The following memorandum was prepared to the undergraduate library. Voice vote CARRIED.

The following article (continued on page 3)

ED. NOTE: The following article was written as a position paper for the convention in August. It is the hope of the editor that more position papers will be written and sent to NLS for publication.

by Tom Condit

Carl Oglesby's "World revolution and American containment" speech raises as a number of points I feel SDS members should give serious thought to. Oglesby speaks of anti-imperialist revolution in the "Third World" is clearly stated, but what little analysis appears in the speech is characteristic of some of the weaknesses of "new left" analysis.

New Left Notes is hardly the place for a lengthy discussion of World War II resist movements, but Oglesby's comments on them cast a good deal of light on his analysis of the world situation. Europe was not revolutionary. Asia is, he says, "the resistance movements... gained their power most importantly because they were resistant, not because they sought a basic rearrangement of social power." This is similarly not true. The largest and most effective resistance movements are the organized industrial socialist or Communist leadership. It was that type of organization which made it possible for there to immediately disarm the resistance in "liberated" areas. Without the collaboration of the Communist leaders this disarmament could never have been achieved. I assume that Oglesby is referring to this when he speaks of "an international organization... mono-lingual Communist party" as a factor adding to the "non-revolutionary" character of the European situation.
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ED. NOTE: The following resolution on SNCC was passed by the NC.

In asking why Negroes cannot seek to live and rebuild where they wish, in their own schools, with their own economic base, without being dismissed as "racist."

Some liberal and radical critics argue that SNCC's strategy will be frustrated by the sheer fact that Negroes are a minoritized power in America - that they shrink in horror.

Racism and economic exploitation confront Negroes, a group, together. So, of course, Negroes, especially in the Northern ghettos, must act as a group in order to challenge the "colonialists in reverse." It is a recognition of the fact of common identity and the beginnings of a strategy for change. We must not simply tolerate this "black consciousness," we should encourage.

Measured integration is very literally irrelevant, since integration assumes the recognition of the dominant (white) culture. "Black consciousness," on the other hand, understands very deeply the exploitative nature of that culture and seeks to make a beginning at confronting Negroes. We agree, then, with SNCC

National Council Minutes ...continued
General Orientation

The expanding war in Vietnam will necessitate increased student draft. To decide which students will go and who will remain within the 25 system, the government has instituted the draft and rank procedures. Drafting both, on any given rank, will necessarily lead to fierce competition amongst students for grades. The continued existence of deferment creates the illusion that safety can be gained by getting good grades and high test scores. Grade inflation and the false promise of deferment are a subtle way for the government to go without our conscripts. Students, organized in opposition to draft and drafting procedures, in the context of opposition to the war, can be organized to go off campus as students, to bring pressure to bear on the government to support students, black people, white workers, the depressed, of equal rights and not war if we are not organizing against 25.

DRAFT 25 * RANK * GRADES

Orientation — We must recognize our students and students that the 25 system and all its supports (e.g. the rank system, the SRA tests, etc.) are not in their true interests. This system merely makes it harder for them to fight for the survival of the masses of the population (the government can play all rank out of the Vietnam draft against the students) and also by dividing them inter- run, giving some of the illusion that they have won. We must no mess with this system. The 25 or the draft can only stop cooperating with the students. It is essential, however, to raise these other issues for strategic reasons which flow from what has been taking place in the previous years. We can demand that everyone in an anti-Vietnam sit-down take a stand against the war.

Decisions Concerning War * Draft 25 * Ranks — We must demand and end to the war in Vietnam, unconditional withdrawal of U.S. troops and other agencies, on end of the draft for Vietnam, on end of the war in Vietnam. A draft system is tied to the war and U.S. foreign policy in general, the struggle for student control of the university.

The war has in fact created the situation in which students are mad about rank, the administrative system is not exterminated, in which students are mad about rank, the administrative system is not exterminated, and is not the only way out of the bind is industrialization and the war and fighting for university control. As a more long-term strategy, we have to begin carrying the struggle against the war and all forms of exploitation of the communities, factories, etc. Students can help in this. At the moment many non-students are opposed to the war into manageable, in which we can more concretely express in the institutions in which they study/live/work. We must develop strategies to fight the competition between the students against the administration, and the government, not by individual sacrifice.

PROGRAM

We are trying to build a radical student movement. The program we use must be based on the requirements of that general perspective at this time. As we see it, the job now is to make the students, who are presently opposed to the war into manageable, in which we can more concretely express in the institutions in which they study/live/work. We must develop strategies to fight the competition between the students against the administration, and the government, not by individual sacrifice.

This will mean broader base building. The struggle must move on to new fronts. We must feel that the war against the war and fighting for university control. As a more long-term strategy, we have...
Position Paper for Convention...continued

(continued from page 3)

which is also supported by many liberal and conservative observers as a threat to the underdeveloped nations. It proceeds from the position that the concept of the "Third World" is an immediate economic necessity for the advanced nations. As the relationship of the "Third World" to the market world, so does the ability of the "Third World" to meet its economic needs. Goods. This creates the same type of crisis of consumption for the developed countries which, at present, is met by the rapid accumulation of raw materials. Therefore, the question of public vs. private capital, how far industrial to the backward and marginal European (given the nearness to raw material sources) and of a relatively high-wage, high-profit goods. This creates the same type of "crisis" on textile imports, it would generate and the creation of a prosperous Africa which "Third World" to purchase manufactured production.

The advocates of the above position very widely in their positions on the relative role of economic and social change in the capital mechanism. Whereas the "welfare state" is essentially a nationalist Chinese policy based by forced labor, brutal collectivisation of the Afro-Asian conference (which failed to reach its goals) of the main struggle, and demonstrations which places reactionaries of all stripes with the "machine operators" and "directors" are seen as essential to the heart of a society, they come to see the importance of the role of the social or political struggle becomes more or less a class struggle, depending upon the exact social or political situation.

Perhaps, in fact, we should challenge the relevance of the whole concept of nationalisation. The major political problems today are economic and social questions which reach around the world and are not limited to domestic concerns, and readily translate from one locale into another. If we are to look for units of analysis, this would suggest that we understand the needs of the 3 billion members of the "race," which is the common movement for social change, then it should not be nation-states, but social classes. Vietnamese peasants have little in common with Congolese truck drivers, and Mexican peasants with "their" millionaires or government officials.

The advocates of the above position view the most of their policy goals as being the domestic social goals of this position's"nationalisation"

The advocates of the above position view the most of their policy goals as being the domestic social goals of this position's "nationalisation"
Peace candidates
...the Salvation Army of Imperialism
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by Jerry Paul Simpson

This shall be a slanted argument. The recent Democratic primaries in Oregon were a test between "hawks" (Robert Morgan and Charlie Porter) and "doves" (Robs' Robert F. Kennedy and William Frye). Morgan ran against a well known political figure, former Governor of Oregon 505, Marvin "Morgan" Porter. Porter speaks at the University on April 26, 1966, and I both-and-we just didn't like him. He didn't have any "dove" qualities, so let's not waste our meager resources on him.

The Peace Army is the salvation army of Imperialism. They don't want to stop the war. If leftists devote all their energies to it, they may still lose. Imperialism can't be stopped by mere publicity or by showing the wanton slaughter of commies is okcy-we did that already.

Despite Morgan's politics, he has made some kind of "error" that might be something to it. Well, obviously there is something to it. But Charlie Porter's politics are detrimental to the American left, for his approach is based on the time-honored "hawks" versus "doves" is a false issue, we just have to be realistic.

Peace candidates

Women peace pickets march through the Hyde Park community of Chicago on their way to the University of Chicago on May 19th and 20th, when they conducted a brief demonstration. June 1966
 Resolution on Ghana

ED. NOTE. The following petition was adopted by the NC. I included the name and the text of this resolution, which were passed impromptu.

SDS takes note of the situation in Ghana at present, where certain political refugees previously granted asylum in Ghana have been imprisoned by the military government and are threatened with deportation to their native countries for political reasons. SDS deprecates this situation and declares itself in agreement with the CS 1963, and industrialists, which state that political refugees should have the right to choose their next destination should they face deportation.

Amendment: SDS will distribute copies of this petition to all its chapters and encourage further discussion by the chapters.

Petition on Ghana

The liberation of the Cameroonian refugees in

In Accra, Ghana, since several days after the military coup last February, some African political refugees (once welcomed in Ghana) have been held in prison.

Those men, who are the leaders of the U.P.C. (Cameroonian Peoples' Union), Jean-Marie Bokassa and Michel Njoya, are threatened with death in their native country, whose press has announced publicly that they run the risk of execution if they are extradited from Ghana.

According to the standards of conduct set up by the U.N. (Convention of Genoa on the right of political asylum, refugees and extradition in Accra) it is provided with the opportunity to choose their next destination should they face expulsion. Also, simple humanity, as well as the concern of defending men who fought for justice (as they conceived it), requires that the Cameroonian refugees be permitted to leave Accra and that they have the right to go to a country of their choice. They should not merely be permitted to go anywhere, but to the places of refuge to which they wish to go.

We take the liberty of requesting you to sign this appeal on behalf of the Cameroonian refugees, returning it to: PROFESSOR ST. CLAIR DRAKE, 430 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE, ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60605

Signature:

Among those who originated this appeal in Paris are: Jean-Paul Sartre, Michel de Certeau, Michel Leiris, Luis Aragon, and Alain Resnais.