

by Bob Gottlieb
New York-AI-Large SDS



Gerry Ryan of the Uniformed Firemen's Assn. came over. He stood with a drink in his hand. "You deserved it," he told Rockefeller.

"It's not all in yet," Rockefeller said. "It will be, and you started right at the bottom and came up and got it," Ryan said.

If the Chase Manhattan Bank is starting at the bottom, nobody should allow himself to be born into means.

- Jimmy Breslin, the N. Y. World Journal Tribune, the day after.

To analyse electoral processes and the role of political institutions in an advanced industrial society is an unenviable task: moreover, when radical alternatives within an electoral context are absent - as in the case of the United States although not of Western Europe - analysis tends to be sterile and to focus on given facts and assumptions rather than on the potentialities of a situation. All too often actuality is substituted for potentiality and a critique of contemporary political realities is limited to the framework of a politics of protest. At the same time, a tendency arises (especially within SDS) that looks outside the realm of electoral activity in attempting to develop movements that want no part in politics. A society defined by political, albeit manipulative, roles and institutions, a society which consists of

the political economy of capital, whether in the private or public sphere, forces these movements to relate to or be crushed by the political world surrounding them. Thus electoral politics becomes a Pandora's box: if we refuse to open the box - to take part in the political realities of contemporary America - we remain irrelevant; if we open the box we seem to be engulfed by the fixed limitations of a manipulative consensus.

Three years ago Tom Hayden and Gene Feingold wrote an article for SDS depicting the probable situation for the elections of '64. This was written before the assassination of Kennedy and with the assumption that the Presidential race would be between Kennedy-style liberalism and Goldwater conservatism. The issues as presented relate to two basic spheres in American political life: the Cold War and the role of the public sector of the economy. Hayden and Feingold argued that on one level we should support the liberals: if the programs of the public sphere were accepted, a real dialogue and confrontation of real alternatives could occur. If we advocate the democratization of an increased public sector through decentralized community control, then our alternatives are more clear and attainable once the sophisticated liberalism of Kennedy has been accepted. What is presented is a centralist-decentralist dialectic: the conditions

(Continued on page 2)

national secretary's report

BEYOND THE BELOVED COMMUNITY

A Response to Pat and Ken

Movements, like individual men, need to pause from time to time in order to examine their past history and discover their present situation so that they can chart their future course. This need becomes especially acute when the individuals involved in those movements begin to suffer from the schizophrenic malaise which results from an inability to reconcile the deepest human impulses which brought them into the movement and the day-to-day activity in which they are involved. It is this divorce between the revolutionary needs which brought people into the movement and non-revolutionized mode of existence which they find while working in the movement which creates the frustration and the sickness that finally threatens to immobilize them. Driven to despair by the unfulfilled character of their own existence, they begin to despair of the possibility of achieving the revolutionary ends which they

so strongly desired. Having desired to live in a free world and unable to attain freedom in their own lives and in their relationships with others, they begin to doubt the possibility of ever achieving freedom.

It would be easy to dismiss such sentiments in a cynical fashion by treating them as naive and superficial. I cannot concur in the facile judgment of the cynics, nor will I despair of revolutionary possibilities. Revolutionary movements are not born out of cynicism, but out of the deepest kind of faith in the potentialities of a liberated humanity. Cynicism about human nature and human possibility is finally the unifying stance of both liberalism and conservatism; both regard revolutionary demands as naive; both reject the notion of freedom. Let us leave cynicism to the liberals and the conservatives. The desire for freedom, the faith in its

(Continued on page 3)

an internal newspaper of
students for a democratic society

1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

VOL. 1, NO. 45 let the people decide NOVEMBER 25, 1966

(Nov. 25, 1966)

JOHNSON & VIETNAM

Gambler's Dilemma

Hysterical, war-mongering Goldwater or rational, moderate Johnson - which would be President of the U.S.? Two years ago this looked like a vital question.

Then, most of us would have regarded as over-cynical this comment from a Saigon newspaper: "Whether Johnson wins or Goldwater makes no difference to what happens in Vietnam. The difference between Johnson and Goldwater is that Goldwater wants to take on the Soviet Union and China together, while Johnson wants to make peace with the Soviet Union in order to concentrate the attack on China."

Well, now we know better. And judging from the November Congressional election results, more and more people are beginning to know better. Johnson's personal popularity has slumped. In both the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Democratic Party sustained significant losses.

A Major reason for this debacle is the effect of the Vietnam war on the American economy. In committing the U.S. as deeply as he has in Vietnam, the President, it is clear, has taken insufficient account of the strain on its manpower and resources. His is the classic dilemma of the greenhorn poker-player, who finds he has already staked such ruinous sums that he dare not withdraw from the game - and so has no alternative but to go on raising the stakes.

DECEMBER N.C. SEE PAGE 5

The more dollars, the more lives are squandered on the battlefields of Vietnam, the more unthinkable it becomes for Johnson to retreat from his intransigence and admit that they were spent in vain.

How Many Chips on the Table?

There are now 287,000 American servicemen in Vietnam. To supply and service them is, even for the U.S., a major undertaking. The Defence appropriation for the current year reached the record figure of over 58 billion dollars. There are signs that Congress is already growing restive at such massive military expenditure; but the U.S. will have to do more than that to achieve a military victory. It is thought in Washington that the Administration intends to have 400,000 men in Vietnam by next January. On 10th August Senator John Stennis, chairman of the Senate Preparedness sub-committee, stating that the number of troops "must be stepped up to avoid a prolonged war of at least several years", indicated that he had in mind a figure of 500,000 to 600,000.

In the air, too, the war is proving more costly than had been expected. According to the official American figure, 346 jet aircraft have been shot down over North Vietnam in the past 18 months, mainly by ground fire. (North Vietnamese sources put the figure at over a thousand.) Seven fighter bombers were recently lost in a single day - the cost of these alone is estimated at something over 4 million. The U.S. cannot afford to go on losing such expensive aircraft.

Economic aid to the South Vietnam government cost 675 million dollars in the fiscal year from July 1965 to July 1966 - 25% of the total amount allocated by the U.S. for foreign aid in that year.

The construction of new harbours in South Vietnam and Thailand, the high spending of American troops in Vietnam, the so-called

"pacification" programme - these can cost the U.S. a thousand million dollars and more in a year. (The pacification programme, even if 100% successful, would take 20 years, at its present rate of progress, to "pacify" all the 15,000 hamlets of South Vietnam. But in any case, no one really expects it to succeed - too many previous such schemes have failed; it is primarily a piece of window-dressing, designed to distract attention from the more openly brutal approach of Marshal Ky, who is more interested in crushing the Buddhists and inciting an invasion of the North than in dealing with the problems of the Vietnamese peasant.)

"But I've Got a System . . ."

In America, as in Britain, inflation has now become a talking point. Increases in prices and wages are outstripping the official "guideline" of 3.2%; interest rates have risen to around 4.5% - the highest for twenty years: America is being edged into a credit squeeze.

No one doubts that the escalation of the

(Continued on page 8)

inside
this
issue

PRACTICAL
POLITICS
page 3

ALIENATION
OR
PARTICIPATION
page 4

CANADA
page 7

NAC minutes
page 8

SHOPPERS
BOYCOTT
page 7

L.A.C.
page 5

On Egleson's Report From Buffalo

by John Bancroft,
Swarthmore, Penn.

My mother, after reading Nick Egleson's article on the referendum at Buffalo, would have called him a Trotskyite. But rather than resort to name-calling, I will simply outline my objections to Nick's article. He said that he felt SDS members should not take part in an official referendum on the draft exam at Buffalo because there was not enough time for the election, because the university-draft board relationship should not be decided by vote, and because the administration should not be allowed to sidestep the more general questions about campus democracy.

I know no more about the Buffalo situation than Nick tells us, but I object to what he says.

If there is one thing we have learned from our organizing experience, it is that we must act in areas where there has been generated a potential for change. (ERAP was seen as a viable strategy because *The Other American* unemployment, and the War On Poverty had made people aware of the problem.) To say that we will not participate in an election because there is not enough time is to isolate ourselves unnecessarily from a possible opportunity for change. Why not campaign in the election, and at the same time add one more argument against the administration by pointing out that they are trying to railroad through a measure? Recently, Boston SDSers went so far as to lay down in front of McNamara's car in order to force him into debate on the war. Would it not have been silly of them to refrain from such action on the grounds that they were not being given a fair chance to debate McNamara?

Nick seems excessively purist also when he says participation in the referendum would have been sidestepping the whole previously-raised issue of general student democracy. But if we wait for an opportunity to decide on all questions of campus democracy at once, we will wait forever. By participating in the referendum, one is in the position to say first, "this vote is unfair because we haven't been given enough time," and more importantly, "okay, now that you've let us vote on the draft exam, you must let us vote on the curriculum."

I object most to Nick's suggestion that the issue is so fundamental that it should not be decided by a vote, and further that this is so because there is no U. of Buffalo equivalent to judicial review.

This is an ahistorical and anti-democratic point of view. Just because judicial review, largely for political reasons, has been helping the left more than hurting it for the last 10 years does not make it a good thing. Does Nick forget that for decades judicial review was used to strike down progressive measures that had been arrived at democratically? Nick sounds like John Marshall when he says that some issues are too fundamental to be decided by democracy. If we really believe in letting the people decide, then we should renounce such things as judicial review which are part of America's checks (on the people) and balances (against democracy) system, and not extol judicial review simply because the Supreme Court has been liberal for the last few years.

But this matter shouldn't require such references to history and jurisprudence, for basically my point is that the question of university autonomy from the state, and other such fundamental questions, are exactly the ones that must be decided by democracy, and we can't cop out by making purist objections to the circumstances and scope of the vote. In the Buffalo situation, if it was as Nick suggests, SDS should have spoken out in the referendum debate, while at the same time objecting to the railroading involved. If they lost, they should have faced the fact, demanded a new vote, and then done enough organizing to win the next vote on the draft exam. Thus the Buffalo SDS chapter, instead of isolating itself from the campus would take part in a vital student vote, and would be ready to press the administration for a vote on other major issues facing the campus.

ELECTORAL POLITICS '66

for democratic decentralization are most ripe once a more centralized and integrated economic structure has been realized. (After all, Western Europe has a more rationalized, centralized, and even more integrated Capitalist system than the U.S.)

However, the argument falls short in two ways. First, our foreign policy has become increasingly tied to the economic, political, and military needs of contemporary imperialism (even given the possibility of Bobby K as President). Not only has the U.S. become the predominant imperialist power, but it also has expanded its role in containing various national movements for political and economic control over their countries. Although the possibility of a confrontation with the Soviet Union has been reduced, the focus of confrontation has shifted from the two industrial powers to the underdeveloped world. Cold War rhetoric and the ideology of anti-communism have not diminished but have been reformulated to meet the needs of the contemporary situation. China has displaced the Soviet Union as the enemy of the American people.

Secondly, and perhaps more important, the inability to present and communicate radical alternatives overshadows the possibility of a dialogue. In Western Europe, the working class, underclass, students, and intelligentsia all have the ability to perceive alternatives, no matter how distorted, through communications media, a left-wing press, personal contact, the academic world, and within the electoral process. It is our absence of real alternatives that drives us to feelings of hopelessness and frustration.

If S.D.S. wants to formulate an electoral perspective, it must first try to analyse critically the electoral situation, the issues presented, and their relation to real events, and then try to develop a political strategy. It is in this light that I want to analyse the 1966 elections and how they relate to our budding movement.

NEW DIRECTIONS?, OLD THEORIES!, AND THE MOVEMENT

It is ridiculous to associate social progress with a political party one of whose Presidents ended his term in 1952 unable to settle an unfortunate war in Korea, and another of whose Presidents is at the moment unable to settle an absolutely inexcusable one in Viet Nam.

— Murray Kempton, the New York Post, two days after.

In the '66 elections three kinds of issues tended to predominate: racial problems, inflation, and the War in Vietnam. None of these issues was fully explored, either by the Left or the Mainstream, for their potential or actual significance. There was no concern with the interrelationship of issues, nor were issues seen as part of developments and trends in American Capitalism. Although that is not unusual, the inability of the New Left to develop those analyses and incorporate them into a political strategy concerning the elections was disturbing.

What about the mainstream? The communications media focused on the "backlash" as their primary concern. As was repeated *ad nauseam* in the press after the elections, neither whitelash nor backlash had overwhelming political import. In the South racism flourished; in the North no significant trend developed. As for "la cause celebre" — the N. Y. Civilian Review Board — referendum democracy proved fatal as had been previously demonstrated in California (Prop. 13) and Chicago (Bond issue). No one has fully explored the politics of race and racism by relating it to the political and economic institutions that control the black communities. If these institutions have a need to maintain the situations and values of racism, how do they affect electoral politics? If they do not, what would be their converse influence? Another important area of analysis is the unfortunate degree of racism prevalent in poor and working class white communities. What are the historical roots of this situation, its relation to economic questions, and then to voting patterns? Though the advocates of "fascism is coming," or, after the '66 elections, "fascism is here," cite this racism as proof of the validity of their thesis, what they forget is that both

political parties are committed to the principle of intergration in capitalist society. (Didn't Goldwater say in Mississippi that the Republican Party advocates integration?) Racist attitudes and values are channeled into the framework of mainstream electoral choices which do not diverge widely from accepted contemporary capitalist assumptions and objectives concerning race. The quantitative extension of social welfare measures, which is as far as the liberal wing of the Democratic Party will go, may well be stopped; but whether this means fascism or the maintenance of contemporary socio-economic relations remains to be seen.

The issue of inflation, being felt as a local issue, is apparently what benefitted the Republicans most. Here the abdication of the Left is even more disturbing. Inflation was seen as a result of the War in Vietnam (this analysis was not limited to the New Left but included such eminent economic figures as the President of S & H Green Stamps). What was not pointed out was the relation of inflation to the American economy. The root of the problem of inflation is not a war which itself is a reflection of political and economic needs of American capitalism, but rather the economic and social structure of American society and its allocation of resources. If we look for radical structural change, what more imposing and personally felt issue than inflation could help us present our alternative position?

In mainstream political terms, inflation helps the Republicans because it seems to relate to the degree of Government spending here and abroad. What Republican fiscal conservatism implies is the maintenance or possible reduction of social welfare measures. Once again within both parties the actual allocation of resources is accepted, but the quantitative amount of spending in one area, domestic welfare, is what usually distinguishes the two parties.

The third issue, the war in Vietnam, was the one closest to the hearts of the New Left and New Politics people. Most of our energies went into those campaigns either within the Democratic Party or third party candidates (Cook in Connecticut, Weinstein and Aptheker in New York) who, although running on multi-issue platforms, were seen as independent peace candidates. Although these campaigns tried to link the war to domestic problems, they were unable adequately to present their position in the community or to constitute themselves as an electoral (political) force. They had no base in the community, a base which could have been developed by community organization, establishing themselves within the various social groups (labor, poor people, or middle-class organizations) or even through financial spending that could use non-personal vehicles for the presentation of their ideas. (An interesting point to note is the use of money in electoral politics: e.g. Jim Weinstein running as an independent for Congress in Manhattan spent about \$10,000 for 3,400 votes — Gov. Rockefeller spent over 5 million dollars for about 2 million votes; each spent about \$2.50 to \$3.00 a vote.)

But even more important, the peace candidates refused to come to grips with the problems of power in American society. They either accepted the assumptions of mainstream politics and just shifted to the left on one issue, or they refused to develop a comprehensive critique of American society and American politics and became irrelevant as an alternative position within the electoral process. Peace candidacies, especially of the radical variety, were seen as an extension of peace marches and demonstrations, even then the scope and numerical strength of the politics of protest were dramatically reduced, to the delight of the communications media.

The war issue was too serious for Democrats and Republicans to commit themselves to a position. The only candidates who wanted to stress the issue were hawks, and they were defeated (Duncan in Oregon, Thyng in New Hampshire). Both the Democratic and Republican parties tacitly agreed not to talk about Vietnam, especially since no essential differences in terms of a coherent critical position separated the two parties.

What conclusions can be drawn from the 1966 elections? First, the much-heard ideological division between the two parties,

so ardently desired in 1964 and thereafter by one perspective on the left, has not and is not about to take place. The politics of coalition position, if it is to continue to have any relevance, must completely redefine its objectives and assumptions about working exclusively within the Democratic Party. On the other hand, those that roundly condemn the coalitionists and spit-hell-fire on liberals and the Democratic Party, have yet to develop a comprehensive critique and strategy concerning electoral politics. Third party candidacies at this stage, given their analysis and totally inadequate presentation of alternatives, seemed doomed to that safe haven for old-time radicals: the factional left sect.

What is interesting about the '66 elections is the overwhelming similarity of political positions within the mainstream. However, when a real or potentially real issue is presented, no coherent position and alternative is open to the public. The N.Y. Civilian Review Board is an excellent case in point. By the end of the campaign the only reasons for which voters were supposed to support the Board, was the conspiratorial role of the John Birch Society (it used to be the Communist Party), the powerlessness of the Board, and the possible immunization of the police force from graft investigation (the sleeper clause). Only Mayor Lindsay occasionally emphasized the para-military nature of the police but did not extend the analogy to the question of the community and the police. The issue died there.

Where does that leave the New Left? Although this article is far from complete, it tries to raise the questions that preclude analysis. If the processes of electoral politics and the innumerable problems it raises for the New Left are to be dealt with adequately and comprehensively, we must develop theoretical insights and analyses directly related to the actualities and potentialities of American society.

As Marcuse pointed out, a technological universe is pre-eminently a political universe: in the U.S., electoral politics describes a manipulative consensus which means, above all, the absence of ideological diversity within or outside an electoral context. The politics of Welfare Statism, which is still a distant future, (the only two important areas falling within the public sector are Defense and Education) is, in itself, far removed from the politics of structural change and social transformation. (cf. Dorothy Wedderburn's "Facts and Theories of the Welfare State" in *The Socialist Register 1965*, M.R. Press) To develop a new politics or rather an alternative politics is of the utmost importance: unfortunately our politics are new in name and not in fact. What is absent is not only the strategy but the analysis itself. As a revolutionary of former times once said; without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary practise.

NEW FILMS

The Free University of New York now has available the following new anti-Vietnam films:

Peter Gessner (and the A.F.S.C.), "Time of the Locus" (about 15 minutes, basically concerned with atrocity — containing some brilliant Japanese documentation).

FUNY Workshop, "Dog Burning at Noon" (about 7 minutes, a rather surrealist portrayal of the ritual of extermination in an industrial wasteland).

NLF (the "Vietcong"), "Vietnam, Land of Fire" (about 20 minutes, the first half devoted to U.S. aggression, the second to defensive response).

DRV (North Vietnam), "Days With the Youth Shock Brigade" (about 25 minutes — the brigades are concerned with the repair of destroyed installations, roads, etc.).

All of these were made in 1966, all are in 16 mm sound. In order to make more copies we're asking \$7.50 and \$5 as rental for the two American films, respectively; \$15 (plus or minus \$5 for exceptional cases) for the two Vietnamese films. We also ask for a deposit to insure against theft by finks, etc.

Write to: Free University of New York
20 East 14th St.
New York, New York 10003

PRACTICAL POLITICS

by Ed Jahn
U of Penna SDS

The elections of this November were a minor victory for the right wing. Steve Max's article in the Nov. 11 NLN represents one common reaction to this fact: a reaction of dismay that so many respected liberals were defeated. If only "we", the left, had been a little less stiff-necked about our principles; if only we had gotten out and worked for more of these candidates. The "independent" candidates were mostly trying to get into the Democratic War and Segregation Party via the primaries. The regular Democratic-and-Republican liberals (Douglas, Brown, and company) were oh-so-mild in their opposition to the war and very, very moderate in their support for civil rights. But they were all nice guys. And after all, the left is weak, we have to make compromises and be realistic . . .

This is a familiar line of thought. Despite its demand for "realism" and pragmatism" it is profoundly irrational. It would have us work for candidates not because they have

good intentions. This is not pragmatism but sentimentalism.

A really pragmatic electoral policy would have us vote for candidates who are clearly going to act in accord with our principles. People who will actually fight for an end to the war, for civil rights, for non-exploitative aid to the poor. But if those were the standards we set, then we would vote for a liberal candidate about once every second blue moon.

The record of the "good guys" -- those liberals who are generally considered to be the best and most well-intentioned -- is almost always disappointing. Consider the state of Oregon, home of Wayne Morse and Charlie Porter. Oregon voters elect hardly anyone but extreme liberals (occasionally an anti-war Republican too). It would be hard to imagine any good reason why liberal programs should not be carried out in Oregon, at least at the state level.

The state of Virginia, on the other hand, is run by reactionaries -- Byrd-Machine Democrats. But the state of Virginia has more progressive social and welfare legislation than the state of Oregon.

In Oregon, home of the Wayne of Morse, single men are not permitted to receive Welfare. This may sound trivial, but there are thousands of single men in the state -- migrant laborers. They pick the hops that go into your beer, and spend their lives in flop houses and boxcars. The only thing liberal Oregon has done for them is to send cops to chase them out of respectable neighborhoods.

In Oregon, there is no compulsory Workmen's Compensation. When I lived there I helped the AFL-CIO gather petition signatures to put such a law on the ballot. The petition was disqualified by the liberal state government on a trivial technicality. I'm not saying that if Oregon had compulsory Workmen's Compensation it would be a paradise. But it would be a little easier for the lumber workers who got his leg cut off in a mill that was not covered by the voluntary compensation program.

Oregon lacks welfare provisions (anti-usury and anti-garnishment laws should be added to the list) that are considered elementary needs of civilization in a state like New York. Yet Oregon is a more liberal state than New York. College professors, Bobby Kennedies, religious pacifists, and

other "good guy" types win the primaries and win in the elections, not occasionally, but all the time. They defeat civil-defense appropriations and call for recognition of Communist China. But for the Negroes, the workers and the poor they do nothing.

The "liberal" politicians that "practical" left-wingers are supposed to support are politicians like all the rest. They promise you anything but give you the same old bullshit.

This election will have very little effect on national politics. The right wing won petty victories, true, and this may improve the morale of YAF. But the balance of power in the country has not changed. The main effect will be to provide Johnson with an excuse for cutting back welfare legislation. He was going to do that anyhow, to save money for the war; but now he can blame it on the conservatives. Those who believe this excuse will merely demonstrate their gullibility.

As long as the left tries to play in the great con game of Democratic-and-Republican politics, it will be wasting its energies for no good reason. It is true that we are small and weak. All the more reason not to waste our time on phoney political campaigns.

the BALLOT or the BULLET

by MALCOLM X

The continuation for this article was lost in the shuffle last week. Sorry! Here is the complete article.

No, I'm not an American. I'm one of the 22 million black people who are victims of Americanism. One of the 22 million black people who are the victims of democracy, nothing but disguised hypocrisy. So I'm not standing here speaking to you as an American patriot, or a flag saluter, or a flag waver--not I. I'm speaking as a victim of this American system. And I see America through the eyes of the victim. I don't see any American dream; I see an American nightmare.

These 22 million victims are waking up. Their eyes are coming open. They're beginning to see what they used only to look at. They're beginning to politically mature. They realize that when white people are evenly divided, and black people have a bloc of votes of their own, it is left up to them to determine who's going to sit in the White House and who's going to be in the dog house. It was the black man's vote that put the present administration in Washington, D.C., that has seen fit to pass every kind of legislation imaginable, saving you until last, then filibustering on top of that.

And you and my leaders have the audacity to run around clapping their hands and talk about how much progress we're making. And what a good President we have. If he wasn't good in Texas, he sure can't be good in Washington, D.C. Because Texas is a lynch state. It is in the same breath as Mississippi, no different; only they lynch you in Texas with a Texas accent and lynch you in Mississippi with a Mississippi accent.

And these Negro leaders have the audacity to go and have some coffee in the White House with a Texan, a Southern cracker--that's all he is--and then come out and tell you and me that he's going to be better for us because, since he's from the South, he knows how to deal with the Southerners. What kind of logic is that? Let Eastland be President, he's from the South too. He should be better able to deal with them than Johnson.

The Democrats have got the government sewed up, and you're the one who sewed it up for them. And what have they given you for it? Four years in office, and just now getting around to some civil rights legislation. Just now, after everything else is gone, out of the way, they're going to sit down with you and play with you all summer long--the same old giant con game

that they call filibuster.

All those are in cahoots together. Don't you ever think they're not in cahoots together, for the man that is heading the civil rights filibuster is a man from Georgia named Richard Russell. When Johnson became President, the first man he asked for when he got back to Washington, D.C. was "Dicky"--that's how tight they are. That's his boy, that's his pal, that's his buddy. But they're playing the old con game. One of them makes believe he's for you, and he's got it fixed where the other one is so tight against you, he never has to keep his promise.

So it's time to wake up. And when you see them coming up with that kind of conspiracy, let them know your eyes are open. And let them know you got something else that's wide open too. It's got to be the ballot or the bullet. The ballot or the bullet. If you're afraid to use an expression like that, you should get back in the cotton patch, you should get back in the alley.

They get all the Negro vote, and after they get it, the Negro gets nothing in return. All they did when they got to Washington was give a few big Negroes big jobs. These big Negroes didn't need big jobs, they already had jobs. That's camouflage, that's trickery, that's treachery, window-dressing.

I'm not trying to knock out the Democrats for the Republicans, we'll get to them in a minute. But it is true--you put the Democrats first and the Democrats put you last.

Look at it the way it is. What alibis do they use, since they control Congress and the Senate? They blame the Dixiecrats. What is a Dixiecrat? A Democrat. A Dixiecrat is nothing but a Democrat in disguise. The Democrats never kicked the Dixiecrats out of the party. The Dixiecrats bolted themselves once, but the Democrats didn't put them out. Imagine, those lowdown Southern segregationists put the Northern Democrats down. But the Northern Democrats have never put the Dixiecrats down.

No, look at that thing the way it is. They have got a con game going on, a political con game, and you and I are in the middle. It's time for you and me to wake up and start looking at it like it is, and trying to understand it like it is; and then we can deal with it like it is. ☉

national secretary's report

(Continued from page 1)

possibility (and, finally, the belief in its necessity), and the working for its accomplishment are the sentiments of truly revolutionary movements. We need not be ashamed of them--even when we are confused about how to attain them. Above all, we must not deny them: to do so would be to betray ourselves before we start.

In the face of frustration and confusion, our task--our revolutionary task--is not to purge ourselves of the desires, the vision, and the hope which brought us to the revolutionary movement. Our task is to examine ourselves and our movement and our work in order to sustain our revolutionary hope--in order that, despite the reality of frustration and despair, we might continue the building of the movement which we know is right because it corresponds to what we want for ourselves and what we understand to be necessary for the survival of the race.

I would contend two things: that our desire for freedom and our vision of a free society is correct, but that our self-understanding of what it means to be a movement involved in a revolutionary struggle for freedom has been wrong--or, at least, inadequate.

FREEDOM HIGH AND THE BELOVED COMMUNITY

The first question we must ask ourselves is: what were our motivations? or, how did the desire for freedom which brought us into the movement translate itself into immediately felt demands?

Pat and Ken have spoken of our need and desire--in the midst of a alienated, dehumanized, and privatized world--to "know" others, "to be close" to them, and, finally, to be able to love. Cynicism easily dismisses such sentiments as naive. And yet, no sentiments seem to be more revolutionary in the society in which we live--because there is no clearer denial of human freedom on the most immediate level than the destruction of the kind of community which makes human relatedness and love possible. These demands are so primary that the mass failure to respond to their absence becomes the most frightening symbol of an unfree world. Those who find such feelings trivial or naive are themselves "witnesses for the prosecution." Feelings of lovelessness, aloneness, and despair are not only "revolutionary"--they are psychologically and existentially prior to and prerequisites for all other revolutionary demands. Freedom implies a priori the satisfaction of those demands and only the cynical disbelievers in human freedom could deny their validity. That is what I mean by the correctness of "our desire for freedom and our vision of a free society."

What then, is the inadequacy of our self-understanding as revolutionaries struggling for freedom?

The revolutionary "freedom movement," the "new radicalism" in America, has a brief

but, at the same time, strange and wonderful history. It is the history of "two-dimensional anti-politics" in the face of (to borrow Maruse's phrase) "one-dimensional society." Confronted with a world of human relationships built on the sterility of one's "image"--be it grey-, blue-, black-, or pink-flannel--people began to act in new ways by sitting in, marching-in, and dying-in which transformed the universe of how one could be in the world. Courageously, we were "gonna tear this buildin' down."

And then, out of the first months and years of struggle and confrontation, with the world-out-there, came the primary and immediate demand: the demand that freedom be part of our lives NOW. FREEDOM NOW. And the new wave of immediacy overwhelmed all activity. "Projects" became transformed into "freedom houses." There was a syndrome--motherfuckallorganizations-MOFO--an anarchist immediacy demanding that the revolutionary demand be satisfied within the revolutionary movement. And then, THE BELOVED COMMUNITY, and the movement had found a new identity, a new self-definition. While struggling to liberate the world, we would create the liberated world in our midst. While fighting to destroy the power which had created the loveless anti-community, we would ourselves create the community of love--THE BELOVED COMMUNITY.

There is a division in our ranks: a division between those who deny the validity of the sentiments which strived to create the BELOVED COMMUNITY (and who, probably, never participated in that glorious and disastrous endeavor) and those who cling desperately to the validity of the sentiments while remaining unable or unclear as how to explain or justify the disaster associated with the attempt at their immediate implementation within the movement. That division expresses itself in the split between the "politicos" (the "old guard") and the "anarchists." The "politicos" say: "I told you so." The "anarchists" don't say much at all--at least not publicly--or else, talk a great deal among themselves, get frustrated, and write their "statement of values" in order to convince god-knows-who of the sincerity of their sentiments.

Let's quit playing games and stop the self-indulgent pretense of confusion. MOFO, FREEDOM HIGH, and the BELOVED COMMUNITY have been disastrous and demoralizing--especially for those who believed most deeply in them. We tried to get close to each other, we tried to create community in the midst of an anti-communitarian world, we tried to find love in the midst of lovelessness and it ended up as either a fruitless mutual-titillation society or as disruptive self-destructive chaos. The results were catastrophic: let's face up to that. We will never win the argument on the face of the evidence regarding our organizational effectiveness.

The real tragedy would consist in refusing

(Continued on page 8)

ALIENATION or PARTICIPATION:

the sociology of PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

Note: This article will be reprinted as an S.D.S. pamphlet available at 15¢ per copy from the N C

BY
Martin Oppenheimer
Vassar College

I.

The history of industrialized, urbanized society is the history of man's increasing alienation from decision-making processes. As society has moved from village life to city, from closely-integrated primary groups in which one's relationship to all aspects of life was well-understood and well-regulated to a life in which individuals are no longer the captives of tradition, freedom has become possible. Yet freedom from tradition has not become freedom to decide the course of one's life, because modern life is organized, bureaucratic, increasingly centralized. The institutions which have freed Western Man from "the idocy of rural life" at the same time have subjected him to organizational structures farther and farther removed from his immediate control. The factory, the school, government, religion, the media and even the arts are more and more subject to bureaucratic processes, and less and less open to communication from, much less, control by, those who work in them and are subject to them, except on the highest levels of the "power structure."

This dismal phenomenon has resulted in a new ideology, that of "alienation," the concept has even replaced the older notion of class-struggle, and is at once evidence of wide-spread social frustration in terms of life's condition for many, especially intellectuals who work in bureaucracies, and a new rallying cry for those who used to look to working-class revolution as a liberating force in world affairs. At the same time that alienation has become the slogan of the trapped functionary, the limitations of democracy have been vividly portrayed -- in contemporary affairs, by the defeat of socialist revolutionism in the Soviet Union and Cuba, and in intellectual circles by the dismal writings of social scientists who talk of "the iron law of oligarchy," and the "organizational paradox." For a variety of reasons having to do with the nature of bureaucracy, it has come popularly to be accepted that some kinds of oligarchy (that is, a separation between leaders and the rank-and-file, between authorities that "know" and followers that "don't know", between exploiters and the exploited) are almost inevitable in all political systems. This view has been expressed by such well-known writers as Pareto, Mosca, Michels, Weber, Lasswell, Selznick, Lipset, and of course by various critics of Soviet developments such as Burnham, Djilas, Shachtman, and countless lesser-known observers. Such authors have frequently differed as to whether this trend is good or bad, inevitable or somewhat controllable by "countervailing powers," but the trend has been either trumpeted or bemoaned by all -- from Mosca to Burnham, from Kropotkin to Trotsky and Dwight Macdonald.

Today, alienation has become a symbolic enemy from which people want to be liberated. Participation, control over decisions that affect one's day-to-day activities, a demand that one be fulfilled, that work and play be relevant to one's sense of worth, are increasingly popular demands. This is so especially in the student generation, among those who find themselves on the road to relative financial success in large bureaucratic organizations which somehow do not appear satisfying or worthwhile, within a society which mouths the slogans of democracy and freedom only to muzzle any real expressions of freedom either here or abroad. To become servants in such organizational life is hardly consistent with what life is or should be about, within the potentials created by 20th Century civilization.

The result is that anarchism, in the form of demands to control life at the immediate level, where control is relevant, is on the rise

II.

Man's history of separation from power over his personal destiny is accompanied by his history of struggle to become free to make his decisions. The "new left" student movement is part of that continuous struggle, and "participatory democracy" is the conceptual focus of this concern. The remainder of this paper will attempt to describe the nature, historical antecedents, and problems of "P.D." as a viable "alternative to alienation" and as a challenge to the intellectual pessimism of those who see democracy as inevitably doomed to the iron law of oligarchy.

Today, four segments of the student movement share the "P.D." approach, and provide the data on which this discussion is largely based: The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the Canadian Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA), and the "free university movement." None, however, perfectly illustrate "P.D." in practice, and, of course, the organizations differ in many other respects.

The idea of "P.D." grew up largely in response to pragmatic, in-the-field problems confronted by SNCC and SDS during various organizing campaigns. Educational problems faced by Northern white volunteers in Mississippi's Freedom Schools in the summer of 1964 particularly helped to focus attention on the problem of students' reactions to authority figures, to whom they reacted in a hostile and negative manner, in keeping with their own life experiences. The failure of welfare agencies in the North to organize the poor through traditional agency practices also brought home the fact that new approaches were needed, as did the failure of slum public education. The increasing frustration of some college students with the mass-production nature of information-receiving, which passes for education in many institutions of higher learning, further augmented an experimental atmosphere covering the entire range of authority-dependency relationships--everything from management-worker to bureaucrat-client, to teacher-student and even parent-adolescent within the last few years. It should also be said that certain of the more pioneering efforts of the government's anti-poverty programs at one point showed receptivity to some new ideas, although that phase seems to be passe now. The movement's response was at once a technique and a philosophy of action.

Little of theoretical interest has been written about "P.D." Partly this is a problem of energies being applied to other issues, and partly it is due to a basic suspicion of theory in the first place within the student movement. But a failure to grapple with theory and history of the movement can cripple efforts to deal realistically with future problems; this essay is in part designed to begin to do such grappling, and stimulate thinking within the movement. A relevant charge, for example, has been that "P.D." has never been adequately defined, despite all the talk about it. This I shall attempt to deal with at once.

"P.D." involves the notion (a) that people are inherently capable of understanding their problems and expressing themselves about these problems and their solutions, if given a social context in which freedom of expression is possible, that is, a situation in which one is free of personal and political hang-ups; (b) that no real solutions to

problems are possible without the fullest participation of the people in these solutions, nor without the development of freedom from dependency on authorities and experts; and (c) for community-organizing types of groups, that cultural groups which differ in their value systems from the dominant culture cannot be organized unless a context of free expression is created; and (d) for education-oriented groups, that real education (as distinct from learning information only) cannot take place for anyone unless a situation is created in which the student is able to evaluate what goes on around him critically, without being hung-up on the judgements and values of persons in an authority relationship to him. Finally, of course, "P.D." is a way of functioning in groups so that those ideas are realized, for the purpose of helping to create a society in which everyone will participate in decisions concerning his everyday and long-range affairs to his fullest potential. The assumption is that the good society is one in which people will want to try to function to their fullest potential, and that, conversely, a society cannot be good unless this happens. Further, we must sow the seeds of the good society within the context of the bad, particularly within its movements for change, because the end is implied in the means, and a democratic society cannot be created by non-democratic agents of change. By the same token, the precise nature of the good society has to be determined by this same democratic process, which precludes our attempting to blueprint the future.

In practice, then, "P.H." involves such techniques as running meetings without agendas or presiding officers (or, at worst, rotating presiding officers); allowing officers minimal decision-making powers away from the general meeting; running meetings by consensus or "sense-of-the-meeting" decision-making; refusing to limit discussion or debate; letting as many executive-administrative decisions flow from the whole body as possible, without delegation of responsibilities to agents or committees; and encouraging the body to act immediately on decisions taken, that is, dropping the artificial division between meeting and non-meeting so that in the extreme the meeting is a community and the community a virtually constant meeting. "P.D.'s" basic effort is, therefore, to approach direct democracy as nearly as possible, and to discourage the development of a leader-follower dichotomy.

The basic approach of "P.D." is neither new nor unique. Among other approaches which share many of the same assumptions, have been these (and in each case the literature has much to contribute to the present movement): (1) small group sociology, which has studied the effects of democratic and non-democratic procedures on people and on getting tasks done, for a long time. (2) the psychological tradition of learning theory and the educationalist tradition of John Dewey, with their emphases on the importance of motivation, "readiness" to learn, and learning-by-doing. (3) the psychiatric tradition, especially existential and Rogerian therapy, which points up the importance of developing the freedom to make independent decisions in life; (4) the political traditions of anarchism, libertarian socialism, and left socialism, particularly in terms of the faith that working people have the ability to make decisions about the workplace (related to the concept of soviets and workers' control), and that socialism cannot be achieved from above; (5) Quaker and Gandhian non-violence, which assumes that all members of a group are worth hearing, that none should be overridden or beaten down, hence the practice of running meetings and other gatherings by means of a consensus rather than a parliamentary system.

In particular, (especially for those concerned with de-alienating the educational experience, say, at the college level) attention should be drawn to the work of Carl Rogers and his colleagues in psychology. This has assumed various labels closely parallel to "P.D.": client-centered therapy, worker-centered management, student-centered teaching, and, more broadly, group-centered leadership, which is precisely what "P.D." is. Descriptions of the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Schools, and some "free university" experiments, could be interchanged with those of Rogerian education, and perhaps a brief description of student-centered teaching might be of value to members of the student movement, situated as they are in an educational, or perhaps pseudo-educational context.

Student-centered teaching is designed to overcome the "authority hang-up" which interferes with both culturally-different and culturally-similar groups' learning to deal with themselves, each other, and the world around them realistically, critically, and in ways that will solve their problems as they perceive them. It is a technique that maximizes motivation to learn, improvement of self-image or self-esteem, more objective thinking, and the accomplishment of tasks seen as worthwhile by the class, by means of giving power to the class as a group, hence a de-alienating experience. The agenda for the class is set by the whole group, and not by the teacher. The class is unstructured by the teacher, who acts primarily as a resource person whose job is to help the group develop as a group. The teacher limits his participation, especially at the outset, in order to overcome the "authority hang-up." The teacher tries to be as sympathetic, open, and helpful as possible, and to believe in the worth of each individual. In short, student-centered teaching is self-determination in the educational setting, "P.D." in the classroom, and a powerful tool for subverting the "multi-versity's" emphasis on creating servicerment for the Establishment.

Another closely-related phenomenon which can contribute significantly to practitioners of "P.D." is the so-called "T-Group," or training group, an idea developed by the National Training Laboratories, a subsidiary of the National Education Association. The definition of a T-Group will illustrate why it is so closely related to "P.D.": "A T-Group is a relatively unstructured group in which individuals participate as learners. The date for learning . . . are the transactions among members, their own behavior in the group, as they struggle to create a productive and viable organization, a miniature society;" and again, "Democracy stresses the potential ability of people collaboratively to define and solve the problems they encounter in trying to live and work together. It posits that common problems cannot be well solved without the participation of those affected by the solution . . . (and) assumes a procedure of consensual validation as the final arbiter of the rightness of any collective judgement or arrangement . . . The democratic principle of 'consensus' assumes that group agreements can be wrong . . ." "5 The "Soul Sessions" of a few years ago were a related phenomenon, as is the group therapy--but the emphasis of the T-Group is on the "here-and-now," on the group as it is and is becoming, rather than on the past or the unconscious. The T-Group (also called "sensitivity training"), unlike group therapy, furthermore makes no assumptions about the mental health of the participants.

The T, Rogerian, or "P.D."-type group, then, is a situation in which the dynamics of the group process help the participants learn more about themselves, about others (hence helping to break down stereotyped thinking), about relationships between people, and about the wider world, by means of sharing the experiences all bring to the group, and the experiences the group confronts, say, in social action. The nature of the process creates, optimally, a situation in which many of the less verbal gain the confidence to speak out, and the more verbal learn to listen. The lack of structured leadership (involving, sometimes, the conscious refusal of an assigned leader or trainer to become the authority that the group expects him to be) forces participants to think for themselves, become more critical, engage in direct decision-making, and thus become more self-determining and less alienated.

III.

Yet "P.D." is no panacea, no perfect formula for solving the crisis of the alienated in a mass society. To behave as if it were, to act as if all circumstances were equally amenable to solution by this method, would be to throw out valuable tools which can lead to better "P.D.", protected against abuse and assault by those who knowingly or unknowingly undermine it. It is perhaps necessary to look at "P.D." as a utopia, in the sense that it is not completely achievable, given various sociological and psychological limitations, but rather achievable in steps only, and certainly valuable as a tool in dealing with particular problems such as education, industrial democracy, organizing the poor, and giving people a strategy for self-determination. Qualified by this statement, then, what are some of the urgent problems to which advocates of "P.D." must address themselves?

Two broad problem areas are perhaps most critical: that involving the nature and limitations of small groups versus larger groups; and that involving the nature and problems of all organizations, democratic or bureaucratic alike (such as the problems discussed by the "iron lawyers" mentioned above). The first is a set of problems involving interpersonal relations; and second, impersonal, structural relationships (which involve people, of course).

A number of people gathered together in one place is not necessarily a group. The development of group consciousness and morale, including a set of norms about the way things are done in a group, and including a climate of acceptance for dissenting views, and for the non-verbal participant, takes time. The larger the number of people, the longer a time it takes, especially in a democratic group, because for democracy really to work we have already said we must have maximum participation, and the development of individual potential to contribute. We must maximize interaction and communication, to create what is in some senses a family, a fraternity in the true sense of that word. This cannot be done at one meeting. Furthermore, there are limits to the number of people that can effectively work as a democratic decision-making group. When we run over 25 to 30, there are limits to how much interaction there can be, regardless of how long the group works together. It is, therefore, clear that a one-shot mass meeting cannot develop a real spirit of "P.D.", not even if the leader of the meeting refuses to lead and there is a lot of free discussion. In a context involving short time and/or a lot of people, one does not become free of authority hang-ups. People with reputations are listened to in a different way than people who are unknown.

Under such circumstances, that is, when "group-ness" has not developed, the dissenter fears to speak out. First of all, if it is a consensus group, he will not like to block action and thereby risk unpopularity, especially when leaders with reputations are for an action. Or, in the attempt to maximize his own popularity and carry the decision (rather than educate a few, but lose), he will tend to become a demagogue. In this fashion a consensus procedure sometimes encourages demagoguery and non-democratic actions. In many ways, the procedural safeguards of a parliamentary system insure the rights of the dissenter, and promote the idea of speaking to educate (rather than to sway) much better than a "sense of the meeting" system.

In large groups, then, especially in the short run, hang-ups about authority are encouraged. Authoritarian types tend to dominate, because the pay-off for demagoguery is higher. Real democracy is not possible in such an atmosphere. This is the critical distinction between participatory and plebiscitary democracy. Ten thousand people waving their rifles and shouting "yes" is not "P.D."

Proponents of "P.D." thus must confront this issue: in large-scale society, how much decentralization will be possible and necessary to promote real democracy? Centralization and efficiency are not necessarily linked—nor are democracy and inefficiency. Yet in a modern nation tasks must be delegated. Direct participation is not always possible. The concrete problem of where to draw the line has still to be faced.

In addition, "P.D." groups share certain problems with all other groups that are created to carry out tasks in some organized way. As an organization comes to life, paradoxes are born which frequently abort the effort; and even when life goes on, contradictions become inherent in an organization's career.

For example: say an organization is created to further democracy. It involves cooperation among members. Yet all cooperation involves, also, delegation of some tasks so that there is a distinction between initiators of tasks, and those who carry them out. The former and the latter frequently have different sets of priorities. Agents learn skills that the others do not possess, and confront situations which the others have not foreseen, but which must be dealt with. Particularly if the organization is engaged in conflict, the tendency is strong for those with skills to maintain themselves in power, due to the "emergency" at hand.

Another paradox is that between the democratic content of a group, and the progress of the group towards a measure of power in the community. Too much discussion, and we stop moving; too little, and we are no longer what we were. To achieve a goal, we need unity, but to achieve unity it sometimes becomes necessary to compromise, to gloss over some very important issues—also when we make alliances. Which shall it be?

All formal organizations, no matter how democratically conceived, develop informal patterns based on prestige, friendships, cliques, personalities, and other subjective factors such as race and sex. These are all part of the paradox: to some degree they all help to undermine the democratic processes of the organization. In democratic organizations, particularly those that are set up to help create a better society, the ends are very much involved with the means—and organizational short-cuts can be dangerous. But organizations are composed of people, and people are never as pure as the goals for which the organization was created. 6

To put the matter in its harshest terms, he who says organization implies oligarchy, in much the same way that he who negotiates also must betray. There is no way out of this. It is the socialist's equivalent of original sin, and it must be lived with, acknowledged, confronted if we are to survive as a democratic movement.

In conclusion: "P.D." is a very positive synthesis of many earlier ideas concerning the need to involve people in decisions concerning their own destinies. The revulsion on the part of many people towards the increasing rate of bureaucratization of the modern world will likely lead to more experimentation, to the development of many more alternatives to alienation, of which direct decision-making is only one. The development of dual or parallel institutions, such as the "free universities" will probably involve experiments of the "P.D." kind, and in turn their "graduates" will take this concern into other institutions of our society. Yet there are serious problems connected with the practice of "P.D.". If we confront them honestly we shall progress.

Note: This essay is based on a paper first read at the 1965 Meetings of the Pennsylvania Sociological Society. Another version was published in the Canadian magazine *Our Generation*, May, 1966. It was rewritten for S.D.S.

FOOTNOTES:

1. Dwight Macdonald, *The Root Is Man*, a collection taken from *Politics* magazine, remains an outstanding contribution to this kind of discussion.
2. See, for example, Hare, Borgatta and Bales (eds.), *Small Groups*, and other works of this kind.
3. Hal Draper's cogent "The Two Souls of Socialism," *New Politics*, v. 5, no. 1, is an essential statement on this.
4. Compare Carl Rogers, *On Becoming A Person*, ch. 15, with Florence Howe, "Mississippi's Freedom Schools: The Politics of Education," *Harvard Ed. Review*, Spring, 1965.
5. Bradford, Gibb and Benne (eds.), *T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method*, pp. 1, 34.
6. Two good sources (anthologies) on this are Merton's *Reader in Bureaucracy* and Etzioni's *Complex Organizations*.

DECEMBER N.C.

DECEMBER EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE
December 29-30-31
Berkeley, California

CAMPUS RADICALISM AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Housing for the conference participants will be provided in the homes of Berkeley SDS members in the vicinity of the campus and in the university co-ops.

Preparations are being made for workshops on a variety of topics: The campus as economic organization; the campus as community and institution, campus organizing for pressure or power; the campus as a political force; the campus and the constituency of a third party; the campus and the draft; the campus and educational reform; students as organizers; students as a social class; high school campuses. Additional workshops dealing with electoral politics and the labor movement will also be held. Working papers for the conference should be sent to:

Northern California SDS
924 Howard St.
San Francisco, California.

NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING
December 27-28
Berkeley, California

The December National Council meeting will be held the two days preceding the December Conference. This will enable those who must return early to their campuses to attend the Council meeting first.

ATTENTION! CHAPTERS!

Chapters must submit the names of their chapter delegate(s) to the National Office no later than December 23 in order to permit the National Secretary to compile the list of voting delegates before leaving for Berkeley.

LATIN AMERICA COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED

by Paul Booth

A national meeting in Chicago Nov. 4th and 5th created the North American Congress on Latin America, to organize and articulate opposition to U. S. economic and political domination of Latin America.

The Congress has established an office in New York, and set up four working committees to outline program plans leading up to its next meeting in February. An editorial committee, chaired by John Gerassi, author of *The Great Fear in Latin America* has been established to put out a popular English-language monthly with analysis, news, journalism of exposure, etc. A research committee, chaired by Prof. Brady Tyson of New York, is setting up a national network of watchdog committees paying attention to specific countries, U. S. corporations, and student movements, and is preparing to publish a pamphlet series.

An organizing and action committee, co-chaired by Steve Weissman of SDS and Scott Robinson of Cornell, is responsible for speakers and exhibit tours, for planning of direct action campaigns, and for building the network of activists prepared to work on Latin America questions. Administrative (Chaired by Prof. Richard Schaul of Princeton) and Finance (chaired by Procter Lippincott of the NACLA staff) committees are also at work.

Temporarily, NACLA headquarters are in rm. 924, 475 Riverside Drive, NYC 10027. Staff are Fred Goff and Procter Lippincott. SDS chapters and individual members should contact them to plug in to these activities.

The following statement has been issued publicly by the committee:

A growing number of North Americans are deeply troubled by the widening gulf between our own lives and interests and the lives, needs, and aspirations of the more than 200 million people of Central and South America.

The North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA) has been formed by a group of such North Americans as a result of serious consideration of the existing vehicles for confronting this problem.

Through research, publication and action, we seek to:

- examine the Latin American policy of the United States - both government policy and the policy of North American corporations, philanthropic foundations and educational institutions;

- deepen our understanding of the process and implications of social, political and economic change and the agents of this change;

- examine the assumptions underlying a "harmony of interest" approach to U.S. - Latin American relations and explore new relations, which, due to a conflict of interests, may be needed;

- build a community of informed and committed individuals who combine research and action and who will work to broaden the base in North America for a reorientation of U.S. policy toward Latin America.

The Congress is interested in maintaining contact (via a newsletter and eventually a publication) with university, church, labor, and other citizens' groups across the nation who share these concerns. We also want to explore ways of relating these groups to one another. Please contact us at our provisional headquarters: Room 924, 475 Riverside Drive, New York City, N. Y., 10027; telephone # 212 870-2507.

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, Thane Croston

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) 889-5797
Niagara Region: 107 Dryden Rd., Ithaca, NY
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif; (415) 362-7922
Southern California: 1347-1/2 Riviera Ave., Venice, Calif.
New England: 2076 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass. (617) 547-5457
Radical Education Project: 510 East William, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Advertisement

REFUSE TELEPHONE TAX

We appeal...

**You have it in your power to hold back this tax.
Some have stopped paying —
their phone service continues.**

Why was the 10 percent telephone tax restored?

Because of the widening war in Vietnam, federal legislation was passed which, in April, 1966, restored the 10% tax on telephone bills. At that time the tax was 3% and due to be dropped entirely in 1969.

"It is clear," said Rep. Wilbur Mills, who managed the tax legislation in the House, "that the Vietnam and only the Vietnam operation makes this bill necessary." [Congressional Record, February 23, 1966]

What does your telephone tax pay for?

Congressman Mills was always careful to refer to "our operations in Vietnam." But those of us who know its true nature know that it is not an operation but a tragic bloodbath. We know that revenue for the Vietnam war pays for:

- napalm, mass bombings, and other attacks on civilian areas resulting in extermination of thousands of Vietnamese—about 200,000 casualties in the last year and a half
- forcing young Americans into "kill-civilians-or-be-killed" situations. Over 5,000 American G. I.'s have been killed in Vietnam
- perpetuating a military dictatorship
- violation of the Nuremberg precedents, the U. N. Charter, and the Geneva Accords of 1954
- indefinite continuation of war against a people who desire above all to be alive and to determine their destiny free from foreign domination.

Why boycott this tax?

A tax boycott demonstrates that you believe this war to be immoral and/or illegal and that you are willing to act on this belief.

We boycott the telephone tax because:

- it is a tax directly imposed to pay for the war in Vietnam
- anyone who has a phone can refuse to pay this tax
- telephone companies have indicated that refusal to pay this tax will not result in interruption of your phone service
- the monthly refusal of a small amount of money creates a thorny collection problem for the Internal Revenue Service.

What happens to telephone tax refusers?

Individuals in many parts of the country have begun refusal of the war tax. In all instances on which we have the facts, telephone companies have assured the refusers that their telephone service will not be interrupted.

The phone company treats refusal as a matter between the individual and the government. In most cases the refused tax will continue to be carried on the telephone bill as an "unpaid balance," but in at least one case the customer will no longer be billed for the tax by the phone company.

There are some indications that telephone companies are welcoming protests. One phone company called to remind a customer that on the bill he had just paid he had gotten to refuse the tax.

See back panel for possible but unlikely legal consequences of telephone tax refusal.

We appeal to you to join us by signing and returning the following pledge. By this simple act of refusal you can declare to your government that this war is not your war.

We would appreciate copies of letters you write and receive on the matter.

Please fill out and return to CNVA, 5 Beekman St., Room 1033, New York, N. Y. 10038.

I hereby plan to deduct the Federal tax from my telephone bill payments from now until there is an end to American military action in Vietnam.

Signed _____

Date _____

You may make my name public as a participant in this action.

Please keep my name in confidence.

Please send more copies of this leaflet (price: \$1/100; \$7/1000).

Name _____
(please print)

Address _____

Zip _____

Enclosed is my contribution of \$ _____ to help with the on-going work of CNVA.

Enclosed is \$1.00 for a trial subscription to WIN.

Please send more information about the war in Vietnam.

Please send more information about CNVA.

The New York Times Magazine

SEPTEMBER 25, 1966 SECTION 6, PART 1

A Critic Calls for— A Third Theater That Is Superb, Gay and Wild

By ROBERT BRUSTEIN

CERTAINLY, the most explosive play thus far turned up by the third theater is Barbara Garson's "MacBird," scheduled to open off-Broadway in November. This work immediately establishes its young author as an extraordinary gifted parodist, for in converting "Macbeth" to her own uses, she demonstrates an unusual ear for Shakespearean verse and an impressive ability to adapt the rhythms and accents of a past age to a modern idiom.

But Mrs. Garson's purpose is hardly esthetic: "MacBird" is a savagely angry work, venting the author's fury, in the most abandoned possible manner, at the past six years of American politics. Imagine a "Macbeth" in which Lyndon Johnson plays the title role, John Kennedy is Duncan and Bobby Kennedy is Macduff, while characters such as the Egg of Head (Adlai Stevenson) enjoy Ham-

let-like soliloquies about whether to leave the new Administration or work for change from within.

The seditious implications of "MacBird" are clear and apparent—it is a work in which all political leaders are seen as calculating, power-hungry and bloody, and nobody comes off well. But although the play is bound to start a storm of protest (not all of it unjustified) and may even be suppressed by some government agency, it will very probably go down as one of the brutally provocative works in the American theater, as well as one of the most grimly amusing.

ROBERT BRUSTEIN is dean of the Yale School of Drama and drama critic for The New Republic. He has written "The Theatre of Revolt" and "Seasons of Discontent."



The cover of a "savagely angry work" that is a prime example of Brustein's "third theater," as published in Berkeley, Calif.

Send \$1.00 per copy to:

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY
1608 W. MADISON ST.
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60612

50% Discount to Chapters Placing Bulk Orders with Cash in ADVANCE

SHOPPERS BOYCOTT

HERE ARE THE LATEST AVAILABLE FIGURES ON CHAIN STORE PROFITS

Name of Supermarket	Net Profit as % of Net Worth**	
	1965	1964
A & P (New York)	9.05%	10.28%
Safeway (Oakland, Calif.)	14.71	14.26
Kroger (Cincinnati)	11.87	10.51
Acme Markets (Philadelphia)	8.42	9.12
National Tea (Chicago)	8.92	7.20
Food Fair (Philadelphia)	8.90	7.59
Winn-Dixie (Jacksonville, Fla.)	22.10	21.27
Jewel Tea (Melrose Park, Ill.)	12.06	11.77
Grand Union (East Paterson, N.J.)	10.72	8.54
First National (Somerville, Mass.)	6.59	7.43
Colonial Stores (Atlanta)	11.55	10.57
Arden-Mayfair (Los Angeles)	12.28	--
Allied Supermarkets (Detroit)	11.03	12.08
Stop and Shop (Boston)	12.99	12.33
Lucky (San Leandro, Calif.)	19.50	13.99
Food Giant (S.F. Springs, Calif.)	13.49	11.58
Red Owl (Hopkins, Minn.)	10.58	10.23
Von's (Los Angeles)	18.79	15.42
Cook Coffee (Cleveland)	19.98	15.27
Thriftmart (Los Angeles)	13.87	10.82
Loblaws (Buffalo)	5.24	5.39
Albertson's (Boise, Idaho)	21.38	19.06
Shop Rite (Albuquerque)	13.45	13.73
Giant Food (Landover, Md.)	10.29	10.07
Borman Food (Detroit)	22.86	20.18
Sup' Mkts. Op'Rat'g (Cranfield, N.J.)	22.33	19.20
J. Weingarten (Houston)	11.24	11.40

** Net Income as % of Net Worth: This is the percent of net profit after payment of taxes, salaries, advertising, games and all other costs of carrying on the business.

Source: Food Topics, February, 1966

Prepared by: The Research Committee

Washington Area Shoppers for Lower Prices
c/o St. Stephen's Community Center
3421 Center Street, NW (16th and Newton)
phone: 265-5135

This is a list of proposals, from the Washington housewives, as to what individuals can do to support the boycott. IDEAS?

WHAT CAN I DO AS AN INDIVIDUAL?

1) Contact all organizations that you belong to (for instance, your church, women's club, fraternal organization, labor union, block club, PTA, community organization, and others) and ask them to endorse the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT. Also, make sure that the organization assumes responsibility for leafletting door to door, and leafletting and/or picketing the supermarkets in your area, etc. Furthermore, your organization should also take responsibility for mobilizing other organizations in your neighborhood behind the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT.

2) Volunteer your services, for instance picketing, leafletting, driving a car, doing office work, etc. to our city-wide headquarters at 3421 Center Street, N.W. (16th & Newton) Telephone 265-5135, or contact your local area headquarters.

3) Talk to your neighbors and friends about the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT. Give them some leaflets to distribute. Get them active too.

4) Make a \$ contribution, if you can afford it. The SHOPPERS BOYCOTT desperately needs money for leaflets, telephone, transportation and hundreds of other expenses. If you can't make a personal contribution, organize a cake sale, or bread-baking party, solicit contributions, or ask your organization to make a contribution. Please send all contributions to our city-wide headquarters at 12 10th Street, N.E.

5) Write a letter to the newspaper or call a radio talk-show about the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT. The plight of the consumer, and the story of high food prices must be told far and wide by radio, newspapers, TV, and every other way.

6) Ask political candidates to endorse our boycott. In Virginia and Maryland, we must expect every candidate who wants our votes to endorse our fight against higher prices.

7) And, of course, DON'T BUY FROM THE CHAIN STORES. Every individual, whether or not he can contribute in other ways, has the responsibility to himself and her neighbor to keep up the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT, until the chain stores accept our demands.

WHAT CAN AN ORGANIZATION DO?

1) Endorse the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT. Every organization in the Greater Washington Area is being asked to endorse the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT. Please phone your endorsement in to our city-wide headquarters. Organizations are also being asked to make contributions to the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT in money or resources when possible. Washington Area Shoppers For Lower Food Prices needs money, paper for leaflets, facilities for meeting, automobiles and buses to transport boycotters to CO-OPs, another sympathetic stores in the suburbs, and many other things. We need help.

2) Leaflet your neighborhood in behalf of the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT. All organizations are asked to distribute leaflets door to door, on the street-corners, or at meetings. People in all communities must be told about the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT and asked to support it.

3) Leaflet and/or Picket your neighborhood supermarkets. Every supermarket in the Washington area (all 250 of them) must be continually leafleted, to inform all potential customers of our SHOPPERS BOYCOTT, and ask them to shop elsewhere.

4) Call a meeting of other organizations in your neighborhood. Call all the other groups in your area, for instance, block clubs, womens clubs, fraternal organizations, labor unions, churches, etc. to a meeting to plan leafletting and other methods of informing neighborhood residents about the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT, and urge them to participate.

5) Ministers are being asked to announce the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT IN CHURCH ON SUNDAY. The support of the clergy and the churches has been essential for our initial successes, and they play a key role in our movement. All men of the cloth, be they Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish, are being asked to endorse the SHOPPERS BOYCOTT and urge their congregation to participate and help.

CANADA

The new regulations are not aimed at Draft Dodgers. Official policy (which often bears no resemblance to actual practise) holds that draft questions are a matter to be worked out between the Immigrant and the USA, and are of no concern to the Dept. of Immigration.

Official policy provides three ways to gain landed immigrant status.

1) One may come to Canada as a visitor, and apply here for status at an Immigration Office in the interior. In order to do this one must have actually intended to come as a visitor and genuinely experienced a change of mind once up here. Examples might be an especially good job offer, or falling suddenly in love with a Canadian girl with the intention to marry. This is very difficult to establish, and must be genuine. In practise, this alternative is rarely pointed out to people, but the regulations do provide for it. Status is rarely granted by this route, however. Usually people are told to proceed to the nearest border point and apply there. Consequently, we do not advise using this method in any case.

2) One may apply at the border at time of entry. This involves a half-hour or so examination by the Border Guards, after which status may be granted conditional upon a physical examination (which is no problem.) The advantage to this is that it is instant. However, the border guards apparently ignore the official policy and sometimes do refuse people apparently on the grounds that they are draft dodgers. It is difficult to gain entry by this method unless one is clean-cut, has some money (in one case \$600.), or has a job offered to him in Canada. A Bachelors degree is helpful. None

of these things is by itself certain to gain you admittance, because of the arbitrariness of the examining officials. This method, consequently, should be used only by those who are hard pressed for time, and always should be preceded by a phone call or letter to the SUPA Office where the latest information on requirements and approach to the problem can be obtained. This method is chancy, but it is available to those who have no other choice.

3) One writes for an application to the nearest Consulate or to the Dept. of Immigration, Ottawa, Ont. A form will be returned and can be easily filled out with the help of the SUPA office or the SUPA Pamphlet. One to three months later, after a security check with the FBI and assuming that one fits the requirements for Immigration, one is issued a temporary card for entry as a landed immigrant. The physical examination can be taken anywhere in the U. S., prior to entry. With this card one applies at the border. This method takes time, but the temporary card takes most of the discretion out of the hands of the border guards, so people who look clean-cut usually have no difficulty whatever. We recommend this method.

In any of these approaches, an appeal to the Minister is available and should be made if one's application is rejected. Make the appeal, and contact the SUPA office for legal help in pursuing it.

There are technicalities all along the way, by whatever approach one chooses, never try to apply without first obtaining the assistance of the staff of the SUPA Draft Project, c/o SUPA, 658 Spadina Ave., Toronto 4, Ontario or the Canadian Committee to Aid War Resisters. P.O. Box 4231, Vancouver 9, B.C. Canada.

DO YOU KNOW THIS GIRL



JOAN LEE AUGENBLYCK
640 Overhill Road
South Orange, N. J.

Age: 15 yrs. Height: 5'3"
Color: White, extremely fair skin Weight: 135 lbs.
Hair: Straight blond, past shoulders Eyes: Hazel

Occasionally wears heavy black round frame glasses.

Plays guitar.

May be wearing: black trench coat, or black Mexican poncho with brown and beige markings, gold ring with rough surface and deep holes, heavy silver necklace with large oval rings.

Affiliations: National Ethical Youth Organization
Congress of Racial Equality
Students for a Democratic Society

Last seen in New York City on Sunday, Sept. 18, 1966.

PLEASE CALL COLLECT IF YOU HAVE ANY INFORMATION

Mrs. Ted Lowy
640 Overhill Road
South Orange, N. J.
201-762-7554

Mr. Harry Augenblick
10 Microlab Road
Livingston, N. J.
201-992-7700
201-334-3781

(Or)

If Joan is alive and safe, contact the N.O. and we will inform her parents. No other information is necessary; replies and whereabouts will be kept anonymous.

national secretary's report

(Continued from page 3)

to examine the results in order not to talk about the premises. If we do that, we abandon the field to cynicism. I feel no need to pretend that "freedom houses" and "freedom offices" were efficient or can be—that individuals who seek community and relatedness to one another before anything else can be functionally operative in the midst of the demands of a revolutionary movement. BUT, AT THE SAME TIME, I remain in total sympathy with their search, and, I regard what they seek as revolutionary. Just because I do not believe in FREEDOM NOW does not alter my allegiance to their struggle for FREEDOM.

ABOVE ALL, I WOULD NEVER ABANDON THE FREEDOM STRUGGLE FOR WHAT THE POLITICOS CALL 'politics.'

POLITICOS, 'POLITICS,' AND THE NON-FREEDOM, NON-MOVEMENT

The alternative which is offered by those who disparaged the "anarchist" freedom movement is 'political realism.' The line runs: those guys are a bunch of beatnik kooks who don't know nothing, so let's talk seriously about realities—let's talk politics.

Talking 'politics' rather than talking about 'freedom' is being 'realistic,' being 'realistic' is not being 'sentimental' or 'romantic.' Talking politics is talking 'realistically' about 'realities.' The interesting thing about anti-freedom 'politics' is that it defines reality in terms of an existing system which lacks everything that I consider important. Its cynicism about the "freedom movement" and its

motivations is a perfect reflection of the cynicism of corporate liberal society about human nature and human possibility. Those who demand community, relatedness and love simply don't understand 'reality.' They are naive. What the movement needs is 'politics'—that is, a good dosage of 'reality.'

Strange argument: Reality—as defined by people who demanded relatedness, community, and love become an effective revolutionary force, or is their only alternative to it. In the language of the politicians, reality, as defined by the impossible system of non-alternatives, is what we have to accept before we can be effective (or 'efficient,' or one of those liberal categories). The 'political' alternative is, finally, no alternative at all. It is only a cynical argument for not raising the most important questions. The 'political' and 'realistic' stance is no alternative because it would leave us without a movement, and certainly, without freedom.

BEYOND THE BELOVED COMMUNITY: A REVOLUTIONARY SELF-UNDERSTANDING

The next important question becomes: is there a revolutionary alternative? Is there a revolutionary self-understanding which transcends the dead-end of the 'beloved community' while incorporating the revolutionary demands of the movement? Can the people who demanded relatedness, community, and love become an effective revolutionary force, or is their only alternative to 'cop out' in the face of 'hard-headed political realism'? Must they seek their self-realization in increasingly individualized and privatized forms of retreat—in social or psychedelic primitivism?

I think not, because I am finally convinced that a truly revolutionary movement must be built out of the deepest revolutionary demands and out of the strongest revolutionary hopes—the demand for and the hope of freedom. I do not, however, believe that such a movement can be the beloved community; it can only be a revolutionary community of hope.

What finally happens to those who desired freedom so strongly and find it unattainable within their own lives? One of two things happens: either they despair and lose hope, or, their freedom becomes a new kind of reality and hope becomes a new kind of force in their lives.

We wanted freedom so badly. What did we find: a constant struggle. We had a revolutionary vision of a free society in which we discovered that we would never live. And then, perhaps, we began to discover that revolutionary freedom and the freedom of a revolutionary were not the same thing. The first was what we wanted for all men; the second would be the reality of our lives. But, up against all that, we need not abandon either our attachment to freedom or our commitment to the struggle. We are not the new life of freedom: but that does not mean that we cannot be the force which gives it birth. We are not the beloved community; we can only hope to become the revolutionary community of hope which will give birth to the beloved society, the society of men liberated by our efforts but not bound by our failures. Our freedom is not to be free but to be a force for freedom.

I think I understand the frustration and despair, Ken and Pat. I also believe in the revolutionary force of the motivations. I can only say that the image which will bind us together will never be born out of the failures of the present, but, rather, out of our vision of the tomorrow which you and I will never know.

There is a deeply moving book which most movement people have read: A. S. Neill's *Summerhill*. I felt despondent after having read it because it talked of a revolutionary model of the world, and because I knew that I was not nor could ever be a product of freedom in child-rearing. I knew that my freedom would consist of struggling to create a world in which Summerhills would be the right of all children. Sometimes, I have wanted to go away to Summerhill and teach and live and be a freer person. We have all longed for our utopia, and Summerhill is one of them, just as the Beloved Community was one of them.

I have only meant to say that we can hope for Summerhill, but that we must stay here and fight if we are not to abandon the field to those who believe that Harvard or Taft or Hill Military Academy are decent models for human society.

JOHNSON & VIETNAM

(Continued from page 1)

Vietnam war is a major factor in this situation. The war has led to a shortage of various kinds of goods and has created an expenditure — met out of taxation — for which there is not an equivalent volume of production.

But President Johnson, with the gambler's everlasting conviction that the latest "system" is the answer to all his troubles, has now gone overboard for the latest McNamara formula for applying the methods of big business to foreign affairs. The most recent theory dreamed up by Defence Secretary McNamara is that of "cost effectiveness" applied to war: decisions in the field of war materials are to depend simply on whether the cost is justified by the "benefit" obtained.

This grim calculus becomes something bordering on fantasy when one considers what would be the cost and "benefits" of extending the war to China — if, that is, the policies of the present leadership are permitted to continue to their logical conclusion. Today's 58.6 billion dollar defence bill could become in ten year's time (allowing for inflation) 158 billion

Materially and morally, the U.S. is being absorbed by the Vietnam war. But even if the U.S. were able to achieve victory in Vietnam it is clear that Vietnam would not be by any means the last hand in the game.

The rich countries are getting richer, the poor countries poorer. Western statesmen pay lip service to the doctrine that Asia must be "saved from Communism" by raising living standards rather than by military action — but their acts belie their words — the 57 billion dollars devoted by the rich industrial nations to helping the underdeveloped countries over the past ten years is less than the U. S. defense budget for a single year.

Where the majority of the population lives near the very depths of poverty under corrupt and feudalistic government there will inevitably be numerous popular movements of the kind which the U.S. has characterized in Vietnam as "Communist aggression". As Senator Fulbright remarked: "Must we be prepared to fight in all the 81 countries to which we give so-called aid?"

PEACE-LOVING ALLIES

Whenever there has been a pause in the American bombing of North Vietnam, the Hanoi government has approached Washington with proposals for negotiation. Despite Johnson's claim that he is willing to negotiate "any time, any place", these ap-

proaches have all been rejected: the only response from the U.S. has been to resume and intensify the attack.

Mr. Donald Keys, an American delegate to the conference of the International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace held recently in West Germany, drew attention to the approaches made by Hanoi during the most recent pause, in January of this year.

A message was sent through Polish diplomatic circles to the effect that the Government of North Vietnam was prepared to enter into discussions based on the Four Points put forward by it in April 1965. The proposal was significantly different from earlier ones in that it stated merely that the Four Points ought to be the basis of negotiation — not that they must be the basis, which up till then had been the usual formula.

This message got through to Messrs. Rusk, McNamara and McGeorge Bundy in the early hours of the morning; they were roused from their beds, and after consultation sent back the reply that this was "not the signal that the U.S. was looking for."

Mr. Keys' own organization (SANE - the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy) had obtained official confirmation that Hanoi's message had in fact reached the State Department and Pentagon.

These facts highlight the hypocrisy of the American position; they also demonstrate how meaningless is the position of Mr. Wilson — who told the press, on his last visit to Washington, that he was satisfied that Johnson's offer of "unconditional negotiation" meant what it said.

NEW OFFICE ← ←



University of Pennsylvania SDS now has an office. Jon Goldstein, an active member of the chapter (U of P SDS has no officers) writes: 'If you want to, call it a regional office (we are trying very much to make it that)'. Chapters in the Philadelphia area should write:

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY
3601 Locust Street
Philadelphia PA 19104
Phone: 215/BA. 2-8969

HAVE YOU RENEWED YOUR MEMBERSHIP ?

Dues: \$4.00 Year
(Includes subscription to new left notes)

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

Second-Class postage rates paid in Chicago, Illinois

J. Walton Senterfitt
2115 S St. NW
Washington, DC 20008

NAC minutes

November 11, 1966

Members present: Steve Kindred, Earl Silbar, Jean Tepperman, Paul Lauter, Greg Calvert, Rich Berkowitz.

Members absent: Brent Kramer, Tom Condit, JOIN.

Others present: Don Tylke, Mark Kleiman, Sasha O'Reilly, Jack Bateman, Dee Jacobson, Carl Davidson, Art Rosenblum.

Agenda — 1. Finances 2. Adult organizing 3. Chicago Peace Council 4. December NC and Conference 5. LID Mailing 6. Penn State 7. Staff 8. Printing and literature 10. REP 11. Speaking engagement.

1. Finances. (a) We now have \$49 in the bank. The financial situation is DESPERATE. We need additional funds immediately. (b) A fund-raising drive is now being co-ordinated in the New York City area. (c) \$100 will be borrowed from Chris Hobson for printing buttons.

2. Adult Organizing. Ed Richer, through correspondences, proposes (a) that we begin the groundwork for MDS and if at all possible (b) he begin full-time organizing with adult radicals. The NO will send Richer all listing and files it has on MDS.

3. Chicago Peace Council. The CPC has asked SDS to send a delegate, who would represent SDS, to its meetings. A discussion about the Chicago Region and Chapters developed out of this. It was decided that the CPC should contact local chapters on the matter and that it was not the business of the NO to conduct local affairs.

4. December NC and Conference. A site has not yet been determined. So far all efforts to get a site outside an urban complex has failed. An idea for transportation: borrow union cars. It was the feeling of the NAC that minimum resources be spent on resource people for the conference. Carl Davidson is going to California after Thanksgiving to work on the planning of the conference.

5. LID Mailing. The IUD Bulletin and American Federationist will be sent to the membership.

6. Penn State. A movement against the administration has developed and Penn State SDS requested that the NO send somebody to help. Mark Kleiman was given permission to go.

7. Staff. Dee Jacobson was hired as Interim Asst. National Secretary and office manager.

8. Printing and literature. (a) a printing press will be leased from John Rosten (our landlord). (b) There will be a chapter mailing of the REP Study Guides and all existing literature. (c) Davidson's paper on Student Syndicalism will be re-printed in the bulletin of the American Council of Educators.

—submitted by
Rich Berkowitz