

Midwest Regional Conference

SDS MIDWEST REGIONAL CONFERENCE—
NIU, DEKALB, ILLINOIS—FEB 17, 18, 19
SOME GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

Bill Murphy — NIU-SDS

With the opening speech of the conference on Friday nite, it became apparent that this meeting was to be a definite departure from most gatherings of this kind held in the past. The first talk was on the history of revolutionary activity in America from the 1930's to the present. At first, some people wondered at the choice of such a topic, but a clear pattern emerged as the conference proceeded. The movie, "Time of the Locust," shown the first evening of the two and a half day meeting centered on Vietnam and made those horrifying details of the war we so often read about REAL—almost to the point of being nauseating. The silence was deafening after the film and a tone of dead seriousness was established which lasted throughout the rest of the conference.

Saturday morning, the conference moved from Northern's semi-plush Center to the austere yet uniquely human setting of the Unitarian meeting house. The morning session dealt with the general question "WHY?" America's reasons for waging war against the Vietnamese people were analyzed from three main viewpoints: economic, political, and military. Econ. and polit. were lumped together since economic concerns control politics anyway. The speakers' analyses pointed to the fact that the Selective Service System is an integral and necessary part of the corporate giant America is building at home and in underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It soon became clear that the military draft is a relatively small part of the whole system. The threat of conscription is a form of "intimidation and coercion" used to "channel" personnel into "critical occupations" in the American economy. (This last statement was lifted in part from the SSS handbook used by workers in the draft boards). At this point the theme of revolution, established the previous nite, again asserted itself. The point that most of the morning speakers were making was that those in the New Left should not harp on small side issues alone, but should realize that everything is interrelated. Hence, the phrase that was used repeatedly was "total resistance."

Later in the morning a period of introspection regarding SDS and the people in it began. This mood, as became clear later, was tied up with the tone established Friday nite and renewed early in the Sat. Meeting. After the morning speeches everyone broke into workshops and one specialized in exactly this introspective field. What place do the "Hippies" hold in the movement? Is

"copping out" a revolutionary action? (Robert Frost: "One can do worse than be a swinger of Birches.") Why should everybody fly? Taking some ideas from Berne's Games People Play, what are the games that SDS people might accidentally play at times? (Is the revolutionary hobbyist playing an offshoot of "NIGYSOB" or "Uproar?") These were some of the questions that faced people Saturday morning. The consensus of the workshop group dealing with this field was that a total revolution probably could never go anywhere unless it began within those attempting to bring it about. Again we see the theme of absolute revolution and resistance coming to the fore.

The highlight of Saturday nite's session was the film "Son and Daughters", a movie about the peace demonstrations and movement at Berkeley. As far as immediate results were concerned, the movement there was frustrated. What "Sons and Daughters" is all about is the establishment of a "climate of resistance" which will find success only in the long run thru its effects on people. This idea was to be renewed often during the remaining day of the conference.

Sunday morning saw more workshops in progress—these dealing with campus organizing, peace work with unions, churches, and liberal groups in general. Another workshop considered power structure research in universities, especially regarding Government grants in subjects related to chemical and biological warfare. The Provos meeting was enough to "blow anyone's mind" and resulted in a candy, money, and flower handing out type march thru Northern's campus and downtown DeKalb—much to the dismay of local "dead heads."

In the afternoon came the general session. This part of the meeting was undoubtedly the most revealing in regard to the state of the movement and those in it. The main business of this session was to consider the formation of an SDS Midwest Region and also the question of SDS support of the March 25 Peace March in Chicago and the April 15 Mobilizations in New York and San Francisco. Although the establishment of the Midwest Regional was postponed until a meeting in the near future so that its arrangement will be more representative of local needs and desires, the position of regional field traveller was created and on-the-spot contributions provided expense money for the first month. The meeting turned into a loud harrangue at times between those urging support of the Chicago Peace March and those against such support. The ostensible reason for the disagreement was that the March 25 rally represents a consolidation of efforts of politically divergent groups—some

(Continued on page 3)

REP CONFERENCE

Steve Halliwell NY REP

The weekend of February 17-19 saw over 300 people from the New York Regional chapters of SDS descend on Princeton University for a combined regional REP-regional SDS conference.

The opening session on Friday night was devoted to a new SDS document by three New School students — Dave Gilbert, Bob Gottlieb, and Gerry Tenney. The paper, called *Towards a Theory of Social Change*, attempted to delineate trends within the society and the economy and pointed toward new groups that might become agents of radical social change. From the questions and comments that followed, it became evident that the group assembled represented both "old guard" SDS people, who had thought and discussed these questions before and had specific questions and very new people, whose questions touched upon the most basic aspects of radical consciousness. To add to the fun, the voices of West Coast hippiedom and American Old Left also were heard. Since the presentation of the essay could only be a sketch of the questioned covered in the original, the discussion ranged far and wide with little coherence. Issues were raised, however, that recurred throughout the weekend: the question of agency and constituency; the question of Marx and class consciousness; the differences with the Old Left; and the implication of a radical or revolutionary stance.

The Saturday session included a paper by

(Continued on page 3)

U. OF WISCONSIN BATTLES THE FORCES OF CORPORATE LIBERALISM

On Tuesday, Feb. 21, sds members in Madison mobilized to "keep their date with the man from Dow". Chapter members voted to confront the interviewers from Dow Chemical Corporation by marching into the buildings where the interviews were being held with signs protesting Dow's production of napalm and challenging the right of the university to allow the use of facilities for the purpose of recruiting future designers of bigger and better napalm. When sign carrying students attempted to enter the building where interviews were being conducted, they were blocked by the campus gestapo who announced that "no signs are permitted in the building". At this point, organizers of the demonstration protested that no such regulation exists (U. of Wisc. administrators have been negligent) and insisted upon their right to demonstrate. The campus reacted to this insistence by dragging two of the more tenacious students from the building and throwing them in the slammer for the remainder of the afternoon. So ended Tuesday's attack.

Wednesday saw more Dow interrogations scheduled, and the students turned out in mass with the idea of driving the napalm demons from the campus and protesting the police brutality and jailings of the previous

day. The crafty administration attempted to thwart the students by holding clandestine interviews. However, when the students were unable to find the agents from Dow, they descended 500 strong upon the administration building where they "sat in" around the chancellor's office. Meanwhile, sds sleuths had discovered the sight of the secret interviews, and they persuaded some twenty-five students that an on-sight protest would be more effective than an administration building "sit in". When these twenty-five arrived at the building in which the interviews were to be held, they were greeted by more cops. Ten of the students rushed by the cops and into the office where the interrogations were in process. Pandemonium! The men from Dow were terrorized and the cops carried nine students kicking and screaming to the paddy wagons. Other students threw themselves in front of the wagons, and seven more were arrested. After a lengthy struggle, the sixteen were deposited in the city jail and the cops wanted \$1,600 bail money before they would release them. Several citizens of Madison put up bail money, but only \$800 was raised. Faced with the prospect of having the students remain in jail overnight, the administration kicked in the additional \$800 — crafty devils.

As this article goes to print, popular rumor has it that 1500 students turned out on Thursday to really give the administration hell.

Dee Jacobson,

new left notes

1608 w. madison, rm. 206

chicago, ill. 60612

VOL. 2, No. 8 let the people decide FEBRUARY 27, 1967

Iowa - ready for change

Donald Siano
Iowa State

Last year, here at Iowa State, SDS was generally thought of as being pure shit. We had five demonstrations — all very small — all very ineffective.

But, a week ago, after a wild campaign, an SDS member, backed by a rejuvenated SDS, was elected President of the Government of the Student Body. The general election drew over 7200 votes — about twice the usual number. There were 4 candidates — two radicals and two "conservatives". Don Smith, the very image of the stereotyped bearded, long-haired radical took 47% of the votes cast.

We feel that his election could be a significant victory for the student left in this country because it demonstrates that even in an "Institute of Science and Technology" the students are ready for change. They are tired of a powerless student government, and they are not shy of voting for a candidate who expresses their desires for radical change. His tactics can probably be adapted to other "apathetic" institutions of higher education.

His 4-point program included: abolition of all University regulation of student life outside the classroom; the formation of a student federation to combat high-rent housing; the elimination of class rank and cooperation of the University with the S.S.S. unless a student requests; creation of a student owned cooperative bookstore. He wore his same old clothes, kept his long hair and spoke with conviction about student power and student freedom.

Iowa State SDS is fairly small, about 30 activists, but it was able to carry on a fair number of activities in addition to the election. We had a well attended "REP weekend". Then we formed a radical theatre group that put on an immensely successful production of Ferlinghetti's "Servant of the People". It is still active. We sponsored a talk by Richard Thomas on South Africa. We have a group active in community organizing in a slum

area of Des Moines. We showed "The Troublemakers".

During the month of January, we've carried on a "classic" campaign against the University's policies toward the draft, including the rank. Many leaflets, petitions, articles in the "Daily", etc. Faculty council voted to support (pretty much) what we wanted.

We're still working on it.

As a result of Don's election and the interest generated by these other activities, especially REP and RAP, we feel that it will be possible to start a Free University here. Plans are well along on this already — we have about a dozen courses lined up.

During the recent bombing "pause" we circulated a "We Won't Go" statement, like that of the U. of Chicago's, (25 signatures). We announced it to the press at a booth opposite the Army Recruiters in the student Union the day after the bombing was resumed. The booth had a large "We Won't Go" sign and was plastered with the pictures of burned children from Ramparts. This went over very well. Attitudes have really changed around here. There were no raised voices, name calling, or any of this rot. There was almost always a small crowd around talking and looking at the pictures. They weren't shocked or hostile to the fact that we weren't going to go. The response from the press hasn't been all that we had hoped, but nothing new in that. The reactions to this activity are still going on, so we haven't had a complete evaluation yet, but as a means to get lots of people working on the war again, without getting into the demonstration gab, this seems to be a very promising tactic.

Most of us felt that we've been pretty successful and productive in our activities so far. Attitudes toward SDS have changed radically (if you'll excuse the pun). The reasons aren't terribly difficult to see: No demonstrations. REP and RAP work well on a campus like ISU. Baldness, honesty and imagination went into an initially sterile election. Much work. Good leafletting, letters to the editor, poster, and reporting in the "Daily". No pressure from the administration. A bored, "apathetic" and sterile University ready for change.

Just got our NLN. We'll have a Gentle Thursday sometime this Spring — Maybe around April 15.

inside
this
issue

ON THE
mobilization p. 2

BOOK REVIEW
p. 3

on the Draft p. 3

SDS breaks ties p. 2

M.P.I. letter p. 3

no more parades

ON THE
mobilization

An S.D.S. Position Paper on the April Mobilization

Pat Popkin
for the Regional Council

Several local chapters of Students for a Democratic Society, the December National Conference, and the Northern California Regional Council of S.D.S. have all recently voted not to endorse the April 15th Mobilization. This seemingly divisive action on the part of the organization which called the first major march against United States intervention in Vietnam is the result of much discussion and thought on the part of the members of S.D.S. Several of the most frequent arguments against participation will be recounted here so that the position of the group might appear more intelligible and those supporting the Mobilization might come to question some of their, perhaps incorrect, assumptions.

(1) The parade as a tactic. It was the feeling of many S.D.S. members that the parade is no longer a viable tactic to be employed by the Peace Movement, since it serves no political or organizational purpose. Since we began marching the war has continued to escalate in total disregard for the visible sentiments of the Peace Movement. Moreover, marches no longer serve as a means by which to organize others. Rather, they draw upon the already organized groups who are tired of marching as evidenced by the dwindling number of participants in the various "Days of Protest". Also press coverage of mobilizations has also decreased.

(2) The places of the mobilization. The choice of places in no way suggests drawing upon new constituencies: e.g. rural areas or

the Southern United States. Nor is it politically relevant, as the decisions regarding the war are not made in Chicago, San Francisco, and New York—the decisions are made in Washington.

(3) The timing of the mobilization. The time as well is politically irrelevant. Although April 15th has symbolic value, it is not particularly relevant to the day-to-day atrocities of the war about which many citizens not in the Peace Movement are concerned and may be moved to respond to.

(4) The war in Vietnam as a single issue. We in S.D.S. do not view the war in Vietnam as an aberration of U.S. Policy. Rather, we view it an oppressive action on the part of the government similar to many other oppressive actions which form part and parcel of the lives of many Americans. Thus, we feel that the suffering of the Vietnamese people is akin to the suffering of the people of the United States, that the draft and the war are manifestations of the same kind of thinking on the part of the government, that poverty and racism are as much a result of deceptive government action as the Vietnam war—and that these links must be explicated, understood, and spoken of. The Peace Movement fails to do this in any real way. Rather, the issues are in no way linked—the emphasis is only on the war. Thus, the movement fails to relate honestly to the oppression experienced by many Americans as part of their everyday lives.

For these reasons, then, and many others S.D.S. members feel that the April 15th Mobilization will fail to gain political relevance or organize new people in opposition to the war in Vietnam.

spring action

ON THE
mobilization

Peter Orris
Harvard Radcliff SDS

There has been much written for NLN about the proposed Spring Mobilization against the war in Vietnam. The last article I saw went so far as to say that a failure in the Spring would be a success for the anti-war movement. This last statement appears to be so obviously ludicrous that I will not deal with it further except to outline my feelings on the subject of the spring action.

It is important to realize the relationship between national mobilizations and local organizing. Both actions become most effective when they stimulate each other. The stress on national actions to the exclusion of local organizing has been accurately labeled a waste of time; yet at the same time to merely try to encourage local work without a national focus from time to time, is to disregard the reality of the present state of the anti-war effort. It is true that the large cities probably will engage in local efforts around the war without a national stimulus and it is fortunate that the movement is at this level.

It is equally true, though, that rural schools and communities need the impetus, at this stage in their development, of national efforts that have local focuses. I recently found this to be the case for most schools in New Hampshire and Vermont to which I traveled for the NERO (New England Regional Office) and the Student Spring Mobilization. I understand this is also the case for Maine.

The Student Spring Mobilization around the week of April 8-15 is made to order for local initiative. It is a very flexible call for some sort of anti-war activity directed to the campus during the course of this week. Depending on the local conditions, these activities can range from the radical (strikes, War Crimes Tribunals to judge the University involvement in the war effort, anti-draft activity) to the very mild (Teach-ins, education campaigns etc.) Even the person who is against national actions has to agree that this is the most local national action yet tried. To be against it he must maintain that it is better to engage in local activities separately and at different times than in a united way. (With that position what he is organizing for? — is his position: "Individual acts are obviously better than effort?")

The other half of the mobilization which is to mass large numbers of people in both New York and San Francisco gives these campus groups, that for the previous week have been directing their activities toward the campus, an opportunity for internal education and for common involvement with thousands of others who agree with them.

A bus with all the members of a chapter on it traveling over a journey of several hours offers an unequalled opportunity of doing serious thinking about the many areas of concern in each chapter. If the chapter can take two buses, one might offer one seminar and the other another on a different subject. I have found that these kind of experiences are important in encouraging new people to take a more active role in the chapter and promoting a feeling of camaraderie within the group.

Still further, the old hacks who are bored with national demonstrations having been on so many that have not produced anything in terms of a shift in governmental policy are not the people to who this type of action is directed. This type of National Action is exciting to the small rural SDS chapters on conservative campuses where the members beat their heads continually against the stonewall of conservatism of the student body. This can and often does become a very depressing scene, and leads to introversion on the part of the chapter. It is crucial for these members to get to national actions where emotionally they can feel that they are not totally isolated even if they know this intellectually already.

I feel, therefore, that the proposed national action for the Spring against the war in Vietnam is an effective tool for increasing the movement on the campus.

I have concentrated here on the Campus; yet this is not to say that the mobilization can not be used in certain communities to build the movement as well.

N.C. BALLOT

COMING UP-

As two chapters have challenged the vote of the December N.C., there will be a mail ballot of chapter delegates on the question of national SDS support for the April Mobilization. The exact text of the resolution and the details are not available as we go to press, but will be included in the first class mailing issue of NLN to chapters and will be in next week's NLN.

CHAPTERS SHOULD DISCUSS THE QUESTION IMMEDIATELY so they will be prepared to make a decision as soon as possible after they receive further details. Recent issues of NLN could be reread for various opinions as statements on the Mobilization question.

As this is an N.C. ballot and not a membership referendum, each chapter will receive votes in proportion to their membership, in the same way that the number of N.C. delegates is computed.

SDS breaks ties

REPORT FROM SDS PRESIDENT

The press release appearing below was read before a Washington press conference on Feb. 21 by Nick Egleson, sds president. Although this break followed rather closely a New York Times article which linked USYC with CIA supported foundations, it was not the result of bad publicity, but of long felt disaffection among many of the members of sds.

In the face of recent revelations concerning the funding of a variety of organizations by the Central Intelligence Agency, the most disturbing fact which emerges is the bland acceptance of this activity by both the organizations involved and the American public in general. Even organizations of the radical left such as our own, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), have exhibited the same sense of powerlessness in confronting the permeation of all phases of American life by covert government controls. SDS was a nominal member of one of the government front organizations, the United States Youth Council (USYC), which received large sums of money from the CIA. Although SDS had ceased to participate in USYC and regarded it as an agent of the government, we did not denounce it or break our ties. We, like everyone else, shrugged our shoulders because we saw no way of effectively curbing this kind of activity. We now believe that the acceptance of our powerlessness was a mistake and feel that SDS should take the lead in asserting the right, the necessity, of organizations to be free of government interference if democratic institutions are to have any reality.

The National Interim Committee of SDS has voted unanimously to sever its ties with USYC and calls on other member organizations to do the same. We recognize, however, that this is not sufficient to deal with the depth and complexity of the problem. It is too easy to think that the problem is simply the explicit involvement of the CIA. In fact, the CIA's involvement is just one facet of a larger problem: the involvement of the government and the military in all aspects of American educational life. Not only must the CIA be uprooted from student organizations; the time has come to separate education from the military, learning from the processes of government. Secret military research in our universities not only compromises the integrity of our scientists and scholars, but also perverts the real educational tasks of those institutions. The present investigation of CIA influence in non-governmental organizations would next lead to a thorough investigation of the role and influence of the military in those institutions whose freedom and integrity is necessary to the life of a free and democratic America.

The trend which we oppose is that which is leading to the creation of a monolithic American society dominated by and organized for the needs of a military and foreign policy which in itself must be questioned. Those who continue to participate in organizations like USYC help to maintain the myth and illusion of democratic pluralism when in reality those institutions are designed to create and maintain monolithic controls. All those who, from whatever perspective, strive for the creation of a free and democratic America should withdraw their support from discredited organizations and work to build new and independent structures governed by the principles of democratic participation.

Nick Egleson, President
Students for a Democratic Society

AND CHANGE

by Carl Oglesby and
Richard Schaul

a radical analysis of American
foreign policy

Order NOW from:
Book Service
SDS - Room 206
1608 W. Madison
Chicago 60612

DEKALB

(Continued from page 1)

people of the old left, some of the new, and many liberals. The question was raised: "Which is more important, political purity or attendance at a large newsworthy peace demonstration?" The second important question raised regarding both March 25 and April 15 was "Are marches worthwhile nowadays?" This led to beneficial discussion which touched on the theme of "Sons and Daughters" and the idea that even if peace efforts come to naught in immediate results, it is the establishment of a long run—long winded "climate of resistance" that is most important. As a result the general session of the Midwest Regional Conference of SDS (speaking for itself and not necessarily for individual local chapters) decided to support the two peace efforts. Regarding the Chicago march, however, this support depends upon the condition that SDS have a speaker at the rally that is to follow the State Street march.

Sunday evening's conference was entitled: Draft Resistance or the American Revolution—and other Alternatives. At this closing meeting feelings and excitement ran high because the four people on the panel did so well in expressing their convictions on draft resistance and related themes. Another reason for the fervor stirred up was that Northern's administration had forbidden three of the speakers to talk since their names had not been registered with the student activities office early enough (because of an upset in the speaker schedule). Of course, all SDS people are unusually desirous of conforming to the wishes of "our parents away from home"—but oddly enough, the three unregistered people spoke anyway. However, more than these two factors, the Sunday night session was the culmination of the thinking and feeling and responding that had been building in pitch all weekend.

What, then, was the value of this conference? What new ideas and feelings did its participants carry away with them? The value (admittedly, as seen only a short time after) is that the response of this gathering of people indicates and can give an impression of the condition and tenor existing in the radical movement. It seems that we are emerging from a period of disenchantment, of near despair, of disorganization, of relative inactivity. We have entered into a new spirit centered around the themes that ran thru the conference—namely: that we in SDS—involved in the radical movement—are participating in DEAD SERIOUS BUSINESS. We must open our eyes to the fact that resistance in one area is not enough. Our resistance must be total and absolute. This must lead to a revolution unlike any other in history. It cannot be solely political; it must be all encompassing—starting from within our own hearts and proceeding outward and upward. Hope and immovable resistance, then, characterize the feeling tone of the New Left today.

NEW LEFT NOTES

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

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Nick Egleson, president; Carl Davidson, vice-president; and Greg Calvert, national secretary.
National Office: 1608 W. Madison, Rm. 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312) 666-3874
New York City: 49 West 27th St., NYC, NY 1001; (212) 889-5793
Niagara Region: 107 Dryden Rd., Ithaca, NY
Northern California: 924 Howard St., San Francisco, Calif; (415) 362-7922
Southern California: 4319 Melrose, Los Angeles, California, 90019
New England: 138 River St., Cambridge, Mass., 02139
Radical Education Project: 510 East William, Ann Arbor, Mich.

R.E.P. conference

(Continued from page 1)

John Cowley also of the New School, on the New Left in relation to changes in the American economy, and a talk by Norman Birnbaum on American and European universities. Responses again followed the same pattern: annoyance from those who felt they'd seen all this before (someone commented "everything they're saying I've thought ten times by myself.") and gratification from the new people who thought they'd learned something.

Calvert's talk in the afternoon was an exception — everyone seemed to see the discussion of potentials for organizing as serious, important statement. Greg called his paper, rewritten that morning in response to the discussion the night before, "In White America" — a recognition that white radicalism has to prove itself apart from the black struggle. After first disowning the Old Left talk about "mobilizing the masses" in order to secure "our own freedom" as an "intellectual elite" in terms that were almost too polite, Greg set the context for radical politics in terms of actual freedom vs. the potential that existed. The new issues in white America, Greg suggested, are control, meaninglessness, and work; the groups that are emerging as radical in orientation are social workers, teachers, and members of the medical profession. It is in these fields that direct human contact still exists and consequently a potential for fulfillment that has been drained from most other forms of work; it is in these very areas that the manipulative aspects of American society consequently make themselves most starkly evident — a teacher is not there to liberate through education, many are discovering, but to act as a cop, to break spirit.

The reception Greg's talk received was a result of its sweep — it brought together the questions of radical consciousness and the pressing problems of organizing and developed directions for organizing quite directly from the broad analysis of consciousness. Old guard and newcomers were brought together within the context of the paper.

After the evening presentation (Birn-

baum's discussion of the university), there was a party with a blues band. It was like all other good parties until the band collapsed in total exhaustion at 1:30 in the morning; at that point, a spontaneous rhythm section established itself on the floor with makeshift drums, hippies appeared with flutes, and even a few Africans carrying their own drums. Dancing chanting and singing arose out of the primitive community that had been created and events moved under their own strength for well over an hour before a proctor appeared to shut things down.

Sunday was devoted to analysis of the American economy. In the morning Harry Magdoff presented an elaboration on some points of his article on imperialism in *Monthly Review*, specifically on the questions of the role of military spending on the economy and the character of US investment abroad. In the afternoon, Paul Sweezy spoke on the effect of technology since the publication of *Capital* 100 years ago and E.J. Nell presented a model of a society using its technological knowledge for social betterment that fit quite closely with the discussion of "post-scarcity" in Friday night's *Toward Theory of Social Change*.

The conference was generally viewed as a success, but its area of success should be carefully delineated. It is true that the fact that 300 people attended a conference obviously concerned primarily with theory was a very good sign for SDS; however, the fact that it's been over a year since New York region met explains some of the attendance. Also the disparity in outlook or "development" among those attending noted above is a good sign — it means the organization is growing and people are looking for a course of action.

At the same time, however, a conference of this sort suggests the magnitude of the problems facing SDS and radical politics in general.

At one point someone from the floor commented that the conference wasn't concerned with the relation of theory and practice, but with "the theory of theory and the theory

(Continued on page 4)

BOOK REVIEW the blank face

Three Faces of Fascism by Ernst Nolte, translated from the German by Leila Vennewitz (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966).

Chris Clausen
Athens, W. Va.

The "three faces" which Ernst Nolte deals with in this authoritative study are those of the Action Francaise, Italian Fascism, and German National Socialism. Those who read the book looking for significant resemblances between any of these visages and that of America in the Age of Johnson will be disappointed, for as liberal political scientists never tire of pointing out (it is their own academic variety of jingoism), American political movements have seldom paralleled European ones. Perhaps the Action Francaise comes closest to being an exception, for in a number of respects its brand of paranoid reaction, an utter rejection of every political development since 1789, resembles that of the American right wing. (It also resembles the American right in that while both movements had — or still have — considerable influence, neither really understood the modern political world well enough to take over.) Hitler and Mussolini we have had none.

There is, of course, a fourth face of fascism — the blank face of the citizen whose only reaction to the atrocities committed in his name is, "We didn't know." Perhaps the extent to which people find it necessary not to know what their government is doing is a better index of fascism as a political and cultural climate, or as the prevalent political outlook of a nation, than whether or not it conforms to any particular kind of political development. On this scale America scores very high, as anyone who has ever tried to inform an unwilling public about Vietnam has reason to know. Unwillingness to know what is going on implies at least a rudimentary awareness that one's country is acting in a criminally aggressive manner, and perhaps that very combination

and knowledge and action on the part of a government can serve as a definition of fascism. Fascist or near-fascist systems have always operated ruthlessly and glorified ruthlessness; yet they have always attempted, in guilty fashion, to hide the worst that they do.

It is here that a parallel between Germany and America becomes apparent. Both the extermination of the Jews and the deliberate bombing of civilians in Vietnam have been done as surreptitiously as possible; both have been simultaneously denied and justified. "Right is what benefits the German people," Hitler said in an attempt to alter the accepted (verbally, at least) standard of international morality. Thirty years later Dean Acheson said: "The end sought by our foreign policy . . . is, as I have said, to preserve and foster an environment in which free societies may exist and flourish. Our policies and actions must be decided by whether they contribute to or detract from achievement of this end. They need no other justification of moral or ethical embellishment . . ." The effect of this sort of line upon a generation who have been brought up to hear little else is one of the dynamics of fascist or fascist-leaning society.

An American soldier recently convicted of murdering two elderly Vietnamese and mutilating their bodies is currently arguing not that he didn't do it, but that he was acting under orders. His townspeople have hired two lawyers to appeal his conviction on this basis. They do not understand how a soldier acting under orders could possibly be held responsible for anything; and, of course, the two villagers were probably Vietcong anyway . . .

In discussing the relations of fascism to bourgeois society Nolte is relatively unlightening, although he examines its intellectual underpinnings — its relation, for example, to Marx, Weber, and Nietzsche —

(Continued on page 4)

Draft Resistance on the draft in Iowa

Tom Jepson

(Tom Jepson has previously applied for a C.O. status, and was refused; in his hearing with his local board he found his board had not read his appeal before hand — nor did they clearly understand the C.O. position. He then decided to resist the entire Selective Service System. The following is a letter written to Bill Hartzog, SDS field coordinator on the draft, after Tom reported to his induction center in response to an induction notice.)

Dear Bill and all:

I arrived at the Induction Center at about 6:15 AM Friday, February 17. I went immediately to the waiting room and was given my papers within a few minutes. Next, the very brief physical re-examination took place. I then went upstairs and was directed to the desk of an enlisted man. He asked to see my personal history questionnaire. I informed him that I did not intend to sign it. He then asked if I intended to sign any of the induction papers and I replied no. This caused him to lose his composure briefly but he regained it and asked if I was aware of the consequences of refusing induction. I replied that I was but he insisted on reading the penalty to me. I was then asked to wait in the lobby for a few minutes, as I observed was the normal routine for inductees.

Next, I was called in to talk with one of the secretaries. She did indicate to me that she had been informed of my intentions and her first act was to destroy my draft card. I then informed her of my decision. She expressed regret at my decision while at the same time attempting to convince me to sign several forms including a term of service agreement. The secretary noted my education and replied that it would be a shame to waste it as I would be unable to get a job later on. As she informed me that our interview was finished, she added that if I changed my mind, I could come back and talk to her again.

Next, I was taken to see a Navy lieutenant who appeared to have highest authority in the Induction Center. It was obvious from our conversation that this was an attempt to convince me of the error of my ways. He discussed, in the best tradition of the conventional wisdom, such matters as:

the constitution (which I was informed contained articles and amendments), the fact that only a few "nuts" wanted to go to war but if we didn't stop the communists now . . . the misuse of the concept of freedom by a small minority of the people who were causing the destruction of the values, customs, and traditions which have made America great, the glories of the private enterprise system, etc. He agreed that the draft system had flaws but added that it was best possible arrangement.

After a short wait, I was led into an office occupied by an Army Intelligence officer. We talked for a few minutes during which I gave my name, residence, schooling, etc. He wanted to type up my answers in the form of a statement and have me sign it. He then read back to me what the statement would say, after putting my answers into complete sentences. I informed him that I would not sign such a statement for three reasons: it contained information which I had not given to him verbally, it contained information which was already available to him and thus was unnecessary, and I did not enjoy the possibility of being quoted out of context. The Intelligence officer, having abandoned hopes of my signing the statement, informed me that refusal to sign the personal history questionnaire and the security questionnaire was unusual in induction refusal cases. After an inquiry by phone, he informed me that such refusal would not constitute a bar to induction. He then asked me to and I did sign a statement which acknowledged that I understood that my refusal to sign these two questionnaires did not constitute a bar to induction but did reduce my possibilities for positions if I was a member of the Armed Forces. I have repeatedly questioned the wisdom of this action and consider it my greatest mistake. I believe that this statement was the major goal of the intelligence officer although he appeared to be much more interested in the statement which I would not sign.

After a long wait, I was fingerprinted. Next, I was taken into the office of the Navy lieutenant again. In the presence of four witnesses, I was informed that by stepping forward when my name was called I would be inducted into the Armed Forces. The

lieutenant called my name and waited several seconds but I didn't take that step. He then turned to the section in the regulations which stated the penalty for failing to comply with an induction order. He then repeated the procedure and once again I held my ground.

Next, I was taken into another office where I was introduced to an FBI agent. He asked my name, etc. and then told me that he had to inform me of my rights concerning an interview. He did so and I told him that I did not wish to grant him an interview. He then emphasized that the police also had rights, such as to ask your name, etc. I interpreted the tone of his voice to represent his (or more probably J. Edgar's) thoughts concerning recent Supreme Court rulings on the questioning of suspects. He then asked me not to speak but merely listen to what he had to say. He told me that while the members of the FBI might not be very smart, they do know about SDS. He said that they know all about the stunts which SDS pulls. He did not elaborate on this point. He informed me that the FBI was only an investigatory agency and did not prosecute (only persecute-mine) but he felt that he should tell me that it was probable (his word) that legal action would be taken against me. He advised me to see a lawyer. He said that his next step would be to contact the clerk of my draft board on Monday, February 20. He suggested that I stay near home. He then asked the Navy lieutenant if he wanted me for anything else. The lieutenant replied no and I left the Induction Center at about 3:00 PM.

Some brief observations:

(1) During my interview with the Army Intelligence officer, someone gave him a copy of the "army life" (copy included with this letter) statement which was being distributed outside the Induction Center. This caused the Intelligence officer to temporarily blow his cool and he angrily asked me if I wished to name any of those who were outside. I declined. He pursued this matter no further.

(2) The attitude of those employed at the induction center was generally that the consequences of my action and not the nature of my beliefs was of paramount import-

ance.

(3) I experienced very little open hostility. Perhaps a better description of the behavior which I encountered was frustration. I had put a wrench into the machine and their efforts to remove it continually failed.

(4) When the Army Intelligence officer learned that SDS literature was being distributed outside, he looked at the list of "subversive" organizations on the security questionnaire.

(5) I was told that I was being used by the

(Continued on page 4)

M.P.I. letter to sds nat'l sec'y

Dear Friend,

We saw in the last issue of the *National Guardian* the resolution adopted by your organization with regard to Compulsory Military Service. We applaud your straight forward position and certainly wish that your anti-draft campaign will prove effective.

The people of Puerto Rico are engaged right now in a struggle against Compulsory Military Service. Our opposition is based on the same reasons and principles that yours is, plus one very important addition: the draft is for us a colonial imposition; we are forced to fight in the armed services of our enemy against people who, like us, are struggling for their National Liberation, such as the Vietnamese people.

Our campaign has been very successful. Over twenty Puerto Ricans have already legal cases pending for refusing to be inducted. And about a thousand others have signed a declaration — a copy of which I am enclosing — expressing their firm intention of not serving in the U.S. Armed Forces and backing the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

We would also like to keep closer communication between our organizations.

Fraternally,
Juan E. Mestas
Secretary of Political Education

Draft Resistance

(Continued from page 3)

demonstrators. Several times it was pointed out that the group had "deserted" me. Nice try with the psychology, fellows!

(6) The knowledge that there were people passing out anti-war and anti-draft literature spread quickly. Enlisted men and secretaries beat a steady path to the window in the lobby which permitted them a view of those "queers" outside. The fact that there was not nearly enough work to keep the employees of the center busy meant that a significant disruption in the processing did not take place. Enlisted men of all ages boldly broadcast "their" attitudes toward the demonstrators and offered many remedies including anti-personnel bombs, shotguns, and physical attack. A secretary mentioned that the demonstrators had constitutional rights but no one replied to this.

(7) Other remarks of the enlisted men included: probably none of the demonstrators had finished the eighth grade, noticing that one of the demonstrators had been in service, noticing that women were among the demonstrators, the suggestion that the "old man" was the demonstrator's ringleader (the "old man" they referred to was Bert Howard, Bill).

I imagine that you have already received letters from Dave Leonard and Gordon Burnside concerning the activities and observations of those who went inside and/or were outside. I only hope that I, also, have contributed.

Please let me know what you're doing, Bill. I want to help you in any way I can.

I close by saying that the road to any triumph will be peopled by those who, in the words of Bwana of Bimini, KEEP THE FAITH, BABY!!!

nac minutes

submitted by C. Wilkerson

NAC MEMBERS: Steve Goldsmith, Jean Teperman, Cathy Wilkerson, Dee Jacobson, Jane Adams, Earl Silbar.

Absent: Greg Calvert.

Others Present: John Venezia, Jim Wright.

Agenda:

- 1) Reports from Madison and Washington
- 2) Finances
- 3) Staff
- 4) Draft Resistance
- 5) Levi Strauss boycott

1) Report from Madison on activity around Dow Chemical Recruiters (See NLN). Report by the National Secretary who is in Washington, D.C. He and the SDS National President Nick Egleson held a press conference in Washington for the purpose of withdrawing SDS from the U.S. Youth Council which, according to the N.Y. Times, has also accepted CIA funds. SDS has been an affiliated member of the Council in the past though we had not paid our required dues for over a year and a half. Previous to the press conference the National Interim Committee had been polled and had voted unanimously to withdraw. Greg reported (by phone) that though the reporters had started off being fairly hostile, but the press conference came off fairly well.

2) Non-existence of Finances. - The current balance is under \$100,000. Staff members were paid \$10.00 this week. We are heavily in dept to T.W.O. with our debts starting with four issues of NLN back. (This week's issue of NLN was cut to four pages or this reason.)

3) STAFF: The NAC unanimously hired Jean Venezia as national fund raiser. Mark Kleiman had asked for funding from the N.O. as a Regional Field Secretary for Northern California, as he had been approved by the Northern California Regional Administrative Committee. The NAC voted unanimously to hire Mark.

4) DRAFT RESISTANCE: Various people reported on a growing number of draft resistance unions growing up around the country. It was decided that it would be a good thing to run a special draft resistance issue of NLN, though the current financial situation makes it impossible at the moment.

5) LEVI STRAUSS BOYCOTT: Steve Goldsmith reported on the White Organizers Conference held recently in Washington, D.C. One of the highpoints of the conference, Steve said, was finding out about the activity of women in Georgia who have gone out on a wildcat strike for the past seven months against a company which manufactures, among other things, the material for Levi Strauss blue jeans. Steve suggested that we support the strike and comply with the strikers request to boycott Levi Strauss blue jeans. He mentioned that this was an ad-

N.Y. - R.E.P.

(Continued from page 3)

of practice." In other words, instead of a dialectical process presenting itself, it seemed that the conference had subsumed both sides of the dialectic under one half. It was another way of saying that it was unclear where the practice of radical politics was heading.

The same question emerged in a very different manner when Ron Clark of CORE asked quite bluntly which was more important to SDS people, their radicalism or traditional white racism. The reaction was nervous laughter and the speaker said that he thought his radicalism was much more important. But the question hit an SDS nerve: it is evident that the black freedom struggle went through an important transformation when black power was thrust upon the consciousness of white America, and the implications of that transformation, the shifting of alliances, is still shifting out. But it is already clear that the struggle has become a lot more serious, a lot more fundamental than the moral outrage of Selma. The call for black power has implications for structural change that vary among its proponents, but there is an undeniable thrust toward structural change; post-war America has been particularly hostile to anyone outside the corporate elite talking about structural change.

The problem is SDS has not yet made that shift, the change from moral outrage (Vietnam is the Selma of white radicalism) to a call for structural change. The question of whether we are ready for any such change - with so many people still pouring in on the moral outrage question - is a legitimate one, but we should realize that our talk about radical change, the "theory of practice" discussion, looks pretty whimsical to the black movement. The conference certainly increased knowledge and will help in the effort to create a radical critique of America, but the implications of a radical politics remains unclear and the course of action uncertain.

OHIO

OHIO REGIONAL SDS CONFERENCE, Bowling Green University, March 3, 4, and 5th.

Dave George
Bowling Green, SDS

An educational, action-oriented Ohio Regional Conference has been called to discuss chapter organizing (or re-activation), draft resistance and to set up a regional office in Cleveland. The purpose of the conference is to share ideas and to co-ordinate state-wide action. It is hoped that thru co-ordinated local activities on the war and the draft that a movement effect can be created on a state level for the week of April 8-15th.

FRIDAY, MARCH 3

Night: Bull sessions, exchange of REP papers and local publications, literature sale, register at the Union 6 - 12 p.m.

SATURDAY, MARCH 4

Morning: Carl Davidson on national perspectives, Ken Friedman on Ohio Regional proposal, other regional reports and chapter reports.

Afternoon: Workshops on Ohio Regional office, funding, communications, conventions, draft resistance proposal.

Evening: REP staff member on university reform and campus action, Workshops on Student Power, Free Universities, Chapter Organizing, Peace Action, and Draft Resistance and Alternatives.

SUNDAY, MARCH 5

Afternoon: discussion of local action for April 8-15th Student Mobilization against the War and Draft.

Registration fee is 50¢. For housing contact:

Charlie Tobasko
442 E. Court
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402
(419) 353-2403

ministrative decision because it was clearly within the mandate of the Clearlake resolution on labor. Steve is going to write up a full report for NLN readers. The NAC approved the SDS support of the boycott,

MARXISM AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS

(STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY) in association with

(AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR MARXIST STUDIES) present a seminar

Wednesday, March 8 - Sever 37

MARXISM AND EXISTENTIALISM: SOME REMARKS ON SARTRE AND LUKACS

Robert Cohen, Chairman, Dept. of Physics, Boston University; Chairman, A.I.M.S.; author, *Dialectical materialism and Carnap's logical Empiricism*

Commentators: Hubert L. Dreyfus, Asst. Prof. of Philosophy, MIT
Gerald Dworkin, Asst. Prof. of Philosophy, MIT

Wednesday, March 15 - Burr A

PEASANT REVOLUTION AND GUERRILLA WARFARE

Eric J. Hobsbawm, Visiting Prof. of Humanities, MIT; author, *Age of Revolution; Primitive Rebels*

Commentator: Barrington Moore, Jr., Research Fellow, Harvard Russian Research Center; author, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*.

Wednesday, March 29 - Sever 37

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FRANTZ FANON'S IDEOLOGY

Irene Gendzier, Assistant Prof. of History, Boston Univ.; Research Assoc., Center for Middle East Studies, Harvard.

Commentators: Martin Kilson, Lecturer on Govt., Harvard Univ.; Research Fellow, Center for International Affairs.

Mark Solomon, Grad. Student in American History, Harvard
Charles Turner, Community Organizer, Roxbury Associates

All meetings to be held at 7:30 p.m. at Harvard University in the hall indicated (Sever is next to Widener Library. Burr A is on the corner of Broadway and Quincy Street). For further information, consult Hal Bennenson of Harvard S.D.S. (868-7811) or Al Silverstone of M.I.T. S.D.S. (547-6533).

Further seminars will appear in next week's NLN

BOOK REVIEW

(Continued from page 3)

in true German scholarly fashion. It has generally been recognized that fascism is in large part an outgrowth not of conservatism but of liberalism. Its chief popular support has generally come from those elements of the lower bourgeoisie who, having supported liberal political movements in the past, feel themselves threatened by the proletariat—or crushed between the proletariat and the upper classes. In this sense America's twenty-year case of paranoia about Communism is squarely in the tradition, and it is quite appropriate that such liberals as Hubert Humphrey should have been in the

anguard of repression. Nolte declares that fascism involves, in the last analysis, "metapolitics"—that is, it creates a situation in which traditional political cleavages and issues ("inward antagonisms") become irrelevant and unreal, and are replaced by "outward antagonisms."

As debate and division in the United States Congress becomes more and more of a charade each year, and as the traditional American indifference towards the political process is gradually replaced by a positive unwillingness to know what is going on, we are discovering—in a uniquely evolutionary fashion—the feel of fascism.

NEW LEFT NOTES
Room 206
1606 W. Madison
Chicago, Ill. 60612
Return Requested

Second-Class postage rates paid in Chicago, Illinois. Entered at Chicago and other points.

Helen Garvey
710 Willow
Apt. 12
Hoboken, N.J. 07030

a communication

U. of OKLAHOMA CONFERENCE

Sunday, March 20:

8:30 am - free discussion
10:30 am - speaker on the draft
12:00 - Lunch
1:00 - Workshops

The Occasion - a "regional" conference

The Topics - The state of the movement in this region, the draft, campus reform.

The Time - March 18, 19 and 20. Friday evening thru Sunday afternoon.

The Sponsor - The University of Oklahoma chapter of S.D.S. Norman, Okla.

The Participants - S.D.S.-type people from Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Kansas. Carl Davidson, S.D.S. National Vice-President will be there.

Tentative Program - very, very amendable.

Friday evening: registration, ad hoc meetings, coffee, etc.

Saturday, March 19:
8:30 am - free discussion
10:30 am - Carl Davidson on the University

12:00 - Lunch
1:30 pm - Workshops
8:00 pm - Party

Finances - as cheap as possible, \$3-\$4 if we can provide food. \$0.50-\$1.00 if we can't.

Sleeping Arrangements - Most people should expect to be provided a nice, comfortable floor and should plan accordingly (i.e. sleeping bag, bed roll, etc.).

Directions - When you arrive in Norman go to the university area and ask directions to either of the following addresses:

Terry Roberts John Ratliff
721 DeBarr 760 Jenkins, Apt. C
JE 6-89990 JE 6-8435

People planning to attend should inform us before hand so that we can get an estimate of attendance. Write to Terry Roberts, 721 DeBarr, Norman, Oklahoma. People in Texas should also write to Robert Pardun, Box 8519, Univ. Sta., Austin, Texas if they are interested in working out some cheap transportation system for getting to the conference.