

NEW LEFT NOTES

SDS · 1608 W · MADISON · CHICAGO · ILL.

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 21

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

MAY 22, 1967

MISSOURI REPORT

Gordon Burnside

For some time we've been meaning to send NLN a report on our progress out here, but have put it off because (a) we've been too deeply immersed in political work to take time off to write; and (b), taken bit by bit, none of that work seemed earth-shaking enough to expound upon at length. Now the semester is almost over and we must begin to evaluate our activities. And then, on second thought, the accumulation of developments here—simply because this is Missouri and not California—seems significant enough to us to share with NLN readers.

The last time I saw Bill Hartzog we tried to set the growth of Missouri and Kansas student radicalism in some sort of perspective. It was a rather cheering session, simply because that growth has been dramatic. SDS was created here two years ago as a front, more or less, for the local Socialist Party. At that time we—the Socialist organizers—envisioned SDS as being a sweeter pill for liberals to swallow than the Party itself. Nevertheless, SDS, though it did pick up liberal students, did not grow much larger than the Party in vitality and audacity.

Today the University local of the SP has gone the way of the National Party, and SDS (without the benefit of social democratic counsel) has managed to gather in some 200 local members and become the most exciting group in town. Because there is no other radical student organization on the campus, SDS soaks up a bewildering variety of ideologies, styles, and commitments. On the other hand, a very large percentage of our membership is made up of almost apolitical but eager freshmen and sophomores—something rare in the history of radical groups on this campus. The kids tend to be more conservative tactically and strategically than those of us who have been in the movement longer. But I think they learn faster than we did: last week some of us older people went off to make pitch to the AAUP, and while we were gone the kids caucused, denounced elitism in the chapter, and elected their own leaflet-writing committee. There will be a solid SDS here long after the founders have gone.

Actually MU SDS is more a coalition of committees than an organization. We have spawned an anti-war veterans group, a We Won't Go union (with 18 draft-eligible members at present), a theater group, a jug band, and a very young ERAP-type project. For the summer months we plan a free university and intensive anti-war work. (Two of our members have been hired

co spokesmen:

ALLOWED ON LA HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUSES?

Bill Doyle (Local 1021)

Los Angeles teachers gave a new boost to the campaign to put conscientious objection on high school campuses. Women's groups, ministers, lawyers, and parents' groups are already pressuring the L. A. Board of Ed. to tell students the full details of selective service. On May 10 the teachers added their weight to this struggle.

The resolution passed by Local 1021 of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) is disarmingly simple. It requests the Board to provide that, when the schools hold their annual Armed Services Day and invite spokesmen from the various services on campus, they extend a similar invitation to a reputable C. O. spokesman. A democrat might expect that the schools would naturally do this, but they don't. To date only the militarists have been invited to sell their wares, and various principals have turned down parents' requests for C. O. information.

This situation may change soon. Spokesman for many groups will appear before the Board May 15 to urge "equal time"—and equal facilities—for C. O. groups. Now that teachers have joined in, the Board will find it harder to suppress vital facts about the legal rights of students. In New York, Chicago, and other cities where AFT represents all teachers through collective bargaining, the union should be able to support this principle even more forcefully.

ANTIOCH CANCELS

CONVENTION MOVED TO ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN. DATES SAME. A PAINFUL CASE. THE HASTLES IN THE GRASS; OR, Goodby, Tent City, You were a good idea. (Moral: LIBERALS is liberals even in yellow springs, o.)

Neil Buckley
(erstwhile Convention coordinator)

A few weeks after the Administration of Antioch College, not much unlike the more obviously repressive administrations at all other colleges and universities in the country, had given approval to Antioch SDS to host the Convention, the Administration decided that there had been a "misunderstanding" between the involved parties and it was not possible for the college to host the Convention because of "previous commitments to other groups." The Administration tried several other places (the Antioch high school, Central State University of Ohio, etc.) and could not find anyone willing to give us facilities for the Convention. Rather than wait for the Antioch College public relations department to make any more forays into the bureaucracies of academic Ohio, we decided to move the Convention.

When the first indications of bourgeois obfuscation started to come in, we called several campuses in the Midwest to see if they could host the Convention. VOICE in Ann Arbor managed to get the Michigan Administration's approval to host the Convention. Eric Chester from the No. California Regional Office and VOICE members are working to finalize arrangements. The NAC decided to hire Jerry Lustig to work full time with VOICE from 1 June until the Convention is in session. At this time things look fairly settled; yet considering the events of the past month it is impossible to predict what travesty may befall us.

The complications arising from the events of the past few weeks bring to mind several possible alternatives which may prove to be solutions.

First, a committee be established by the Convention

or the NC to prepare arrangements for the next Convention a year in advance. With the full realization that in the past this has been attempted with no success and that long range, one shot movement committees often disband naturally before the long range goal is fulfilled, it seems best that the committee so constituted be responsible to the NO and be responsible to report on progress at each NC preceding the Convention. If we are to continue to use campus facilities for Conventions and NC's, it will be necessary to have solid commitments in hand so administrations can't go back on their promises as they have done in the past.

It is probable that with the increased effectiveness of SDS programs against the University, both as an institution which miseducates and as a provider of military research and military personnel, administrations will refuse to host either conventions or NC's in the future. Thus, while it may become important for us to learn self-sufficiency, as Greg Calvert suggested strongly at the Cambridge NC, it may also become important for us to become independent with regard to facilities for NC's and Conventions. A suggestion has been kicked around the NO for the past several weeks that we purchase some land in the Midwest where we will build sufficient facilities for meetings, housing, food preparation, etc. One suggestion to implement the building program is a "Build, Not Burn" week where all good Movement carpenters would converge on the site and construct the camp. The camp could be made self-supporting from rental fees charged to other student or radical groups who have had similar problems finding facilities for large meetings. This proposal would seem to be the more logical and indeed favorable of the two. (The camp could also serve as a rest home for weary radicals.)

to be Vietnam Summer organizers for Missouri.)

This spring has seen revolts on a number of Missouri campuses, probably poorly reported outside the state. Students at two extremely authoritarian campuses, Lincoln University at Jefferson City (black) and Central Missouri State at Warrensburg (white) rioted and sat in against their administrators in March. MU SDS people helped Lincoln students organize for a while. In early April Jim Black, Vernon Urban, and I were busted here in Columbia for chalking anarchist slogans and Gentle Thursday notices on campus sidewalks. We were given 45 days in jail, later changed to work sentences. Soon after we were released from jail, 30 professors and the Student Government president led a march of 1500 MU students down to the county courthouse, where everyone had a good time writing the Declaration of Independence and other messages on the sidewalk.

At the moment MU SDS is involved in a campaign to turn the Student Union over to student control. This issue was kicked off by our harassment of army and marine recruiters in the union.

It was significant that Black, Urban, and I were given such stiff sentences for a thing like graffiti writing. The judge was very explicit about the political nature of his decision: he offered to let us off if we left town; if we remained, he said, we would eventually "Latin-Americanize" the University. More recently, the judge has been seconded by a group of "moderate" student leaders, who have developed their own conspiracy theory of SDS, supporting it with mimeographed copies of Carl Davidson's student syndicalism paper. We have, in fact, made student syndicalism and student power real issues on the campus. Even our Gentle Thursday (actually Tuesday, April 18) became politicized when hundreds of students let go of their balloons and marched on the admin building chanting "Student Power!"

MU is not yet the University of Caracas, but every day more and more students are being forced to talk politics, and more important, about a politics they barely knew existed: their own. We are not yet able to predict how deeply we will be able to plant radicalism in MU students. But those of us who have been here for some time agree that what's happening now is very pleasantly unlike the old YPSL.

vietnam work-in

RASCISM, THE WAR AND THE WORKING CLASS

Where do we go from here? That's what is bothering many of us. By now most of us can see that the government is not motivated by popularity polls. Clearly, normal strategy and tactics are insufficient to deter a government bent on conquest.

Yet the Movement remains narrow and isolated. Anti-war and radical students, we busy ourselves "broadening" our following, but restrict ourselves, efforts and our planning almost by instinct to people like ourselves—ignoring the coldest fact of political life: isolation. Seventy million — who work for wages — stand aside: for them the Movement is as far away as Vietnam and for most, as fearsome. Yet these are the people with the power to end this war.

WHY THE WORKING CLASS?

Great dangers, but also great opportunities confront the Movement and Americans generally this summer. Workers, especially industrial and transportation, are the decisive sector. Further, the conscious pitting of black against white workers by the ruling class in an attempt to crush the militant opposition of black people to this war, its draft and oppressive ghetto conditions in a sea of blood must be combatted.

Sold out and silenced for years by labor bureaucrats, workers are rebelling. Militant strikes in war industries such as GE and Olin Mathieson and wildcats in Auto and Steel are concrete manifestations of this undercurrent. In fact workers, with their strike votes and picket lines, are demonstrating their lack of enthusiasm with this war. Job conditions and pay come first! With increased direct government intervention against workers, Johnson and Co. are afraid that workers will begin to oppose the unpopular war which workers sacrifice for with increasing opposition at home. In fact, the conditions exist for workers to draw the political lesson that in fact the government works for the bosses at their ex-

(Continued on p. 8)

U. S. CAPITALISM — PROSPERITY OR CRISIS ?

(Draft of a paper to be presented at the SDS Convention in June: Bob Schwartz -- BU SDS, Boston PLP; Ted Bayne -- Boston PLP, Cambridge Vote on Vietnam Group; Jared Israel -- Harvard SDS, Boston PLP)

I. INTRODUCTION

SDS has become a strong and radical influence on several hundred American campuses. Many SDSers are now wondering how the movement should relate to the off-campus world—whom we should try to organize, to ally with; and of course what we should say to them, what we should ask them to do.

It is crucial for SDS to build and expand its on-campus activities, to organize students against the ways capitalism oppresses them. At the same time (and the first goal must not be allowed to contradict this) we must organize students to undertake the difficult job of allying with working people, the people who, far more than we, are exploited and oppressed. The Vietnam war is the clearest and sharpest attack which the system is presently making on the needs and interests (in fact, the lives) of American workers and students. We have to respond to that attack by organizing an alliance between the student anti-war movement and the working class against that war. Such a worker-student alliance will be an important step in the process of radicalizing the American working class, the class with the power to overthrow capitalism and establish a socialist America.

The undisputable fact of post-war prosperity has had a debilitating effect on American radical thought. There is now a widespread notion among radicals that: 1) The economy has overcome the hangups that brought on depressions in 1929 and earlier and has now entered a stage of Permanent Prosperity; 2) The so-called traditional working class can therefore no longer be expected to act as a force for revolutionary change—at least it can't be the leading force.

The Praxis group in New York has to a certain extent systematized these views and is now putting them forward to SDS. As we see it, these ideas are based on misestimates and lead to conclusions which could be harmful to the movement. We will consider them here, therefore, and in answering them, put forward some ideas of our own.

The Praxis people argue that the reason for this alleged Permanent Prosperity is Keynesianism. That is, the ruling class has learned to rely "on the public sector which can stabilize and counteract market fluctuations." (1) The future will be smoother-going still with the increasing use of "economic planning, rationalization, equalization of income, full employment practice..." (2) These devices will ensure capitalism a "continued ability to expand". (3) In this way the capitalists will, the argument goes, prevent deterioration in the conditions of U. S. workers and thereby destroy the material basis of revolutionary change.

Praxis feels that as this cornucopia capitalism continues to modernize, a "new working class" will become numerically dominant. This "new class" will step into the void left by the "traditional" working class, which "has failed to deliver the revolutionary blow". (4) This "new class", composed of professionals, technicians, teachers, and highly skilled production workers, will be revolutionary despite the prosperity. For, according to the Praxis group, the members of this "new working class" have "new contradictions"; they are discontented due to the contrast between their educated backgrounds which open up "creative avenues of expression in work" and their jobs, which are dull, regimented to the boss's needs, without creative content. The task of radicals, in this view, is to develop programs which capitalize on the new working class's boredom and malaise. (5)

We have a different view. We don't feel that this government, that this system has solved or for that matter can solve the problems it has created and continues to create. It cannot provide a decent life for Americans. It is becoming more and more the world-enemy of working people. Instead of looking to "new" elites, fashioned together sloppily as a "class" to somehow alter Imperialism, we are for organizing the bulk of the population, people without a "creative" education but who are oppressed and exploited by this system. We will discuss all this later. Praxis bases its various ideas on a view of stabilized capitalism, on a notion of Permanent and ever-expanding Prosperity. Has the system solved all its economic problems, actually?

not as fast as at other times (cf. Kolko). Real spendable weekly earnings of manufacturing production workers rose from \$67.93 in 1945 to \$87.88 in 1966 (constant 1957-1959 dollars). (6) Unemployment (official) never went above 5 million, compared with 10 and 12 million in the depression years. (7)

For the capitalists things have been good. Profits after taxes rose from \$14.8 billion in 1945 to \$40 billion in 1965 (constant 1957-1959 dollars). (8) American investments went overseas and found ready access to raw materials, plantation export crops, and cheap labor. Total private investments abroad went up 5 times to \$75 billion. (9)

However, capitalism has not been tamed. The Praxis people base their estimate of capitalism on its face value, its superficial appearance. They therefore fail to discover the very real and growing contradictions in the American economy.

How Capitalism Works

Before World War I, the U. S. economy had basically one sector—the private sector. That sector is still around, although, as we shall see later, it is no longer alone. Let's consider how it functions.

The private capitalist takes money, hires labor, and sells the commodities thereby produced, aiming to end up with more money than he started with. Where do these profits come from? Why is the value of a car greater than the value of the steel, chrome, etc. in it? What has been added is labor—the time, effort, and skill of the men who made the commodity. These workers are paid a wage—but that wage represents only part, not all of the value they have added to the raw materials to make the commodity. The capitalist's profit comes from the value which is not returned to the workers.

Now what do the capitalists do with these profits? From observation we know that capitalists are in fact never satisfied and always want more. This is not just an ugly whim on their parts. Aside from greed, competition drives them to make more money, to out-do, and not be replaced or absorbed by competitors. Therefore capitalists take those profits and (having deducted a small amount for their own subsistence) do three things:

- 1) They introduce new types of machinery and plant facilities into existing operations in order to lower costs.
- 2) They buy more of the existing types of machinery and buildings in order to raise output and sell more.
- 3) They invest in new enterprises abroad to reap the higher profits obtainable overseas.

The problem is that it gets harder and harder to make new profits. Profits come from labor, that is from the difference between the value produced by the work force and the cost of feeding, housing, and educating that force. But as capitalism progresses, labor is displaced more and more by machines. Those machines don't add new value. In fact, as anyone can see, when a capitalist mechanizes an operation, the value of the commodity declines. Only labor produces profits, and the displacement of labor by machines means that relative to total investment, profits must fall.

That is what Marx understood and called the Law of the Falling Rate of Profit. It is what Keynes sensed and called the Declining Marginal Efficiency of Capital.

Does this process actually function? It does. It is impossible to calculate the direct rate of profit accurately. However there is one statistic which directly reflects what is happening to profits. That is the rate of capital accumulation, the rate of accumulation of the machines, etc. which the capitalist buys with his profits. A fall in the rate of profit would therefore immediately be reflected in this growth. Simon Kuznet's figures show the following drop in the rate of growth of business capital per year: (10)

1869-1879:	3.9%	1909-1919:	2.8%
1879-1889:	4.8%	1919-1929:	2.2%
1889-1899:	4.5%	1929-1939:	-0.4%
1899-1909:	3.9%		

After 1889 the rate dropped every decade through 1939! In the 1930s, the lack of investment demand, due to low profit rates, was so severe that over 12 million men were unemployed in 1933, at a time when over 50,000 businessmen were going bankrupt. (11)

Everyone knows about the depression. But that was 30 years ago, say many radicals. Now capitalism has solved those problems, runs the argument? But has it? Let's see how well modern capitalism has gotten over the dangerous disease of too little profit.

The Current Situation

Profits continue to be made in post-World War II capitalism. But the key thing is that these profits are

small in relation to total capital assets. The amount of profits in 1965 was \$74.7 billion before taxes. But the amount of capital invested in existing machines and buildings was \$342 billion. In 1950 profits were \$42.6 billion before taxes compared to capital assets of \$100.2 billion. (12)

There is an obvious and growing disparity between the amount of profits and the value of invested capital. Profits are shrinking in relation to assets.

This is very important. It means that it is becoming increasingly difficult for owners to make productivity increases big enough to significantly enlarge their profits. To really modernize the steel industry, for example, that is to replace all the equipment and build new factories, would cost many billions. Profits are not large enough. This means that fully automated industries are a myth. "...No fully automated process exists for any major product in any industry in the U. S. ...Nor is any in prospect for the immediate future," says George Terborgh in his book, *Automation Hysteria* (1966).

Because of the relatively little profit they have on hand, American capitalists usually modernize by introducing inexpensive scientific innovations or by streamlining existing plant and equipment. This way of increasing productivity, this form of modernizing takes little investment. Using this method they have achieved gains in productivity—but these gains have been small. No other capitalist country has done worse since World War II, except decrepit and tottering Britain. (13)

So the capitalists are stuck. They have some profits. They want to use them to increase productivity and make bigger profits. But they don't have enough profits to really modernize. That means the first method of making more profit is not very useful to them.

What about the second method—increasing old facilities to get more output? It's not of much use either. A dollar invested in America yields a smaller increase in output—18¢ worth per year—than is the case in any other industrial nation. (14) America is already overbuilt with a productive plant which chronically functions around 20% below capacity. (15) Profits on new sales are small and falling. Between 1948 and 1964, sales of the largest 177 firms went up over \$100 billion, but after-tax profits rose only \$5.2 billion. (16)

The chronic situation since the depression has been that the system produces profits (at home) which are too small to be profitably invested. Let us call such profits "fat". The failure to use these profits can only mean falling investments, and unemployment.

Think of it in terms of the following analogy, in which men symbolize corporate profits. (1) There is a piece of land which produces enough food to feed 10 men—but there are in fact 15 of you. In order to increase the land's output you have to irrigate it. But it takes 20 men to work the land and run the irrigation system simultaneously. Bad situation—too many men, but too few men. 10 men can stay on the land, 2 or 3 others might also stay, trying to make minor innovations to get a little more output. But the last two (the "fat" in this situation) must starve unless some way is found whereby they can get food.

What about sending the investment "fat" abroad? This won't solve the problem of U. S. unemployment, but it will help the capitalists. And investments abroad have certainly been a key outlet for "fat"—U. S. investments in foreign countries increased five times since World War II. But—and we shall go into this later—there are limits on such investments as well. These limits are the political and economic difficulties

(Continued on p. 5)

NEW LEFT NOTES

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 W. Madison St., Chicago, Ill. 60612, except July and August, when publication is bi-weekly. Phone (312) 666-3874. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Illinois. Subscriptions: \$1 a year for members, \$10 a year for non-members. Signed articles 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; Greg Calvert, national secretary
National Office: 1608 W. Madison St., Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612, (312) 666-3874
New York City: 49 W. 27th St., New York, N. Y. 10001, (212) 889-5793
Niagara Regional Coordinating Committee: PO Box 57-31, River Campus Station, Rochester, N. Y.
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif., (415) 362-7922
Southern California: PO Box 85396, Los Angeles, Calif.
New England: 39 Lee St., Apt. 3A, Cambridge, Mass.

VOL. 2, NO. 21 let the people decide MAY 22, 1967

A CRITIQUE OF RADICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE CAMPUS

(a position paper discussed at the April NC Educational Conference: written by Paul Potter and Hal Benenson on the basis of discussions in the group that planned the Conference; revised for New Left Notes publication by Sarah Eisenstein)

Improbable as it seemed only a few years ago, we can say today that there is a radical movement on the campus, relevant to the consciousness of significant groups of people and capable of injecting itself into the politics of a number of situations. Because it has become possible to take for granted the existence of a movement of some sort, we think it is especially important now to begin developing an analysis of the movement, where it is, where it is going or drifting, what its most pressing problems are and how we should think about directing or changing it. We are looking for a general perspective, a set of criteria that can be used to evaluate growth and develop goals and direction.

Perhaps our single most important worry is that the movement is failing to generate the kind of political life that will change the people in it in ways sufficiently compelling to build and sustain a base for radical social change.

So what does it mean to say that we don't think the movement is very radical? Its analysis is radical and obviously the sharing of that analysis by more and more people must have an impact on the course of politics in this country. What we want to argue is that despite radical rhetoric there is very little comprehension of what the words we sling around mean either as descriptions of the society or as prescriptions for action. This is dangerous for a number of reasons: first, because it makes the words the left uses tiresome and hollow and turns people off in and outside the movement; second, and as a corollary of this, it adds to the sense that the movement is a highly stylized reaction to American society without serious significance; third, and most important, it confuses and contorts attempts to develop insight into the way the country operates; fourth, it creates a false sense of accomplishment and strength which in turn compounds despair when the real weaknesses of the organizations we build are revealed through time or significant confrontations with power.

Our point is that there is a lot of radical hip-talk that lets people know we think the system stinks but can't explain why we think that or what we want to do about it; and that behind the militant posture of many campus movements one often finds a liberal analysis and moderate programs.

For example, although many students now consider America to be an 'imperialist' power, few seem to have any rigorous or precise idea of what they mean by that. One gets the distinct feeling that for most, imperialism means that the United States does pretty ugly and objectionable things to other people. But there is little sense of how or whether those ugly things are related to the structure or nature of the American economic system.

Although people call American society undemocratic and corporate dominated, they still maintain heavy commitments to the parliamentary democratic structure. This leads to a deeply liberal involvement in the numbers game, based on the assumption that numbers of adherents can be roughly equated with power, that getting a majority of people to vote for something creates a force for change. How and where do corporate institutions dominate? What has happened to radical parties that committed themselves to electoral power rather than other forms such as strikes and social dislocation?

Although we talk about the need for change and the development of a radical movement in this country, many of us are as deeply cynical about the possibility of real change as the next guy.

Everybody accepts the fact that there is widespread poverty in the country, but most radicals are convinced that the United States has the power to abolish poverty and eventually will without changing.

On a more personal, self-conscious level it is generally claimed that student radicals today represent a qualitatively new kind of radicalism that is post-depression and that has not been fed as our parents' was on economic and status insecurity. There is presumably a freedom that comes from the weakening of those two sanctions that allows us to stand aside from the materialism of society and begin to form an independent position in relation to it. There is some truth in this claim, but in fact most students hold a kind of dogged, career-oriented conception of their lives which would fully satisfy their parents. In spite of their reduced anxiety about status and economic insecurity, they are deeply committed to the life style and trajectory expected in the positions prepared for them in the system.

What we are saying is that the attitudes and perceptions generated by the American system are extremely deep and pervasive, shaping even the analysis and politics of the most radically disaffected. Presumably the primary purpose of a radical politics is to pry people loose from that complex of ideas and give them at least the conceptual distance to combat it. Jargonized, unexamined rhetoric cannot do that; and at its worst it may conceal and make dangerously palatable an analysis basically consistent with the assumptions of American liberalism. The slogans we use acutely heighten our sense of radical alienation, but the failure of those slogans to specify any content also heightens our sense of desperation and impotence and leads rather directly to withdrawal into privatism and stylized sub-cultures and communities or into apocalyptic politics.

We need a way out of this syndrome of attitudes and political misconceptions. We need to develop what we will call here a radical political perspective that can be counterposed to the highly stylized, radically disaffected, yet basically liberal politics that characterize the movement today.

We are not going to suggest that such a perspective will be developed by reading Marx or carefully deciphering Praxis each month—although people should read Marx and someone should decipher Praxis. On the contrary, what really flows from what we've been saying is the need to develop perspective around problems and political issues that engage us, and to approach the notion of perspective with the idea that what must be done is to cut down the distance between our political sentiments and what we actually do. We must still deal with Mills' injunction to link personal troubles to public issues, else we will continue to feel that our politics are irrelevant.

A CRITICAL RADICAL PERSPECTIVE

Perhaps the best way to describe what we think a critical radical perspective is like is by discussing the current concern with student power. We would like to point out, though, that our experience is with a limited number of chapter situations which may not be completely typical. The problems we will discuss are, however, in many ways symptomatic of the general difficulties confronting the student movement.

One obvious goal of student power activity is that it provides a way for larger numbers of students to become involved in SDS programs and identify with its aims. One justification, then, for student power is that the idea is popular and can be used to bring people into a radical organization which in turn will begin to change them in other ways. Unfortunately, most SDS chapters do not provide the atmosphere of experience which would make that possible. Only a handful of people in the chapter are actively or deeply involved; membership meetings are tedious and tendentious, except occasionally during times of crisis when a certain emotional unity is created; the mortality rate of participation between the first and the third meetings of the year runs to seventy or eighty percent; the kind of work that new people are most frequently asked to do is bureaucratic shit-work that by its nature requires no thought and creates no commitments; some of these people remain active in the chapter over a period of time, but never advance to more demanding roles, thus strengthening the popular elitist myth among chapter leaders that many people don't enjoy making decisions; this in turn stands as a partial explanation of why the chapter is so small and responsibility for the chapter shouldered by so few.

In addition, the kinds of demands raised under the slogan of student power seem largely to be formalistic ones, often centering around narrowly defined and often privileged concerns of students—things like social rules, greater say in determination of course selection (fewer requirements) and perhaps some reduction of the competitive pressure of the university (pass/fail). There is little conception of an alternative content for education.

But the real dangers of the dominance of the style of political activity we have been describing lie not so much in its immediate results, which in many cases have been impressive, but in the fact that a narrowly defined politics of confrontation leads fairly directly to student radicals thinking of themselves as the select few, of the campus as the only base for radicalism, and of making headlines and provoking confrontations as the only important way to build a movement. Consider the slogan 'student power'. It comes from the Southern ghetto derivative, Black power. However, there are some crucial differences: first, it is critical, as most of us have reluctantly come to understand, for separatism to develop politically and ideologically in the Black Community. The problem of transferring the slogan to students is that it is critical that

separatism not develop to any significant extent among students. There are reasons for this. Despite the genuinely victimized and degraded status of students, it must be understood that we represent a privileged class; Negroes do not. The kinds of demands that students are raising, that they have more influence over the corporate decision-making entities that control their lives, is a reasonable demand for people who are going to be the technical and professional elites in the society to make. We fear that increasing concentration on the interests of students as students may develop a defensiveness that can be used to pit potential allies against each other and to pervert the goals of the student movement. At one university an effective strike protesting large classes was separated from strong faculty support when the president of the university insisted that he was totally sympathetic to the students' demands and would work with them to get the lazy faculty of the university to teach more courses, thus allowing the reduction of class size. The students bought it.

How will the generation of student radicals that emerges from the campus in coming years be prepared for the slow, difficult tasks of organizing, sustaining and educating a radical movement in middle class and lower class communities, in unions, on the job among fellow white-collar or professional workers, or even on the campus? The most urgent issues we face concern what we will do with our lives and what kinds of lives those will be; where we will go to live and work and what kinds of communities of radicals and political insurgents we can hope to build. The point is not that the university is peripheral to the long-range problem—the campus will be one of the most important of these communities; it is, however, that much of what radicals do on campuses now is irrelevant, often destructive, to the possibility of developing that perspective.

There are a number of ways to suggest what this perspective consists of, and we want to suggest several of them. First, we are talking about a reflective, thoughtful, critical attitude toward the work that is done in a chapter. There is an important need that we understand the limits of the work we are involved in, what a particular approach can and cannot do. Thus, for example, a student power controversy over social rules aimed at getting participation from large numbers of students can lead to some specific confrontation and concessions from the administration, can develop some popular support for an SDS chapter, and can lead to some discussion about why people should have control over the decisions that affect their lives. It cannot, however, engage people in dealing with a broadly significant social and political problem; it is not likely to educate people about the way corporate power operates throughout the social structure. Although it may lead people to identify with other 'exploited' people, it cannot give people a very profound sense of what their needs are, and it cannot lead people out of a narrow absorption with themselves into any direct contact with people who can't go to universities. It is conceivable that given these kinds of limits, people will still want to deal with social rules; the point is the limits should be understood and appreciated.

Similarly, people ought to have some sense of where their work leads. Most of us are guilty of thinking much too schematically about such problems. We may reason that once the campus is up in arms about social rules and the injustice of that system, it will be easier to introduce other issues, say curriculum revision. The abstract connection between the two may be spelled out in some detail, but other logic is most frequently ignored. For example, one alternative is that after a sharp, cathartic conflict with the administration over one issue, most students will be content to return to their books for the rest of the year. Another involves the problem of why you weren't able to attack the curriculum in the first place—that students feel incompetent to challenge what they are taught and consider that problem the legitimate domain of their professors.

Again, there is a need to be clear in our thinking about how experience around a particular activity or with an SDS chapter engages or radicalizes people. If the experience of most people in an SDS chapter is not important or challenging, what would make it that way? What would allow them to think strategically and plan and prepare and carry out certain programs? How could you make the SDS chapter the kind of group that people could draw real support from, and what would real support be like? What brings people to SDS in the first place anyway, and why is it that so few stay?

An example of a difficulty most chapters face in this regard is the widespread inability to establish concrete objectives and meaningful programs around an issue like the war.

(Continued on p. 4)

CRITIQUE of CAMPUS PERSPECTIVES

(Continued from p. 3)

One of the shortcomings of the national organization is that it has not developed this kind of debate. But if there is some excuse for a failure at the local level in dealing with the question of whether or not the war can be ended, there is no reason why chapters cannot develop concrete political goals and objectives about the university. Both by virtue of personal experience as well as the availability of a good deal of writing, it should be within the grasp of most chapters to consider what, if anything, is worth setting out to accomplish in the university. Can students control the thing—or transform it? What specific features of the university are most objectionable, and do they hang together, or would it be possible to chip away at some of them? Out of such questioning and analysis comes a conception of the limits of what you can expect to do and what is worth doing.

However, it is important to understand that the current stage of the movement in fact represents what we view as a third phase in its development. The first was most dramatically characterized by the outbreak of moral protest through the sit-ins, the San Francisco demonstrations against HUAC, the vigils in California against the execution of Caryl Chessman, and the development of an anti-nuclear-testing movement. The moral protest of the early sixties represented in many ways a rather non-political set of acts of confrontation with injustice in this society.

The success of this activity in exposing real sources of social need, coupled with its ineffectiveness in building powerful movements that could cope with those movements once exposed, led to a second phase of community and political organizing efforts which led many of the people who had been most involved in building moral protest movements off the campus and into self-conscious political roles. In SDS this move was represented by the community organizers who went into the ghetto with ERAP in 1964-65. Political discussion in SDS had led to the analysis that students or intellectuals alone could not bring social change; that the sources of radical discontent in American society were widespread and not just confined to university life; that the student radicals had to relate themselves to the day-to-day struggles of other groups on the basis of long-term commitments.

Because of the escalation of the war in Vietnam, the fantastic growth in the size of SDS on campuses, and then Black Power, and the real failure of community movements to maintain effective links with the campus, SDS entered a new phase with late '65-early '66 as the turning point. Emphasis was shifted back to the campus as local anti-war and student power struggles got underway. In part, these developments have added a new depth to the radical movement. The beginnings of an analysis of the role of large corporations and the state in stifling radical change at home and abroad has been articulated. Students have started to relate their problems to the structure of power and interests which mold educational institutions and upper-middle-class roles in America. But the shift back to the campus has also meant for many a turning away from the large questions of how we intend to organize a broad movement for radical change, and an increasing perplexity about what a radical commitment can mean after college.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

It is critical at this point first to open students up through their experience with SDS to the notion that there are ways for them to remain active radicals beyond college and challenge them to examine their own career orientations in this light. Second, it is important to establish links between radicals in different places in the society not only to broaden and reinforce the base of the movement, but also to assure that different radical constituencies do not become so isolated from one another that they can be played off against one another. Thus, for example, linking radical teachers with radical parents, students, and organizers in a community movement to take power over a neighborhood not only implies a stronger movement but also helps to prevent the sort of situation in which teachers interpret their interests narrowly and 'professionally', one example of this being the spectacle of the presumably radical New York teachers unions opposing the parents' moves for control in PS 201. One of the most effective structural inhibitions against the development of a broad radical movement in this country is the kind of occupational as well as class fragmentation that leads people to view their interests conservatively and in isolation.

An example of a specific chapter program that seeks to develop long-range perspective and to break down the isolation of student radicals is the Boston labor committee. The committee was set up about a year and

a half ago by individual students from different chapters who wanted to get involved in working with unions. Now the committee—composed mainly of Harvard-Radcliffe students and some students from Boston University and Boston College—is engaged in aiding an organizing drive among hospital workers. Activities range from handing out leaflets early in the morning at entrances to the hospitals, making home visits or attending night meetings of the various hospital organizing committees, to writing leaflets, printing up union cards, putting out the union newspaper and running a political education film series. About twenty to twenty-five people are active on a steady basis. About six or seven people have been working with it for over a year.

Labor committee discussions usually center around specific problems of organizing, plans for the next week's leafletings and meetings, and general discussions which take off from someone telling how he handled a specific problem or reacted to some incident. The meetings are held every Sunday evening, although the four or five people assigned to one particular hospital will usually get together more often. Meetings are always open to people who want to find out what is going on but who don't have the time to get active. Since February, more and more meeting time has been devoted to discussions of general issues rather than to the specifics of writing leaflets, tactics of organizing etc. This has been stimulated in part by the need to develop an intensive commitment to sticking out the frustrations of organizing and a sense of responsibility to the hospital workers who risk loss of their jobs. The barriers to the commitment and sense of responsibility have been not so much inexperience or lack of organizing skills, as inability to see why one should get involved at all and little sense of what the program saw as its long-range objectives.

NOTICE!
CONVENTION MOVED FROM
ANTIOCH TO U. MICHIGAN
DATES UNCHANGED

The general discussions deal with the four problems raised by our off-campus focus. First of all, we are in the process of clarifying our ideas on the kinds of ties that can and should be built between student and workingclass movements. These discussions proceed from a rough analysis of the political reasons for organizing among non-student constituencies, and specifically for organizing workers into trade unions. They also dwell upon the awareness we've developed of our personal political histories, and of the concerns and experiences which first motivated us to get involved in the labor committee.

Secondly, we are trying to relate our work with the labor committee to what we will be doing after college. Thirdly, we are discussing a strategy of organizing radical unions or caucuses in unions organized around radical demands. Finally, we are constantly seeking means to involve the campus chapters in the discussions of our work in the union and where we see that to be heading. At Harvard, for instance, we held a general membership meeting of the chapter which was attended by over a hundred people, showed a movie about the hospital worker strike in New York, and then led a discussion on our own perspectives on organizing.

The most exciting part of the discussions has been the attempt to find out what is common to both our own perception of what's wrong with American society, and the way the hospital workers see their demands for changes, their conflict with their bosses, and the act of fighting together to win their rights. We are feeling out a mutual basis for developing a radical outlook and commitment. This process in turn forces the students to re-evaluate their own motivations as radicals, and leads naturally into discussions of what kinds of jobs and life-situations will be most meaningful given our basic concerns and needs. To broaden our knowledge and the scope of our discussions, we have tried getting people to read and discuss books—on labor history, and on current issues—like industrial working conditions, labor insurgencies, automation, and workingclass attitudes toward work and mobility etc.

These discussions have just begun. But they demonstrate the possibilities for probing long-range personal and political problems, and for grappling with the slogans that we like to throw around—like building a broad-based 'multi-issue', fighting for 'radical democratic unionism and workers' control', developing 'radical commitment' and 'cadres of organizers'.

There is a certain substance to most of the slogans. But the substance is real only when the limitations of the simple formulas are understood on the basis of practical experience and discussion.

The example of the Boston labor committee may be of little use, particularly as a model, to people from different areas. But there are other examples of efforts in similar directions from other types of organizing work.

RADICAL CAREERS?

Certainly one of the things that has prevented campus politics from developing more responsively to the needs of a long-range movement has been the apparent paucity of radical roles or radical careers for people who leave the university. For a while, the mystique of community organizing created the sense for many people that unless they could see themselves spending their lives as organizers in poor communities, living at or below subsistence, and severing all ties with the system, they were doomed to be ineffectual politically. As with campus radicals who insist on separating themselves from other less "committed" people, the invidious distinction between community organizers and other SDS people was destructive to the potential for building a movement.

Talk about radical careers and developing an adult SDS continued to be frustrating as late as last summer. But in the last few months, the fruition of a lot of seed work has begun to appear. Thus for example, a group of radical teachers, most of them young, has been meeting in Boston for the last several months. The group seems to have been successful on a couple of important levels. First, it has done a great deal to combat the sense of isolation that usually overcomes young teachers who are serious about being good teachers and using the classroom to raise important questions with their students. Second, it has been able to develop a number of ideas about how radical teachers could be effective politically, ranging from infiltrating a particular school in order to create a presence there and work with community movements, to finding ways to resist the narrow professionalism of the teachers union, to setting up counter-curricular courses for education students that will recruit and channel more people into their program.

Similar approaches are being tried with other groups, including radical faculty, seminary students, social workers, chaplains etc. In each case, there are similar problems and goals, overcoming isolation, attempting to create a radical political community that has a perspective on what can be done within the limits of a particular situation, creating links between groups, and helping people find and examine satisfactory political roles for themselves.

At the same time, after years of talk, a national conference on radicals in the professions has been organized, and a general meeting for adult radicals has been called for this summer. One of the things that seems exciting about much of this work is that it promises in most cases to feed quite naturally back into campus radical communities.

In the end most of us are likely to end up in middle-class jobs. Moreover, the most effective organizers of the poor and the workingclass will be the poor and the workingclass themselves. Nonetheless, there are things in our middle-class, radical perspective that are important to share, ways of looking at things that are critical to the development of a movement.

WHERE DOES IT LEAD?

We have tried to sketch the historical background to the present phase of New Left activism. Out of a sense of what the shift of focus back to the campus has meant, and why it happened, it is possible to re-evaluate the significance of much of the work that is done in SDS chapters. The questions it is important to ask about any particular chapter activity are: 1) Where does it lead? What long-range prospects does it offer for challenging the uses of power around key issues? How will it create links between different groups on the basis of common radical objectives? How does it articulate concrete radical analyses of the causes of major social problems? 2) What are its limits? What issues does the activity fail to deal with? What are the limits on the kind of gains the tactics chosen can hope to achieve? 3) What does it do for the people involved? How does the experience of activism call into question liberal attitudes? How does it generate long-range perspectives on personal commitment and career-orientations? How does it stimulate strategic thinking about political objectives?

But most important, what we can hope to bring out of experience in a non-middle-class world is a greater sense of the needs and demands of other groups, a clearer idea of how they may fit together, of what common bases there are to the dissatisfactions and

(Continued on p. 5)

PROSPERITY OR CRISIS?

(Continued from p. 2)

which block overseas investments, which mean they can't reap big enough returns to solve forever the problem of insufficient profits at home.

What should the capitalists do? They can't just sit there and do nothing.

Enter: The Government

The capitalists' answer has been Keynesianism—government spending. The government taxes or borrows the "fat" and employs men the private sector can't. It thereby creates a public sector. That sector produces goods which do not compete with the private sector, which are not sold on the open market. Since World War II, the government has scooped up an increasing part of the private sector's profits (Keynes' "savings") and provided employment for millions of men, thus avoiding a crisis.

We must be clear on one thing. Government spending is not, as Baran and Sweezy maintain, "in addition to, not a subtraction from private surplus". (17) On the contrary, taxation and borrowing come directly from the profits of the private sector. The deductions are spread over the whole capitalist class (taxation) and over time as well (deficit spending). Nevertheless, they do reduce available profits in the private sector.

This may not hurt that sector at first. Ultimately it is fatal.

Since government spending comes from the private sector, that spending grows only when sufficient "fat" profits are produced in the private sector.

This is the kicker. The private sector in America is having increasing difficulty producing the "fat" necessary to feed the expanding government sector. Why?

Increases in productivity achieved by rearranging old equipment or by introducing scientific innovations have their limit. One can go only so far patching an ancient plant, and:

In 1963 the U. S. reached the position of operating the oldest stock of metal working machinery of any industrialized country in the world. In that year 64% of American machine tools were 10 years old. (Seymour Melman, *Our Depleted Society*, p. 50)

And productivity increases are beginning to decelerate: slower in 1956-64 than in 1947-55. (18) This is certain to continue. At the same time, due mainly to the Imperialist wars this system is fighting, government spending has continued and must continue to leap ahead of the private sector's ability to support that government.

These strains, these contradictions are the flaws in the Keynes-Praxis notion of Permanent Prosperity. The system is to be saved by government spending. But when that spending swells beyond the private sector's ability to pay with the "fat" which is increasingly difficult to come by, the spending begins to strangle that sector. Then military spending means decreasing private production instead of increasing employment. The only way to get out of this is for the government sector to stop growing.

But the government sector can't stop growing. We listed earlier the three main ways capitalists can increase their profits. We discovered real problems with the first two ways. The third way, the only way left open, consists of investing more and more profits overseas. Since they desperately need these profits, the capitalists must gamble on increasing military action in the (in fact, vain) hope of getting hold of the world. This can only lead to more unemployment, bankruptcies, and a tighter squeeze on workers. And the people of the world have the strength to fight U. S. Imperialism and ultimately to swallow it up.

Evidence for this argument for the deadly character of too much government spending? In World War II, the government was taking "roughly half of the national product. Under these conditions, however, the rate of investment was 2.9% of the G.N.P.—a rate below that of the depression years." (19) That didn't kill the private sector, but only paralyzed it for awhile. But the Imperialists can't win this war against the oppressed peoples of three continents in a few short years. They also cannot afford to give up.

Today local, state, and federal government takes 29% of the private sector's net income to pay its mammoth \$212 billion expenses. (20) The percentage has been growing since 1948. The effects of this squeeze on the wages of U. S. workers are already beginning to be felt. (See Section V.) What will happen when the percentage goes to 35%, 45%...?

Some capitalists see through the Keynesian rhetoric. They sense what is happening. So do some bourgeois economists. For example, Dr. Elsie Waters of the Tax Foundation in New York says that "at some point taxes would reach a level which would have a disastrous effect on operations of the private sector of the economy. There are different shades of opinion

among experts as to whether we are already in that area." (21) Dr. Lowell Harris, economics professor at Columbia, said "...somewhere, there is a point at which obviously bad effects from high taxes make the game not worth the candle. Where such a point is I don't know." (22)

U. S. News and World Report posed the problem succinctly last fall when it was discussing the proposed increase in corporate taxes from 48 to 52%. In an article called "Next for U.S.—Profitless Prosperity?", the magazine spoke of:

A Hard Choice

If the turn in the war is one way, it means more government restraint and higher taxes, limiting expansion. If the other way, it means that arms spending as a major support for today's boom is removed, and an old-fashioned recession could follow. (23)

The drop in purchases of durable goods which has amazed many economists recently shows the effects of adopting the first way.

Permanent Prosperity is a myth. Keynesian measures only put off depressions and guarantee they will be more severe. The reality today and for the future is increased problems for capitalists, a lessening ability to modernize, and the necessity of increasing the pressure on U. S. workers.

In the next section we consider the difficulties Capitalism gets into trying to solve its problems by taking over the world.

III. IMPERIALISM AND ITS MANY ENEMIES

The limited success of post-war capitalism has depended in large part on the huge profits it grabs from foreign countries. Survey of Current Business (7/61) estimates that one-fifth of after-tax profits in the private sector come from abroad. The future success of the system depends on its ability to maintain this inflow and, even more important, to expand it. The desperate goal of U. S. capitalism is therefore to get, keep, and expand control of the "third world", to further prepare a labor force there—which entails wrecking the local societies—and to capitalize these regions to the extent necessary to reap a new level of profits. This could allow U. S. capitalism to fundamentally modernize its domestic plant and

NO GUNS FOR IMPERIALISM aussie seamen refuse

LABOR UNION NEWS FROM DOWN UNDER
submitted by John Venezia

The Australian Seaman's Union, in a struggle against both the government and the Australian Council of Trade Unions (the AFI-CIO in Australia), refused to man ships carrying arms to Vietnam.

Members in locals all across Australia in a work stoppage vote held on March 8th, 1967, decided not to man the "Boonaroo" and "Jeparist" which were scheduled to carry arms to Vietnam. The resolution passed by the Sydney local read in part: "We condemn the Government proposal (that we carry bombs and arms to Vietnam) as an attempt to further involve Australia as a base, and its people as agents of U.S. aggression in the undeclared war in Vietnam."

The government's reaction to this was to commission the ships into the Royal Australian Navy and man the ships with Naval personnel. This was accomplished with the tacit approval of the A.C.T.U.

equipment, meaning a whole new lease on life.

We see U. S. Imperialism as fated to fail in this attempt for two reasons.

1) Imperialism needs to but cannot hold onto the colonial world.

Imperialism wants colonial areas for the markets, cheap raw materials, and fantastically cheap labor available. But people resist exploitation. They rebel. The imperialists try various means to put down these rebellions, but that only consolidates the opposition, strengthens the revolutions of these oppressed peoples. When the imperialists are finally driven out, the development of these countries by their own people and the socialization of land, mines, and factories cuts the liberated colonial areas off from Imperialist exploitation and profit sucking.

But do the oppressed really rebel?

• In Iran, more than 12,000 U. S. advisers lead a huge army of the puppet Shah fighting the increasingly revolutionary people. (Napalm has been used against southern tribesmen.)

• In Thailand, thousands of U. S. advisers are actively engaged in failing to defeat armed rebellion

(Continued on p. 6)

benenson-potter proposal: conclusion

(Continued from p. 4)

approaches of different groups, and of how we can relate to them and make them relevant to the organizing we do among the middle-class technicians and professionals with whom many of us will work.

We have tried to clarify the basic problems facing chapters and the entire radical movement at this stage in its development. We must now ask: How far will the notion of a critical radical perspective take us? The question is difficult to answer.

First, let's look over what a 'critical radical perspective' adds up to, as the idea has been developed in this paper. In negative terms, a critical perspective rejects the fascination with radical rhetoric that often covers up liberal attitudes. It rejects the notion that programs must isolate students from other groups in order to reach a lot of students on easy issues. It is sharply hostile to the attitude toward chapter activity which mistakes tactical bickering and stylized slogans for political content; which justifies elitism and in-groupiness among the activist 'hard core'; which fails to provide an SDS experience that speaks to real needs and to post-campus roles and objectives.

These questions are not intended to be rhetorical. It would probably be worthwhile for every chapter in the country to initiate small-group chapter-activity-evaluation discussions. Often such discussions have failed because people immediately begin throwing around bullshit arguments and empty phrases. One method which avoids this is to have one person responsible each time for a presentation about his own perspectives on chapter activity, and specifically, on his own work, where he thinks it is headed, why he thinks it's important etc.

A critical radical perspective is more, however, than a set of questions and an orientation with which one evaluates current activities. It can also suggest directions for future work. We have seen in the case of the Boston labor committee a kind of chapter program which integrates an action project with strategic thinking on SDS labor work, and with developing post-campus personal commitment and vocations. Similarly in the professions strategies are taking shape which break down traditional career-orientations and professional attitudes. Possibilities are opening up for

creating new ties between radical groups.

The accumulation of the experiences of different approaches to anti-war and university reform work has made it increasingly possible to clarify realistic objectives in these areas. What is necessary is a willingness to discuss and to shape the character of the SDS-chapter experience.

It is clear, though, that a sense of direction and priorities does not amount to an overall strategy for action. The relationship between what such a strategy for the New Left might look like, and the critical radical perspective we have outlined, is worth exploring. We see the transition from the perspective we have been discussing to such a strategy as a difficult, but necessary task. The next step in that direction would be a careful scrutiny of the criticisms we have been leveling at the campus movement, in the light of specific evaluations of the problems and achievements of chapter work. Out of this self-examination may emerge a clearer view of the strategies which we act on without making explicit. For before we can have an overall Strategy, we must first have strategies—for university reform, for labor, for work in professions, for anti-war activity, for community organizing etc.

The focus on strategies for specific organizing programs should not, however, obscure efforts to add a real depth and concreteness to our overall analysis of American society. The tension between the insights of that growing analysis and the strategic possibilities of specific organizing thrusts will produce a sense of where the New Left is headed, and a prescription for where it should be moving.

At some point we will have to deal with power in the society as a whole. We will have to develop clearer distinctions between basic or 'radical' demands, and peripheral ones. And at some point we will have to challenge from below the dominance of corporate capitalist interests. But a more precise elaboration of how this can be done on a national level must await a critical evaluation of specific organizing efforts. This is why the first step, as we see it, is the development of an awareness of the limitations and possibilities of our present activities.

BOSTON PL PROPOSAL

(Continued from p. 5)

in the northeastern and southern provinces.

• In Laos, the Pathet Lao is fighting a war of resistance to U. S. Imperialism that matches the fight of the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front in skill and bravery.

• In the Philippines, the Huks, once defeated, have now regained immense strength. Government troops are unable to put them down. How long before U. S. intervention?

• In Indonesia, armed struggle has begun after the terrible but temporary defeat of communist-led workers and peasants by U. S.-backed local fascists. How long before U. S. intervention?

• In Colombia, Guatemala, indeed in many Latin American countries, guerrilla movements are gaining strength. This is the case also in several African nations—such as Angola.

National liberation movements are far stronger today—both in numbers and in the understanding of how to defeat Imperialism—than at any time in the past.

But will these growing movements be able to defeat the U. S. government? The Vietnamese people beat the Japanese, the French, by 1964 the South Vietnamese puppet troops led by U. S. advisers—and now they are beating the U. S. military machine itself. They have forced the U. S. government to send in hundreds of thousands of troops, to become bogged down. In desperation, the U. S. has escalated to the point of a possible all-Asian land war. The National Liberation Front has demonstrated that a People's Army, having a solid political understanding of Imperialism and a real mass base, is in fact invincible.

And people are rising up everywhere. On the one hand, the U. S. capitalists and their government can only satisfy their class needs by exacerbating the problems of these countries. On the other hand, the example and leadership of revolutionary communism in China and other countries has given real strength to the oppressed everywhere, has led to the emergence of forces which are tying Imperialism up in an ever-expanding war to push back those once oppressed but now revolutionary peoples. This war's cost means an accelerated squeeze via taxes on the domestic capitalists. That class tries (of course) to transfer the burden to the working class—through speed-up, wage-cuts, price increases. Workers also suffer, perhaps most of all, from the death-draft for this war. These hardships, suffered to service a war which daily becomes more and more clearly unjust, can and are in fact already turning the domestic working class against the war.

The second block to increased inflow from overseas investments comes from the other capitalist nations. Since 1962, the rate of profit on U. S. investments in Europe—which was once quite lucrative—has fallen below the domestic rate! (24) Immediately after World War II, the U. S. faced a pretty much non-competitive world market. But this becomes less and less so as European and Japanese rates of increase in productivity far outreach the U. S. rate. And these strong capitalist countries with newly built plants are no longer leaving the U. S. a monopoly on exploiting the colonial world.

2) U. S. Imperialism needs to but cannot industrialize the "third world".

Economic weaknesses at home and new international competition have caused Imperialism to devise a new strategy—the capitalization of the "third world".

An American electronics manager has credited Taiwan's workers with being the island's biggest industrial asset. He said they learn the assembly line operation in a third less time and do better work. The average wage is \$20 a month, half that in Hong Kong and a third that in Japan. . . . pay for comparable work in the United States would be \$300 a month. An American company shifting the work of 1000 girls from the U. S. to Taiwan stands to save \$2 million a year. . . . The island has no strikes. (Electronic News, 3/22/67)

To prepare the colonial world for this role as a workshop for manufactured goods, the U. S. has been feverishly "Marshall Planning" these areas—that is, developing basic transportation and communications facilities, the roads, ports, etc. (25) Everything is fine for Imperialism—except the people. It is they who must comply as their societies (that is, themselves) are torn apart and wrecked to provide foreign investors with cheap labor and huge profits so they can modernize their domestic factories. As we have seen, they do not submit; they fight back.

The Imperialists will not be able to defeat these people; they will try anyway. This is not irrational on their part—the alternative is stagnation and economic crisis. But this attempt to subjugate the world is exposing the nature of the capitalist system as it has

never before been exposed. This attempt and that exposure together form the dominant political reality of the world today.

Contrary to the way Praxis views the situation, Imperialism is not a serene Octopus gobbling what fish it will in safe oceans. It is the real enemy of the working people of the entire world—and that includes American working people. It is attacking Vietnamese peasants with this war; it is also attacking most Americans with this war. That is concrete reality as opposed to the Hegelian verbiage, the big talk put forward by Praxis.

The job of revolutionaries is to organize the people this U. S. Imperialism is hurting. That means all working people and most students. We must organize them in day-to-day struggles so that out of those struggles they (and we!) can gain the revolutionary understanding and conviction to defeat the enemy.

IV. THE "NEW WORKING CLASS"

Let us now consider Praxis's "new class". It includes teachers, artists, welfare workers, technicians, and highly skilled production workers. As Praxis sees it this group is increasing fast and will become the class-leader of radical struggle. Let's take a look at this group.

The "New Working Class" ?
Not New. No Class.

First of all, the groups included in the so-called new working class are in the main pretty old. Teachers and other professionals and highly skilled workers have been around for some time. Welfare workers existed since the 1930s. The only part of this "new class" which is new—which has appeared only recently—is the technicians associated with automation.

Does this grouping of old (teachers) and new (automation engineers) constitute a class? Not unless the word "class" is used completely subjectively—that is, to describe whatever one wants to stick together.

In fact a class is a group of people with a common relation to the means of production (Do teachers and IBM operators and doctors and artists share such a relation??), and with a common relationship to other classes, especially in regard to those means of production. A class is not some made-up notion. It must exist in reality; to be a class it must function, in reality, on the basis of those relationships.

By this definition, the Praxis list of careers nohow constitutes a class. The only new profession among them, that of technicians associated with automation, is in fact notoriously hard to get to act collectively, even with other technicians. The "new working class" is a purely verbal phenomenon.

The "New Working Class" :
A Slow-Growing Vanguard

But, one might argue, even if these groups don't constitute a class, aren't they growing fast? Actually the rate of increase of technical and professional workers as a percentage of the total employed force has declined from an average yearly gain of 0.4% from 1950-60 to 0.2% from 1960-65. (26) The boom appears to be over—and it was never a hell of a boom. Contrary to Praxis's predictions of a rapidly accelerating increase in college graduates as a percentage of the total work force, the President's Manpower Report in 1962 indicated that, while 11% of the labor force were college graduates that year, in 1975 the figure would be 19% for the age group 25-34, which means 15% for the total work force. (27) Up 4% in 13 years.

The "New Working Class" :
Weak Vanguard

Aside from those technicians in key jobs and highly skilled production workers, most "new workers" are distinctly secondary in terms of their inability to stop the system. (This doesn't make them completely unimportant by any means.) If teachers stop teaching, for example, it will not prevent the mills from producing steel. But production workers and those workers with basic jobs in communications and transportation associated with production are absolutely necessary to the daily life of U. S. capitalism.

What about technicians? In some industries, as sociologist Bernard Goldstein noted in a study of professional employees of industry, they are closely tied to production. For the most part, they "can be put aside for weeks or months with little or no effect on production." (28) (Skilled workers in production jobs are of course quite important. In any event, it is difficult to understand why the Praxis people included them.)

Upstate with sds

NIAGARA SDS CONFERENCE REPORT

Karl Baker

On April 29 the Niagara Regional Coordinating Committee held a regional conference at the University of Syracuse. The conference was attended by representatives from local SDS, SNCC, PL, and CADA chapters throughout upper New York State. Some of the workshops included discussion of draft resistance, Black Power, chapter goals and tactics, New Left assumptions and the growth of the hippy movement.

The question of draft resistance dominated discussion at the conference. It was seen to be one of the most promising forms of resistance to the war effort. Many of the local groups have begun various forms of draft resistance organizing and CO counseling. Of particular interest was the recent draft card burning in New York organized by the Ithaca We Won't Go group.

As a result of these activities and the regional nature of the selective service system, the need was seen to establish a regional committee to help coordinate and support the draft resistance effort. The initial commitment was shown by fourteen workers and a committee was set up to meet independently beginning in June for those who will remain in the region over the summer. Those who are interested in working with the committee should contact me through the NRCC, Box 5731, River Campus Station, Rochester, New York 14627.

In addition the Vietnam Summer Project, which is being supported by Dr. King and Dr. Spock, was discussed and it was decided to begin setting up a staff regionally. We hope to have two staff members in each major city and as many volunteers as possible. Where there is need the staff will receive \$25 a week from the national committee and whatever can be raised within the region. The particular organizing approach will be left up to the local groups. Those who are interested in joining the staff should contact Pat Griffith at 1448 Tramsberg Road, Ithaca, New York, as soon as possible.

The next NRCC conference will take place early next fall.

Clearly, most sections of this non-class are without the power to overthrow the system. But perhaps the "new working class" could be the vanguard, lead those who actually have the power?

The "New Working Class" :
The Vanguard Brings Up The Rear

Many of the groups included in the "new working class" tend to sympathize with the bourgeoisie, not with the working class. They look up to a brighter future for themselves. This is probably most true of the only really new group Praxis mentions—automation technicians. "Professional employees (in industry) identified themselves with members of their own profession rather than with industrial workers." (29) In The Technical Elite, Gould describes them as already very close to management and trying by their individual efforts to get in.

All the groups Praxis mentions can, however, play a role in a working class based, working class oriented movement. Most will play a secondary role, as allies, not as the core of the main force.

When production workers strike, it is good, for example, for them to be joined by engineers. All too often the engineers act as scabs. We shouldn't dismiss them for that reason. We should try to win them away from those bourgeois-oriented ideas they hold and strengthen the pro-working class aspect in their thinking, the aspect that sides with workers in struggle against the boss.

Teachers can and should be organized into unions. They can gain a good deal of working class consciousness from the struggles they engage in, as part of a union, against their boss, the government. Most non-college students are working class, destined for jobs in basic industry—factories, transportation, communications, and low-paid assembly line-type sales and clerical jobs. By putting forward militant, working class ideas and attitudes, these teachers can have a good effect on the development of a revolutionary movement.

Welfare workers are oppressed. The SSEU, a welfare workers' union in New York, includes many militant rank and filers. There is no reason why it cannot become a very strong union with a revolutionary membership—if those members are won to a working class perspective.

(Continued on p. 7)

schwartz, bayne & israel: conclusion

(Continued from p. 6)

We could go on, but the point is clear. The groups which compose the "new working class" are mostly old-fashioned mental workers, usually performing services apart from production, secondary services. Some (technicians and highly paid production workers) work at or near the actual point of production. None (except the better paid production workers) have the direct, clearly exploited relation to the means and owners of production that exists among basic industrial workers--such as factory hands, longshoremen, truck drivers, etc. We do not mean to "put down" teachers, welfare workers, etc. They should be organized.

But they will not lead in developing the clarity and militancy that the UAW workers showed at the Mansfield Ohio auto plant when they wildcatted against GM and Reuther. People who do mental work, professionals--small store keepers for that matter--should be organized. Their role in the revolutionary struggle will be important but secondary.

Workers' Control

The Praxis people also put forward a notion of "workers' control" as the strategy for leading the "new working class" to radicalization.

This "workers' control" is a neat phrase. It can mean anything, but carries the favorable connotation of people running their lives. Everyone probably approves of some sort of workers' control.

We approve of workers' control--workers' control of everything. That means the workers overthrow the state, seize control of all industry (the entire economy), set up their own working class state, and run the economy in the interests of all workers.

If workers' control means that--if it means socialist revolution to create the dictatorship of the previously oppressed over the would-be oppressors--we are all for it. That kind of workers' control is no more a new idea, however, than teachers are a new profession. It is, however, an excellent idea. But it is certainly not a demand, except at the time of, or just before, a revolution. One should certainly talk to workers about this kind of control (that is, revolution). But there isn't much point in putting it forward to the boss as a demand until you can win. This means a long period of struggle during which revolutionaries must try to win the workers to these ideas. Shouting "WORKERS' CONTROL" doesn't work like some Red drug. People don't make revolutions until they are convinced they need them.

It doesn't appear that this is what Praxis means by workers' control. What they are talking about seems to vary from time to time. On the one hand, workers' control seems to mean to them battles over on-the-job conditions. On the other hand, it means workers sharing control with capitalists over this Imperialist system.

As for the first meaning--nothing, of course, is wrong with workers fighting to improve their conditions of work. The most militant strikes and wildcats are often fought over speed-up, job security, subcontracting, etc. These fights are attacks against the power of the boss. Like all class struggles, they are bad for the system. Such struggles are not themselves revolutions; they do not equal a battle for workers' power. But they can be steps in the direction of making a socialist revolution--if they show workers who their real friends and enemies are, if they demonstrate the necessity of workers fighting in a collective way against the boss and his government.

Like the excellent notion of revolutionary socialism, the idea of fighting around job conditions is both good and old. To call it workers' control is silly.

This is not all that Praxis meant by workers' control, however. There are also to be battles for joint worker-management inspection of financial records, joint worker-management planning of expansion and investment. Battles, that is, for the "new working class" to share in the management of firms. By such co-management, Praxis does not really mean workers' control. It really means that the better-off workers (technicians and highly paid workers) should help run capitalism with the bosses.

This is certainly not a revolutionary notion. It is a proposal that would institutionalize the existing parasitic features of some sections of the so-called new working class. It would not radicalize anyone. It plays up to the social climbing mentality of many "new workers". It is not an impossible program. It is just completely reactionary.

V. WORKER MILITANCY AND THE NEED FOR A WORKER-STUDENT ALLIANCE

Permanent Prosperity is a myth. The reality is that the bosses are trying to transform their "hardships" of profit squeeze into the workers' real hardships--wage freezes and wage cuts, rising prices, increased taxes

for working people. This is not a prediction; these things are happening.

Real spendable incomes of production workers fell for the past two years. That represents the longest continuous period of decline since the depression. There is talk about raising corporate tax rates to 52%. We can expect this to be cushioned by a fall in wages.

As real wages have been falling, capitalists have also tried to make good their losses by increasing speed-up (of machines, while the operator continues to receive the same wage). Recent speed-up is probably in back of a rise in rates of productivity.

Speed-up is more vicious than wage cuts. It shows itself in increased injuries for workers as the pace goes up. The injury rate has been climbing steadily throughout the '60s. For example, the number of permanent impairments has been rising by almost 2% a year since 1961. (30)

Workers are responding to the changing situation with increasing militancy. When (as is often the case) union "leaders" try to sell the workers out, the workers wildcat against official union orders. Thus the Mansfield UAW strikers defied not only GM, but Reuther himself; G.E. wildcats took place last fall despite demands of an 11-man directorate that the men go back; airline mechanics struck after turning down their "leaders'" offer of a nice (sellout) contract.

Is the working class really bought off?

The ruling class knows it's not. They have a number of tactics to use against this increasing militancy. There is the threat of new (worse than Taft-Hartley) anti-strike legislation if the strike wave continues. There was even talk earlier in the year of a law to make it illegal for workers not to ratify agreements made by their union "leaders".

Along with this economic militancy there is a political stirring. Among black people it's more than a stir: it's a movement. Most black people are opposed to the war in Vietnam. Few support it. Over 2,000 black people marched from Harlem on Spring Mobilization day--not carrying signs asking for Negotiations Now, but saying DEFEAT U. S. IMPERIALISM!

Among white workers it's still only a stir. However the Cambridge Vote on Vietnam Group, which has aimed at reaching white workers, has so far gotten an excellent response. The group has had over 4,000 conversations with workers. Between 1500 and 2000 signed on a referendum petition which clearly states: "The war serves only the interests of business. The U. S. should get out of Vietnam."

Working people are discontented. They see their conditions of life deteriorating, watch their relatives go off to fight an unending war which many are beginning to see is unjust, become more and more worn out under the ever-accelerating speed-up. The burdens increase, grow worse, and never stop.

In this situation it comes like a sick joke to say--"traditional" workers are irrelevant. They have no "real problems"--"real problems" being boredom, ennui

The movement is confronted with U. S. capitalism, oppressing real working people in Vietnam and America--causing substantial misery through a war of profits, a war to strengthen the U. S. ruling class at the expense of Vietnamese and American people.

What should we do in this situation?

blue grass REPORT

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
Compiled from newspaper clippings by n.b.

UK sds has started to recover from the physical beating it took at the hands of thugs last fall and is rapidly becoming an important political force on the Lexington campus of UK.

In the Spring Student Government elections, two UK sds members, William Murrell (presidential candidate) and Martin Wheeler (vice-presidential candidate), came in a low but significant third in the balloting. Martin and Wheeler had the support of the student newspaper, the Kentucky Kernel, in their bid for the SG seats; the lack of support for radical candidates is apparently a result of the fact that sds is relatively new on campus.

In other activities, UK sds has sponsored two successful Gentle Mondays in the middle of April and sponsored Pete Seeger and his group at the Second Annual Southern Folk Festival. The Kernel said sds was to be congratulated for bringing Seeger to campus. UK sds has also had a debate with the local YR group on Vietnam. Much opposition to the War has been generated on the campus by UK sds and the local Citizens for Peace in Vietnam. Considering the backward conditions under which UK sds has had to work, the chapter is doing a fine job radicalizing the campus.

REP summer research

There are still openings in the REP Summer Research Projects.

--Be trained by Pete Henig, Mike Locker, Jill Hamburg and others

--Work with N-CUP, American Committee on Africa, North American Congress on Latin America, Cleveland Community Project, Chicago Center for Radical Research, or Florida Farm Labor.

--Training Institute begins June 11.

--Applications must be in SOON!

--Write to Linda Kerley--Summer Research Projects
c/o REP, Box 625, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48108

To Reach Workers: Worker-Student Alliances

As we said earlier, we do not propose that SDS move off campus. We do propose that the movement try in every way possible to bring itself and its campus base into contact with working people. The discontent many Americans feel can go either way. It can move toward a revolutionary understanding, gradually seeing the connections, coming to understand the necessity of overthrowing this filthy system. Or it can move into bitterness and cynicism--and violent anti-communism and racism, a potential base for fascism. It is crucial that radical students reach working people with our ideas.

This can be done many ways. Students can aid workers' struggles--in strikes, in food boycotts, by fighting anti-strike legislation, by aiding attempts to organize unions. We can get jobs, as has been proposed by the WORK-IN Committee, and talk to workers every day, on the job, at least during the summer. We can leaflet workers or go to them with referendum petitions. In all these situations, we must find the ways to talk to working people about the war, ways to bring our radical view of the system into their experience of that system. Gradually, we can begin to win workers to the anti-war movement. That is the only way we can begin to gather the strength to defeat this system's Imperialist war. In the long run, it is the only way we can defeat the system itself.

On campus, to organize people around their problems and try to show students the necessity of allying with workers.

Off campus, to bring the anti-war movement into contact with the working class, a contact from which both can only gain.

That, in essence, is our suggested program.

FOOTNOTES

1. Gerry Tenney, Bob Gottlieb, Dave Gilbert in the Port Authority Statement, p. 35
2. Gilbert, Tenney, Gottlieb, "Praxis", New Left Notes, 2/13/67
3. Port Authority Statement, p. 58
4. Ibid., p. 51
5. cf. Andre Gorz, Strategie Ouvriere et Neocapitalisme
6. The U. S. Book of Facts, Statistics and Information, 1967, p. 238
7. The Handbook of Basic Economic Statistics, p. 12
8. Ibid., p. 94
9. Harry Magdoff, Monthly Review, 11/66, p. 20
10. Joseph Steindl, Maturity and Stagnation in American Capitalism, p. 160
11. Handbook, pp. 12, 150
12. U. S. Book, pp. 494, 496
13. The Economist, 10/1/66
14. Ibid.
15. Baran and Sweezy, Monopoly Capital, p. 247
16. U. S. Book, p. 496
17. Baran and Sweezy, pp. 148, 149
18. George Terborgh, The Automation Hysteria, p. 18
19. Paul Mattick, "The Limits of the Mixed Economy", Science and Society, summer 1964, p. 301 (Paul Mattick is an economist living in Cambridge who has done the first real exposure of the illusion of a capitalism stabilized through government spending.)
20. U. S. News and World Report, 2/27/67
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. U. S. News and World Report, 10/17/66
24. First National City Bank Economic Letter, 3/67
25. L. Marcus, The Third Stage of Imperialism, West Village C.I.P.A.
26. U. S. Book, p. 229
27. U. S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President, 1964, p. 5
28. Bernard Goldstein, American Sociological Review, 1955, pp. 199-205
29. Ibid.
30. U. S. Book, p. 245

NAC minutes

times 2

MAY 25, 1967

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Bushell, Greg Calvert, Dee Jacobsen, Earl Silbar, John Venezia, Cathy Wilkerson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tim McCarthy, Mary Wood Allen

AGENDA: 1) REC Center; 2) USSR trip; 3) Office change; 4) Literature program; 5) Convention; 6) Vietnam Summer; 7) Basic brochure; 8) Support for a Compatriot

1) REC CENTER: The NAC gave approval for the purchase of a building in Chicago to house the Radical Education Center. The possibility of setting up a non-profit corporation to purchase the house was discussed and tentatively approved. The total cost of the house would be \$11,500, exclusive of taxes and other fees.

2) USSR TRIP: The Soviet Union has offered to pay the round trip expenses for one SDS member to participate as an observer at the Youth Celebration of the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution. Possible representatives were proposed and discussed. The decision was deferred until more people could be contacted about the trip.

3) OFFICE CHANGE: John Rossen had requested that SDS give up the second floor office space now used for NLN editorial offices and the national secretary's office. We would receive a larger office on the third floor of the building in which the NO is located in exchange for this space. The NAC approved the proposal.

4) LITERATURE PROGRAM: Ellie Brecher reported on the great loss of \$ each year from literature non-sales because people did not pay their bills. Because we are not in operation primarily to give literature away, the NAC approved a proposal that all literature orders over \$2 would have to be pre-paid; this revolutionary change goes into effect June 2, 1967. No hustling, please.

5) CONVENTION: Buckley reported the unfortunate happenings in Yellow Springs. (See Page 1 for the awful details.) VOICE of Michigan had requested that we hire a full-time person in Ann Arbor to work on the Convention. Brother Rothberger from VOICE had suggested several possible full-time people; the NAC decided to hire Jerry Lustig as of June 1 as a full-time staff member. Brother Lustig will receive the same salary as the NO staff. VOICE had also brought up the problem of providing pre-convention financing for their operations; the NAC voted to insure payment of all bills provided all expenditures over \$10 were approved by the erstwhile NO Convention Coordinator.

6) VIETNAM SUMMER: Brother Jacobsen reported that he would be absent from the ranks of the revolution for 10 days to go to Boston and New York to work on the draft resistance end of Vietnam Summer. Since VNS agreed to pay all of the goodly Jacobsen's expenses, the NAC wished him godspeed (no pun intended).

7) BASIC BROCHURE: The need for a new basic brochure outlining the programs and other things about SDS new or potential movement people often want to know has arisen. A mock-up of a new document was presented to the NAC. Approval was deferred until certain objectionable photographs and copy paragraphs could be either changed or removed.

8) SUPPORT FOR A COMPATRIOT: The one way plane fare of the NO Rate Clerk to Kansas City, Missouri was approved since the goodly scribe was going to the prairie to do draft resistance work. The total rate was \$14. (Synthesized from Brother Jacobsen's notes by Buckley.)

MAY 18, 1967

MEMBERS PRESENT: Greg Calvert, Dee Jacobsen, Tim McCarthy, John Venezia, Cathy Wilkerson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mary Wood Allen, Jim Bushell, Earl Silbar

AGENDA: 1) Composition equipment; 2) Convention; 3) Fund raising rally; 4) Staff; 5) NC ballot; 6) ICPAE; 7) Iowa radio; 8) Contemporary films; 9) Support for a Revolutionary

1) COMPOSITION EQUIPMENT: The NAC, after a long discussion of the long and short range problems involved, approved the purchase of a Freiden Justifying System for NLN production and other commercial jobs which the print shop will do; the total price of the equipment is \$7,000. The initial outlay from the NO

SUMMER WORK-IN

(Continued from p. 1)

pense. Conscious and directed working class opposition to the war is the most powerful anti-war movement imaginable. To be with, to move and move with American workers, we've got to go to work with them. To bring anti-war, anti-racism, and radical ideas to the workers, we've got to know what moves them, what their attitudes really are; we've got to know where they live. This can best be done by sharing their work, their on the job problems.

And if we work hard—remembering that we are part-time workers while others have been there years, that we should LISTEN, NOT PREACH, that we should concentrate on making friends, presenting our ideas clearly without orating or getting into heated arguments—then some of us will go back to school (just as some of us will remain) with 2 or 3 working friends. Collectively this means thousands of working friends for the movement across the country, avenues opened for further organizing. Thousands of workers and their friends beginning to see the war and the society through our eyes. And we begin to learn how to relate the job issues, the bread and butter demands, and the spreading strikes to the movement. We will begin to forge the links which will unite us with the greatest power in society and put an end to our isolation.

HOW TO BEGIN

Call a meeting in your campus or community. Study the economic activity of your region for a week or so. Go out and get a job to last the summer, preferably in large industries or places employing many area residents. Try to get at least two people in each place. Organize regular meetings for people in your area project to discuss conditions, problems, mistakes, and victories. Such meetings will help overcome the 'natural' feelings of frustration and isolation and can serve to bring greater collective experience to individual hang-ups: As Lenin said: "There can be no revolutionary practice without revolutionary theory." This WORK IN project is, for those interested, a good opportunity to study theory with others on the project.

This program can and will be carried out. We urge you to think about it, discuss it, and join us. FOR INFORMATION AND MATERIALS: Write to THE VIETNAM WORK IN, temporary address: 149 W. 108th St., New York, N. Y. 10025 (telephones 212, 773-3855 and 222-1763) or 274 Coleridge, San Francisco, Calif. 94110, or to these coordinators: New York Area: Steve Fraser, 212, 222-1763, Rick Rhoads, 212, 773-3855; Ann Arbor: Bill Sachs, 313, 668-8813; Baltimore: Tom Bowers, 301, 732-8990; Washington D. C.: Wayne Horman, 301, 474-6479; Boston: Dennis De Coste, 617, 868-6614, Debbey Levinson, 617, 354-7730; Los Angeles: Jim Dann, 213, 399-6819; San Francisco: John Levin, 415, 282-5827; Rochester: Alan Shelzoff, 716, 325-4773.

The VIETNAM WORK IN will publish a national bulletin during the summer for exchange of ideas, evaluation and plans. Local groups will be in touch with each other through the center. VIETNAM WORK IN is preparing an organizers manual with suggestions on: 1) how to research the local job situation, 2) what jobs to look for, 3) how to get a job, 4) what to expect on the job, and 5) coordination and follow up.

Irv Himmelblau, U. of Ill. (Chicago) SDS; Rich Berkowitz, Chicago at large SDS; Phil Breneman, Wright Jr. Coll. SDS; Kathy Fischer, U. of C. SDS, PL; Joe Weintraub, U. of C. SDS; Sally Yagel, U. of C. SDS; Jon Kaplan, U. of C. SDS; John Gloor, Roosevelt U. SDS; Jane Adams, SDS secretary; Earl Silbar, R. U. SDS, PL; Fred Kushner, R. U. SDS, PL; Bernie Farber, R. U. SDS. (Chicago: Kathy Fisher, LI 8-4503.)

VIETNAM SUMMER 1967

VNS -- will build a movement to release the voices of the American People.

If you wish to work for VNS, send your application to: VNS, 129 Mt. Auburn St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138

REVOLUTIONARY NOTICE
ACCORDING TO THE RECENT NAC DECISION, ALL LITERATURE ORDERS OVER \$2 MUST BE PRE-PAID. THIS DECISION WILL BE FOLLOWED. SO PAY UP.
Ellie Brecher

CONVENTION SITE: MOVED to ann arbor
(See Page 1 for the full story direct from Antioch)

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.

Saul Wellman
15354 Monica
Detroit MICH 48238

"treasury" will be \$2500. This equipment will replace the proposed IBM system which the NAC had previously approved. Provisions were made to break the contract with IBM capitalists.

2) CONVENTION: The NO Convention Coordinator reported that after many hassles over facilities, Antioch College was trying to make arrangements elsewhere in the Yellow Springs area for the Convention. An Administration decision would be forthcoming, it was reported. (See Page 1 of this issue and also the NAC minutes for 25 May for further gruesome details.)

3) FUND RAISING RALLY: Jean Venezia had set up a fund raising rally for 24 May at which Muhammad Ali, Carl Oglesby, Jim Bevel and Oscar Brown Jr. would speak and entertain. The NAC gave its approval for the rally; the gate would be shared with the Chicago Peace Council after expenses were removed.

4) STAFF: Rod Rose was hired as financial secretary. (He wandered into the NO last week and we kidnapped him.) Dave Kamatsu was hired as a full-time printer to help with the printing load. He was hired at \$70 per week guaranteed. It is understood that this is a family subsistence (wife and 3 kids) and not a raise in Movement wages.

5) NC BALLOT: Br. Sari's call for an NC Ballot on the REP Question was deferred until more information could be received about the need for the Ballot.

6) ICPAE: The ICPAE had asked for a resolution giving the Chicago case workers' strike support. The NAC decided that it did not have the power to pass such a resolution.

7) IOWA RADIO: Bob Allen at Station WOC, in Davenport, Iowa, has requested a speaker from the NO to speak on his radio show; they were looking for a "controversial speaker." Considering the hassle with Mike Wallace (or whomever it was), the NAC decided to refer Mr. Allen to the Iowa City chapter for a speaker.

8) CONTEMPORARY FILMS: A request had been received for SDS support for the film "The War Game." Contemporary Films wants us to arrange a chapter contact mailing about the film and publicity for the film. The NAC decided to defer the request for publicity until a showing of the film could be arranged for the NAC; the chapter contact list will be given to them for the normal \$5 administrative fee.

9) SUPPORT FOR A REVOLUTIONARY: Brother Dennis Williams, who has been traveling in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Delaware and parts of New Jersey organizing a region of sds, had requested \$20 from the NO to help pay for repairs on his Ford Falcon incurred in revolutionary travels. Funds granted by the NAC.

(Gleaned from Brother Venezia's notes by Buckley.)