

Int. Institut
Soa. Geschiedenis
Nebenstr. 1 202-268
Amsterdam-C.

In Defense of Politics

A RESPONSE

— Paul Le Blanc
Pittsburgh

I'd like to discuss the National Secretary's well-written report of the recent National Council meeting — "From Protest to Resistance" (NLN January 3, 1967). I think it has helped to clarify some of the gravest problems facing the "new left."

Greg Calvert wrote: "SDS just simply was not interested in talking about organizational problems or about political analysis; it revealed its deepest concern about what people can do with their lives . . . and their bodies." Draft resistance is the answer — a way in which the movement can pry open the jaws of the "life-destroying society" of which we're a part. Draft resistance will "engage the lives of people in new ways" and will help build revolutionary cadres. This is a part of the struggle which has "offered imprisonment and even death as a way of being free." He insists: "Call that anarchistic, personalistic, religious, or crazy — you will not have dealt with the reality which created the movement."

I don't want to speak about the decision of the National Council to embark on a program of all-out draft resistance. I do have some questions about the tactical wisdom of this decision, but I have doubts about the ability of national SDS — with its present lack of organizational structure and discipline — to effectively carry out this NC decision. What worries me more are the arguments put forth in the National Secretary's report.

One aspect of the report which disturbs me is, perhaps, a minor one. It seemed to be speaking for all of us in the organization ("SDS believes in X rather than Y."), basing itself on the discussion of sixty-six NC delegates who met on the West Coast. The views expressed in the report certainly don't represent me. Nor do they represent the position of a sizeable minority — and very possibly a majority — in the national organization. Does this mean that we should no longer consider ourselves a part of SDS?

It seems to me that the National Secretary's report is permeated with a terrible defeatism and sense of alienation. What analysis there is in the report is poetic, but hardly concrete. The approach for which it argues will lead to a greater isolation of the movement

from American society, will lead to a deepening sense of powerlessness and despair among activists, will contribute to the degeneration, disorganization, and disintegration of the "new left," especially of SDS.

Defeatism and alienation. In reading the report I was struck with visions of the beauty and splendor of martyrdom. The warm and honest man of commitment — the "SDSer" — is pitted against the hideous monster that is our own "life-destroying society." Using his body as a wedge, he creates between the jaws of the beast a certain precious breathing space for love — a "freedom space" — before being consumed. Such an act of human resistance makes life worthwhile, so that we can find freedom in imprisonment and even death.

One of the key passages in the report
(Continued on page 3)

new left notes

1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

VOL 2, NO. 7 let the people decide FEBRUARY 20, 1967

ARMY INVESTIGATES

BY ADAM HOCHSCHILD

A 27-year-old graduate student and Army Reservist, under military investigation for his membership in the anti-war Students for a Democratic Society, was told recently by an Army Intelligence agent that the investigation might be stopped if he agreed to spy on his fellow students.

The person involved is John Moore, a graduate student at Washington University in St. Louis, and a Fellow of the St. Louis Ethical Society. His encounter with Military Intelligence Special Agent Glendon D. Arnold, Jr., took place last November.

Moore is a husky, bushy-browed, jocular

man who still speaks with the slow drawl of his native Arkansas cotton country. It was a quiet Monday morning when Agent Arnold came to see him.

"He showed me his credentials first," Moore recalls. "They were enormous ones in color, with big eagles and seals, and broad-lined signatures. Very out of keeping with the man himself."

Arnold was a slight, nervous, somewhat timid man who wanted to ask Moore some questions. Moore said that was fine, so long

reprinted from
SUNDAY RAMPARTS

as he was given a complete transcript of the interview. Rahter surprisingly, Arnold agreed.

He then quietly told Moore he had been under investigation by Army Intelligence for over a year, for being active in the Washington University chapter of Students for a Democratic Society, a "known left-wing organization."

Arnold said Moore's political activity had a bearing on his "sensitive" position as an Army Reserve officer. (Moore is obligated to remain in the Reserve until 1968. He has always performed all his Army duties carefully; and SDS does not appear on the Attorney General's list of "subversive" Communist-front organizations some Army personnel must swear they've never belonged to.)

The interview actually extended into a subsequent meeting, and partly involved the
(Continued on page 8)

HUAC Struggle at Penn. State



by Neil Buckley

On 17 January, 1967, Penn State sds sent University President Eric A. Walker a mildly worded letter seeking clarification on the PSU Administration's position regarding the release of membership lists of anti-war groups on campus to the House Un-American Activities Committee; in the same letter we also asked if Walker would refuse HUAC the use of campus facilities for hearings. *The Daily Collegian*, the campus newspaper, gave strong editorial support for the sds letter.

Since no response was received in one week, the steering committee of sds sent a much stronger letter demanding Walker answer our questions and set noon, Tuesday, 24 February as the deadline for his answer; if no answer was received or if our questions were obfuscated in any way we stated we "would not sit passively by and allow the University through its Administration to pervert our basic civil liberties." The President, in an effort to avoid answering sds, claimed the second letter was an onymous since it was signed "steering committee, Penn State sds" and bore no signatures. After the steering committee and both co-chairmen, the President's office informed sds through University Secretary Wilmer Kenworthy that "President Walker would not answer threats or ultimatums" and that an answer would be forthcoming if it were "presented through the constituted channels of communication," the Undergraduate Student Government, a group of Administration-centered "student leaders" SDS had severed relations with in the Fall Term, 1966 (cf. Accardy, et al., "Student Power," NLN, 1, 548, for the complete account). *The Daily Collegian* editorialized against this Administration attempt at trickery and strongly asserted the right of any group or individual to communicate directly with the President on matters of such obvious importance.

The Sit-In

At 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, 1 February, thirty-five sds members assembled in front of Old Main, the Administration building, and picketed for one and one-half hours; at 12:30 p.m. the group entered the build-

ing and picketed in front of Walker's office until 1:00 p.m. when the group entered the anteroom of Walker's office and sat down. After Secretary Kenworthy fled, locking the door to Walker's private office behind him (Walker was in the office at the time); lame-duck Dean of Men Frank J. Simes appeared and told sds they could not remain; Simes was told we intended to stay which ended, at least for the moment, intimidation from the official Administration. At 2:30 p.m. Henry Sams, President of the Faculty Senate, appeared and asked the group to leave the office. Sams was told we had voted unanimously to stay and that we intended to do so. A similar request from USG President Richard Kalich, who came to speak to sds as a "concerned fellow student," received the same answer.

A vote was taken in the late afternoon on whether we would face arrest or leave the building if threatened with arrest; the vote was 17-11 in favor of staying and facing arrest. However, the group decided by an almost unanimous vote that no members would go to jail unless all members went; it was further decided that if we were threatened we would leave the building.

Three members of the executive committee of the local ACLU chapter came to Old Main at 8:45 p.m. and informed the demonstrators that ACLU could give them no support unless police brutality were committed removing the demonstrators from the building. (A fourth member of the executive committee of ACLU was sitting-in with sds.) Simes, who had been in top-level meetings about the sit-in most of the day, read a prepared statement threatening us if we did not leave immediately; the charge apparently was trespassing on public property after closing hours, but the exact nature of our crime was made vague by Simes during the
(Continued on page 6)

COLORADO

COLORADO SDS CONFERENCE TO BE HELD IN BOULDER ON MARCH 5

An SDS statewide conference is planned for March 5, to be held in Boulder at the University Memorial Center on the Colorado University Campus. The conference will begin at 1 P.M. and will cover discussion of the April Mobilization against the War in Vietnam — whether or not to send people, and whether or not to hold solidarity actions in Colorado during the week of April 7-15. Future joint activities for the five SDS groups in Colorado will also be discussed.

All SDS Chapter members are invited to attend, as well as any at-large members in the state. This is an opportunity for Colorado SDS people to get together and meet each other and find out what other groups in the state have been doing and are planning. The meeting is being held in early March to give chapters and individuals time to carry out any plans for the April Mobilization that are decided upon.

No self-respecting radical will miss the conference, as it is part of a plan to generate new interest in the movement here in Colorado, to help reactivate the SDS chapters in the state, and help at-large members to meet other at-largers from their area who might be able to get together and organize a chapter among themselves. Representatives from the SPU groups in the state, plus the anti-war committees in the region attendance, which will give everyone the opportunity to meet other like-minded people in their areas.

All SDS chapters and individuals in the state should write to the CU SDS, informing them of how many people from their group will be attending the conference. The addresses to write to are:

Pat Simer	Willow Blumenfeld
Brackett-10 or	1705 Marine
Colorado	Boulder, Colorado
University	80302
Boulder, Colorado	
80302	

We hope all interested people will attend the conference, so that we may at last get things moving in Colorado and adjacent areas. Be seeing you at the conference!

in this
issue

REVIEWS p.5

Mobilization Debate p.4

publications p.7

AGITPROP p.6

foreign policy advisors p.3

democratic
decentralism p.3

New Orleans

C.E.W.V.

At its regular meeting February 5th, the New Orleans Committee to End the War in Vietnam approved the enclosed reply to Peter Buch of the Bring-the-Troops-home-Now Newsletter and the Young Socialist Alliance.

Mr. Buch had written the N. O. CEWV on January 20th asking its cooperation with the Spring Mobilization Committee, the Student Mobilization Committee, and a projected speaking tour by Mr. Charles Bolduc of the YSA to build these events.

Dear Mr. Buch,

The New Orleans Committee to End the War in Vietnam has by resolution (February 5, 1967) authorized us to transmit the following reply to your letter of January 20, 1967.

The New Orleans Committee to End the War in Vietnam has considered your request for cooperation with the Spring Mobilization Committee and speaking engagements for Mr. Charles Bolduc of the Young Socialist Alliance. We wish to inform you that it is not possible to comply with your request.

We had thought that upon the occasion of your last visit to New Orleans in connection with our October Conference on Vietnam Organizing that we had made clear the differences between ourselves and the organizations which you represent. Evidently, this was not the case, and we shall now spell out those differences with, we hope, sufficient clarity so as not to be misunderstood.

First, we wish to draw your attention to the following resolution which was introduced at the National Council meeting of Students for a Democratic Society:

"Moved: that national sds supports and urges all chapters to participate in the Spring Mobilization."

This resolution was defeated by the National Council of SDS. Insofar as many of the members of our committee are either members of SDS or sympathizers with that organization, we feel bound by and intend to implement the decision of the National Council.

In addition, we wish to make it completely clear that we do not accept either yourself, or the Rev. A. J. Muste (pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation), or Arnold Johnson (Communist Party U.S.A.), or Fred Halsted (Socialist Workers Party), or Hugh Fowler (DuBois Clubs of America), or Paul Booth (National Conference for New Politics), or Sydney Peck (Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy) — we do not accept either these individuals or the organizations which they represent as "the national leadership" of the anti-war movement; and, we do not feel bound to implement any decisions these organizations may make individually or in concert.

For in spite of their and your evident sincerity, we do not accept your collective thesis that a "broad," middle-class parade of bi-annual demonstrations against the war is capable of either ending the war or of building a lasting movement against those institutions of American society which caused the war in the first place. Nor can we be a party to a "movement" in which a handful of self-appointed "leaders" get together behind closed doors and make all the important decisions which are then handed down to the rank-and-file like the ten commandments.

We hold that in order to both end the war and build a lasting movement that will succeed in eliminating those institutions of American society which oppress people at home and abroad, we must build a series of inter-connected movements based primarily on the poor, and almost as a separate group, the poor black population, unorganized and organized poor labor, and students. These movements must be both responsive to the immediate demands of their constituencies and constructed with a view towards linking up these immediate demands into a perspective of fundamental and radical changes in the structure of American society. In all cases, such movements must be con-

on the draft

To the Editor:

Peter Henig's article was an excellent expose of how the SSS not only "allocates" live meat for Vietnam but (as their own damning Selective Service Orientation Kit explains) "... engenders a sense of fear, uncertainty, and dissatisfaction which motivates ... others to fill the ... needs of the national health, safety, or interest ... However I disagree with the tactical suggestion that "... the main thrust could be toward exposure of the unrepresentative nature of the draft boards ...", and the slogan "classification without representation."

To argue thusly is to grant the Establishment their major premise — that SOME men have the right to coerce others — and to merely quibble over WHO should have the right. To, for example, attack the system for authorizing an all-WHITE board to rule on the draft eligibility of a Negro, implies that it's all right for an all-NEGRO board to do so, and is a kind of racism.

While the authoritarian nature of the present system and the barbarism of the Viet Nam war are important issues in their own right, they are peripheral to the question of conscription. Either kidnapping and murder (which is what the draft is all about) are wrong no matter WHO inflicts them, or they are not. Either a man has the right to be unmolested (so long as his actions are peaceful) or he does not. The consistent application of the latter premise is totalitarian "anarchy" — everyone becomes "fair game" for everyone else and the most brutal and cunning rule.

Of course one may grant this and yet maintain that so long as conscription remains, it is better that one's life be controlled by one's peers than by total strangers. But one thereby resigns from the radical opposition and is co-opted into Establishment. Let the Establishment provide their own Loyal Opposition (they do anyway); we can be more effective on the outside working in.

Yours for freedom,
Elton Roy

FROM THE EDITOR

The photograph on p. 5, Vol. 2 No. 4 was from the Southern Patriot.

THE WHITES — in last weeks PRAXIS was written by David Fleischaker, from Philadelphia.

Free School Films

Two Additions to Free School of N.Y. Anti-War Film Library —

The Viet Cong: "The Use of Toxic War Chemicals in South Vietnam"

The DRV: "The Children Accuse"

Both are 16mm sound and run about 15 minutes. The rental is \$10 each and although we'll haggle with special cases we ask for a deposit to avoid theft by finks. More information on request.

controlled by the people of which they consist, and not by a handful of self-styled "leaders." To put the matter rather crudely, Mr. Buch, leadership is won by organizing people to win their demands; it is not a piece of stolen jewelry one dares only wear behind closed conference doors.

Hoping our position has been made completely clear, we remain,

Sincerely yours,
Darlene Fife, Chairman
David Dybek, Coordinating Committee
Fred Lacey, Coordinating Committee

(Ed. Note: The Dec. N.C.'s decision not to support the Mobilization meant only that the decision to participate or not was up to the discretion of each chapter.)

LETTERS to the editor

To The Editor,

I want to express my agreement with the widespread radical sentiment against the Spring Mobilization. The antiwar movement must get away from these liberal pressure-protest methods to "end the war" (as if the war was some isolated phenomenon which could be "solved" by itself, without attacking the entire imperialist superstructure connected to it).

It is unfortunate, however, that this middle-class pressure-protest and "single-issue" approach is being associated with Trotskyism (as in "The Mobilization Debate" by Doug Norberg in Jan. 20 NLN) No doubt this is because the biggest proponents of the single-issue approach, and the spring mobilization, are the Socialist Workers' Party and the Young Socialist Alliance, which still call themselves Trotskyists, however timidly.

For the record, though, please let it be known that the SWP-YSA line is not necessarily the line of "the Trots". In 1963 a minority tendency in the SWP-YSA was expelled for fighting against the SWP-YSA's right ward drift towards middle-class politics. This tendency has grown into the present-day Spartacist League, a Trotskyist organization which continues to counterpose a working class perspective to the middle-class orientation of the SWP-YSA.

For those interested, the SL has published an analysis of the SWP in *Marxist Bulletin* No. 2 ("SWP: Revolutionary or Centrist?") which can be obtained for 50¢ at P. O. Box 8121, New Orleans, La. 70122. An article on the SWP also appeared in *Spartacist* No. 6 (10¢).

Available for free from the SL is a pamphlet — "Perspectives and Allies For the Antiwar Movement" and "Discussion of YSA-SWP Policies in the Antiwar Movement" — by Stephen Fox, who was expelled a year ago from the Detroit branches of SWP and YSA.

Revolutionary greetings
Mark Klein

Dear Sir,

I had considered beginning this letter with some comment about the sad shape of our country and so forth but the thought occurred to me that this would be a needless repetition of facts already known to you. Therefore I will come more or less directly to the point.

Recognizing the need for effective social change, I am concerned with the most effective means of utilizing the potential and resources that we have at hand. While I would be amazed if the following proposal was original on my part, I feel that it is meaningful enough to be submitted for general discussion and consideration.

To the point: Basically I suggest that Students for a Democratic Society initiate, develop and coordinate a "summer project" program similar to that of SNCC's during the summers of 1963 and 1964.

Working in these projects students would live in communities other than their own, all over the country, in order to do research on the problems of that community, to develop a dialogue on the results of their research and develop dialogue on the more widespread issues of state policies and national domestic and foreign policies, and to organize community action groups working to solve the problems.

These goals might be attained by a dozen different means, depending on the nature of the community involved, and I would not venture a more specific program, feeling that such a decision would have to be made

by the community involved.

In the projects students could live with members of the community, establish "Freedom centers" and so forth, and I'm sure that much of the financing of these projects could be gotten from community donations and from support groups.

I can anticipate two questions that might arise if this idea is considered. First, "Why choose SDS?" This question is fairly easy to answer. SDS has chapters all over the country and is in contact with literally thousands of students and has a system of national communication. The members of SDS have a knowledge of the need for social change and already have a commitment to working for the necessary change. SDS members have at least nominal experience with organizing and social activism. If any group is to handle such a project, it will have to be SDS.

The second question is "Why not encourage the students to organize in their own communities?"

First of all, we would be cutting off those communities that do not have the benefit of a local SDS chapter. In my own community (Marin County) we do not have a chapter but in talking this idea over with members of our Friends of SNCC group and our New Politics organization I met with a favorable enthusiasm, and one family volunteered a home if anything materializes.

Secondly, students would be able to work much better if they are removed from their home environment. If a student is at home, he is subject to the demands of an already established daily routine; there will be more pressure to find a "job" and there will be an increased burden of subjectivity when interacting with the community.

Thirdly, members of the community somehow seem more prone to offer funds and resources to someone who comes from another part of the country rather than someone who is a resident of the community. I realize that this is not a specific rule but I feel that it holds generally.

I apologize for not being able to expound upon this idea to a greater extent; I hope at least that the intent of it is clear. I'm sure that we have enough student resources and potential to make a program like this successful. I hope you will give it the greatest consideration.

In hopes for a better world,
Hal Aigner
Kentfield, California

Dear Sir:

Effective immediately I request membership in the Students for a Democratic Society.

The statements and actions of the members and officers of the organization over the last several months have convinced me that SDS is capable of achieving a society free from poverty, ignorance, war, exploitation, and the inhumanity of man to man. SDS, by rejecting the free market economy and representative democracy, presents the only means through which radical change can succeed in America. SDS has by its public actions alienated the bourgeoisie class of the American people, the class which allows only "legal" change in their free society. SDS is attempting by thinking in terms of ideology and action rather than opportunism to present workable solutions to the problems of American society. SDS has through the support of black power encouraged that kind of radical change which is threatening to destroy the present American social order.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly,
Victor Aronow

NEW LEFT NOTES

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

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

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

in defense of politics

ITALY

(Continued from page 1)
speaks of "the kind of struggle which has been most meaningful to the new left - the revolutionary struggle which engages and claims the lives of those involved despite the seeming impossibility of revolutionary social change." (Emphasis added)

The struggle will engage the lives of those already involved - the emphasis is on engaging our (SDSers') lives - rather than attempting to reach other people of our society. But this is only logical, the others being a part of the life-destroying arch-beast. "People" is a beautiful word, and we believe in "the people", except when it's sweaty, day-to-day, living reality, and then we'll most people don't understand our dreams about "freedom space," they don't fit into the dream, and it would be too much of a strain - all this ideological and organizational stuff - to try to reach out to them to involve them in any kind of struggle. Indeed we are alienated from the people and from the society of which they're a part.

Viewed in this light, of course, the chance of our bringing about any kind of basic social change is "a seeming impossibility," to say the very least.

But we must do something. We are nothing but our lives, and if we don't act upon our beliefs, then those beliefs are meaningless. So we (the movement) will resist it (the life-destroying society). Even if we die. And maybe - just maybe - we'll break the jaws of the beast. In which case we'll experience new lives in love and freedom. Maybe.

The subjectivism and fantastic imagery of dreams and poetry are very precious, adding new color and motion and valuable insights to the things we see and the way in which we see them. But they cannot replace clear and concrete analysis when such analysis is called for.

PERSONALLY

Isolation, despair, adventurism, disillusionment. In the past year - throughout the entire anti-war and radical movement - there has been a certain "let down." Much feeling and energy and hard work have gone into the anti-war protest. And the war escalates. Despite new laws and new riots and new slogans, racism and poverty are still very much with us. We're watching the Berkeley re-runs now, and the multi-versity still confronts us. There's so much to do and - in spite of all our efforts - we've hardly begun. At times it's very frustrating.

In some of us this frustration negatively affects the way in which we function politically. Some of us, when we express ourselves with words and actions, speak to our frustrations rather than to other people. We find that we tend to express ourselves rather than communicate with others. Yet if we fail to speak to other people's needs in terms that they can grasp and understand, then we talk to ourselves. We find ourselves isolated and ineffective. This lack of effectiveness increases our isolation. After a time people expect to see concrete results from their activities. If results are not forthcoming, they tend to feel that their activity has been fruitless, that their energies have been wasted, that what they dreamed about cannot be attained. And so they become disinvolved from the fruitless activity.

Those who remain involved naturally face despair. And in an effort to battle against such despair they sometimes turn to a desperate adventurism - activity which is not well thought out but which seems to offer the promise of decisive confrontation with Evil; it is activity, too, which has the most important virtue of being activity. "What counts is that SDS be where the action is." And when this fails to bring about decisive change - disillusionment. And deepened isolation.

Greg Calvert writes: "Neither ideological clarity (as political analysis) nor organizational stability are fundamentally important to SDSers." This is an accurate statement of the problem. But he glorifies the dilemma as "the spirit and the dynamics of the movement!"

WHO ARE SDS

Organizational problems. I remember the picture I had of SDS - from afar - before I joined it. There seemed to be a certain freshness and vitality about SDS. It seemed like a grouping of serious people who felt that certain things were wrong with our society and our country's foreign policy and who were honestly trying to find a way to change that. There seemed to be a healthy

combination in it of scholarship and activism - studying certain aspects of the problem, working out an analysis on the basis of this study, and then going out to do something about it, revising and refining the analysis on the basis of real involvement and living experience, and using the analysis and knowledge to be more effective in the struggle for social change.

People in SDS had something to say about foreign policy, and through the Peace and Research Education Project (PREP) they seemed to be doing things. They had something to say about poverty and unemployment, and through the Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP) they seemed to be doing something. They had something to say about the university, and they seemed to be doing something in this area as well.

Different people had different ideas on how to best work for social change. Some argued that a liberal-labor-civil rights coalition could reshape the political scene in such a way as to make the Democratic Party a real people's party. Others argued for a third party approach. Still others argued that - instead of becoming involved in electoral politics - radicals should work to build a movement of the inter-racial poor, that this was what would do most to bring about social change. And there was activity and experimentation and learning in all of these areas. There was no "line" to which everyone had to conform but, instead, a wonderful openness and flexibility. People didn't have pat solutions of panaceas. They did have searching questions, certain ideas about what the answers might be, and an increasing amount of experience.

This was already beginning to change, it seems, when I joined SDS, and by the time I became active the organization was quite different. The escalation of the war in Vietnam tended to concentrate attention and energy on that aspect of American foreign policy, to the detriment of other projects and activities of the organization. The escalation of the war and of the anti-war protest also brought more people into the organization, and the membership jumped from about 1000 to 2000 to 4000 to 6000. The loose and flexible structure of the organization had been quite adequate for a membership of several hundred fairly knowledgeable members whose moral outrage with the war was, in general, matched neither by political knowledge nor organizational experience, this old structure was very much inadequate. The nature of National Council meetings that I've attended tends to bear out this analysis. The probable failure of any effective draft resistance program, I'm afraid, will also bear it out.

There is a tremendous need for education within the organization. There is a tremendous need for greater communication and coordination within the organization. There is a tremendous need for a sounder financial base for the organization. If SDS is to survive, it must develop a structure which can meet these needs. A regional structure in which the emphasis is on unifying rather than "decentralizing" an already amorphous organization seems to me to be a realistic solution. But I don't think SDS can, in its present state, make these self-adjustments.

Yet Greg Calvert writes that those of us who are "dismayed by the state of the organization" are "simply refusing to deal with the state, the spirit, and the dynamics of the movement and the struggle in which we are involved."

EFFECTIVENESS

Political analysis. Our society is on the verge of a whole series of crises. It may be that if certain fundamental changes aren't made in "the American way of life," everything important to us will be engulfed by a rising, desperate violence, will be brutalized and destroyed.

There are certain tragic contradictions in our society which result in the perpetuation of racism, poverty, powerlessness and alienation, fear and want. We find some people being so stunted that they withdraw into themselves, while others lash out with a blind, violent fury on the streets. Still others seek solutions in the prescriptions of anti-humanist demagogues and reactionaries. And internationally, decisive segments of the American power structure have decided to attempt to contain revolution in the under-developed world in order to maintain our military, political, and economic interests. This role of international policeman threatens to drain and exhaust our society in this age of revolution, and there

is the possibility of events spiraling out of control into nuclear holocaust.

It is the responsibility of radicals to oppose this ugliness and this horror which harms and threatens to destroy all people. It is the responsibility of radicals to be as effective as possible. Radicals believe in basic social changes as the solution to such problems. Radicals must work to build a strong movement which is capable of carrying on a serious struggle for such change.

To effectively do this we must develop an understanding of the realities we face and from this try to find what we can do that will accomplish what we want to accomplish. We dare not be superficial in trying to determine what is and what is to be done (i.e., in trying to develop a workable ideology or political analysis) because so much is at stake.

Yet Greg Calvert tells us that SDS isn't interested in talking about political analysis, that those of us who are dismayed by this fail to "understand the dynamic of movement sensitivity."

ON CONTENT

Alternatives. In the last paragraph of the National Secretary's report a paper entitled "From Protest to Radical Politics" by Lee Webb and Paul Booth is mentioned and dismissed. I think this is unfortunate, there being much of value in that paper.

Webb and Booth argued: "We must find a way to end that (Vietnam) war, and the solution to this question must incorporate the lessons we have learned. Vietnam is not a separate moral or political issue. It is a political issue, as is Mississippi racism,"

(Continued on page 4)

DEMOCRATIC DECENTRALISM

MEMORANDUM FROM THE NATIONAL SECRETARY

TO: THE NATIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

RE: DEMOCRATIC DECENTRALISM AND THE BURNING QUESTION OF FINANCIAL SOLVENCY IN THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

The current crisis in relations between the National Office of SDS and Regional offices of the organization revolves around the questions of fundraising and the necessity of regional autonomy and local control over the activities of regional offices. Given that fundraising in the organization can only be carried on effectively if it is centralized and directed by the NO, and, given that political activity must be carried on in a decentralized fashion, there arises a contradiction between the fundraising needs of the organization as a whole and the decentralist principles of its political activity.

This contradiction can only be resolved by dividing the question into its constituent parts, by assessing the primary goals which we strive for, and by devising an operational formula which provides for the effective achievement of the goals without compromising principles.

There are two basic propositions with which none would take issue: 1) that it is necessary to provide adequate financial resources for the effective functioning of both the National Office and the regional offices and that it is immensely more efficient to centralize the fundraising activities which service this level of activity in the organization, and, 2) that democratic decentralism must be maintained, viz. that the political direction of regional office activity is properly the domain of democratically elected regional councils representing the choices of individual chapters.

It is equally clear that regional offices have proven themselves unable to fund their operations adequately and in addition that regional fundraising not only conflicts with the fundraising activities of the national organization but seriously limits the effectiveness of total national fundraising activities and prevents SDS from maximizing its fundraising potential.

It is, therefore, proposed that the following formula be adopted to resolve the conflict:

1) that the National Office be given re-

A conference is being held in Agape, Italy, from July 21 to 31. The theme is "Dissent as a Voice of Hope; an encounter of American and European young people". No money is available to pay travel expense. But it is very important for the success of this conference that at least two or three Americans in the New Left come. If any SDSers are planning to be in Europe this summer, and would like to attend this conference, they should contact Len Clough, University Christian Movement, 475 Riverside Dr., New York, N.Y. 10027 for further details and information.

NIAGARA REGION

PLEASE NOTE

NIAGARA REGIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE HAS BEEN TRANSFERRED FROM ITHACA TO ROCHESTER

NEW ADDRESS:

KARL BAKER & CHARLES GREENBERG
NIAGARA REGIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
BOX 5731
River Campus Station
Rochester, New York 14627

sponsibility for and control over all fundraising activities which relate to the funding of the operations of the National Office and the regional offices - except as noted below.

2) that each regional office shall include on its staff a full-time fundraiser who shall be responsible to the National Office and whose activities shall direct funds to the National Budget of the organization - this National Budget shall include the Basic Operating Budgets of the regional offices.

3) that the Basic Operating Budget of the Regional Office shall include the salaries of one National Fundraiser, one Regional Coordinator (office manager), and one Regional Field Secretary (Traveller) plus the rent, utilities, and office supplies of the regional office.

4) that Regional Offices should submit annually their Basic Operating Budgets and that these budgets should be scrutinized by the National Secretary and the National Administrative Committee and that they should be presented to the National Council for approval.

5) that the funds required by the regional offices for the Basic Operating Budgets should be paid by the National Office to the regional offices in twelve equal monthly installments.

6) that the National Office will hire the National Fundraisers subject to the approval of the regional councils but that the hiring of regional coordinators and regional field secretaries plus any additional regional staff shall be the exclusive domain of the regional councils.

7) that the expenses of the regional offices beyond the Basic Operating Budget including the hiring of additional regional staff will be borne by the chapters affiliating with the region.

8) that the National Office has the responsibility of hiring regional field secretaries (travelers) in those areas where no regional council exists and that these regional field secretaries shall work for the establishment of new chapters and the development of effective and democratic regional coordinating committees with the eventual goal of establishing a regional council.

9) that for special programs (viz. draft resistance) the national office may hire travelers and organizers but that such organizers must be approved by regional councils if their work is centered within the area administered by a regional council.

Greg Calvert
National Secretary

Foreign Policy Advisors

by Paul Booth

On October 18, 1966, the Department of State announced the creation of a series of civilian panels to advise on foreign policy. The Department stated that:

"President Johnson and Secretary Rusk appreciate and value the advice and suggestions which have come from private American citizens interested in the conduct of our foreign relations. The President and the Secretary welcome the opportunity which the creation of these teams will present for the organization and application of new ideas designed to enhance the formulation and conduct of U. S. foreign policies."

Seven panels have been created (through the end of the year); the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs already had its panels. Given the Executive Branch's tendency to

make foreign policy with only perfunctory reference to Congress nowadays, SDS members should be aware of the names of these advisers as they are of the names of members of Congress. In fact, because so many of these men come from the academic community, it is apparent that LBJ has identified for us the men on campus to whom we should direct our feelings on American foreign policy.

One key problem we have faced in attacking foreign policy has been the remoteness of the decision-making process. But now, right on campus, we can find a select group of faculty who have been formally charged with a share of the responsibility for making foreign policy. The list is too long for NLN, but if you would like to know who, on your campus, is in behind the scenes — write to NLN or Paul Booth, c/o the N.O. and we will send you the names on your campus and your region.

The Spring Mobilization Debate

Doug Narberg
Southern California-SDS

On February 4 three hundred people from throughout the Western States, primarily California, met in San Francisco to deliberate the content and form of the April Mobilization. This was no meeting of fire-eating young revolutionaries, nor was it a drawing together of politically astute social democrats, tired but inspired by their own momentum to yet another meeting. It was both of these, but new "elements" were present: the church administrator and the liberal businessman, curious about the meeting but concerned about the war (at last); the nationalist from Watts, who equated this meeting with another held just prior to the 1965 riot; the Teamster who expressed the feelings of a surprising number of labor people at the meeting (from perhaps twenty unions) when he talked of the growing peace sentiment in the rank and file. The meeting as a moral inventory was definitely new.

In contrast to the newness of those present was the style of the meeting. After the speeches by Dave Dellinger and James Bevel, the structure of the discussion gave one the distinct impression that he was part of an audience, not an integral member of a body politic. Floor debate was nonexistent; those who wished to speak joined a line of those with similar intent. The proposals thus brought out were treated as if they would have no consequence, for the ideas were not debated, speakers made no attempt to relate with one another, no response from the audience was sought, and the line of idea after idea moved inexorably through the minds of those present. The dominant mood projected to the audience was, first, "let's have a demonstration that everyone can join," i.e., no offense intended, ma'am, just join our march, it's a warm, sunny day; and second, as Chairman Ed Keating said, "we're trying to form a consensus," words with a familiar ring.

The final decision was to proliferate local actions culminating in a demonstration in San Francisco coincidental with actions in New York. To make the appeal as broad as possible, the local actions are to assume a coat of many colors a la Joseph — city rallies, church sermons, hippie happenings, school rallies, etc. We Try Harder, 'cause we're only number two. In short, the meeting was confusing, frustrating, but the semblance of democracy left the people with something they could identify with: a massive series of actions thoroughly respectable — without radical content, without militant form.

The presence of liberals heretofore unseen in the peace movement may be seen as analogous to that point in the civil rights movement when it became respectable for liberals to demonstrate for Negro rights — i.e., Selma-Montgomery. We constantly make the mistake of underestimating the flexibility of the Establishment mentality to absorb our causes. I would posit that, on the one hand, the presence of liberals in the motions against the War in Vietnam does not indicate that liberals have become radical but that the status quo has an in-

terest in ending the war. My greatest fear — outside of the question of resources and priorities — is that all the Mobilization will do is help create a political climate for a pullout from Vietnam not unlike that which was maneuvered in Korea. The economic stimulus of Vietnam has been outlived, and businessmen are now becoming quite naturally scared by the level of inflation which, as they learned in Korea, has disastrous effect on the possibilities of post-war growth. Furthermore, if the government comes through with corporate tax savings as it did following the Korean war, corporations can envision a balance to the immediate losses they will suffer after the war.

On the other hand, we mustn't underestimate the sincerity of the latent peace-niks of the Establishment. That their moral vision has been cleared by the facts of economic life is undoubtedly true. But there is a psychological level of frustration, anomie, and alienation which demands a reassertion of identity and liberal values. The climate for that reassertion is not only our product; when the *Saturday Evening Post* editorializes against the war, and *Ladies Home Journal* publishes heart-rending stories about napalmed children, and *McCall's* carries an article about the trials and tribulations of moral witness by the mother of a CO convict, a direction for that reassertion becomes clear. And a Mobilization is announced . . .

The point is simply this: the morally outraged liberal, wrapped up as he is in the promise of a moral withdrawal from an economically defunct Vietnam, is walking a tightrope between economic conditions and a politically radical moral vision.

Saturday, April 15, 1967, was a balmy, beautiful Spring day in both San Francisco and New York. Tourists of many persuasions were journeying from far parts to those cities to register their lack of comfort. They were patient; the registration lines in those cities stretched for miles. A number of them carried placards reading "End the War" and "Stop Civilian Bombing and 'Is Maiming Children in the National Interest?'" On the whole, they were neat and orderly, although there were a few untouchables who had marched forever before. It resembled a picnic — entire nuclear families walked together, the younger members producing smiles on the faces of onlooking hippies. The respectable young march monitors, sticky and uncomfortable in their suits, kept the march under control as they led a repeated chant: "End the War — End the War . . ."

At both sites people stared quizzically at those with them wearing a button with the message "resist!" None of them seemed to know exactly what that meant, but they were friendly folk and smiled at one another, so in time the curiosity moved to those on the sidewalks . . . when the "resist"ers unfurled banners which read "End the War in Guatemala," "Stop American Imperialism," "Let

(Continued from page 3)
Chicago unemployment, university paternalism, and the public aid system, that can be dealt with only by attacking the way that decisions are made in America, who makes them, and the purpose of a society."

They offered a summary analysis of American society: "The America we face denies democracy — it is a nation in which the crucial economic decisions which affect us all are made by corporate managers and bankers, in which millions of people are dependent upon the indulgence of public welfare systems over which they have no control, in which the decisions of war and peace are made by a clique of advisors and experts."

Webb and Booth offer the following anti-war perspective: "New constituencies must be created, growing out of the immediate aspirations of the poor, welfare recipients, trade unionists, students, and others."

"Many of these groups will not be anti-war. However, their very existence and growth,

and the resulting politics, will create the first viable anti-war movement in this country. It will be on the bedrock of the demands of the poor for an income, Negroes for an end to racism and economic discrimination, students and faculty for the control over their own universities, that this movement will be built. It will be the political force and direction of these movements, not their rhetoric, that will build a movement against the war. For the demands of these movements will rock the very foundations of the domestic consensus on which our foreign policy rests. This attack on the manner in which decisions are made in this society, on the concentration of wealth and power into a few hands, and on the manipulative nature of American democracy will announce to the world the beginnings in this country of a real movement for a democratic society."

They argue for four "strategic goals":

- 1) build mass constituencies for change which comprehend the connections between the major issues, and which draw on hitherto unorganized people;
- 2) encourage motion within established liberal institutions in creative response to independent protest and political activity (a prime example would be the campaign of Robert Scheer for Congress in California);
- 3) conduct radical education in the new movements, to strengthen the connections and deepen the sophistication of those active;
- 4) construct viable institutions of the movement where people can be part of that which offers some hope of change, and over which they can exercise control.

I think this would be a fruitful program. The last two points are of special importance; they are prerequisites for any serious radical organization which wishes to maintain itself as an organization. I think that these two points might be broken down further:

1. There is the need for education within the organization.
2. There is the need for greater involvement of the membership in policy discussion and decision-making;
3. There is the need for greater communication and coordination of activity within the organization;
4. There is the need for a sound financial base to support such an organization.

ON STRUCTURE

The solution, to repeat, is an organizational structure which will meet these needs, a unifying regional structure. Regional educational directors could help initiate and coordinate local chapter educational programs, functioning as a vital link between the national Radical Education Project and the local chapters. Regional organizers could be responsible for helping to initiate important policy discussions within local chapters and for seeing to it that votes are taken and sent into the National Office on policy; this would tend to make NC and even membership referendums much more meaningful and feasible and therefore more frequent. A regional council would make decisions on how national policies could be implemented in the region. Regional fund-raisers would ensure a more efficient collection of membership dues and would also raise funds for regional and national programs. The regional education director, the regional organizer, and the regional fund-raiser would be full-time staff, hired by the National Interim Committee, subject to the approval of the regional council. Each regional council would be made up of elected representatives from each of the local chapters. Such a structure, would, of course, facilitate regional and inter-regional conferences and the like, which would greatly increase meaningful communication within the organization.

The hope for organizational and political growth and effectiveness, I think, lies in these general directions. SDS, in its present state, is unable to accomplish any of this. Let us hope, for the sake of its survival, that it can evolve to a certain state which will permit it to make the necessary transition from alienation to radical activism.

RESIST

As the banana boat pulled into the San Francisco Port, large numbers of people could be seen on the dock. Many determined, many curious, a number of them stopped the unloading operations by putting their bodies on the line, as it were: lying in front of trucks; boarding the ship if possible and, wherever it seemed possible to pry open crates, they did so, throwing bananas overboard. The scene on the dock resembled a truck-stopping demonstration used in the farm workers' boycott of Pirelli-Minetti products; on board, it looked like the Boston Tea Party. Many of those originally curious became involved in these maneuvers, and were arrested with the others when the police closed in a few minutes later.

Everything was pacific at the Guatemalan consulate, with a few hundred demonstrators milling around with placards demanding an end to the war, until someone, equipped with a sawed-off light bulb, filled with ink and corked, threw it at the building. A number of things can be said about what then happened, but suffice it to say . . . all hell broke loose. Again, the police moved in, made a number of arrests, and eventually the crowd dispersed.

The liberals went home considerably transformed, excited but quite moody . . .

The Wrong Man in Uniform: a review

Peter Henig — REP

THE WRONG MAN IN UNIFORM: OUR UNFAIR AND OBSOLETE DRAFT—AND HOW WE CAN REPLACE IT, by Bruce Chapman, Trident, 1967. \$3.95. 143 pp.

This book is a reminder of the exquisitely awkward tactical position occupied by those whose reasons for opposing the draft are intimately linked with their opposition to Vietnam-type military endeavors. For the author has produced the best and most concise description to date of the unfair and inefficient way the current military manpower procurement system goes about meeting the nation's military requirements. At the same time, and without contradicting himself in the least, Chapman is able to cite with approval the following definition of the military results that a fair and efficient military manpower procurement system ought to be able to produce:

THE BURDEN OF WORLD EMPIRE

"We need a professional Army to man the outposts, and to be prepared to put out brush fires before they can escalate to thermonuclear holocausts. An army composed of officers and men who stay in their units for years, not months. An Army composed of units which will be sent where the need exists and will stay until the need no longer exists, or until they are relieved by other units... An Army composed of officers and men who, for a period of their adult lives, make a profession of the service, rather than an Army composed of civilians in uniform."

Chapman's plea for voluntary military service is couched in terms of "the best interests, then, of national defense as well as of individual liberty. For several hundred years, a successful Pax Romana was maintained throughout the known world by the professional legions of Rome. Britain in her period of greatest world influence did not resort to conscription..." Thus, we have the spectacle of an author who has mercilessly dragged the Selective Service System and the Department of Defense through the coals in the name of fairness, democracy, the rights of the individual, and practicality — and yet has done so to show that the burden of world empire can be distributed more equitably among the young men of the United States while making the empire even more secure in the bargain.

His criticisms of our current methods of getting the job done are valid enough; The draft as a device for equitably distributing the military burden is obsolete. Designed in a time of manpower scarcity, it is not capable of producing equitable results in a time when more men are around than the military is willing or able to demand; The draft is unnecessarily disruptive of the lives of young men just starting out with families and careers; The Selective Service System wreaks havoc upon the educational system by "motivating" the otherwise unmotivated to remain in school, while at the same time, employing absurd and haphazard methods to yank others out of school and into the Army; The complex system of decentralized policy implementation by local draft boards is inaccurate, clumsy, expensive, and unfair to individual selective service registrants; The teamwork of SSS and the Department of Defense in carrying out the induction process leaves a very great deal to be desired. And so on.

FOR TOTAL PREPAREDNESS

Chapman's proposed remedy is, as one might expect, an all-voluntary, all-professional military force and much of the book is given over to proving that such an arrangement would not only be most fair, but more practical and productive of a better level of military preparedness. Military manpower turnover and the immense training expenditures it necessitates would be reduced and the savings thereby realized could be used to raise the pay of soldiers to something nearer civilian levels. Higher pay along with related psychological factors would make a professional military career more attractive, and raise the re-enlistment rate enough to make it possible for the manpower deficit to be made up by the recruitment of volunteers. The end result, as noted above, would be a better-trained, better-motivated modern army — better-equipping the United States for its "mission in the world." All of this sordid confusion, inefficiency,

violations of individual rights and other forms of coercion of U. S. citizens that are by-products of our current army-raising procedures would be eliminated. We would be able to concentrate our energies abroad — upon those who are in opposition to our "mission in the world."

According to Chapman, the failure to enact draft abolition or reform is a result of the efforts of a "draft lobby." The "draft lobby" is partly composed of those who defend the draft on the antediluvian grounds that it is beneficial to the moral tone of society and before long the author has developed the arguments needed to demolish this faction handily. The other part of the "draft lobby" is the Selective Service which has an understandable vested interest in the draft, and the Department of Defense which fears that an end to conscription would leave it exposed to Congressional appropriation whims when it comes to maintaining desired force levels.

Yet, his description of the "draft lobby" is lacking in credibility. When a manpower procurement system is so much at odds with the national intent of fairness and efficiency, it should take more than a few flag-waving committee chairmen, American Legion chieftains, and military bureaucrats to hold the line against progress. After all, the draft is, as Chapman rightly notes, "just one aspect of civilian and military manpower policies." Which leads one to suspect that the failure of reform — or rather the apparent dearth of determined reformers — could be more convincingly explained in the context of the total national manpower policy.

POWER IS TO BE USED

It is ironic, then, that Rep. Thomas B. Curtis, the Missouri Republican who wrote the introduction for THE WRONG MAN IN UNIFORM, pointed the way toward the more fruitful analytical path that Mr. Chapman fails to follow up. Rep. Curtis states that:

"The importance of the draft lies in its function as a method of allocating our scarce resources of manpower between the military services and the civilian sector. The 'river' of manpower, which Mr. Chapman describes, is a limited quantity and must be channeled efficiently to meet the demands of the military and also the needs of our booming civilian economy. As Mr. Chapman's research illustrates, the 'dams' and 'valves' which have been set up to meet the military's manpower needs have proved rusty with age. These archaic procedures have proved to be both a burden on the military... and a handicap to industries faced with an overwhelming economic demand for expanded services and more products, and, at the same time, a dwindling supply of skilled manpower as a result of the draft's pressure."

WHO IS UNCLE SAM?

The pity of it all is that Mr. Chapman's actual text concentrates so heavily upon military manpower needs that it does not, in fact, describe the draft's function "as a method of allocating scarce resources of manpower between the military services and the civilian sector" in such a way as to

meet both military and industrial needs. Had the author investigated the way in which the draft serves both of these needs, he might have come up with a different approach to the occupational deferment system which the Selective Service employs to, in its own words, "develop more effective human beings in the national interest" by "controlling (through fear of loss of deferment) the service of those not in the armed services." As it stands, Chapman merely condemns on civil libertarian grounds General Hershey's description of the deferment as "the carrot that we have used to try to get individuals into occupations and professions that are said by those in charge of government to be the necessary ones." He fails to see that if business and industry had come to feel that it was not benefitting from these government policies, business and industry would today be in the forefront of the anti-draft lobby.

Indeed, businessmen are not crusading for an all-volunteer military because they are being served reasonably well by the present system of conscription and prescribed activity under threat of conscription (i.e., occupational deferment) that is the real heart of our current "method of allocating our scarce resources of manpower between the military services and the civilian sector." Chapman should have realized that as long as definitions of "the national interest" that are used when handing out occupational deferments are synonymous with the interests of business and industry, he will find no strong allies in his quest for voluntary military service.

Manpower control inevitably is used in a social system that has set for itself the goal of palming the world while doing business as usual back home. Such a social system will tolerate, and even actively explore, new methods of manpower control in order to realize its goals more completely. It will not under any circumstances willingly sacrifice the goal of "business as usual" for the sake of military omnipresence when it has in operation a viable method for realizing both goals.

It should be apparent, then, that those who are fighting the draft because it is unfair both to the people of the United States and to the people of Vietnam and Latin America, will be finding themselves in strange company. At their elbows will be the likes of Mr. Chapman, who, in the name of fairness and efficiency for the people of the United States, advocates a volunteer professional army which would be more effective at imposing the Pax Americana. Also on hand will be the more realistic types who understand the importance of precise manpower control in a society which cherishes global ambitions. This strange company will be merely looking for a more effective system of putting the right man into uniform. Unfortunately for those who do not see a need either to serve men up to business and industry at home, or to wield a better global police force, or to have a professional army — it will be their strange companions who will be asking the questions.

Who Killed MALCOLM X

a review of
Eric Norden in
the Realist

reprinted from THE MOVEMENT

By Terence Cannon

On Sunday afternoon, February 21, 1965, Malcolm X was assassinated in the Audubon Ballroom in New York City. Four men were involved in this killing: two with revolvers, one with a sawed-off shotgun, and one who distracted attention with a smoke bomb.

Most people, if asked Who Killed Malcolm X? would reply — the Muslims. Hardly anyone would be able to give a name. Yet in January of 1966, three men were brought to trial for the killing and sentenced to life. Two of them were probably innocent. I don't even remember reading about it in the San Francisco papers and remember holding in the back of my mind for many months the thought — I really ought to check up on what happened to Malcolm's killers.

Now, Eric Norden, writing in the February, 1967 issue of *The Realist*, has brought the issue back to life. In doing so he has raised as many frightening questions and conclusions as Mark Lane did in his examination of the assassination of President Kennedy.

The killing of Malcolm may be as important to the future of America as the killing of the President. He was, in Norden's words, "one of that rare breed of men who are truly irreplaceable. A black — or white — leader of his genius may not arise again for generations, and it would not be an exaggeration to say that his assassination has radically altered the course of American history."

The purpose of this review is to get you to read Norden's 18-page article. Back issues are available from *The Realist*, Dept. 73, Box 379, Stuyvesant Station, New York, N.Y. 10009 for 25¢. No review can do justice to Norden's research. The importance of his article is in the questions he raises. He does not prove his conclusion: that Malcolm was killed by the intelligence apparatus of the United States government. He does prove that the official explanation, as in Kennedy's case, is totally without merit, honesty or truth, and he brings together enough evidence to implicate the New York police department and the government in Malcolm's murder. As a first step, this is a strong achievement.

The questions must be answered. Some of the most important are:

"Why, one week after the fire-bombing of his house in Queens, were there no police at the meeting where Malcolm was murdered?"

"Why was Malcolm poisoned almost fatally in Cairo the day before he was to deliver a scathing denunciation of the American Government to the Summit Conference of African prime ministers?"

"Why was Leon Ameer, Malcolm's New England representative, found strangled to death in his Boston hotel room hours after he had told a public meeting he had evidence that 'the white power structure killed Malcolm'?"

"Who was the mystery man arrested outside the ballroom after the shooting as he was being beaten by a mob shouting, 'He shot Malcolm!' Why did he disappear from sight immediately after being taken into custody, and why has he not been identified or heard from since?"

"Why did one of the defendants at the murder trial admit his guilt, absolve his two co-defendants, and then claim he and three other men had been paid for the murder by a third party who was not a Muslim?"

Shortly before his death, Malcolm wrote: "In the past, yes, I have made sweeping indictments of all white people. I will never be guilty of that again — as I now know that some white people are truly sincere, that some truly are capable of being brotherly toward a black man... It isn't the American (Continued on page 6)

CONTAINMENT AND CHANGE

by Carl Oglesby and Richard Schaul

Introduction by Leon Howell

Published by MacMillan Company

A RADICAL ANALYSIS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

available MARCH 1 from

\$1.45 per copy

Book Service

Students for a Democratic Society
1608 West Madison - Room 206
Chicago, Illinois 60612

PENN. STATE & HUAC

NAC MINUTES

by the GAD flow

(Continued from page 1)
entire exchange. We reaffirmed our mutual responsibility vote of the afternoon and left the building.

The Second Day

At 11:00 a.m. next day fifteen sds members met in Old Main and picketed in the lobby until about 1:30. m. when the group, then about forty-strong, moved into the private corridor to Walker's office and resumed the sit-in. Simes appeared at 4:00 and read a second prepared statement which reaffirmed the Administration's Wednesday night threat of arrest and stated that "in the future no warnings would be given before the police were called." All forty demonstrators went to Simes' office for a meeting during which Simes was questioned by sds members about the University's disciplinary policies, the HUAC issue and the refusal of Walker to recognize sds' legitimate claim USG's sovereignty as the sole voice for student opinion on campus. The ambiguity of the bill precluded any rational interpretation of its contents.

The Third Day

The demonstration continued in Old Main on Friday from 9:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. when Simes and his assistant Raymond Murphy called the demonstrators into Sime's office where sds was informed that they were faced with "serious disciplinary action," the nature of which and the authority of for an answer. Simes lost his temper several times and finally declared the meeting ended; he left the meeting disturbed and visibly angry.

That night USG passed an ambiguous, poorly worded bill which asserted the right of groups and individuals to deal directly with the power structure; it also affirmed which Simes refused to disclose. Rather than be dragged into a meaningless shouting match with unreasonable and inflexible men, the demonstrators left the building in disgust.

A major breakthrough occurred the same day. Apparently feeling the full force of sds' intentions, Walker arranged a meeting with sds representatives of Saturday, 4 February. The high points of the twenty-minute meeting with sds, Walker and a University lawyer were: Walker would answer a "polite" letter from sds; Walker had been "holding off" certain groups which demanded stronger action against sds (which we later learned meant he was keeping people from physically attacking us - assuming, no doubt, that we were non-violent resisters); Walker was under great pressure from other groups to take a hard line against sds yet he still acted as a free agent in all University matters, a point which contradicts itself internally as well as in fact; that the country was "tired of protecting protestors"; and that Walker "had not forgotten about the sit-in," inferring that his office was considering "strong disciplinary action," no doubt internal University actions which could not be fought in the courts.

Our Victory and Their Run-Around

sds declared the sit-in and recognition by Walker of sds' claim a victory at the Sunday night educational forum. Plans were sketched for the fourth letter, which consists of three sentences, quite polite, the draft of which was approved at the membership meeting two days later.

In the meantime, USG's Kalich had written Walker as a "concerned" student about the HUAC issue. Walker sent Kalich a long, ambiguous answer dated 6 February which naively tried to obfuscate the issues sds raised about HUAC. Walker claimed he did not have a membership list (other than a list of officers and charter members); yet our anti-war activities have shown that the University Security Division can rapidly and accurately collect names of demonstrators and group members, a tactic which no doubt would be affected if HUAC asked for our names.

sds, while recognizing the existence of Walker's letter to Kalich, refuses to accept any material contained in the reply as an answer to the sds letters; we will honor only a direct communication to sds as an answer. Acceptance or non-acceptance of Walker's

answer is a matter for future determination. We are waiting for an answer at this writing.

Implications

The issue started simply as the right of the Administration to release our names to HUAC; it has since developed into an issue of the right of free speech and the right of petition. Moreover, considering the concerted attempts of the Administration to intimidate individual sds members through the offices of the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women, through the offices of the academic deans and department heads, through the continued suggestion of unexplained disciplinary action and through the partial threat not to "allow" the state-wide Convention to take place on campus on 24-26 February, the issue now is one of the bounds of arbitrary authority the Administration thinks it can reach. Furthermore, the dignity of a leftist group, or any group of "unacceptable persuasion," has been questioned by the manner with which we have been dealt with by the power structure. The slander campaign against sds as a group Walker has initiated in the last few days through his academic deans and department heads and the personal slander campaign started against individual SDS members (carried out by such diverse persons as the campus priest to a teacher of business statistics) indicates the lengths the Administration will go to to halt any "unacceptable" political movement and the success of our efforts. Through their blunders, the Penn State Administration has made a potentially disastrous single-issue struggle one of such a general nature that many students who may have been confused or alienated by the HUAC issue can now be organized around the issue of free speech.

We are by no means finished. The lines have been drawn for a prolonged confrontation. The Administration is running scared and making more critical mistakes at each turn. We intend to make use of each mistake to point out the inequities of the present system and to further the aims of complete student freedom at Penn State.

February 16, 1967

Members Present: Greg Calvert, Earl Silbar, Dee Jacobsen, Jane Adams, Cathy Wilkerson, Rich Berkowitz, Jean Tepperman
Members Absent: Steve Goldsmith
Others Present: Idsoc Epstein, Carl Davidson, Bill Hartzog

Agenda:

- I Finances
 - A. National Secretary's Memorandum
 - B. Current Financial Status
- II Draft Resistance
- III National Secretary's Travel Report
- IV Vice President's Report
- V The National Student Association, CIA, and other enemies of the people

I Finances:

A. National Secretary's memorandum: As all you careful readers of the NAC minutes may recall, last week's NAC meeting was the scene of a bar room-like struggle involving the issue of the relationship (financial and otherwise) between the NO and the Regional Offices. Since this tussle had been terminated with a recommendation for a dicta from the secretariat, this week's administrative confab opened (predictably enough) with Greg presenting a proposal for discussion. The text of this proposal can be found in the issue you now hold. After Greg read his proposal it was commented upon and criticized by the NAC members and everyone else in the bar. One slightly soused old broad bellowed out her support for the proposal suggesting that we shoot the opposition. Everybody cheered and the agenda was rolled. Jane Adams protested the rolling and suggested that the proposal should be published in NLN. The NAC concurred and Greg urged the body to study his suggestions with the intention of presenting constructive alternatives and additions.

B. Current Financial Status: The grim financial situation was again reviewed; prayers were offered, beads rubbed, and a young

white mouse (who had fortuitously wandered into the room) was offered as a sacrifice to the Gods of the liberal corporate establishment.

II Draft Resistance:

Greg announced that Bill Hartzog, our Great Plains Draft Resistance Field Secretary, has been arraigned for refusing induction into the forces of the common oppressor. He indicated that this means Bill will be tried in the Federal Courts within three to six months time. Carl Davidson moved that Bill be re-appointed by the NAC to the position of National Draft Field Coordinator. Carl pointed out that such an appointment would allow Bill to travel about the country speaking on and coordinating draft resistance activities. The NAC approved Bill's appointment by smiling simultaneously.

III National Secretary's Travel Report:

Greg recounted his recent trip to Minneapolis where he attempted to subvert the minds of some young Americans at the U. of Wis. by delivering a Marxian review of forgotten alternatives in the long since dead New Deal labor movement. Greg also attended a small regional meeting, and he stated that he was impressed with the chapter people in attendance.

Gulliver Calvert also outlined his projected whirlwind tour through the Eastern realm of Lilliput.

IV Vice President's Report:

Carl reported on his tour through Colorado. He bolted about Denver, tripped (literally) through Boulder, and was present at an organizing conference at Colorado State College. He indicated that anti-war activities characterized the programs of the five schools in attendance. The organizing conference was successful in that a decision was made to hold monthly educational conferences.

On his return from Colorado, Carl spoke
(Continued on page 5)

SDS-AGITPROP STICKERS

Agitprop Stickers: 1¢ apiece; sold only in bundles of 100 stickers. (Agitprop: Agitation Propaganda).

GENOCIDE

For fun
and profit

SUPPORT
U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

- sds -

Mississippi Viet Nam

FREEDOM is the
same ALL OVER

- sds -

*We want
everyone
to fly*

- sds -

Brainwashers
Arsonists
Sadists
Killers

Enlist today
in the service
of your choice.

-sds-

NOTES FROM CHICAGO

MICHAEL JAMES

ORGANIZING HOUSING TENANTS

reprinted from THE MOVEMENT

Chicago, Ill.

It is an understatement to say that there is a shortage of adequate housing for poor people in Chicago. Housing in the ghetto, no matter what the ethnic composition, costs far more for smaller and inferior housing than that found in middle and working-class areas. There are a handful of groups currently organizing tenants' unions, seeking negotiated settlements or collective bargaining contracts between tenants and landlords. The growing tenants' movement provides a forum that brings community organizations involving poor people together, under the banner of the Tenants' Federation.

JOIN Community Union, representing poor white and Spanish tenants in a 24 unit building, signed a contract with the owner in May, calling for specific repairs, grievance procedures and binding arbitration. In July, the East Garfield Park Union to End Slums, a westside group initiated by SCLC, won a similar contract covering 40 buildings with the large slum real estate firm, Condor and Costalis. The idea of tenants' unions and contracts caught on quickly; the number of organizations working for or winning contracts grew to include several more poor peoples groups and several groups composed of middle-class people inhabiting small buildings.

Our limited experience reveals a number of problems associated with organizing tenants, including the difficulty of building consciousness and the internal strength of tenants groups, as well as legal and financial

problems arising from the institution of slum housing itself.

No contract has yet been tested in court. The few legal skirmishes to date have (on both sides) avoided the issue, either ending up in temporary injunctions based on technicalities, or addressing themselves (currently in process) to the right to picket real estate agents. The few possible test cases (due to landlord non-cooperation) are weak in terms of the organizational strength of the tenants themselves. This is true of single buildings where tenant involvement in the rent strike phase was high, as well as the large contracts covering many buildings, some having virtually no organized tenants even though efforts are being made to "fill in the structure."

The size of the landlord's holdings appears to be another factor affecting tenant union organizing efforts. Many landlords claim, perhaps correctly, that they are unable to make the repairs demanded in seriously dilapidated buildings without raising rent, or because they can't get loans for slum building repair. Given the scary shadow of urban renewal that threatens every budding movement group, many large slum firms can hold out. Tenant organizing efforts are presently too small to even seriously consider the large question of taking on the mortgage holders, enemy of both tenants and small owners.

Large slum firms appear to be able to make a profit, although it is not clear that they can do so in the face of a serious contract calling for in-depth rehabilitation. Some

have threatened or actually chosen to sell. If this were to become the pattern, it could be a serious problem, forcing community organizations to seek financing from the Federal government or through private foundations. The non-profit Presbyterian Church-connected Community Renewal Foundation, which bought a large building and made an agreement with its tenants who had been on strike for two months, has proved to be no friend of the Movement. They applied for a type of Federal financing that excludes the poor after the repairs are made. Cooperative housing proposed by EGPUES and the Lawndale Union to End Slums, using Federal money secured by SCLC, threatens to absorb too much of the organizers energies on the issue of making the project work internally; this could easily deter from the building of multi-issue community unions.

A possible alternative to this and to other complications with the contract would be to return to using housing problems solely as an organizing device rather than becoming in large measure a single issue, locally focused organizations. For example, an organizer might go into a building with no heat, talk to tenants and get them to hold back rent until the landlord provides heat. Chances are that as many people would join or become sympathetic to the organization, and the organization would not become bogged down in the difficult, time consuming, single and very local issue of rehabilitating buildings and getting tenants to cooperate in "keeping them clean."

Another problem facing the tenants' movement is the top down union orientation of the Industrial Union Department (AFL-CIO), who convened the Federation. The IUD is seeking a way to become directly involved in the civil rights movement, certainly in a partial attempt to exert political control, and probably as a vehicle to reach unorganized workers in non-union shops. (It may be worth noting that IUD recently received \$75,000.00 from the Stern Family Fund for "community organizing" in Delano, Chicago, and one other city.) IUD and movement people, particularly community based, community union oriented organizers, have been at odds as to the composition of the board of directors of the proposed cooperative housing mentioned above, as well as the "class" structure of the Tenants' Federation. In both instances, they have been reluctant on the issue of control by tenants (poor people).

The relationship between movement and union people, although not easy, is currently workable. Recently, the Federation decided that decision making and the running of meetings would be left to tenants, each participating organization having three members on the board of directors. An educational program is now underway, bringing neighborhood people together to discuss common experiences and problems. The hope of the Federation and the Movement in the city is in part an educational program that goes beyond just the issue of housing, education that seeks to build leaders knowledgeable of the multi-issue character of the system they seek to change.

CHINA conference

RADICAL EDUCATION PROJECT (REP) MID-ATLANTIC AND NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE ON CHINA AND THE UNITED STATES

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The continuing and pressing questions posed by events in China call for a fresh and thorough appraisal of the Chinese revolution, in its domestic development and as it relates to the United States and the rest of the world. Thus far, the response of the United States to a new and powerfully dynamic China ranges from outright threatening hostility on the one hand to proposals for softening policy on the other. It is imperative for Americans to examine both the underlying assumptions and probable implications of the "containment without isolation" doctrine posed by members of the liberal establishment in their criticisms of the present U. S. position. It is also necessary to analyze the relationship between the reality of a modernizing China, present U. S. policy, and the "liberal critique" of that policy.

In order to make a beginning in what is an extremely important and difficult process of education, a conference of all those who are opposed to American attitudes and policy towards China is being called on April 21-23, 1967, in New York City. It is the goal of this conference to present critical analyses of the internal situation in China and of China's position in international politics. It is hoped that the scholars, teachers, journalists, students, and other people concerned with U. S. foreign policy and China who participate in the conference will come away better equipped intellectually and with a commitment to offer intelligent alternatives to the present impasse.

A schedule of events will be printed in a future issue of NLN.

For further inquiries and donations please write to:

REP CHINA & U. S. CONFERENCE
P. O. Box 326, Cathedral Station
New York, N. Y. 10025

Submitted by Mark Scher
N. Y. R.E.P.

PUBLICATIONS

for readers on the left

by Carl Davidson
SDS - Vice President

(Those prices which were left off this list will be run in next week's NLN.)

Minority of One, P.O. Box 544
Passaic, N.J. 07055 \$5/1 yr.
Southern Patriot, 3270 W.
Broadway, Louisville, Ky. \$2/1 yr.
U.S. Farm News, 1024 Grand,
Des Moines, Iowa \$2/1 yr.

RADICAL PACIFIST

Liberation, 5 Beekman Street,
NYC, 10038 \$2.50/1 yr.
Sanity, 3837 St. Lawrence Blvd.,
Montreal 18, P.Q. Canada
Win, 5 Beekman Street, NYC, \$2/12 issues
10038
Peace News, 5 Caledonian Rd.,
Kings Cross, London, N.1. \$1/8 wks.

ANARCHIST/SYNDICALIST

Catholic Worker, 175 Chrystie
St., NYC, 10002 \$2.25/1 yr.
Anarchy, 17a Maxwell Rd.,
London, S.W. 6 (joint sub)
Freedom, 17a Maxwell Rd.,
London, S.W. 6 \$1.50/3 mo.

Direct Action, (SWF), 34 Cum-
berland Rd., London, E. 17 \$1/1 yr.
Toward Anarchism, P.O. Box
261, Cooper Sta. NYC 10003 \$1/12 issues
Industrial Worker, 2422 N. Hal-
sted St., Chicago, Illinois \$1/1 yr.
Speak Out, (Facing Reality),
14131 Woodward Ave.,
Detroit, Mich.
The Green Revolution, Brook-
ville, Ohio (School of Living) \$3/1 yr.

Socialist/Communist (Assorted)

The Worker, (CP), 23 W. 26th,
NYC, 0010 \$7/yr.
People's World, 81 Clementina
St., San Francisco, Calif. \$1/10 wk.
Weekly People, (SLP), 116
Nassau St., Brooklyn, N.Y. \$1/6 mo.
The Militant, (SWP), Box 471,
NYC 10003 \$1/4 mo.
Challenge, (PLP), G.P.O. Box
808, Brooklyn, N.Y. \$4/1 yr.
Worker's World, 46 W. 21st St.,
NYC 10010 \$1.25/6 mo.

The Week, 54 Park Road, Lenton,
Nottingham, England \$1/10 wk.
National Guardian, 197 E. 4th
St., NYC 10009 \$1/10 wk.
PL (Progressive Labor), GPO
Box 808, Brooklyn, N.Y. \$2.50/1 yr.
Studies on the Left, P.O. Box
33, Planetarium Sta.,
NYC 10024

Insurgent, (DBC), Chicago, Ill.
Young Socialist, (YSA), Box 471,
Cooper Sta., NYC 10003 \$1/1 yr.
Independent Socialist
Newsletter, Box 910,
Berkeley, Calif. \$1/5 issues

Bulletin of International Social-
ism, 339 Lafayette St., NYC
10012 \$5.00/10 issues
People's Voice, 1313 E. Fire-
stone Blvd., Los Angeles, Cal. \$1/2 mo.
Monthly Review, 116 W. 14th
St., NYC, 10011 \$4/1 yr.
News & Letters, 8751 Grand
River, Detroit, Mich. \$1/12 issues

Single Issue Publications

Bring the Troops Home Now
Newsletter, 34 Park Row,
NYC 10038
Peace & Freedom News,
(NCCWEWN), 420 W. Wash-
ington, Madison, Wisc.
South Africa Bulletin, 211 E.
43rd St., NYC 10017 free sub
Africa Today, 211 E. 43rd St.,
NYC 0017
Freedomways, 799 Broadway,
NYC 10003 \$3.50/1 yr.
Vietnam Courier, 46 Tran Hung
Dao St., Hanoi, D.R.V. free sub
Civil Liberties, (ACLU), 156 5th
Ave., NYC 100 0 \$3/1 yr.
Dowdrath, (End the Draft), 150
Crown St., Brooklyn, N.Y. \$2/12 issues
Viet-Report, 133 W. 72nd St.,
NYC 10023 \$5/1 yr.
Vietnam Bulletin, c/o 25a
Abbey Gardens, London,
N.W. 8

SCC Newsletter, (SCCEWVN),
Box 9085, Atlanta, Ga.
Memo, (WSP), 2016 P Street,
N.W., Washington, D.C. \$5/1 yr.

Movement-Oriented Pubs.

SUPA Newsletter, 658 Spadina
Ave., Toronto 4, Canada \$5/1 yr.
New Left Notes, (SDS), 1608 W.
Madison, Chicago, Illinois \$5/1 yr.
The Movement, (Cal. SNCC),
449-14th St., San Francisco,
Calif. \$1/1 yr.
JOIN Newsletter, 4533 N. Sher-
idan, Chicago, Illinois \$10 donation
East Village "Other", Box 571,
Stuyvesant Sta., NYC 10009 \$3/1 yr.
New Orleans Freedom Press,
Box 2647, New Orleans, La. \$1/1 yr.
El Malcriado, Box 1060, Delano,
California \$2/1 yr.
New South Student, (SSOC),
1703 Portland Ave., Nash-
ville, Tenn. \$1/1 yr.

LIBERAL

Texas Observer, 504 W. 24th,
Austin, Texas \$5/1 yr.
Southern Courier, 79 Com-
merce St., Montgomery, Ala. \$4/6 mo.
Fellowship, (FOR), Box 271,
Nyack, N.Y. \$4/yr.
I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618
Nebraska Ave., N.W.,
Washington, D.C. \$5/1 yr.
Change, (CSDI), Box 4427,
Santa Barbara, Calif.
The Nation, 333-6th Ave.,
NYC 10014 \$6/6 mo.
The New Republic, 1244-19th
St., N.W., Washington, D.C. \$8/1 yr.

SOCIAL DEMOCRAT

Dissent, 509-5th Ave., NYC
10017 \$2.50/1 yr.
New America, (SP),
1182 Broadway, NYC 1000
Young Socialist Review, (YPSI),
1182 Broadway, NYC 1000 \$3/1 yr.

questions and answers on G.A.I.N.

PROPOSALS FOR A GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME (GAIN)

AND GUARANTEED EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES (GEO)

John Rossen
Chicago

Q. What is G.A.I.N.?

A. A proposal for federally guaranteed annual income, as the only realistic way of ending poverty in the U. S. and assuring a more equitable distribution of the national wealth and income.

Q. How would it work?

A. As a sort of "reverse" income tax. People whose income tax return shows they failed to earn a given amount, would be paid the difference by the federal government.

Q. How much income would be guaranteed?

A. Minimum subsistence requirements would call for at least \$2500 annually guaranteed for single adults, or for the head of a family group, and an equal amount for his or her spouse, plus at least \$7250 annually additional for child under 21 not in college (see proposal for GEO). This means that a family of husband, wife and three small children should be guaranteed at least \$8,750 yearly.

Q. Who would be eligible for this GAIN?

A. Every Person resident in the United States or U. S. territory.

Q. Could U. S. economy afford such a program?

A. U. S. economy is producing wealth right now at a rate of about \$800 billion a year, with the prospect that in a year or two this figure will surpass ONE TRILLION DOLLARS, which is nearly \$5,000 a year for every man, woman and child in the U. S.

Q. How could such a program be administered?

A. Simply by using the present set-up of the Internal Revenue Service. A recent article by W. Lippmann discloses that there is a total of 374 government bureaus and agencies disbursing federal funds, to veterans, aged, etc. All this expensive bureaucracy could be eliminated, at a great saving.

Q. But that still doesn't eliminate the need for the government to collect up a lot more revenue than it has up to now. How would that be accomplished?

A. Parallel with the legislation establishing GAIN, there would be needed additional legislation to accomplish the following:

1. Limit personal income to \$30,000 a year, with at least 50% tax on incomes above \$20,000.
2. Across the board surtax on present corporation taxes of at least 60%. Elimination of tax loopholes like depletion allowances, capital gains deductions, etc.
3. Establish federal minimum wage of \$2.50 an hour, and 30-hour week; expand and extend medicare to include every resident of the U. S. and to cover all medicines, eyeglasses, or prosthetic devices, doctor and hospital bills.

Q. What about G.E.O.? (Guaranteed Educational Opportunity)

A. G.E.O. would work as follows: Every student qualifying for admission to any institution of higher learning (college or university) would receive from the federal government full tuition costs, plus a regular stipend based on \$2,000 for a full academic year. For graduate students, or married students, the stipend would be identical with the general Guaranteed Annual Income for the general population (in addition to tuition costs).

I invite comment on this program from student chapters of SDS as well as from SDS'ers working in community unions, etc.

"SURE, YOU THINK WHAT YOU WISH. BUT YOU WISH TO THINK WHAT THE CONTROLLERS WISH YOU TO WISH TO THINK."

"Will the author of this pearl get in touch with the N.O.?"

WAR GAMES

Cathy Parkus, for the WRU Committee to End the War in Vietnam

In accordance with our position of opposing every expression of pro-war sentiment, the Western Reserve University Committee to End the War in Vietnam sent a copy of the enclosed letter to a local, campus-area bookstore protesting its sale of the two "games," "Vietnam" and "Nuclear War". If the merchants do not comply with our demands we are considering a school wide campaign to focus attention on their callous behavior.

We think people enraged by these games will be interested in our letter and will similarly express their opposition to the sale of these games in their own areas.

Dear Sir:

On December 9, 1966 your store ran an ad in the Reserve Tribune for two "games," Vietnam and Nuclear War. We of the Western Reserve University Committee to End the War in Vietnam, as students and American citizens opposed to the war in Vietnam, would like to protest both the ad and your selling of the two games.

We are shocked that anyone, either manufacturer or merchant, would engage in the sorry business of seeking personal gain by exploiting and mocking the suffering and misery of the millions of Vietnamese and Americans whose lives are being affected by this brutal war.

We feel that these games are sorry reflections of the brutal and cynical attitude which seeks to justify wars such as the one against Vietnam in the name of self-interest and personal gain and thus threatens the integrity and well-being of the American people.

Therefore, as American citizens opposed to our government's unjust, illegal, and immoral war on Vietnam, we demand that you immediately remove these "games" from your shelves and print a statement to the effect that you have done so in all publications in which you have advertised them. Until you have done so, we declare our intention to cease dealing with your store in the belief that the selling of such games leads only to the creation of an atmosphere devoid of clear thinking on important issues of war and peace and thus conducive to further unfortunate involvements such as the one in Vietnam. And we believe that, should you refuse to remove these "games" from your shelves, we will be joined in our boycott of your store by many fellow students who, even if they support the present Vietnam policy, are totally opposed to the debasement of major questions of war and peace by the cynical exploitation of human suffering for personal profit.

We hope that you will be able to contact us soon telling us that you have removed Vietnam and Nuclear War from your shelves and that you intend to print the appropriate statements.

Yours truly,
Donald Gurewitz, for the WRU Committee to End the War in Vietnam

N.A.C.

(Continued from page 5)
at a University of Missouri teach-in where 700 students were turned on to the nature of Yankee Imperialism.

V The National Student Association, CIA, and other enemies of the people:

The NAC reviewed the recent scandal surrounding the revelation that NSA and the CIA have been sleeping together for years. Potential sds reactions to probable reverberations on the national student scene were plotted in a cold blooded manner, and the meeting ended when a drunk staggered in off the street and screamed "Drinks ON me".

The NO GADflew

"Men who meekly submit to CONSCRIPTION do not deserve to be called free men." --- May 1, 1863

Clement L. Vallandigham
Democratic candidate for governor of Ohio.

Army Investigation

(Continued from page 1)

exchange of written questions and answers. Arnold also asked Moore about his opinions on Vietnam, and once even asked him if he had ever "lectured at an atheistic organization." (An obvious, though inaccurate, reference to the Ethical Society.) He didn't explain the relevance of atheism to the Army Reserve.

Finally, Arnold probed for more precise information: "Throughout this interview you have referred to a number of individuals and associates (in SDS) without naming them. Would you now disclose their identity?" Moore politely refused.

Then, just as Arnold had given Moore his transcript and was leaving, came the clincher: a veiled hint that Moore could probably avoid further trouble from the Army by spying on his SDS friends and turning the information over to Military Intelligence.

"This investigation will continue," Arnold said, "Any more information you can give me will go a long way towards clearing your name." Moore refused again.

Several days later, Arnold walked into

the office of the Washington University Department of Sociology and Anthropology. His mission was to question several of Moore's professors.

One of the men Arnold talked with there was Irving Louis Horowitz, Professor of Sociology. Arnold first asked Horowitz if Moore ever "acted funny" - evidently using the classic intelligence technique of trying to get some "dirt" on someone (such as proof of homosexuality) that might be used to force him to cooperate. The effort failed.

Arnold: "Do you feel Mr. Moore is loyal to the United States?"

Horowitz: "Yes, in the way most of the people I know are loyal. What other qualities do you think are important for a U. S. Army officer to have?"

Arnold: "I would say courage is the most important, and integrity."

After being questioned further about the Army and his beliefs on Vietnam, Special Agent Arnold departed.

Moore still does not know the results of the Army's investigation of him. Worried, he told his story to the New York Times, but nothing was ever printed.

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

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

Helen Garvey
710 Willow
Apt. 12
Hoboken, N.J. 07030

Malcolm X

(Continued from page 5)

White man who is a racist, but it's the American political, economic and social atmosphere that automatically nourishes a racist psychology in the white man.

Malcolm was beginning to apply this new political understanding to America domestically. Internationally, he was beginning to open up the possibility of real cooperation between American Negroes and the radical socialist African states.

He was pushing to bring the American racial crisis before the United Nations, a move that by placing the U. S. in the same position as South Africa, would have seriously embarrassed this country's government.

Malcolm was a dangerous man. He was seeking non-black allies in an international movement; he was moving to the left. I am afraid that we can no longer trust in nor believe our government. Some people call this a "credibility gap." What I have in mind is more like what Thomas Jefferson said when he wrote the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are

endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new Government, laying its principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

If, as it seems, the Government of the United States has destroyed one of its greatest leaders, and has destroyed these rights for many millions of those it supposedly governs, if we can neither trust in nor believe it, Thomas Jefferson points the way out.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE MOVEMENT
449 14th St.
San Francisco