The Case for the Case: Fighting Political Repression

On Oct. 26, General Hershey of SFS fame stated in his infamous letter to draft boards that "the ends justifies the means when they serve the national interest. It is obvious that any action that guarantees an expanded Selective Service Act or the regulations or the related processes cannot be justified." It follows that those who violate them should be denied deferment in the national interest. It also follows that illegal activity which interferes with recruiting or causes refusal of duty in the military or naval forces could not be justified. This argumentation is being used to justify the actions of the SDS in protesting the draft. The National Guardian's conference that if an anti-war constituency committed mainly organizing. Our rhetoric called for the needs of the national health, the individual, his sense of well-being and satisfaction. He does not have the inhibitions of fear, uncertainty, and dissatisfaction which the stigma that has been attached to being out of uniform would engender. The door is open for him as a student to qualify if capable in a skill badly needed by his nation. He has many opportunities and is provided to make a decision. The psychological effect of this circumstantial climate depends upon the individual, his sense of good sportsmanship, his love of country and its way of life. He can obtain a sense of well-being and satisfaction that he is doing as a civilian what will help his country most. This process encourages him to put forth his best effort and removes to some degree the stigma which has been attached to being out of uniform.

The International Days of Resistance

or 10 Days to Shake the Empire

by Carl Davidson and Greg Calvert, NCC

The discussion of the National Mobilization Committee (NMC) during the NIC meeting was a major agenda item. The rise and repetition of the debate going on within the SDS membership for the last two years. However, there were significant differences. Most of us felt a new responsibility for SDS to respond constructively to a growing anti-war movement which had reached a new level of development. In the past, national SDS stood apart from the whirlings and dealings of the anti-war marches by insisting on a certain future with no prospect of military service or civilian work. As such, it constitutes the first systematic attempt to use apowerful system of coercion to destroy the New Left. In the face of repression, the last thing to do is to back down—particularly if the form of repression leaves the enemy totally vulnerable.

The News Release on the Hershey Case

Following is a short passage from a Selective Service document entitled "On Channeling":

"Delivery of manpower for induction, the process of providing a few thousand men with transportation to a reception center, is not much of an administrative or financial challenge. It is in dealing with the other millions of registrants that the system is heavily occupied, developing more effective human beings in the national interest. Educators, scientists, engineers, and their professional organizations, who have been convinced that this is true. It is in this atmosphere that the young man registers at age 18 and pressure begins to force his choice. He does not have the inhibitions of fear, uncertainty, and dissatisfaction which the stigma that has been attached to being out of uniform would engender. The door is open for him as a student to qualify if capable in a skill badly needed by his nation. He has many opportunities and is provided to make a decision. The psychological effect of this circumstantial climate depends upon the individual, his sense of good sportsmanship, his love of country and its way of life. He can obtain a sense of well-being and satisfaction that he is doing as a civilian what will help his country most. This process encourages him to put forth his best effort and removes to some degree the stigma which has been attached to being out of uniform.

In the less patriotic and more selfish individual it engenders a sense of fear, uncertainty, and dissatisfaction which motivates him, nevertheless, in the same direction. He complains of the uncertainty which he must endure; he would like to be able to do as he pleases; he would appreciate a certain future with no prospect of military service or civilian work. He feels that he is being forced into a choice by the system and that he is being deprived of his right to make a decision. He feels that he is being forced to choose between two undesirable alternatives.
DECEMBER 27-31 BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA

CHAPTERS WISHING TO BE REPRESENTED AT THE NC SHOULD ELECT THREE DELEGATES AND SEND THEIR NAMES TO THE NATIONAL OFFICE BY DECEMBER 20TH.

All local chapters wishing to be officially recognized by national standards at the December NC should send immediately to the N.O.:

(a) the names of at least 5 national members;
(b) a chapter constitution or statement of purpose (can be brief — must be non-exclusive and in broad general agreement with the aims and principles of national standards);
(c) a request for official recognition as a local chapter of national standards.

Chapters that are recognized at the NC will be eligible to be represented there by voting delegates (the number of delegates is determined by the number of national members there are in the chapter — one delegate for the first 5 to 52 members or part thereof — i.e., 51 national members = 3 voting delegates.)
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safety or interest—or is denied deferment.

Thereafter his career as a student, the pressure—the threat of loss of deferment—continues. It continues with equal intensity after graduation. His local board requires periodic reports to find out what he is up to. He is impelled to pursue his skill rather than embark upon some less important enterprise and is encouraged to apply his skills in an essential activity in the national interest. The loss of deferred status is the consequence for the individual who acquires the skill and either does not use it or uses it in a non-essential activity. The psychological pressure of losing choice under pressure to take action is the American or indirect way of achieving what is done by direction in foreign countries where choice is not permitted.

It should be clear to all of us that the Selective Service System is one of the most powerful instruments in American society for determining the life choices of young Americans. Deferments, like 2-S, are an essential part of this gigantic system of manpower channeling. The 2-S deferment ensures that millions of young American men will, at least in the long run, do what the government tells them to do without question. This is the price that we must pay for the American system of indirect coercion. If the Selective Service System, and to all other systems that make those actions of the American people to work for the redefinition of those ends which are truly in the interests of the nation.

We want once again to make it clear that we are entering this case not to try to redefine that interest, but to redefine the political opposition of the New Left.

We want it to be clear that this is not only our constitutional right but also our duty to the American people to work for the redefinition of those ends which are truly in the interests of the nation.


10 Days to Shake the Empire

continued from page 1

go through the experience of the mass
demonstrators abroad and black America at home. This is the time to develop a political strategy to make them a part of a national movement to end the war were to end. The crisis we are dealing with is one of the most serious the nation has faced, and our failure to deal with it will have profound implications for the future of the country. We must act now and make our presence felt.

The international aspects of our program must be given due consideration. The United States has a vital interest in maintaining its influence in the world, and we must not permit our domestic problems to distract us from our responsibilities abroad. We must be prepared to take action to protect our interests in the region, and to ensure the continued stability of the world order.

In conclusion, I urge all of you to support our efforts to shake the Empire. Together, we can make a difference. Let us act now and seize the moment.

10 DAYS TO SHAKE THE EMPIRE

MIKE SPiegel
National Secretary

---
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On Organizational Responsibility and Political Maturity
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The New Left Notes is an independent publication that covers the political landscape of the time. It provides insights into the ongoing debates and discussions of the New Left, which was a significant social and political movement in the United States during the 1960s and 1970s. The publication was known for its radical perspectives and its role in shaping the political discourse of the era.
Reform is only a temporary palliative to the existing relationships. If we replace Left authoritarianism with Left authoritarianism we have made a great reform movement, not a revolution—the structural and cultural relationships are the same with a few changes in the legal fictions.

Revolution, as opposed to reform, does not mean it was accomplished but how much and to what extent. (Viva Revolution! Morte Reform!)

We have been increasingly dismayed at the authoritarian tendencies and te authoritarian rhetoric that has been creeping into our movement especially from SDS. It is understandable. The constant frustrations that full-time movement people are confronted with sometimes are overwhelming. After knocking ourselves out in full dedication to our revolution we see little concrete results, little that we can call successes, and thus become apathetic. We have seen that the bourgeois role in which it boils down to—not who is anti-democratic or democratic but rather who is on our side and who is against us. The former can have free speech, the latter can't. Very truly yours,

Leif Johnson

Dear Leif,

Your letter disturbs me very much, not because I disagree with it, however, but because I agree very much with it.

The problem of how to finance our activities is one we must take with the greatest emphasis on grass-roots responsibility, and the problems you raise are central to that.

First, your analysis of where the $12,000 came from is basically correct. However, the contributor did not in any way mandate the way the money was to be used.

Well, what to do about money from the membership—it undoubtedly exists out there, but getting it from the members is a very difficult job.

The organization requires the need for a radical force and then our finances were unreliable?—and our finances were unreliable?

Vive the revolution and our responsibilities! What would happen to SDS if we were to set up a pledge system of a buck a month for students, five or ten a year for workers. For workers, I think the minimum should be ten a month. There is no reason to give less.

This kind of financing would stabilize income and make the organization financially responsible to its members. It would also reduce the influence of the middle class....

Very truly yours,

Leif Johnson

Dear Mike,

I noticed in a recent NAC Minutes that the N.O. has collected $12,000 during a recent fundraising drive, but there was no indication as to where this money was collected. Was it collected from the membership or, as I suspect, from rather weak—do-gooders? Was the money a charitable handout from the middle class which likes our libertarian ideas?

It seems to me that this is the least desirable way of raising money. You cannot avoid becoming beholden to a group that has given you the money. Its easy collection destroys initiative to find other money.

Money should only be raised from the membership, in principle and in practice, if necessary, because SDS should be the sole proprietors only. You might set up a pledge system of a buck a month for students, five or ten a month for workers. For workers, I think the minimum should be ten a month. There is no reason to give less.

This kind of financing would stabilize income and make the organization financially responsible to its members. It would also reduce the influence of the middle class....

Very truly yours,

Leif Johnson

Dear Mike,

None of this is to say that any change should be made without an honest prioritization of which we have set—priorities which place the greatest emphasis on grass-roots responsibility. The political role of the N.O. has been defined, but the financial support for that role has to date not come forth. Consequently, because of the lack of financial support and because of the political role the N.O. has been defined, it has attempted to fulfill that role in what amounts to a self-financing program so that we may have full-time organ-izers and a newspaper. Every SDS member should feel the need of contributing to the organization and its members to contribute analyses of social conditions and movements and description of radical activities to organize other students and to do what we must do to win the battle—to another First or Second World great-power oligarchy.

Revolution is the total turnover of structural and cultural relationships. One cannot have free speech because they are anti-democratic (which they are without doubt) when we come to the dilemma of choosing who is a democrat and who isn't. One cannot have free speech if the bourgeoisie plays with us, and yet merely putting the label of "bourgeois" on them (Drug War, etc.) is not the whole boat. Let us have our cake and eat it. Let the people decide.
Jeff Gordon's thoughtful article on the Brooklyn situation is in sharp contrast to the rambling self-contradictory article by Mike MeCroop. Where Carl is all in favor of institutional resistance and glowingy catalogues all the good things that SDS has done, Jeff Gordon flatly denounces SDS and the whole of this movement. He is unequivocal and I want to second him. If we chase the revolutionaries, we have only one card left in our sleeve: to build a movement encompassing half of the population, and that could apply an overwhelming ratio of forces in a true guerrilla strategy to really keep our heads above ground. This is presented by the contrast between the situation here at Wisconsin and the one described by Jeff Gordon at Brooklyn. At Madison understanding has increased; the number of potential resisters is higher as a result of what has happened. At Wisconsin, the hard core that got their heads bloodied on October 18th, remains just what it was. The many liberal students and faculty members who, despite police brutality are still not convinced that Dow or the CIA should be in the war. There is no consensus and I believe the university is part of the corporate hierarchy that rules America. As Jeff Gordon says, we already exist within this hierarchy. The student movement is basically an internal organ which can be of tremendous value if members contribute to it and we can export it as more than an internal organ which can be of tremendous value if members contribute to it and we can export it as more than an intellectual asset. Obviously, we are hexing for a response to Davidson. A recent issue of NLN had a very exciting article which showed the myriad ramifications; I think they were trying to prove—black revolutionaries, liberals, socialists—pros, guerrillas—politics. Who are we? Many think we don't have an ideology, that's our next step.

It is a band of people, I have been forgiven by those people, we have to prove our words and not just talk. If that is the case then this "thing" we can and we will, it is a recurrent theme and some projections made about its future.

Similarly, myself and often in the company of others, a recurrent theme is voiced. How can so many different people be organized? In the past we thought of large organizations, and with so many different ideas ever get together and organize to bring about revolutionary change in this country, in a culture-society that we don't know how to begin, we must begin within the system. Now thought is toward revolution.

NATIONAL SECRETARY'S REPORT

solution in the past—but it fails since we can get more people involved

Obviously, we are hoping for a response to the present fundraising mailing. In addition, people can get more involved in the movement, which has a double effect. They strengthen the movement financially while also broadening the audience of New Left Notes—an internal organ which can be of tremendous value if members contribute to it and we can export it as more than a four-paper. Speaks to those people in your communities, they are the ones who don't have national membership; it is a painless way of strengthening SDS. Also, we are trying to compile a fundraising guide for the local level, which we hope will contribute each month.

We must confront the political implications in the present organizational and financial situation. The movement is a politically mature organization both in theory and practice. To continue without realistically facing those implications creates a dangerous situation within SDS—where that "everyman" lies. The working class, the most potentially revolutionary class in America. We are at a starting point once again. Where are we? We are at the beginning of the most crucial phase of the struggle. We have a long way to go, brothers.

Mike MeCroop

Madison, Wisconsin
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I have just read your article in NLN, and would like to contribute the following to your discussion:

1. I am generally in agreement with the preliminary remarks associated in your point #1, but I think you have to be aware of the importance of getting women in leadership positions who are sufficiently undeveloped, precisely because of women's historical low status and the knowledge that the experience will lead to an erosion, rather than a development, of their self-confidence. I think you have to be aware of a situation where a woman is put in such a position and finds herself not in fact a leader, would not be able to assume as a confirmation of what has been taught all her life—that she is inferior, intellectually.

2. This is connected with the above and is, I think, the fundamental theoretical problem, in my opinion, that women's liberation groups must face. Namely that, unlike any other oppressed groups in history, e.g. colonial peoples or blacks in the U.S., it is not possible for women to separate themselves fully from their oppressors, or at least nowhere as fully as other oppressed people have been able to. Obviously, in the nature of their oppression and their emotional needs, of women and men both, there must be a constant interaction between the personal and the historical. The dilemma that this brings up, it seems to me, is that women must seek their liberation at the individual level, and that oppression must be must understood and combated on the basis of the individual situation. That is, as women struggle for liberation, and tensions occur, women must face this dilemma. I'm not saying that it is not a fact—not really, though in some cases rationally—that it is the sexual caste system which is an important part of the tensions. (Certainly to say, all men, we are giving it up or not, because the burden and the stigmas of being oppressors.) What this implies to me is that women must build a revolutionary political program, in which he clearly feels is secondary to this argument. Mostly, "Revolution as the overall (or historical) function of a political movement" is, in my opinion, given over to the primary form of struggle in Latin America, and that the primary form of struggle in Latin America is the popular revolutionary (and not the guerrilla) movement, of the peasants' as well as the guerrillas' (Don McKelvey)

The dilemma that this brings up, it seems to me, is that women must seek their liberation at the individual level, and that oppression must be understood and combated on the basis of the individual situation. That is, as women struggle for liberation, and tensions occur, women must face this dilemma. I'm not saying that it is not a fact—not really, though in some cases rationally—that it is the sexual caste system which is an important part of the decisions. (Certainly to say, all men, we are giving it up or not, because the burden and the stigmas of being oppressors.) What this implies to me is that women must build a revolutionary political program, in which they clearly feel is secondary to this argument. Mostly, "Revolution as the overall (or historical) function of a political movement" is, in my opinion, given over to the primary form of struggle in Latin America, and that the primary form of struggle in Latin America is the popular revolutionary (and not the guerrilla) movement, of the peasants' as well as the guerrillas' (Don McKelvey)

3. The above notwithstanding, I think it is important to be as specific as possible about the particular manifestations of this tension in your own personal (or any personal) situation: and actions. Aside from writing about such things yourselves, it might be a good idea to get some guy to write something like "Confessions of a Male Feminist"? it would be considered less threatening, I think, to other guys.

4. Lastly, and this is a random thought: the fact of women's changing names on marriage is one thing that should be mentioned loud and long. In whatever context, as a fact of sexual identity so central to herself should be changed.

ED: NOTE: The address of the women's group in Chicago which authored the exercise you cite is: Women's Union, 916 N. Francisco, Chicago, Illinois 60622, (212) 242-1825. For New York Groups, contact the N.Y. RELIGIOUS OFFICE.

The dialectics of history (and therefore of revolution) often dictate that in the midst of important struggles basic truths be obscured by more specific concerns. Unfortunately, such crises often arise with more frequency than should be the case. Crudely, such is the case with Regis Debray's "Revolution in the Revolution", which he clearly feels is secondary to this argument. Mostly, "Revolution as the overall (or historical) function of a political movement" is, in my opinion, given over to the primary form of struggle in Latin America, and that the primary form of struggle in Latin America is the popular revolutionary (and not the guerrilla) movement, of the peasants' as well as the guerrillas' (Don McKelvey)

A struggle, of historic significance, for control of the Left in Latin America is occurring between those who would emphasize primarily legal, city-based actions, and those who emphasized illegal, armed guerrilla warfare. In "Revolution in the Revolution?", Debray more assumes than argues that armed struggle must be the primary form of struggle in Latin America today, and devotes little space to this argument. Mostly, "Revolution in the Revolution?" is a series of arguments for why the guerrilla movement must be controlled by the guerrillas themselves, rather than by a city-based political movement of the Latin American Communist Parties.

The most important section of this review is his discussion of the extent of Debray's book which he clearly feels is secondary to this argument. Mostly, "Revolution as the overall (or historical) function of a political movement" is, in my opinion, given over to the primary form of struggle in Latin America, and that the primary form of struggle in Latin America is the popular revolutionary (and not the guerrilla) movement, of the peasants' as well as the guerrillas' (Don McKelvey)

The most important section of this review is his discussion of the extent of Debray's book which he clearly feels is secondary to this argument. Mostly, "Revolution as the overall (or historical) function of a political movement" is, in my opinion, given over to the primary form of struggle in Latin America, and that the primary form of struggle in Latin America is the popular revolutionary (and not the guerrilla) movement, of the peasants' as well as the guerrillas' (Don McKelvey)

As to Debray's second main point: his argument that guerrillas themselves, rather than a city-based political movement of the Latin American Communist Parties.

Debray says some very important and helpful things about the development of the relationship between guerrillas and peasants, and about the power that guerrillas have in delegitimizing the oppressive institutions of the society. (In fact, he even quotes Lenin approvingly that "the best propaganda is the act itself"). But I think you have to be aware of the fundamental political need for women's liberation groups to establish themselves as the leadership of the struggle, rather than as the followers. But I think you have to be aware of the fundamental political need for women's liberation groups to establish themselves as the leadership of the struggle, rather than as the followers. But I think you have to be aware of the fundamental political need for women's liberation groups to establish themselves as the leadership of the struggle, rather than as the followers. But I think you have to be aware of the fundamental political need for women's liberation groups to establish themselves as the leadership of the struggle, rather than as the followers. But I think you have to be aware of the fundamental political need for women's liberation groups to establish themselves as the leadership of the struggle, rather than as the followers. But I think you have to be aware of the fundamental political need for women's liberation groups to establish themselves as the leadership of the struggle, rather than as the followers.
One unfortunate result of the notion of having preconceived notions whatever (One may well consider it a stroke of good fortune or bad luck that the military writings of Mao Tse-tung are dominating the political consciousness of the U.S. at the same time that the story of the struggle is being传动) is that American soldiers are being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the Chinese people. This can hardly be said to be an accurate reflection of reality, but it is probably true that the soldiers are more likely to be influenced by this type of thinking than by any other. The problem is that the soldiers are not being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the Chinese people. Instead, they are being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the U.S. and its allies. This is a dangerous situation, because it is likely to lead to a lack of enthusiasm for the war, which will in turn lead to a lack of effectiveness in the war effort.

One of the reasons why the soldiers are not being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the Chinese people is that the soldiers are not being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the U.S. and its allies. Instead, they are being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the U.S. and its allies. This is a dangerous situation, because it is likely to lead to a lack of enthusiasm for the war, which will in turn lead to a lack of effectiveness in the war effort.

One of the reasons why the soldiers are not being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the Chinese people is that the soldiers are not being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the U.S. and its allies. Instead, they are being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the U.S. and its allies. This is a dangerous situation, because it is likely to lead to a lack of enthusiasm for the war, which will in turn lead to a lack of effectiveness in the war effort.

One of the reasons why the soldiers are not being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the Chinese people is that the soldiers are not being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the U.S. and its allies. Instead, they are being trained to think of themselves as being involved in a struggle for the survival of the U.S. and its allies. This is a dangerous situation, because it is likely to lead to a lack of enthusiasm for the war, which will in turn lead to a lack of effectiveness in the war effort.
continued from page 7

...the case he should make that very clear. Instead he (and the Cubans too) allows the reader to draw the conclusion that here is something very close to the gospel on Latin American revolution. One can only take a vengeful position that as long as the guerrillas survive everything will be all right.

What this means is that a political reading and crystallizing and directing a revolution— as in Cuba, or China—has a very definite, extremely important political task to fight against man's history and consequent psychology, and to make the strongest possible effort to involve the masses in the running of the society. This is where the Cultural Revolution in China is so important, it is far the most far-reaching effort along these lines in the history of socialist power. Superficially, and at one level, it is against the Communist Party itself (and all others with power who fail to see in to activate the masses), but only in the sense of strengthening the Party by emphasizing its members' revolutionary duty. It is a purge, not so much of individual men from the Party (though to a certain extent it is that) as of unreconstructed, and therefore counter-revolutionary, thoughts from men's minds.

Why do I go through all this? Because there is in Debray's book not the first hint of a recognition that a party has a kind of all-around their influence perform—and by his words at the time of the Cultural Revolution in China, an ex¬ 
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