

# It's Time... for a New South

Nobody much likes poverty.  
But nobody likes to do much about it unless they are poor themselves. And poor people have so much to fight for . . .

They could use some full-time help -- the type of help that they decide they want when they want it -- and on their terms

Not more degrading welfare

Not more uniformed bullies

Not more interfering social workers

We think that means a community organizing project that can help people most just by showing them they are not helpless.

We think the people can come to see that poor white people and poor black people don't have to compete for the crumbs in our society and that the way to gain strength is to fight together for economic and political demands.

We think we can create in the white working class community something better than what the Klan and the Nazis have to offer. If we don't do it, they will -- AND THEY ARE PUTTING MILLIONS INTO A CAMPAIGN TO ATTRACT THE PEOPLE.

## THE YOUTH

We will be working a lot with young people -- who aren't taught much in their schools, except obedience . . .

Young people who are discouraged from thinking

Young people who are harrassed by the cops

Young people who just "hang around" or work on their cars or get drunk because there isn't much else to do

Young people with the talent, ability and potential that this society has closed its doors to . . .

And they sure don't like it. But they don't know what to do about it either. They are trapped and frustrated. They get angry quickly and are always ready for a fight. THEY KEEP TRYING.

And that's the most important thing about them -- they haven't given up. They just accept all the hell that is tossed at them. They can't find a way -- yet -- to stop being pushed around, but we think they are willing to learn.

That may include learning some things very strange to them such as, "organizing", democratic politics, economics and some lessons about other people in our society -- those who can and will help them, those who can and will try to stop them. They can learn to see their own strength and talents once they have a vehicle for using them. They can get some hope into their lives before they get old and beaten down.

Then they will be able to do something about the conditions around them and won't have to take being pushed around. They can

start doing some pushing and if they push hard enough and long enough, maybe they can push this society right off their backs.

## PROGRAM

The community is supporting the housewives' boycott to lower food prices. We want to see a cooperative buying service develop along with a consumer education program.

Tutorials which involve the parents as well as the children are important. We will seek acceptable tutors among our friends and supporters. The tutorials will be part of the larger program to broaden contact between people. We see that showing films for children and films that the teenagers choose to see are important in a recreation program that the people have control over. We are trying to get a record player, records, a decent library, dart board, later on a pool table.

We think a cooperative day care program would be vital to the community. Also a voter education program will be a necessity.

If the people are to win the battles that their efforts will bring about, they must also know how to use politics -- and what politics to use. Thus we hope to tie in a study on the city power structure and ownership patterns. It's vital that people know just WHO controls WHAT in their lives.

It becomes more important every week that passes for staff to be more and on

(Continued on page 6)

# new left notes sds

1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

VOLUME 2, NO. 5 let the people decide FEBRUARY 3, 1967

## Free School: a base for change

Chas Bauman  
SIU Free School

After looking for a long period of time (4 years) at the State College Campus, some things become more evident.

One is that students operate in a different reality than the outside world. This is probably universally true. But, inspite of this, their reality is still very much determined by their parents. For instance, students at Washington University, a fairly wealthy school, have attitudes which reflect their class and professional backgrounds: whereas SIU students come out of a basically working class lower middle class background. These two backgrounds are very strong in influencing the students new reality.

SIU students are mostly worried about doing their "job" and having a good time on weekends. Whereas Washington U. students are (very) caught up in drugs and being intellectual.

Both schools have students who are worried about "being in" and not as much about "making it". But who believe that they'll make it. At Washington it takes the form of drugs and being intellectually hip. At SIU it means many things, but basically material-

ly and sexually making it.

As a student of SIU I have tried to figure out how to live in a culture I disliked. What I find is that you have to do something different.

Talking and debating about the draft makes little sense at a state school. It needs to be done, but as a single effort it fails to change the now or the future. People who have been accustomed to "doing the job" don't like to be told to think about their job. And when you do they become hostile. Instead, I found that if you challenge the system you're in by creating a parallel one, it is more effective.

The FREE SCHOOL is such a counter educational system. At SIU the Free School stresses student control and student concerns and needs, i.e. sex education, China, Vietnam, Black Power, etc.

(Continued on page 6)

## GENTLE THURSDAY

Bob Pardun  
Austin

Recently the Austin, Texas, chapter of S.D.S. had what was called Gentle Thursday. In talking to people around the country I have found quite a bit of interest in Gentle Thursday so I wrote following historical outline to help people who might want to have a Gentle Thursday on their own campus.

At the beginning of the fall semester there was quite a bit of concern within the Austin SDS chapter about the fact that SDS had essentially built a wall around itself. In establishing the SDS community of love barriers had been built which effectively stopped us from establishing meaningful dialogue with fraternities, sororities, and other "straight" people. Although we realized that there are real barriers of ideas, values etc. between us it was felt that we should take steps to break down the unreal barriers such as beards, long hair, suits and ties. Jeff Shero had been nurturing an idea while traveling around the country talking with SDS people which seemed like a good one. This was the idea of Gentle Thursday.

For about two weeks before the proposed Gentle Thursday people left messages around the university area (rest rooms, cafeteria tables, walls etc.) saying "Gentle Thursday is Coming". About three days before Gentle Thursday we began passing out leaflets on campus to explain what Gentle Thursday was all about. The leaflets said something to this effect:

Gentle Thursday is coming. It will last all day on the campus and will be a time when people will be nice and gentle to each other. But we realize that most people in this society are not expected to be gentle and that many people don't even know how to be gentle so we will give some suggestions for what to do on that day. People should sit on the grass and eat their lunches. Poets should get up and recite poetry, singers should sing. People who don't know each

other should talk to each other. People should wade in the fountains and draw with chalk on the sidewalks. People should fly kites on campus and carry balloons. SDS chicks should hug fraternity guys and sorority chicks should take emaciated beatniks out to lunch.

Now if people like Gentle Thursday then we will plan to have another one. If people are still excited we will have two Gentle Thursdays in one week. If people are still turned on, we'll have a whole week of Gentle Thursdays. From there we can escalate to Gentle Thursday Month. And when we have Gentle Thursday year, then the revolution will be over."

When Gentle Thursday arrived we had a balloon seller on campus and a large part of the student body sat on the grass. One of my beatnik friends was invited out for lunch by two sorority chicks. People talked, flew kites, wrote gentle things on the sidewalks, buildings and the ROTC airplane.

The general repercussions were very good. We did in fact begin to make inroads into the barriers between us and the rest of the student body.

SDS was called before the committee on Student Organizations for a variety of things including, non-student participation in SDS, writing on buildings, defacing the ROTC airplane, running a red balloon up the flag pole, tying a balloon to the statue of Jeff Davis, flying kites on campus. It turned out to be an excellent opportunity for us to get our newer members involved in confrontation with the administration.

The main place we fell down was in not having another Gentle Thursday. We felt that we didn't want to have too many too soon fearing that people would get tired of them. There are some plans to have another Gentle Thursday in the spring. If other campuses get excited about that maybe we can work out a National Gentle Thursday. If interested write Pardun, c/o SDS, Box 7098, Univ. Sta., Austin, Texas.

## inside this issue

### REP Report

P. 3

### FLORIDA

P. 2

P. 4

## NAT'L V.P. REPORT

### Student Action

P. 2

## ON THE DRAFT

P. 3

### No Hunters

P. 7

## Penn State Sit-In

During the past week, members and supporters of the Penn. State SDS continued their struggle for academic freedom and student power by challenging the administration's right to release the names of radical students to HUAC investigators. The Administration has failed to enter into serious dialogue with the students, and they have refused to issue a statement regarding their intentions to either cooperate or non-cooperate with the HUAC super-sleuths. Having exhausted reasonable means for relating to the reluctant administration, SDS called for an administration building sit-in which, according to an SDS spokesman, will "continue until the administration decides that releasing student names to HUAC is in clear violation of student rights."



**R.I.****Peace Candidate**

Due to the sudden death of congressman John E. Fogarty, a special election will be held to fill his vacancy. An independent peace candidate will be run and backed by the R. I. Committee for Peace in Vietnam and other campus action groups in Rhode Island.

Much money will be needed and contributions will be welcome. Anyone interested in giving a benefit concert to be held in the voting district between February 2 and March 25 should call (401) 331-4373. Also any helpful literature or personal comment should be sent to the R. I. Committee for Peace in Vietnam, East Side Station, Box 2382, Providence, Rhode Island 02906.

**DETROIT**

January 12, 1967 a group of Detroit clergymen, lawyers and others today established a Draft Counselling Center for use by young men seeking alternatives to service in the Armed Forces. The Center, sponsored by the newly-formed Draft Counselling Center Committee, will hold its first regular Sunday night counselling session this Sunday, 8:00 - 10:00 p.m., at the Center headquarters, St. Joseph's Episcopal Church, 31 King Street, Detroit.

The Center is an outgrowth of the much publicized and highly controversial Conference on the Draft, sponsored by many of the same people creating the Center. Rev. David M. Gracie, who conducted the earlier conference, is the chairman of the Draft Counselling Center. Other officers include: Rev. George Coleman, Vice-Chairman; James Lafferty (Detroit attorney and recently a peace candidate for Congress in Detroit.) Treasurer; and Dena Clamage, secretary (SDS).

Commenting on the Draft Counselling Center, Rev. Gracie stated, "As a result of the earlier conference, we have decided there is definitely a real need to offer the young men of this community counselling on the draft. Those of us creating this Center are opposed to American intervention in Vietnam and feel we have a responsibility to the many young men who are being forced to fight in a war they may not understand or agree with. This responsibility includes discussing with them alternatives to military participation in this immoral war."

Rev. Gracie made it clear that although the sponsors of the Center oppose the Vietnam war, the center is open to all young men who are worried about induction, regardless of political affiliation.

The Center will make available literature on draft deferments and conscientious objection, as well as other alternatives to the draft, such as emigration to Canada. For those who cannot attend regular sessions on Sunday evenings, special appointments with draft counsellors may be arranged through Rev. Gracie.

**A Book on****DRAFT RESISTANCE**

Dear Friend:

I am preparing a book about men who have refused to fight in the Vietnam war and the issues or experiences which lead people to defy Selective Service or military orders on the basis of their conscientious objection to this particular war.

If you are willing, I would very much appreciate it if you would send me a personal account of what you did, why you took such a stand, what the decisive factors were in arriving at your decision (including experiences from your childhood or other aspects of your background if you think they had a formative influence), what consequences you have had to face, and how you now feel about what you did. Statements in court, letters from prison, biographical data, or other things you may have already written would be useful. You may not have the time or inclination to write a fresh piece at this time, but if you do, think of it as what you would say to someone who is

himself trying to decide whether or in what form to noncooperate with the draft. The desire to write this book grows out of the sense that those who are now grappling alone or in small groups should know of the existence and experiences of men who have already made this confrontation, with the hope that such sharing may provide help to those who are now sifting out what to do and understanding support for those who may be in need of it.

Please send information or questions to me at 26 Court Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06511. It would be helpful to regard the end of February, 1967, as the date by which I would have material and could begin to put the book together. In any case, I would like to hear from you to know how this strikes you. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Alice Lynd  
(Mrs. Staughton Lynd)

**NEWS****Washington D.C.  
& the DRAFT**

Vietnam News Service  
NCCEWV-N.Y.C.

Congressional action on the draft act will proceed as follows:

**January:** Report of the President's advisory Commission on the Selective Service System. This commission, headed by IBM's Vice-President Burke Marshall, will recommend continuation of the present system, though with the correction of certain inequities. Under the commission's plan, students with deferments would be drafted upon completion of their education.

**March 1:** Report of the Advisory Committee of the House Armed Service Committee. When President Johnson announced the formation of his advisory committee, the House Armed Service Committee set up its own. The House Advisory Committee is headed by General Mark Clark.

**March:** Hearings by the House Armed Services Committee on the draft law. Present indications are that the hearings may begin before March 1st, in order to complete legislative action on a new draft law before expiration of the current one on July 1. This committee, chaired by Rep. Mendel Rivers, held hearings on the draft last June, but has not yet announced plans for the hearings this spring.

**Before June:** Consideration of the draft law by the House and the Senate.

**Who Owns Tulane?**

Bob Head  
New Orleans

I'm doing a paper, WHO OWNS TULANE? My intent was to describe the dynamics of the Tulane Board of Administrators. It is a 17 member self-perpetuating body (appointed in 1882 by Paul Tulane). There is no student-teacher control.

I didn't realize what it was I was getting into. Now getting bogged down in a morass of corporations, interlocks and chain-banks. Sam Newhouse's *Times-Picayune*, Sam Zermurray's *United Fruit*, Middle South Utilities Inc, Coca-Cola, City Stores Co., Sears Roebuck & Co.

Example: Darwin S. Fenner, Senior Vice-President of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, is chairman of the board. Now how do I deal with the world's largest dealer?

What I have is too static. It doesn't show how it works. (Minutes of the Tulane Board meetings don't seem to be available to the public.) Anybody doing or having done like work, I need help. I need a method. It's a paper I want to write not a 500 page book.

710 Ursulines  
New Orleans, La.  
70116

**FLORIDA****Hooah**

Allan Levin and others of the Gainesville SDS-SSOC report that they are tentatively planning to have a march for "love, sun, and peace in Vietnam", in Florida during spring vacation. Plans are not definite and depend upon the responses received. They hope to attract northern students who plan to spend the spring vacation in Florida. Levin stated that the march would be "to withdraw the troops, end the draft, and bring Love, Sun, and Peace to Vietnam".

Activities tentatively planned are:

March 24th -- a rally and speeches in Fort Lauderdale;  
March 25th -- a march from Fort Lauderdale to Miami;  
March 26th -- a march and rally in Miami.

Anyone interested in mixing sun and fun with anti-war and anti-draft activities during their spring vacation should contact:

Alan Levin  
Gainesville SDS-SSOC  
Box 13636 Univ. Sta.  
Gainesville, Fla. 32601

**STUDENT  
ACTION**

T. S. Davisson  
1230 Ivy Street  
Chico, California

(T. S. Davisson works for the NFWA in California)

For the most part, students interested in affecting changes within society have restricted their efforts and campaigns to campus oriented issues such as the draft, free speech and the academic padrone system.

While there is a need to mount campaigns regarding these issues there exists a greater need for students to become more directly and actively involved within other spheres of our society such as poverty and civil rights.

The rationale for becoming involved in issue oriented campaigns outside of the monastical cloisters of the campus is simply that it is out there where the real society exists with its very real injustices. It is within the slums that are not far from your campuses where the tenants councils exist, it is in the communities surrounding your universities where the welfare recipients live with their Welfare Rights Organizations, it is in the rural farmlands where the migrants live with their NFWA and it is in those bastions of Southern white bigotry where the Black Panther is beginning to shape up. It is clearly not in the groves of academe that you will come to grips with the problems you purport to be concerned about.

This is not to say, however, that for every slum there exists a tenants council, for every welfare recipient a WRO, for every farm worker an NFWA or for every poor rural Black a Black Panther Party. What it is to

(Continued on page 7)

**LETTERS to the Editor**

To the Editor:

May I commend you for your review of a very important book for our time, "Go Ahead and Live" by Mildred Loomis. It is my hope that autonomous and community living will prove to be our way out of this spreading morass of bureaucracy, hypocrisy, and evil.

It is my feeling that all of us who wish to live in a decent way and to do our part toward a decent community of men, should work together, sharing our ideas and ideals.

Do you know the publications "Green Revolution" and "A Way Out"? Both may be obtained from:

School of Living  
Lanes End Homestead  
Brookville, Ohio

I would like to know more about your work.

Blessings,  
Hermine Hurlbut  
2615 S.W. 34th Ct.  
Miami, Fla. 33133

To the Editor,

Members of the S.D.S. across the nation have been in the forefront of the anti-Vietnam war effort. This is to their everlasting credit as true patriots, for this was is most un-American.

An excellent analysis of this illegal, immoral and insane war is given in the War Resisters League leaflet, "A Birthday Message to Americans". In the interests of peace, I will be glad to send a copy of this study of our involvement to any members of SDS who will send a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Richard Chinn  
600 Third  
Providence, Ky, 42450

Editor and Friends:

A letter in a recent NLN reported that a few individuals and groups have been compiling lists of American businesses involved with and supporting the Right or their ideas. I compiled such a list approx. 9 months ago, the validity of which must still be intact and high. The list is documented, but I have yet to detail the activities qualifying the companies for inclusion in the list. If anyone wishes to compare notes, write:

Rubworthe Seferian  
288 W. 92nd St.  
N.Y.C. 25, N. Y.

**NEW LEFT NOTES**

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago, Ill. 60612. Phone (312) 666-3874. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Illinois. Subscriptions: \$1 a year for members, \$5 a year for non-members. Signed articles and letters are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the editor, Cathy Wilkerson

**STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY**

Nick Egleson, president; Carl Davidson, vice-president; and Greg Calvert, national secretary.  
National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312) 666-3874  
New York City: 49 West 27th St., NYC, NY 1001; (212) 889-5793  
Niagra Region: 107 Dryden Rd., Ithaca, NY  
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif; (415) 362-7922  
Southern California: 4319 Melrose, Los Angeles, California, 90019  
New England: 138 River St., Cambridge, Mass., 02139  
Radical Education Project: 510 East William, Ann Arbor, Mich.

**VOLUME 2, NO. 5 let the people decide FEBRUARY 3, 1967**



## What is a

## Radical Perspective ?

Mike Goldfield  
Ann Arbor— REP

People in SDS have considered themselves radicals. Sometimes our claim to this label has been attacked, and often we ourselves have questioned whether we were not really "liberals." Emotionally, radicalism has seemed to mean activism rather than procrastination when it came time for commitment on issues of social change. To our critics it must have meant merely the desire to cause controversies for their own sake.

One use of the description radical has been to designate a program that was in opposition to a fundamental part of the *status quo*. Before 1860 in this country, being for abolition; or being for secession both were considered radical. Some people today say that the only way to be radical is to be against capitalism and for socialism. All of these latter people are *programmatic radicals*. Others have said that to be radical is not only to have an opposition program, but to have an opposition method. These people, who often call themselves "left oppositionists," feel that left radicals must constitute themselves as a separate force in opposition to the established power configurations — not being taken in by the lure of permeating the power structure as "leftists in disguise" or by advancing via "creeping socialism."

It seems to me however, that to be radical is something more. In the words of a well-known 9th-century philosopher, "To be radical is to get at the root of a thing. And for man the root is man himself." To have a radical perspective is to develop an approach which is a relevant humanism. Thus, we must try to articulate what we feel is wrong with society, why it is wrong, and in what way it is wrong. To develop a radical perspective is to develop a comprehensive critique of contemporary society in *human terms*. It is also to create alternatives to this society. This definition of radical is, of course, relative to our analysis, so it is with our analysis that we start.

Getting to the root of things in America

involves examining three closely related aspects of our way of life: (1) the operation of democracy, (2) the correspondence between programs and needs, (3) the quality of American life. Each aspect requires a critique and an alternative.

(1) DEMOCRACY — Our critique of American society contains an indictment of the way decision-making power is distributed in this country. People do not "make the decisions which effect their lives." Most of us are disenfranchised.

This is most clearly evident when we look at the poor. Their streets are uncleared, their jobs are insecure, their schools are bad. They have no better place to move. If they live in a city, their homes may be torn down in the name of "urban renewal," with no place for them to go, but a more crowded slum or an infamous "project". Few know the police as their friend; the War on Poverty is controlled by self-aggrandizing local politicians. If people are on welfare, they may have their place searched in the middle of the night or their checks cut off — their protests to these actions being to no avail (or more often, further trouble), because rules are rules. Of these things they have no control.

In more subtle ways, even the middle class is disenfranchised. They pay their taxes as wealthier people slip through the loopholes. By examining where power lies, we discover the lack of our own. Congress responds not to our petitions, but to the pressure of organized lobbies usually representing financial interests. The support of these interests is vital to winning elections, the campaigns of which now loom so expensive. Even without reading Fred J. Cook or C. W. Mills, it is hard to imagine that 50 plus billion dollars in defense contracts (better known as the military-industrial complex, via Eisenhower's terminology) are not fighting to preserve their self-interest. To the extent

even that foreign policy is freed of such influences (and it is hard to imagine that this extent is large), policy is made by a handful of elite. Only some of these elite are elected, and even this as a result of a highly manipulative campaign run by poll-takers and ad-men. Even if the elections were non-manipulative, the information people normally receive (about the nature of communism, what's going on in Vietnam, we needed an "expose" several years ago to discover poverty, which until then had been discussed as only existing in small pockets) is to a greater or lesser degree distorted, making democracy sluggish, to say the least.

Our attitude toward those centers where power is concentrated is one of opposition. We do not want to take them over, but to reconstruct them democratically. Our suggestions for alternatives are as yet only underdeveloped and tentative. We are beginning to get ideas about welfare systems, Wars on Poverty, and "free" universities, being run by the people they elect. Maybe we envision, in the distant future, corporation boards being mainly composed of citizens who have no large financial interests in them, only public interest. We need more work in this area, but it is also the most difficult one in which a radical perspective must be developed.

(2) PROGRAM — Because we are so concerned about undemocratic distribution of power, we have been less concerned about what programs we think are necessary. Our caution in advocating specific programs has been based on the valid fear that a good program undemocratically administered, often perpetrates the oppressive nature of existing institutions. We do, however, recognize the need for radical programs. Programs directed towards fulfilling the needs of people, rather than powerful interests or winning elections are vitally tied up with

(Continued on page 6)

A Report on  
REP

by Mike Goldfield

It has been eight months now since implementation of the original REP proposal was begun. Much has happened and some of it is worth noting:

## REP's BUREAUCRATIC INHERITANCE:

A number of problems that were caused by the initial establishment of REP have been worked out in the past several months. REP was conceived as a conglomeration of nationally coordinated research and study groups. Hundreds of names were solicited from NLN and hundreds more through mailings — on the promise that they would be hooked into this not-yet existing network. Much staff time was spent during the summer trying to figure out how to meet the commitments that we had made to these people.

In the early fall, all the forms were gone through carefully and people were matched as best as possible according to their interests. We then tried to find people who would "coordinate" groups around these interests. "Coordinators" were sent long letters giving a summary of the information we had on each person in his area of interest, and a description of what we thought a coordinator should or could do.

Thirty such groups were set up in this way, with varying success. Many people appeared in more than one group. People in groups that we could not find coordinators for were made aware of the other people who seemed to have similar interests. We correspond with these coordinators, give advice, and hope for the best. As new people write in, we place their names in our files and send them to the coordinators in fields they are interested in. If no groups exist in their area, we send them our newsletter which gives reports of study groups and research groups, among other things. This bureaucratic inheritance has been much simplified during the last few months (partly because we now take care of letters as they come in, and partly because most people can be hooked in to existing group. (Continued on page 6)

## How to Relate

## Creatively to a Board

by Mark Kleiman  
California

There are numerous ways of messing up draft boards. Some are only harassment techniques, while others may be good for organizing. I shall seek to explore both.

The first thing you could do, would be to get hold of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and read the part dealing with draft board procedure. A good working knowledge of what rules are supposed to govern the operation of a draft board can give you a much better idea of the spots at which they are most vulnerable.

First, things which are effective when done on a collective basis, but may also be done individually. The draft board is required to keep a copy of anything you send them in your file. This opens up several possibilities. You are supposed to notify your board of any change in your physical condition, so you might wish to send them a postcard each day telling them that you had sneezed the night before. Along the same lines, you might wish to send them a copy of *History of the Russian Revolution* by Trotsky, Mao's *Military Writings*, or anything else that might be handy. One person on the West Coast expropriated several hundred Gideon Bibles, and sent one to his board each day for six months. On the other end of it, you have a right to see the file your board has on you if you make an appointment. Under most circumstances, there is nothing to prevent you from absconding with all or part of your file, or, possibly inserting new data.

The law which prevents the destruction of a draft card says nothing about the loss of the card. A weekly note requesting a new card, or stating that since you are required to have the card on your person at all times, you took it swimming with you and need a new one might be in order.

Another good technique might be to get a job in a bookstore, cafeteria, etc., and apply for a II-A on the basis that your job is in the

interest of the national defense. You could appeal this all the way up to the State Board, and, when refused, get another job and appeal again, renewing the appeal process. It might also be good to simply send your board a card saying, "I appeal", and leave it up to them to find out precisely what it is that you are appealing. A beneficial side-effect of this form of harassment is that you cannot be drafted while anything relating to your draft status is on appeal.

## OVER at the BOARD

Other types of harassment and/or organizing require your presence at the board. It is possible to register people who do not exist. A day at City Hall going through the Death Records, and then the Birth Records, should yield the names of numerous people who died when they were children, but would otherwise be 18. You can get a photo-stat of the relevant birth certificates, go to a draft board, and register under a false name and address. (This is punishable by 5 years if you're caught.) The fun ensues when this mythical person does not respond to any mail, and fails to report for a physical or induction. Ultimately, federal agents will spend much time attempting to track down people who do not exist.

Other activities at the board itself may take the form of either getting you as an individual out, or educating people about the war and the draft. Refusal to sign the loyalty oath will at least hold up your induction for three months while military intelligence checks you out. If you are politically active to a significant degree, there is a good chance that you won't be taken.

It is possible to fake a IV-F without using drugs to wreck yourself. You could go to a doctor, and complain of ulcerous symptoms, (sickness after drinking alcohol, sickness if you don't eat, burning sensation if you do, etc.) He will tell you to come back for an X-ray. The night before the X-ray, take some

(Continued on page 8)

on  
the

DRAFT

## AGAINST U.M.T.

Free School of N. Y.  
SDS Chapter

To develop clarity about the meaning of America's war in Vietnam has been and will remain a difficult job. To do it we will have to fight with the limited weapons at our disposal against the mass media, the intellectual prostitutes, the sham universities, against, in short, all the weapons of the Juggernaut.

A number of folks, legitimately disturbed by the jury-rigged, class biased, murder-the-poor draft system have decided that the best approach they can now take to the thoroughly corrupt selective service law is to demand retraction of the 2-S classification: on the grounds that it furthers class division in America.

These folks are right, or course. That's what the 2-S does, that's what the establishment wants the 2-S to do — to allow middle-class kids to learn technical and managerial skills at college, and to allow black and poor white kids to bring 20th century American democracy to the Vietnamese at bayonet point.

There's only one trouble. McNamara and the establishment recognize that the 2-S is an "inexpedient" device to do the work that needs to get done in the American Corporate State of tomorrow. They want to do the following job:

1. Allow the middle-class kids to develop the technical skills necessary to build bombs, develop germ warfare, manage colonialized people, etc.

2. Train the illiterate American poor (black and white) in reading, since trained workers are more useful to the economy than untrained.

3. Work on the social and political delinquents among America's youth; see if some of that uneconomical destructiveness can be channeled into more socially useful

behavior (the Black Berets, perhaps), and see if the political delinquents can't (under concentrated instruction) be made to see the error of their ways.

4. Encourage some of the more "idealistic" (i.e., potentially rebellious) students to develop — under government supervision — interesting community projects in the poverty "pockets" of America.

5. Provide military instruction, first-aid and civil defense training to all Americans (regardless of race, creed or color).

6. Recruit for the current Asian war and maintain combat-ready divisions for future "peace-keeping" operations in South America and Africa.

The entire program is to be applied through the mechanism of UMT (Universal Military Training): all Americans will have nominal service requirements (black, white, rich, poor); these requirements will be satisfied in a fashion calculated to maximize the potential contribution of the citizen-soldier to the military and the military to the citizen-soldier. America is strengthened in the process, class divisions are smoothed over (not resolved, mind you, just less visible than the 2-S makes them), and the middle class still gets the soft jobs — and America still polices the world. McNamara referred to the plans during the summer of 1966 (in response to student criticism of the 2-S), and the reports at the time can be examined. Social scientists who have worked closely with the American Wehrmacht (like M. Janowitz of the University of Chicago sociology department, who sold himself to McNamara when they were both in Ann Arbor six years ago) have been talking up the program for years. Given the right climate of opinion (the result of a war with China, let's say) and an appropriate cool in the implementation of the new program — and there should be no difficulty in selling it to the public. (Continued on page 6)



# NATIONAL VICE-PRESIDENT'S REPORT - - -

BY CARL DAVIDSON

## WHERE WE'RE AT AND WHAT WE'RE ABOUT

Recently, Nick Egleson and I, after visiting about 60 SDS chapters between us, compared notes on the numerical size of SDS. According to our modest, if not conservative, estimates, about 30,000 young Americans consider themselves members of SDS chapters. Over 6,000 of these have National SDS membership cards. The 30,000 figure is remarkable in two ways. First, we are much larger than we thought we were. Second, starting from almost zero, we have achieved that number in 7 years; we have grown *tenfold* in only 2 years. However, except for those of us who have "gallop poll politics", we should take a deeper look at ourselves before we celebrate our greatness. In this report, I'll attempt to take that deeper look, even though my experience is limited. I hope that many of you will write comments, criticisms, put-downs, or whatever, to what follows.

The figures above indicate that SDS is truly an American phenomenon. Our organizers aren't that good. Far more people come looking for us than we manage to consciously reach out to. Hardly a week goes by that the National Office doesn't discover an active SDS chapter somewhere that no one knew existed. Generally speaking, we are the products of a corporate liberal America of the 1960's. Specifically, we are creatures of the War in Vietnam, Bob Dylan, ugly cities and impotent, neurotic elders. Our political styles are American to the core. We reflect most, if not all, of the popular historical prejudices of this country. Regional chauvinism finds expression in "Texas anarchism", "Prairie Power", etc. Most of us tend not to identify with political systems or events abroad, reflecting a kind of isolationism. We have a minority psychology of "there's only us against all that power" that reveals a lack of a sense of internationalism. Our identification with Castro, Mao, or Uncle Ho displays more of the common American hang-up on personalities rather than any international solidarity.

We have the typical middle-class ambivalent attitude toward violence -- both abhorrence and fascination. Like most of our countrymen, we have little or no sense of history. The tradition of anti-intellectualism comes out in our tendency to rally around a series of slogans or styles of rhetoric. Our commitment to individualism usually manifests itself in demagogic obstructionism rather than permitting "the free development of each to be the necessary condition for the free development of all." (Karl Marx)

I don't want to say that these characteristics of our style and personalities are bad in themselves, like blemishes to be purged from our souls. To do that would be to deny our history and ourselves. Many of those prejudices and traditions have a positive side. However, rooting out the good aspects of those traditions requires a kind of revolutionary self-understanding that most of us lack.

But our problems go beyond an unconscious cultural and historical traditionalism. We are plagued by contemporary America as well. The SDS chapters in worstshape are located in and around the large cities -- New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Chicago. In spite of numerical strength, intellectual and financial resources, organizing issues, and regional offices, there is more stagnation and isolation surrounding SDS chapters and members in the large metropolitan centers than in the small state colleges out in the middle of nowhere. The only way I can make sense of this is by viewing the urban centers as creatures of U. S. monopoly capitalism, and, as such, the cities accomplish a major task of that system -- dividing people from each other.

In the cities, 5 SDS chapters can be only 5 miles from each other, yet most people in the chapters don't know anyone in the other chapter or what they're doing or

thinking. What's worse, they don't even want to know. Since most city colleges are commuter schools, most SDS people within a chapter see each other only at lunch time, and have even fewer possibilities of developing personal contacts among the general student body. The big cities are brutal, dehumanizing places. Even "liberated new Leftists" are turned into psychotics. Perhaps these forces, more than anything else, cause the faction fights, personality struggles, and sectarian in-fighting that so viciously plagues the big city SDS chapters.

## DIVERSITY

Despite the preceding interpretations, the two most overriding features of SDS as a national organization are its "uneven development" and its ideological diversity. To begin, very few members have what we would traditionally call ideological perspectives. But among those who do, the diversity is tremendous. We have within our ranks, Communists of both varieties, socialists of all sorts, 3 or 4 different kinds of anarchists, anarcho-syndicalists, syndicalists, social democrats, humanist liberals, a growing number of ex-YAF libertarian laissez-faire capitalists, and of course, the articulate vanguard of the psychedelic liberation front. Every chapter has at least one, if not several of the above. Whether or not one sees this kind of diversity as good or bad, healthy or disruptive, to be encouraged or to be stamped out, naturally depends upon one's own political analysis. My own feeling is that the diversity would have a great deal of creative potential if the ideologues would deliver fewer harangues and more thoughtful reflective analysis and research.

To my mind, the uneven development within National SDS is a more significant characteristic of the organization than ideological diversity. The "unevenness" is seen for the most part, in the tactical and programmatic activities of the chapters. There are chapters just beginning to organize for their first teach-in, while other chapters have had several on a variety of topics. A few have abandoned the tactic entirely, having played out its usefulness. In some places, there are active unions of draft resisters; while elsewhere, chapters are debating whether or not the C.O. handbook is too radical for the literature table. There are even one or two chapters where a literature table is considered too extreme.

University reform activities range from strikes demanding student power to working-within-the-system weekly luncheon "dialogue sessions" with an assistant Dean of Men to "liberalize" dress regulations. Some of the newer chapters have skipped over the past syndromes of SDS, plunging right into more radical and significant programs. With other chapters, it seems likely that they will have to painfully struggle away with all the dead-end issues many of us have since learned to avoid.

We should be careful not to look at these newer chapters or their programs with a "more radical than thou" attitude. They may succeed with a program or tactic that older chapters failed with due to their own ineptitude rather than because of the limits of the issue. Besides, even if we "old hands" are right, the newer chapters can learn a great deal from the experience of their mistakes. However, we obviously should try to learn as much as possible from each other's past successes and failures.

The internal, uneven development of SDS becomes most significant when we consider the problem of the formulation and implementation of national programs. Consider the student strike proposal. A few SDS chapters could carry out an effective student strike-type activity against the war. Most chapters could do something, but it would probably go unnoticed. Other chapters couldn't and/or wouldn't do anything. But the real problem arises when this kind of national program disrupts, if not destroys, the local chapter's organizing efforts. The legalism of local chapter autonomy means

little when the mass media puts the screws on. I see no simple solution for this problem. There may not be any solutions. The best we can do is work for better communications, internal education, and more thoughtful National programs. Until then, we will continue to have agonizing, poorly attended National Council meetings that expend a great deal of time and energy passing empty programs and irrelevant resolutions.

## ON CHAPTERS

Although our chapters differ significantly in size, style, environment, and the specific content of programs and positions, there is a kind of underlying reality that is shared by almost all of them. The interesting thing is that if chapter people are aware of these common factors, they usually feel these things to be their unique problem. Rather than talk about specific chapters, I can probably best describe these common characteristics by using an abstract model with a few "ideal types".

Within any chapter, there are usually three different kinds of people. The bulk of the membership, about 85-90%, is made up of what I call the "SHOCK TROOPS". They are usually the younger members, freshmen and sophomores, rapidly moving into the hippy, Bobby Dylan syndrome. Having been completely turned off by the American system of compulsory miseducation, they are staunchly anti-intellectual and rarely read anything unless it comes from the underground press syndicate. They have never heard of C. Wright Mills or even Bob Moses, nor do they care to find out. In one sense, they have no politics. But they come to meetings, for awhile anyway. They turn out regularly for the demonstrations. They are morally outraged about the war, cops, racism, poverty, their parents, the middle class, and authority figures in general. They have a sense that all those things are connected somehow and that money has something to do with it. They long for community and feel their own isolation acutely, which is probably why they stick with SDS.

The second SDS type makes up about 5-10% of the chapter's membership. These are the "SUPERINTELLECTUALS". Most are graduate students in the Social Sciences or Humanities; a few are married. They read the left-wing journals, maybe even subscribe to one or two. They follow political events carefully. They know all the arguments for and against pluralism in American society. They show up at chapter meetings sporadically, but when they do, they talk a lot. Although they know a lot about politics, their own positions are rather obscure, due to a myriad of contingencies and qualifications. They tend to waver between moods of cynicism and super-seriousness. They spell out grand strategies for the chapters activities, but will rarely sit behind the literature tables. They talk a lot about power structure research, the need for analysis, and are turned on by the REP prospectus. They join most of the demonstrations, but rarely help make the picket signs.

The third ideal type within SDS, the final 5% are what I call the "ORGANIZERS". These are the people that keep the chapters going. Their age varies, anywhere from high school seniors to faculty. An increasing number are dropping out of school, but staying near the University community. Many more would probably drop out if it weren't for 2-S and the draft. They do the bureaucratic shitwork (reserving rooms, setting up tables, ordering literature, etc.) or see that it gets done. They are constantly trying to involve new people or reinvolve old people in chapter's activities. They experiment with ways to reach new constituencies -- talking in Fraternities, Dorms, YAF meeting, churches, working class bars and restaurants. There is not much political analysis here, most of the organizer's projects are experimental, spur-of-the-moment decisions. They often take on

too many responsibilities, get their personalities wrapped up in programs, begin to manipulate people, end up giving orders and turning into a one-man political machine -- all in the name of participatory democracy.

They tend to alternate periods of intensive organizing with periods of moody mystical soul-searching. Sometimes they don't come back. Their politics tend to be erratic, changing whenever they finally get a chance to read a new book. Their basic commitments and instincts for relating to other people usually remain constant. The organizers continuously develop a seductive rhetoric, and an excellent skill for an interpretive analysis of specific situations. But they tend to shy away from the important kinds of factual analysis and research. They are the people who try to attend the regional and national conferences. Most of them see the broader movement beyond their local chapters as the thing that sustains them. The most significant aspect of the organizers, especially the best of them, is that somewhere along the line they went through an intense radicalizing experience, usually involving a direct confrontation with the power of the police in the South or in the Northern ghettos and poverty areas.

In order to understand more fully the frustration and despair in many SDS chapters, it is important to look at the dynamics that exist between the three types. To begin, the super-intellectuals are intensely cynical toward the younger shock troops, especially the hippies. In retaliation, the younger troops put the superintellectuals in the middle class bag along with their parents and the Dean of Men. This is a tremendous waste, for the superintellectuals are, without a doubt, some of the most brilliant young people in America today. They have the intellectual skills of analysis our younger members need. The needs go the other way too. There is much to be learned from the hippie shock troops. The exuberance, humor, gentleness and openness to one's own experience are qualities that many of us who were young during another scene can learn a great deal from.

How do our intellectuals relate to our organizers? Ideally, and sometimes in practice, they see themselves as the organizer's brain trust, the source of his data, strategies, and models -- the kind of knowledge that gives the movement its "real" power in the world of politics. The organizer accepts a good deal of this, with the qualification that the "real" power is in the people he's working with rather than the analytical research, which he sees as helpful, although secondary. For the most part, however, our intellectuals view the organizer as a sloppy-thinking mystic with no sense of history. In return, the organizer often looks at the superintellectual as a new kind of Fabian Society opportunist who lacks the guts to break with the middle class. There is a bit of truth in both of these attitudes.

Finally, let us look at the interaction between the organizer and the shock troops of alienated youth. First of all, the organizer's attitudes toward them are truly ambivalent, almost schizoid. The ambiguity of the whole teeny-bopper, hippy scene itself has something to do with it, but the organizer's mixed feelings are more likely to be the result of the fact that he is not too far removed from that whole scene himself. He certainly shares their pain. At times, he is tremendously hopeful, seeing himself as an archetype. He broke out of the syndrome; therefore, there is hope for them. On the other hand, when he is particularly worn out and burdened, he measures his exhaustion against their frivolity, feels cheated, and reacts with bitter harangues about bourgeois decadence.

The younger troops feeling toward the organizer are mixed as well. Sometimes there is a great deal of admiration and the resulting shyness, especially if the organizer is particularly charismatic. Sometimes, they feel guilty, because of their failure to be more involved in the chapter's daily work.



# Has SDS Gone to Pot?

But they often justify this by attributing a lack of sensitivity to the organizer.

This completes my analysis of the dynamic tensions within the "average" chapter. The problem I will speak to now is how a radical education program should be oriented to the different tensions and personality types within our membership. However, before I can outline specific national programs, I will try to develop some general notions about radical education.

## THE FIGHTING TASK CONFRONTING WORKERS WITHIN THE MOVEMENT

The name of the system we live within is imperialistic monopoly capitalism. We have labeled the official rhetoric of that system "corporate liberalism". We all also realize that if our values of participatory democracy are to be realized, then the system must be fundamentally changed. Whether that change is called "sweeping reform", "radical social change", or "revolution" depends upon one's particular political perspective. My own choice is revolution. But I think most of us realize that we are not living within a revolutionary situation. In fact, most Americans are not even thinking of change. Since this is the case, there is little need for revolutionary organizations.

But what we do need to be doing at this stage of the game is building radical or revolutionary consciousness. Given the condition of our times and the character of SDS, this is no simple task. Most of us have been systematically miseducated and thrust into a political vacuum. We had no awareness of any radical historical traditions or politics. The adult political activity of our times offered nothing but impotence and mundanity, with a few scattered exceptions. Surrounded with a massive apathy, we had only our moral sensibilities. For those of us who can remember that vacuum, it is clear that we have come a long way. Ronald Aronson once remarked in *Studies on the Left* that to become a radical in contemporary America is virtually to give birth to oneself. Now that some of us have been born, what we need is a good number of midwives. In other words, we need to expand and strengthen those members within our chapters that see themselves as organizers. How can a radical education program help to do that?

Carl Oglesby made the comment at our Clear Lake convention that we could find truth in our experience, rather than in the newspapers. I couldn't agree more with that concept. But like all seminal statements, it needs a closer examination. One implication of that concept is that radical education does not occur via the printed word, either by creating more research or printing more pamphlets. Obviously, I am not suggesting that we stop doing research and sell our printing presses. I only want to assert that, if one is concerned with radical education, then something more is involved. What is that "something more?"

The key concept we need to examine is "experience". We should notice that Oglesby didn't say that our experience was truth. The syndrome of mystical existential immediacy has gone on long enough, and should be consigned to our past. He only said that truth could be found in our experience. This implies reflection and analysis, taking ourselves as data. Ultimately, it means revolutionary self-consciousness. Furthermore, we should realize that Carl talked about our experience as opposed to my experience. The cult of individual liberation and individualistic truth-seeking should be left to Timothy Leary and his League for Spiritual Discovery. (I am not putting down the psychedelic movement, only Leary's faction. For many people and situations, acid can be a good thing.) We should remember that political movements are social in character. We should be dealing with men of flesh and blood, rather than "Man" with a capital "M"; or, for that matter, a capital "I".

What does all this mean for our organizers? First of all, that they must consciously

see themselves as teachers. For too long, our organizers have failed to be teachers, out of a fear of being manipulative. This is quite understandable, since, throughout their entire lives, they probably never confronted a teacher who wasn't manipulative. This is mainly a result of the prevailing notion of education, where knowledge is something you give to, impose on, or shove down the throats of people. But radical education need not be like that. Examine the word itself. "To educate" comes from the verb "to educe", meaning "to draw out from". A good teacher draws people out of their isolation, helping them recognize the nature of their own experience, the connections their own immediate experience has with the experience of others, and finally, the historical character of their experience. The process is dynamic rather than static.

The student undergoes what John Dewey called radical education -- the qualitative growth of experience. The student, since he deals with his own experience, sees himself as an active agent in the process. Since this is in fact the case, the process is two-way; and the teacher learns and grows as well. Obviously, precious little of this goes on in the classroom of progressive education.

Organizers often shy away from expressing their own point of view. For the most part, this is an impossible task, since one's convictions have a way of popping up in a variety of ways, even by remaining silent. When the organizer refuses to express his own viewpoints, and those viewpoints come out anyway, the organizer denies both himself and his responsibility. We are trying to change people's lives. We do change the lives of a good number of people, including our own. We should accept the responsibility involved. It would make us better people, as well as strengthening the people we organize. Emiliano Zapata once said "A strong leader makes a weak people, and a strong people don't need any leaders". What our organizers and our radical education programs should be about is making stronger people.

## WHAT IS TO BE DONE

With these notions of radical educations in mind, what needs to happen with the three kinds of people in our chapters? Generally speaking, the percentage of organizers needs to expand if the movement is going to grow and expand into new areas. First of all, what are the needs of our organizers? To begin with, they need a historical perspective. We need a sense of the radical tradition of the American past, both to enable us to better understand the present and to give us a sense of radical self-identity. Previously, we went about this with an unconscious, haphazard romanticism. Many of us, (including myself) joined the IWW and hung pictures of Gene Debs on our walls. While this was certainly identifying with a past radicalism, this is not quite what I mean.

What we need is a radical understanding of both the positive and negative aspects of American history and culture. Only by understanding our roots in the past, will we be able to develop our own radical self-identity in the present. When we achieve that revolutionary self-consciousness, we will begin to shape the future. At present, a great number of us are frustrated, moody and disillusioned. If being disillusioned means having our illusions stripped away, then perhaps we can see reality. If we add to that the reflectiveness of our despair and the energy of our frustration, we just might develop the radical self-consciousness and understanding we so urgently need.

More so than the past, our organizers need to recognize the limits of the present. If we acknowledge those limits and act accordingly, we are not so likely to succumb to despair. In fact, as we push beyond the limits, our hopefulness will increase. At present, SDS has the ability only to expand its campus base, to experiment in poor white communities and insurgent unions and to educate a limited number of people. Neither SDS nor any of the groups that have grown out of it

have the ability to take power. The only overtly political power we have is the power to disrupt. But even this limited power can be significant. Like the Provas, we need to develop techniques of creative disruption.

Regarding the future, our organizers need to expand, develop and articulate our vision of participatory democracy. In a society becoming increasingly alienating and fragmented, we need more than ever to touch the lives of middle-class America with articulate notions of community, participation and liberation. But we must understand the implication of a statement of Marcuse -- that liberation depends upon the consciousness of servitude. To those we are trying to reach, we must talk about power and powerlessness. Among ourselves, we must understand the narrow limits of our own liberation, that our beloved communities have been neurotic anti-communities, and that participatory democracy only operates within the context of community. If we continue to operate under the illusion that our national and regional meetings, or, in many cases, even our chapters, are communities, we will continue to see tragic results. This is not to say that participatory democracy is any less viable as a vision or even as an experiment. In fact, our acknowledgement of the realities and problems involved make it more possible.

Finally, what should our organizers be about for the foreseeable future? In my opinion, they should be creating permanent local centers of radical opposition with the capacity for becoming the foundation of an American resistance movement. Implied in this notion of a local community of resistance is that it must necessarily see itself as part of a greater community. Thus, our organizers should develop strong regions, building up a web of mobility and contact among chapters and other regions. In the process, the organizers fulfill their own need for that broader, supportive community that enables them to continue.

Enough for our organizers; what are the educational needs of our superintellectuals? To my mind, the best thing for them to do would be to leave the university community. They have all the intellectual skill and discipline they need. What they seriously lack in their experience are the intense, emotional direct confrontations with power. They need to live and work among people who suffer those conditions daily. They might go to Texas where organizers are needed among the farm workers. We need people to work with in the poor white communities, in the rural South and in the Northern cities. Even full-time draft resistance organizing among high school and working class young guys would be good. If nothing else, they ought to campus travel and/or organize new campuses as much as possible.

What we have to realize is that it is becoming increasingly impossible to live the life of a middle-class professional and, at the same time, to take an active role in the movement needed to radically change this country. As Staughton Lynd said somewhere, "The conditions for revolution will begin when we begin to lead revolutionary lives." In America, that means we are going to have to give up quite a bit of the security, prestige and material comforts that are available to us as intellectuals.

Finally, what are the needs of the greatest number of SDS members, the young shock troops? Simply speaking, they need to be turned on to political thinking. But we must take into account their intense anti-intellectualism. Especially when we consider that, for non-political people, most political texts or even pamphlets are quite boring. What we have to understand about the non-political person's view of the world is that he looks at social phenomena, especially his own life and problems, in entirely personal terms. Our "alienated youth" are far from being separated from the isolated anomie of the middle class. Rather, we must understand them as manifesting the bitter end of bourgeois life. Although close, they have yet to make the break to become *de classe*.

Since the world of one of our shock troops is a personal one, a radical education pro-

gram must begin by relating to him in personal terms. We wouldn't think of politically educating poor white gang kids in Chicago by mailing them pamphlets and book reviews from an office in Ann Arbor. What is needed is a new kind of "teacher" who shows up in the flesh; an organizer with the sensitivity to determine "where the people are at" in terms of political awareness. He must be able to understand and relate to the experience of his students, drawing them out and enabling them to see the social and political implications of their own hang-ups.

Some of the best educational conferences I've seen consisted of 30 or 40 people from different chapters in a region getting together somewhere for a weekend. After the people got to meet each other, the conference would begin with a workshop on some pre-selected social or political topic. The workshop leader would make the initial speech, followed by questions, answers and counter-speeches from other intellectual and organizer types. After a while, one or two of the organizers (in some cases the workshop leader) would notice that only 5 or 6 of the 30 or 40 present were participating. The others, of the shock troop type, were tense, bored and restless. At this point, one or two of the organizers would begin to draw these people out, asking them questions about the topic at hand that were formulated in such a way as to call for answers based on the person's own experience, rather than an intellectual background. After some hesitance and a few fits and starts, the younger people would begin talking in earnest. The most significant thing is that people would begin talking about their own lives, the original topic becoming secondary. The organizers would speak occasionally, drawing more people out, connecting issues, broadening or narrowing the topic, and indicating new directions.

After a relatively long period of time, the discussion would seem to abruptly, but naturally, come to a halt. People would set silently, looking rather embarrassed. At this point, one of the organizers would start talking about the significance of what had just transpired. Among other things, he would be sure to discuss the meaning of people using their own lives and experiences as valid data in a political discussion. The realization people would come to was that political problems were not something that occurred apart from them; but rather, the issues and problems were part and parcel of their entire lives. Finally, they would see how political activity was more than a vent for personal hostilities or a kind of spare-time altruism. Rather, political action was an area for reaching out to other people; and, at the same time, making the meaning of one's own life deeper and more valuable. In short, people turned on to politics. For some, the reading, writing and research would follow as a matter of course. Others would have to be turned on a few more times.

In my opinion, the only effective thing we can do on a national level to meet the educational needs of the vast majority of our membership would be the hiring and mobilizing of a number of field secretaries--organizers who would work locally and regionally to enable dozens of the kind of conferences described above to occur and continue to occur. Naturally, "bringin' the peoples together" is not the only thing we can do; nor is it enough, in itself, to build a radical movement. But I am convinced that it is our first priority *vis-a-vis* internal education.

Another thing we can do, although we probably won't have enough money, would be setting up and mobilizing a series of travelling teach-ins on major issues like "Yankee Imperialism", "China", "Kennedy Assassination" or "Black Power". These would be groups of 3 to 5 people each with a proficient knowledge of a certain aspect of the general issue. They would need a car, relevant films, and a supply of literature. The NO would then, working with regional offices, chapters, and travellers, set up a tour, hitting one or two chapters a week. The team would serve as the core of a teach-in, with the local chap-

(Continued on page 6)



## A Radical Perspective

(Continued from page 3)

radical change. We realize that many problems require power and planning; the elimination of slums, and employment — transportation in cities, dealing with the pollution of air and our natural resources, the transition from a military to a peacetime economy, and many others.

(3) VALUES AND THE QUALITY OF AMERICAN LIFE — Our critique is significantly concerned with the injustices that poor people suffer, but it is fundamentally a critique of the values operating in middle class life which make these injustices possible and palatable. We are critical of those values which are dominant in our society.

An honest person becomes disgusted at one time or another at the prevalence of double-standards in all areas of our culture — this is the difference between our rhetoric and reality. In some cases, the discrepancy is more blatant than others, but its range goes from civil right to sex, from corruption and graft in the government to the role of HUAC and the FBI in a "free" society. As students we often see gaps between what learning is supposed to be and what it must be. We also see how the status emphases in the social consciousness dictate goals (a

car, a wife, "a college degree and a color TV"). Aggregate tendencies of people spending twice as much on liquor and cigarettes than on education, while classrooms remain overcrowded and science rooms remain unbuilt, indicates to us that something is wrong.

These and other less-easy-to-pinpoint characteristics make for a rather poor quality of human relationships. One's self-definition or identity tends to be created in terms of self-interested, competitive, and status-oriented values. The insecurities that would result from losing this type of orientation tend to make us view people as objects to our ends or frustrations to them. This atmosphere makes it difficult for love, human respect, and honesty to prevail.

These criticisms are made in terms of something affirmative. We desire to create a recognition structure among men; where people are regarded as human beings, not objects to defeat competitively or fear, where people are not only free to develop their potential in self-fulfillment and in relation to other people, but where they are encouraged to do so. A society where there is honesty, openness, and community must prevail.

As we proceed in our examination of each of these three areas we feel that separately taking each of them is inadequate. The first by itself does not recognize the apathy, selfishness, inhumanity, and stupidity of man. The second alone would be manipulative and no different from present society. The third alone is a utopian vision. Being radical, we recognize the interrelation of the three areas.

Usually, we call the ideal which integrates them "participatory democracy", that system in which decisions are not made from afar, which responds to human needs, and allows for self-development and fulfillment within the context of meaningful social relationships. We really mean that programs which operate "top down" are inadequate no matter what their nature. Democracy becomes meaningful only in a non-manipulative context of self-development or freedom. Values cannot operate in oppressive situations — their institution requires programs and democratizing. The organic interrelation of all aspects of a situation or whole society is what Sartre calls a *totalization*, and it is a totalization that we seek in our analysis and action.

The question arises whether everyone doesn't believe these ideals, but that most people consider them impractical. WE must reject this claim. Belief that does not lead to action (and action must be viewed as broader than quitting school and working in the South) is somehow unreal. It is an embodiment of the apathy and resignation against which we are fighting. Practicality, moreover, is a judgement made in terms of what your values are. Certainly, if profits and efficiency are held supreme, people are impractical and the sooner they are replaced by machines, the better. This criticism may seem heavy-handed to some. What about the activists who are so-called liberals. Are they not radicals?

To distinguish a liberal perspective from a radical one, we usually distinguish three

types of liberals. The first kind is the one who claims that the basic orientation of the major institutions in society is fine; it is the machinery that needs a little oiling. He thinks that the civil rights movement has been successful because it has instigated the passing of recent civil rights legislation. Insofar as his aims direct him to work with radicals, he is our ally, but it is clear that if he maintains his liberal perspective, his activism will stop when his limited results have been achieved. The second type of liberal says that society as presently constituted has severe flaws, but the progressive changes will right it. This position is what has been termed programmatic radicalism and is typified by Eduard Bernstein's evolutionary socialism (and, currently, Rustin and Howe). The third type of liberal usually agrees with our analysis, but says that the social conditions are not ripe for basic change. He, therefore, abandons a hopeless task and tries to make this world the best that he feels is possible. In a sense, he has disavowed the freedom of human beings to have a profound effect on social change.

Our radical perspective differs from all these views in emphasizing the interrelationship of democracy, programs, and human values. In practice, this means that we do not accept the civil rights bill as a fundamental advance for the cause of human dignity. We recognize it as positive and significant, but not as a sign that our task has been accomplished. Radicals and liberals during the '30's were elated at the passage of welfare legislation; liberals, however, did not recognize it as merely programmatic advancement. They saw its humane benefits, but did not recognize it as a continuance of paternalism. A radical perspective means that our action is not guided by single issues, but is guided by the continuity of a comprehensive analysis.

This does not however, mean that we should not work with liberals on single issues. Though they do have the tendency to retreat from activism after token gains have been made, they are disturbed about similar ills that we are. If our analysis is correct, a single set of programmatic changes or slight democratizing of some institutions will not completely solve any one ill. If we are constantly aware of these factors, we will be able to remind them of these problems. If the war in Vietnam ends, but foreign policy changes slightly, we will be able to point to Vietnam's deeper significance. They too may develop a radical perspective as a result of the rationale of it (it is clear that this has happened extensively to young people in the civil rights movement). Coupled with our activism is the necessity for radical education.

What does this mean for us now in America? To me, it means that a multi-issued movement must develop which embodies in it human values. This multi-issued movement must build its own democratic institutions, try to democratize other institutions, and seek programs for these institutions which gear to the real needs of people.

## A NEW SOUTH

(Continued from page 1)

regular jobs less. That means we are more and more dependent upon friends and supporters to keep us alive.

We are part of a movement for a new and more democratic society. We need the financial aid of those who share our faith. We suggest:

- A monthly pledge to pay all or part of the subsistence for a staff member (\$100 a month). Perhaps a group could keep such a pledge.
- A monthly pledge to pay the cost of renting films (approx. \$80 a month)
- The cost of a 16 mm sound film projector
- Funds toward building a library or for recreation equipment
- Rent and utilities on a 5-room house (\$100 a month)

We will appreciate whatever you can do for this effort — thank you.

SOUTH NASHVILLE COMMUNITY PROJECT  
Box 6072 — Nashville — 37212

## REP REPORT

(Continued from page 3)

The value of having on file several thousand people who want to do REP work is several-fold: 1) When any new project develops, be it studying radical history or studying tax-evasion procedures in the Boston area, there are usually a number of people in our files who want to work on it. 2) We are finding many new people who have skills in interesting areas (be they knowledgeable about the Wobblies, experts on Southeast Asia, or heads of radical labor union locals) who will speak to local chapters or at conferences. 3) Some of these people have written good material (and are willing to write more) for us to publish. 4) These people would easily hook-in to the organizing of caucuses in the academic disciplines and the professions — a long-term project that many of us talk about, but that none of us have been able to do anything about.

### WHERE STAFF-TIME GOES:

The bulk of staff time, however, has not been spent dealing with the names in the files. Most of it has been spent dealing with matters that could be called "internal education." Rather than continue to talk generally, I think that a discussion of REP's current activities, and those projected for the near future will give a better idea of what REP is about. Additions, suggestions, and changes will be welcomed.

1. *Study Guides and Pamphlets:* Three study guides are now available from the NO: "Power in America" by Jim Jacobs, "The New Left" by Hal Benenson, and "Marxism" by Mike Goldfield. "American Foreign Policy and Imperialism" by Steve Johnson is edited and should be ready in early January. "Radicalism in America" by Ken Walzer and Dennis Greg is being printed commercially with money that was contributed for that purpose. We have promises that Pete Henig's Chapter Film Program Guide and Film Catalogue will be ready soon and that Mike

Locker's "How to Research Your University Power Structure" will be in our hands by January 30. We should also receive Jesse Lemisch's "The American Revolution from a Radical Perspective" by the end of January.

Bob Ross, who promised a study guide on Urban Politics and Lee Webb, who promised a study guide on the American Labor Movement, both by Oct. 15, have not indicated when theirs will be ready. Jill Hamburg is now trying to get a grant to do a handbook for community organizers on researching community power structures which should be ready in late March. We also have commitments for study guides on Latin America and on Socialism in Contemporary Europe, in the less immediate future. Kathy MacAffee and Evi Goldfield are trying to plan ways that they can be used as counter-curriculum proposals in the university.

2. *Basic Issues Series:* So far this fall, REP has failed to utilize sufficiently NLN. Besides communicating more regularly about what we are doing, REP, in order to help meet the educational needs of new people, will be sending into NLN, every two weeks a short (3-page single-spaced typed) paper which will try to pinpoint and clarify several basic issues with which radicals are concerned. The first one, "What is a Radical Perspective?" by Mike Goldfield, has already been sent to the NO. Others to follow will be on "Elitism and Pluralism," "Corporate Liberalism and the Welfare State," "Foreign Policy and the Cold War," and something on the university.

3. *Speakers Bureau:* Evi Goldfield has built up a file of 75-100 people who have made commitments to speak to local groups. She has on file biographic information, what they wish to speak about, how far they will travel, and how much money or traveling expenses they will need, if any. This information will be distributed to local and regional areas in another month or so. It is expected that local and regional people will add other names to the list and inform REP of the additions.

## U.S.I. Free U.

(Continued from page 1)

This kind of challenge is considered very legitimate by the powers that be. There is no threat to their position. We have \$100.00 from Student Government and a promise of a house and equipment from the SIU administration.

Now, does this Free School develop radicals. The answer is clearly "No". But it does develop questioning and a legitimacy for that questioning. One student teacher who is strongly in sympathy with Mao and the Red Guard Movement is listened to by students in the course on China.

It also develops a sincerity about education. People realize there is something real and worth studying for. I had this feeling especially in the course on the Other America. People are not as afraid to admit their ignorance. Because the classes only run about 10 to 15, there is a trust and therefore a freedom amongst the students.

With the legitimacy of the FREE SCHOOL endorsed by student government, you can have debates on the Draft, conferences on Freedom in America, and student interest arising out of the School in which many students participate. One of the things coming out of the FREE SCHOOL here is a FREE STUDENT UNION. This is not yet a movement, but with the School being legitimate, we can have action leaflets printed through the School.

Because many kids have heard of the Free University of New York or Berkeley, they think that it's "in" and sign up. This method, although not necessarily the best, has brought people into the School. The School attacks the free thinkers, which make for live discussion. At the same time, you have the people who want to do and they can put out the newspaper like the one below and help organize conferences, research, and debates. Thus I see the Free SCHOOL as a base for change, much the way the Community Union is in the community. It is a free situation for the people involved.

## On U.M.T.

(Continued from page 3)

The point to be made in all this is why help the Butcher Government? Why give the option of adopting fascism (in the name of democratization) to the State and in the name of the American Left? Our business, after all, is to clarify consciousness — not to collaborate in its obfuscation. We must seek to expose the murderers for what they are, to explain why they murder, to relate these things to what the system is — to show where the system is leading us.

If we want to help the government "democratize" its killing and perfect its techniques of social control, then we might as well apply to the Pentagon directly rather than confuse ourselves and others around SDS.

## V.P. REPORT

(Continued from page 5)

ters adding to the number with local talent.

Something I would like to see REP produce would be a coordinated series of study guides that, all together, could serve as an extensive counter-curriculum, with radical courses of interest to most students on an average campus, even the engineers. Local chapters could use this series to facilitate the organizing of "free universities within the university". The local chapter would run its courses as critiques of the courses concurrently scheduled by the university. This way, a free university would operate as a constant force of opposition and resistance, rather than as a withdrawal from our prevailing knowledge factories.

Finally, the National Office, if it can get the money, should buy films to place in the hands of travellers, buy paper and ink to print lots of new and better-looking literature and buy a stock of assorted important paperbacks for a mail-order new leftist bookstore.

Other than through the suggestions offered in this lengthy and somewhat psychoanalytic report, I can't think of any other ways to help the New Left to wise up to Imperialism, Bobby Kennedy, and their local power structure. Unless they do it on their own. Let's hope we don't have to learn the hard way.



# NO HUNTERS

## WHO WILL HUNT FOR THE MISSING ASSASSINS?

The recent books and articles on the Kennedy assassination have generally pointed in the same direction. They say the Warren Commission did a sloppy job of considering the evidence, and pasted together a theory of the assassination that the Commission's own evidence contradicts at point after point.

So far, so good. But what conclusions have these critics been coming to? So far as I have noticed, from reading some of the book reviews and the articles in Ramparts, the critics have done little more than suggest that a new commission is needed. They seem to feel a new commission should be established that would reconsider the available evidence, and then come to the conclusion that the old commission, the Warren Commission, was wrong.

That seems like a very tame recommendation. One would think under the circumstances that the Congress should be calling for a manhunt. If there is an assassin on the loose, or several assassins, an investigation to determine who they are and a manhunt to find them wherever they are, would seem to be called for.

And now we come to the hidden fears of Establishment America. There is no governmental agency administratively capable of conducting a successful manhunt! And further, a manhunt would be forced to peer right into the heart of the Dallas power structure, and perhaps even the entire Texas power structure!

Now the Texas power structure is a "hands-off" question if there ever was one. It undoubtedly maintains several underground networks of strongarm men, who use methods of violence and fear to "discipline" any number of possible opponents of the Texas power structure.

Not only would the Congress run into tremendous resistance if it tried to empower any set of investigators to move into that area; Congress would also find that there is no government agency capable of organizing such an investigation.

It has been the long-standing policy of the FBI to work hand-in-glove with local police departments. Any manhunt for JFK's assassins still at large would have to question the Dallas police long and hard. This the FBI would refuse to do.

If not the FBI, then who? The CIA would have even more qualms about offending its friends in Texas than would the FBI. The Secret Service that guards the President is too small. There is no government agency able to find President Kennedy's missing assassins. Dallas, and Texas, are going to work to prevent anybody from looking.

Thus, so far as the Congress is concerned, who cares if there are few of Kennedy's assassins still at large? Since there are no government agencies capable of hunting for them, since Texas doesn't want to be investigated anyway, the only way for Congress to deal with the problem is to move to lay it on the table.

# CHANGING CONSCIOUSNESS

## A STRUCTURAL APPROACH WITH AN ORGANIZATIONAL IMPERATIVE

Gordon L. Peterson  
U. of Wisconsin

We say that a big change is gonna come, and that we're gonna help bring it. But to change America, we must first change Americans' consciousness, their way of seeing things. Simple? Yes. But John Stuart Mill (I'm afraid) was wrong: this cannot be done by simple argument. People's minds, or rather the way they look at things, their Weltanschauungen, their perceptual structures, are not free agents. Consciousness has ties to the unconscious—it's hung-up on supra-rational (or irrational) bases. Bases that rest in structural (institutional) environments.

We are democrats, radicals, we say. I mean we are setting out to make this revolution a majority deal, this change we're bringing — 80-90% of the population are going to be turned-off to the system and turned-on to a new way of looking at things. Meaning we have to bring people, nearly all the people, to a radical, democratic consciousness — get them grooving. And we'd better get doing this (if we're serious about changing things). 'Cause after all the bomb, and we don't have forever (it won't give us forever, the bomb won't).

Structures tend to determine consciousness — to structure perception, to put people in ideological bags, put colored glasses and blinders on them all consonant with the nature and goals of the structures involved. In the Administrative Republic of America, the primary structure encountered by living beings is the bureaucracy. It takes various forms: educational (high schools, universities, etc), economic (corporations), military, governmental (agencies, departments, etc), and even ideological (religious institutions, academic, etc). The most important of these are those which dictate primary social roles: educational institutions (for those 'growing up') and bureaucracies of employment (where one finds one's economic role in society after he has 'grown up').

The important things for us radicals, us democrats, to note about bureaucratic structures are these:

- 1) perhaps more than anything else, these structures affect peoples' personalities and their consciousness; the structures implant perceptual structures;
- 2) bureaucracies are profoundly, obviously anti-democratic — i.e., authoritarian. They tend to implant attitudes and outlook conducive to the maintenance of the structure and its authoritarian na-

ture, i.e. they tend to foster anti-democratic personality types bolstered by a justifying ideology (consciousness). Basically, they are not democratic in that the flow of power is the opposite of a democratic system: in a bureaucracy power flows in one direction — down. The reverse is so in a democracy: those on the bottom make the decisions affecting their lives, power resides at the base and flows upward.

Power relations in a bureaucratic system are perhaps best illustrated by a marine sergeant of mine (who knew). His not so cryptic description: "Candidates . . . Shit flows downhill, Candidates. And you're at the bottom of that fucking hill." In the military and other bureaucracies the vocabulary stressed is "yes (sir)"; in a democratic system people say no to power. In the former, the key to survival (and upward mobility) is acceptance — of a system which denies one control over those decisions affecting ones life. One learns to accept shit-in-the-face (from those in 'authority'). Accept and live with it, and be compromised by that acceptance.

Friends: acceptance is the enemy of democracy. We democrats throw the shit back and refuse to take it (as my sergeant would surely have said had the structure in which his ego moved made him a radical sort.) Like we stand up and say, "We will make those decisions. Give the orders, etc. We are men, etc. etc." Someday no shit.

Brothers, sisters, (soul people): we are students. Our lives are tied in knots in bureaucratic bags and we have to fight the easy urge to say 'yes' (it wasn't and isn't easy to say 'no' with all that excrement coming at you from our liberal administrators. Yet we do say no!) Around us are (the majority of) students who accept: vegetables who only move at the command of a higher 'authority!' think only when they are told, and what is more (and worse) don't relate to one another.

How are we going to turn these people on and get them to say, "I too am a man. I decided, for myself, think and act and make the decisions that affect my life. It is my life." Can we win them over by argument? ('look at your apathy, vegetable, and hate them who made you apathetic'), or must we teach them to walk, step by step, bringing them to change the structure that deforms them (and us) and in so doing change their consciousness? To democratize the uni-

(Continued from page 2)

say is that the need for the types of organizations mentioned above or their facsimile does exist and that the agent for motivating their establishment should be those who recognize the need for their establishment. In the absence of their existence, these people must assume the consequences of the un-democratic society which we currently live in and which is denying the existence of over 20% of its citizens.

Suffice it to say then, that sitting around on campus congratulating each other on how bad off or exploited the poor are affects nothing. The real question is where do you go and how do you start.

Perhaps the first thing to do is recognize immediately that their are very few radical organizations which truly represent the interests of the poor. It is quite obvious that the only good organizations are those which are owned lock stock and barrel by the poor or exploited themselves. A process of illimination might proceed as follows:

LABOR UNIONS, while sympathetic to the poor, have demonstrated very little interest in doing anything for today's poor. Perhaps one of the greatest social tragedies of our time is that the various unions and their affiliates who saw their birth some 30 years ago when everyone was down and out have simply walked off and left today's poor holding the empty bag. The NFWA's march to Sacramento was a classic example of sympathy only. When the farm workers arrived, there to greet them were placard carrying members of UAW, ILGWU locals and many more. Hell, where the devil had they been for the past 30 years while the 'blue-sky' sweatshop workers' fed them? Carrying placards isn't exactly a very bold venture and certainly not anything new for them.

If one wants to concern himself with the idea of unions or unionizing, then work towards representation for those marginally skilled occupations such as domestics, janitorial workers, nurses aids, casual laborers and gas station attendants. It is here, within the lower echelons of labor unions where the new and radical constituencies need to be established.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY, whose theme song should be "sell-out '66", does not merit any real consideration. This is not to say however, that poor peoples organizations should not be aware of good candidates but the real impetus should be placed behind poor peoples organizations sponsoring their own candidates.

FEDERAL ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY programs are good only if they are or can be manipulated and controlled by the poor themselves which was the whole idea behind their creation. While a good thing on paper

versity, is to make that structure one in which any shit that flows does so from bottom to top, where people stand with Bertolt Brecht and say (loudly) to those people above, 'NO!' Where people make those decisions that affect their lives and again feel that they can, will and must do things for themselves — "no one's going to administer me — I'm a man, etc."

Now I say to you, soul folk: Don't mourn — organize. It is time we learned from the IWW and our own gutsy organizers at JOIN etc: Don't Mourn, Organize! Unlike the Wobblies, we're all in jail, this bar-windowed society; we can't afford to sit on our bunks mourning with cocktail glasses in hand discussing, being pious like Irving Howe (O Holier than Thou), telling one another how turned-on we are and how out of it they are (that majority, our revolution). Ours is a life sentence unless we make this jail over: unless we organize people to change the nature of their institutions, the bureaucracies that shape their (and our) lives. Get those structures, democratize them, and turn them against the system. Say: "System — look at this island of humanity we've made of one of your shit heaps. And we're going to reclaim more until we've got that majority setting their egos on their own little democratic independent no-saying islands — sitting there, living and being human, looking you in the face, system, and knowing what you are."

Students: Soul Sisters and Soul Brothers. At our-bureaucracies (the universities) God is on Our side. Our administrators are rhetorical liberals (they talk about freedom and democracy). And we just have to get those vegetables, our more (than ourselves) de-

they have amounted to nothing more than a bone thrown out to the poor by LBJ's crummy society men. I have yet to hear about one good CAP program or council that has a "maximum feasible participation of the poor", (two-thirds poor people), on it. For the most part the majority of councils look more like chambers of commerce. Furthermore, when it gets down to the nitty-gritty and really letting the poor do for themselves, some politician starts bitching, such as what happened in Delano, when the federal funds were shut off. Or, the hopes of the people turn into a political football which eventuates in the poor getting disillusioned and going home. The best way to take advantage of EOC grants is to help the poor write up their own request, see if they can come up with the required 10% of their request "in kind" without going through the communities elected officials. When you come right down to it, however, the handwriting is on the wall for federal poverty programs, guns and butter simply don't mix.

CHURCH GROUPS are good places for support but insofar as really getting radically involved they appear to be more concerned with trying to determine whether God is dead or alive. Definite exceptions to this are the Migrant Ministry and the Catholic Rural Life Committee.

As I have mentioned before, the best organizations are those which are both new in their establishment and which are owned and controlled by the poor themselves. Due to the dearth of any form of national social protest on the part of the poor, (excepting minority groups), we need to begin building radical constituencies around local issue-oriented campaigns within the neighborhoods. This seems to be the best course to take in that the degree of suspicion, distrust and alienation on the part of the society towards the poor and exploited is great. Society has gone to great lengths to muffle and stifle those who try and point up its failings and injustices — welfare is a beautiful example of this type of safeguard.

When you begin to move into a community to help, remember to respect the people for being what they are — the only real experts on their situation. Remember too, that you are an outsider and it is they who must live with whatever consequences occur. Keep in mind that you are asking for success from people who have less to offer in terms of funds, knowledge of how to deal with those who helped put them where they are and how to get out of it.

But they lack nothing at all when it comes to ideas, feelings and most important of all — guts! Watts wasn't exactly any hot-bed of intellectualism but they managed to pull off the most democratic thing since the Boston Tea Party!

formed and apathetic fellow students, to take a few short steps learning to walk, demanding they control things a little (by little). Our authorities just can't throw shit on those demanding that they live up to their own justifications, their own rhetoric; they can't throw shit on their own 'beliefs' — they will have to let the students start making some of, (then all) the decisions effecting their lives or face their own lives as lies. If they do evacuate upon the administered, the latter might just get disillusioned with 'authority' and all the sooner learn to say 'no!'. And see then how it's always been. And then change it. Either way they're learning to walk. God knows we've got to get America back on its feet again. Oh, Barry G(olwater) — yes, society is making us vegetables — no initiative, apathy, etc. etc. Yes.

Soul Folks, we race the bomb. And those structures will stand and make people accept as long as we mourn around our wine and beer and test the dryness of our social martinis. Shall we be up off our asses, be gutsy (it's boring and slow) and organize? Do we have any choice? Can we change peoples' consciousness otherwise? and you know we must. There is no one else to do it. So. In the words of J.P. Donleavy (amended), a prayer:

And dear God  
Give me strength  
to put my shoulder to the wheel  
and Organize

My style is meant to be readable. My sociology is indebted to Marx, Mannheim, Weber, Marcuse, Brecht and Berger/Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality*, ( 966).



# THE BOARD

(Continued from page 3)

peanut butter, roll it into a ball 1/4 inch in diameter, and leave it out to harden overnight. The next day, swallow it just a few minutes before the X-ray. It will show up in your stomach as a duodenal ulcer. At this point, it shouldn't be too hard to get a letter from the doctor stating that you have this condition. At the physical itself, you could keep a straight pin on the inside of your shorts, and prick your finger lightly when asked for a urine sample, so that a drop of blood becomes mixed with your urine, which would look very much like kidney trouble.

Another possibility is feigned insanity. Melodramatic outbursts will not usually work, but it is possible for people to learn to mimic the pattern and dislocation of insanity fairly well. It might be practical for insanity workshops to be started, with some movement-oriented psychologists first talking about what insanity really means, and then coaching people and helping them to imitate these patterns.

Organizing for resistance and harassment during physicals is another situation, though. A number of tactics can be used. Simply talking to guys waiting in line, and refusing to take any shit from sergeants can be highly effective, as can the distribution of a leaflet. The best thing to be done, though, is the circulation of a petition among the potential draftees, calling for an end to the war or the draft, for this actively commits some of them to being on your side.

One thing which is very important to re-

member is that these centers are rarely on federal property, in which case orders from soldiers should be resisted firmly and as loudly as possible. At the very worst, the police might be summoned to arrest you for disturbing the peace. This has the effect of: a) educating people as to how the state reacts to people trying to exercise their political freedom, b) generally convincing people that you shouldn't be drafted, and c) delaying any attempt to draft you, as current policy is not to draft people who have prosecutions or appeals pending. Defense lawyers have argued that it is impossible for someone to be guilty of breach of the peace or disorderly conduct while in the act of exercising his right to petition, but no cases, to my knowledge, have been decided yet.

One thing which has been successful recently has been getting people off of charges of refusing induction on the grounds that the board did not afford due process by violating its own regulations. For example, the law states that no member of a draft board may be in the military, which includes the reserves, which is frequently overlooked. Also, boards are required to post in a conspicuous place the name and address of the board's legal advisor, who is supposed to counsel people about their rights under the draft law, which is rarely done. There are numerous other things which draft boards invariably overlook, but nonetheless, make their proceedings illegal even under their own law, and these ought to be taken advantage of.

## REP Report

(Continued from page 6)

4. *Tapes, films, etc:* We now have available for distribution a 1-hour tape on the war in Vietnam made by Jerry Lustig from newscasts in the past year. During the coming year, Pete Henig plans to assemble tapes, films, and possibly even a photo-exhibit for chapter use; he is particularly concerned about new ways to present material to those who have not yet been radicalized.

5. *Literature Packets:* Almost finished is a collection of about 20 articles and selections of materials on the nature of the university and "university reform." The collection is being edited by Evi Goldfield. She plans to include several liberal views of the university, several original articles, one or two New Left versions of how a university should be run, extracts from the programs of one or more university reform movements, and other pertinent materials.

Few of the things written on the university (out of the thousands that have been written) are decent, and those that are, are difficult for ordinary people to find. This collection will include an introduction, commentaries on each article, a bibliography, and a study guide on how to use the material either as the basis for a single discussion or meeting, or as the basis for a seminar. Printing should be finished by the end of January or the beginning of February, if things happen on schedule.

6. *The REP Summer Institute:* This is probably the most important single program as far as internal education is concerned. Plans so far are quite tentative. We are thinking of having one or two four-week sessions (3-three week ones if there are that many people). A good hunk of the time would be spent taking four courses from radical faculty people. The areas might be The American Economy, The American Ideology, Radicalism in American History, and U. S. Foreign Policy. The rest of the time would be spent getting experience leading discussions, discussing chapter problems, learning to use new materials and techniques, seeing films, and planning chapter programs. A lot of what will be done will depend on the type of people who come, the programs, and the material the full-time coordinator can get together during the spring. Money will be raised simultaneously to the setting up of the institute.

7. *The New Left Papers:* The book that is being edited by Steve Weissman is slow in progressing. It is to consist of about twenty analytical essays by people in the New Left. Many of the people who gave commitments last May to write articles are either slow at getting their articles in or have reneged on them completely. At present, half a dozen articles are in and another half a dozen are expected soon. Though the book is progressing slowly, we hope it will not be too long before the copy can be sent to the publishers.

8. *The REP Newsletter:* REP is currently putting out a newsletter every month or so that tells what study groups and research groups are doing, what material is available from us, and what pertinent material is available elsewhere. It also contains book reviews, study and research plans, and other types of information of interest to those who are setting up education or research programs.

9. *Traveling and Assistance:* REP staff, insofar as they have been able, have been and will continue to help regions or chapters that are having conferences. We can help with names of speakers, getting material for working papers, and sometimes with staff assistance at the conference. In many cases (half a dozen, so far) we are able to send someone on staff to participate. Upon request, people on staff have traveled to speak to local groups about REP, not only in Michigan, but to various parts of the Midwest and the East. We will continue to do this as we have time (Staff people have visited over thirty places this fall).

10. *Research and Task Force Groups:* A number of these groups are functioning quite well, ranging in subject matter from urban renewal to anarchism to other countries. Notable groups include the following: REP along with UCM and several other groups of people convened a conference of 40 radical Latin American scholars including a number of SDS people. They have set up a Latin American institute for coordinating research in this hemisphere, suggesting direct action programs around U. S. policy, and publishing a new Latin American magazine. They already have a full-time director in Fred Goff and John Gerassi as head of the editorial board for the magazine. In economics, Frank Ackerman is putting together a critique of Samuelson's economics with the aid of some

## N.Y.R.O.

## Lit List

The New York office must relocate at the end of January. (Please send all mail requests to our old address until further notice.) Help us clean out the old office by ordering literature from us. We have the following in amounts of bulk (plenty), medium (50 to 100 copies) and few (under 50 copies).

### ANTI-WAR

Donald Duncan, "A Green Beret Blasts the War", bulk, 10¢ each.

"Why Are We Killing, Burning, Torturing the People of Vietnam?" Subway sized poster, \$1.50 plus \$1.00 postage.

"This is the Enemy". Small poster, 2¢ each or a penny each on orders of 100 or more.

### LATIN AMERICA

Andrew G. Frank, "Exploitation or Aid? U. S. -Brazil Economic Relations. A Case Study of American Imperialism." Medium quantity, 10¢ each.

### GRAPE STRIKE

El Malcariado, back issues, 10¢ each.

"Plan of Delano", bulk, 5¢ each.

## ANGRY ARTS

Week of the ANGRY ARTS against the war in Vietnam -- Jan. 29-Feb. 5

The week of the ANGRY ARTS will see an unprecedented protest against the war in Vietnam by members of all the arts: music, painting, theater, film, dance and poetry. Program will include "play-ins" in lobbies of public buildings; poetry readings on street corners; a "paint-in" on billboards; concerts, recitals, plays and films in theaters, bus terminals, parks, etc.

Boycott cards, Perelli-Minetti, free. HUELGA posters, 35¢ postage. Medium number left.

### CHINA

Halperin and Perkins, "China's Foreign Policy", 15¢ each. Medium amounts left.

Don McKelvy, "Socialist Man and the Chinese Revolution" 15¢ each. Medium amounts left.

Felix Greene, "Visit to a Rural Commune", 10¢ each, bulk.

### SOUTHERN AFRICA

"Witness to the Mozambique Revolution" "The Problem of Angola"

### GENERAL

C. Wright Mills, "An Open Letter to the New Left", 15¢ each. (10¢ each on orders of 5 or more.) Bulk quantity.

John Graham, "The American System" 25¢ each, 5 for \$1.00, 20 for \$3.00.

Heather Dean, "Scarce Resources; The Dynamics of American Imperialism" 10¢ each.

Bob Ross, "Notes on the Welfare State" 10¢ each.

Carl Davidson, "Toward a Student Syndicalist Movement" 5¢ each, bulk quantity.

"The Freedom Budget" (A. Philip Randolph Institute - a big Band-Aid for the Great Society.) Free, 10¢ postage.

"Automation's Unkept Promise", IUD-AFL-CIO about Migrant farm labor. Free with postage. Bulk quantity available.

"The Sunflower Story", Special new booklet on April, 1967, elections scheduled for Sunflower County, Mississippi. Produced by MFDP. 10¢ each. Bulk quantity available.

"The Lowndes County Elections", MFDP report, 10¢ each. Bulk quantities available.

"Community Organizing: the N.C.U.P. Model", 10¢ each.

"Port Huron Statement", 50¢ each, 5 or more for 35¢ each.

"SNCC, 1966" Carmichael Statements, 5¢ each.

"SDS National Council Statement on SNCC, 1966", free with postage.

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

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

Mr & Mrs Leon SHULL  
6417 Western ave N W  
Washington D C 20015  
for Jane

radical economists. There is also a group of radical American historians who are quite active.

11. *Reprints and Occasional Papers:* We will also be attempting to publish reprints and occasional papers as we get money. The first paper of this sort will be "A Radical Approach to History" by Jesse Lemisch. Other papers that we plan to have printed are studies on the Dominican Republic and Guatemala.

### HOW REP WORKS:

There are many other projects that are at a much more tentative stage either because money or people do not seem to be immediately available. Here is how the procedure for the adoption of REP programs tends to work in practice: Someone comes up with an idea and presents it to the REP directorate which met twice this fall (once in October and once in November). We then try to figure out who will work on it and how we will get money for it, assuming that the idea is acceptable.

Generally, except in the case of something that is deemed highly important, like Hal Benenson's proposal for the summer institute, projects get postponed unless there is someone who agrees to work on it. Things which the directorate deem important enough (speaker's bureau, U. reform collection, study guides, or the short series

for NLN) or can best be done from Ann Arbor, get large commitments of staff time. When other people don't come through on programs, be they study guides, articles for the book or whatever, people on staff get pressured into doing them. Our only way to make sure that people do not renege on commitments seems to be to bring them to Ann Arbor, as happened to Weissman. These factors should be kept in mind when sending proposals in to REP.

Two last notes on things of interest: Tax-exemption still seems a long way off. Each time we see our lawyer, he wants another ten forms filled out by Steve Johnson (who keeps the books), and the process seems unending. Also, vis a vis the REP bulletin: the money that one must have to put out a monthly journal with a circulation of 10,000 (6,000 SDS people, people in our files and other New Left sympathizers) is exorbitant; one need have about fifty thousand dollars to get off the ground, so don't hold your breath. There is a better chance that we will have that type of money after the book comes out, but that will be quite awhile.

Current staff includes Peter Henig, Steve Johnson, Evi and Mike Goldfield. Jim Jacobs is taking a leave for four months and will be back on staff in the middle of May.

(Ed. Note - A large part of this report was written just prior to the Dec. N.C.)