

NEW LEFT NOTES

SDS · 1608 W · MADISON · CHICAGO · ILL.

file

Volume 2, Number 36

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

October 16, 1967

NSA-CIA-OEO-ETC.

by Raymond Mungo
Liberation News Service

WASHINGTON, D.C. (Oct. 6)—A planned anti-war march was dropped and official involvement in a 1968 Dump-Johnson campaign taken underground by the U.S. National Student Association (NSA) as a result of pressures from at least two offices of the U.S. government, according to information released today by the student newspaper at Wayne State University and the Liberation News Service, Washington, D.C.

The U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), which has some \$294,000 invested in NSA in the form of grants for tutorial programs, applied pressures on NSA which forced a cancellation of its announced march on the White House to protest the war during NSA's August congress in College Park, Md., the Wayne State SOUTH END said. Moreover, Douglas Cater, special assistant to Lyndon Johnson called NSA president Ed Schwartz and demanded to know, in connection with the "dump Johnson" initiative, "why students aren't supporting the President," and OEO later conducted "a hair-raising investigation" of NSA's books, according to information gathered by this news agency.

In the SOUTH END's copyrighted story, staff writer Peggy Cronin charged that a "planned anti-war march on Washington and a dump-Johnson campaign were dropped by the NSA this summer after OEO, an agency of the U.S. government, threatened to cut off funds...."

"The Association's National Supervisory Board held a secret meeting to discuss the threat...and the NSB agreed to keep the reason for the cancellation (of the march) secret."

"Schwartz," the SOUTH END account continued, "admitted that OEO had indicated its displeasure at the march, but said that NSA would not sell itself out. He added that OEO was particularly upset at the creation of a dump-Johnson movement by NSA delegates."

NSA called off the march, scheduled for August 24, "because of the likelihood of rain" (although the weather was clear on the 24th) following a special meeting of the NSB in which Schwartz expressed fears that the government might react angrily to NSA's support-for-black-power resolution, Schwartz admitted in Washington today.

But he called the Wayne State story "all lies throughout," and said NSA couldn't participate in a move to replace Johnson in 1968 because it is tax-exempt as a non-profit, apolitical organization.

Meanwhile, in New York, NSA "will be working covertly, under the table, and quietly" on the dump-Johnson effort, now called ACT '68, according to ACT co-founder Clinton Deveaux.

continued on page 2

Pike County, Kentucky

FOUR SCEF WORKERS CHARGED WITH SEDITION

by Joy Fenston

PIKEVILLE, Ky.—Politicians in Eastern Kentucky responded to growing unrest among the people, and a direct attack on the power of the coal operators, by charging five movement workers with sedition in mid-August.

Their attack backfired when a U. S. court ruled the state sedition law unconstitutional September 14. The decision left them with one less weapon to fight the change which threatens to come even to this stronghold of reaction.

Charged with sedition were four members of the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF)—executive directors Carl and Anne Braden, and field organiz-

ers Al and Margaret McSurely—and Joe Mulloy, a member of the Appalachian Volunteers.

The case began August 11 when Thomas Ratliff (prosecuting attorney for Pike County, former head of the union-busting Independent Coal Operators' Association (ICOA), and now Republican nominee for lieutenant governor of Kentucky) led a posse of 15 armed men into the McSurelys' cabin. He arrested them and seized their library. Mulloy was arrested a few hours later.

The arrests came a few hours after Ratliff had met with a group of Pike County's leading citizens—including the county judge; Robert Holcomb, present head of the coal operators, who also serves as president of the local chamber of commerce; the sheriff; members of the fiscal court; leading Republicans; etc—to discuss what to do about the organizers.

Presumably these gentlemen were disturbed about a recent decision in favor of a small landowner who refused to let strip miners onto his land. It was the first time a state agency had ruled against the operators. Mulloy had helped organize the resistance.

Ratliff accused the McSurelys of working to "take over Pike County from the power structure and put it in the hands of the poor," and charged them with sedition.

They claimed the charge was unconstitutional, as a result of a 1956 ruling by the U. S. Supreme Court that the states have no jurisdiction over sedition. They and SCEF asked for a three-judge federal panel to rule on the question.

Their suit also asked that Pike County officials be restrained from prosecuting them until the federal court reached a decision. Ratliff agreed to this at a hearing September 1. But four days later a Pike County Circuit Court judge ordered the grand jury to proceed with its in-

vestigation. The grand jury indicted the McSurelys and Mulloy—and the Bradens as well.

(This was the second time the Bradens had been charged with sedition in Kentucky. The first case was in 1954, after they helped a black family buy a house in a previously white neighborhood. In that case Carl was sentenced to 15 years in prison. His conviction was reversed in 1956 after the U. S. Supreme Court took sedition out of the hands of the states.)

The Pike County grand jury charged that a "well-organized and well-financed effort is being made to promote and spread the communistic theory...to overthrow the government of Pike County."

SCEF's Southern Mountain Project, based in Eastern Kentucky, is working to help the poor and powerless people in Appalachia organize for political and economic action to improve their condition. Most of them are white, but wherever black people live, black and white are being organized together.

This may well sound seditious to the coal operators of Pike County, one of the largest coal-producing counties in the United States and headquarters of the powerful coal operators' association. Until recently their power has gone unchallenged.

On September 14 it was challenged again—this time by the federal court, which held the Kentucky sedition law unconstitutional, freed the Bradens, McSurelys and Mulloy, and ordered local officials to stop prosecuting them.

Pike County officials tried to ignore the ruling. On September 30 a circuit court judge said he planned to go ahead with the trial. He threatened to issue bench warrants for the five and seize their bail. But he backed down October 4, the day before the trial was set, when

continued on page 4



WORK WANTED

plays to be done at U S Army Induction Centers

thanks to - they did it first -
Draft Resisters Union Local #3

Arthur Carpenter reported for his P-I as ordered. He wore sandals, coolie hat and black pajamas. "I went to the entrance and showed the guard my credentials. As I went to go thru the door, my friends started screaming: "There's a Viet Cong! KILL! KILL! KILL for the boys in the International Trade Mart! KILL for the tin, tungsten and rice! KILL!" meanwhile they shot me with waterguns filled with red ink. I spun thru the doors into the lobby and fell dead at the feet of the other draftees."

from
COPKILLER
Box 2342
New Orleans La 70116

NC RESOLUTION ON BOLIVIA

SDS has said that it is committed to working to block US involvement in a sixth or seventh Vietnam. This is the realization that the US Vietnam policy is part of a global policy of containing revolutionary change in the Third World. It means that SDS is committed to build a consciousness of this basic fact and to understand how US imperialism operates in the Third World.

Why does the US fear revolution in the Western Hemisphere? Why would some still try to destroy the Cuban revolution? What are the "real US interests" in Latin America? Though these are complex questions we all know they are basic to an understanding of current realities. The US intervened militarily in the Dominican Republic in April 1965 and has continued to manipulate the Dominican situation to the advantage of US economic, political and military interests in the Caribbean.

Bolivia is not as obviously strategically important as the Panama Canal Zone or economically as valuable as oil rich Venezuela. Nevertheless, Bolivia has been subject to US political manipulations with a marked degree of success. The Bolivian revolution of 1952 had its base in the armed miners, peasants and students. A combination of US economic and diplomatic pressure and a weak nationalist leadership undermined the possibility of achieving a fundamental redistribution of wealth and power during the Bolivian Revolution of the 50's. The final blow to President Victor Paz Estenssoro's revolutionary administration was dealt by Air Force General Rene Barrientos in a military coup November 1964. General Barrientos has since proved to be a good friend of US policy objectives.

While the poorest South American nation, Bolivia is rich in natural resources. Conflicts over control of these resources were the cause of the 19th

century Nitrate War and the Chaco War of the 1930's. The Nitrate War as a result of which Bolivia lost its entire opening to the Atlantic to Chile, broke out over the right of British and Chilean interests to exploit the nitrates in this region. The Chaco War between Paraguay and Bolivia ended in the loss of oil rich territory to Dutch interests in Paraguay.

Currently the Bolivian economy is based on mining. Tin brings in 70% of the country's foreign exchange and while the tin industry employs only 2-3% of the working force, it is of crucial economic importance. In the 1950's a US threat to cut off aid prevented Estenssoro from accepting various Russian loan offers to build a tin smelting industry. This would have ended Bolivian dependence on the fluctuating US manipulated world tin market. The agricultural sector of the economy occupies only a second place in the Bolivian economy although it employs 2/3 of the population. Most of the peasants barely manage to eke out an existence.

Foreign investment in Bolivia totaled \$206 million in 1960—the greater part was from the US. England and Japan played much smaller roles as investors. The major US investments are in petroleum, gold, mining and domestic commerce. US Gulf Oil Co. (controlled by Mellon banking interests), one of the five largest international US oil companies, has over \$100 million invested. In 1966 Gulf began pumping 18,000 barrels of oil a day to California. The Gulf oil contract with the Bolivian government was concluded at the expense of the development of the national oil company (YPFB).

South American Gold and Platinum has had landholdings and exploitation rights in Bolivia since 1958. By 1964 the company, a subsidiary of International Mining Corporation (which also has large holdings in Colombia) produced 67,000 ounces of gold. The high price of gold, minimal taxes, incredibly low wages make these holdings extremely valuable.

In the last six months W. R. Grace, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Chase Manhattan Bank, and US Steel have undertaken a tin dredging operation in Bolivia. And Chemical and Mineral Phillips (Englehardt Industries) and US Steel have contracted the take over of one of the lead and zinc mines confiscated in 1952 from the Bolivian Hochschild interests.

These direct US investments are complemented by indirect US investments in the Bolivian infrastructure. For example in the 1960's the Inter-American Development Bank financed road construction granting easier access to areas of US investment. Moreover this construction was contracted to US companies.

Bolivia came to world attention last March when a guerrilla foco was discovered in the southeast jungle region. The military patrol which discovered the guerrilla band was led by an oil employee who was allegedly supplying the guerrillas.

Barrientos realized that an ill-equipped, unmotivated, poorly trained army of peasant recruits could not deal with this situation. The US military response was to rush in counter-insurgency experts, Rangers, planes and other equipment. Recent reports have estimated there are from 100-200 special US advisers in Bolivia.

The North American press has played up the force as a band of Castro-inspired agitators, led by Argentine Che Guevara who have no real roots in Bolivian social reality. One of the main exhibitions at the September 1967 OAS conference of foreign ministers, Bolivia presented "evidence" that Che Guevara was leading the foco in Bolivia.

A Bolivian Peace Corps returnee came closer to the truth when he said that from his evaluation of the possibilities of political action and from his observations of the Bolivian US aid programs, revolution was the only possibility for real social change in that country. Barrientos' military regime has outlawed the major leftist parties and has carried out severe political repressions. It is

against the background of brutal suppression of the militant miners' uprisings in May 1965 (300 dead, over 700 wounded) and June 1967 and student agitation that the guerrillas in Bolivia have emerged.

Early newspaper accounts hinted that the army was suffering severe losses at the hands of the guerrillas. According to an American observer at this summer's OLAS conference in Havana, one of their tactics was to pick off the army officers thereby demoralizing the surviving peasant recruits. Current Bolivian-US claims are that the guerrilla forces have suffered serious defeats and that they are now surrounded. Any present claims should be evaluated only when balanced by information from anti-government sources. Both sides have reported arrests of people in La Paz accused of supplying the foco. It is more than likely that US forces are much more deeply involved than what is currently reported. Bolivia is one example of the beginnings of the Vietnamization of Latin America.

Shortly after the discovery of the foco Regis Debray was arrested (April 1967). Since then he has been held in prison pending military trial for having entered Bolivia illegally to undertake subversive activities—a crime punishable by 30 years imprisonment. Debray is a young French intellectual who visited Cuba several times in the early 1960's and taught philosophy at the University of Havana. His close contact with Castro and the Cuban revolution inspired him to review the successes and failures of the guerrilla fronts opened in Latin America from 1959-1965. This analysis entitled *The Long March*

in Latin America appeared in *New Left Review* of Sept.-Oct. 1965. His more recent and longer piece *Revolution in the Revolution* attempts to draw prescriptive conclusions from the Cuban revolutionary experience. In this essay Debray advocates "armed struggle" organized along the lines of guerrilla foci as the road to revolution in Latin America.

Debray was in Bolivia as a revolutionary journalist for the Mexican magazine *Sucesos*. He had gone to interview guerrilla leaders as Menendez an editor of *Sucesos* had interviewed Turcios in Guatemala and Castano in Colombia. At the time of his arrest he was in civilian clothes. At least twenty-five other political prisoners representing all the major Bolivian leftist parties have been confined in isolated jungle prison camps with little food or protection.

Be it resolved that SDS—

1. condemns every form of US intervention in Bolivia (economic, political military etc.) and supports the Bolivian people's struggle for their own liberation—
2. demands the release of all political prisoners in Bolivia
3. urges thorough research of US penetration in Latin America with the goal of building a consciousness in this country of how US power operates at home and abroad.

MORE NC RESOLUTIONS
NEXT WEEK



NSA

continued from page 1

Deveaux' assertion means that NSA would be violating the provisions of its tax-exempt status.

"Most of the kids at the NSA Congress still think NSA is running the anti-Johnson campaign nonetheless," Deveaux said. (Well over 400 delegates, more than half of the voting body in College Park, signed the petition advocating Johnson's removal from office next year but NSA now has no national coordinator for the movement.)

Deveaux added that no actual threat of withholding funds was posed, but OEO "did do a hair-raising investigation of the whole thing" and "demanded a penny-by-penny accounting" of its grant expenditures.

Letters to NLN

October 9, 1967

Toilers, Student-toilers, Black-toilers, Intellectual-toilers, and malcontents:

We have it on unimpeachable authority (CBS, The New Left) that the turmoil presently observable in our American Youth receives its impetus and inspiration not from an alien cabal of mendacious miscreants, but from the American Experience....Free Enterprise, Baseball, Teapot Dome, Apple Pie, Mother, and the IWW. Gratified as we are at being co-opted into the American pantheon (nominated by the very pinnacles of American capitalism, yet), we can't help but feel a little uneasy lockstepping into the ranks alongside the House of Morgan, NCF, and AFL-CIA. Then again, it was clear the IWW proffered an historical example. Perhaps our memories deceive and our old class martyr fire-eaters were less cantankerous than us....but we doubt it.

Feeling, therefore, a certain responsibility that the new radicals not misconstrue the Wobblies' position vis-a-vis The Grating Society, we of the Chicago branch are calling a two day regional conference for November 24-25 (the Friday and Saturday following Thanksgiving). We feel a mutual brain-picking on the topic of the relevance (or irrelevance) of revolutionary industrial unionism to current societal ulcers might be profitable, excuse the term, to all who might feel inclined to attend. Any organizations or individuals who would like to participate would be warmly welcomed to Friday's sessions albeit, they may be heatedly opposed once discussion begins. Saturday's sessions will be devoted to forming positive programs of action for the IWW, and will be open only to card-packing Wobs. If you're sufficiently proselytized on Friday, however, you should encounter no difficulty finding a delegate ready to sign you up preparatory to Saturday's meeting!

The meetings, consonant with our libertarian views, will be rather unstructured, aiming at the widest possible participation and airing of divergent views. It would seem certain, however, that the topics of peace, Black liberation, the draft, community organization, poverty, and direct v. political action would be examined. There would be a few short speeches to get the ball rolling for the general chaos. Organizations interested in stating their positions via a speaker should advise the Conference Committee at the address below as early as possible. Position papers would also be welcomed. The organization plans to have only two pundits, so, unlike brother Romney, fear not that you will be brainwashed. Several names that loom rather large in American commitment to attend but do not desire prior billing as the TV cables and cameras might get in the way of our bodies and minds. Rest assured they will be there, however; come and puncture their pretensions!

We are presently planning the conference at our General Headquarters at 2422 N. Halsted, Chicago. We would appreciate hearing as soon as possible from those who plan to attend so as to ascertain the possibility of the necessity of a larger hall, refreshments, diggings for out-of-town participants, etc. The evening of Friday's sessions will be devoted to more social pursuits, including, probably, a film. If you have any addresses to whom you think this call should be sent please let us know. Further mailings concerning exact hours, other details, etc. will be forthcoming.

Solidarite
Solidaridad
Solidaritat
Solidarity
For the OBU.....

IWW Conference Committee

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, Ill. Subscriptions: \$1 per year for members, \$10 a year for non-members. Signed articles are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the editors, Carol Neiman and Lyn Kempf.

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Carl Davidson, Infer-organizational secretary; Robert Pardun, Internal Education secretary; Mike Spiegel, National secretary.
National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206 Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312/666-3874)
New York City: Rm. 436, 17E. 22nd St., New York City, N.Y. 10003
Niagra Regional Coordinating Committee: PO Box 57-31, River Campus Station, Rochester, N. Y.
Southern California: PO Box 85396, Los Angeles, California 90072
New England: 39 Lee St., Apt. 3A, Cambridge, Mass.

VOLUME 2, NUMBER 36 let the people decide OCTOBER 16, 1967

new left notes is a member of the underground press syndicate and liberation news service

Seriousness in the Student Movement

IN RESPONSE TO CARL DAVIDSON

Leif Johnson

I am answering Carl Davidson's article calling for seriousness in the student movement (NLN 9/25/67). No doubt seriousness is a good thing. But the nonsense that was written in an appeal for seriousness I think deserves comment.

What is a student? He is a person being educated—trained if you like. Trained for what? To take his place in society. Any place? No, some few move automatically into the highest government or corporate positions; some enter the middle class as artists, writers, independent professionals, large farmers, entrepreneurs or ideologists for the system—union leaders, foundation executives, poverty businessmen, consultants. Then, last, there is the large bulk of the students graduated from the multiversity. They graduate to look for work. Finding salaries at \$80 to \$100/week and the draft after them, some decide to go back to graduate school.

When a person must earn his living solely by his work without benefit of property to "earn" for him, that person is a worker. Most students become workers; some build the machines and computers for industry, some publish the books, do research, write reports, that maintains the burgeoning bureaucracy that holds the morbid corporate system together. Others teach (or train) the next generation to be like they are.

Seventy years ago the two great corporate foundations, the Rockefeller foundation and the Carnegie Institute, encouraged and set up public education for the lower classes. The Foundations moved from state to state setting up the education departments, initiating education legislation and establishing education funds which later were to be replenished by state tax appropriations. Secondary education followed closely behind so that by WW I, most states provided free education through high school.

Why did these foundations encourage free public education? To allow the fullest development of the individual and create a nation of philosopher-kings? Hardly, it wasn't that kind of education. The society required a literate work force. Even for basic jobs the ability to read was necessary and beyond that, increasing mechanization of industry required fewer manual laborers and more clerks, engineers, supervisors and skilled workers.

In our generation, the corporate society organizes the educational system to fit its current needs. First, it needs more highly skilled workers; computer experts, laboratory technicians, researchers, chemists. Second, it needs many fewer workers than before. There is now an enormous "reserve army" that is being kept in the most absurd undergrad and grad programs only to graduate into a paper-processing job at a Social Security or Welfare office. Of course much of this "reserve army" is dropped out long before it reaches college. Illiterate, demoralized, unable to do but the meanest of work, always on call by the day or hour, this is the "track" for the minorities and rural poor.

Why is it so difficult to conceive of a white collar worker as a worker? After all, a worker is not so because he carries a lunch-box, wears cover-alls and expends his physical strength at his work. He is a worker because of his relationship to the corporate society: he produces a surplus value to which he has no claim.

To understand why the work force is becoming largely white collar we must see the labor process in its total operation. Suppose the production of a commodity were automated, displacing the workers who formerly tended machines. Wouldn't the entire labor process be disrupted? Of course not. Labor would merely be added at different points in the line of production. Instead of the bulk of the labor being added by labor performed at a machine, that labor is increasingly performed in the building of the machine and the preparation of raw materials. The engineer who designs, the physicist

who produces new raw materials, the draftsmen and metal workers who make a machine which requires no manual workers now add a larger portion of value to the product of the machine. Increasingly the value of the product consists of the labor added to the raw materials and to the machine itself which is necessarily partly consumed in the process of production. Thus, as the value of a product consists of greater proportions of labor in the machine and raw materials, the proportion of labor done at the machine falls.

Under what conditions is this "new" labor performed? Does the engineer own his office, the physicist his laboratory, and do they collect the full monetary value of their labor? Obviously not; they work for a corporation and collect a salary paid not in proportion of the value of their labor but in order to maintain them and prevent them from leaving. If each makes, let us say \$15,000/year, yet adds \$100,000 value to the product, the \$85,000 difference goes to the employer. This relation then is the measure of how much this worker is being exploited: only 15% of his labor time is represented by his salary.

Can this engineer be exploited without being oppressed? His choice to work for this or any other corporation was not freely made. His alternative was to starve. An individual worker confronting the colossal corporation quietly takes his place in the company order. He accepts the alienation of his labor, the discipline of the work place, the idiocy that corporate society calls entertainment and culture, the non-fulfillment of his creativity, the onerous taxation to support the surplus work force, and finally, if he were to transgress, would feel the op-

pression meted out by the armed forces of the state.

But when the engineer was a student he was not oppressed? Can you imagine what would happen if, after four years of not suffering any oppression in college, the engineer and his fellow students were, upon graduation, faced with the full oppression of a corporate society? The multiversities would have failed utterly and the social system would be destroyed by those unwilling and unable to submit to its exploitation and oppression.

You are well aware of how students are being oppressed into the labor force. They are made to follow rules and regulations dictated by campus authorities, oppressed by increasing work loads and enormous booklists, taught not to question or think analytically, set into perpetual competition with each other, individually and collectively, and are forced to endure this processing under increasingly inferior physical conditions. These very things are pointed out in *The Multiversity: Crucible of the New Working Class*.

What about the social worker who oppresses his clients and the schoolteacher, his students—aren't they the oppressing class. No they aren't the oppressing class. They are the salaried employees of the oppressing corporatist class. The corporatists employ one segment of the working class against another; black against white, social case worker against client, college graduate against non-graduate, grad student against undergrad, men against women, younger worker against older worker, unemployed against employed.

The conflict among sections of the working class is never the same as the conflict between the working class and the corporatists—the ruling capital-

ists. Conflicts among workers are always capable of solution and must be overcome if a working class movement is to succeed. On the other hand, conflict between the working class and the corporatist class must be joined and fought implacably by the workers. A working class movement cannot grow without understanding which conflict should be resolved and which should be precipitated. Without such understanding it will not distinguish its allies from its enemies, and must ultimately fail.

What does this mean for the student movement? It means that the movement must enable the multiversity student to examine both the nature of present-day corporate society and the student's place in it as a member of the working class. For members of SDS it means we will have to learn to study and write so that we may be useful to others in the development of a working class radicalism. It means that we must be very careful not to write, as Davidson does, such meaningless abstractions as, "Administrators are the enemy", "Refuse to be 'responsible'", "Have more faith in people than programs". These slogans may sound good, for there is an element of truth in all, but they do little to develop our thinking.

Students learn about their class and about the whole of society much as others

about the whole of society much as other workers learn—in their work place. A multiversity freshman has a political science reading list of James Baldwin, Robert Weaver, E. H. Carr and Michael Harrington. The instructor will say in an exam, compare Harrington's, Carr's and Weaver's solution to modern problems.

"Hollow Suggestions" for Serious Issues?

Al Spangler
University of Nebraska

I have just read Carl Davidson's article in the September 25 issue of NLN. I found it quite out of character, and since Carl and I are old and good friends, I feel obliged to offer the following remarks.

1) "Organizing struggles over dormitory rules seems frivolous when compared to the ghetto rebellions."

Of course they do, but what is the point of the comparison? New Left Notes seems frivolous, perhaps, compared to the journalistic efforts of the N.L.F. (Cf. this week's Guardian), but it doesn't follow that New Left Notes isn't worthwhile. It serves an important function for sds members, just as organizing around dorm rules can serve to introduce students to a new political form of life. Remember your own days of marching to save Caryl Chessman, for example.

2) "The war hardly affects most students."

I suggest that you read Lewis Hershey's "Manpower Channeling" again, and take a look at any college bulletin board to see which companies are holding job interviews. It's true that students aren't the ones, in the main, who do the dirty work in the jungles. They're too busy getting that degree, that "ticket to ride" on the big fat war machine which will affect their lives until they die. As well, more than a few students have split for Canada, burned their draft cards or raised hell at the induction centers.

3) "Draft resistance tables in the student union building—the arrogance of it all."

Take a look at yourself if you want to see a paradigm case of arrogance—the arrogance of power. So you are morally pure while the rest of us are left to wring our dirty hands. In case you don't know, sitting behind an sds literature table involves taking a very large step, if you happen to be a Nebraskan fresh off the farm, and don't even know who Marx is.

4) "Students are oppressed. Bullshit.... Most of us don't know the meaning of a hard day's work."

I think the latter claim is just false, though I don't have the time to conduct a survey. The former claim is, I suppose, of a theoretical nature. It seems to me that being trained to be an oppressor is itself to be oppressed. These "lackies" are being victimized, being used (to play your language game) by their oppressors, and by the system in which they play such a vital and unwitting role. This is why so many of them see the Administration of the University not as their enemy, as you would have it, but as their friend. Our task is to make them conscious of their predicament, viz., being manipulated by their alleged friends. Students lead very empty lives because of this predicament, and perhaps that is why black janitors scrape their knuckles scrubbing the students' alienation off the Administration building walls.

5) "Classes are large and impersonal. Reduce the size of the class in counter-insurgency warfare from 50 to 5."

What is the point of this gross exaggeration? Is your case so weak that you have to resort to this? I don't think so. Of course we have to question not only the logistics of the classroom, but the purpose of going there as well. Some people are trying to do this with Free Universities, and it would be much more useful to everyone to criticize this tactic than to engage in sophomoric dramas about counter-insurgency.

6) "We want to control student rules, tribunals, and disciplinary hearings 'ourselves'. One cop is so much like another."

If you are advocating that anarchy is our proper goal, that's fine. But I would like to see some reasons, since it isn't a settled issue for me. All "cops" are alike in the sense that they are supposed to carry out part of the job of enforcing the law. Some cops do this

well, some do it poorly and some don't do it at all. And I recognize that there are good and bad laws. It is not entailed by these facts, however, that all laws cannot be good ones. Nor does it follow that we cannot work to bring about a good society with laws that are enforced by police who try to perform their task fairly. As I recall from a recent conversation, you had nothing but praise for the cops in Cuba. Another fact your generality fails to take into account is that not all students are trying to replace an oppressive administration with an equally oppressive student government. I don't think you've done these people justice.

7) "Yet there is a student movement. Something is afoot on the nation's campuses...What can we do with it?"

I'm daily growing more suspicious of this talk about "the movement", or should I say, The Movement. As far as I can tell, we are the movement, so we'll be doing something with ourselves (political masturbation, anyone?).

8) As regards your positive suggestions I do not find them very instructive: "deal with serious issues...make a revolution etc."

OK, give me a week and I'll get two of them going. How can we deal with serious issues if people like yourself offer hollow suggestions like the above? You say in your conclusion that we ought to deal with the issue of getting the US out of Vietnam, even though you claim earlier in the article, "Draft resistance tables in the student union building—the arrogance of it all...the war hardly affects most students." Perhaps I'm just not very sophisticated about such matters. If not, I think it reasonable to suppose that there are many others like myself. Perhaps you can offer some helpful suggestions, as you have done so excellently in the past. I suppose we all have a great deal to learn, "students" and "people" alike. After all, we're just folks.

BOOK REVIEW

Containment and Revolution

Edited by David Horowitz, Beacon Press, 252 pages, \$5.95.

"Oh, Ahab," cried Starbuck, "not too late it is, even now, the third day, to desist. See! Moby Dick seeks thee not. It is thou, thou, that madly seekest him."—Melville, MOBY DICK

by Daniel Schechter

How relevant and refreshing it is to reread Moby Dick and see it also, as the description and prophecy of our United and discordant states creating, pursuing, and finally being consumed by the elusive and powerful red whale. The hunt is not a new one and every week a new book surfaces spouting new details of how deeply institutionalized and essential this quest is for the nation's basic structure and overall goal.

It is only now, with the publication of the work of Fleming, Horowitz, Oglesby, Williams, Alperovitz et al, that the con-

cealed patterns and deceptive strands of the cold war begin to peel away. The

college student awakes and understands why it was he played, as a child in New York, with "Fight the Red Menace" bubble gum cards. The Free World Colossus stands exposed, naked in its imperialistic quests, and more and more trapped by its Ahab-like monomania and global crusade.

New Scholarship, crucial for a detailed understanding of Western policy is slowly emerging. Last year in London, Bertrand Russell quietly opened a new Centre for Social Research. With the young historian David Horowitz as its director, the Centre is publishing a series of volumes entitled "Studies in Imperialism and the Cold War." The first volume, Containment and Revolution: Western Policy Towards Social Revolution: 1917 to Vietnam has just been released by Beacon Press (\$5.95). Here is a timely and important book which offers a re-examination of the historical,

record. It is clearly a valuable addition to the radical book shelf and reading list.

In the new book, Horowitz has brought together eight articles on various phases of Western (eg American) behavior in the cold war. A central theme through all the studies—compiled by an impressive group of committed radicals—is that American intervention in the affairs of other countries has been clearly counter-revolutionary in intention and execution. Impeding social revolution is the basic goal of containment! When examined in the light of historical evidence, the outline of this policy shows its face way back in 1917 when American troops arrogantly marched into Russia.

The collection begins with that 1917 intervention, offers both general and specific re-assessments of the crucial cold war confrontations. Here is the late Isaac Deutscher's brilliant speech to the 1965 Berkeley Teach-In. Those who were there will remember and others should read it. It is marked as is so much of Deutscher's writings by a clear and compelling stance. In reading it, one sees why the great historian's recent death means such a loss to the cause of radical scholarship and political integrity.

William Appleman Williams, certainly a guru for any serious student of the diplomatic history of American expansion, offers a detailed description and analysis of the American intervention in Russia: 1917 to 1920. Williams shows how the spectre of the "red bogey man" camouflaged the desire to contain basic economic and social changes. The other contributors are younger but also offer impressive documentation of the historic imperialist whale hunt.

The other scholars include John Baggely, who examines the policies of World War II as a prelude to the Cold War. Henry Berger looks at the late Senator Taft's role as a conservative critic of the cold war. John Gittings explores "The Origins of China's Foreign Policy," and Richard Morrock relates "Revolution and Intervention in Vietnam." All of the pieces are good. Some better than others, but all unavoidably handicapped by the limited

HELP!
the N.O. fill its coffers!!!
send names and addresses
of all underground-type
bookshops, mags, etc. in
your area, so we can push
our fantastic line of radical
posters!
LIBERATION PRESS
1608 W. MADISON
CHICAGO, ILL. 60612

access to crucial documents which are so vital to foreign policy research.

One of the best—if not the best—articles in the book is the former SDS president, Todd Gitlin's tightly argued case study of "Counter-Insurgency: Myth and Reality in Greece." At a time when a fascist government has seized power and an armed resistance movement is slowly organizing within the country, this article is highly relevant. Gitlin shows that "Greece was the Vietnam of the 1940's in more than a rhetorical sense." This historical account explodes myth after myth about the "free world" role in crushing the Greek Revolution. Especially lucid is the attempt to get inside the revolution itself and recount how it was organized with an emphasis on the role the Greek Communists played.

Taken together, the volume offers a picture of the steady evolution of a foreign policy seeking primarily to "contain" social revolution in order to keep "the world safe for democracy" (sic)—read "American hegemony". It has its limits, of course. There is nothing about Latin America or Africa. The British and French also come in for relatively light treatment. More importantly, some crucial assertions reflecting an economic determinist view require further documentation. Most likely the other volumes in this series—which incidentally mark the first breakthrough of a marxist radical series into the "respectable" publishing world—will expand and fill out in inadequacies of this first volume.

Revolutionary harpooners can use this book as ammunition in the effort to redirect the Peqod's (read: "great society's") journey or sink the ship. There's a whole lot of fish out there waiting!

PORTLAND DRAFT CONFERENCE

Seattle, Oct. 10

Note: This statement has been prepared by people active in draft resistance in Seattle, Washington. It was read and discussed at a conference on draft resistance held at Reed College, Portland, Ore. on October 1, 1967. It is the position of those who sign it, not of any organized group. Comment is invited.

Jeff Segal of S.D.S. reports that the August conference of anti-draft activists in Madison, Wisconsin floundered around without doing much of anything. Segal feels this happened because of little work on strategy on the local level. (See Sept. issue of The Movement) Actually, the problem is much larger than that. Lately we seem to be running into the problem of the lack of an overall strategy in terms of long range perspectives and a definition of what Draft Resistance is all about. Is it more than just another individual technique for getting out of the army, for whatever reason? If so, what is it then? Since the reasons can be so different, how can the movement have a common strategy, or even purpose?

There are those who would tell us that these questions are irrelevant and that we need only to throw ourselves into activity more vigorously for these problems to evaporate into thin air. But action needs to be based on at least a minimal understanding of what that action means in the long run, or it will very quickly lose momentum and any semblance of direction and we will find ourselves at an impasse.

We must realize that the nature of the movement and its strategic effect is determined primarily not by the hopes and wishes of the activists but by the reality of the objective conditions which created the need for draft resistance. Julius Lester of SNCC reporting on the OLAS conference in Havana (in the same issue of The Movement) puts it in these terms:

"It is crystal clear to us that we are fighting an international structure that enslaves us all. The only way we can beat it is to internationalize our struggle so that you'll have an international power fighting an international power. That is the way we can win, because if we do what Che says we should do, that is, to create two, three, many Vietnams, we shall have them fighting on all fronts at the same time and they cannot win. When we isolate the struggle they can bring all their power on one country, and once they do that, that country is lost.

"But they cannot fight all of us at the same time. So that even if we do not have the same goals, even if we do not have the same political ideology, we have the same common enemy."

These are the international facts of life which must be taken into account when considering strategy.

The Liberation Movement forms the first such front against the common imperialist enemy inside the United States and the growing strength of the uprisings in the Black ghettos is just a foretaste of what is to come.

Once the anti-draft movement goes beyond helping a few individuals and begins to seriously threaten the supply of military manpower, once it becomes a means of helping to build a really effective resistance inside the military, it will be striking at the very heart of the imperialist war machine, and will, in effect, constitute a second front against the common enemy at home. As such it can expect to meet exactly the same sort of repression the system uses against the Black people and against the Vietnamese or Dominicans. The imperialists realize quite well that the military monster which is their chief means of support is also quite vulnerable.

If these are the true facts, then the strategy has to be to expand and develop this second front as widely and as militantly as possible. It is only common sense to unite with those outside the country and fight the same aggressor. It is only common sense to unite with and support the Black rebels who have created the first front against the common enemy inside the country.

When these things take place, the aggressor, the U.S. Power Machine, far from running the world, becomes a besieged fortress. Within that fortress, it becomes possible to open up even more fronts, 3, 4, and 5 more.

For example, scientists and intellectuals, white collar ditch-diggers too, can refuse to cooperate and can do more than talk. They can sabotage and demolish whole sectors of the research and technique on which the highly sophisticated aggressive weaponry and structure depends. Industrial workers have similar possibilities. In a fortress under siege, the struggle does not proceed primarily by majority vote, and small beginnings in the right direction will eventually open up entire new sectors.

Draft resistance must expand its own front, support the Black Liberation Movement, build strong ties with revolutionaries in other countries, and encourage the opening of new fronts by others and in the end there is really no doubt we will win!

Donovan Workman
Russell Wills
Cynthia Wills
Delbert McCombs

Robbie Stern
Ed Morman
Judith Shapiro

Robert Armstrong
Alice Armstrong
Pat Ruckert
Fred Lonidier

NEW LEFT NOTES
Room 206
1608 W. Madison
Chicago, Ill. 60612
RETURN REQUESTED

Second-class post-
age rates paid in
Chicago, Illinois.

J. Walton Senterfitt
2115 S St. NW
Washington, DC 20008

Pikeville Sediton

continued from page 1

a U. S. Marshal served him with a copy of the U. S. Court's order.

Challenges to the county power structure continue. More than 700 teachers have been on strike for three weeks, demanding a pay increase, and parents stopped construction on a new school administration building and a dam in protest against conditions in the schools.

These protesters are aimed directly at the coal operators, since school conditions are a result of the fact that there is almost no tax on coal.

Meantime, Ratliff seems determined to appeal the decision to the U. S. Supreme Court. At this point he cannot afford to drop the case because it is one of the main planks in his campaign for lieutenant governor. His running mate, Louie Nunn, won the Republican nomination for gover-

nor by appealing to segregationists and to anti-Catholic sentiment in the mountains. He swore he would run the Bradens and SCEF out of Kentucky if elected.

An appeal to the Supreme Court could mean a long and costly fight, even though the courts have clearly rejected Ratliff's case. SCEF is already in debt for the early costs of the case. Money to pay off that debt and to sustain and expand SCEF's organizing program in the mountains and the Deep South are urgently needed. Contributors will receive a year's subscription to SCEF's monthly newspaper, the Southern Patriot. Send money to:

The Southern Conference
Educational Fund (SCEF)
3210 West Broadway
Louisville, Ky 40211.