

NEW LEFT NOTES

SDS · 1608 W · MADISON · CHICAGO · ILL.

Volume 2 Number 40 2/1

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

November 20, 1967

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM
LOCAL BOARD No. 76
322 FEDERAL BUILDING
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74108

November 13 1967

John Milton Ratliff
739 Chatauqua Rm 15
Norman Oklahoma 74069

SS No: 34-76-48-723

Dear Sir:

Your file is being transmitted to the State Director for transmittal to the Appeal board for consideration of classification.

Information has been submitted to this office which the local board members did not feel was justification for continued classification in class II-S.

Section 1622.25 of the Selective Service Regulations says—

Registrant deferred because of activity in study—

(a) In Class II-S shall be placed any registrant whose activity in study is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety or interest.

The local board did not feel that your activity as a member of SDS is to the best interest of the U.S. Government.

For local board No. 76
Tulsa Oklahoma

Laura T. Brown, clerk

Hershey Directive Followed

SDS ACTIVITIES COST OKLAHOMA MEMBER A 2-S

General Lewis B. Hershey's recent statement to the effect that anyone interfering in any way with the draft would be immediately reclassified 1-A was apparently no idle threat.

And the Tulsa Oklahoma draft board has taken Hershey's directive a step further in reclassifying University of Oklahoma freshman John Ratliff from 2-S to 1-A because of his membership in SDS.

Ratliff, a member of SDS for 2 years, received notice of his reclassification on November 2. He filed an appeal on November 13, and later received the letter shown on this page.

Lt. Col. Charles Humphrey, manpower specialist at the Oklahoma State Selective Service headquarters admitted that Ratliff's reclassification was due to his anti-war activities. "You're aware of General Hershey's statement..." he told an Oklahoma City Times reporter, "He said because of their activities maybe they

shouldn't be deferred and maybe we should look at it. So that's what the boards are doing.

Hershey's statement, issued to all local boards soon after the October 21 march in Washington, said, "The selective service laws provide penalties for any person who shall knowingly interfere or attempt to do so in any way by force or violence. And from now on we intend to live up to the letter of the law."

"It follows that illegal activity that interferes with recruiting or causes refusal of duty in the military could not be construed as being in the national interest."

Ratliff said that, although he has participated in demonstrations, he has "never been arrested for anything other than a speeding ticket." He is appealing the 1-A classification, and ACLU and ECLC have both expressed an interest in his case.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

Dow Shalt Not Kill

HOWARD ZINN
LIBERATION News Service

(Editor's Note: Howard Zinn, a professor at Boston University, has written Vietnam: The Logic of Withdrawal; The Southern Mystique; SNCC: The New Abolitionists; and La Guardia in Congress, which won the Albert J. Beveridge History Prize.)

Many faculty members and students, being passionate opponents of American violence in Vietnam, and also insistent civil libertarians, are troubled by the recent demonstrations against Dow Chemical. No dilemma exists where the action is merely protest—by picketing, leafletting, speaking—against Dow, napalm, and the war. That is a plain exercise of speech, press, and assembly. But physical interposition, where Dow recruiters are blocked from carrying on their recruiting, opens puzzling questions. As one concerned both with civil liberties and the war, I would like to think aloud for a while, in print, and try to reach some conclusions.

First, it seems to me that the "civil liberties" of Dow Chemical are not in question. "Civil liberties" encompass various forms of freedom of expression, as well as certain procedural guarantees against arbitrary police or judicial action, and are fairly well covered by the first, eighth, and fourteenth Amendments. No one is abrogating Dow's right to express its views; indeed, the recent demonstrators in this area invited the Dow representative to state his case publicly, and gave him a platform for this purpose. If Dow wanted to set up a table, or hold a meeting, to declare its views, any interference would be a violation of civil liberties.

However, the actions of an individual or group which (unlike even the most malicious or slanderous speech) have immediate and irremediable effects on the lives and liberties of others, must sometimes be restricted for the health and safety of the public. Thus, we pass laws against murder, rape, arson. Thus, we regulate the sale and manufacture of harmful products. We even restrict the restaurant owner's freedom to choose his customers by racial standards. To put it more broadly: the whole body of criminal and social legislation is designed to restrict some people's freedom of action (not their civil liberties) in order to safeguard the health and happiness of others. Therefore, a law which prevented Dow Chemical Company from recruiting people who might be engaged in the manufacture, sale or promotion of a substance to be dropped on men, women, and children in order to burn them to death would be easily as justifiable as the Meat Inspection Act of 1906. It would (unlike a law interfering with talk for or against such a substance) no more be an infringement of civil liberties than a law barring the indiscriminate sale of deadly poisons at the corner grocery.

The doctrine that the "civil liberties" of corporations are violated by regulatory laws was predominant in this country during the age of "the Robber Barons", and was constitutionally sanctioned for about fifty years, until 1938. Then, a sharply-worded opinion by Justice Black (Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. v. Johnson) declared that corporations should no longer be considered "persons"

continued on page 6

BUST OF ANTI-WAR ACTIVISTS BEGINS:

Draft Card Burners Called to NY for Federal Grand Jury

Neil Buckley

STATE COLLEGE, PA.

An undetermined number of federal marshals swarmed into State College the morning of November 9 with subpoenas for at least six Penn State SDS members who had been present at the mass draft card burning in New York on April 15. The six SDSers, five men and a woman, have been "commanded" to appear before the Grand Jury of the Southern District Court of New York in Manhattan between November 16 and 28. All six are to appear on different days, hinting at an attempt to get people to incriminate themselves and others; the hearings are closed to the public, according to an official at the Manhattan courthouse who was contacted by telephone. The subpoenas, which were sworn out October 6, were served the day after Hershey's order of immediate reclassification and induction for anti-war demonstrators became public.

Telephone contact with other movement sources on November 9 indicated that we were part of a nationwide bust. Brother Spiegel reported from Chicago that the chapters at Yale, Dartmouth and Harvard had been busted on November 8. Visiting Brother Dumbroski from the Philadelphia Anti-Draft Union contacted his office and was told several ADU organizers had been

picked up by federal marshals and that plainclothesmen were looking for still other ADU organizers. The ADU had also heard of busts in Los Angeles and Denver. Brother Halliwell reported from New York that subpoenas were out in Houston, Atlanta, and Chapel Hill, N. C. for activists in the Resistance. Steve also reported three arrests in Denver.

Conversations with Brother Davidson and other NIC members who were at the Chicago meeting on November 9 led to the following tactic: the New York Regional Office will coordinate and organize support demonstrations during the Grand Jury hearings and act as an information center for the 12 days of the hearings. Brothers and sisters who have been subpoenaed should call the NYRO as soon as you arrive in New York; it is strongly suggested that you arrive a day ahead of time.

Penn State administrators collaborated directly with the federal marshals in the bust here. The marshals contacted the offices of the Deans of Men and Women and Campus Security; the latter arranged a meeting between SDS people and the marshals at which the subpoenas were

continued on page 7

LETTERS

Editors:

I find Mike Goldfield's article—Power at the Pentagon—very distressing. While I agree that the aura of infallibility of the American system needs to be dispelled, I disagree that "The aim should be to make them (cops, Chase Manhattan, etc) look foolish to everybody, not just ourselves."

They do not look foolish to me. They do not look foolish to American Black people, Vietnamese, Guatemalans and Bolivians. It is an insult to the millions of human beings whose lives are ruined by the U.S. to call the Pentagon a foolish and vulnerable institution.

I am not playing a game with rich, established, but silly, stupid, haphazard people. I am trying to fight a powerful, efficient, highly organized and deliberate murderer.

Although what happened at the Pentagon was brutal and shocking, it was mild compared to what America does in the slums and foreign lands every day, and, I believe, compared to what it will do to critics of the future.

As you said—let us remember who we are—"A group of middle class kids." It may have been valid and useful to regard our parents and high schools as foolish. But, I presume, they had neither the desire nor the means to murder us and hundreds of others, daily, for profit. yours in struggle,
Elinor Lerner
SUNY at Buffalo SDS

Membership Secretary
SDS

Dear Sir:

I find myself unable to remain a member of your organization due to the fact that I can no longer agree with the methods that you advocate for change. I am still in fundamental agreement with the aims of your preamble "to effect change at the most basic levels of economic, political, and social organization." However, I cannot agree with the methods which contain seeds of suspicion and mistrust which are to be despised in other areas of life.

I am still for a world of peace without armies and armaments, but I can see no way to improve it in the manner which most of the members of SDS with which I am acquainted wish it. Peace, as Pope John XXIII says, "must be built up daily by works of peace." It is a necessary task, but it will take a great deal of time. Men must be taught to love one another, or at least not to see other races.

We must seek this through fundamental change in the area of education, housing, employment, and an end to all forms of discrimination. It will not be effected through revolution. All revolutions are ephermal if they do not touch the deepest levels of humanity.

I do not condemn those whose conscience tells them they cannot serve in the military, for example; the teaching on "just war" has long been a teaching of the Church. Nevertheless, there are morally appropriate ways to protest such wars which are not illegal.

Finally, although the preceding is sufficient reason for my resignation, the fact that my membership in SDS might alienate people whom I must serve is also a consideration. It is too difficult to reach people without such irrelevant things disturbing them. Not that pursuit of morally necessary goals is unimportant, but when mere membership in an organization which has members in it whose goals and methods are unacceptable to me and I am aware that people to whom I am attempting to minister are disturbed by those people and I am thus unable to reach them, then such membership is not only a liability it is a positive fatality, in some cases.

I feel that whatever reform is needed, and much is needed, that I should pursue those through more normal political and social instruments.

Sincerely yours,
Henry P. Roberson
Immaculate Conception Seminary
Conception, Mo. 64433

NIC Minutes

Bob Pardun
Internal Education Secretary

The NIC decided to change the date of the Conference on SDS and the Working Class. The Fall NC had proposed that such a conference be held at the Winter NC but it was felt that a much better conference could be held if more time were allowed for setting it up. Therefore the conference will be held sometime in the spring.

It was decided that the Winter NC should be structured in such a way that much more exchange of information and discussion of strategy can take place. The usual plenary sessions do not satisfy those needs. The next NC will consist of 3 days of workshops and 2 days of plenary sessions. The suggested topics for the workshops were:

1. The role of the student movement in the broader movement for radical change.
2. Direction and potential of white organizing.
3. Direction and importance of the anti-military on campus movement. The student strike.
4. Stop the Draft Weeks as a program for relating the student movement to off-campus groups.
5. Strategy concerning LBJ, electoral campaigning and the Democratic Convention.
6. Long range anti-imperialist politics and the movement. The importance of the concept of anti-imperialism to the movement.

TALE WITH A TRAGIC ENDING

INCOME:	
Dues & Subscriptions:	\$478.00
Literature:	238.00
Contributions:	146.50
Pledges:	91.05
Sales:	92.16
Miscellaneous:	85.00
Exchanges:	35.00
NLN Ads	00.00
Printing:	324.75
Loans:	00.00
Chapter Tax:	00.00
Journal A:	-15.00
Total:	\$1505.46

Boe Shomer Financial Secretary

Deficit: \$197.90
Balance: \$1338.16

EXPENSES:

Petty Cash:	\$5.20
Travel:	240.00
Subsistence:	345.00
Office & REC supplies:	73.12
Printing Supplies:	432.51
Exchanges:	35.00
Car Expenses:	9.00
Typesetting:	18.32
Postage:	43.67
Telephone(REC)	47.66
Gas & Electric(REC)	34.01
Rent (REC)	125.00
Debts:	50.00
Miscellaneous:	-244.87
Total	\$1703.36

CAMPUS NEWS

BOSTON SIT-IN

The Wednesday, November 15 sit-in of some 300 Boston University students against recruiters from the Dow Chemical Company on their campus started as a quiet, uneventful protest and ended with faculty and students lining three floors of BU's placement building with their bodies and pumelling the trapped Dow man's car in the midst of the worst November blizzard in Boston history.

The anti-Dow demonstrators, some of whom picketed outside the placement building all day in the storm, originally intended to give the recruiter free access and exit to the placement offices, according to Craig Kaplan, BU junior and member of Student Congress.

Following a rally at which Prof. Howard Zinn spoke and the appearance on campus of the university newspaper, the BU News (News Editor Joe Pilati urged obstruction of the recruiters "by any nonviolent means" and featured a huge page one blowup of two children scarred by US napalm), the students decided to block Dow from leaving the building.

Prof. Robert Cohen, chairman of the BU physics department, told Dow recruiter Dean Wakefield that he could leave the building only by stepping over hundreds of bodies, Cohen's included. BU dean of students Staton R. Curtis, who is also a commander in the naval reserves, then announced that Wakefield was prepared to leave.

The Dow recruiter stepped on the students' bodies until he reached the first floor of the building, where a general uproar of shouts of "assassin" and "murderer" brought a covey of campus, city and Metropolitan District Commission police.

While waiting in his car in the roaring blizzard, Wakefield was surrounded by students and teachers who threw snow, took air out of the car tires, and blocked his exit for about 45 minutes.

The Central Intelligence Agency has cancelled its on-campus interviews scheduled for January 30.

The BU administration, which issued a warning prior to the demonstration that obstructive tactics "cannot be permitted" has to date taken no action against the demonstrators.

Raymond Mungo
LIBERATION News Service

were out of jail by 8:00 that night. (Since then, the defense lawyer has been in court twice; the students have yet had to appear. The lawyer is hopeful that he can get the disorderly conduct charges declared unconstitutional as was recently done in Kentucky.)

The next day, October 31, the left greeted Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. It was a truly eventful occasion. The administration, of course, cried out against the violation of free speech. Because we had earlier forced the administration to invite Howard Zinn, they had felt we would ignore the man in the auditorium who was only "making his point." They didn't understand that we were only making our point. Perhaps we made our point more effectively than ever before. This time our point couldn't be missed. In a very real sense, the students who heckled Rusk made the blood just a little too obvious for the people who sat quietly in the audience.

That wasn't all, though. The day was still young. Over 200 students went next to the office of the President of the University, Elvis Stahr, past Secretary of the War Department. (Remember the Bay of Pigs, that's him.) The students were there to present him with four demands concerning the University's complicity with the war vis a vis the Rusk talk and Dow Chemical. We gave our demands to the Dean of Students after demanding and obtaining a meeting with the President for

continued on page 3

UCR AND THE USAF

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT RIVERSIDE—Twenty-five people sat down at the entrance to an office where two Air Force recruiters were spending the day at UCR on Wednesday, Nov. 8. They avoided arrest by leaving a 14-inch path for passage of those who wanted to see the recruiters. However, no one went in during the demonstration. Also at the demonstration was the Immolation Army Band, "a collection of instruments designed to make more noise than music", according to the UCR Daily Enterprise. Joel Edelstein, one of the SDS members in the demonstration said, "We left our 14 inches today. Maybe we won't next time."

DRAFT RESISTER CHARGED

CINCINNATI, OHIO—Dan Bromley, an 18-year-old high school student who refused to register for the draft, is now facing charges brought against him Nov. 9 for violation of the selective service law. Bromley, who was recently expelled from Lakota High School in Ohio for refusing to take off a "Resistance" button or to quit discussing draft resistance with his classmates, was supported in Federal Court by members of the Yellow Springs Draft Resistance. Bromley's arrest took place two hours before a scheduled conference on the possibility of his reinstatement in school. On the expulsion, the Lakota High School principal said, "I have to stop the flow of his ideas to the other students; I mean, I must prevent the advocating of Draft resistance to others, and the passing out of literature and buttons regarding it."

U. OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON, KY.—Four people were arrested Nov. 6 by the University of Kentucky Safety and Security Department for sitting in the doorway of a Defense Intelligence Agency recruiter. The four were arrested when they remained after most of the SDS demonstrators had agreed to move as requested by the Dean of Students.

DOW AND RUSK AT INDIANA

On Monday, October 30, there was a demonstration against the presence of Dow on campus at Indiana University in Bloomington. There were 36 arrests, two students being clubbed unconscious and consequently hospitalized. All the students

new left notes

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 W. Madison Street, Chicago, Ill., 60612 except July and August when publication is bi-weekly. Phone 312/666-3874. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Ill. Subscriptions: \$1 per year for members, \$10 a year for non-members. Signed articles are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the editors, Carol Neiman and Lyn Kempf.

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Carl Davidson, Inter-organizational secretary; Robert Pardun, Internal Education secretary; Mike Spiegel, National secretary.
National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206 Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312/666-3874)
New York City: 41 Union Square West, Rm. 436 NYC, NY 10003 (212/675-2626)
Niagra Regional Coordinating Committee: PO Box 5731, River Campus Station, Rochester, N. Y.
Southern California: PO Box 85396, Los Angeles, California 90072
New England: 901 Massachusetts Ave. Cambridge, Mass. 02139
Washington D.C. 1779 Lanier Pl., N.W.

Various and Sundry Reports, Thoughts, etc. On the NIC, SDS-Mob. Relationships, etc.

Report on the Student Mobilization Committee in General and the National Student Strike in Particular...

Jeff Jones
New York Regional Office

One of the common injuries received by SDS people at the Pentagon was internal hemorrhaging caused by Linda Morse's announcement that the Student Mobilization Committee was calling for a nationwide student strike on March 19. She had been asked by the Vietnamese in Bratislava to coordinate a student strike and related campus protests around the March 19th date, because that is the anniversary of the first Vietnamese student protests against American military presence in Vietnam.

I went to the SM meeting in New York, Nov. 4, to talk about our various conceptions of what an effective student strike would be, and to find out just what they had in mind. It became apparent that the old split between symbolic protest, and more solid political action still remains very much a part of the anti-war movement. Their conception of the strike was to call out as many students from around the country as possible on March 19, total the number, and show that, yes indeed, masses of American students are still opposed to the war.

I explained that SDS had been thinking about calling for a student strike for the past five months, that we had had many conversations, and were still not sure whether or not we wanted to call for the strike, or what form it might take. I did say that our intent was to work within an anti-imperialist framework, directing the actions against university complicity with the military-industrial complex whenever possible, and that strikes, if organized well, could conceivably be directed towards real power confrontations on several of the campuses. It seemed at the Madison NC that most SDS people did not want to call for a nationwide student strike on a specific date, but rather, wanted local campus groups to develop their strikes based on their local constituencies, striking if and when it became a viable tactic at the local level.

It seemed that the essential differences were between the SDS conception of a strike designed to build local political movements, some with the serious intent of ending campus complicity, as opposed to the Student Mobilization conception, which was the old mass mobilization thing, only given the name "strike" and occurring in local areas.

They were very conscious at the Mob meeting that SDS had been thinking about calling for a national student strike and they were very up-tight about their attempt to co-opt us by calling for the strike themselves. For a while, however, it seemed that they might actually do that. In the end, they decided to begin contacting people nationally and internationally, raising the idea of a strike and calling for a national conference sometime in December or January (after SDS has had the December NC, and some people from SNCC have had the chance to raise the idea at the December staff meeting.

The question of the Student Mobilization and the National Student Strike were discussed at the just-completed NIC meeting in Chicago. It seemed to those at the NIC meeting that if we do decide to call for a national student strike at the December NC (when the Convention resolution says the final decision is to be made), then it will be because SDS people think it is an important tactic and one which we want to succeed. It seemed also that the type of strike the Student Mobilization is talking about calling could possibly have a detrimental effect on our strike and subsequent action that we might want to take. Because a call has been issued by an organization for a single day strike, campus groups that are in a position to organize toward a strike will in many cases plan to hold theirs on the 19th. That will have the effect of structuring the development of local political groups in the kind of way that was seen as undesirable at the Madison NC.

As an organization, the Student Mobilization does not have the constituency to pull off a mass strike, and would be relying mainly on our people to add the numbers to their mass of American students. The feeling of the people at the NIC meeting was that SDS should make its decision at the December NC as planned, and if the decision is made to go ahead with the strike, then we should set up a strike committee and invite other organizations, like the Student Mobilization, to send proportional representation to that committee.

It is important to understand this discussion in the context of the NIC decision to recommend to SDS at the December NC that there be more active participation in the National Mobilization. Davidson's proposal for a "National Weeks of Resistance" called by the National Mobilization Committee could include as part of that nationwide resistance, some of those SDS strikes. The Student Mobilization committee could put their efforts into organizing campus and community demonstrations that would tie in with the "weeks of resistance" and the Vietnamese holiday of March 19th, without hurting the politics we would be trying to create with our strike.

One of the interesting parts of the Student Mobilization meeting was the decision about voting representation at the December Student Mob meeting to talk about calling the strike. The DuBois clubs wanted to give an NCNP type of 50-50 split to any black caucus that

continued on page 6



The '68 March

on Washington

... And More Particularly, the SDS Relationship to the Mobilization

Jeff Shero
National Interim Committee
New York

With the echo of the latest march in Washington still in our heads, the NIC took up the problem of the SDS relationship to the National Mobilization with a view to developing a new program of fuller participation in national actions. It was observed that at all the marches SDS chapters turn out a significant bulk of the demonstrators, but SDS has had little voice in the planning of the actions themselves. The old stance that activists' energies are better put to use on grass roots actions with a view to building a solid radical base, was not seriously questioned. Rather it was recognized as a need for many in the movement to have periodic national actions in order to develop local organizing. It was also argued that SDS' somewhat aloof posture from national marches has been interpreted as divisive to the general peace movement and that efforts should be made to better integrate SDS programs with those of other groups.

A decision was made to go to the National Mobilization committee meetings and argue for a restructuring of the committee to more closely represent the numbers which the various organizations actually turn out for actions. Besides arguing for a more representative restructuring, a spring national action—an International Weeks of Resistance—is to be suggested. It was seen that one to two weeks of resistance activity could unify all anti-war forces in a militant common campaign, while leaving each organization free to plan actions in accordance with the will of its membership. Thus SDS might integrate the student strike program into the weeks of resistance, while local Resistance groups are disrupting the draft centers, while adult peace groups might decide to encourage draft refusal, etc.

Three principal arguments for the plan were put forward. It was seen that as national sentiment grows increasingly hostile to the war, the establishment forces will move to split the Peace move-

ment, isolating the radicals who argue that the war is a logical outgrowth of the American political-economy and that the major issues confronting the society are interrelated, from the moderate peace forces who, if a division occurred, might well put their resources into a project like turning out the vote for Eugene McCarthy in key democratic primaries. It seemed particularly important at this time to maintain a working relationship with the less radical peace movement.

A second argument for working in the National Mobilization committee centered around several NIC members' perceptions that black organizations were opening up to the idea of working within the peace movement with white organizations. A restructured Mobilization committee was seen as a form where a working alliance based on the mutual respect developed during October 16 to 21 might take place.

Thirdly, sentiment was against a continuation of symbolic national actions, and it was thought instead of pronouncing a new program, it would be better to work with other groups in formulating plans for a "weeks of resistance."

Carl Davidson was put in overall charge of the program, with other NIC members providing assistance. A report of progress and a proposal will be brought to the December National Council meeting. Because the National Council is clearly a higher policy-making body than the NIC, all NIC members felt that the outlined program could only tentatively proceed, until the NC gave its approval or disapproval, or changed or amended the plan.

Want a printing press for your chapter?
Have Money?
Near New York City?
Contact:
SDS-New York Region
c/o Tim Morearity
41 Union Sq. W. Rm 436
New York, New York

Indiana University

continued from page 2

the next morning. Three student representatives saw Stahr and got nowhere with him. He gave the students the "I have no power" bit.

The next day, the Dean of Students announced that he was placing all 36 to 40 students involved in the Dow demonstration on critical disciplinary probation. Student Government, being continually pushed by the President of the Student Body, an SDS member, passed a resolution condemning the Dean of Students' action.

There is now talk that the administration is out "to get" five of us. The administration subscribes in public, at least, to the conspiracy theory. They want to rid the campus of those who have been sent here to make trouble.

All this is by no means over. And the campus knows it. Most important, the people in Bryan administration building have a new awareness of just what kind of changes we might be able to bring about. For Elvis Stahr learned something too. The student representatives who had the meeting with him gave him the real State of the University message: the move from

protest to
resistance
could mean

—any number of things
here in

quaint

southern

Indiana.

Dan Kaplan
UI SDS

*An outline of Carl Davidson's weeks of protest will be in next week's New Left Notes.

ON RESISTANCE STRATEGY

by Thad Marty

The Movement has reached a very delicate stage. On the one hand, the need is felt everywhere to move beyond a resistance mood and discreet resistance tactics to a strategy of resistance. Sharp personal opposition to oppressive authority has been established as a style. "We won't go" and "drive the military off the campus" have proved themselves as tactics designed to deprive the government of manpower. There is a general consensus amongst us that what comes next is the creation of a functional equivalent to a revolutionary party, or to say the same thing differently, the creation of a long-term strategy for achieving a socialist America which disciplines and coordinates the work of individuals and local groups. Almost without words, as if by tacit agreement, resistance to the war in Vietnam has taken on the dimension of building a long-term resistance movement against fascism, and for socialism.

But on the other hand, in tension with these indications of seriousness, these exciting prospects for revolutionary change, there exists a tendency prematurely to escalate rhetoric and structure in an essentially romantic manner. This shows itself in the adoption of a vocabulary derived from guerrilla movements at a moment when none of us have the slightest idea how guerrilla warfare with any prospect for success might materialize in the United States. Romanticism shows itself also in the temptation to convene small groups of self-appointed leaders presumably to constitute themselves nuclei of future central committees. Should we not recognize that almost no one in the white portion of the Movement has a constituency or "base" off the campus, almost no one belongs to a non-student community which has mandated leadership to him? and that hence the patient building of regional structures from below remains our first task?

These contrasting tendencies have an objective basis. The peculiarity of a resistance movement is to combine life-and-death struggle with reaching-out to new constituencies. Ordinarily we think of militant resistance and flexible coalition-building as contrasting political styles. Building a resistance movement requires the ability to combine them. Exactly that is what Lenin called for in *What Is To Be Done?* (a centralized party of professional revolutionaries and anti-autocratic agitation among all classes), what Mao and Ho practiced in developing movements to defeat the Japanese and to take power.

A current illustration: In confronting campus recruiters we have acted as if it were necessary to choose between "bourgeois democratic" rhetoric and obstructive tactics. But in general, a resistance movement against fascism begins poorly by handing the First Amendment to its antagonists; we should present ourselves as the most consistent defenders of threatened democratic values. Concretely, this would mean not permitting oneself to be talked out of obstruction, but at the same time defending obstruction as a valid action within a civil liberties framework. So long as what we do is nonviolent obstructive civil disobedience, our rhetoric can defend this action within a civil liberties framework by offering the same opportunity for nonviolent obstruction to the hawks and YAFs.

What is key is inwardly believing both that our Movement can win majority support and that socialism is possible in our lifetimes. Since World War I American radicals have lacked real conviction on both counts.

About majority support: We need to analyze comparatively the resistance movements of Yugoslavia, China and Vietnam (which defeated foreign invaders and took power), the resistance movements of France and Italy (which mobilized mass resistance to fascism but did not try to take power), nonviolent resistance movements as in India and Norway, and popular front movements in the

United States. In addition to extremely difficult objective circumstances, poor leadership and inadequate attitudes contributed to the failure of the latter. The American Communist Party behaved in the 1930's as if it lacked confidence in the possibility of leading in its own name; it behaved in the late 1940's and 1950's as if it depended on the law, rather than on the people, to protect it. The traditional style of revolutionary socialists is to use legal proceedings to prosecute the prosecutors, in the same way that the socialist elected to legislative bodies speaks "durch das Fenster" (through the window), not to his fellow legislators but to the people out of doors. This attitude was magnificently exemplified by Eugene Debs when under trial for sedition in World War I. But it cannot be assumed mechanically. It requires confidence that the people can be reached.

Our new concern to organize in white working-class constituencies would appear to indicate a resurgence of such confidence. Along with that confidence there will develop, hopefully, a less cavalier attitude toward American revolutionary traditions. Without disguising the "bourgeois democratic" features of the American Revolution, the abolitionist movement, the labor movement, even of black radicalism in many of its phases, we like Debs ought to be able to feel a tradition at our backs, to distinguish those features of earlier movements which were circumscribed by racism or a belief in private property from such enduring concepts as the right to revolution, internationalism ("my country is the world"), the primacy of human rights ("the earth belongs to the living").

About the possibility of socialism: The term "resistance" opens a door here. Instead of a movement gradually advancing toward socialism by electing more and more Congressmen who nationalize more and more industries, we begin to glimpse a movement dialectically advancing toward socialism through a process of defending democracy. The probability is that we will fail and all be killed. But it means much, it offers new hope, to know that in Western industrialized societies in the twentieth century there have been resistance movements which came to the threshold of socialism, of power. The most striking instance was the Spartacus movement in Germany during World War I. Here there was no foreign invader, as in France during World War II, nor was the presence of a friendly foreign army required to create a revolutionary situation, as in World War II Italy. German defeat in the summer of 1918 very nearly made it possible for a movement which had opposed the war with the slogan, "the main enemy is at home" to become the German government.

The Spartacus experience brings us back to resistance to the Vietnam war, for the possibility of revolution in World War I Germany grew directly from total opposition to the imperialist policy of one's own government. (It is even the case that the strongest Spartacus constituency was in Stuttgart, where during the war special efforts had been made to assist deserting soldiers.) It would appear justified tentatively to extrapolate the tactical lessons of the movement against the war in Vietnam into a sketch of a resistance strategy.

First, imperialist war rather than economic depression creates the revolutionary situation. The tendency to economic depression has been held in check precisely by overseas investment, by war and preparation for war to protect the possibility of such investments, in short by the "permanent war economy." But this does not extricate capitalism from crisis. The crisis is shifted, displaced. Revolution against world capitalism begins at that system's weakest links, in colonial and semi-colonial Third World societies. And in the imperialist homeland, oppression takes the form of the draft rather than depression. The permanent unemployment of death replaces the temporary unemployment of joblessness.

The industrial reserve army is absorbed in the front-line conscript army of imperialism.

Second, however much American society may have stabilized an "affluent society" at home, its international position is eroding. Socialism continues to spread across the face of the earth. Like the South on the eve of the Civil War, American capitalism is economically expansive and yet fundamentally on the defensive against a more productive economic system which grows and spreads more rapidly than itself. Wars like the war in Vietnam therefore become chronic. Perhaps, as Che Guevara wrote, it will even be the case before long that the United States will find itself involved in several such wars at once. Or those who govern the United States may be mad enough to take on revolutionary China. In either case, imperialist warmaking would make more demands upon American society, the possibilities of resistance would cease to be merely tactical and become strategic. One would begin to be able to consider a movement which sought not merely to end one war, but to end the system which produced the war.

Third, it must be expected that as the defense of world capitalism becomes more demanding, and as resistance to that defense grows stronger in the United States, the American government will turn toward repression. We should anticipate that such repression will be more prolonged and more severe than in the McCarthy period. For one thing, then there was a real "Communist menace" overseas but an invented one at home; now, Communist-led socialist movements abroad are complemented by a real "menace," the black liberation movement, in the United States. And in the second place, as American capitalism loses the world struggle of competing economic



Resistance in action at Oberlin, Oct. 26, where over a hundred were held captive until they were dispersed by tear gas and fire.

systems it will become ever more hysterical, it will thrash about more wildly, it will act more and more short-sightedly. Nevertheless precisely this repression will make it possible for a movement against war and imperialism to broaden into a movement against fascism as well. Precisely this repression will attract new allies to us: liberals alarmed by attacks on the First Amendment, workers stirred by restriction of the right to strike. Under this repression we will mature into worthy comrades of the more-oppressed and more-experienced black radicals who no doubt will give leadership to the movement as a whole.

Repression need not be provoked. It is coming.

Repression should not lead us to adopt a wholly negative posture, to concentrate on destruction. One of the reasons Ho's leadership was accepted, say the Vietnamese, is that he had a vision of the future.

If we can avoid the escalation of rhetoric and an overly-conspiratorial approach to organization, if we can become more militant at the same time that we reach out to off-campus America, then just possibly we can use our antagonist's aggression as the means of his downfall, and through resistance find the path to a socialist America.

Joe Pool Finds Commies 'Neath Radical Press Bush

LIBERATION News Service

Marshall Bloom

A "preliminary investigation" of underground newspapers has been called for by HUAC member Joe Pool (D-Texas).

The call apparently came following a speech by Pool at the Conservative Party of the Yale Political Union on November 6, where Pool revealed that "I have information that throughout the United States underground newspapers will be published as a nationwide underground press syndicate. The purpose of these newspapers will be to slander and libel everyone who opposes these traitors in their attempts to destroy the American government."

Pool—who has already made a major plank of his re-election campaign in Dallas the harassment of NOTES FROM THE UNDERGROUND, a member of LIBERATION News Service and the Underground Press Syndicate—did not state in his speech that he had called for the investigation of the underground press (although he did call for a HUAC investigation of SDS, Veterans for Peace, Committee for Independent Political Action, Stop the Draft Week Committee, Progressive Labor Party, SNCC and Resistance.)

This fact was revealed by his spokeswoman, who would not give her name for attribution. She stated that Pool could not reveal whether the preliminary investigation of the underground press had been begun by HUAC, since its executive sessions are private.

The Yale speech was given two weeks after the merger meeting of LNS and UPS which was attended by 300 newspaper representatives. This meeting on the eve of the October 21 Pentagon Confrontation may have been Pool's reference, since the attack on underground newspapers, the major part of Pool's address, came after a criticism of the demonstrators

at the Pentagon as "motley, die-hard, rear-guard characters."

"The people of our country have not heard the last of such traitors, however," Pool said, moving on to talk about the spreading of the "underground news syndicate." "These smut sheets are today's Molotov cocktails thrown at respectability and decency in our nation," Pool explained.

Reviving a charge made against Socrates, Pool said that the underground newspapers "capitalize on the innocence and confusion of the very young."

Even though they capitalize, these newspapers are "the newest Communist strategy," and people say these activities are not communist inspired! To them, my best answer is: Who benefits most by such strategy? The communists brag about being a part of the draft resistance movement in the United States. These underground newspapers are an integral part of their plans, and all responsible U.S. newspapermen condemn their gutter journalism."

Several times in his speech, Pool blamed the right of free speech as the cause of these newspapers. "The plan of this underground press syndicate is to take advantage of that part of the First Amendment which protects newspapers and gives them freedom of press," he complained.

"A revolution of some kind," a "destroy America movement" and the encouragement of a "readership of potential degenerates" are what he took to be the various goals of the underground press. "They know that the more obscene and dirty their newspapers are, the more they will attract the irresponsible readers whom they want to enlist in their crusade to destroy this country."

But Pool is not merely a cranky, middle-aged man. In Dallas, the Southern next page....

Selections Made for Cuba Trip

Jeff Shero
National Interim Committee
New York

Choosing between human beings, judging friends, is a particularly difficult and unwanted task. In selecting people for the Cuba trip the primary criteria applied by the NIC was how much others in the movement would benefit from a particular person's experiences and political insights. We looked toward choosing people who had recently been active in their own locales, and who would continue doing speaking and writing in their areas upon their return. The criteria of geographical distribution and importance to the person's political development were also considered.

The NIC was mandated by the national council to choose at least half of the members of the trip from chapters. Be-

cause nominations came from only twelve chapters, the selection was weighted against those older, more well-known SDS members who are regional office members, campus travellers, etc. Many strong activists in the non-campus group were not selected because there were approximately 10 slots and thirty applications.

The current plans are to send Carl Davidson to Cuba to the Third World Intellectual's Conference in early January as an SDS observer and to finalize arrangements for the two-week tour. The NIC will also select one other person, along with Davidson, to attend the Conference, although Carl will be the only official observer.

The tour itself will take place in the early part of February. The SDS members will journey to Cuba via Mexico City if State Department travel permits can be obtained, or through Prague if they can't. Because the cost to each individual will be about \$500 if the journey must be made through Prague, and because the trip will coincide with many university's exam periods, a prioritized list of ten alternates were also chosen. One of the eleven national officers will participate in the trip as a leader and coordinator of the tour.

The names of the people selected, as well as the alternates, will be published in New Left Notes after they have been notified.

100 people held a naval recruiter
e hoses used by police. photo @ P Martyn

CHAPTER TAX NEEDED TO PAY CONVENTION DEBT

Boe Shomer
Financial Secretary

The axe is about to descend on the University of Michigan VOICE (SDS) chapter in the form of the loss of its officially recognized status on campus. The issue responsible is hardly a radical one—it is simply money. An outstanding bill of \$850, incurred by the SDS National Convention last June, must be paid by the end of the semester in mid-December or VOICE will lose all of its rights to access to University facilities.

The National Office had agreed to pay all of the expenses of the Convention, estimated at a maximum of \$500. VOICE has protested the addition of \$350 to the bill to cover the costs of fire marshals, but so far to no avail.

It is impossible for the NO to pay this bill. (Within the next month a coach house behind the Radical Education Center must be torn down before liability insurance on the property can be obtained, additional electrical work is needed in the NO to operate the new press, and the expenses of a fund-raising campaign for the press must be paid.) VOICE, with an average monthly expenditure of about \$50 is likewise unable to defray such a proportionately huge expense.

This bill was incurred by every SDS chapter participating in the June Convention. Neither VOICE nor the NO can be expected to bear the expenses or administrative repercussions alone—it must be borne by us all. And that means the realization of the commitment to pay the chapter tax.

Few SDS chapters have made any attempts to pay the \$5.00 per national member agreed upon at the April NC. While the NO did agree to pay for the convention when VOICE accepted the responsibility of holding it in Ann Arbor, the chapters had made a previous commitment to support the NO.

What the chapter tax boils down to is a buck a week for five weeks. Is that really so much to ask, to permit the NO staff to continue to receive \$20 per week (two-thirds of subsistence) throughout the winter, and to free VOICE from a hassle that may seriously undermine their efforts to organize the campus around the real issues?

..... Underground Press

Methodist University SDS Chapter dissolved itself under the heat of Pool's attack last month, the Dallas Draft Information Center was illegally evicted from its office and NOTES FROM THE UNDERGROUND was banned from campus in a double-think statement by the President of SMU defending freedom of the press.

This past year, Pool has introduced a bill to Congress to prevent the disruption of the Selective Service System, and a bill to prohibit Americans from sending tangible aid to any group engaged in armed conflict with the U.S.

As a strong believer in "our beloved freedoms," Pool has recently urged that "Congress should deny funds to any university which permits SDS to have an organized chapter on its campus."

Old Scarbally Meets The People (he thinks)

Patty Lee Parmalee
UC Irvine SDS

Do you remember hearing some months ago (I believe it was after the massacre of June 23rd in Los Angeles) that Johnson only wanted friendly crowds? And people wondered how the hell he was going to go campaigning? Since he has hardly emerged into the public at all since then, people may have forgotten. But he made a sudden or at least unannounced decision to appear at several military bases across the country on Veteran's Day, Nov. 10. Note that he appears only on military bases. Not just because of dying enthusiasm for the war needs resuscitation, but because he only wants friendly crowds. Get this:

LBJ was scheduled to land with McNamara at El Toro Marine Air Station in Orange County, California at 12:20 that Friday, to speak briefly and greet Vietnam returnees for a total of 1/2 hour. The base was to be opened to the public. Having found out about it only 24 hours beforehand, and with no clear idea of what kind of action to take, SDS and Orange County Peace Center people showed up around 11:00 at Gate 1. Cars were streaming through; we all parked outside the gate and started demonstrating outside, holding signs and giving leaflets to drivers. Civilian cops were buzzing. Meanwhile some kids, leaving their signs and leaflets behind, decided to go onto the base and get a place from which to cheer No. 1 at inappropriate places in his speech. Nothing doing—batteries of guards at the gate wouldn't allow kids who had been demonstrating. "Why not? The base is open to the public, you can't just arbitrarily decide to keep us off."

"We don't have to justify our decisions to you—you'll stay off because we say so." was the answer. Rather than argue I walked back among the cars to hitch a ride through, taking off my sunglasses and SDS buttons so as not to be recognized. Two hippielike guys in a truck picked me up.

At the gate the MP's waved us over and looked through the back of the truck thoroughly—for guns, I thought; for grass the boys feared, but when they looked through a newspaper we realized it was for signs of leaflets. This was just like driving a car into East Germany.

We were allowed to drive onto the base, waved on by Marines, across dirt roads and fields. We passed school children holding signs—presumably pro-Johnson signs let in with no trouble. Finally we were told to park a mile and a half from the speaker's platform. When we got out of the car a man in civilian clothes materialized from nowhere and took away the leaflet I had given one of the boys, flashing a star in his wallet so quickly that I couldn't see what department of repression he was from. I put my buttons back on and we walked to the nearest of three long lines of people, waiting to get on buses to be taken back

that mile and a half. I went first to one of the marines regulating the line and asked if I couldn't walk instead of riding the bus because I had to catch a plane and couldn't wait (true). "No," he barked. "No one walks anywhere away from this line, and if we catch you trying..."

So we went to the end of a line and enjoyed encouraging a little girl to throw rocks for practice, till her mother screamed at her to stop. Air Force I landed nearby, and mothers pointed for their children who oohed and aahed and admired their Fuhrer (the most frightening thing of the day). Finally I got to the front of the line. A Marine standing at the bus entrance to inspect people looked at me and ordered, "Stand over there!" What the hell? I thought. "Let's see your buttons!" He was virtually yelling, like to a drill squad. I took them off and handed them to him, wondering if he thought I was going to use the pins to stab the President. The guy started sending messages off via runners and a guard was assigned to watch me so the other guy could go on-honest-frisking people. I got to watch about 5 minutes. Each woman wanting to get on the bus had to open her purse, and the guy didn't just glance inside, he looked through everything in there including leafing through a check-book. No one seemed to mind.

Then two big guys in civilian suits came up, demanded to see my buttons, and one of them said really brutally, "Get over there," nodding toward a jeep that had just pulled up. I went, along with the other one, who ordered me into the back in the same tone. He got in the front and ordered the driver to go the two miles back to Gate 1. I realized that simply because I was in silent disagreement with a speaker they were actually going to all the trouble of throwing me out before he spoke.

The jeep stopped inside the base and the boss guy escorted me outside, ordering the guards not to let me in again. Kids standing outside later told me that descriptions of people forbidden entrance were radioed to the other entrance, too.

There is not much to comment on the surreal, fascist-state experience, except to point out that that is where Johnson's at. He is clearly terrified of the people. The man has become utterly paranoid, setting up speaking situations that decrease his actual popularity, but allow him to continue in his mad delusion that the people do not hate him. He is deliberately hiding himself deeper and deeper in complete unreality; presumably his whole campaign will be conducted in places where the audience can be selected. The country is that far gone already.



"I believe very strongly in the right to dissent." (UPI)

from the Chicago Sun-Times, Nov. 18

"symbolically enacting a law which is urgently needed"

continued from page 1

to be protected by the due process clause of the 14th Amendment. It soon became established in constitutional law that the regulation of business was not a deprivation of a civil liberty, that what is known as "substantive due process" would apply only to cases where real persons were being deprived of their rights of free expression. Today, it is well established constitutionally that the U. S. government could make illegal the manufacture of napalm, and charge any persons recruiting for a napalm-manufacturing company with conspiring to violate the law.

But: there is no such law. Indeed, the government itself has ordered the napalm manufactured by Dow, and is using it to burn and kill Vietnamese peasants. Should private citizens (students, faculty—in this instance) act themselves, by physical interposition, against Dow Chemical's business activities? To do so would be to "take the law into your own hands." That is exactly what civil disobedience is: the temporary taking of the law into one's own hands, in order to declare what the law should be. It is a declaration that there is an incongruence between the law and humane values, and that sometimes this can only be publicized by breaking the law.

Civil disobedience can take two forms: violating a law which is obnoxious; or symbolically enacting a law which is urgently needed. When Negroes sat-in at lunch counters, they were engaging in both forms: they violated state laws on segregation and trespassing; they were also symbolically enacting a public accommodations law even before it was written into the civil rights act of 1964.

Most of us, I assume, would support civil disobedience under some circumstances: we would commend those who defied the Fugitive Slave Act by harboring a Negro slave, and those who symbolically enacted emancipation by trying to prevent soldiers in Boston from returning Anthony Burns to his master. Otherwise—to declare that the law in all circumstances is to be obeyed—is to suppress the very spirit of democracy, to surrender individual conscience to an omnipotent state. Thus the issue becomes: under what circumstances is civil disobedience justified and is the Dow Chemical situation one of those circumstances?

National Mobilization

continued from page 3

might develop, while SNCC and SDS were represented by an argument for one man/one vote on the assumption that anyone who comes to the meeting will do so because they have a specific interest in the strike. One of the fears raised by some of the people there was that some of the larger groups might use their size to pack the meetings and "push their lines, i.e., do their things." I guess we should keep that in mind as a possible, disgusting, eventuality.

The Student Mobilization committee itself is not a paper organization. In too many cases, Mob chapters exist in the absence of SDS chapters, doing the same kinds of things SDS chapters would do. The Washington area is an example of this. The lack until recently of a developed regional SDS program produced a large number of Mob chapters. In Los Angeles where the region has existed longer than in Washington, the Mobilization regional office has nearly ceased to exist. One of the reasons for the decision at the NIC meeting to work more actively within the National Mobilization committee was because so many of these Student Mobilization chapters have grown up around either April 15 or October 21 and have a great potential to move into more than mass confrontation politics. A worthwhile concern for SDS would be trying to reach those Mob chapters, not necessarily to turn them into card-carrying SDS people, but to get more of our thoughts into the stuff they're doing.

It seems to me there are two essential conditions for the right to civil disobedience. One is that the human value at stake must involve fundamental rights, like life, health, liberty. There is no real cause, for instance, to disobey a traffic light because it is inconveniently long. But human slavery, or racism, or war—these are overwhelmingly important. Thus, the argument "what if everyone disobeyed the law every time it displeased them" falls before the observable fact that those who engage in civil disobedience are almost always law-abiding citizens who on certain very important issues deliberately, openly, temporarily violate the law to communicate a vital message to their fellow citizens.

What of Dow Chemical and napalm? Four American physicians, in a report, "Medical Problems of South Vietnam," have written: "Napalm is a highly sticky inflammable jelly which clings to anything it touches and burns with such heat that all oxygen in the area is exhausted within moments. Death is either by roasting or by suffocation. Napalm wounds are often fatal (estimates are 90%). Those who survive face a living death. The victims are frequently children." Napalm is dropped daily on the villages, the forests, the people of Vietnam by American bombers; the saturation bombing of that tiny country is one of the cruelest acts perpetrated by any nation in modern history; it ranks with the destruction of Lidice by the Germans, the crushing of the Hungarian rebellion by the Russians, the recent mass slaughter in Indonesia. Dr. Richard E. Perry, an American physician, wrote in Redbook in January, 1967, on his return from Vietnam: "I have been an orthopedic surgeon for a good number of years, with rather a wide range of medical experience. But nothing could have prepared me for my encounters with Vietnamese women and children burned by napalm. It was shocking and sickening, even for a physician, to see and smell the blackened flesh."

We are not, then, dealing with trivialities, but with monstrous deeds. This fact somehow becomes lost in the bland, reasoned talk of businessmen and university officials, who speak as if Dow were just another business firm, recruiting for some innocuous purpose, making radios or toothpaste.

The root issue, it should be clear, is not simply napalm; it is the Vietnam war as a whole, in which a far-off country is being systematically destroyed, and its population decimated, by the greatest military power on earth. The war itself is the object of the civil disobedience; the use of napalm is one particularly bestial tactic in this war.



AP Wirephoto

Himself, illustrating all about how there's "a difference between constructive dissent and stormtrooper bullying, throwing yourself down in the road, smashing windows, rowdyism, and every time a person attempts to speak trying to drown him out."

Because, after all, our Vietnam policy is the only sane response to a situation akin to seeing "a little child in this room who was trying to waddle across the floor and some big bully started stomping it." (We have to fill up this space with something, and besides, that Nov. 17 press conference was so fine. The man is obviously suffering from a rapid loss of his mind.) As he says, "If I have done a good job of anything since I have been President, it is to ensure that there are plenty of dissenters."

This brings us to the second condition for civil disobedience: the inadequacy of legal channels for redressing the grievance. This is manifestly true in the case of the Vietnam war, which is being waged completely outside the American constitutional process, by the President and a handful of advisors. Congress is troubled, but follows sheeplike what the White House decrees. The Supreme Court, by tradition, leaves foreign policy questions to the "political" branches of government (the President and Congress) but recently one of its more conservative members, Justice Potter Stewart, said that perhaps the Court should review the constitutionality of the war. This, after 100,000 American casualties! Citizens have taken to the auditoriums and to the streets precisely because they have no other way to protest; yet both President and Vice-President declare with the brazenness of petty dictators that no civic outcry will change their policy. If ever there was an issue which called for civil disobedience, it is this run-away war.

Then why do we become uneasy when students interfere with Dow Chemical? Occasionally, we read of housewives blocking off a busy intersection because children have been killed there as a result

of the lack of traffic lights. These housewives thereby interfere with the freedom of automobiles and of pedestrians, in order to temporarily regulate, or even disrupt, traffic, on behalf of the lives of children—hoping this will lead to the permanent regulation of traffic by government. (Those are not the automobiles that killed the child, anymore than this Dow Chemical representative, or the student he is recruiting, is actually dropping the napalm bomb.)

Why do we so easily sympathize with actions like that, where perhaps one child was killed, and not with actions against Dow Chemical, where countless children have been victims? It is possible that we subconsciously distinguish between the identifiable children down the street (who move us), and the faceless children of that remote Asian land (who do not)? Is it possible also that the well-dressed, harassed representative of Dow Chemical is more human, therefore more an object of sympathy, to the well-dressed, harassed officials of the University (and to us), than the burning, bleeding, blurred faces of the Vietnamese?

There is a common argument which says: but where will these student actions lead? If we justify one act of civil disobedience, must we not justify them all? Do they then have the right to disobey the Civil Rights Acts? Where does it stop? That argument withers away, however, once we recognize the distinction between free speech, where absolute toleration is a social good, and free action, where the existence of values other than free speech demands that we choose right over wrong—and respond accordingly. We should remember that the social utility of free speech is in giving us the informational base from which we can then make social choices

continued on page 7

The New York Region is starting an offset print shop comparable in size to the one in the NO. To do this we need money (\$3,000-4,000) and equipment at low prices. A list of equipment we need follows: 1 Multilith 1250 (or comparable press) 1 Webendorfer or Chief 22 (17x22") or a Harris stream fed (17x22) 1 folder (17x22) & 1 folder (approx. 10x13) 1 paper cutter (prefer power model) 1 plate burner (17x2u22u) 1 camera (17x22) 1 headliner 1 justwriter (typesetter) light tables darkroom equipment staplers and/or stitchers SDS Free Press, 41 Union Sq. W. Room 436 New York, New York.

SDS GLOSSARY

The "Knick-Knacks" Unveiled

1. SDS-Students for a Democratic Society. An undefined term.
2. NO-National Office Administrative, co-ordinative center in Chicago, staffed by poor harrassed radicals.
3. NAC-National Administrative Committee. A 9-man body elected at each NC (see below) to serve as a watchdog on the operations of the NO (see above).
4. NIC-National Interim Committee 11 officers, elected at the annual convention, who meet periodically to make political decisions and impliment policies determined at conventions and NCs.
5. NC-National Council A body composed of one representative for every twenty-five national members in each chapter. Makes policy decisions and may mandate committees or individuals to carry them out.
6. REC-Radical Education Center A newly-formed center devoted to internal education, practical research, development of a traveling-organizer program, and expansion of the existing SDS literature.
7. REAC-Radical Education Administrative Committee (What the NAC is to the NO!?) Primarily makes decisions on questions related to literature production.
8. NLN-New Left Notes YOU'RE READING IT, BABY!

—Boe Shomer

Resistance Busts

Don't Get Mad, Get Even!

continued from page 1

served; both students and non-students were contacted by the University. Later reports have it that University officials opened confidential files held in various University offices to federal marshals. This overt collaboration surprised no one. Penn State receives 90% of its "research" budget from the Department of Defense. Further, Penn State operates on-campus facilities called the Ordnance Research Labs which develop small and medium capacity arms; the Thomas Water Tunnel carries out sophisticated underwater sound detection experiments and is an important national center for torpedo and underwater missile design and experimentation. Penn State also operates a nuclear submarine test base under DOD contract in Italy. The Aerospace Engineering, Electrical Engineering and Psychology Departments are heavily sub-

sidized by DOD money. University President Eric Walker, inventor of sonar, is on the Board of Directors of the Institute for Defense Analysis and the National Science Foundation; several years ago he served as the latter institution's president. Walker, a power-hungry fascist, had previously stated in private that University files were closed to federal investigative groups.

It is obvious that a challenge to government suppression on the University's part would endanger both the fantastic war budget and the personal power of Walker. Rather than being an act of complicity, University participation with the forces of fascism is a predictable act of brotherly solidarity.

No one is particularly pissed off; we agree wholeheartedly with the dictum of the anarchist Millen: "Don't get mad, get even."

EAT DOG FOOD THIS THANKSGIVING

ALPO represents a sickness in our society. While two-thirds of mankind suffers undernourishment, our own upper classes live amidst superfluous abundance. Must the "profit-motive" feed pure beef to dogs while hundreds of millions of people beg for cereal? A lack of protein causes 35% to 40% of the 20 million babies born in India each year to eventually suffer some degree of brain damage. They are so mentally and physically stunted by lack of protein that they will never be able to concentrate sufficiently to absorb and retain knowledge. Millions of sub-humans are produced annually. Alpo soes have a high concentration of protein, but it will be fed to dogs if that is more profitable. The world's population is expected to double in 30 years. Population in most hungry countries is growing much faster than in opulent countries. For instance, in Latin America population will almost triple from 250 million to about 700 million by the end of the century. If we are to avoid "the biggest famine in history" which poses a serious threat to peace, we must feed People before dogs, and place Human values above dollar values. We hereby demand that the profit made by Alpo be given to help the starving people of the world. WHIP--World Health Instead of Poverty-has announced that it is planning to protest the making of Alpo dog food on Thanksgiving. Cans of Alpo dog food will be eaten by the demonstrators in front of the Allen Packing Company in Allentown Pa. The demonstration will begin at 10:00am November 23.

Dow at Harvard

Hutch Jenness Harvard-Radcliffe SDS

In early October, SDS started an educational campaign against the Central Intelligence Agency, asking Harvard not to host CIA recruiters in November. But intellectual resistance to university involvement with the war turned physical on October 25th when hundreds of students and faculty just back from Washington discovered a Dow Chemical Corporation recruiter mysteriously in their midst. An on-the-spot vote turned the early morning picket into a sit-in. Dow's Dr. Leavitt soon left Conant Hall, explaining that his assistant would interview chemists there. But the demonstrators abandoned the stooge for Mallinckrodt hall, where Leavitt had again set up shop. At 10:00 a.m. Harvard's dean of students read the riot act to the first 140 sit-inners. Before he could ask spokesmen for their student IDs, we pooled our cards. Picket-lines drew more students and faculty to Mallinckrodt, and 400 cards were turned in by evening to share responsibility. 100 more came later, as the deans threatened dismissal for some 35 "ringleaders" apparently picked out for high visibility or previous radical activities (MacNamara, etc.)

Several hundred Harvard and Cambridge police stayed on alert, while the Harvard and Radcliffe deans held council just off the corridor where we debated the sit-ins target and demands. Since the university consistently disclaimed responsibility for Leavitt's presence, the question was whether Leavitt should promise never to come back himself or should call headquarters for Dow's corporate pledge.

At 6:30 p.m. we let Leavitt leave, the recruiting day over, and passed a demand that the university bar all Dow, CIA, and regular military recruiters. Michael Ansara chaired the debate, and his statement that we would "bring the university as they know it to an end" became the target of faculty furor. Our rejection of Harvard's role as assembly-line for U.S. foreign policy was interpreted as arrogation to ourselves of all university decisions.

The first of the week's crisis meetings continued in Mallinckrodt until 8:30 p.m., with at least half of the newly-proclaimed movement not previously active in SDS. Those who sat-in, and those who would have, formed smaller groups in the Harvard and Radcliffe Houses and signed letters of collective responsibility. Several law professors unsuccessfully tried to stay disciplinary action, as the administration dropped its facade of impartiality. Petitions of all stripes were circulated among students and faculty, and campus groups ranging from the CRIMSON editorial board to PBH (representing some 1000 social service volunteers) demanded no punishment and a review of the political issues raised by the sit-in. Remembering Berkeley, the faculty eventually put 81 undergraduates on probation and tentatively approved a student-faculty administration committee to probe recruiting, protest, and university involvement with the war. In his first such press conference since McCarthy days, President Pusey announced that the punishment had been based solely on "the physical obstruction of an individual."

This argument carries much weight among liberal students and faculty. When we say that Dr. Leavitt's personal inconvenience was irrelevant or "the lesser of two evils", they hear "the end justifies the means." Few doubt that napalm is extraordinarily evil, and many would grant our claims of genocide. But to justify our actions at Harvard, we must show the specific ties of the university to the war, just as to justify MacNamara's detainment last year we had to show how he was using Harvard as a sounding-board. Underlying the fallacious distinction between belief and action (oppose the war but stay in line) is a feeling of distance from the war. Harvard is supposed to be neutral, a place for ideas instead of force. We point out that ROTC trains students in violence, and that political groups like SNCC aren't allowed to recruit here. But these are correctable imperfections. Napalm nightmares bring the war a little closer to home, but training reactionary leaders for underdeveloped countries is a proper function of the Business School. Dow is our least subtle enemy, and war recruitment will not end just because the CIA decided to skip Harvard this time. It is our job to turn horror of genocide into a determination to change the system we call imperialism, or the military-industrial elite. This elite comes from the universities.

may not express themselves on public issues. It is time (if not now, when?) asks the Old Testament) for the University to forsake the neutrality of the I.B.M. machines, and join the human race. ((Printed reprints of this article are available from Liberation News Service, 1729 Church St. N.W., Washington, D.C.)

Resistance Busts in Denver

Tom Harris
University of Colorado

The first busts resulting from our October 16 action have been made here and in Denver. Three students who returned their cards, Mendel Cooper of Denver University and Allen Haifley and myself of Colorado University, have been arrested on charges of "refusal to possess" and "mutilation of" our draft cards. We were arraigned on Friday, November 3, and given separate dates for preliminary hearings, beginning Thursday, November 9.

We have obtained legal aid from three Denver lawyers. This aid has been given us free of charge, but due to the nature of the defense planned by these attorneys, some funds are needed desperately. We plan to challenge the constitutionality of the Universal Military Training and Service Act without a formal Declaration of

War and also the legality of the present U.S. action in Vietnam.

Preparing such a case will require a great deal of time on the part of our lawyers, as well as transportation for witnesses to testify against the war and the draft.

We are in the process of contacting professors at the Universities and other people in the Denver area regarding financial assistance, but more money is still needed. If you have any available funds or know of possible sources in your area, please let us know.

Since this is the first direct confrontation with the courts, it has been suggested that sympathetic demonstrations around the country might be helpful. We will notify you when our trials begin if you are interested in this. If you have any other ideas, your suggestions will be appreciated.

The Colorado Resistance is in the process of obtaining two new, permanent offices, one in Boulder and one in Denver. Until then, we can still be reached at 160 Arnett, Boulder Colo. 80302.

"the University does not understand what civil liberties are"

continued from page 6

in action. To limit free speech is to distort our capacity to make such choices. To refrain from making choices is to say that beyond the issue of free speech we have no substantive values which we will express in action. If we do not discriminate in the actions we support or oppose, we cannot rectify the terrible injustices of the present world.

Whether the issue of the Vietnam war is more effectively presented by protest and demonstration (that is, the exercise of speech, press, assembly) rather than by civil disobedience, is a question of tactics, and varies with each specific situation. Different student groups (at Harvard and M.I.T., for instance) have used one or another against Dow recruitment, and each tactic has its own advantages. I tend to favor the protest tactic as keeping the central issue of the war clearer. But, if students or faculty engaged in civil disobedience, I would consider that morally defensible.

So much for student-faculty action—but what of the University administration? The University's acceptance of Dow Chemical recruiting as just another business transaction is especially disheartening, because it is the University which tells students repeatedly on ceremonial occasions that it hopes students will be more than fact-absorbing automatons, that they will choose humane values, and stand up for them courageously. For the University to sponsor Dow Chemical activities as a protective civil

liberty means that the University (despite its courses in Constitutional Law) still accepts the 19th century definition of substantive due process as defending corporations against regulation, that (despite a library with books on civil liberties) the University still does not understand what civil liberties are, that (despite its entrance requirement of literacy) the University has not read in the newspapers of the terrible damage our napalm bombs have done to innocent people.

The fact that there is only an indirect connection between Dow recruiting students and napalm dropped on Vietnamese villages, does not vitiate the moral issue. It is precisely the nature of modern mass murder that it is not visibly direct like individual murder, but takes on a corporate character, where every participant has limited liability. The total effect, however, is a thousand times more pernicious, than that of the individual entrepreneur of violence. If the world is destroyed, it will be a white-collar crime, done in a business-like way, by large numbers of individuals involved in a chain of actions, each one having a touch of innocence.

Sometimes the University speaks of the "right of recruitment." There is no absolute right of recruitment, however, because (beyond the package of civil liberties connected with free expression and procedural guarantees, which are the closest we can get to "absolute" right)

all rights are relative. I doubt that B.U. would open its offices to the Ku Klux Klan for recruiting, or that it would apply an absolute right of private enterprise to peddlers selling poisonous food on campus. When the University of Pennsylvania announced it would end its germ-warfare research project, it was saying that there is no absolute right to do research on anything, for any purpose.

The existence of University "security" men (once known as campus police) testifies that all actions on campus are not equally tolerable. The University makes moral choices all the time. If it can regulate the movement of men into women's dormitories (in a firm stand for chastity or perhaps some other value equally dear), then why cannot it regulate the coming and going of corporations into the University, where the value is human life, and the issue is human suffering?

And if students are willing to take the risks of civil disobedience, to declare themselves for the dying people of Vietnam, cannot the University take a milder step—but one which makes the same declaration—and cancel the invitation to Dow Chemical? Why cannot the University—so much more secure—show a measure of social commitment, a bit of moral courage? Should not the University, which speaks so often of students having "values," declare some of its own? It is written on no tablets handed down from heaven that the officials of a University

Stokely Carmichael's "Black Power"

Leif Johnson

Black Power is currently a favorite topic of the corporate press. Black Power is being distorted, ridiculed, and explained away by corporate academics and mass media hacks. To add to hundreds of newspaper, magazine, radio and TV features, Random House has just published, in both paper and hardback, a book entitled Black Power. This time, however, we have it straight from the horse's mouth: this book was co-authored by Stokely Carmichael.

It is because we expect an honest book from Carmichael that this book is unpardonable. This book embraces a totally corporate philosophy. It is even more conservative than Charles Silberman's Crisis in Black and White, published three years ago by Random House. Silberman is an editor of Fortune.

Can you imagine a book by the former head of SNCC that does not once mention Vietnam, and the relation of that war to the black liberation struggle in this country? Can you imagine the originator of the slogan "Black Power" writing a book of which a quarter is used up quoting such corporate ideologists as Sorenson, V.O. Key, Charles Silberman, Kenneth Clark, Edward Banfield, and Hans Morgenthau?

Is it possible that Stokely Carmichael, the guest of honor at the revolutionary OLAS meeting in Cuba would write,

"The concept of Black Power rests on a fundamental premise: before a group can enter the open society, it must first close ranks. By this we mean that group solidarity is necessary before a group can operate effectively from a bargaining position of strength in a pluralistic society. Traditionally, each new ethnic group in this society has found the route to social and political viability through the organization of its own institutions with which to represent its needs within the larger society."

The paragraph continues with this professorial cliché:

"Studies in voting behavior specifically, and political behavior generally, have made it clear that politically the American pot has not melted. Italians vote for Rubino over O'Brien; Irish for Murphy over Goldberg, etc. This phenomenon may seem distasteful to some but it has been and remains today a central fact of the American political system."

NAC Minutes

Nov 14, 1967

Members Present-Carol Neiman, Earl Silbar, Karen Gellen, Tim McCarthy, John Rossen, Howard Strange, Henry Balsar, Carl Davidson, Mike Spiegel.

Absent-Bob Pardun

Others Present-Jon Dunn, Boe Shomer, Lyn Kempf, Joe Horton.

1. Financial Report:

NO (you read it right!) Money Tues., Nov. 7 to Mon., Nov. 13
A Tale with a Tragic Ending on page 2!!

2. Liberation Press Service wants us to pay for its service-\$15 for November and \$15 for October and September. The NAC approved this expense.

3. Ads for the REC House are to be put in College papers such as the Torch and the University of Illinois paper.

4. The NAC voted to accept Clark Kissinger's suggested fund-raising ad.

Where did you last read this shopworn bit of wisdom? Was it Moynihan? Reisman? Harrington? Glazer? Kerr? Or was it Roche? Schlesinger? Lasswell? Bell? Myrdal? How many times have we been subjected to the fabrication that each ethnic group, if properly organized, can have equal footing in the society and an equal share of the pie? How many times have we been fed the casuistry about "pluralism", and about ethnic groups building "their own institutions"? Could we really believe that the central fact of the corporate political system is the favoritism of the Irish for Murphy or of the Jews for Goldberg?

There are other myths Carmichael chooses to reheat and serve us. The society is "middle class"; the society is "growing affluent"; the "major interest formation in the cities is the new middle class". He says, "Technology, corporate consolidation and public economy are transforming that class from a property base to a wage base."

What Carmichael is really talking about is the transformation of a large group of people from the middle class to the working class. Anyone serving property rather than living from it, anyone who

lives from wages, is a worker, not a member of the middle class. Our society is not "middle class", and the "growing affluence" flows primarily into corporate pockets.

For the chapter on the ghetto, Carmichael enlisted the assistance of Ivanhoe Donaldson, a former SNCC worker now employed by the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington. In this chapter they tell us that, "The core problem within the ghetto is the vicious circle created by the lack of decent housing, decent jobs, and adequate education. The failure of these fundamental institutions to work has led to alienation of the ghetto from the rest of the urban area as well as to deep political rifts between the two communities."

To what do Carmichael and Donaldson attribute this failure? They say, "Herein lies the match that will continue to ignite the dynamite in the ghettos: the ineptness of decision-makers, the anachronistic institutions, the inability to think boldly, and above all the unwillingness to innovate. You see, our leaders really have our best interest at heart, but they suffer the aforementioned handicaps and are therefore unable to serve us properly.

It isn't that corporate capitalism exploits, degrades, oppresses and destroys us, and sends us to all corners of the earth in bloody defense of their enterprises, and creates hideous ghettos in the cities. It is only that our leaders are inept, unwilling to innovate, and timid and that our institutions are anachronistic.

Well Stokely, you are full of it. The corporatists are adept and audacious far beyond your imagination. They can smell a dollar at eight thousand miles and send us out to fetch it back to them. They can sell Coca-Cola and refrigerators to a world that needs food; they can subvert and ravish not only countries but whole continents. They can buy off and coopt domestic radical movements; their institutions of domination and exploitation are quite up to date. They are even so clever as to be able to get a militant radical, a member of the most oppressed section of the people, to write a book expounding corporate philosophy. And that, although quite unintended, is the lesson this book contains for the rest of us.

which are set up to specifically challenge the content of a particular course taught by a cold-warrior.

d) chapter internal education: it is hoped the critiques will also have value in such internal education activities as study groups, free universities, conferences, seminars, etc.

Briefly, it is hoped that the critiques will help stimulate a movement of political agitation into today's cold-war classrooms. Combining direct action and hard thinking, such an undertaking could have important effects: both in broadening personal political perspectives and also by disrupting one of the important means of socialization to the American System.

The first four essays in the series have been published; they are:

1. "Seymour M. Lipset: Social Scientist of the Smooth Society" by Jim Jacobs
2. "Would You Believe...? An Introductory Critique of The True Believer"

REP BOOK CRITIQUES

Bringing Radical Politics into the Classroom

Stu Dowty
REP staff

Madison, Wisconsin SDS and the Radical Education Project are co-operating in the publication and distribution of a series of book critiques. These are short essays that critically evaluate books commonly encountered in the college classroom. Primarily oriented toward the social sciences, this service grew from the feeling of many radicals that the material encountered in the classrooms of today's universities and colleges consistently reflects the assumptions, approaches, and ideology of the status quo and the Cold War.

The purpose of the series is to provide a radical critique of American academic "scholarship" through empirical and theoretical evidence while analyzing the works of today's "scholars" in terms of their implicit or explicit political orientations. For example, Eric Hoffer's The True Believer is not just a bad book because of its factual absurdities and simplistic social theory. It deserves criticism because Hoffer's ideas are also used by "academics" to ignore or explain away the issues, problems and political questions raised by radicals. Hoffer's book also should be exposed for its contribution to the persistent theme of liberal anti-communism. Similarly, in Political Man, Seymour Martin Lipset's concern for economic requisites of democracy, and his mania for political stability, provide an underpinning for America's counter-insurgency foreign policy. The critiques will seek to publicize the works of today's "scholars" by pointing out how—despite claims of objectivity, dispassionate analysis, or academic detachment—they serve ideological and political needs of the present American Establishment.

While most of the series will be written as radical critiques of specific books, a few will be essays with broader concerns—involving general fields or entire disciplines or sub-disciplines. (For example, one of the four critiques now published is a general essay on the historiography of the New Deal period.) The books selected for the series are ones commonly used in introductory history and social science courses throughout the U.S. The critiques are written for the college undergraduate and thus may be used in precisely those courses where college students are first exposed to the works of bourgeois "academics".

Probably the most important aspect of the whole series, however, is the use

to which they are put. The critiques are not merely intellectual or academic literature—rather, the intention is that they become nothing less than organizing tools within the classroom. They are written with specific political purposes and uses in mind. They reject from the beginning the misleading, impossible, and (given the way it is used by today's academics) dishonest posture of "non-partisanship". It is time that the political indoctrination of the classrooms be challenged in the classrooms. Radicals

NEW LEFT NOTES

Room 206 Edward J. Lessin
1608 W. Madison St. Peel St.
Chicago, Ill. 60612 Lansing, Mich. 48823
RETURN REQUESTED

Second-class postage rates paid in Chicago, Illinois

should bring their movement into the classroom—challenging the distortions of cold-war apologists and pressing important political demands and issues.

While only experience will tell what some of the more effective uses of the critiques can be, some general ideas might be listed as starters:

a) general distribution to large classes: mass distribution of the critiques to the large multiversity classes where some of the specific books are being used might be an initial move in a campaign to challenge the content of the course.

b) distribution to graduate and teaching assistants: graduate students often have little or no voice in what materials are used in a course where they lead discussion sections; some might find the critiques welcome aids to the materials they're stuck with.

c) counter-courses: students, and maybe even radical faculty, might make use of the critiques in "counter-courses"

by Paul Breines, and "Eric Hoffer and Cold War Ideology" by Peter Wiley

3. "America the Beautiful: An Essay on Daniel Boorstin and Louis Hartz" by James O'Brien

4. "Historians and the New Deal" by Brad Wiley

These four essays are the beginning of what is hoped to be an extensive series of critiques. Help is needed from all persons interested in the series. Anyone wishing to contribute, either by writing or advising, should contact: Stu Dowty, REP, Box 625, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108 or Jim O'Brien, 8 Frances Court, Madison, Wisconsin 53703.

Copies of the critiques now available may be ordered for 10¢ each from the Madison, Wisconsin SDS chapter; or outside the Madison area from the Radical Education Project, Box 625, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48108. REP offers SDS chapters and other movement groups a 25% discount on bulk orders.