

NEW LEFT NOTES

SDS · 1608 W · MADISON · CHICAGO · ILL.

Volume 2, Number 45

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

December 18, 1967

Participatory Democracy, Collective Leadership and Political Responsibility

Greg Calvert

The rapid growth in development and the sudden turn towards the new militancy in the student movement face SDS with new demands and new organizational responsibilities which must be met if the New Left is to develop as a mature radical political force in America. On all levels—nationally, regionally, and locally—our organizational structure and style are proving inadequate to cope with the strains which the new upsurge of activity and the new political seriousness have produced. Old methods of work which once were responsible for the vitality of the organization are now proving inadequate to the task of building both the organization and the movement. Unless these internal contradictions are resolved in an intelligent and effective fashion in the next few months, SDS will be unable to provide an effective organizational instrumentality for the radical movement.

1. THE PROBLEM OF PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

The primary contradiction in SDS involves the conflict between the notion of participatory democracy as a vision of the good society and its ineffectiveness as a style and structure for serious radical work.

No one could deny the importance of the rhetoric of participatory democracy

as embodied in the Port Huron Statement. That rhetoric provided a basis for the criticism of both social democratic and liberal reformism at home and bureaucratic socialism a la Soviet Revisionism abroad. Furthermore, it spoke to the alienation of Americans from all the major—i.e. top-down bureaucratic-corporatist—institutions, which control their lives and channel their energies. Finally, it identified their powerlessness in the face of the overwhelming power of America's corporate-military elite and pinpointed the political criterion of control, individual and collective, as the basic goal of a radical movement.

In addition to its analytic and rhetorical function, participatory democracy as an organizational style appealed to the deep anti-authoritarianism of the new generation in addition to offering them the immediate concretization of the values of openness, honesty, and community in human relationships which they so desperately desire. Born and raised in a society of almost total manipulation, they responded enthusiastically to the possibility of actually being able to "make the decisions affecting their lives" in an honest political community of equals. It was from this style of operation,

rather than from analysis or ideological commitment, that the "utopian" and "anarchist" strains in SDS developed.

It is important to understand that the popularity of the concept and style of participatory democracy are not "accidental". SDS as a movement embodying certain specific values is not the product of some utopian scheme or of anarchist romanticism. SDS as a movement is a specific historical response to a specific set of historical circumstances and contradictions which have emerged within new-capitalist society in the last decade. Those pretended Marxists who refuse to deal with the New Left in historical terms reveal the bankruptcy of their analysis. It should be the peculiarity of Marxists in viewpoint and style to be able to understand themselves both as the subjects and the objects of history: to see their acts and their insights as both the products of what is happening in the society at large and as a decision to act upon that objective reality.

The New Left and SDS notion of participatory democracy are the response to the fact that capitalism is living on borrowed time. Since the Second World War, American capitalism has not only extended its control over the rest of

the capitalist world and over the Third World, it has developed a technology and productive capacity which contain, through the possibility of automation, the potentiality for the rapid achievement of a post-scarcity society. Capitalism, because of its production for profit and its need to dominate both the human and material resources of the world for present and future expansion, is unable to realize this immense potential. Thus the contradiction emerges that young Americans are growing up in a society which has the potential for eliminating alienated labor and the mechanisms of control and repression associated with exploitive class society. And yet, they encounter a system which becomes increasingly repressive and brutal in order to maintain domination and exploitation both at home and abroad. They want the elimination of repressive institutions and they want it now.

The vision which SDSers embody, and which has been vaguely infused in the rhetoric of participatory democracy, is the Marxian vision of post-scarcity communism—the liberation of man from material need and the society of equals where "no man is an object for another man's ends". It is no accident, but rather a historical necessity that the demand

continued on 7

DELEGATION TO HANOI RETURNS

Cathy Wilkerson

On Nov. four people set off for Paris with the final destination of Hanoi, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Other groups had previously visited Hanoi, but this was the first "student delegation" to go. Karin Koonan of the Movement, a member of the steering committee for the Oakland Stop the Draft Week; Steve Halliwell, N.Y. SDS; Jeff Jones, N.Y. SDS; and myself were invited by the Federation of Youth of the D.R.V. This group is the umbrella organization for a number of student and youth groups, the two principal ones being the Union of Students and the Committee of Working Youth. In the rushed weeks before our departure a number of individuals were asked to be part of the delegation but could not go, including Linda Morse from the Student Mobilization and Don Sweeny from the Resistance.

The D.R.V. Union of Students consists of all students who have completed the regular ten years of education and who have gone on to courses of Superior Education. The Committee of Working Youth consists of young people working in the growing industrial sector of the nation. Among these youths, however, many are registered for Superior Education correspondence courses. (In 1965 the figure for all students in correspondence courses was 26,300, of which 80% were the children of workers.)



The Youth of the D.R.V. had invited a student delegation from the United States to discuss the experiences of the youth in both countries, especially their experiences as important vanguard forces in building a revolutionary movement. In addition, we expected the youth of the D.R.V. to help us understand more about their lives as youth and students of a country being attacked by American imperialism, in a nation mobilized for armed struggle.

Unlike most of the previous trips which had been arranged by groups in Hanoi, and which had remained in Hanoi for the duration of their stay,

e.g. those invited by the D.R.V. Peace Committee and by the D.R.V. Women's Federation, we were to spend most of our time traveling to a number of different provinces. This was essential for a student delegation since the intensive bombings have forced a total decentralization of the educational system. There are now very few students left in Hanoi. Instead, they have re-established schools in the mountainous regions of the country, or in the plains where the bombing has been less intense.

The decentralization of education, as with other sectors of the country's life and economy, has had interesting and

important results. For one, the basic principle of Vietnamese education—the union of practical social works and pedagogical pursuits—has been achieved to a great degree. Depending on the branch of studies, students contribute in some way to the building of the country and to the national self-defense. Furthermore, the students themselves, from the youngest to those in Superior Education courses, have constructed the schools in the new areas; in most cases cook their own food; and contribute to their own self sufficiency as much as possible.

We arrived in Cambodia on Wednesday. The only flights to Hanoi are those of the International Control Commission, arranged by the 1954 Geneva Agreements. There is an average of three flights every two weeks. However, due to heavy American bombing, it is not unusual for flights to be cancelled or to be turned back unexpectedly. Although there is a "gentleman's agreement" between the U.S. and the ICC, it is not totally reliable. Only a few weeks before our arrival, American bombers followed an ICC plane into Hanoi, and took advantage of the temporary cessation of anti-aircraft fire to unload tons of bombs in the suburbs around the airport.

Monday morning, we were informed that we would not be able to take the ICC flight the next morning. The Committee of Working Youth had sent a telegram to Phnom Penh explaining that the bombing had become so heavy that any travel outside Hanoi would be extremely dangerous, especially for those untrained in self-defense against sudden bombing raids. In addition, the surety of regular ICC flights was diminishing under the heavy bombing. We were told that almost all foreign visits had been cancelled, probably until February.

continued on 4

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDENT STRIKE DEBATE

by Carl Davidson
Inter-organization Sec'y, SDS

Prior to the last few years, the American student movement has not been noted for its radicalism or its militancy. With few exceptions, our history lacks the rich experience of our brothers and sisters in European and Latin American universities. As a result, we have few lessons to draw from in evaluating the pros and cons of student strikes. It is difficult to give historical substance to a debate around the program of a national student strike against the war in Vietnam.

The strike program was first initiated by Bettina Aptheker in the early fall of 1966. Bettina's plan called for a national, broad based student action during two days in the spring of 1967, when students across the country would boycott classes in protest to the Vietnam war. Furthermore, depending on local circumstances, students would expose and protest their school's institutional complicity with the war, due to the existence of military training and research on the campus. SDS and others in the radical student movement argued strongly against Bettina's program. I will try to outline those arguments, as well as criticize them in relation to our current situation.

First, there were those who argued simply that the student anti-war movement was neither large enough nor strong enough to carry out such a program. This was probably true at the time. However, even then, Bettina argued that no one hoped for a majority of the students to strike. Rather, she remarked that if 'even 10%' of the American student population of 6 million were to participate, the program would be quite successful. Considering the dramatic growth in both numbers and militancy of the student anti-war movement during the last year, her argument now seems more feasible, at least on this point.

Another argument made against the strike at that time objected to the national dimension to the program, rather than to the tactical question of a strike. National single issue protest focused on supposedly harmed multi-issue local organizing efforts. Since local areas were 'unevenly developed' and growing at different rates around a variety of issues, each with their own dynamic, a national action was seen as impeding or thwarting the viability of local movements. Even if this were true, it should be seen that this is an argument against any national program, and does not address itself to the particular question of a strike. However, I think the experience of the last year has taught us that national programs, if well conceived, rarely have the effects attributed to them above. Even if they did, a strong argument could be made at this point for 'evening out' and consolidating our unevenly developed movement.

Bettina handled the argument that the strike was only another national protest demonstration by pointing out that the strike would engage the issue of university complicity on local campuses as well as having a national demand

of ending the war. Some people objected, asserting the senselessness of a national strike over local demands. However, this criticism failed in understanding the nature of those 'local' demands. It is true that any given occurrence of CIA contracts on a particular campus is a local problem. However, the CIA, as well as most other military and para military institutions operating within our universities are national institutions having national and international consequences resulting from their local work. Added up, local issues and targets of this sort are obviously of national importance.

Our previous objections to a National Student Strike no longer seem adequate to the current situation. If we are to oppose the program, we must find different grounds for doing so. The current proposals seem to have all the qualifications that would lead us to adopting the strike as a national program. The objection still might be raised that the dynamic of a national strike against the war would quickly develop, as the target date(s) grew nearer, into a symbolic protest action, rather than a struggle for and against power around concrete demands. There is a good deal

of validity to this argument. Even if this would be the outcome, however, why not have a symbolic strike? Especially since this would be the exact nature of a variety of foreign student strikes that would probably take place in solidarity with whatever action we might take. In the absence of an alternative program for mass student action, a symbolic protest seems justified, if not desirable. Furthermore, the mere existence of the radical student movement is impressive testimony as to the effectiveness of past symbolic protest activities. But our main concern

continued on 5

National Program, Local Organizing, etc.

Robert Pardun
Internal Education Secretary

In the week since the Calvert-Davidson proposal for an International Weeks of Resistance appeared in NLN there have arisen several questions concerning it. Much of this lack of clarity may be due to the theoretical presentation of the program. By discussing those questions in more concrete terms I think a lot of the problems can be resolved.

The entire program rests on a precise definition of the word "resistance". That word is never defined in the article although Calvert and Davidson use it in a specific way. The problem lies in that people interpret the article in light of their own conceptions of resistance thus creating much confusion. It is easy to understand why this happens. Our understanding of the concept comes from our activities of the last six months, and those activities have been very diverse. The time has come for us to define more precisely what resistance is and to be self-critical of our past activities in light of that definition.

Resistance is a way of looking at yourself and the movement which comes when you finally lose all faith in the ability of those in power to make any meaningful change. It defines a resistance to that power's manipulation of your life, but also it defines an understanding that liberation can only come through collective struggle. Taken in that way the resistance movement is one of positive action toward reaching new people, exposing the nature of power in this country, and raising people's consciousness about the kinds of struggle which must be waged if that liberation is to be accomplished.

Obviously this kind of definition is not common to everyone. One of the purposes of the N.C. is to talk about resistance as a positive outlook and to begin to eliminate the negative aspects. We must begin to give serious thought to how our activities affect other constituencies and how they raise consciousness, and then begin to implement our decisions. We must be able to show the participants in any action that the way they carry out the action is very political. They must

keep the target and its implications in mind at all times and not do things which detract from the main target or which alienate potential allies.

The Foreign Policy Association was well chosen as a political target, but the people participating ended up stopping traffic without any apparent reason. The original plan was to stop limousines headed for the FPA dinner because of the economic and political power which they symbolize and which the FPA represents. Many of the demonstrators were unclear about the target of the demonstration. People were unable to move easily because of tight control by barricades and mounted police. In the frustration which followed people moved

into the streets more to spite the police than to pick meaningful targets. The fact that the focus of the action became traffic in general indicates the amount of political work which must go on before an action takes place. We learned important things through that action. People driving down 6th Avenue in Fords are potential allies and should be the object of our propaganda and not the focus of our demonstrations. We do not want to become the first leftist movement in history to demonstrate against the people!

The only way this concept of resistance can become real is through intensive internal discussions before and after

continued on 3

LETTERS

Dear Editor,

Can women be liberated separate from, say, men? Children? BEFORE men? Children? MORE than men? Children?

If none of the above, then WITH men? Children? Women once liberated, everyone else still dragging their chains—would that spell mother, mom, or what?

To be liberated is to what? Not change your name? My dear—a rose by any other name etc. Can you worry about these items at THIS MOMENT in history?

To be liberated must be to engage in liberation, I think. Therefore, one works to free the men and women and children from, perhaps, the Draft, imperialism, lousy schools, filthy air or, we could GIVE BIRTH instead of being delivered of babies by opening wide the legs, breathing deeply and letting those babies GO!—With a joyful noise and open gates. Liberation from guilt, fear, and outraged virginity for all.

The question, sisters, is can the first step be taken, even? Can we possibly stop worrying about what everyone else thinks of us? The sins of the mothers have an insidious tenacity, no?

A primal mistake to think someone is withholding it. It's here. We are Hooray!

This is not to say that equal wages, abortion laws and many other things are not to be fought for or against as the case may be. We are free to do all that, but we must realize that it is connected and stay with the central revolution, the main event, the business at hand.

Mona Cunningham
Chicago

Youngblood,

I read your reply to my previous letter in NLN, November 27, and I thank you for your criticism, although I am surprised at the malicious attack that you leveled against my personality, especially your reference to my intelligence.

I must agree that the largest, most potentially effective revolutionary force is the working class, and I did not mean to imply that this class is any more duped than other socio-economic groups in this country. Unfortunately, I made a gross and embarrassing mistake by not thoroughly explaining my position. Instead of saying that the greatest revolutionary potential today lies in the academic communities, I should have said that the academic communities have the most readily tapped potential.

I experienced one of the riots this summer, and what I observed convinced me of the much greater need for organization among the working class. Black people were struggling in a futile battle against a force much more unified and effective than they were. People working in a factory, where I worked, screamed that "those niggers" should be "shot" for breaking the law. Although the working class has always had revolutionary potential, they are for the most part unready. Not every community has a JOIN project.

Therefore, I believe that those people who are capable of helping these people organize should do so. I do not want to argue about semantics, but the words "leader" and "organizer" are somewhat synonymous to me. I recognize that by ignoring true workers, as well as members of all other classes but the bourgeoisie, we would lose whatever insight we have gained. I believe that only a few workers, other than the Black people, have been able to realize their situation, no matter how much I would like it to be otherwise. Therefore, I will not follow the advice of either Venezia or you, and I will stay in school where I believe that I will be of greater benefit.

Also, I wish that you will refrain from insulting a person by questioning his intelligence, when you disagree with his argument. I admit that my first letter was poorly written, and I apologize for this.

Steve Shank

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 St., Rm 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312/666-3874)
New York City: 41 Union Square West, Rm 436, NYC, NY 10003 (212/675-2626)
Niagara Regional Coordinating Comm.: 1504 E. Genesee St., Syracuse, N.Y. 13210
Southern California: PO Box 85396, Los Angeles, Calif. 90072
New England: 102 Columbia St., Cambridge, Mass. 02139
Washington, D.C.: 1779 Lanier Pl., N.W.



ACTION AT SAN FRANCISCO STATE. SEE STORY P. 7.

Cal State, SFV & Dow

Jack Jones is the West Coast Public Relations Director for the Dow Chemical Company. We met him several times during the week of December 4. The first time was on Tuesday at San Fernando Valley State College (SFV) and the second time was at Cal State, L.A. (He also was the Dow representative at the San Jose State riot the previous week.)

His job is to travel around to trouble spots where Dow is coming under fire from students and engage them in public debate. Both times this past week, the liberal administrations were eager to encourage this type of debate between the SDS people and the Dow man. The purpose of this is obvious. The Dow man is slick, cool, and American. He talks about how Dow has an obligation to "do its part" to support the fighting boys in Vietnam and how many jobs Dow provides people, especially in California. In both instances, the administrations scheduled the Dow man to speak at times designed specifically to co-opt the pending SDS actions. At SFV he attempted to speak during the SDS rally held just before the march to the administration building, but was told to get off the stage by the SDS rally leadership. He then spoke to the crowd that remained behind (significantly, that crowd consisted of the SFV football team, organized by the Student Body Vice President to serve as a counter-force). It had been the hope of the administration that the Dow man would draw those students who hadn't worked out their civil libertarian hang-ups into staying behind. For the most part, it didn't work. The SDS people went up, did an excellent agit-prop theater thing and had a demonstration. The football team then came up to the demo, and tried to break it up. A few fights began, but basically the footballers were committed to staying in school and were backed down. (Later, in a follow-up incident, an SDS combatant spoke with his opponent and got through. He was invited to speak at the guy's fraternity.)

The SFV demonstration was a follow-up to a scheduled anti-CIA demonstration which had been cancelled the week before because the CIA had decided not to come on campus (same thing happened as a result of a threatened demo, at UCLA).

In the end, the SFV Demo. broke up, unable to prevent the 5 people scheduled from reaching their appointments, and were kept out of the administration building by locked doors, and armed cops on the inside. As a follow-up to the SDS chapter's previous action, a draft protest class walk-out which turned on and mobilized over 1,000 people, it was not a comfortable success. The demonstration points to a critical reevaluation of this whole Dow business which is dealt with later in this report.

At Cal State, the situation was basically the same. SDS had called a rally to precede the demo, and the Dow man was scheduled by the administration to speak at a conflicting time. Rather than change the SDS rally, a walk-out of the Dow man's speech occurred and the rally was held. Speaking jointly with the SDS people, were representatives of the Black Student Union which had a set of grievances to present to the administration. The rally was followed by a march to the administration building, where the college president was asked by the BSU to meet its demands, and was asked

by the SDS people to ask the Dow man to leave the campus. All requests were denied, so the demonstrators left and marched down to the recruiting office, leaving an administration building creatively sprinkled with magic-marker resistance slogans. At the recruiting office, an old white trailer, the SDS and BSU people asked the Dow people (who had locked themselves inside) to leave the campus. Their refusal was followed by an attack on the trailer which left it dented, though not destroyed. At this point the college Vice President announced to the students that the college was pleased to have them demonstrate, but that violence could not be tolerated. At some point, a stink bomb was thrown into the trailer, and at some other point, the Dow men escaped into another building. Also at some point, the administration called up 350 of Los Angeles's finest, who brought riot guns, buses, and were stationed about 300 yards off campus, in a parking lot behind a hill. As the Dow men were escaping the trailer, a dummy was napalmed and then the demonstrators moved inside the other building. There they were all placed under arrest by a campus cop, but at that same moment, the Dow men crawled out the back window and ran to their car. The students chased them, and looked at them through the car windows as they sped away.

Later that day, Dow man Jack Jones was interviewed by all the corporate radio stations in Los Angeles. He told a tale of horror, about how they had feared for their lives as the stink bomb was tossed into the trailer and how they would never return to the Cal State campus without proper assurances by the campus administration that they would be protected. It's important to note, that this demonstration was happening at exactly the same time as the San Francisco State rebellion, and was a further cause in the hurried meeting of the State College trustees.

This was the first major action of Cal State SDS. It was beautiful because it left the chapter with a solid victory in its first action. It was beautiful because it was an action carried out in cooperation with the Black Student Union.

It seems to me that these Dow demonstrations have played a very important role in the development this fall. It was important and good to confront the issue of free speech for Dow men, and CIA of free speech for Dow men, and CIA men and military recruiters. We've caused some unpleasantness for the Dow Chemical Company, but we haven't seriously cut into their profits. On the list of American companies receiving contracts from the Defense Department, Dow ranks number 181. There are 180 companies more involved in the complex than Dow. At Cal State, there were also 4 IBM recruiters who were in the trailer and who were forced to stop recruiting. People were neither excited nor concerned about having prevented them from recruiting. That means that the demonstrators were beyond the civil libertarian point of being concerned about interrupting the work of another corporation that was recruiting, but still saw Dow and its napalm as the major point of conflict. In terms of building this movement, we've got to relate this to two things. We've got to raise people's anti-corporate conscious-

Toward A Common Concept of Resistance

continued from 2.

the action and through intensive propaganda campaigns directed toward our potential constituencies.

The kinds of activities proposed have already been going on and undoubtedly will continue during the spring, so why propose a "Weeks of Resistance" in the first place? It is precisely because the program already exists in a very informal way that it is seen as viable for the spring. We are not going to make the new militancy disappear, so we should see our job as one of giving it direction and political content.

Planning a national resistance program forces us to look over past experiences in detail and to decide what we did right and what we did wrong. We have to decide who to try to reach and how to do that. We have to decide where the whole thing will take us. We are forced to talk about politics and analysis and to share information because we are going to want to choose political targets for our actions. Those targets will come out of discussions of how this country works and which targets can best be used to reach other people about the nature of power in this country. In short the program forces us to look at ourselves to see if we are serious about the direction we are headed and if so to be serious about how to proceed. By setting a time period for the weeks of resistance we are forced to begin to do the work necessary to make action relevant to our constituencies. The focus allows us to set a future time when we will be able to

CHICAGO AREA PEOPLE

THE NATIONAL OFFICE WILL HAVE A LOT OF SHIT WORK TO DO JUST BEFORE THE NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING. CALL TO FIND OUT WHEN YOU CAN DO YOUR REVOLUTIONARY DUTY TO HELP OUT THE N.O.!

ness, so that we can begin to educate and act around some of the other corporations besides Dow, and we've got to reach as many people as possible and turn them on to the struggle. Dow Chemical confrontations are important to the first job, but seem to get in the way of the second. This is especially true when compared to organizing around the draft (for example the difference in the draft and Dow demonstrations at SFV). The main point here is that we've now reached a stage where local chapters shouldn't feel an obligation to confront Dow every time it comes to campus, but should only do so when it clearly is in the interests of that local chapter's organizing program. Such was the case at Cal State, while at SFV the Dow demonstration was a detriment. It raised the issue of free speech which only tied up important chapter time and energy, since they had been able to mobilize so many people around the draft protest. One got the feeling that the demonstration was being held because SDS had an obligation to confront Dow, not because it grew from the organizing the chapter was doing on campus. One final detriment is that picking the first confrontation that comes up, or trying to confront every one of the different varieties of recruiters, channels people's energy, and is cutting down on the kind of discussions about campus organizing that people had to undergo at the beginning of this fall, when issues had not yet developed to the point they have now.

If Dow has to hire regional public relations directors to combat us, then we've hurt them. The Madison demonstration against Dow led off our finest week, and all our heads were raised a mile. But it's too easy to keep hitting the same target over and over, even if it occurs on different campuses in different parts of the country. We know we can't destroy Dow Chemical Company just yet, and even if we could, it wouldn't matter a bit, because, as Jack Jones says, "If Dow wasn't making napalm, somebody else would be."

evaluate our work and to make decisions from there. The "Weeks of Resistance" should not be seen as an end in itself but as a tactic for mobilizing people for further political action.

The question concerning resistance, the student movement and community organizing should also be discussed. Questions about the program come from two opposing directions. One is that the resistance movement is basically a student movement and should concentrate on expanding its student base. The other is that community organizing is the most important direction of the movement, and should, therefore, be the primary function of the office and of the chapters. In an article in NLN, Nov. 6, 1967, I tried to outline an intermediate position. We are basically a student movement and we should see ourselves as such and not as a training ground for community organizers. We must realize, however, that the student movement by itself cannot change the base of power in this society. The student movement must begin to relate to other movements and other constituencies. This will have two effects: First it will legitimate the student movement to other constituencies and second it will develop a consciousness among students about the need for community based work. We must face the fact that at this point most of our members are not ready to do community work. For us to put our efforts solely into developing those kinds of projects would mean ignoring the base we have.

By getting people involved politically in resistance and in the political thinking and day to day organizing necessary to make it work, we build people's consciousness so that when they leave the campus they can function as radicals in the community. Just as the sit-ins and mass confrontations of the early 60's raised people's consciousness to go into ERAP projects later. Meanwhile we build a viable student movement in this country.

Our main work will be done on campuses but we should not miss opportunities to relate to other movements and to make ties between ourselves and the community. For example, one possible target for the weeks of resistance might be Anaconda Copper. We could shut down its administrative offices using our own tactics to make connections between the student movement and the copper miners who are now on strike and who are being threatened with an injunction because of the necessity of copper in the war. We would also make the point clear about our opposition to imperialism and capitalist control: Montana-Chile; exploitation is the same all over.

We must be extremely careful in picking off campus targets, however. Stopping workers from entering a defense plant because of our opposition to what they produce might in fact do more harm than good. The defense plant as the target would be lost. The workers trying to enter the plant would see themselves as the target as would everyone else including some of the demonstrators. It is important for us to know which side we are on and who our potential allies are.

The fact that the targets we pick aren't all obvious anti-war targets is important. People will begin to ask "Why did they demonstrate against Standard Oil?" and we must be prepared to give them answers.

The process of bringing this country to a halt is not an easy one. We cannot afford to be romantic about "making the revolution" when in fact that struggle demands the ability to constantly interpret and expose things to people. We have to begin to plan and coordinate our activities and to be conscious of our role within the movement as a whole. It is not enough to just have sporadic actions in reaction to conditions imposed upon us (e.g. Dow comes to campus). We must begin to take the initiative and to pick our own targets on political grounds dictated by the strategies we have decided upon. And we must be ready to change both the strategy and the tactics as experience shows us that they should be changed.

The Guerrilla Theatre of the NLF

continued from 1

Representatives of the D.R.V. explained that in the past, any bombing pause, even if it was to last only a couple of days, had been preceded by an increase in the tonnage of bombs during the weeks before and in between the pauses. Thus, the months of December and January, with a pause at Christmas, New Year's, and Vietnamese New Year's in February, have been the worst months. From all indications, the North Vietnamese had deduced that the same was to be definitely true this year.

Despite our inability to finally get to North Vietnam, we all felt that the trip was well worth while. During our ten-day stay in Cambodia, we had many long conversations with a number of Vietnamese officials and Cambodians. Phnom Penh is only 40 miles away from Saigon; at night it is possible to see the U.S. bombers and a flare of light as they bomb the Vietnamese countryside. In addition, the culture and climate of Cambodia is very similar to South Vietnam; both are predominantly agricultural nations with similar crops.

In a series of five articles, we will convey much of the information and the impressions gleaned from our trip. Above all we understood very clearly that a more thorough understanding of the details of the war in Vietnam and the situation in all of Southeast Asia is of critical importance for the left in the U.S., if we are to understand more precisely the nature of American imperialism and the most effective means to combat it.

THE NLF DANCE AND SONG TROUPE

I will begin the articles with a brief description of an experience we had soon after our arrival. Wednesday night the first of five performances was given by the song and dance troupe of the National Liberation Front. Normally this troupe travels to liberated zones in the South and gives performances for the troops and local people. As the pictures indicate, the performers and audiences are constantly prepared for surprise

attacks—ready with camouflage and rifles. Usually the performances are given out in the open, using damaged American tanks as back drops or bomb craters for a stage.

The repertoire consists of a mixture of classical and modern Vietnamese songs and dancing, and political dances based on the current conflict with the Americans. For instance, one dance we saw depicted a group of village women and an old man who were hiding a young man from conscription into the Saigon army. The women wiled and reprimanded the American soldiers who appeared in pressed camouflage uniforms as they marched in highly stylized, rigid form onto the stage. The American soldiers reacted to the women by trying to do the twist with them—hips swinging with weighted awkwardness. As the soldiers attempted to shift into more seductive approaches, the Vietnamese women struck back.

The soldiers then tried to capture the old man, apparently threatening to do away with him unless he revealed the whereabouts of the young man. Again the women attacked the soldiers and rescued the old man. As the soldiers continued to be frustrated in their attempts they became more threatening and violent. Finally they uncovered the hiding young man.

In the ensuing struggle, in which the heavy weapons of the Americans are drawn—the villagers having no weapons—the women continue to battle with the soldiers. Finally they trick the soldiers out of their weapons through a series of rapid and complex movements. Without their weapons, the American soldiers cringe in fear. They express an awareness of the strength of the women. They are then sent scurrying away, while the villagers celebrate their triumph.

Another dance describes a wounded Vietnamese soldier being pursued by American troops. The wounded soldier is seen by a local villager, who views him from a hiding place with intense suspicion. The villager watches the wounded soldier struggle along his way until finally he collapses and falls. The villager then comes out and scouts back along the path until he sees that the pursuing soldiers are Americans, crashing through the underbrush. He then rushes back and helps the wounded soldier off into a hiding place and covers the trail behind them. The villager goes out to confront the Americans and try to



distract them from the hiding place of the wounded soldier. However, the Americans attack the single villager. Hearing the struggle, the wounded soldier comes out of hiding to help the villager. The soldier pulls out an unexploded American grenade which he has found and throws it at the Americans. They are thereby able to get the weapons away from the soldiers and to chase them away.

The response of the audience was strongest to those dances which were explicitly political. Spontaneous applause spread throughout the audience whenever an American soldier was tricked or defeated. The atmosphere was strange for us. It was moving to be for the first time in a large crowd of people who explicitly shared a common opposition to American imperialism and aggression in Vietnam. At the same time, it was important to me to remind myself that the individual soldiers in the dances were symbolic of the American intervention as a whole. That when we joined in the applause at the defeat of the soldiers, it was not to celebrate the fate of the particular soldier, but the successful resistance to U.S. military power. The more we learned of specific details about the way the Americans conduct their war, especially the way the G.I.'s are treated by the U.S. command, the incredibly ugly and self-defeating situations they are forced into, the more I felt in closer alliance with the G.I.'s on the bottom of the dirty little war. I will talk more thoroughly about this aspect of the trip in another article.

The performances were held in the large sports coliseum in Phnom Penh. The stadium was packed each night. We had been given special tickets by the NLF representation in Phnom Penh, and we were able to sit in the front rows. Sitting next to us was a young girl who was part of the troupe, although she was not dancing that night. One of the NLF men we had met previously introduced us to her. She smiled warmly at us when she learned of our mission. Her response was typical of the response we received from all of the Vietnamese we met—it was very clear that the political hatred the Vietnamese felt was towards the power forces conducting the war and not towards the American people as a whole. They appreciated the struggle of the American movement as being similar to their own struggle.

Our experience indicated that most of the Vietnamese do not have specific recommendations for activities for the peace movement in this country, although they are all enthusiastic about large actions which receive a lot of international publicity, such as Oct. 21 and Stop the Draft Week in Oakland. Nonetheless, many of the people we talked with indicated an understanding that demonstrations cannot be effective in a vacuum—and were interested in learning of less visible, but equally important trends within the movement. We attempted to describe some of the major questions facing different parts of the left in the U.S.

After the program was over, we were all excited about the possibilities for more guerrilla theater in the U.S. There is no doubt that the NLF troupe has played an important role, both in unifying the people and in carrying out political education throughout the provinces of South Vietnam. The members of the troupe are not professional dancers, but had come from the peasantry and fighting forces of the South. Most of them also participated in the armed struggle when necessary. Certainly, all the areas of the U.S. where there is organizing activity going on have the potential for forming an on-going troupe of this kind, and we need to experiment with the possible uses and advantages of more of these non-professional troupes in our own organizing work.



Send in your chapter name and the number of delegates coming to the NC no later than Dec. 20th to the National Office, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago, Ill., 60612. Mail in the same information PLUS the number of cars you plan to bring from your chapter and special housing information (e.g., children, couples, etc) to Jim Wallahan 448 E. 2nd Street, Bloomington, Indiana—also by Dec. 20th. This information should be sent in order that housing and meeting rooms can be arranged for in advance.

Upon arrival, check in at Ballantine Hall, first floor, Room 013. If you have any problems locating the center of activity, notices will be posted at: Ballantine Hall; 448 E. 2nd St.; 102 N. Dunn St.—all in Bloomington. If you can't figure things out from the notices, call 339-2058 or 339-4791.

There will be a \$5 registration fee to cover various expenses. Arrangements are trying to be made for free or very cheap food, but that is tentative. People should play it safe and bring \$2 to \$2.50 per day for meals.

BLOOMINGTON
INDIANA

NATIONAL
COUNCIL

«The student strike can work...

only as a tactic that is part of a larger strategy»

continued from 2

has been with concrete political struggle, rather than symbolic protest. Thus, the further development of my conception of the strike in this paper will be from that perspective.

As stated earlier, we have little experience to draw upon in resolving this question. However, we do have one example which may be helpful. On April 13, 1967, SDS at the New School for Social Research in New York City organized a student strike against the war. (See NLN, 11/6/67) Approximately 65% of the New School's students and faculty supported the strike, which culminated a week of anti war and anti imperialist education. The strike also coincided with and was seen as related to the Spring Mobilization against the war. However, the New School SDS organizers stated, 'Despite this superficial success, the strike must be viewed as basically a failure, a crude mockery of what could have been.'

Why this conclusion? First, we must

understand that as a symbolic moral protest against the war, the strike was a success. Only when we evaluate that strike as a political struggle with the intention of revealing the nature of the university's power and raising the political consciousness of the students struggling against that power around concrete demands; then we can begin to see how it failed. First of all, only IMPLICIT within the strike action is the assumption that universities in general are part of the military and industrial complex responsible for the war. As a result, it is only IMPLICIT within this situation that the university was a legitimate target for anti-war protest. Alone, the tactic of a strike failed to make this connection (although obvious to us) EXPLICIT to our potential constituency. The strike organizers remarked that students and faculty went along with the strike reluctantly, and did so out of a sense of personal moral commitment against the war, rather than out of a sense of political

opposition to the system of institutions making the war, and others like it, possible. Furthermore, the failure to connect the university with the war did not result from a failure in education and propaganda work. That was fully done. Rather, the failure was in the strike tactic's inability to EXPLICITLY expose and pinpoint those connections.

The New School organizers point out several lessons. First of all, the STUDENT STRIKE CANNOT WORK AS A STRATEGY IN ITSELF, BUT ONLY AS A TACTIC THAT IS PART OF A LARGER STRATEGY. Secondly, political consciousness is raised and the nature of power is revealed in the concrete struggle around specific demands, demands that relate the overriding concern of anti imperialism with the immediacy of the university. Finally, they asserted, 'The strike...cannot be a terminal event leading nowhere, but only a possible (not necessary) tactic in a series of tactics that fit in with an integrated strategy.' In this case,

our strategy is resisting and eventually destroying military operations on campus; which is, in turn, part of a broader strategy of fighting against imperialism. Tactics used in this fight are strikes, pickets, sit ins, teach ins, etc.; the viability of each tactic or set of tactics depending on the specific situation or objective circumstances.

In general, the tactic of the strike seems inadequate in INITIATING our strategy. Because it BEGINS the attack on the TOTALITY of the institution (Everyone is asked to stop all work, end all classes.), it serves to obfuscate rather than isolate and expose those specific operations our demands are directed against. From this viewpoint, it would seem that disruptive and/or obstructive actions like sit ins would be better in initiating a struggle, since they focus on specific targets. This is not to say the student strike should be removed from our arsenal. Rather, the problem is one of learning to use the proper weapon(s) at the appropriate time.

When has the weapon of the strike been successfully employed in our struggle? Again, we have little experience to draw upon. However, in the past few years, student strikes have occurred on several local campuses. It is interesting to note that almost all of these were struggles for power over specific demands. A symbolic protest strike, such as the New School action, is a rare exception. Secondly, and most important, almost every student strike occurring thus far has been used as a defense weapon. This is not to say that they have been passive or non aggressive. The students at Berkeley, Madison, or Brooklyn College would never interpret their actions in that manner, even if they lost the battle. The defensive character of the strike is more clearly revealed when we look closer at the situations in which it has been used.

In general, strikes have been called after university administrators and/or civil police have taken overtly repressive reprisals against students who were engaged in a prior offensive action. In this sense, a strike is not only a defensive tactic, but a secondary tactic as well. This can also be seen in the protective nature of most strike demands: reinstatement, amnesty, revocation of disciplinary action, no cops on campus, etc. The purpose of the strike is to halt or disrupt the work of the academic community to the extent that the limited stability the authorities hoped to achieve through repression is destroyed, rendering their decisions counterproductive. Usually the strikers include demands that call for a minor restructuring of offensive parts of the educational or administrative structure. Also, the goals of the original action for which the students were repressed is rarely included in the strike demands.

The success of our past strikes has been limited. Students at Berkeley still resulted in victory or defeat. The latter view seems the stronger. There is little question that the strike of Madison students against the brutality of police during an anti Dow demonstration met with serious defeat. On the other hand, students at Brooklyn College in New York won a tremendous victory against administration and police repression of students during an anti Navy recruiting protest. Many of the conditions determining the success or failure of these and other strikes were beyond the control or influence of the campus organizers. Often, a lot depends on the clumsiness or irrationality of the administrators and police. Or the immediate political level of the general campus and community as well as the size and sophistication of the radical constituency. Likewise, there are many conditions we can effect and control in the crisis situations leading up to and during strikes.

For instance, the successful Brooklyn College Strike (see NLN, 11/13/67) points to a few crucial decisions that may have made a difference in some of the other strikes that were lost. First of all, a decision had to be made on whether or not to include an anti war demand among the anti police and anti

GUERRILLA THEATRE: PERSPECTIVE AND POTENTIALS

by Margret Mills

Antioch College

Guerrilla Theatre presupposes a coherent, together troupe of players, and assumes a certain level of radical political thinking and practical commitment. It can operate in a regular theatre form, presenting radical plays (eg: "US", "Viet Rock", "Mac Bird", "Ubu-Roi") in a theatre, on a stage, and before an audience. Productions often introduce political-artistic innovations into the basic theatre forms (eg: the nine-foot puppets of New York's Bread and Puppet Theatre, the musical parodies of the South Vietnam Liberation Front Song and Dance ensemble, the San Francisco Mime Troupe's revitalizations of *comedia del' arte*, vaudeville, minstrel shows, punch-and-judies, and the Artaud-like audience involvements of Cafe La Mama and The Living Theatre.

However, an essential characteristic of a guerrilla troupe is its readiness and ability to appear in many different shapes and guises.

This frequently means taking the theatre off the stage and into the streets, into the people:

*retaining its theatrical identity, the troupe becomes street corner theatre, strolling players, medicine wagon performers, a touring company, etc. (eg: the NLF Song and Dance Ensemble, Bread and Puppet Theatre, SF Mime Troupe, El Teatro de Campesino, Everyman's Strolling Carnival, New York Pageant Players and Street Theatre);

*operating an unpredictable hit-and-run theatre, in which members enact unannounced spot pieces in strategic locations and then split. Although the public can still identify the activities of this kind of Guerrilla Theatre as theatrical performances, the line between hit-and-run type theatre and mind-fuck theatre (discussed next) is rather thin, especially for the first few moments of the piece. Richard Schechner's staging of Peter Head's "Kill Viet Cong" in NYC (see Village Voice, November 2, 1967: "Killing the Cong in the NY Streets"), the Non-Student Man pie throw at a lecturing U.S. Colonel, and the rehearsed and pointed disruption of a trustees' meeting by the Radical Theatre at Antioch College, all illustrate the hit-and-run phase of Guerrilla Theatre activity.

If a staged incident is drawn from day-to-day reality and performed in that context, it is not necessarily immediately, reassuringly identifiable as theatre; the line between solid, genuine reality and artificially created (theatrical) events becomes obscured. And, when the incidents staged in that unsettling twilight reflect the sickness of our society—when people are forced to witness unmistakable police brutality, or the violent arrest of a schoolmate by the feds, or a man arguing their very own position so fully that its horror (or at least its absurdity) becomes embarrassingly evident—the result is often a jarring of apathetic and fearful consciousness out of their

safe and comfortable ruts, patterns, mind-sets, bags, etc.—a process we might call Mind-Fuck.

A few weeks ago, two large men dressed in military uniforms marched into the cafeteria at Antioch and began to arrest a draft card burner. Two of the latter's friends at the dining table tried to resist the MPs, knocking over the table as the police exited with their prisoner.

Most of the students in the room were standing by this time, and many ran into the lobby after the men; some were alarmed and angry, believing that the violent arrest was a reality; some were confused, not certain to which world it belonged; many acted nervously skeptical; others were disgruntled, annoyed at that kind of politics. One boy's equilibrium was so shaken that he ran after the actors and vehemently attacked their 'prank'. Later, the same student complained to an officer of the student community government that there should be a CG policy against using the cafe for activities which interrupted people during their meals.



In its farthest form so far, Guerrilla Theatre comes closest to actual guerrilla tactical warfare: organizing and uniting the people and executing strategic actions. A traveling troupe can carry the word from campus to campus or community to community, acting as information liaison between organized radical groups or individuals. It can carry specific communications and/or news (often first hand) of developments in other places.

At the same time, such a troupe is naturally a radicalizer, acting upon its audience both collectively, through the theatre medium, and individually, after performances, when members of the audience approach individual players for elaboration or argument on the play's political content.

If the troupe can arrange a loose time schedule, members will be able to participate in any political action which might develop while they are on the scene. As guerrilla players they can help perform, with all the special resources and powers invested in the theatre, the necessary educational work which must be done "before we use tactics like obstructive sit-ins" (see Carl Davidson's article on "Institutional Resistance", New Left Notes, November 13, 1967). Or, temporarily putting aside their theatre identity, the players can participate in the action as individual radicals. Then,

there is a third possibility. Still guerrilla players, they can effectively engage in the resistance; and, it is at this point that theatre moves out of the area of propaganda and becomes a form of strategic activity.

This area has probably been the least explored, and there are as yet few precedents or examples to guide us. But it seems to me that theatre can become a kind of obstruction and resistance with which the enemy is not fully prepared to deal. A play which blocks up an induction center as effectively as an obstructive sit-in or which distracts federal troops can certainly be considered tactical activity.

The projected second caf incident of the Antioch Radical Theatre also approaches this type of Guerrilla Theatre. FBI agents have informed a draft card delinquent (April 15th burnings) that they have a grand jury subpoena for him. Rather

than compound contempt of court charges with his present charges, he plans to accept the subpoena. He will arrange to meet with the agents at 6:00 pm in the school cafeteria. Assuming that they accept and keep the appointment: Feds have a short script of their own which they must legally follow—i.e.: to obtain personal verbal acknowledgment from their 'victim' that he is in fact the addressee of the subpoena or warrant. Furthermore, the agents themselves must give their own names and occupations if asked.

Scenario: Agents (they travel in pairs) approach the student in the cafe (they know what he looks like)

Agents: Are you X-?

Before X answers, other male students, sitting at his table speak up:

I am X.

I am X.

No, I am X.

Others (some planned, others spontaneously) stand up:

No, I'm X.

I'm X—

Till the entire dining room is filled with Xs. Now some voices are starting to murmur:

What are you doing here?...Just what the fuck do you think you're doing here? You better get the hell out of here...

continued on 7

continued on 6

Strike Debate

continued from 5

repression demands of the strike. This is an important point, the value of which we can more clearly understand if we remember that a strike is basically defensive. In situations requiring short range defensive action, we need as many allies as possible, regardless of their positions on the war. Since the alliance is short term, it should not misdirect our long term political goals. In addition, we may win many new converts as a result of their participation in the action. We should keep in mind that strikes occurring in this two week period of anti war activity will be seen OBJECTIVELY as anti war strikes, even if their only demands are against police and repression of students.

A second point to remember along these lines is the importance for radicals to assert and maintain leadership positions in any strike committee coalition, even if the more radical anti war demands have been eliminated. To leave a militant struggle against our repression in the hands of liberal leadership is not only a political cop out, but likely to result in the loss of the struggle as well. To fight feebly against repression and lose, or to not fight at all, usually results in a demoralization and disintegration setting the local movement back months or years.

What are the implications of all the above considerations for our proposed program for a National Student Strike? First of all, the above analysis, in addition to the militant activities of the past few months, clearly indicates that our decision to organize resistance actions against military and para-military operations on campus, as a facet of our general anti war work, has proven to be an excellent strategy. However, our adoption of a national strike as a tentative tactic for carrying out this strategy needs serious reconsideration. Putting aside the question of a symbolic strike, which the Convention clearly did not intend to involve us in, how could our conception of a more radical strike come off? If the preceding analysis of the strike tactic is generally correct, the possibilities are limited. The only scenario I can envision has several contingencies. First, it assumes that the resistance actions of the last few months continue escalating in frequency and militancy, on and off the campus. Possibly, a few schools will become involved in local strikes to protect themselves from the repression these actions are likely to call forth. Hopefully, that repression will be met and defeated in many cases, strengthening, broadening, and emboldening the movement.

A second contingency assumes the adoption of a Spring program for an International Weeks of Resistance (or something similar) involving a focus of resistance and protest action for 10 to 14 days sometime in April. That period would be marked by massive, militant protest and resistance actions hitting a wide variety of political targets, on and off the campus. Contained within this period and series of targets would be an intensified direct action and educational campaign against military research, training, and recruiting on campus. The campus actions would employ a variety of offensive tactics, excluding strikes for the time being. In addition to mounting on campus confrontations, we would also use campuses as a base of operations for sustained series of off campus mass actions.

Now, assuming these first two contingencies are met, certain events should follow. First, after 3 or 4 days of the actions described above, a few university administrations are likely to join with civil police in repression of the actions. When this happens, local campuses should strike, if feasible, and plan to hold out at least until the end of the 10 to 14 day period. By the sixth or seventh day, we could possibly have a situation where 10 to 15 campuses are on strike, as well as having the movement in general confronting

a variety of non campus repressions, (harassment from police, politicians, local fascists, large numbers of demonstrators in jail, etc.). The country in general might be in a minor political crisis. At any rate, the academic community would be in a major crisis, resulting from the interaction between resistance actions, repressions, and defensive strikes. At that point, around the 8th or 9th day, we call a national student strike, calling on all students to walk out in solidarity with those schools already on strike and/or in opposition to their school's complicity with the war. The national strike would a) oppose all repression of anti war demonstrators, b) oppose university complicity, and c) advocate immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. All of this naturally assumes a final contingency; namely, that local radical students be thoroughly familiar ahead of time with the details of the conception and possible implementation of strike tactics; and, concurrently, that national SDS have the communications and propaganda network necessary for coordinating such an action on the national and regional level.

Improbable as this scenario may seem, it is a possibility everyone concerned with a strike ought to consider. However, it is also likely that a symbolic strike, lasting for 1 or 2 days, may be called by the Student Mobilization Committee. In debating how national SDS should respond to such a call, we should remember that the label 'symbolic' should not be used as a put down. Rather, it is simply a distinction made in clarifying the different characteristics and purposes of the two actions.

The value of the symbolic strike is primarily in the area of propaganda. It could also serve in giving a sense of unity and solidarity in the academic anti war community. This second point is specially important to those schools with a small and isolated anti war movement. Even if only a handful of students were to join the strike on those days, their being a part of an international action with hundreds of thousands of students across the globe could serve to strengthen their local work. If such a strike were to be called, a good deal of attention should be given to the kinds of work students should engage in while not attending classes. Even where local groups are not on strike, students might think of 'striking on the job', i.e., raising the question of the war in all their classes.

Campuses with stronger anti war constituencies may find some conflict with a national symbolic strike, if they are planning alternative actions during the same period. Energy and resources given to organizing for the strike could draw away from their own work. It is also likely that plans for a symbolic strike could be creatively integrated with alternative programs. Since a strike is a negative action (students are asked not to attend classes), students out of class could join in the other programs (demonstrations, anti war canvassing, stop the draft induction center actions, etc.).

From this discussion, several points seem to emerge:

1) Some sort of militant student anti war program is needed for the spring. Contingency plans for non symbolic strikes to oppose the possible repression of those actions should be made.

2) National SDS itself should not initiate a symbolic strike. Our resources should be directed to organizing the offensive actions for that period.

3) If the SMC should decide a symbolic strike, we should not oppose it, but try to integrate it into our program. We should argue against the symbolic strike and for an alternative program at the SMC January Conference. If they call a strike anyway, we should nominally support it and attempt to influence its direction and content. For instance, a one or two day symbolic strike might be a good way to begin the program for an International Weeks of Resistance.



"We learned the way to fight, namely to arm ourselves, and we wish to keep on going with the people who fight in each nation."

—ZENGAKUREN
JAPAN

THE HERSHEY CASE

Legitimiza^{tion} of the system?

Tim McCarthy, Asst. National Secretary

In response to the article "The Case for the Case" we have received a letter and several comments raising questions that we feel should be clarified in further detail. Elsewhere in this issue we have outlined a history of the case and the legal and political strategies which are involved (see page). In this article we will respond to the theoretical and political arguments and questions raised about the case and offer one suggestion about how the case relates to local organizing. As the first article (NLN, Dec. 4) assumed certain knowledge which was not explained, it might be useful to read it again after reviewing this article and the other one in this issue on the Hershey case.

Questions have been raised which basically put forward the argument that for us to carry our battle to the courts, we are legitimizing a system which we consider oppressive. Imagine the following situation: you are arrested on conspiracy charges for political activity. The natural response to that political attack would be to get a lawyer and fight the case in order to avoid imprisonment. You would not worry about legitimizing the establishment's right to make conspiracy laws, or their right to arrest and try you under them, but rather, your prime concern would be to remain free and continue to organize. Several of our brothers are faced with a similar situation in regard to General Hershey's statement, and the threat exists to all of us. Given that situation, the obvious move is to preempt the carrying out of that threat. Obviously, we do not desire to legitimize either the judiciary system or the Selective Service System. Our desire is to attack the overall system and protect the movement: we should especially attack at those critically vulnerable points, such as General Hershey's letter and the delinquency regulations of the draft; and protect the movement with whatever means available.

To those of us who are involved in resistance activities, the important thing will be that we are free to continue our organizing with the minimum of harassment, not that that greater measure of freedom to organize and act was obtained through the courts. This is not to say that the draft will not be used as a weapon of political repression in the future; however, as was stated in the Dec. 4 article, we have been offered "...the opportunity to break out of our isolation and to build the kind of public legal barriers against repression which provide the kind of intermediary buffers necessary to sustain our political work in a non-revolutionary situation."

How should this case be used by sdsers throughout the country? How can it be of immediate relevance? The first step is that all cases of repression, especially through the use of General Hershey's letter and the delinquency stipulations of the draft regulations, should be reported immediately to the National Office. By communicating such situations to us, there is the possibility of pulling such instances of repression out of isolation and into the national spotlight. They can be used in the case as clear evidence of the repressive nature of the SSS and also can receive wide circulation as revealing examples of the repressive nature of the society. During the time that the case is in court, we have the potential to make such repressive instances widely known, where they now too often get only limited circulation—and perhaps, through publicity, stave off other instances of this type of repression. We are now coming into a period when widespread repressive action is being taken against sdsers and other people in the movement; effective defense against such repression and the widespread circulation of its occurrence can be increased by using what tools we do have available at the national level. We gotta protect our own.

LEGAL & TECHNICAL FACTS OF THE HERSHEY CASE

In its current case against General Hershey, SDS is involved in a political offensive on two fronts: first, it seeks an injunction against the procedures involved in the enforcement of the directive to local boards on October 26, and thus hopes to obstruct the use of the SSS as a means of local harassment; and repression; secondly (and perhaps more importantly), the suit is directed against the enforcement of the delinquency provisions of the SSS law and, if the injunction is issued, would put a stop to all investigations and reclassifications connected with draft-card burnings, induction refusals, and failures to comply. As such, the case offers tremendous opportunities for the construction of legal buffers against political repression. It is important that SDS learn to utilize contradictions within the existing legal system to its own advantage and that we understand the ways (however limited) in which the law can be used as a political weapon.

On October 26, General Hershey issued a letter to all members of the Selective Service System. This letter became public on November 9 (see article NLN, Dec. 4, and New York Times, Nov. 9). The National Student Association approached Arthur Kinoy of the Law Center for Constitutional Rights and proposed to him a case seeking an injunction against General Hershey, seeking to prevent him from implementing his letter. Kinoy approached SDS about the possibility of joining NSA and several other organizations and individuals as co-plaintiffs. This permitted Kinoy to broaden the scope of the suit to include not just the letter sent by Hershey to the members of the SSS, but also the delinquency procedures, which had been standard procedure long before the issuance of the Hershey letter. On December 1st, the National Office took a telephone poll of the members of the National Interim Committee to decide whether or not to involve SDS. The vote was 8 members for joining the suit, 1 against, with 2 members out of the country.

Continued from page 6

On December 4, a request for a permanent injunction was filed in the Federal District Court in Washington D.C. Immediately following, we filed suit for a temporary injunction, asking for "relief" during the time that it took to consider the motion for a permanent injunction. A motion for a temporary injunction usually takes a few weeks, and after it has been decided upon a date is set for the hearing on the permanent injunction. During the times of the hearings on these two injunctions, our position is that any relief that we get from the court is binding on all local boards. If local boards do not comply with relief we get from the Federal court, our lawyers have assured us that they will institute identical suits against local boards wherever they dare to cross us. Technically, all 4081 draft boards are autonomous and not bound by any decision made by the central crotch. However, we have taken Hershey at his word, and enjoined him as dictator of the SSS fiefdom. This means that should any local board attempt an act of political repression we will have established a precedent at the highest possible level. Our lawyers and ourselves have taken the position that any actions already taken by local boards to illegally reclassify and induct draft resistance organizers and anti-war demonstrators is a violation of political rights. And we will fight these cases on the same grounds wherever they occur. On Dec. 9, General Hershey and Attorney General Ramsey Clark issued a statement which attempted to obscure the real issues. Basically, their statement in no way changed the position taken previously by General Hershey. Its content was that reclassifications and delinquencies would only be given in cases where the activity was "clearly illegal". They in no way confronted the issue of the use of the draft as a punitive measure against political dissent. In response to their statement of Dec. 9, we have instructed our lawyers to seek an emergency injunction against General Hershey. The three types of injunctions—permanent, temporary, and emergency—which are the three levels of speed with which one asks that a suit be considered all relate to the single complaint and its content.

The case is being fought within the courts on these constitutional grounds: the Hershey letter violates the rights of political dissent, freedom of speech, assembly, etc. It violates the provisions for the separation of powers, as it usurps the legislative and judicial functions in this situation. To quote from the complaint filed in court, "The directive purports to amend and alter the legislative enactments regarding selection, classification, and deferments, of registrants with the SSS....It further purports to authorize and sanction the administrative trial of persons for the exercise of rights otherwise guaranteed to them...." Outside of the courts, we will continue to fight not only the SSS, but the entire system for which it is only a fascist production force.

"WE NEED TO GO BEYOND THE RHETORIC OF PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY WITHOUT LOSING THE VISIONARY POWER WHICH IT EMBODIES."

Continued from page 1

for the end of material scarcity and the creation of a non-repressive society emerge in the midst of a technologically advanced neo-capitalist society. Our task should not be to scoff at this demand but rather to articulate it in much more careful terms and to relate it to revolutionary political necessities. We need to go beyond the rhetoric of participatory democracy without losing the visionary power which it embodies. 2.

The basic problem with participatory democracy lies not in its analysis or vision, but in its basic inadequacy as a style of work for a serious radical organization. The major organizational problem of SDS grows out of the fact that it recruits on the basis of that

rhetoric and then attempts to do its political work as if the rhetoric were sufficient to create, here and now, the non-repressive society of equals. In the operation of local chapters this has usually meant the avoidance of an elected leadership (in the name of anti-elitism), the reliance on long, formless mass meetings (in the name of individual participation), and the absence of careful strategic thinking (in the name of spontaneity). The real results of this mode of operation have been: elitist manipulation by individuals or cliques which can operate freely because there is no defined leadership responsibility; the disillusionment of large numbers of new recruits who find it impossible to participate in the manipulated mass

Guerrilla Theatre

continued from 5

Don't you ever come back again, you motherfuckers...Just what the hell....

(The murmurs grow louder, as students form a circle around that first table with the Feds. Immediately nine students don long black robes and theatre masks; one of them has a portable loudspeaker.)

The case of the People of the United States versus the Government of the United States. Court will come to order. Agents P— and E—, you are charged with being accomplices in crimes against humanity. You are charged with murder in a genocidal war in Viet Nam...Detroit ... Latin America ... Newark ... Africa ... Puerto Rico ...

You are charged with enslaving American youth in the war machine. You are charged with obeying the orders of an illegal, immoral government.

Have you anything to say in your defense?

Therefore, we find you guilty as charged and declare you enemies of the people until such time as you join us.

Now get the fuck out of here and don't come back!

Court is adjourned.

The anticipated disruption of FBI department proceedings, which should forcefully communicate to them that students will no longer passively accept their attacks, at the very least approaches strategic "tactical political resistance... disruption and obstruction of certain events by whatever means necessary" (Davidson's article).

A sense of community cohesiveness and potential radicalizings would also be expected.

Two final notes on Guerrilla Theatre:

first, at this point no one type of Guerrilla Theatre (conventional, hit-and-run, mind fuck, organizing, or tactical) is abstractly preferable to any other type. The activities of a troupe should be integrally related to the particular political situation of the social and geographic area(s) in which it is going to operate. Obviously, an effective piece for UCLA could be a poor choice for Antioch or for the streets of Rochester, N.Y.

Secondly, a guerrilla troupe may be created by bringing talented theatre people into a radical political consciousness or by bringing together radicals who have slight, but undeveloped theatrical abilities. Or, if you are fortunate, you may have people who can already function well in both areas. But, regardless of the troupe's origin, serious training workshops in theatre skills will be just as essential for an effective guerrilla troupe as will the political development of its members.

The Provos and the SF Mime troupe, among others, have demonstrated to many that American theatre need not remain in the stupor which envelops so much of our culture. Like people, when theatre is not afraid, it can open its eyes to the world it lives in today and, by engaging its very life-energies in changing that world, become powerfully relevant, become alive. If we look carefully, we may see parallel awakenings in the rest of the arts, in all areas of "human endeavor" around us. And if we can't see them in some of those areas, then maybe those of us who care should ourselves start thinking about relating them to revolution. The exchange is essential to the life of both parties.

San Francisco State

At 11:45 A.M., Dec. 6, people gathered in front of the Administration Building of San Francisco State College. Black and white students were up in arms over the recent actions of the S.F. State Administration, particularly the liberal president and administrator John Summerskill. Students were angered by the political suppression and the less-than-subtle racism practiced by that liberal institution.

The demonstration heralded the shut-down of the whole campus for the rest of the day. The Administration Building was closed down and then taken over by the students, classes were either called off or were closed down by the student demonstrators, the library was shut down...by the administration, the bookstore ravaged, and the cafeteria was closed after reluctantly distributing a few free meals.

The reasons for this uprising date back more than a month. Nine students of the Black Student Union (BSU) were suspended and arrested for allegedly attacking and beating the editor of the Gator (student paper) because of his racist editorializing. If convicted of this charge, they may each go to jail for thirty years.

Several weeks later, Summerskill banned the other student newspaper, the OPEN PROCESS (a radical newspaper, which prints articles which are anti-war and anti-imperialist) and suspended the editor and one of the writers ostensibly because of the publication of that writer's poem on masturbation, which happened to be dedicated to one of the college's P.E. instructors. Thus all the vestiges of free speech, free press, and due process were dropped from the rhetoric of the liberal institution.

The students rose up against the college because of this repression of the anti-war movement and the Black movement. In

movement and the Black movement. In order to try to break the spirit that was developing, Summerskill pardoned the two white students of the OPEN PROCESS. But the Black students and the white students still worked together to pull off the demonstration. The Movement Against Political Suspensions (MAPS) was formed in response to the growing crisis. A support demonstration was planned and the action of the day took off from that point. Although the issue which led off the demonstrations and rebellion was a very political one, the rebellion quickly became non-political in scope.

There was at-large destruction. The student bookstore, which could be a very political target because of its high prices, was very nearly decimated. But there was no sense conveyed to either the demonstrators or the non-participants about why the bookstore was being attacked and why the workers there were being attacked. Although both Blacks and whites were involved in the rebellion, there was little real coordination or contact between the two groups. Neither group had any overt political direction apart or together. The Blacks seemed to be leading the

Continued on page 8

truths, or intimidation. The presumption to lead or organize a radical political movement must be rooted in the firmest convictions about the truth and rightness of what one says and does.

3. POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITY AND INTELLECTUAL LEADERSHIP

Organizational seriousness will not be sufficient to deal with the political responsibilities of SDS. A revolutionary organization has two basic duties: 1) it must develop the most serious analysis possible of the society in which it finds itself, and 2) it must discipline itself to reach those elements in the society which can form the base for a mass movement. To do the second without doing the first is to run the risk of "mindless activism".

SDS has emerged as the leader of the New Left without having developed a sufficient analysis of American corporate capitalism and without clearly articulating its historical alternative. The Port Huron Statement has been transcended in our experience: it is high time that it was replaced by a new document which would correspond to the new understanding which we have developed.

Our failure to develop analysis is, like so much else, a reaction to the sterile dogmatism of the Old Left which thought it sufficient to talk about economic oppression, the industrial working class, and the inevitable collapse of capitalism. Neither the rhetoric nor the analysis of the 1930's can meet the needs of the New Left.

We have made a beginning by analyzing the role of students and the multiversity in the transformation of the work force to meet the needs of new-capitalism's new technology. We have begun to investigate the potentiality of a post-scarcity economy, but have failed to investigate the relation of automation to the present character of both working-class and ghetto struggles. Only the development of such analysis will permit us to link our struggles to those of other elements in the society and to create the mass movement which can transform America.

meetings and who are given no opportunity to develop politically through other structural forms of participation; the frustration of serious activists because neither serious organizational forms nor long-range programs are developed.

None of the above should sound new to anyone: we have lived through the cycle time after time.

The resolution of these contradictions depends first on a recognition that serious political radicals who are moved by the potentiality and hope for human liberation must find serious organizational forms if they are to reach and develop the largest possible base and create a mass movement. Furthermore, it requires that we make clear to others whom we recruit that our organizational forms are designed to render our work effective now so that our values can be realized in a transformed society. Above all we must find organizational forms which allow us and others to grow politically.

This is not to suggest that we discard our experience and values in favor of rigid authoritarianism and dogmatic elitism. On the contrary. The best defense against irresponsible and manipulative elitism is responsible collective leadership which can be held accountable to its constituency. The best form for the encouragement of real participation leading to the real political development of new recruits is small work-study groups—not mass meetings which can be manipulated by charismatic individuals. The best way to avoid continual frustration and discouragement is to make the collective leadership responsible for the development of long-range organizing strategies and programs which can be intelligently discussed and criticized by the members.

It should not be assumed that such a structure of a steering committee and work-study groups is a magic formula which will solve all the organizational problems of SDS. A steering committee will only function effectively if it really understands the notion of collective leadership and fights constantly against elitism and irresponsible individualism. Work-study groups will only meet the needs of the membership if they engage in real criticism and self-criticism. The chapter itself will only be effective if it recognizes that its primary task is to organize a movement, to reach, and educate new people through both individual contact and mass actions. Above all, it must be remembered that manipulation destroys movement rather than creating it. Only those who are unsure of the truth need to manipulate others through lies, half-

I read the news today oh boy..

Carl Davidson

1) INNER CITY VOICE (12/15/67, 253 E. Warren, Detroit, Michigan, 48201; sub.—\$200 for 6 months). This paper, dubbed "out of sight!" by young people in the local black community, is by far one of the best black community papers in the country. In addition to reporting the day-to-day victories and setbacks of the black liberation struggle across the country, this issue contains several articles of interest to SDS people. First, there is an interview with Stokely at the OLAS conference by the editor of SUCESOS, a Mexican magazine. In the interview, taken by many as a major statement of SNCC policy, Stokely handles questions on SNCC's origins, racial and/or class struggle, the U.S. white working class, and urban guerrilla warfare. In the same issue, James Boggs—a black Marxist—has a column titled "Birth of a Nation", a continuing series on the Detroit Rebellion. Also, there is a story called "On the Death of Che", written by Regis Debray as part of his defense. Another weekly feature is "Third World Report", with information on guerrilla insurgencies in Colombia, Venezuela, and Bolivia in this issue. Several pages are given to black culture, with poetry by Leroi Jones, along with weekly Jazz critiques and reviews. Past issues have contained articles on Labor, reprints from the North Vietnamese VIETNAM COURIER, an interview with Rap Brown by Radio Havana, and a sympathetic review of Frantz Fanon's BLACK SKIN, WHITE MASKS. With all this, it still remains a community newspaper, very relevant to the ordinary (!) black people of Detroit. At least one person in every SDS chapter should subscribe.

2) THE NATION (12/12/67, 333 6th Ave., NYC, 10014; sub.—\$10.00 a year). This issue, entitled THE WAR ON CAMPUS, directs all 5 of its feature articles to the issues of student power and resistance to university complicity with the Vietnam war. Gabriel Kolko's article, "UNTANGLING THE ALLIANCES", is the most informative. As evidence of our knowledge factories' contributions to imperialism, he includes:

CORNELL—Cornell Aeronautics Laboratory's five-year 1.5 million Thailand counter-insurgency (COIN) project

MINNESOTA—Classified research on the use of drugs for the interrogation of prisoners

COLUMBIA—Recently revealed CIA sponsorship of the Institute on East Central Europe (exposed by SDS)

PITTSBURGH—Diverse projects on ordinance systems and chemical warfare against Vietnamese tunnels

PRINCETON—IDA project on code making and breaking for the National Security Agency

MICHIGAN—\$21.6 million (\$10 million classified) in Pentagon contracts, including Thailand COIN projects, missile research, and development of electronic and infrared weaponry systems of the Vietnam war

WISCONSIN—\$1 million in Defense contracts, in addition to a \$1.4 million Army Mathematics Center (for calculating kill rations?)

Marshall Windimiller's article, "Scholars and Soldiers...A Crisis of Values", adequately portrays the concerns of liberal academics with the presence and opposition to the military's on-campus operations. Likewise, he betrays the near-bankruptcy and irrelevance of that perspective and critique for the radical movement ("If these were normal times, and our government were not dominated by the military-industrial complex....I should welcome the opportunity to educate future officers of the military services, even though I believe that to them the values of the academy would always be secondary to those of their chosen profession."). However, his article does give us some useful information on Berkeley. "The university operates for the AEC two gigantic nuclear bomb factories, one at Livermore, Calif., the other at Los Alamos, NM." and "Why should a social science study (for Berkeley's Himalayan Studies Project) of the strategic Himalayan states north of India be funded with a \$285,000 grant from the Air Force?" A recent report of I. F. Stone's answers that one. It seems that non-acclimatized Indian (and potentially US?) troops had a rough time simply surviving in that region, let alone engaging Chinese border guards.

John Shover's article, reviewing the resistance to recruiters at San Francisco State ("Preparation for DOW Day"), written before the recent campus rebellion, reveals how inept the liberal analysis is. Ironically, his conclusion asserts, "A qualitatively better environment has been created for dealing with perplexing questions." A few weeks later, those perplexing questions resulted in violent insurrection.

George Ross; contribution to the issue ("Mr. Leavitt Comes to Harvard") is more significant. He offers an excellent description and analysis of the anti-Dow opposition in Cambridge. His insights and criticism should be useful in evaluating much of our anti-military work.

The final article is a report on NSA's "Student Power" conference in Minneapolis ("National Rally for Student Power" by James Brann). When reading the piece, one soon realizes that NSA is behind the times, dealing with issues SDS dropped as co-optable one or two years ago. For that reason, organizers who have to deal with NSA should examine Brann's review of NSA's perspective.

THE NATION has made the issue available to campus and student groups at bulk rates: 100 for \$25, 200 for \$40, 500 for \$75, plus shipping charges.

3) NATIONAL GUARDIAN (12/9/67, 197 E. 4th St., NYC, 10009; student sub.—\$3.50 for 1 year), PEOPLES WORLD (12/9/67, 81 Clementina St., San Francisco, 94105; sub.—\$5 for 1 year), and THE WALL STREET JOURNAL (12/8/67). Three separate but related articles offer the sort of information required by SDS organizers interested in developing more sophisticated political targets for direct action. THE NATIONAL GUARDIAN runs an article detailing the repression of a general strike by the Chilean government ("Bullets, Gas, Reply to Chilean Strikers" by Alfredo Hopkins). Also involved in this repression, and others in the past, is the Anaconda Copper Co., which, along with Kennecott Copper and the US government dominates Chile's political economy. Secondly, the PEOPLES WORLD reports on a national strike of 50,000 copper workers in the Western United States, from El Paso to Montana. On strike since July 15, the workers have been holding militant rallies, burning effigies of the companies' presidents and Senator Bennett of Utah. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL examines the strike from the corporate point of view ("Copper Strikers..." p. 10), mentioning the interest of the Defense Department. For the military, copper is a strategic resource, with steady and sizable amounts needed for the Vietnam war. On the basis of this kind of information SDS might construct some exciting and effective programs. For instance, in this situation, we could possibly connect the issues of the war in Vietnam, Imperialism and its fruits in Chile, and the struggle of American workers for better wages and working conditions and against Federal and State repression of their strike "in the National interest". The issues would be connected pragmatically, as well as analytically. Simultaneous sit-ins and mass demonstrations could occur at all the corporate offices of the copper industry, along with the Chilean Embassy and consulates. Slogans might read: Montana to Chile: Exploitation is the same all over. SDS chapters in the West could offer help to strikers, perhaps joining picket lines. Recruiters from any of the copper companies could be resisted on campus for complicity with the war and in solidarity with the strike. People interested in this kind of action, send criticisms, new ideas, and information to the NO. (PS: This issue of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL also has an article written by the President of Dow Chemical on "Why Does Dow Chemical Co. Make Napalm?")

NC AND EDUCATION CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Dec. 27th, 8am-10pm: REGISTRATION at Ballantine Hall, first floor, Rm. 013. The Indiana University campus at Bloomington, Indiana.

The Indiana University campus at Bloomington, Indiana.

Dec. 27th, 6pm: MASS SESSION--working papers will be distributed.

WORKSHOPS:

Dec. 28th, 9:30am-10pm:

SELECTING POLITICAL TARGETS.

RECRUITMENT AND EDUCATION IN THE COMMUNITY LEADING UP TO ACTION.

DEMONSTRATION TACTICS AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE.

REPRESSION AND DEFENSE.

Dec. 29th, 9:30am-7pm:

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL COORDINATION.

SUMMER PROGRAM.

FINAL MASS MEETING OF EDUCATION CONFERENCE.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

Dec. 29th, 7pm-10pm:

PLENARY SESSION

Dec. 30th, 5pm-10pm:

PLENARY SESSION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

Dec. 30th, 9:30am-4pm:

RESOLUTIONS WORKSHOPS

Dec. 31st, 9:30am-10pm:

PLENARY SESSION OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL

SAN FRANCISCO STATE

continued from 7

whites, from the Administration Building to the bookstore to the psychology building. There was a real lack of tactics and strategy which could make those necessary political points.

There was a political point to the demonstration, but it did not come across to people. One of the BSU leaders tried to make clear the issues when he told his brothers, "We call ourselves guerrilla warriors and then run around in a mob beating up white boys who couldn't fight their mothers....Jumping whites ain't gonna stop our nine black brothers from being drafted or even getting 30 years.... We gotta move with organization and keep this campus closed until our nine brothers are reinstated." (Berkeley BARB Dec. 8-14) But even that kind of talk did not keep the real issues from getting covered over.

Yes, the Administration Building was captured and classes were shut down for the rest of the day, but the Administration instituted and controlled those action, and it was the Administration which kept the situation in control. Summerskill did not call the police onto the campus, but he may well be removed from that position by his bosses, the political administration in Sacramento. They still control the power and the institutions.

And what was learned from all this? To have further demonstrations this week. But will these demonstrations mobilize the campus around political issues? So far, the projected demonstrations have been bogged down in internal fighting within MAPS.

Will there be any defense by a constituency next time? Will there be clear political targets which demonstrate to the students, the city, the country, the demonstrators themselves; the power of the college, which is controlled by the government, business, and military? Are the demonstrations against the power of our society which is not in the interest of the people of the world? People have to understand the implications of demonstrations before they will join with us.

Ed note: This story was compiled from conversations with several people who had first-hand information on what has happened at San Francisco State. It was unfortunate that we did not receive a complete first-hand story, but the editors felt that it was important to cover this story especially in light of what happened at Cal State (see story on page 3) on the same day and the repression which has become more overt and widespread throughout California and the country.

NEW LEFT NOTES
Room 206
1608 W. Madison
Chicago, Ill. 60612
RETURN REQUESTED

Second-class postage rates paid in Chicago, Illinois

Mike KINDMAN
Box 367
East Lansing, MICH 48823

NAC MINUTES

Members present: Carol Neiman, Tim McCarthy, Henry Balser, Howard Strange, John Rossen Earl Silbar
Others Present: Jeff Sharlet, Vernon Urban
Members absent: Carl Davidson, Mike Speigel, Bob Pardun.
1. The NAC decided to strengthen office security.
2. Financial Report:
N.O. BREAD: Dec. 5 to Dec. 11 (1967)

INCOME:
Dues and Subscriptions: \$ 526.60
Literature: 277.10
Contributions: 653.36
Pledges: 163.00
Sales: 20.45
Miscellaneous: 148.00
Exchanges: 258.00
NLN Ads: 00.00
Printing: 307.00
Loans: 1.00
Chapter Tax: 44.05
Journal A: 00.00

Total \$2400.56

EXPENSES:
Petty Cash: \$ 00.00
Exchanges: 158.00
Travel: 125.60
Office & REC Supplies: 79.39
Print Shop Supplies: 157.35
Cars: 12.05
Postage: 103.21
Equipment: 200.00
Miscellaneous: 19.00
Printing: 181.50
Loans: 45.00
Telephone (NO & REC): 401.15
Subsistence: 350.00
Typesetting: 70.46
Total \$1902.71

Still to be spent \$597.85
Balance \$2914.70

submitted by Karen Gellen