

HUMPTY DUMPTY has a great fall

Richard Bogart
John Saari

An Essay on the Merits and Demerits of
Democracy and Anarchy

1: WHAT HAPPENED

Hubert Humphrey's visit to Stanford Mon. Feb. 20, sparked one of the more militant anti-war protests on this campus of the past two years. The history of that demonstration offers several lessons which you are about to share.

The Wednesday before Humphrey's visit, a group of moderate faculty members met and decided that a silent protest would be appropriate. They proposed that students and faculty should symbolize their opposition to the war by wearing white arm-bands and remaining silent throughout the program. The faculty group responsible for this action was composed largely of clergymen who had just entered the anti-war movement through the Peace Fast of the week before. No attempt was made by this group to involve the more radical faculty members in its decision, much less the students, who had called a meeting for later in the day.

Wednesday evening, over one hundred students met and formed the Ad Hoc Committee to Greet Humphrey. They refused to accept the faculty proposal of silent protest; indeed, the first proposal placed before the group called for disruption during the speech. From this point there ensued a long discussion over "image and effectiveness" which resulted in a compromise action - a silent walk-out half-way through the program. It is clear that the students did not agree to stronger action because of the faculty position.

By Friday the entire campus knew that Humphrey's appearance would be protested. The Ad Hoc put out two leaflets, both denouncing cold-war liberalism. The first, entitled "Over the Hump With Humphrey", itemized Hubert's glorious career as a red-baiter and cold warrior, while the second briefly explained the mechanics of the walk-out (in particular it asked for silence before the walk-out and made other concessions toward the faculty position). Friday also was highlighted by two developments among the faculty. First, a group of radical faculty members organized to support the walk-out. Second, the leaders of the moderate faculty group were called in by the administration and were encouraged to convince the students not to walk out. Prior to this, there had been co-operation between the moderate faculty and the students. Naturally the students were upset with the faculty's divisive new position, for the students had been willing to accept both a walk-out and a silent protest. After a rather tense meeting Friday afternoon, at which the moderate faculty harped on freedom of speech, courtesy, and the myth of the academic community, while the students pointed out that the walk-out itself was a considerable concession by those who felt that stronger action should be taken, the moderate faculty members left, leaving the protest hopelessly split.

After a weekend of preparatory work (done entirely by the students) and an all-night teach-in, we were ready to greet Humphrey. At 10:00 Monday morning (Humphrey was to speak at 11:30) there were about 1000 people waiting in front of the auditorium, nearly all protesters who wore white arm bands. When the doors were opened, the auditorium filled up quickly - too quickly, for non-protesters had been let in through side entrances, and many seats had been reserved for administration officials, press, party hacks, etc. In all, there were about 1000 protesters of both types, in a crowd of 1750. Another 1000 protesters remained outside the building.

At the outset, Humphrey was not bothered by the silence, as faculty members had

claimed he would be. 700 applauding fans might just as well have been 700, for any audible difference it made. The format of the meeting was such that direct confrontation between members of the audience and the vice-president was impossible, although one attempt at heckling was made; it was not followed up, so Humphrey turned it to his own advantage. Humphrey dodged every question put to him by a select panel, and played for his rooting sections. When he said that he had not found one piece of evidence to support the contention that the administration does not enjoy the support of the academic community, hundreds got up without any other signal and walked out. In all, 403 people walked out, by an usher's count; police "estimated" 240. The rest of the speech was uneventful, as anyone who might have raised trouble had left (anyway, so had the author, and most reliable sources).

Meanwhile, outside the auditorium, 1000 would-be walkers-out were upset to enraged over having been denied admittance. First thoughts jumped to Humphrey's inevitable exit. His car was located, but was snuck out when it was evident that it had become the center of some attention. By this time the crowd had been swelled by 403 people who were almost equally enraged, and the variety of frustrations imparted a mobbish, or militant, mood to the crowd. People were stationed at every exit to the building. Whenever Humphrey was spotted, shouts of "Shame" and "Murderer" attracted the bulk of the crowd, and he would quickly dodge back in. After an incredible cat-and-mouse game, Humphrey popping in and out, the crowd surging from one exit to another, he made an armed escape through a poorly guarded side exit. Even this did not prevent his car from being mobbed, and he left between two columns of cops and SS men. Only two persons managed to get in front of the car, and they were quickly shoved aside, one narrowly escaping injury.

2: EFFECT OF THE DEMONSTRATION & CRITICISM OF TACTICS

It is apparent that the silent treatment was an entire failure. Furthermore it would have been almost impossible to carry out effectively, for it would have required enormous unanimity and discipline; besides, given the nature of the war, such a protest is far too mild. The walk-out, while morally satisfying and slightly more effective, left much to be desired. Given the predictable banality of Humphrey's speech, it was cor-

(Continued on page 4)

new left notes

1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

VOL. 2, NO. 9 let the people decide MARCH 6, 1967

ambassador goldberg

A TOWN MEETING AT HARVARD

by Jon Wiener
Harvard

U. N. Ambassador Goldberg came to Harvard three months after MacNamara's refusal to debate war critics provoked the wild demonstration that embarrassed the university and delighted the left. The challenge to SDS was to make Goldberg's visit as successful an expression of anti-war sentiment as MacNamara's had been. But this time the officials got smart: the challenge to debate was accepted, and SDS was faced with the problem of the diversion of anti-war sentiment from direct protest into a verbal confrontation in which the administration might come out unscratched.

The problem of a debate is that it gives the administration a chance to answer, and since they have an answer for anything, the political fact of opposition could be lost. With the dean's office in charge of the debate format, the situation was especially threatening.

In an effort to maximize the possibility of the effective expression of anti-war arguments, SDS issued its "demands" for the Goldberg appearance, calling for (1) a panel of questioners, at least half of whom were war critics; (2) the opportunity for panelists to rebut Goldberg's answers and ask follow-up questions; (3) lengthy and detailed questions from the audience; and (4) accessibility of microphones to panel and audience. The demands were accepted, and the panel was named. It included two faculty members, one of them a New Left type, and three students: a Young Republican, a student government leader, and an SDS representative. All five panelists turned out to be anti-war in one way or another.

The Sunday afternoon of the debate, (Feb. 12) students, who lined up an hour early to get seats, were met at the auditorium door by a "Polish freedom fighter" dressed in a white uniform and carrying a sign reading "Communism is Jewish from Start to Finish." He was identified by the *Crimson* as Joseph Mlot-Mroz, "a veteran of SDS marches." The police wouldn't let anyone

near him to ask whether he thought Goldberg was a Red, or whether he knew that Uncle Ho was a gey.

The debate itself fulfilled all expectations for the worst. Goldberg argued that "we fervently desire that the war will be brought to an end," saying "we're ready to negotiate, we're ready to accept whatever the people of the country want." When asked for the number of civilian casualties, he replied that whatever the number, it was too great, the loss of civilian lives was terrible, and was one reason the U. S. was calling for negotiations. In answer to all questions, he invoked the desire of the U. S. for peace, the failure of the enemy to accept proposals to negotiate, and his own personal sorrow over the evils of war.

He was shaken from this pose only twice in two hours. The first time was when the

ON RADICAL ACTIVISM

There are two kinds of radicals:

THE DUES and

THE DON'TS

The dues help build a radical movement. The don'ts are a noisy bunch of catbirds.

This week's issue of NLN is the second consecutive 4 page issue . . . because we can't increase our debt any more.

student government leader voiced the "New Middle" line, originally formulated in the letter to the president of Dec. 31 signed by 90-odd student body presidents. Harvard's representative told Goldberg, "Our friends to the left have made their complete alienation from U. S. policy absolutely clear. What you should be concerned about is the more moderate group of students who . . . are becoming increasingly disaffected . . . The sad thing is that our own leaders have destroyed our idealism. To me this is one of the great sorrows about the war in Vietnam, and the problem lies squarely with you and other members of the administration." This won the loudest and longest applause of the afternoon.

The other statement that shook Goldberg was that of the New Left faculty representative, Michael Walzer, who cited statistics showing that the ratio of civilian to military casualties was six to one. The figure "is unequaled in any war for which we have statistics," Walzer said. "I would like to ask you, Ambassador Goldberg, whether you think our ends in Vietnam can possibly justify the extraordinary brutality of our means, whether we can maintain the freedom of the Vietnamese by killing them, and maintain their right to choose their own government by subjecting them to a more significant degree of coercion than any country of that size has ever been subjected to." (Continued on page 4)

LEVI STRAUSS CO. BOYCOTT

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, call for a nationwide boycott of Levi Strauss Co. products. The boycott will support a "wild-cat" strike of 460 workers at the Levi Blue Ridge, Georgia plant. These garment workers - women from the lower Appalachian mountain country - have carried out an 80% effective strike since August 1966, without any outside support. They organized themselves into a union two years ago to combat sweatshop conditions in this plant which had located there in order to exploit the underemployed workers of the region.

Across the country there is a growing movement of poor people's organizations. The Levi's strike in rural Georgia is representative of the militant new tactics which ally labor and community organizing. This is the time for united action to affirm this movement.

We therefore call upon interested persons and organizations to form boycott committees in their areas and to maintain contact with the central headquarters. The office will provide information on the continuing developments in the strike, and on the progress of the boycott. The boycott will continue until the demands of the Georgia Levi workers are met.

(signed):

Nick Egleson	Cathy Archibald
Bob Zeller	Mitchell Zimmerman
Sue Thrasher	Ron Carver
Ann Braden	Todd Gitlin
Donna Allen	

1. Write letters to the Levi Strauss Co. main office, Battery St., San Francisco, Calif.
2. Raise money and write letters of support to the Blue Ridge strikers: checks payable to: Mrs. T. W. Whittenberger c/o Temporary Levi Boycott Committee 610 West 116th St. #53 New York, N.Y. 10027
3. Don't buy levis for yourself or your kids.
4. Publicize the boycott: have demonstrations, put information in your newsletters and local papers, get out a mailing to your membership - remember students are a large Levi market as are mothers who buy them for their kids.
5. See that your local stores are pressured - they shouldn't carry Levi products.

An informational mailing will be sent to you in about two weeks. By that time you should have started the ball rolling in your organization, on your campuses, in your towns . . . SO PLEASE REPORT WHAT YOU HAVE DONE AND WHAT YOU PLAN TO DO BY MARCH 1:

TEMPORARY LEVI BOYCOTT COMMITTEE
610 West 116th St. #53
New York, New York 10027

PLEASE SEND MONEY GET TO WORK
DON'T BUY LEVIS

(Note NAC resolution on Levi Strauss - last issue of NLN.)

inside this issue

HOT ISSUES FOR BOSTON N. C. p. 2

U. of ILLINOIS sit-in p. 3

LEVI BOYCOTT p. 2

U. of WASHINGTON p. 3

ENGLEFINGER p. 3

N. C. MARCH 25-26
BOSTON AREA

CONFERENCE MARCH 23 - 24

Chapters should send credentials for their delegates to the N.O. IMMEDIATELY - See Chapter contacts for details

a new shirt or just more patches

Jane Adams

In the past year, there have been the beginnings of major changes in the organizational structures of SDS: We are building a staff of campus organizers (mandated by the NC, but without much consideration of the controls put on these organizers); we are in the process of instituting a new financial structure; we are forming regions without a clear definition of what a democratically constituted region is. All of these changes are attempts to deal with very new organization problems: SDS has grown from an organization of 35 chapters to one of 224 chapters, with an active (if not dues paid) membership of something close to 30,000 (6000 national). The creation of New Left Notes incurred a new \$22,000 a year expense, increased regional and local activity has made membership money unavailable to the national. Regions have had constant problems funding themselves and organizers, and request aid from the national, which is so broke the staff do not get paid.

So let's break the issues down:
1) Field secretaries, or regional organizers (for draft resistance, internal education, and regional development.) The NC has consistently mandated the NO to hire such staff as deemed necessary to carry out the programs it has outlined. In line with this, 7 national organizers have been hired by the NO. The NC has in no way outlined their areas of responsibility: are they responsible to the NAC, the national secretary, the NC, the regions, the chapters? Their current status is this (by decision of the NAC, which can reverse itself at will): The field secretaries are responsible to the region, if there is one. They are formally approved or selected by the region, and at least partly funded by the NO if necessary. If there is no existing region, they are responsible directly to the NAC and, hopefully, to the chapters (only there is no real way to make that happen, except as chapters feed back responses to the NO).

Given the existing vagueness of their mandate, the nationally hired field secretaries could become a 'cadre' without direct responsibility to the membership. That is, the NAC could tend to hire those people with whom it agreed politically, who might

not be representative of the people in their area. The NC needs to give the NAC and national secretary a clear definition of responsibility. I feel that the current status, as defined by the NAC, is a workable one, that should be passed by the NC.

2) Finances: disaster. The region are broke, the national is broke. There is money available if we could reach it. In the past, jurisdictional disputes (between regions and national) have handicapped both from getting money: the national organization can reach money the regions cannot (richies who don't see anything happening in their area, but can see a national perspective); the NO can coordinate singers, etc. on tours, with the regions doing most of the leg-work. The problem is: In a cooperative venture in fundraising, how do the funds get dispersed? Also, how do we redistribute the wealth of the nation - centered in 3 or 4 large cities - to our poorer, non-urban brothers and sisters? Proposed plans:

a) Money raised out of a region (say New York) is divided on a percentage basis. Poorer regions are subsidized.

b) All money raised, except for specific regional projects, goes to the NO. The NO then pays budgeted office expenses of all regions (say: 1 office manager, 1 regional traveller, 1 full-time fundraiser, plus rent and utilities.) The NC passes on the regional budget, which should have first been approved by the regional council, or some such formula.

c) We continue in chaos, NEWLEFT NOTES ceases to exist, the regions collapse.

3) Regions: At the present time, the constitution defines regions in a very vague manner. One chapter can form a region; there are no provisions for democratic control by the membership and/or chapters of regions. This has led to chaos and, if one of the above funding proposals is accepted, will lead to further chaos as groups compete for funds from the NO. We could develop that awful ogre of competition in a cut-throat way for limited money. Structures don't solve competition, but can at least make it more equitable.

Let's deal with these issues at this coming NC, before we find that we have inadvertently created monsters that we cannot control.

on the Calvert Proposal

Jean Tepperman
Chicago - JOIN

The national secretary's proposal for the funding of SDS raises two major areas of concern: where we get our money, and how this money relates to the control of policy.

I. Where we get our money

It is clearly true that as long as SDS survives mainly by contributions from people outside its own constituency, fundraising must be done on a national level, for the reasons outlined in the proposal.

I think part of our frustration at recognizing that regional fundraising doesn't work is because this fact brings us up against the more basic problem of where our money comes from. It seems impossible that a serious radical organization could sustain itself for very long on the basis of contributions from richies - because they may stop liking us (cf SNCC), because contributions are unstable and unpredictable, because a seriously radical constituency should be able to make the sacrifices necessary to sustain their own organization. This is not an argument against the current proposal. The necessity for this proposal, however, should make us begin to realize a little more what we're doing, and should make us begin to explore sounder ways of sustaining the movement.

II. Money and power

The proposal centralizes control of all major SDS funds in the hands of the national office.

SDS has more and more emphasized decentralization as the way members could exert control over program and policy. One of the by-products of this policy is that it has left the members with very little real involvement and control over the n.o. Our answer to this has been to restrict the program

functions of the n.o. to almost nothing. Decentralization has become necessary, therefore, since meaningful political decisions are rarely made on a national level.

Whatever you think of this situation, it means that if SDS is to be democratic under the proposed funding system, we will have to do a very tricky thing - centralize money and leave power decentralized.

The proposal provides strong guarantees against the n.o. staff using funds for political control - such as the exclusive right of regional councils to select staff, and the N.C. approval of regional budgets.

It leaves out a major area - WHAT IS A "DEMOCRATICALLY CONSTITUTED REGIONAL COUNCIL?" The SDS constitution is so vague about this that judging the legitimacy of a regional council depends a lot on the discretion of the N.O. staff. This discretion could easily be used as a political tool (perhaps not totally consciously - it's easier to consider someone "representative" when you agree with him). A partial answer to this would be a set of constitutional guidelines for forming and maintaining a region. The guidelines should deal with things like the procedure for selection of a council & staff, the percentage of chapters that participate, procedure for frequent review of staff, etc.

But I think it's necessary to recognize that there is no such thing as a constitutional "guarantee". If the national office decides to ignore all this and use funds as a political club, it can, as long as it has the money. That's inherent in this proposal. I think the only thing we can do is make that very difficult. This has been worked out in the proposal, plus my suggestion.

It seems like only an extreme disintegration of the SDS political community could pervert this arrangement. I think it's worth taking that risk in order to have functioning, solvent, stable regional offices able to coordinate, educate, and organize.

N.C.

Another Wild Bust

THE STUDENT NONVIOLENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE feels that national attention should be focused on the case of 19 year old SNCC worker Johnny Wilson who has recently been convicted by an all white jury of four Georgia State charges and sentenced to 3 years on the Georgia chain gang. This case stems from demonstrations held on August 17, 1966 outside of the 12th Army Headquarters and Induction Center in Atlanta, in which 12 SNCC workers were peacefully picketing to protest the induction of black men into the U. S. Armed Forces and their being sent to Vietnam. Following an incident between some of the demonstrators and Atlanta police, Wilson and the other 11 demonstrators were arrested on city charges, convicted of various misdemeanors, and sentenced to terms at the Atlanta City Stockade, ranging from 30 to 120 days.

Judge T. C. Little, who presided over the case, was prejudiced by the fact that he had a son fighting in Vietnam, and charged Johnny Wilson with "insurrection" a crime which carries the death penalty in Georgia and which subsequently was declared unconstitutional in a case involving three other civil rights workers - this charge was later dropped by the State of Georgia.

During 2 weeks spent in the Fulton County

jail before being transferred to serve his sentence at the Atlanta Stockade, Wilson became ill and suffered several blackouts. Prison doctors refused to admit him to the hospital. At the city stockade, Wilson, along with the other 9 male demonstrators, were segregated from other prisoners for their political beliefs, and sent to the hole (a box 4x4x7 feet) for talking, or saying "Black Power" to their fellow prisoners. While in the hole, prisoners are given only bread and water, one blanket, and a tin can for waste disposal. Johnny Wilson suffered two blackouts in the hole, and was given aspirin as a remedy. Excessively high bond totaling 36,000 dollars was set by the judge on the prisoners, and when enough money was finally raised for their release on bond, Judge Little had left town with orders not to free the prisoners. As a result of their treatment and segregated facilities in the city stockade, the twelve prisoners filed suit against the City of Atlanta and prison officials. After which, they were finally freed after serving 60 days in the stockade.

On February 1st and 2nd, 1967 Johnny Wilson stood trial on 2 state charges of "obprobrious" language. Out of a panel of 24 jurors, 5 black men were scratched by State Asst. Solicitor General Robert Sparks. Throughout the trial, Solicitor Sparks prejudiced the jury through constant referrals to SNCC and the War in Vietnam, and stated "If Johnny C. Wilson will not fight in Vietnam, why should he be allowed to fight in the streets of Atlanta."

Conflicting testimony for the state was given by the City Police and the U. S. Army. All six witnesses could not identify any of the demonstrators except Wilson, yet they were very "certain" that Wilson was the person who allegedly assaulted 2 of the police officers (one of them Captain Morris G. Redding). Howard Moore, Attorney for Wilson, overheard one of the army officers say "They all look alike," and the only description that any of the witnesses could give of the demonstrators picketing the induction center on August 17th, was that they "had beards, long hair, and were colored." Captain Redding stated that the first time he saw Wilson, Wilson was getting ready to throw another officer against the wall, yet he could not identify the officer, and no such officer ever gave any testimony. Redding alleged that Wilson hit him in the face and tried to choke him. On the day of the picketing, Redding was dressed in plain clothes, had no identification that would mark him as a policeman, and was unknown to Wilson. Captain Redding, who has arrested other SNCC workers including SNCC Chairman Stokely Carmichael, further prejudiced the jury by referring to SNCC and using the words "Black Power."

The all white jury took approximately 2 hours to reach the verdict of guilty on all four counts, and Wilson was subsequently

(Continued on page 4)

NEWS QUIPS

PRINCETON

Two regular silent vigils are being conducted. One, sponsored by Princeton SDS, forms in front of the Woodrow Wilson Building on Wednesdays from 12:15 to 1:00 P.M. The other is held on Saturdays from noon to 1:00 P.M. at Palmer Square in the center of Princeton.

The Bulletin Board at the corner of Nassau and Witherspoon Streets continues to be manned for two hours each day, Tuesday thru Saturday. For information, contact Carol Jacobs: (609) 924-9124.

POWER ELITES COME EVER CLOSER

Washington - Social Security numbers will be used by U. S. servicemen instead of serial numbers, commencing July 1.

The Defense Department said the change in procedure would be completed gradually over a two-year period.

Most military forms presently require both a Social Security number and a military serial number. Officials at the Pentagon saw no reason to continue a dual system.

to the editor

Dear Editor:

Would like to recommend very highly that NLN reprint, or perhaps better make a small pamphlet out of an excellent article by Noam Chomsky in The New York Review of Books (February 23, 1967), pp. 16 - 26. In the first place it is a very well and wittily written article. In the second place it is very well documented. And in the third and etc. places, Chomsky guts many important liberal apologists for the war and intellectuals involved in it like Schlesinger, Rostow, Kissinger, Kristol and others. More important, in the article (which is entitled "The Responsibility of Intellectuals"), Chomsky deals in a very coherent and persuasive manner with the

argument of the war as U.S. imperialism (that is, he supports the argument) and deals handily with some of the simple-minded objections to that, and with the arguments of (1) foreign affairs as a realm for experts, (2) the end of ideology intellectuals, (3) the vested interests of American intellectuals in the status quo.

You can doubtless gather by now that I am rather enthusiastic about this article. It seems to me to combine so much of importance in one place that we can't afford not to circulate this in some convenient form very widely among our members.

Peace,
Mitchell Zimmerman
Princeton, N.J.

NEW LEFT NOTES

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

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Nick Egleson, president; Carl Davidson, vice-president; and Greg Calvert, national secretary.

National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312) 666-3874

New York City: 49 West 27th St., NYC, NY 10011; (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.

U. of Washington

a touchy situation

John Venezia
N.O. Chapter Correspondent

University of Washington SDS is undergoing a factional fight. The issues involved are not what divides most chapters, (maybe it is), such as going too fast for the student body, alienating or charges of alienating people, etc., but go far deeper than that.

Bernard Yang is one of a group of 4-5 sds members who are sponsoring the "Seattle Barb" (which is modeled after the "Berkeley Barb"). Charges are being made by other sds members that the "Barb" is immature and isn't responsible because it deals with such unimportant issues as sex, drugs, liquor, and LSD. Yang, in explaining why the paper was formed, said that "the paper was organized after some members of the University SDS found they were in disagreement with the limited objectives of SDS." Also, "the issue of sex has gone too long undiscussed".

Karen Manarolla, an sds member, in putting down the "Barb" in a letter to the College paper, expressed the opinion that the values held by the editors of the "Barb" are immature and that people who believe "that all the good things of life are liquor, drugs, sex, marijuana and LSD", are really merely looking for escape routes.

Tim Lynch also an sds member attacked the "Barb" in a letter to the college paper and said "student employees need higher wages, our former classmates in Vietnam would like to come home now . . . not after we have purged ourselves of frustrations through sick sex orgies, drugs and pointless profanity." Jim Brown, one of the editors and author of the article "To Fornicate is Divine", which produced the reaction, in a statement defending his views said in part: "The literary artist, in absolute commitment to the mystical process of creativity, will not and cannot answer for the guilty hypocrisies of a society which does not embrace the cleanliness of nature . . ."

The "Seattle Barb", contained at least nine other articles on subjects as diverse as racism, Vietnam, Taxes, and cops.

After reading two issues of the "Seattle Barb" it seems to this writer that a positive attempt is being made by the editors of the "Barb" to link sex and drugs to politics and therefore to life. It is also apparent that this attempt is being met with strong opposition both in sds "political circles" and outside sds on the campus itself. It looks as if raising the banners of "free love" and "free sex" is a dangerous thing even in sds.

Where Its At

Bruce Pohlmann
Jim Misiorowski

TO ALL RADICAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

While the University is the place where most of the organizing and teaching of radicalism takes place, the high school is the place where the most important teaching of conservatism and complacency takes place.

It seems that if more and more high school students were exposed to something other than America is good, America is right, and America never makes a mistake the students would be more open-minded to ideas and beliefs other than conservatism.

High school is the glorious institution where students first learn that they have minds and that someday the world in which they live will be theirs to shape and control (hopefully). The school is run by incompetent administrators who lack the guts to act in opposition to the surrounding community. Textbooks are still prejudicial to Negroes as are many of the faculty. Faculty members who sympathize with dissenting students are likely to lose their jobs and be jeered at by the rest of the student body.

The Student GOVERNMENT is even less than a puppet for the administration, and students who run for office are carefully screened to make sure that if they are elected they won't make waves. As to this date the student government has acted against every move by SDS members to liberalize school rules on the distribution of political literature, dress reform and curriculum changes.

It seems that a larger and more effective move for starting high school chapters would be profitable.

Any existing high school chapters who have ideas please contact Berwyn High School SDS, c/o Bruce Pohlmann, 3327 Home Avenue, Berwyn, Illinois 60402.

ENGELFINGER AT TULANE

ON RESEARCHING YOUR CAMPUS
A RESPONSE TO—WHO OWNS TULANE

Peter Henig
REP

You say you're doing a paper on "Who Owns Tulane?" and you got bogged down in a mess of corporate interlocks and chain banks? You say you found out your chief trustee is with Merrill Lynch "We the People" Pierce, Fenner and Smith and you don't know where to go from there. Is that what's bothering you, comrade?

Well, I've been in the same mess myself. Don't give up on the S.O.B.s because there is a partial solution. Let's break the problem down:

(1) The reason you have chosen the subject is that Tulane has a Board of Administrators which has been perpetuating itself since it started rolling in 1882. Because of this there is no student-teacher control. So in choosing your subject you've made the value judgement that the set-up is a bad one because it's undemocratic. What you want to do is describe the circle of power and show how and why the decisions which come out of it are often bad for the powerless.

(2) You have run up against three major obstacles: (A) While you can discover the identities and business inter-connections of those in the circle of power these in themselves are useless because (B) the decisions are made in closed meetings and (C) you have trouble showing why this particular decision-making structure makes decisions that are bad.

You can't make heads or tails out of the maze of business interlocks because by themselves they do not show anything that matters to the people at Tulane. Your Board Chairman could be Engelfinger (the gold-mining tycoon) himself without it making any particular difference on campus. This is where the secret nature of those closed meetings actually comes to your rescue!

A lot of things can get said at meetings, but what is said is not important unless the folks present are there for the purpose of arriving at conclusions and have the power to impose their conclusions on others. But power cannot be exercised unless the conclusions arrived at are communicated to the people who they are supposed to effect. Unless they are communicated the conclusions are not of interest to us. So the secrecy of the meetings is an advantage because it traps and buries the unimportant conclusions, allowing only the significant ones — the ones with power — to get out.

Conclusions that have power can be communicated to the people they effect in two ways. If you, the radical democratic researcher, are very lucky an especially important conclusion of the powerful will have been announced in the campus newspaper or in some other document to which you have access. But that's not the way smart power structures operate. Since they are undemocratic in a society that is supposed to have only democratic power structures, they make your job as tough as possible by openly announcing only their least important conclusions about what is going to happen to you. This makes you feel good because you have been told something. But the really important conclusions of those in the circle of power are not announced. Things just begin to happen.

What you want to do, then, is to find out somehow or other what is actually happening and then explain why your particular power structure caused that particular happening. Which is where the business connections come in.

Since the members of the Tulane Board of Administrators are businessmen and not students or faculty, their prime loyalties go to their business institutions and to the values and goals which go with them. Yet they run Tulane without having to take into account the values and goals of the students or faculty who mostly have different values and loyalties. The result of this exclusion of students and faculty by a business-oriented university power structure is that business values and goals prevail at the university. You can tell an undemocratic power structure by the people whose views it does not have to consider.

TULANE TYCOON

Let us suppose, for example, that gold-mining tycoon Engelfinger actually is Chairman of the Board of Administrators of Tulane University. Let us suppose, moreover, that in pursuit of its goal of "preparing students for real life" the Tulane Administration requires that all students work part-time in a gold-mine that is located on campus and

managed by the Engelfinger interests.

One sunny day the Dean of Extractive Activities announces that student miners are required to wear white shirts and ties (for men) and skirts (for women) while digging the gold in Engelfinger's mine. The reaction of students is one of instant outrage. The campus editorializes about "the right of each individual to choose the mining attire which is best for him." There are rallies and petitions. When things get to the point where the students proclaim that unless the regulation is rescinded there will be a symbolic one-hour work stoppage in the mine, the Dean of Extractive Activities abolishes the new regulation — admitting that his action "may have been ill-considered." After all, he knows it really isn't so important what the students wear when working in Engelfinger's mine. No point in allowing the whole system to become disrupted because of an unimportant rule. So the unimportant rule was eliminated because the people who were effected by it, and to whom it was announced, reacted in such a way as to make it expedient for the Administration to eliminate it.

THE MISSING LINK

Meanwhile, thousands of miles away, there has been a successful popular revolution in the Union of South Africa. Engelfinger's mines over there are expropriated by the new revolutionary government and the Engelfinger corporation is forced to obtain its gold from other sources in order to make a profit.

At first there is no apparent connection between the expropriation of Engelfinger's mines and anything that's happening on the Tulane campus. But something is happening and it is first noticed by the liberal young members of the Faculty Committee on Student Life.

In a confidential report to the Dean of Extractive Activities they note a sudden decline in the quality of academic work and a rise in the number of students falling asleep in lecture. They correlate the difficulties with the gradually increasing output of the Engelfinger mine on campus. Unable to find any evidence of the installation of labor-saving devices in the mine — and with the number of student miners and the hours they are required to work remaining constant — the confidential report states that the sudden academic laziness must be attributable to fatigue resulting from a steady increase in the intensity of the work which the students are required to do during mining hours. The Dean of Extractive Activities now has something to mull over — and he does so for the remainder of the semester.

At the beginning of the new semester the youngest member of the Faculty Committee on Student Life leaks the conclusions of the report to one of his better students who is a member of the editorial board of the paper. An article appears in which the Dean of Extractive Activities is seen to acknowledge the existence of a report but to have "no comment on its validity until it can be evaluated further." An Editorial denounces the "evasiveness" of the answer. One student group picks up the cry and carries further.

Tulane University SDS has been "looking for an issue" ever since the clothing business died down. Not only that — it had been doing its homework. After reading Jack Minnis' *The Care and Feeding of Power Structures* and working through Jim Jacobs' REP study guide on *Power in America*, four of its members (who were later dubbed "The Empirical Investigation Men" in a feature story in *PLAYBOY*) constituted themselves a research team and engaged in a crash effort to find out what was going on.

Starting with the supposition that there must be some connection between the particular nature of their Administration power structure and what appeared to be a new policy in the campus mine they were (A) able to point to Engelfinger's great power in the administration and to describe in detail how the South African revolution's disruption of his gold mining operation had provided Engelfinger with an interest in stepping up operations in the Tulane mine in order to make up for lost production and (B) that he chose to gradually increase the intensity of work in the mine instead of going to the expense of installing automated devices to boost productivity or risking controversy by announcing an increase in the number of hours students would be required to dig each week. The SDS research-

ers were careful to point out that the decision to proceed in this manner, arrived at in a regular meeting of the Board of Administrators, was never even announced to the students or faculty but merely quietly implemented. Moreover, by assigning its members to take detailed notes on what was happening in the mine they were able to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the policy change was real and not merely the product of the wishful thinking of a bunch of theoreticians dazzled by the beauty of an analytical construct.

After the publication of the SDS report things really began to pop at Tulane. A majority of the Faculty Senate voted in favor of a resolution saying that the speedup in the mine was "incompatible with the academic goals of the university" and that it all would never have happened if faculty were permitted to occupy its rightful place in the council that makes the decisions which run the university.

As for the students, they abolished the Student Government Council and set up the Tulane University Student Miners Union (TUSMU) which, at its constitutional convention, pledged "unending opposition to Engelfinger's attempt to shift to the back of TU
(Continued on page 4)

UICC SIT IN

Dick Schumann
(Trusty financial secretary who has turned reporter — due to lack of sufficient incoming greens to keep him busy.)

University of Illinois Chicago Campus

The SDS chapter at UICC is heading up a committee called "Ad Hoc Student Committee for Free Speech." This committee is supported by Socialist Discussion Club, SNCC, Philosophy Club, Illini Humanists, Historical Society, Excedra Review, Faculty Committee on Civil Rights, and UICC Brothers. The bitch is that the Illinois State Legislature enforces the Clabaugh Act that they passed a long time ago. It states that no speakers who are "Subversive, Seditious, or Un-American," or represent such, will be allowed to speak on campus.

Monday, Feb. 27, at 2:00 P.M., a rally of about 400 people was held at UICC to hear Dr. Aptheker, noted negro historian, speak on "Marxist Interpretation of the Negro Struggle." A UICC spokesman read a statement saying that Dr. Aptheker was not allowed to speak to the student body as a whole because of the Clabaugh Act. Instantaneously a vote was taken by the students to see if they wanted to hear him speak. The vote was unanimously in favor of hearing him speak. He then spoke briefly on the ridiculousness of the restraints on free speech and not being able to speak to the student body. After Dr. Aptheker had finished, Irv Himelblau of SDS, UICC, suggested that a group of students form a committee and ask Chancellor Parker to make a statement about the UICC's position on the Clabaugh Act.

At 3:30 P.M. the same day, a sit-in began on the 27th floor of the Admin. building with about 75 students and continued until 3:30 the following day, with about 25 students staying for the night. The sit-in was then terminated because of the ambiguous statement issued by Chancellor Parker; because of the present bill proposed by Representative Scario, of the State Legislature, to appeal the Clabaugh Act; and because the board of trustees for UI are the only ones with the "Recommended" power to the State Legislature for the repeal of the Clabaugh Act.

SDS has dominated the speakers against the Administration's stand on the Clabaugh Act. SDS is sponsoring Mr. West, Leading theoretician on the CP, Friday, March 3, who will speak on "How Free is Academic Freedom" SDS of UICC says that all but one of the faculty has come out against the Clabaugh Act. The UICC SDS chapter has further said that a number of students are willing to go to jail over any incident that arises with the police over Mr. West making a speech, if any such incident happens.

The Ad Hoc SCFS held a press conference at 6:30 P.M., Tuesday, Feb. 28,

Irv Himelblau then said that the call-off of the sit-in is only a postponement of the past action and/or future action to take place.

Stanford Up-rising

(Continued from page 1)

rect to remain silent for the first part of the speech, while he did our work for us; but at some appropriate time, the audience should have forced him to answer their questions, or at least voiced their disapproval. As one of our members pointed out, it was a disgrace to Stanford that the news media should have been able to claim a warm reception for him in the auditorium, as they did, contrasting it with the wild scene outside.

Our primary problem lay in the manner in which the protest was planned. By leaving the decision-making up to a large, open, hastily got-together ad-hoc committee, instead of a group of people with some political perspective, we made it inevitable that

a "moderate" course of action would be agreed upon. Furthermore, the wide publicity attendant to our plans made it easy for the administration to prepare counter-measures. In contrast, the spontaneous demonstration outside left Humphrey and his SS men flustered (although he later denied that he was visibly shaken); it was not only satisfying for the participants, but produced the proper effect, the one we had been aiming for with the other protest.

3: MORAL

1. Democracy in the present context is impracticable; informed anarchy provided in this case the flexible response required.
2. Invite Humphrey to your campus -- he's one of our most effective organizers!

HUMPTY DUMPTY LEAFLET

HUBERT HUMPHREY, a prime example of "cold war liberalism," comes to Stanford, not for an honest exchange of views between the academic community and the Administration he represents, but rather to continue the barrage of lies and propaganda that are an integral part of this government's war in Vietnam. We must not allow ourselves to be manipulated into thinking that Humphrey is in anyway interested in anything more than the hard sell. Let's not deceive ourselves into thinking that Humphrey's appearance here is anything more than window dressing in the Administration's attempt to make the world think that we, the people, have some meaningful influence on its policies in Vietnam.

HUMPHREY'S RECORD

HUMPHREY'S entire career shows that his support of the war in Vietnam is not accidental. Under a facade of liberalism at home and abroad, he has continually supported the most reactionary cold war policies:

1950 - Humphrey sponsored the Denticion Camp Bill for persons "reasonably suspected of espionage and sabotage," so loosely constructed as to include almost anyone.

1954 - During the height of the McCarthy era, Humphrey never spoke up. Instead he sponsored a bill, the Communist Control Act, which outdid even McCarthy in its witch hunting provisions. This bill was clearly unconstitutional, and has never led to any convictions.

1954 - Five days after the CIA-backed invasion of Guatemala, Humphrey voted to support the invasion.

1957 - Voted to restrict defendant's right to access of FBI files in trials; supported the Mid-East doctrine to "combat communism" in that area.

1953, '54, '55, '56, '59, '61, '62, '63 - voted for over \$2 billion above and beyond budget requests for defense: B-52, B-58 bombers, etc.

1964 - Ran on the Democratic Party platform which prided itself on achieving such things as:

- 200% increase in nuclear megatonnage,
- 800% increase in Special Forces trained in guerrilla warfare,
- 1000% increase in ICBM's and Polaris missiles,
- 1000% increase for development of counter-insurgency weapons.

AS ROBERT SCHEER has pointed out, Vietnam is the liberals' war. It is the logical extension of their commitment to a sterile anti-communism and their inability to understand the nature of the revolutionary pressure in the third world today. Although the liberal identifies rhetorically with these emerging forces, in reality he primarily sees them as threats to U. S. interests. The liberals would prefer to counter these threats by simple U. S. economic penetration. As Humphrey says:

The primary aim of aid should be to build a more stable and interdependent world. Promoting trade serves this purpose -- and at the same time a good deal of American self-interest. The less developed countries are potentially vast markets for American goods and services. Foreign aid has had an increasingly beneficial effect on the American economy. Eighty percent of procurement comes from the U. S.

(The Cause is Mankind.)

Foreign aid is a program in which the actual beneficiaries are U. S. corporations, for nowhere does it meet the needs of the people in those countries. When this policy fails, the military is called in.

Liberals like Humphrey talk about supporting "freedom" and "democracy," but their actions speak louder than their words. U Thant has called the war one of the most barbaric in history. This is the true fruit of American liberalism; in the name of freedom, genocide is practiced.

DENY HUMPHREY A PLATFORM TO PEDDLE

HUBERT HUMPHREY IS A FRAUD - HIS LIBERALISM PHONEY. WE SHOULD NOT ALLOW HIM THE PRIVILEGE OF MAKING FOOLS OF US. LET'S MAKE IT CLEAR TO THE WORLD AND TO THIS GOVERNMENT THAT WE ARE SICK OF LIES. WE SHOULD REFUSE TO LISTEN TO ANY MORE OF THE SAME.

ENGELFINGER

(Continued from page 3)

students a burden thrown off by the people of Southern Africa in a just and legitimate social revolution." They have also sworn to work toward the day when the oppressive mining system, so completely antithetical to our values, favoring free and full development for every individual, shall be ended on campus.

To be sure, there were consequences. Some of TUSMO's leaders were jailed in demonstrations and expelled. TUSMU itself was thrown out of its offices in the Student Organizations Center and its literature banned from campus as the Administration tried to excise from "the university community" that which it couldn't manipulate and control. On the national scene, TUSMU's resolution allegedly "condoning the communist takeover in South Africa" was denounced by the U. S. State Department and by the International Union Department of the AFL-CIO. But THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE WASHINGTON POST, and THE NEW REPUBLIC handled the story sympathetically.

The enlightened men who read those journals were not silent. And through them the American people learned . . .

SIGH! . . . In real life, well, things are not so beautiful. Power structures are often elusive. Incidents and encounters that might build awareness are spread out over many years and do not do so. Newspapers are usually either vindictive or obtuse. And if organizations on campus sometimes do not live up to the roles assigned to them by theory it is only because they are made up of people. SDS members, too, are people and not super-people. It is ridiculous to think that, as people, they will be able to pull off miracles of sophisticated research in one week or in one semester. The most they can do is make an honest attempt to find out not only "Who Owns the University?" but also what they are doing with it, why, and who gets hurt in the process. The prospect of only partial success in our search for answers should not deter us from asking the questions which are morally right and politically useful.

golden Goldberg

(Continued from page 1)

Isn't it possible that a war that can only be fought and won at such a terrible human cost ought not to be fought at all? May I just say very briefly that I don't want to be told that this war is ugly and that all wars are ugly. Some wars are uglier than others, and this one is the ugliest in the history of our country." This won a standing ovation.

Both the "New Middle" line and Walzer's radical argument failed to evoke any significant argument in Goldberg's posture; he reiterated his personal abhorrence of war and the desire of the U. S. for negotiations. But the political significance of the two statements, the fact of opposition, got through to him quite clearly, and he was obviously shaken by both of them.

The problem of the afternoon was a perplexing one: how do you argue against platitudes and generalities that are essentially unfalsifiable? How do you present rational, historical arguments when there is no time to document or explain them fully?

The two successful questions provided some answers. First, it should be remembered that this was not an intellectual confrontation, it was a political one. The day would not necessarily be won by the clearest argument. The political effectiveness of the anti-war arguments, rather than their mere correctness or rationality, should have been the primary consideration. Rational arguments that do not imply or provide a radical critique of the war should have been eliminated. Since there will be some answer to any question, it is most important that the question itself convey an expression of radical opposition to the war.

Second, the political potency of the "New Middle" line was clearly demonstrated. This is the approach of the pipe-smoking, striped tie, three-piece-suit group; it relies not on a critique of the war itself, or any ideological evaluation of the cold war; it is not an argument, but rather a genteel statement of the existence of the credibility gap, of the fact that honest students think the administration is lying. Student leaders are "deep-

ly troubled," they have "doubts." This seems to reach the administration where it hurts. An essential factor of the "New Middle" line is their distinctness, their separation from the left. A more radical and more shrill left opposition could only help the expansion of the "New Middle" and allow it to move to the left; the existence of a strong liberal anti-war movement might prove more effective in ending the war than the radical movement.

The most dangerous aspect of the debate, however, was Goldberg's clear suggestion in this closing statement that this had been an exercise in democracy, the government facing the people, as he put it, "Harvard's town meeting." Because we have met, because the administration has listened to critics, and given them answers, the decision process has been a democratic one, and the bombing can continue. The greatest threat to the left is that their desire to debate, their call for a "town meeting," becomes in the hands of the administration a sanction for the continuation of the war. This was the most important argument to destroy, and in this Harvard failed most completely.

N. C. MAIL BALLOT CANCELLED

Because the ballot request for an N. C. Ballot, which we expected last week, was never received, the mail ballot has been cancelled.

(Continued from page 2)

sentenced to 3 years on the Georgia chain gang.

We in SNCC feel that this case blatantly exemplifies the fact that the courts and governmental officials across the United States are engaged in a conscious conspiracy to "frame-up" and deny justice to all black men and black organizations who dare to stand up and fight for their human rights, and refuse to fight yellow men abroad while black men here remain an oppressed and despised colony within the United States.

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

MARXISM AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS SEMINARS

(see last week's NLN)

Wednesday, April 12 -- Burr A

ASPECTS OF MONOPOLY CAPITAL: COMMENTS ON BARAN AND SWEETZ

Myron Sharpe, Economist, Publisher & Pres. of International Arts & Sciences Press; Editor, *Planning, Profits and Decentralization in the U.S.S.R.*

Commentators: Donald Wheeler, Prof. of Economics, Franconia College. David Levey, Teaching Fellow in Economics, Harvard.

Wednesday, April 26 -- Sever 37

MARXIST-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE: WHAT NEXT?

Harvey Cox, Assoc. Prof. of Church & Society, Harvard Divinity School; author, *The Secular City*.

Commentators: Fr. Oliva Blanchette, S.J., Prof. of Social Ethics, Boston College. Marx Wartofsky, Prof. Philosophy, Boston Univ.

Wednesday, May 3 -- Sever 37

MARXISM AND THE NEW LEFT

Howard Zinn, Prof. of Government, Boston University; author, *SNCC: The New Abolitionists*; *Vietnam: The Logic of Withdrawal*.

Commentators: John Maher, Cambridge Committee for Independent Politics. Julian Houston, former President of Student Government, Boston University. Peter Orris, Harvard S.D.S.

Wednesday, May 17 -- Sever 37

MARXISM AS A WAY OF LIFE

Dirk Struik, Prof. Emeritus of Mathematics, Mass. Inst. of Tech.; author, *Yankee Science in the Making*; editor, *Science and Society, Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*.