed opposition to the war in Vietnam. When asked what I thought they should do about the War, I replied that, following the Nuremberg precedent, they should refuse to serve in Vietnam. Despite the jarring nature of this position (in the context of the Naval Academy), I was given a respectful hearing. The usual response was an almost agonizing shrug of the shoulders. After the session ended, several midshipmen accompanied a few radicals back to the hotel to discuss Vietnam.

As the conference went on, Vietnam cropped up again and again. Various midshipmen repeatedly asked me to discuss Vietnam with them. The distinct impression emerged that even Annapolis has a cloud of doubt and fear hanging over it. Midshipmen were particularly interested in seeing our literature and sources of information that are ordinarily denied to them. Although none of them spoke openly in favor of a U. S. withdrawal,

(Continued on page 3)

## new left notes

1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

VOL. 2, NO. 18

let the people decide

MAY 8, 1967

## SDS LETTER ON RHODESIA

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE SITUATION  
WITH REGARD TO THE IMPLEMENTATION  
OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING  
OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES  
AND PEOPLES

PETITION FROM MR. GREGORY CALVERT,  
NATIONAL SECRETARY, STUDENTS FOR A  
DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY, CONCERNING  
SOUTHERN RHODESIA

(Circulation in accordance with the decision  
taken by the Sub-Committee on Petitions at  
its 98th meeting on 1 March 1967)

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Chicago, 6 February 1967

The Chairman

Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples  
United Nations  
New York, N.Y.

Sir,

SANCTIONS ON RHODESIA

The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) condemns the minority racist government of South Africa and in particular the Rebel regime of Ian Smith.

SDS welcomes Secretary Council Resolution 232 of 16 December 1966, but regrets that total mandatory sanctions are being hindered by some delays. This subtle procrastination allows such countries as West Germany and Switzerland, organizations as the Friends of Rhodesia and companies like Union Carbide, Caltex, and Mobil to indirectly assist the rebel government of Rhodesia.

SDS REVIEWS THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

Before November 11, 1965, the United Kingdom had repeatedly offered independence to Rhodesia on the basis that there be some provision in the Constitution for the eventual enfranchisement of the black majority. Even in December 1966, the Rhodesian "government" rejected face-saving proposals which would have ensured a white majority for eight to twelve years. Ironically Smith's rejection of the Tiger document therefore saved Africans from a gargantuan constitution of higher math, a British device to suppress the Africans

(Continued on page 3)

## RESISTANCE GROWS

Paul Hamburg

Bill Hunt

Boston Draft Resistance Group.

On April 17, the following statement appeared in the Harvard Crimson, with 86 signatures:

"We, the undersigned, as American men of draft age, may be asked by our government to participate in the war in Vietnam. We have examined the history and nature of this war, and have reached the conclusion that our participation in it would be contrary to the dictates of our consciences.

We therefore declare our determination to refuse military service while the United States is fighting in Vietnam. Our intention in signing this statement is to unite with other draft-age men who share our convictions, in order to turn our personal moral rejection of this war into effective political opposition to it."

Since that date, the number of signers has risen to 170, including non-students as well as students from Harvard, Tufts, Boston University, Boston College, Suffolk University, Brandeis, and MIT. Support petitions are being circulated by professors and non-inductible friends, and the Boston Draft Resistance Group has grown up among signers and supporters to gather further signatures and to defend the group against government harassment and persecution (including harassment in the form of induction).

Almost immediately we realized the need to make a clear distinction between draft evasion and draft resistance. The vagueness of our original statement left us open to misrepresentation as affluent draft dodgers whose political dissent was a function of class privilege. To counter that impression, we issued a strong statement opposing all conscription while the War continues. Draft resistance is a weapon against the Vietnam War. As a separate issue, the draft is weak; as a means of focusing resistance to the War, it may be the clearest issue we can find.

For in the past two weeks we have concentrated on canvassing students at Harvard about the War and our resistance to conscription for Vietnam. We are assembling a fund of information on the legal aspects of draft resistance, and several of us are receiving training from the Friends on draft counseling. We have no intention at the moment of setting up a counseling service as such, but we intend to base our programs on accurate information rather than Movement hearsay. The New York law firm of Rabinowitz and Boudin has agreed to defend us individually or collectively in the event of indictments for draft refusal or conspiracy. Three representatives from the Boston Draft Resistance Group attended the National Lawyers Guild conference on Selective Service in Chicago on the weekend of April 29. On the basis of discussions there we have discovered that the SSS has a history of playing fast and loose with its own regulations, and that those threatened with induction have considerably more ground for legal resistance than we had imagined.

Our concern now is to move off campus into high school and working-class organizing. We are investigating the possibility of coordinating our draft-resistance work with the community-organizing projects of Michael Walzer and John Maher, which are serving as models for the national Vietnam Summer program. The attitude of national Vietnam Summer toward draft-resistance work is frankly ambiguous, although the steering committee has explicitly endorsed the concept and offered support. For the moment, we strongly urge that groups planning to do draft-resistance work this summer and needing support (money, information, personnel) from Vietnam Summer route their proposals through the Boston Draft Resistance Group, c/o Bill Hunt, 40 Inman Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139. The more information we have about local draft-resistance activities, the more effectively those of us connected with Vietnam Summer can lobby for a major allocation of resources toward those projects.

The BDRG has, at Dee Jacobsen's request, agreed to organize a national draft-resistance conference this summer, probably a few days after the SDS convention. Chicago has been suggested as a suitable site. We need suggestions about the mechanics and agenda of such a conference immediately if we are to have time for sensible discussion.

PARTIAL REVOLUTIONARY CHAPTER TAX HAS BEEN PAID BY HARVARD SDS AND U. OF WISCONSIN SDS

## the REP question

REPORT ON THE REP ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING OF APRIL 18

Evi Goldfield (REP staff)

Advisory Committee members present: Hal Benenson, Carl Davidson, Nick Egleson, Al Haber, Kathy McAfee, Dickie Magidoff, Bob Ross; absent: Paul Booth, Greg Calvert. REP staff present: Alice Fialkin, Evi Goldfield, Mike Goldfield, Steve Johnson, Linda Kerley, Dee Nilsson; others present: Jane Adams, Todd Gitlin, Barbara Haber, Dee Jacobson, Paul Lauter, Roger Manila, Gary Rothberger, Peter Steinberger.

On April 18, there was an emergency meeting of the REP advisory committee to discuss the April NC resolution concerning REP and internal education. That resolution stated that REP would move to Chicago and that its prime responsibility would be to implement and sustain the teacher-organizer program. Most of the REP staff and other concerned people felt that the decision would completely curtail the middle- and long-range programs that REP was originally set up to do.

The following agreements were reached at the meeting: (1) that REP would retain its autonomy and that its directorate or governing body would now be independent of SDS; (2) that although SDS would have the responsibility for the teacher-organizer program, REP's name could be used as a sponsor of the summer training institutes for fund-raising purposes; (3) that SDS would set up its own internal education program, but that REP and the SDS NO would attempt to develop a close-working relationship and cooperate on matters of internal education.

Previously, REP's relationship to the NC had been somewhat ambiguous. Members of the directorate were supposed to be approved each year by the NC. The directorate (or advisory committee, as it was later called as of the December '66 NC) was to have the power in setting REP policy. Other policy relationships to the NC were never very clear. Also, there was confusion about who held the responsibility for the internal education program in SDS. REP has seen itself as providing specific services to a general internal education program; the NO has seen REP as being wholly responsible for internal education. As a result, no one really took responsibility for formulating a comprehensive internal education program.

Discussion at the meeting ranged from argument about theories of education to talk about the relationship of the teacher-organizer program to other REP programs. Everyone agreed that the teacher-organizer program was important. Some people expressed frustration about REP's lack of success at internal education this past year. REP staff members described the difficulty of working on long-range programs while at the same time having to be judged every three months by the changing demands of the NC. We were also unhappy that those who wanted drastic changes in the structure of REP had never discussed their ideas with staff members.

REP and the NO will attempt to cooperate to avoid conflicts in fund-raising. REP will continue to raise its own money. We are now in the process of laying out concrete programs for next year. These programs will be published in New Left Notes. We invite your suggestions, criticisms, and participation.



# spring

A VERY VERY SUBJECTIVE REPORT  
ON THE 1967 SPRING MOBILIZATION  
AS VIEWED FROM THE CROWD SIDE

Itzhak Epstein

# mobilization

# two reports

THOUGHTS ON THE SPRING MOBILIZATION  
AND ANTI-WAR PROTESTS IN GENERAL

Tom Cleaver (CSC SDS)

I happened to have been in New York this weekend. I decided to participate in an anti-War demonstration which had been organized by a pop front of liberals and pacifists on one hand and Old Left sects on the other. For all practical purposes, it seemed as if the march was planned and managed by the New York Police Department, while the official sponsors seemed to have no visible control over its conduct.

Sheep Meadow in New York's Central Park seemed much the same as it did on Easter Sunday's be-in. There were, however, fewer painted faces and more anti-War placards. The holy banana was replaced by a tower displaying VC flags. Alan Ginsberg's circle of Hari Krishna singers was replaced by a sorry-looking self-styled "commend post" consisting of a feeble-voiced sound truck proclaiming unheard and unheeded instructions to the growing multitude. On the slopes of a slight mound, where two weeks earlier a young man had stripped naked, a draft-card-burning party was taking place. Nearby a giant weather balloon proclaimed: "BURN YOUR LOCAL DRAFT BOARD." I came upon the incineration ritual by chance. The burning took place in a very small circle surrounded by the press and pushing, shoving spectators. Hardly any of the observers had a chance to fully observe this historical happening, while the vast majority on the Meadow was completely unaware of it.

I wouldn't trust the people who mismanaged the mobilization with a simple errand, much less the management of a nation's affairs. It was obvious that the Police Department was in superb control of the situation, and was thus justly praised by the press. Unfortunately, the mobilization should have been designed to demonstrate strength and unity in opposition to the regime's foreign (Continued on page 4)

The action taken by the Berkeley NC was, as it turned out, not entirely representative of SDS thinking on the Spring Mobilization, and was an example of the need for an overhaul of the administration of the national and the decision-making process in general. As it turned out, the Boston NC reversed the earlier decision, but not until three months had elapsed in which SDS could have been mustering needed support for the Mobilization. As it turned out, however, this support was given—on an entirely local and uncoordinated basis—by a large number of the local chapters.

The argument was put forward that working for and going to the Mobilization would divert needed people and finances from local projects; but as experience has shown, this was not necessarily so. Most chapters which did support the Mobilization were quite able to delegate certain people to work for it, without seriously jeopardizing their local work.

The people who made the decision not to support the Mobilization were, in general, people who have been in both SDS and the Movement for awhile. However, the vast majority of SDS members and those who consider themselves part of SDS have only come into the movement within the last 12-18 months. To them, stories of how it was on the Washington March two years ago, the International Days of Protest in October, or the November March are just that...talk; and it is talk about actions that they wish they could have been a part of, in the time when the movement was far more visible, vibrant, and alive than many consider it today.

Most of these people also come from areas that have only recently become open to radical organizing, primarily in the Midwest-Rocky Mountain region (where, for example, six chapters have sprung up in Colorado in three months where only one had existed for the two years prior), and in the South (as in Florida). These areas are still the ones where there are no even-seemingly-large numbers of SDSers or any other radicals in any one place, and it is entirely too easy to acquire a feeling of isolation, and from this to develop a policy of no-action-for-fear-of-retribution...a policy that stems from the feeling of a lack of support that the idea of isolation brings on.

## amendments

John Veneziale  
Jane Adams

(1) ARTICLE VI, Section 2: Change "appointment of the National Secretary" to read: "appointment of Assistants to the Secretaries".

(2) ARTICLE VII: Eliminate "The president shall have the power to call a meeting of a temporary national interim committee, to be composed of the seventeen national officers, for emergencies only. Decisions of this body shall be subject to national council approval.

(3) ARTICLE VIII: Becomes ARTICLE VII: National Officers and Staff.

Section 1. The National Officers shall be: National Secretary, Education Secretary, Inter-Organizational Secretary, and eight at-large officers elected one each from the following regions: New England, New York, Mid-Atlantic/South, Southern Great Lakes, Midwest, Great Plains, South-West/Southern California, and North-West/Northern California. They shall be elected by the Convention and serve as members of the National Council. The Convention may on a year-to-year basis create such other officers as seem necessary, and shall designate their voting rights in the various bodies of S.D.S.

Section 2. (Leave as is.) The national officers must have been members of S.D.S. at least two months prior to election.

Section 3. The national officers are the spokesmen of S.D.S. They shall be responsible for seeing that organizational policies are carried out and shall convene the National Council. Primary political responsibility lies with the three Secretaries in consultation with the other officers. The three Secretaries shall work out of the National Office(s). The officers shall be responsible to the Convention and the National Council.

Section 4. The National Secretary shall have primary responsibility for the functioning of the National Office.

Section 5. The Inter-Organizational Secretary shall have primary responsibility for liaison with other organizations, both national and international, and for informing the membership about these groups. He/she shall share administrative work with the National Secretary.

Section 6. The Education Secretary shall have primary responsibility for the functioning of the internal education program.

Section 7. The Secretaries shall appoint assistants as necessary, subject to approval of the National Council.

Section 8. The National Council shall elect administrative bodies to review administrative decisions of the Secretaries.

## dig that

Dear SDS,

Reed Buckingham (see the blatant masthead on check) is an unctuous, dimply, near-diabetic man who flounced into our suburban home one night with black enticements and presumptuous assurances that our future finances would be glutted by that wondrously altruistic progenitor of our marvelous modern world, Standard Oil. All that was needed was our acquiescence to exploration for oil under our little cottage.

As any upstanding member of the Wilderness Society would, we decried the despoliation of our natural resources, chanted our favorite shibboleths, "Ecology, Rape, and Big Trees Everywhere", and immediately consulted an attorney on legal alternatives to exploitation. Shades of The Octopus! And visions of sugar plums danced in their heads.

Seemingly, our great republic designs to give us the choice of being exploited impuissantly or being exploited with a small remuneration. A true conservationist can only sigh resignedly "against the use of nature" (Macbeth) as foul slime is dredged and wrenched from the black pits of earth to titillate the black appetites of the corporate hierophants.

We decided that we could contribute just a little to the decline and fall of the Gothic hagiology that permits such abuse by endorsing to our favorite anarchist charity all remuneration that we receive from Standard Oil. The Wobblies were under serious consideration, as they were most likely to use the money to blow up a

I would like to turn my attention to the kinds of anti-War protests we are engaged in, and offer some criticism and some ideas I have gotten from the experience of the past few weeks. I didn't go to San Francisco, primarily due to a lack of finances; but I did help organize and take part in local solidarity demonstrations on April 15. The demonstration at Colorado University in Boulder was an excellent example of protest to criticize and draw new conclusions from.

The leadership at CU is basically Left-lib, Social Democrat-SPU variety, of the kind that existed and controlled the Peace Movement about three years ago. They had hang-ups about slogans on placards, worrying about the image they would project and trying to keep out "undesirable" elements (the new militant people). Their signs were such as "Peace in Vietnam", "Stop the Bombing", and "Negotiate" (who with and what for?). To preserve their image, they carried an American flag at the head of the march. When we arrived with signs such as "Stop Johnson's Aggression in Vietnam NOW!", "Stop American Imperialism", "Napalm Is a War Crime", etc., they were frankly upset about the deleterious effects on their "image". This is something militants have had to put up with for a long time, and was nothing new; but we should realize that now the liberals are coming into the anti-War movement, we will have to continue to fight this moderation tendency that those of us who have been in for a little longer have seen to be ineffective. What we must do is talk with these people and show them how this sort of stuff just doesn't make it anymore...and the best demonstration is a demonstration-in-action, as we were able to use.

At this demonstration were a number of new people, from campuses in this state that are just getting organized, or just beginning to break out of their formative shells. At CU, there are a number of militants in the rank-and-file who want to put forth more radical programs, but who have been stopped by the arguments over ultimate effectiveness put forth by the Left-liberals. These people are militants with no base, and they are the ones we must reach out to...as we did. At this demonstration, we walked downtown to the courthouse, where a 45-minute silent vigil was held...with no identifying signs allowed, and only that flag flying. This was done to make the little old ladies of WILPF and the old-time pacifists happy. This was a wasted action, and many of the militant people left the line and tried to do something to confront passers-by and create dialogues.

After the vigil, a rally was held, with some CU profs and a couple of out-of-town student radicals (including this writer) speaking. The first two professors spoke about how this demonstration was good because it showed the viability of dissent in a free society (?), and how we must continue to do this because it showed LBJ & CO. and the rest of the world that not all Americans approved (Continued on page 4)

derrick or two. However delightful this ironic act might be, it would not rectify the inequities of government-approved rape. (After all, there were trees on those copper-mine hills that Joe Hill blew up.)

SDS has been called to our attention by the good folks who are inordinately concerned with the preservation of our "system", but who are singularly unsympathetic to the plight of a lonely Torrey Pine. They denounce your group as a threat to the security of our country. Hopefully, you are. Inasmuch as you have merited this reputation, we have duly decided you also merit some rewards for your efforts. If Standard Oil finds black lucre under us, you will receive about 16% of the alleged sales price derived by S. O. from the pools under our house.

We are also alerting S. O. to our intentions so that they may rejoice in the knowledge that they are helping to build a brighter America.

Yours for more trees,  
Ben and Franci Winter  
384 Del Mar Avenue  
Costa Mesa, California

## new new

buttons

RESIST  
not with my  
life you  
don't

SDS  
freedom now  
withdraw now

## NEW LEFT NOTES

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago III., 60612, except July and August when publication is bi-weekly. Phone (312)666-3874. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Illinois. Subscriptions: \$1 a year for members, \$10 a year for non-members. Signed articles are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the editor, Cathy Wilkerson.

### STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Nick Egleson, president; Carl Davidson, vice-president; and Greg Calvert, nat'l sec'y National Office; 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612/(312)666-3874  
New York City: 49 W. 27th St., NYC, NY 10001 (212) 889-5793  
Niagra Regional Coordinating Committee: PO Box 57-31, River Campus Sta., Roch., N  
Niagra Regional Coordinating Comm.: PO Box 57-31, River Campus Sta., Rochester, NY  
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, California-(415)362-7922  
Southern California: PO Box 85396, Los Angeles, California  
New England: 39 Lee St., Apt. 3A, Cambridge, Mass.

VOL. 2, NO. 18

let the people decide

MAY 1, 1967



# Rhodesia Letter

(Continued from page 1)

for another decade. Prime Minister Wilson concluded on December 20 before Parliament that Smith "is a prisoner of some very racist and fascist-minded people".

SDS notes that Prime Minister Wilson has now withdrawn all compromises and opted for NIBMAR (No Independence Before Majority Rule). It thus appears that the British are at last resolved to break the rebellion. (It is regrettable that the United Kingdom did not use force or the threat of force in October or November 1965.)

No one will again be fooled into thinking that Smith will ever share power. In a Newsweek interview of December 19, 1966, the following question was asked of Smith:

Q. "Are you an advocate of eventual majority rule in this country?"

A. "No, I can in all honesty claim that I am not an advocate of majority rule."

Moreover, the New York Times of December 23, 1966 quoted Smith as saying: "We will never negotiate with Britain while Mr. Wilson is in his present position because he is waiting for us to reach the position of one-man-one-vote and this will not happen in my lifetime or in Mr. Wilson's lifetime."

## SANCTIONS

With such polarity for negotiation, it is essential that sanctions be tightened to defeat the "fascist-minded" rebels. SDS does note the rising opposition in Rhodesia, the Reconstruction Group, and the 4,000 people who signed Lord Malvern's petition. But sanctions must be strengthened. The prestige of the United Nations, the validity of economic sanctions as a peace-keeping method, the integrity of the white northern nations, all are at stake here.

## SDS RECOGNIZES THE FOLLOWING PROBLEMS:

(1) The large Rhodesian coal-mining subsidiary of Union Carbide increased production in 1966 on the lame excuse that the Smith Government asked them to increase production.

More significantly, SDS was told by Union Carbide in February 1966 that there was less than six months' supply of chromite stockpiled in Mozambique. Yet U. S. purchases of chromite from Rhodesia during 1966 were valued at nearly \$4 million, far more than the value of six months' supply. There is no need for these purchases, since there is seven and a half years of high-grade chromite in the U. S. stockpile. At the end of 1966 six months' supply of chromite was still in stock in Mozambique.

The United States should give a full account of these movements and transactions. Assurance must be obtained that, wherever the Rhodesian ore is located, the Union Carbide Corporation will desist from supplying Rhodesia with foreign exchange.

(2) SDS regrets that the friends of Rhodesia are allowed to operate quite freely within the U. S. A., especially as this organization is permitted to send foreign exchange through bond issues, to support Smith. Sanctions of Rhodesian exports have the prime purpose of shutting off supplies of foreign exchange to Rhodesia. If the U. N. is serious about defeating Smith, the friends of Rhodesia should be investigated and a full statement made by the U. S. Administration.

(3) OIL SANCTIONS MUST BE STRICTLY ENFORCED Rhodesia consumes oil refined in South Africa by Caltex, Mobil, and Shell B-P. Caltex and Mobil have between them 48% of South Africa's refining capacity. Discussion of sanctions on South Africa began in 1962-63 two years after the racist state had become a police state. Caltex then arrived to bolster South Africa against the possibility of oil sanctions, and completed their \$35 million oil refinery in 1966. Mobil is also spending \$30 million in refinery expansion to assist the self-sufficiency of the racist governments of Southern Africa.

The following twelve U. S. companies are prospecting for oil in Southern Africa so that South Africa and Rhodesia may have indigenous supplies and thus forever resist economic sanctions: Engelhard Hanovia, Kewanee Overseas Oil Company, Argus Oil Company, ESSO Exploration, Karroo Basin Oil Company, Calasiatic and Topco, Placid International Oil, Superior Oil International, Mobil, American Pacific Petroleum Corporation, Tidewater Oil Company, and Atlantic Richfield Company.

Sir, the president of the United States stated on the 1966 anniversary of the O.A.U.: "We will not support policies abroad that are based on the rule of minorities or the discredited notion that men are unequal before the law."

With respect to U. S. oil companies in Southern Africa, the most charitable view is that the U. S. government is inept, rather criminally negligent, in the conduct of foreign policy when U. S. corporations have interests contrary to the declared national interest.

Therefore, SDS, noting that Rhodesia's consumption of petroleum products is only 8% that of South Africa, and observing that Caltex and Mobil refine and sell oil in South Africa and that the oil is then transported to Rhodesia, urge that the U. S. government immediately

cause Caltex and Mobil to cease and desist refining and selling petroleum products in South Africa, as long as South Africa supplies Rhodesia.

Yours faithfully,  
Gregory Calvert  
National Secretary  
Students for a Democratic Society

The above letter was prepared and sent to the United Nations by the sds national secretary with the assistance of the sds South African / Rhodesian secretary, Richard Thomas. It was entered as an official part of the U. N. record. The decision to send the letter was ratified by the NAC. (See NLN/NAC Minutes in March), as a part of the sds policy which condemns apartheid.

## ANNAPOLIS CONF.

(Continued from page 1)

their discussions of the Vietnam question were not pervaded with the usual cliches and phony arguments the Johnson Administration uses to pass off its policy on the American people. Rather, the tone of the many comments seemed to indicate an almost desperate search to find some sophisticated justification for the policy.

At the end of the conference, several midshipmen thanked me for presenting a radical critique of the Vietnam policy because: "We don't generally get to hear that side of the story." Some told me to "take care of myself" and keep on presenting my views to people.

Although this was only a minor encounter with the military establishment, several conclusions seem justified. First, LBJ will face difficulties in prosecuting his war because there seems reason to believe that morale is low even among the officer corps. Moreover, not only does it seem possible to discuss Vietnam with military personnel, but my experiences lead me to believe that members of the military are extremely anxious to hear our point of view and to gain access to our sources of information on Vietnam. The Movement has a responsibility to answer these desires of soldiers and officers; certainly no one else can be expected to. Places like Annapolis, Fort Dix, and even West Point should be flooded with anti-War literature. Every opportunity should be taken to stress that we in the anti-War movement are not enemies of the military. On the contrary, we are trying to prevent them from being killed in futile and reactionary wars. In my brief confrontation with the military establishment, I found not a monolithic facade of pro-Johnson feeling, but a vague aura of anxiety, a vague premonition on the part of military people that perhaps we in the Movement are speaking the truth.

## on Draft Resistance

Hal Cohen (Berkeley, California)

Carl Davidson, in his *Praxis*, notes the direction of anti-draft work from protest to seditious resistance, but his own suggestions for action remain in the "protest" range. In Point 2 he describes the ranges for direct action all centering in the induction center.

"Your local board" is not the place where change in the system will happen. It is the place where there will be some effect on one man's draft status, and perhaps even on some of the inductees (who are "most open and receptive to critical discussion of the draft"?). But what can they do about it at that point? Maybe a local newspaper will print a story. People on the street will get a chance to see real commie demonstrators.

Carl appreciates the weakness of the position of the draft martyr: it shows people despair, frustration, and isolation; and the war machine continues on its way. Solitary jail is no answer. But Carl doesn't even toy with the possibility of a nationally coordinated action that might get a man in prison. Like if we all sent our draft cards back at one time, and also got some big-name backing (perhaps some national figures who would send theirs back too). And all those people who also wanted demonstrations, or, hell, happenings, on the holy sanctity of Federal property could do their thing. The war machine might be surprised.

But Carl's omission is understandable given his objectives: to reach out to draft-age people and help people get out of the draft. Induction-center tactics work well toward these ends. But what if you want to foul up the war machine? Or maybe change it...?

Can an anti-draft union be a basis for developing a radical movement?

First, what would be the objective of such a movement? The primary objective would be an end to the selective service system. This could be a gathering point for all those against national manpower channeling, New Left and Old Right, both of whom object to totalitarian direction in people's lives.

What means would be used? Two have made an appearance. One serves as a means for drawing people together to stand behind anyone who is given a 1-A by the system. That man can be helped by a street demonstration or by the passing out of leaflets in the induction

center. This shakes up the selective service people, resulting hopefully in the drafted man's getting a 1-Y or 4-F.

This method can only be used so much at one center before they get up tight and have to take another kind of action to save face.

It is also not an action for building a radical movement. It forms a service organization, but it is not an agent for change.

A second kind of draft union actively calls the selective service system, and thus the American government, into confrontation with the draft issue of taking men involuntarily to serve in an immoral war. (My preference is for using the Nuremberg backing, whereby it is simply a matter of a citizen calling his government to account for its actions.) It organizes men for a unified action in opposition to the draft whereby everyone who has the commitment would send back his draft card at the same time (presently planned for fall, 1967), and would make his position public before and after the national action. This is aimed at changing the system: collectively saying "We won't go; we won't join."

Is action directed toward going to jail a way to build a radical movement? Those who go to jail will be a disappearing force, but they can bring together supporters who don't have as deep a level of commitment about bringing the government to account for its actions: for example women, who of course cannot directly participate in anti-draft action; and people from the intellectual and business community who, beyond draft age, are not directly involved, but because of their position in the establishment might be effective in changing the system.

Of course a movement cannot be best run by people in jail, anymore than it can be best run by radicals infiltrating into the Army. But jail is not happening now, and there will be time after these people are out of jail. This is the important part. Before going to jail, something can be established that will last until after the jail sentence runs out. That something is a practicing communism. It is building actual communism throughout America. We are the generation that is the transformation of capitalism, and we can live it. SNCC has lived community houses while working against the South-

ern establishment, and it is moving toward building "non-capitalist" societies now while developing Black Power. Emmett Grogan, among others from San Francisco, is establishing community farms. The San Pablo (Stanford University) anti-draft people are developing the community house living situation.

Communes in the past have had a mixed history. Some have come apart. An inverted, exclusive living unit cannot be expected to easily accept new members, some of whom will be the men coming back from prison. The open community can develop because it can take new people as they wish to enter. This is where it's at. We can develop communism from the ground up while attacking the totalitarianism of the present regime from the top.

## draft call

At the Mobilization in New York, 175 men burned their draft cards. These men now urge you to make the same emphatic affirmation of freedom and life, in the face of conscription and murder.

Conscription is incompatible with democracy. We are convinced that conscription is clearly unconstitutional and, in the context of United States involvement in Vietnam, conscription is criminal.

The government of the United States has, through conscription, already oppressed or destroyed the lives and consciences of millions of Americans and Vietnamese. We have argued and demonstrated to stop this destruction. We have not succeeded. Powerful resistance is now demanded.

On May 17, the Mobilization will send a delegation to Washington to confront the President. We join them in their pledge to "escalate resistance" if his response is unsatisfactory.

If you have contemplated the consequences and are prepared to take direct action, please contact us so that such action may be coordinated on a national scale.

(DRAFT DENIAL, 5 BEEKMAN STREET (10TH FLOOR), NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10038)



# M-CUP GROWS

## M-CUP NEEDS SUMMER STAFF

Since the January 20 NLN article about M-CUP, the project has expanded both in number of organizers and in range of activities. But our plans for the summer require even more expansion. Full-time staff people willing to commit themselves for at least six months of hard work are still needed. The real need right now is for student summer help.

Because of the time and energy required to get new staff to the point of doing real organizing, the organizing committee of M-CUP has decided to take summer staff provided that they concentrate on two areas vital to the project right now—research (legal and otherwise) and fund-raising. We are hoping for some people who want some experience in an organizing project, who have some creative ideas about fund-raising and are willing to spend their summer putting their ideas into action.

None of the staff is paid, so applicants should either have enough money to support themselves for three months or plan to get a part-time job. Interested people should contact directly:

Missy Hall  
Minneapolis Community Union Project  
1119 East Franklin Avenue  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
55404

# CU REPORT

(Continued from page 2)

of the War. The third prof to speak was an old SPer who introduced a little militancy by speaking of the bankruptcy of the established political parties and the need to form a new, representative party. For this he was cheered (the first speaker to get a cheer), but unfortunately he blew it all at the last by advocating that we could gain power in 8-10 years with Martin King for President.

Then the radicals spoke. I spoke as a representative of SDS, and gave a speech strongly influenced by Oglesby's Washington speech and Mike James' Chicago speech ("Do It Now!"). The marchers gave me a far more appreciative response—especially when I began talking on the idea of stopping America in order to stop the War, and I was also the only speaker to be heckled. (It has been my experience that when one is heckled it is because the listeners are afraid of what he says because he is getting to them.) The next speeches were in line with what I had said, but after it all, the president of the CU SPU (the organizers of the march) got up and apologized for us, and especially for me. After the rally, the people from the newly organized areas, and a lot of the membership of the CU group, wanted to speak to us who had presented the radical position, wanting to know how they could implement the programs we had spoken of. The Left-libs and SPUers were largely ignored.

These people (and my own SDS region is a clear example of this) really needed to get away from the local projects, from the actions with small turnouts and lots of reaction, and into areas where they could meet with thousands of other people who agreed with them; to feel (even if it had no basis in reality) that they were part of a real national movement... a big national movement. And marching down Market Street and going to Kezar Stadium did just that. The Spring Mobilization was just the thing to pull the Movement out of the doldrums we have been in for the last several months, and to give people the psychological backing to break out of the little shells they had retreated into.

Certainly we who work as organizers see that this didn't really do anything to stop the War, but it sure as hell did enough to people to make them come back a bunch of real fire-eaters, ready to take on the world. The feeling among the kids in our region who returned from San Francisco is "Damn the torpedoes; full speed ahead! Let's get MOVING!"...and we are. People came back with new ideas for tactics and programs—creative ideas—and the willingness to work to see them implemented. Even those of us who didn't go have become infected with this new activism, and we have been motivated to reach out and find new people and involve them. Our last meeting after the Mobilization attracted twice as many people as usual, and they were mainly people we had never seen before. Not only did they come to the meeting, but they got involved in the new projects and will stay and work in SDS. These are the people who didn't go to the marches, but saw them on TV and heard about them from their friends, roommates, or whatever, and were infected with enthusiasm by the people who made the trip.

So we can ask ourselves, here in the interior: Was it worth the effort taken to mobilize contributions to send people there? Was it worth the time spent away from the local to go there? It damned well was! An increase

# NAC

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Bushell, Don Canavan, Dee Jacobsen, Jeff Segal, Earl Silbar, John and Jean Veneziale, Cathy Wilkerson  
MEMBERS ABSENT: Mary Allen, Greg Calvert, Tim McCarthy

AGENDA: (1) Request for Chapter Contact mailing list; (2) Spring mobilization; (3) Vietnam summer committee.

(1) MAILING LIST: The Poverty Rights Action Center of the National Conference of Churches in Washington, D. C. has requested a list of chapter contacts for the purpose of mailing pamphlets to recruit volunteers for welfare education and support projects. Since the chapter contact list is public record, it was decided that it should be made as available as possible. However, starting with this request, a five-dollar charge will be required to cover expense of handling. The NAC reserves the right to waive this charge in situations requiring a waiver.

(2) SPRING MOBILIZATION: Rev. Bevel and a group representing the speakers at the Spring Mobilization are going to Washington May 17 to demand to see the President about ending the War. This group has requested that SDS send a representative to conduct a draft-resistance workshop. They are also seeking representation of SDS on the Spring Mobilization Committee. A decision and statement of position on this matter will be coming out in the next NIC mailing.

(3) VIETNAM SUMMER: Funds may be made available for literature and organizers through this group.

(4) STUDENT MOBILIZATION: The Student Mobilization Committee has called for a meeting May 14 and 15 to discuss and promote draft-resistance, getting the military off campus, and community organizing.

## just out-Spartacist

---Lead Story on sellout in the anti-war movement #10

---Special 8-page supplement:  
BLACK & RED: The Class Struggle Road to Negro Freedom

single copy 10c--12 issue  
sub \$1. from SPARTACIST,  
Box 1377, G.P.O., N. Y.  
N.Y. 10001.  
ad--

CONTAINMENT AND  
CHANGE -- by CARL  
OGLESBY and RICHARD  
SCHAULL.....  
(coming next week -- a  
full review in NLN) --

ORDER NOW !!! \$1.45  
per copy from sds -- NO  
c/o Book Service

of 60-80% in new members, and an almost total increase in new activities and enthusiasm to do them make all the work and travel very much worth it. The Movement has new blood, new life, and a return of the feeling of doing things that we had a year ago; it's a happening to be in the Movement again. Old people are reinvigorated, and new people want to be involved and come to us in larger numbers than we consciously reach out and meet.

I wandered among the assembling contingents. Nobody knew what was happening; the feeble-voiced commend post continued to implore the marchers to join their assigned sections; and Bob Speck was selling poster-sized pictures of Che and Malcolm for a \$ each (proceeds going to SNCC). I talked with various Midwestern campus contingents headed by SDS leaders, and discovered that their travel to New York was generously subsidized. Let's face it: the Movement's financial priorities are decided by those simpatyzers who are most involved in the capitalist economy and most influenced by its corporate liberal mentality.

I headed towards the Park's exit to join the march. The marchers were trickling through a narrow bottleneck into Central Park South; a shrill-voiced monitor was yelling into a megaphone; and the fuzz were directing their attention towards the overwhelmingly anti-War spectators. After a rude cop told us to step behind a non-existent barricade, I lost my cool and said to my neighbors: "Now you know why the VC kill cops." Despite the fuzz, I got in and out of the marching line, talking to long-time-no-see friends. The procession turned into the narrow Madison Avenue, slowing down to allow for intersecting traffic. The paraders now filled the whole roadway. At one time, we were crossed by a

# n y report

(Continued from page 2)

policy, rather than docile dissent. Had we the choice (which we do not have, due to the kind of people America creates), we would have directed the enormous resources (which were not ours to direct) towards resistance and constituency organizing rather than towards a one-shot hoopla. In one aspect the mobilization was successful: the press was impressed. Nevertheless, too many people got off too easy, without beginning to think about their personal responsibility to effect meaningful change.

The "rally" took place at the UN Plaza. It is part of 1st Avenue, bound by the UN superblock complex on the east and perpendicular streets on the west. The speakers' platform was at the northern end of the linear "plaza". To the south of the platform, the police divided 1st Avenue into block-long and driveway-wide strategic hamlets, each surrounded by a police cordon. The marchers were fed into the strategic hamlets through the perpendicular streets (45th, 46th, 47th, etc.). When the Plaza's strategic hamlets were populated by the first comers, marchers began to crowd into the feeder streets. At best, only two to three hamlets' inmates could see the speakers' platform. The inadequate public address system was audible in only a few more hamlets and the tips of side streets. The crowd had little sense of unity; the constabulary kept movement under control in accordance with the best mob-control procedures; and the chilly weather didn't help any.

I arrived at 2nd Avenue with the midsection of the march. The cops were directing alternate collumes into 45th and 46th Streets respectively, and the strategic hamlets were already full. After venturing into one of the side streets and hearing only faint echos of the platform oratory, I returned to 2nd Avenue to discuss the respectability of the demonstration with two attentive and well-mannered college students; they were awfully ignorant. I returned to the side street shortly after Rev. M. L. King spoke and beat a hasty retreat, and began edging myself towards 1st Avenue (alias UN Plaza). I finally liberated myself into one of the strategic hamlets. From there I took the rout northward, smuggling myself through two police-infested "militarized zones" and another strategic hamlet, and arrived at the northernmost people's enclave in time to hear Mr. Carmichael's address. It was the liveliest and most colorful (some pun) speech of the whole dreary afternoon. Later on, Mr. Egelson also talked. He said things that had to be said, and the reception was better than average, but the disoriented crowd on that chilly afternoon was getting tired of too many speeches. A little later it began to rain, and I went home.

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.

Jim ANDERSON  
88½ Edwards st  
New Haven CONN 06511

PL contingent carrying NLF flags; a few blocks later they got into a fight with Right-wing counter-demonstrators, and the mounted constabulary broke it up. The police were doing their job as they saw it, and the march was slow, tame, and dull.

The point of all this rambling is to establish that people no longer respond to the liberal, moderate position on the War with anything but a ho-hum attitude; the radical, activist speech makes people take notice, if only to find out why you are silly enough to put forth a program like that. This creates the opportunity for dialogue; not only that, it touches the strings of possible frustration many people in the Movement are beginning to feel and in many cases vocalizes thoughts they've had for a long while, and provides the precedent for those people to take action along the more radical and militant lines they have thought of for a long time. The idea of organizing for resistance probably gains more support among people in the Movement who are beginning to see the irrelevance of the old tactics of protest by the Left-libs through their largely irrelevant speeches than any amount of talking in chapter meetings could ever do. People are seeing in their own activities the irrelevance of what has happened with the old civil-rights-type tactics, and are becoming willing to respond to radical calls for action. This is what we must concentrate on, and the demonstrations—if they do nothing else—provide us with this opportunity to work on the undecided people who are already in the Movement. For this reason, and to preserve solidarity in the anti-War movement, we in SDS must continue to support the calls for mobilizations and demonstrations, as a place for radical organizing activity within the Movement itself.