

# STUDENT BOREDOM

by Steve Golin  
S. Natick, Mass.

Carl Davidson's analysis of university reform and suggestions for a radical program (NLN 34) are exciting. What's especially exciting is his focus on the universities as crucial bulwarks of the system, as "agents for social change in the direction of 1984". And along with this, his insistence that we not get lost in peripheral issues, but tackle the educational process itself, demanding the abolition of grades. All I want to do is to try to carry the analysis, and the program, a half-step further.

What does it mean to say—as Carl says—that we are commodities of the university factory system? What kind of commodities are we? Knowledgeable ones, yes. Carl makes that clear. We're being shaped

to fill America's need for skilled technicians of all kinds, technicians who—as plant managers, lawyers, city-planners, State Department "experts"—will need to be able to manipulate facts. So our education has to train us in the ability to handle facts. Otherwise we'd be no good to the system. They don't want morons.

But they do what are people who, when they are handling facts, won't get disturbed by the facts of lay-offs and speed-ups, or laws by the fact of a law written and administered for and by the rich, or city-planners by urban renewal, or foreign policy experts by the popularity of the Vietcong. The system needs people who can manage it efficiently, who can daily manipulate the facts of incredible human waste and destruc-

(continued on page 3)

# PEACE MOBILIZATION

Proposal delivered\* at the Conference in Cleveland, Ohio, Saturday, Sept. 10, 1966 by Sidney M. Peck, Coordinator, University Circle Teach-In Committee, Cleveland, Ohio

IsL Institute  
Soe. Caark...  
Berkeley, 740...  
Amsterdam

I want to put forward a proposal which is not in any written form.\* I don't have anything to distribute here because I did not want it to be construed in any way that this was to be a finished proposal. On the contrary, it is very formative. At least it is the kind of notion that will provide a stimulus for counter-proposals, for suggestions for new ideas, for getting things going. Hopefully, when we leave this conference, we will have come to some agreement on what we can do on a national level, in terms of a unified effort to express the sentiment of the people against this war.

I think, therefore, we are talking always about a mobilization of sentiment and outlook. A mobilization that reflects the whole spectrum of opposition to the war. Thus a cardinal point to emphasize over and over again is the unified character of this mobilization — its non-exclusionary approach. It is an effort to involve and to include all those — each and every one — who are in any way, for whatever reasons, opposed to this war!

Now, if we think of what we can do in the very immediate future — namely what can be done prior to the elections — I believe there is general agreement that you can't really develop a mobilization of truly massive proportions in the immediate future. But you can begin to strive for certain kinds of objectives and goals. I want to state several objectives first before suggesting the kinds of things we might do in a unified way prior to the elections.

The first objective would be to demonstrate the resurgence of effort and development of an initiative of our own. We are not going to respond to what the administration does. Rather, we are going to move on a new initiative of our own. We are not going to let the administration or the governing powers, those who have decided to continue this war and escalate it to the point of nuclear catastrophe, tell us what we should do! We are going to make a beginning of it prior to the elections. We are going to show the American people, and the world, that regardless of the profound and real difficulties of an ideological, political, and other sort that separate and divide us, and that reflect genuine differences in the constituencies we represent — that, nevertheless, we have come to a realization that we can no longer allow those difficulties to loom as obstacles in the development of a unified effort. That is a second objective.

A third objective, in addition to the resurgence of concern and development of a unified effort, would be to make sure that the issue of this war remains a fundamental issue during the election period. Thus, an important goal would be that the administration politicians, those who want to hide this issue under the rug, are confronted with the question. We are going to do all that we can to insure that the American electorate and general public are extremely conscious of the issues involved in this war.

A fourth objective would be to develop and inject this question of the war in the electoral scene in the multitude of forms already in motion by national organizations and/or by local committees. Forms that are congenial to what given groups at this point believe are the correct tactical ways of most effectively expressing opposition to the war. Forms and approaches which, in fact, represent the full spectrum of outlook in the anti-war and peace movement. In this objective there is a built-in hope that a fundamental acceptance of the principle of diversity will become an important and meaningful kind of principle to which we can all adhere. That is to say, the development of a mutual respect for differences of approach, so that all tendencies in opposition to the war are included, irrespective of the particular disagreement over this tactic or that tactic, this activity or that activity, this particular form or that particular form. That would be included in the fourth objective.

And, finally, the last objective would be to develop a kind of ad hoc mechanism to cultivate the essential groundwork for a mobilization of truly massive proportions in the near future. This operational means will be a new kind of mechanism based on a healthy respect for difference and diver-

sity. And, it will be based on the recognition that the differences are real. Further, that it is important to maintain differences of identification even while we work together in a common effort to end this barbarous war.

Now these are the objectives that one can set out for the present election period. The question is: What kinds of means can we put forward? There are a variety of specific proposals to consider. Some will come forward from organizations themselves who have advanced such proposals. One thing that we can agree on is that no matter what we do in the pre-election period, let us do it pretty much at the same time. Let us set aside a time when we can work together, however differently may be the activities that we carry on. So the four days prior to the election — say, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday — can be a time in which all national organizations, all regional groups, all local groups, make plans to express whatever they now

(continued on page 3)

## new left notes

an internal newspaper of students for a democratic society

1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

VOL. 1, NO. 38 let the people decide OCTOBER 7, 1966

## national secretary's report the CALCULUS of IMPROBABILITIES

Democratic decision-making is difficult at best in the midst of an authoritarian system. Paul Booth's "Open Letter" to me (NLN, October 1), his Proposal for a National Action, (NLN, September 9), and an invitation to participate on the "David Susskind Show" faced the National Office with a difficult set of decisions. Booth was accusing me of having "badly misrepresented" the Clear Lake convention while suggesting that I should formulate national policy where the Clear Lake convention had failed. Booth had also called for a major program which would gain national visibility out of action that individual chapters had initiated. Susskind, through his representative Herb Blum, was asking that we represent the "New Left" and, at the same time, that we have a forceful and aggressive "leader" who could project our image to the television public.

Having misplaced my copy of Mao's treatise "On Contradiction," I despaired of resolving much of anything and only hoped that I would be able to glean enough wisdom from national officers to overcome the difficult situation which Messrs. Susskind and Booth had put us in.

I thus set out, as per my understanding of the role of a good National Secretary, to consult with the NAC and to poll the NIC and to discuss with the President (Nick) until I had some clarity and a good deal of confusion on which to base the decisions which would affect the lives of Susskind and Booth and millions of Americans crouched in front of their television sets and godonlyknows who else.

Two things were clear: everybody thinks television is groovy but everybody thinks Booth's proposal for getting national television time is lousy. Everybody on the NAC and everybody on the NIC who responded to the ballot thought that we should accept the Susskind invitation to talk to the folks in the hinterland about who we are and what we feel—(everybody, that is, except me who hates the television with a deep and irrational passion). All those people also felt that Booth had failed to understand the sense of the Clear Lake meetings in his proposal to clean up nationally on local protests against the "king-in-the-provinces" by making hay out of the AP-UPI.

I felt personally that there was something slightly inconsistent about wanting air time with Susskind and rejecting a proposal by Booth aimed at getting press coverage. I was still looking for my copy of Chairman Mao and wondering what made the Susskind and Booth proposals so different in the minds of SDSers when I denounced myself as an anarchist wrecker and tried to let the President decide.

By the time the President was able to get to the National Office, decision-making by anybody at all had been immensely complicated by the Susskind show itself. The NAC-NIC had voted "yes" to going on the show; had voted SDS-SNCC to "who's the people we go on with?"; and had voted Nick to appear for us. I had received a letter from Herb Blum saying that it would be a show on the "New Left" with "SDS, SNCC, etc." I had also made clear that in the calculus of the New Left Math the proper equation is

SDS plus SNCC = NEW LEFT,

with a strong tangential bias in the direction of SSOC plus SUPA and a real uneasiness about any equation involving PL, WEB DuB, YSA, or YPSL. These sentiments expressed the majority opinions of the NAC-NIC.

Democracy was a beautiful thing and I loved us dearly and cheerily instructed Nick that he should appear on the Susskind thing about the New Left. (Confession: by this time I had conveniently repressed beyond and below consciousness the "etc." in Blum's letter.) Nick dutifully complied and accepted a slot on the show. Then he arrived at the N.O. and explained that the show as outlined to him by Blum would consist of SDS plus WEB DuB... and after some unpleasant telephone conversation with the show we called the whole thing off.

I have since been accused of red-baiting, copping out, stacking-and-or-consciously-misinterpreting NIC ballots, plus a variety of other sins both deadly and venal but never original. In any case, I still can't find "On Contradiction" and I now refer to the Susskind-Booth syndrome in moments of bitterness.

Incidentally, three SDSers went over to talk to Blum and Susskind at their office before the show. They were told that they were too "low-key" to be seen in public. (They also found it incredible that we actually consulted all our national officers about such a decision.) There are apparently a number of people around who think we are irrelevant unless we bare our teeth and snarl into the cameras. Personally, I suspect that SDS chapters will probably do very radical things that really challenge the power structures and really organize people by involving them in the struggle for social change without the help of NBC-CBS-ABC-UPI-AP which, in the New Radical Math, has always added up to BS anyway.

Greg Calvert  
National Secretary

## Communists in SDS? —a resolution

by Art Rosenblum

In recent days J. Edgar Hoover has made a speech in which he charged that the civil rights and anti-war movements actually are infiltrated by Communists!

In fact, he specifically mentioned SDS as an organization in which card carrying Communists are known to be hiding.

Well, for once, J. Edgar Hoover is right. There are some Communists in SDS. Every regular reader of *New Left Notes* must be fully aware of that fact, and he must also know that some of those Communists have openly admitted their membership in both organizations.

What J. Edgar Hoover did not say, however, is that there are also some members of the F.B.I. in SDS!

Up to the present, however, no member of that organization has been open enough to admit his dual membership. Therefore, it must be concluded that Communists are, on the average, somewhat more honest than F.B.I. people.

SDS is an open organization which welcomes all who seek for solutions to the problems of our day. We welcome both Communist members and our comrades of the F.B.I. We hope that their affiliation with us will have good effects upon their minds and hearts and souls.

Also at this point, it would be well to welcome another dangerous, though small minority in SDS. These are the people of whom it has been said (already many hundreds of years ago): "They are turning the whole world upside down!" In those days, such people were regarded as "enemies of the state" and were often severely persecuted. At that time they were called: "Christians."

Fearful as all those things must be, it is necessary to inform the membership that there was even one card carrying SDS member present at our last convention who is also a member of Lyndon Baines Johnson's organization — a Democrat!

In view of all those dangers coming at us (both openly and secretly) from every side, and so that all of them may be somewhat open, I would like to propose to all our members that by means of a membership referendum we decide whether or not to act upon the following resolution:

### RESOLUTION

RESOLVED: That J. Edgar Hoover (of Washington, D.C.) be made an honorary member of SDS and that accordingly, a membership card (duly signed by our president) and also a free (one year) subscription to *New Left Notes* be sent to him starting at once.

Votes on the above resolution shall be counted and acted upon one month from the date of this issue of NLN.

## Letters To The Editor

Dear Thane,

On page 2 of September 23, 1966 *New Left Notes* in the National Council Resolutions passed at Clear Lake there is an error. Motion by Bob Rogers concerning referendum democracy was not passed.

It was clearly defeated.

Since many of us at the NC meeting felt the motion was absurd, could you please print some sort of a retraction in the next issue of NLN. Thank you.

Fraternally,  
Jim Jacobs  
University of Michigan SDS

*New Left Notes*  
Lost & Found Department

Sirs:

Even though we stole out of Clear Lake beneath cover of both darkness, fog, and rain - we still managed to cop one extra sack full of old clothes, communist literature, NoDoz, and 2 cans of nutmeg.

Found:

One lightly striped laundry bag, containing:

2 cans nutmeg  
1 sweatsuit  
several sets underwear  
3 pants  
1 sweater  
1 book - "Guerrilla and Counter Guerrilla Warfare" by William J. Pomesy and other assorted junk.

IF NLN is desperate for material—run this with note that owner can obtain said junk by writing me at the below address:

Cheers, Love & Black Power,  
Greg Kaslo  
1226 DeHavo  
San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Sir:

I wish to take exception to a sentence in "Against Paranoid Politics" by Marvin Mandell in the September 23, 1966 issue of *New Left Notes*.

"Peking Red Guards attacking lovers of Bach and Mozart are no less sickening than Berlin Nazi hoodlums smashing windows during 'Krystallnacht!'"

I wish to point out that the music the Red Guards condemn is not that of Bach and Mozart but that of MacNamara's Band. They also oppose Chinese who march to that tune.

I find it hard to believe that members of the U.S. academic community cannot recognize Pentagon propaganda when it is dated Moscow.

Paul Burke  
Omaha, Nebraska

Friends,

Enclosed please find a contribution, \$31.98, which is 10% of my pay check this month. I plan to send you the same per cent for the rest of the year. In return, please renew my membership and change my NLN address plate from Swarthmore College, Penna to 10 Brookford St., Dorchester Mass 02125.

One more request: I think it's essential that young adults help finance SDS, especially as there is no MDS. I'd like to help get more people to make monthly pledges - any ideas how I can do it? I understand Mike Zweig at Michigan is also big on this idea. The request - that you guys do something on this line, something more effective than just repeating the plea we've heard for years.

Peace,  
Walt Popper  
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Ed, Note—No, we don't. Do any of you have suggestions?

## Four SDS Members Attacked in Apartment

By Gene Clabes

Lexington police are searching for four unknown assailants who severely beat one University student and roughed up three others last Thursday in Rose Lane apartment.

Robert Amyx, a second semester sophomore from Paducah, was released from the University Hospital Wednesday after six days of treatment for a minor concussion and irritation of a hemophilia condition.

The other students involved were identified as freshmen Brad Washburn, Chicago; Jim Furmall, Louisville; and Darrell Harrison, Ashland. All four students were identified by Amyx as members of the University chapter of Students for a Democratic Society.

Lexington police said today the incident took place between 1 and 2 a.m. Sept. 22 at Amyx and Washburn's apartment at 416 Rose Lane.

In an interview today Amyx said he and Washburn returned to their apartment following an on campus SDS meeting lasting until 9 p.m. the night of the incident.

He also said Furmall and Harrison joined them there following the SDS session.

"We were playing the guitar and the record player when suddenly a man appeared in the back of the apartment and says, 'Where's the party', Smyx said.

Washburn said he told the man there was no party there. Then three other men appeared in the doorway he said.

"They walked over to Jim Furmall, who was playing the guitar and began slapping him around" Washburn said. "They kept saying 'you want to fight!'"

Furmall said one of the intruders threw his glasses across the room trying to 'force me into a fight.'

Amyx said after that happened he moved toward the door, intending to call the police.

"Just as I reached the door one of the men asked me where I was going," he said. "He advised me to get back into the apartment and then he started hitting me."

Amyx said the four intruders then began pummeling himself, Washburn, Furmall and Harrison, "calling us 'Commies' while they were beating us."

"A man in the next apartment came in and halted the fight by appearing to be on their side," Amyx said.

Washburn explained after the assailants left the apartment the three students rushed Amyx to the hospital where he was immediately administered seven pints of plasma. Released from the Medical Center Wednesday, Amyx still has numerous bruises over the right side of his face and a badly discolored right eye.

"Robert (Amyx) was kicked in the face and beaten much more severely than any of us in the apartment," Furmall said.

"As he suffers from a knee condition that hampers his walk, he couldn't get away from the guy hitting him" Furmall added.

Following the beating Washburn informed Lexington police of the incident and filed "John Doe" warrants for the assailants' arrest. (A "John Doe" warrant is obtained when a person accused of committing a crime is known only by sight.) Washburn's warrant was for assault and battery.

Campus SDS leaders speculated the incident may have been provoked by a hostile dialogue recently between SDS members opposing escalation of the Vietnam War and other students favoring the war's escalation.

The dialogue occurred Sept. 13 when SDS members opened and manned a Student Center Booth from which they disseminated anti-war speeches by U. S. Senators J. W. Fulbright and Wayne Morse. A copy of one speech was set afire while other copies were destroyed by hecklers.

According to Washburn the booth was opened about five feet from a Navy and Marine Corps recruiting-information booth. Amyx said he was not convinced the beating was caused by his SDS involvement but said, "It is a strong possibility that this happened because of this."

"I would recognize the four men again but I didn't see them at the Student Center booth Sept. 13" he added. "However there was a great deal of confusion there that day."

Washburn is even less convinced the incident was a result of the booth but adds, "I'm also not sure that it wasn't."

"It seems as if they had been here (the apartment) because of the booth they would have mentioned it before they started hitting us," Washburn said. "But I still have some reservations about walking around on campus. About three or four times daily I'm called a communist and other names on campus. I'm a little frightened."

Following the incident Washburn said he stayed with friends rather than going back to the apartment.

On both Friday and Saturday night break-ins were reported in the Rose Lane apartment, according to Washburn.

Amyx said he had not been heckled on campus but "I don't dress like the rest of them. That does make a difference."

Furmall thinks it was a coincidence but said in the past SDS members have been harassed by anti-SDS persons.

"When a policeman questioned us after the incident, he asked if we were members of SDS," Furmall added. "He said the general feeling in Lexington is that we are communists."

Police today said no leads had turned up on the case but an investigation is being conducted. A detective said he "was not sure if it was University students or not but they must have known their way around to get in the back door."

Robert Frampton, an SDS member, said the campus chapter is thinking of offering a reward for the assailants' arrest.

"However our concern is the hospital bill, we must pay that first," he added.

## Questions!

For some time now, there has been a great rush to Get (or perhaps be gotten by) an Ideology for SDS. I suspect that discussions of the subtleties of Marxism or existential radicalism are desperately irrelevant to most SDS people, however important they may be to those engaging in them. At least this writer, and I think not only him, would like to start by asking a more fundamental question. I realize that in asking it, I am running full tilt into charges of naivety, but it is a charge that some of us have to be willing to risk.

"Let the people decide." This is our motto, and tempers quite a bit of our political thinking. The question that begs to be asked is, can the people decide rightly or at least rightly enough so that the political body would not (1) destroy itself through some disastrous mistake, or (2) devolve into an approximate of the system we have now. I'll be specific. If the miners in some coal-mining state decide that strip mining is the fastest and easiest way to get coal (which it is) and is therefore the desirable one, what practical way is there to prevent the gigantic loss of usable land? Again, if the people of Tennessee decide (as they did) that Evolution should not be taught in their classrooms, how does the SDSer challenge the decision? Or, more conjecturally, if the people, acting on their own volition, ever did decide to make war on some offending country, what can we say besides, "You are wrong?"

I would like to anticipate the answer to my last question which usually runs something like "the people could never wage an aggressive war if they really were responsible for the decision." This is precisely the point I would like to question. Does our concept of a truly Democratic society have as a first assumption faith in the people to ultimately arrive at the right decision? If so, then we should devote as much time as possible to examining the truth of this as yet unverified assumption. Also if so, how do we differentiate ourselves from John Locke and the 18th Century republicans in our optimistic faith? And if not, exactly what do the people decide?

Marc Lendler  
Sharon, Penn

(Ed note: Address your answers to Mr. Lenders Questions to *New Left Notes* % the S.D.S. National Office.)

# NOTICES

### Address Change

The address of the New England regional office of SDS is now:

Students for a Democratic Society  
138 River st.  
Cambridge, Mass. 02139

### White House Vigil

A group of Harpur College students will hold a "vigil" outside the White House Oct. 7 and 8 to demonstrate for an end to the Viet Nam war, according to a student, Mark I. Satin of Wichita Falls, Tex.

Mr. Satin, a coordinator for Students for a Democratic Society, said originally the plan was to take about 12 students—two carloads.

"But so many want to go that there may be more," he said.

The Harpur SDS chapter is collecting signatures on a petition that will be presented to government leaders calling for stronger efforts to end the war, Mr. Satin said.

He said the anti-war vigil is a Harpur project, not a national SDS plan. The petition reads:

"I, the undersigned, a student at Harpur College, would like to express my disapproval of the present government policy on Viet Nam. I believe that stronger efforts should be made to end the war peacefully, including steps toward de-escalation and a truly representative Vietnamese government."

The statement also says the signer supports the Harpur demonstrators. Each student signs a separate sheet, on which he can delete or change any words he does not agree with, Mr. Satin said.

### Chapter Contacts

Our national chapter contact list is sadly out of date. For some chapters, we have no contact person to whom mailings should be sent. For others, we have the names of people who are no longer active in the chapter, or who may have moved away and are having mailings forwarded to them.

Each chapter should designate 1 or more persons to receive the national mailings, NC mail ballots, etc. If possible, chapters should attempt to establish some sort of permanent address ("office", post office box, etc.) to which mailings can be sent. In this way, we won't have the continuing problem of keeping up with the status and addresses of individuals. This is especially important for those chapters which continue to function over the summer but have different officers.

### Draft Refusal Conference

A conference on total noncooperation with the draft system will be held in New York City at the end of this month. The meeting, called by David Miller and other draft refusers and sponsored by a number of radical pacifist groups (Catholic Worker, CNVA, WIN, etc.) will deal with such questions as nonregistration, refusal to take up arms while in the armed forces, resistance while in prison, mutual aid to families of non-cooperators, and community pressure on resisters.

The conference will be held October 28, 29 and 30th, and is open to persons with divergent viewpoints. Further information on time and site can be obtained from: NYC Workshop in Nonviolence, 5 Beekman st., New York City, N. Y. 10038.

# STUDENT BOREDOM

(continued from page 1)

tiveness—and who can do it because they don't believe in an alternative. The function of the university factories is to produce one-dimensional men, men who can handle the existing facts of injustice and unfreedom because they have long since learned not to ask questions, because they have long since learned to make their peace with and submit to the existing facts.

So I think we need to ask, how do universities produce men who are capable in their area, and yet are unable to go beyond the facts? Men who will do a job, and not ask questions? The answer must somehow lie in what goes on in the classroom. Carl is right, grading is at the heart of the university factory system. Grading teaches us to passively submit to meaningless standards, to measure the value of what we're doing in terms of criteria that have nothing to do with real value. Grades are a preparation for later life—when money will take the place as the standard measure for what we do. But we need, I think, to extend our analysis of the university beyond grades, beyond the form of education, to the content itself.

What do our courses teach us? They teach us to separate facts from value, facts from what they mean. Take a look at the dominant trends in almost every academic discipline. In philosophy, the ruling school is positivism, which is founded on the absolute distinction between facts and value-judgements. For example, the war is a fact; that it's wrong is only a value-judgement. Facts are objective, value-judgements are merely subjective; dependent on human frailty. Yet the war doesn't really exist apart from subjective humanity. Human beings, in all their subjectivity, created the fact of the war, and human beings are necessary to see that fact as a fact, and make sense of it. How can we grasp the fact, apart from its meaning? To separate the war from its meaning (its wrongness), as positivists do, is really arbitrary and abstract.

But the dominant trends in academic philosophy are positivist, not rationalist or existential. And though there is no conspiracy of professors, it's still no accident, nor is it an isolated phenomenon. Without going into such detail, let's see how facts are separated from what they mean in other fields. In political science, "pluralism" proves that the American political system has mechanisms for satisfying every group's needs of labor. In history, a kind of historical positivism focuses on the conspicuous motives of men (particularly of men who wielded power), and refuses to deal with so-called "abstractions" like historical forces. In this way the Reformation turns out to have been caused by Luther's desire to reform the Church and Henry VIII's desire for a new wife; "abstractions" like the rise of capitalism need not be considered. In economics, the history of economic theory is increasingly neglected, and Neokyanism—the theory of the existing system—is presented as if its categories were the ultimate concepts of economic reality. The "new critics" turn the study of literature into a study of the subjective world created by the author, which would be OK if they would then deal with the connection between the reality presented in the work and the reality of people's lives—but most of them won't. Psychological behaviorism treats man as if, confronted with two choices, he'll pick one or the other like a rat—forgetting that man has the option of rejecting the system which imposes intolerable choices on him.

And so on. My point, which maybe has gotten lost in all these details, is that by the time we graduate we have been painstakingly trained in separating facts from their meaning. Pluralism, behaviorism, positivism—in all the various fields, the fear of making value judgements is increasingly raised to the level of a principle. Perfectly well-meaning, conscientious professors, well-qualified

(continued on page 4)

# Fort Hood "3"

During the week of September 6 through 9 the "Fort Hood Three" G.I.'s were court-martialed for their refusal to obey orders to go to Vietnam. Two of them, Pvt. David Samas and PFC James Johnson, were given the maximum sentences—five years imprisonment in the federal military prison at Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas. The third, Pvt. Dennis Mora, was sentenced to three years imprisonment. All of them received dishonorable discharges, total forfeiture of pay, and reduction to the lowest enlisted grade.

The Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, although not surprised at these sentences, regards them, and particularly the manner in which they were reached, as a travesty on justice.

The court-martials took place at Ft. Dix, New Jersey, in the heart of the huge Ft. Dix-McGuire AFB military area. The judge and jury were uniformed army officers. The judge, called the "law officer," was a full Colonel. The prosecutor, a Lt Colonel, was the "trial officer." The juries, though different in each trial, were boards of ten high ranking army officers—about half of whom had served in Vietnam—known as the "court."

Stanley Faulkner, who has been representing the three soldiers from the beginning, defended them in the court-martials along with two assigned military counsel, Major Edwin Lassiter and Lt. Jasin Cotton.

The three soldiers were tried separately. Pvt. Mora's trial was the first, and it attracted the most attention. It opened with a series of preliminary defense challenges to the jurisdiction of the court-martial, all of which were denied. Faulkner and Major Lassiter charged (1) that an army court could not reasonably be expected to rule fairly in deciding the question of the illegality of

the war upon which the defense was based, (2) that the law officer could not be expected to judge fairly the legal matters connected with this question, (3) that the military court had no jurisdiction so long as the question of the legality of the war was being considered before the civil courts, and (4) that the order which Pvt. Mora was charged with disobeying was illegal because it was given for the sole purpose of increasing his punishment.

These were intended to become the main lines of the defense argument in the trial. However, at a later point in the trial, the Army ruled out of order all arguments about the legality of the war.

The prosecution proceeded then to prove that Pvt. Mora had in fact violated the "direct order" which he was given to board transportation to Vietnam. Attorney Faulkner's cross-examination of Capt. D.M. DeVera, the officer who had given Mora the order, produced the most dramatic point in the trial. DeVera, a 30-year veteran in the army, contradicted himself so thoroughly that at several points his testimony became ridiculous to the extent that even members of the press were hard put to restrain their laughter. Faulkner was able to bring before the court, through this examination, evidence that the order given Pvt. Mora was not Capt. DeVera's own idea, that it was part of a preconceived plan originated in the top levels of the Pentagon, that Capt. DeVera was told of the plan in a special briefing session in the Ft. Dix Commanding General's office the day before it was given, and that in fact it was so well known that Pvt. Mora was going to refuse the order that Capt. DeVera was told beforehand to bring with

(continued on page 4)

# PEACE MOBILIZATION

(continued from page 1)

have in motion, and, at the same time, to show their respect for the unity of expression in opposition to the war. This could mean, therefore, that those who are involved in supporting peace candidates should work as hard as they can, as I am sure they will, during these four days before the election. There are those who are doing other kinds of electoral work in areas where there is no electoral choice. If they want to do that fine! But make the concentrated effort during these four days. There may be those who say, "I am not going to bother with whether people vote for peace candidates or not. We should organize demonstrations against the war." There may be those who want to highlight the issues of grade-rank in the universities, opposition to the draft, and support for those who resist the draft. There may be those who feel that this is exactly the time when there should be public rallies to gain support for the Ft. Hood Three. Also, there has been the suggestion that in some localities there may be student strikes or adult strikes. One suggestion that has been made is to designate a "sick-of-the-war" day during the pre-election period.

In other words, there are many kinds of things that can be done. The important thing is that they are done with a mutual respect for what is taking place in an effort to coordinate and minimize organizational conflicts. It is particularly important not to render holy judgment that what is being done in "our" group is far superior to what others are engaged in! I think that is the spirit we are trying to develop during this four-day concentrated effort.

This is not a finished proposal, it is a formative one. The elections are going to take place November 8, but certainly the war is not going to end on Nov. 9. And, most surely, our concern is not going to end! If we can move through the obstacles that now separate us, develop a new tone and character, a new resurgence of concern, then we can move ahead to the period around the weeks of Christmas Chanukah. During that period we could develop another action across the nation. The predominant theme would be to focus on the ethical, moral and religious issues involved in this war. This would be a special time to stress,

in a coordinated way, the kind of barbarity that is now being undertaken and legitimized in our name as American citizens. This would be time when religious leadership throughout the country might come forward to spearhead activities around this theme.

Now, if we can have a kind of successful mobilization at this period in December; if we have now developed trusting relationships between groups and persons, respectful of the genuine differences that exist, but concerned about reaching still further to make this mood of public opposition viable, then in the spring—hopefully around the Easter-Passover season—we can mobilize the most massive opposition to the war that has ever yet been undertaken. This can be done by looking forward again to certain kinds of objectives.

One objective is for a truly massive mobilization of a million American people coming out to express their opposition to the war in a concentrated and dramatic way. Instead of appealing on our knees to Lyndon Johnson to stop this war, or to McNamara or Rusk, we should direct the appeal to where it counts—namely, to the people of the world. We should direct our appeal to humanity itself, to the world at large. This is not merely a question for the American people to resolve, although we certainly bear a real responsibility and one which we are going to accept. It is a question that concerns every living human being in this world? So, a second objective would be to appeal to the people of the world, to world humanity, and emphasize the theme of "a world against war" and a world against this specific war in Vietnam. We can bring to bear a world leverage, a world responsibility, a truly universal concern that this war must end. Therefore, whatever we do in this massive mobilization effort would have a kind of international focus to it, and that would be an important objective.

It would demonstrate and show to the people of the world that the American people, unable to express their sentiments in the form of a change in political decision-making, are fully conscious of their responsibility not to allow established power to legitimize what it does in Vietnam in the name of the American people.

(continued on page 4)

# Socialist Party Hdqtrs. BOMBED

The national headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party at 873 Broadway was fire-bombed the morning of Thursday, September 29, 1966 at approximately 5:40. Between two and four Molotov cocktails were thrown at the windows by four unidentified men. A witness said that he saw the men lighting the bottles in the street below the headquarters which are on the second floor.

The bombs failed to break the windows but the flaming gasoline set fire to the building. By the time the fire department arrived, one of the offices was seriously damaged. No one was injured although workers were already coming into the building.

Judy White, New York gubernatorial candidate of the Socialist Workers Party, declared that the bombing was obviously in the same pattern as the bombing that wrecked the national headquarters of the Communist Party in New York September 4, the national headquarters of the W.E.B. Dubois Clubs in San Francisco on March 6 and the headquarters of the Vietnam Day Committee in Berkeley on April 9.

"Possibly a single right-wing or fascist-type organization is responsible for all these outrages," she said. "The commandos evidently hope by violent means like this to intimidate organizations that oppose the war in Vietnam."

"It is part of the general climate of violence in the United States that is being given continual impetus by the Johnson administration's escalation of the war."

"This atmosphere inspires the haterangers to imitate the murderous actions being committed by the Pentagon on a huge scale in Vietnam."

"In Detroit, for instance, a political assassin walked into the headquarters of the Socialist Workers Party last May 16, lined up two members of the party and a member of the Young Socialist Alliance and shot them killing Leo Bernard, a Socialist Workers candidate for Congress in 1964, and seriously wounding Jan Garrett and Walter Graham."

"If the right-wing terrorists think they can intimidate us by such tactics, however, they are mistaken. We intend to continue our opposition to American intervention in the war in Vietnam and our opposition to Johnson's escalation of the war. We will continue to demand the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops."

"We appeal to all opponents of the war in Vietnam to rally with expressions of solidarity against the pattern of violence being used in hope of silencing opposition to Johnson's drive toward a war with China and a possible nuclear catastrophe. Answer the terrorists by closing ranks."

For further information contact Rita Shaw, 873 Broadway, NYC, NY...982-6054.

## 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 10011; (212) 889-5793  
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: 138 River St., Cambridge, Mass. 02139  
Chicago Region: 2059 N. Larrabee, Chicago, Ill. (312) 944-3624  
Radical Education Project: 510 East William, Ann Arbor, Mich.

# Fort Hood "3"

(continued from page 3)

him the forms that would be necessary to confine Pvt. Mora to the post stockade. Faulkner charged later that the only reason for the plan was to insure that Mora - who had announced many times previously his intention to refuse to go to Vietnam - would be forced to disobey a "direct order" (which carried a five year maximum sentence) instead of a movement order (which carried a 1 year sentence). Under military law, an order given only to increase the punishment an offender would receive, is illegal.

At the next session of the court-martial, when the defense began to present its case - based on the argument that the war in Vietnam is illegal because it violates the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the U.N. resolution on the Nuremberg Charter, the 1954 Geneva agreements, and the SEATO treaties - the law officer recessed the court. With a direct and cryptic sentence the officer stated that "it is a matter of law that the war in Vietnam is legal, and I therefore forbid you to argue before this court that it isn't. With this ruling the defense was deprived of its main arguments.

Mora, himself, then became the chief defense witness. He told in a calm manner the reasons why he had disobeyed the order, and why he considered the war in Vietnam to be "illegal, immoral and unjust." He told how he grew up as a Puerto Rican in the slums of Spanish Harlem, and how he had been told as a kid that because he was a Puerto Rican, he could never "amount to anything." He described his struggle to get out of the ghetto, and told how he considered his plight as a Puerto Rican to be not much different than the plight of the Vietnamese fighting for their freedom and independence in Vietnam. He said that he once asked one of his superior officers why we were in Vietnam, and how he was told that we were there "to kill as many Asians as we could." At the close of his testimony even the reporters, who usually tend to be a bit cynical about these things, appeared to have been moved by his testimony.

The court deliberated only twenty minutes to find him guilty.

They then returned to the court room to hear argument about the sentence. The defense introduced into evidence a number of documents from Pvt. Mora's service record to show that his record up to this time had been nearly perfect. In appealing to the military minds of the court, he argued that Pvt. Mora had not, as have so many other young men, sought to avoid entering the service, but had entered when drafted and served as honorably as his convictions would allow. He argued that Pvt. Mora in standing up to his convictions had shown a bravery far greater than that required to merely obey the order.

To this the prosecution replied that "orders are the foundation stone upon which the army is built," that on July 14, when Mora had disobeyed the order to go to Vietnam he "was not a good soldier," and that he should be given "an adequate sentence to deter others from doing the same thing." The court took only 15 minutes to return with the sentence.

The second and third trials, those of PFC Johnson and Pvt. Samas, proceeded in much the same vein. Again, the law officer ruled out of order all testimony and argument regarding the illegality of the war in Vietnam, and again he denied all the defense motions to postpone the trials or challenge the jurisdiction of the court-martial. Faulkner presented to the court, as additional evidence that the trials should be dropped or postponed, 10 or 12 newspapers, all of which had been purchased that day in the Fr. Dix Post Exchange or Officers Club. All carried articles on the case of the three soldiers and the conviction earlier of Pvt. Mora. Included among those newspapers were several non-commercial papers distributed free to soldiers at the base, one of which carried a banner headline on the trial. He argued that no court, having a prior knowledge of this case or of the conviction of Pvt. Mora could rule fairly on the issue. When the "court" was being sworn, he asked each member of the court if he had read any of these papers - and received the incredible reply from several of them that they had never heard of it before. The trial officer, of course, denied the defense motions.

The trials were wrapped up rapidly on Friday, September 9, with the conviction and sentencing of PFC Johnson, and a few hours later, of Pvt. Samas.

A number of the prominent sponsors and

supporters of the defense committee attended the court-martial sessions to express their support for the three soldiers. A news conference, chaired by Prof. Staughton Lynd, was held during the opening day of the trials, and many of the supporters were introduced to the press. A telegram of support from Lord Bertrand Russell was read at the news conference. Sponsors present during the trials included Prof. Lynd, A. J. Muste, Mrs. Donna Allen, Prof. Robert S. Brown, Rev. Lee H. Ball, Rev. Richard Leonard, and members of the families of all three defendants.

## THE NEXT STAGES

The court-martial convictions now go before Lt. General William F. Train, the court-martial convening authority and commander of the First U.S. Army Area. He is required by military law to, within 30 days, either validate the convictions and sentences, or reduce or modify them according to the advice of his legal officers. Attorney Faulkner will present to General Train a brief stating his opinion that the convictions should be reversed, and if that is not done, that the sentences should be reduced.

If this appeal is not successful, the defense then intends to take the case before the Board of Military Review in the Pentagon, where the army's top legal officers will again review the cases, with the option to reverse or modify the convictions. The defense feels that it is unlikely that the convictions will be reversed at either of these two stages, but that there is some chance the sentences may be modified and reduced.

The next stage will be for the defense to appeal the case to the Military Court of Appeals, a three man panel of federal, civilian judges - who act as the equivalent of the Supreme Court in military cases. If this appeal is still unsuccessful - and the defense has been still unable to get before the court argument on the question of the illegality of the war in Vietnam - Faulkner will attempt to appeal the whole case to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Parallel to these appeal steps in the military courts, the defense will attempt at the same time to continue to press the issue of the illegality of the war in the civilian courts. The original suit requesting an injunction against sending the three soldiers to Vietnam was filed on June 30, was immediately denied, and now awaits a possible hearing on appeal before the Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington. In addition, Faulkner has initiated in the Circuit requesting that the federal courts assume jurisdiction in the case insofar as the army courts have refused to consider the basic defense argument based on the illegality of the war. He may also, in the event that is turned down, carry the appeals to the Supreme Court through that channel. It has also become clear, in recent weeks, that the *Lutfig vs. McNamara* case - also argued by Faulkner - which preceded the case of the three soldiers in the federal courts, and which is based on the same grounds, may be pursued so as to become a favorable precedent in that question. In the event that the *Lutfig vs. McNamara* case is won, it may have the effect of reversing the convictions of the three soldiers.

## PUBLICITY ON THE CASE

It has been apparent from the beginning that the case of the three soldiers has tremendous public interest; and the coverage of the trial exceeded by far anything the case previously received. The trials were reported for their entire duration by all the major press services and by most of the major newspapers in the New York-New Jersey area. The story received continuous and sometimes front page news stories in such papers as the *New York Times*, the *N. Y. Post*, the *Trenton Times*, the *Philadelphia Enquirer*, etc. The committee has received clippings of news stories from major newspapers in Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Detroit, Chicago, and several other cities. A CBS-TV newsreel interview with James Johnson, was carried across the U. S. on the CBS network.

Demonstrations of support for the "Fort Hood Three" were held during the trial in several cities, including Detroit, Minneapolis, Chicago and Los Angeles. In Los Angeles, after six persons were arrested for distributing leaflets on the case to G.I.'s at a train depot, a demonstration was held at the depot and leaflets were again distributed - this time successfully. The Cleveland Conference on the November 5-8 Mobilization sent telegrams of support to the three men.

# Peace Mobilization

(continued from page 3)

These would be the prime objectives. What would be the means to attain them? What would be the channels by which we could develop such a mobilization? One suggestion is to concentrate this effort in two centers, not in Washington, D. C., but in New York City and San Francisco. One center would be at the UN in New York and the other center at the San Francisco Opera House, S.F., where the UN was founded. Now, this will not be a one day affair, where people come in town and leave the next day. Instead it would last three or four or five days, or a week. We would want to share our ideas and positions in every way possible. Through the reasoning process we will use the channels of teach-ins, seminars, and conferences, where the full spectrum of opposition to this war can be articulated with a healthy appreciation of differences. We can utilize figures of international stature to share this dialogue of opposition to the war. We are going to consider all of the ramifications, not merely the national ramifications, but what it means to the poor of world and to those who are subjugated, exploited, and oppressed. These are the kinds of questions that can be dramatically expressed in a massive meeting of minds, as well as a gathering of bodies. And, we will parade uptown and downtown and all over the city! The assumption would be that at least a half million people could be mobilized for such an effort in the New York area, where the event could draw from the whole Eastern Seaboard. On the Saturday night of that week, we would encourage the participation of the folk art community and have gigantic hootenannies in New York and San Francisco, and on Sunday - obviously a day of religious concern - sermonizing and preaching by those who have a responsibility to preach and sermonize about the war! It might well be that simultaneous mobilizations for peace in Vietnam would be organized in every capital city in every continent of the world. For, in truth, this is a war that is despised by all mankind.

In the U. S., the Easter-Passover mobilization would have been preceded by a massive signature gathering campaign to secure one million Americans to sponsor the event. This would move us into the community to urge everyone to become sponsors. And, would-be sponsors would also contribute to the cause . . . \$1.00 adults, \$.50 students, \$.10 unemployed. And at the same time these contributions would provide a funding base to build the mobilization through the use of mass media, radio, TV, newspapers, journals, leaflets, signs, etc.

Again, these are merely suggestive thoughts. I want to remind you of the comments of Bob Greenblatt earlier (see Conference Proceedings), when he said that what we do before the election can be sorted out, and considered separately. However, I wanted to put this kind of proposal before you in its formative state so that we can refine it together at some future date.

Sidney M. Peck  
Co-ordinator  
University Circle Teach-In Committee  
11027 Magnolia Drive  
Cleveland, Ohio 44106  
2/6/231-7700, x2385

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

Helen Garvey  
710 Willow  
Apt. 12  
Hoboken, N.J.

# STUDENT BOREDOM

(continued from page 3)

by the standards of their fields yet themselves horribly miseducated, reward us with high grades for memorizing things which are essentially meaningless. No wonder that our classes, with few exceptions, seem irrelevant to our lives. No wonder they're so boring. Boredom is the necessary condition of an education which teaches us to manipulate the facts and suppress their meaning.

The boredom may also be a clue toward formulating this analysis into program. Carl stresses that, as preparation for eventual show-downs with the university administration, we need to organize our fellow students. To do this, we have to speak to their needs, and we need to present - or rather, represent - an alternative way to be a student. One of the most pressing needs of students is to not be bored. We can speak to this need and, in so doing, represent another way of being a student. I think we can do this by asking the professor questions - in class, not afterwards, privately, when everybody has left. Questions which expose the bankruptcy - not of the professor, who is a victim of his own miseducation - but of the existing university system. Questions like, "Do Americans really need the things - cars, TVs, deodorants - they buy, or who has taught them that they do? Are mass insecurity and neurosis the prerequisites for the survival of the American economy?" Or like, "Aren't all existing political systems just different forms of unfreedom?" Or, "Why do we spend time on Charlemagne? Did he change people's lives? Didn't the peasants continue to be ruled by the same local lords, before, during, and after Charlemagne?" Or, "Why is it, in American history, that the only two just wars we've ever fought - the Civil War and the Second World War - were themselves betrayed, so that Krupp is free and black people are still unfree?"

What would happen if we asked such questions in class? A few professors might get excited, be turned on. Most would say "Freedom isn't included in the scope of this course," or "the concept of 'really needing' something implies a value judgement? What's the matter with value-judgements, we could reply, and which course does deal with our question? It wouldn't be easy, especially because we shouldn't get all hostile and aggressive while asking the questions. But such kindly provocation could fill the gap between what students feel - their boredom - and our demands for a radical transformation of the university. By asking questions, we give students a taste of what education might be like, if its function was to develop meaning, not to suppress it.

All this is intended as only a supplement to what Carl said. He has laid out the main lines of a radical analysis and program for the universities. I only add - let's start getting together and getting people to talk about the boredom, and about why we're bored. Let's extend our critique of the university to what goes on in the classroom. And let's have the guts to ask the class the simple questions which liberal education ought to be about, but which are instead almost systematically excluded from it. A classroom-oriented program can give concreteness to our more formal demands for the control of the university by those who use it and for the abolition of grades.

STEVE GOLIN BRANDEIS SDS (14 Leach  
Lan S. Natick, Mass. 01760).

Second-Class postage rates paid in Chicago, Illinois