

sds new
left
notes



**convention
extra**

UNITE TO SMASH CAMPUS RACISM!

Despite obituaries to the contrary SDS is alive, well and growing. Over 1000 are expected at the SDS NATIONAL CONVENTION at Harvard, in Cambridge, Mass., from March 30 - April 2. Working people and students are facing tremendous unemployment, tuition and rent hikes, welfare cuts and inflation and police repression. Blacks, latins and asians get it even worse. People are fighting back all over. To divide and defeat this growing rebellion, those who run this country push racism. Thus it's no accident that right now a bunch of racist ideologues - led by Herrnstein at Harvard, Shockley at Stanford, Banfield at Penn, Jensen at Berkley and Eysenck in England - have cropped up. Their ideas are being pushed by the media and put to great use in the classroom. Over and over we're told that their racist "scholarship" - which pushes the notion of black, latin, and asian inferiority - is rigorously "scientific" and "must be taken seriously," "despite the consequences". SDS says racism stinks - whether it's put blunt and ugly, as Wallace does, or whether it's all decked out in verbal finery. As we see it, these "expert" racists are spearheading a nation-wide campaign of racism. The SDS NATIONAL CONVENTION

will plan a program of action, a counter-attack, a NATIONAL OFFENSIVE AGAINST RACISM.

Naturally, college deans and trustees don't want this convention. For the past 2 weeks, Harvard has been harassing the local SDS chapter about getting rooms for the big Conference. They say no, they say yes, they pretend they misunderstood, then they say no again, and round and round. SDS is fighting back with petitions, leaflets, ads in the papers, all with wide support. We have urged everyone to go to the deans and demand the convention. The administration has to run to the press for help. Their man is (incredibly enough) Gordon Hall, a well-known, Boston-area amateur agent for the FBI and CIA and the old House Un-American Activities Committee. Hall boasts about planting spies in left-wing and liberal groups. Most of Hall's article consists of stupid lies, not worth answering. But there are two things he says that we'd like to point out - because they show, in a backward way, why the deans are so scared of SDS.

1) Hall claims the Herrnstein campaign has been a flop at Harvard. The students couldn't care less, he maintains. But the very fact that

Harvard went to a discredited character like Hall to write a front-page story attacking the SDS NATIONAL CONVENTION gives the lie to Hall's claim. It shows how nervous they are about this fight. Later on we'll reprint some Harvard Crimson articles which demonstrate that the Herrnstein fight is a mass issue on campus. The fight against campus racism is as important an issue as the fight against the war.

2) Hall also maintains that "strange faces are not welcome at SDS meetings." But in a January 9th Herald article, Hall boasted SDS was easy to infiltrate because newcomers were so welcome! Later we quote from the new book, SDS, by Alan Adelson, about just this question.

The fight that SDS members and many others have started against racism on campus is a very serious fight. This SDS NATIONAL CONVENTION March 30th-April 2 can launch that fight on a really national scale. And, despite Gordon Hall's wishes, EVERYONE IS WELCOME AT THAT CONVENTION!! There's an information, housing, and transportation blank at the end of this booklet. We'd like to hear from you!

sds national convention

EVERYONE

COME!

MAR. 30 - APR. 2 harvard univ.

Cry of 'Harassment' Falls Flat

SDS to Convene at Harvard

By GORDON D. HALL

(Gordon D. Hall, now in his 26th year of full-time extremist watching, is a regular contributor to the Sunday Herald Traveler.)

The Students for a Democratic Society, hoping to rebuild its rapidly fading image on college campuses, has announced that this year's national convention will be held at Harvard College, March 30th through April 2nd.

A request for a specific convention site was filed at the college by SDS just before the Christmas vacation began last month. Approval is expected in a matter of days, but the group has already labeled the delay as "harassment" because of their revolutionary political aims.

Earlier this week, Harvard's dean of students, Archie C. Epps, dismissed the charges as untrue.

"This is a recent development," Epps said, "and because of the long vacation period there simply hasn't been time to act on the request made by SDS."

The charges of harassment, embodied in a petition in wide circulation throughout greater Boston, is an obvious move by SDS to create controversy aimed at stirring interest in the upcoming convention.

Mindful of their present minuscule campus strength, SDS views this year's convention as crucial, possibly the last if the turnout isn't heavy.

The petition, entitled "Allow SDS Convention Against Racism," with room for twelve signatures on each one, reads in part as follows:

"They are saying it is a decision the (Harvard) Corporation will have to make because it is different in scale from anything they allowed before. We think the university is concerned with the political nature of the convention and SDS, not about any organizational difficulties. We think SDS should be allowed its convention without further harassment from the administration."

(Continued on Page 5)

The decision to hold the convention in Cambridge was made at an SDS National Interim Committee meeting held in Pittsburgh in December.

The decision was not unanimous. Several committee members wanted the convention held in Chicago, which is more accessible to Midwest and West Coast members and is the location of the group's national headquarters.

HARVARD WAS FINALLY agreed upon because the New England area is now believed by members to be their strongest area.

The decision to meet in convention here reflects the enormous line in group strength that is present in the area.

The future of Harvard SDS, the host chapter at the national convention, to enlarge itself since last fall represents a typical case of revolutionary overkill—the selection of an unlikely target, followed by the issuance of patently false charges and tactics so brutish and offensive to guarantee revulsion in the majority of the campus student body.

The target has been psychology professor Richard J. Herrnstein. More correctly, he has been the group's sole "issue" since Harvard re-opened last September.

During that month, Herrnstein published in the Atlantic magazine a long piece suggesting that intelligence may be, after all, largely genetic.

The piece was informed, restrained, provocative and, of course, highly debatable, but SDS immediately pounced upon it as "blatant racist propaganda."

POSTERS BEGAN cropping up around campus reading: "Wanted for Racism: Richard Herrnstein."

SDS had simplistically taken a thoughtful analysis and twisted it so that it resembled the shabbiest of literature peddled by white supremacists and other racist extremists.

Their picketing of Herrnstein was in the same vein. Placards held by zealots and the shouts emanating from portable bullhorns at anti-Herrnstein demonstrations were abusive, vulgar, and offensive and wholly unrelated to the original magazine article.

Herrnstein as a legitimate campus issue was a bust, but the psychology professor will be a big item on the national convention "agenda."

Meanwhile, Hilary Putnam, a revolutionary communist and Harvard faculty member is seeking funds for a full-page anti-Herrnstein advertisement to be run, hopefully, in The New York Times.

Putnam is a close collaborator with, and an advisor to, SDS. He is still somewhat distant from the group's main focus.

Structure has been a side effect.

STRANGE FACES at local meetings are viewed with suspicion. Leaflets bear only an occasional telephone number, and SDS members seldom identify themselves at meetings other than a first name.

Students on assorted campuses, curious to learn something about SDS at meeting time, are given a cold reception unless vouched for in advance by another SDS member.

This is hardly the formula for building a mass movement on campuses or anywhere else.

What it does suggest is that the student movement, at the top of the headlines during much of the 60s, will, in all likelihood, not survive the earliest years of the new decade. (Next Week: A Talk With Professor Herrnstein).

If Hall thinks the SDS anti-racism fight is so irrelevant, how come he is interviewing Herrnstein next?

M
A
R
C
H
3
0

build a nation-wide
movement to
smash racism!

FORUMS

WORKSHOPS

FILMS

~ APRIL 2

for more info write:

SDS
BOX 423
PRUDENTIAL CTR.
BOSTON, MASS. 02199

Here is a quote from Alan Adelson's new book, SDS, published by Scribners. This book gives a pretty factual picture. Write to the SDS National Convention Committee in Boston for more info.

Unlike the Weathermen, SDS is an amazingly open organization. It has to be since its whole strategy is to reach thousands of new people and "win them over" to joining the long-term battle against the system. Pity the foolish police agents who bother to infiltrate their way into the endless series of tedious meetings and utterly legal demonstrations by which the organization now exists. Other than some embarrassing internal rivalries, SDS has nothing to hide. If there are lots of strange faces at a meeting, the members feel more secure. It means their ideas are catching on. I came to them from the "belly of the beast," as the Black Panthers say: straight from three years with the Wall Street Journal. I was welcomed. Some helped me enthusiastically with this book. Others were a little afraid of it—cynical that it would "tell the truth about SDS," since so little has.

The Harvard Crimson

(The following editorial from the Dec. 2, 1971 issue is the majority editorial of the Crimson.)

The furor surrounding Professor Richard Herrnstein's "I.Q." article in *The Atlantic* has increased dramatically in the past few weeks. Sustained opposition to the article by SDS and the University Action Group has provoked two responses: a heightened awareness and criticism of Herrnstein's arguments, and a groundswell of faculty criticism of SDS and UAG. Both the article and the criticism merit a closer look.

Herrnstein's article builds a view of the future on a foundation of shaky scientific reasoning. Relying on the highly debatable theories of Arthur Jensen and similar theorists, Herrnstein maintained that intelligence is determined predominantly by heredity. From that, he speculated about a world of the future, a world in which technological advances will dry up "low I.Q." jobs and unemployability will be passed with intelligence down the family bloodline. "... (In) times to come, as technology advances, the tendency to be unemployed may run in the genes of a family about as certainly as bad teeth do now," he wrote. And furthermore, Herrnstein speculated near the beginning of his article that "on the face of it there is a powerful trend toward 'meritocracy'—the advancement of people on the basis of ability, either potential or fulfilled, measured objectively."

This is not the place for a detailed criticism of Herrnstein's article. But his reasoning is questionable at best. I.Q. tests measure "intelligence." An undefinable quantity, "intelligence" in this context is identified as the quality that I.Q. tests measure. I.Q. tests are valued because a correlation exists between a student's I.Q. score and his performance in our society. In short, I.Q. tests are designed to predict success. So to say, as Herrnstein says at great length, that people with high I.Q.'s succeed in America is to spout a tautology and say nothing at all.

Herrnstein goes further. He calls those with high I.Q.'s "bright" and those with low I.Q.'s "dull." These sweeping terms ignore scientific data which indicates the cultural relativity of I.Q. tests. Herrnstein gives I.Q. an ontological status it does not possess. And in his discussion of the hereditary transmission of intelligence, Herrnstein deals inadequately with the effects of environment. For example, no one has measured the effects of the prenatal environment on the fetus. This factor alone casts a shadow of uncertainty on Herrnstein's "scientific" figures.

We are not experts in the field. But it is clear that Herrnstein has overlooked one side of an intellectual debate and based a potentially inflammatory argument on some highly disputable facts. Writing in a popular magazine, he has endowed his reasoning with a pseudo-scientific rigor that belies the controversial nature of his assumptions.

We uphold Herrnstein's right to publish his theory. But we are not convinced by the statement of 107 Faculty members which defends Herrnstein on the grounds of a vague "intellectual freedom." This freedom is apparently all-inclusive; at least, its proponents have not taken the time to define it. The boundary between ideas and actions is an academic distinction. The distinction, while fuzzy, is important. Generally, intellectual freedom guarantees that ideas will be opposed only by other ideas, and that a theorist

will always have a place in the academic community. But in some cases, when theorists become policymakers, the distinction between idea and action vanishes. In such cases—for instance, when social scientists commissioned by the government draw up plans to expand the Vietnam War—the phrase "intellectual freedom" no longer applies and the academic community can no longer offer sanctuary.

It would be a mistake to think that ideas are less dangerous than actions. History shows otherwise. "Scientific" racists like Gobineau in the mid-nineteenth century and the anti-Semites of post-World War I Europe helped create atmospheres in which genocide was an intellectual possibility. More recently, some Cold War historians, describing a "monolithic Communist bloc," have given an academic cushion for an American government that indiscriminately opposes Communism.

Herrnstein's ideas also have potentially dangerous implications. His statement that contemporary society demonstrates "the advancement of people on the basis of ability" gives "scientific" fuel to defenders of the *status quo*. And his prognosis of a hereditary caste of the unemployable could leave ominous thoughts in the minds of some readers. It is unfortunate that Herrnstein decided to publish such an irresponsible article on a topic of immense social importance. But we question only his discretion, not his right to publish. And we agree that, in this case, the concept of intellectual freedom applies. Herrnstein's opponents should limit themselves to the arena of ideas.

The 107 faculty members who supported Herrnstein in a public statement have misrepresented the actions of SDS and UAG. In broad terms they have accused the two groups of making "personal attacks upon Professor Herrnstein—by false and offensive placards, leaflets, picketing, and threats to disrupt his classes." By lumping together these types of protest, the professors seek to eliminate ac-

ceptable forms of opposition to Herrnstein's thought. Herrnstein wrote an article with clear political implications. He and his supporters must expect opposition. Leafleting and picketing are justifiable tactics for his adversaries, but the tactics should focus on the ideas and not the man. The statement's claim of "distress to (Herrnstein's) family and friends" cannot be substantiated. A vague statement, it could preclude any criticism of Herrnstein's article.

The faculty statement has another disturbing aspect. Since 1969, the University has progressively narrowed the acceptable channels of political protest. The Resolution on Rights and Responsibilities already lists "personal harassment" as a punishable offense. The category is vague enough to permit broad interpretation. If the interpretation of these professors were accepted, effective political protest would be stifled.

Too many people have discussed this article without reading it. Too many people have accepted the ideas without challenging them. SDS and UAG have helped raise the issues in the Harvard community. Although their actions are clearly not punishable under any rational and equitable system, the two groups have at times lapsed into personal attacks and quoted Herrnstein out of context. But by publicizing the uncertainty of the ideas and the potential harm of their implications, SDS and UAG have performed a service.

Herrnstein should not be fired, as the two groups demand. Nor should he be censured. Neither the faculty nor the University has the authority to take a stand on a man who writes theories and not policies. Within the realm of ideas, however, individual Faculty members have the right—and, in our opinion, the obligation—to challenge Herrnstein's article. Some Faculty members have done so. But a larger group has only attacked the most vocal segment of Herrnstein's critics. The threat of Herrnstein's ideas is more dangerous than the imagined threat of SDS and UAG to intellectual freedom.

Intellectual Darwinism

(This signed editorial was from the same issue.)

There is an intellectual Darwinism among us that believes if only all that can be said or thought is permitted, right thinking will out and the best will come to the fore. But history has shown that there is an economics of ideas as surely as there is an economics of goods. And the free market place of ideas is no more self-regulating, no more inevitably just, than the laissez-faire capitalism which produced it.

Members of the faculty have defended Herrnstein in the name of academic freedom. Unfortunately that is not the issue. The issue is political. The issue is whether there is to be a moral amnesty for mere theorizing, whether an academic community is free to disseminate any idea, consequences be damned.

Professor Herrnstein is not merely one voice out of many, and his article not merely one more proposal to be weighed in the cool balance of intellect. Political circumstances are not to be ignored. Ideas are not introduced into an antiseptic atmosphere of

rational discussion, but into a society where conflict is endemic. Herrnstein's position as a Harvard professor and a writer for a widely-circulated national magazine gives him an air of legitimacy that few in a highly stratified society can hope to attain. Whether or not he consciously calculated the political effects, his article can and will be used to justify reactionary, elitist social policy—a policy we find unconscionable and which we oppose. Political circumstances exist beyond any question of motive; they are circumstances for which Professor Herrnstein, like any political actor, is answerable.

To consider the problem as merely a case of academic freedom is to mask the political implications of that position. The point is this: that it is a political, not a scholarly, act for which Professor Herrnstein is responsible. And it is political considerations that must decide the terms of any debate.

—Jeffrey L. Baker
—Michael Levenson
—Daniel S. ...

HERRNSTEIN DEBATE RAGES...

(MORE FROM THE HARVARD CRIMSON)

Ideas and Coercion

A belief in freedom of expression is not simply an instinctive feeling that anyone should be able to think and say whatever he or she wants—though that is perhaps the root of it—but a belief that a system which allows this freedom is the only guarantee that the good ideas will triumph over the bad ones. People who reject this belief should propose an alternative method for distinguishing between good ideas and bad ones. I, for one, would not want to rely on a majority vote of the *Crimson* editorial board or the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. If history shows too many instances when the bad ideas gained the upper hand, it's because the good ideas were actively suppressed, not because the bad ideas weren't. The triumph of racial superiority theories in Europe is a perfect example.

It's difficult, then, to see how the publication of any set of ideas in the *Atlantic Monthly* can be considered more dangerous than a decision that they're too dangerous to be printed. Therefore the content of Professor Herrnstein's article is irrelevant to a discussion of the propriety of the reaction to it. Likewise, questions of the relationship between research and policy are not relevant here. Professor Herrnstein is not under fire for his research, but for the publication of considered opinions in a national magazine. (Indeed one of the criticisms of Herrnstein's "shoddy scholarship" has been that he conducted no original research but relied too heavily on previously published work.)

If you accept the necessity for freedom of expression, it follows that in an intellectual controversy any attempt to coerce rather than to persuade—to make a person regret having expressed an opinion without convincing him of the error of the opinion itself—is not merely an offense against the person so coerced, but an erosion of the mechanics which make free expression work and therefore make it possible.

The SDS-UAG activities in response to Professor Herrnstein's article seem clearly to be coercive in intent and effect. Placards in and outside his classroom saying "Fight Racism—Fire Herrnstein" and "Pigeon Man",

chanting outside his office, demonstrations demanding he be dismissed from the Faculty obviously are not meant to convince him or others of the mistakes in his theories. These tactics and others, such as interrupting his lectures with questions irrelevant to the subject matter under discussion—though within the rights of those engaging in them—undeniably create an atmosphere of tension in Herrnstein's teaching and personal life outside the legitimate scope of controversy over his article. When SDS-UAG do address themselves to the content of Herrnstein's article, they engage in blatant lies and misquotes (see yesterday's *Crimson*) and McCarthyite illogic (such as arguing that the defense of Herrnstein's article by the Harvard establishment proves that his ideas are important to them and therefore dangerous). It's easy to see how Professor Herrnstein might regret having written his article, and how others might think twice before publishing their own controversial beliefs.

This, of course, is exactly what SDS wants. And it's exactly what the 107 faculty members who signed the petition in the November 29 *Crimson* find distressing. It seems to me that the rhetorical excesses and coercive potential of this document don't compare to those of the materials being distributed by SDS-UAG. The impressive list of names at the bottom of the petition is unlikely to awe into submission anyone intent on harassing Professor Herrnstein, especially since they specifically say such behavior lies outside of disciplinary considerations. Should the fact that they are eminent academics disqualify them from speaking out when they feel academic values to be threatened?

The Herrnstein article on I.Q. has created much genuine intellectual controversy around the country (*vide* the current *Atlantic*). Perhaps there would be more here at Harvard if SDS hadn't refocused the debate. Far from deserving praise for "raising the issue", the members of the SDS-UAG anti-Herrnstein campaign—though their behavior lies outside the disciplinary reach of any rational system of academic justice—deserve the censure and contempt of all members of this community.

—Michael Kinsley



harvard march 30 - april 2

SMASH RACISM

sds convention

SCIENTIFIC WARRANT

To the Editors of the *Crimson*:

The graduate students of the History of Science Department, acting as a body, have voted the following:

1. We condemn as dangerous and unscientific, the racist, sexist, and anti-working class theories of genetic inferiority propagated by R. Herrnstein, W. Schockley and A. Jensen. There is no scientific warrant for ascribing to genetic factors the oppressed conditions of classes and ethnic groups.

Theories of genetic inferiority of races, sexes, or classes, facilitate and justify shifting the burden of the present economic crises onto those who are already the most oppressed. They place the blame for unemployment on its victims, instead of on its beneficiaries. Such theories attack the legitimate aspirations of oppressed peoples for a decent life.

2. We condemn the irresponsible support of such unfounded conclusions by the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Harvard Educational Review*, and the *New York Times*

Magazine, through publication and wide dissemination of them, especially in view of the destructive political uses to which such views are put.

3. We oppose the faculty advertisement in the *Crimson* of November 29, as being pernicious, insensitive and misleading. Professor Herrnstein's article in the *Atlantic* is not a scholarly article and therefore the issue of academic freedom is irrelevant to this public and political controversy. We are furthermore concerned about the chilling effect of that advertisement on legitimate political actions and on reasoned discussion of the issues raised by Herrnstein's article.

Phillip J. Lawrence, Secretary
Graduate Students of the History
of Science Department

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____ Phone _____

School _____

I need transportation _____ from _____

I can give transportation _____ from _____

I need housing for _____ people

I can provide housing for _____ people

_____ here is \$5 for the preregistration fee

_____ here is \$7 for the preregistration fee and SDS membership

Here is a \$ _____ donation to help provide transportation to the convention for West Coast friends.

MAIL TO: SDS Box 423 Prudential Ctr. Boston, Mass. 02199