

MIGRANT STRIKE



Photo (by Jim Russell)

Jesus Salas talks to striking migrant laborers in Wautoma, Wisconsin church, asking them whether they want to continue the strike. The answer "Siga la Huelga!"

Siga la Huelga
Jim Russell

ALMOND, WISCONSIN (October 12) -- A small but vital migrant labor movement is making its first strike in this small northern Wisconsin town. Faced with threats of eviction from their company houses, strike breakers, and dwindling resources they have defiantly raised the cry Siga La Huelga. And continue they are as they give proof to the meaning of the Delano victory for inspiring migrants all over the country. Everyone on strike here wears an NFWA "Huelga" button and most will concede that

it was Delano that gave them the confidence to act.

The strike began October 7 and involves about 65 workers at a potato farm and processing plant owned by local millionaire and pillar James Burns. These workers, all Mexican-Americans with most coming from Texas, work in the shed of the processing plant sorting and bundling. What they are demanding is an across the board pay increase of 25¢ over the current \$1.31/hr., time and a half pay for over 8 hours, that the decision to work overtime be determined by the worker (work weeks are sometimes

(continued on page 9)

REACTIONARY RADICALS

"For lack of a better name, they called it peace."

Camus, *The Plague*

by Dick Howard
Paris, France

We of the "New Left" have been gadding about the country for several years now, trying to "build a movement." We have had our "successes" and our "failures." We have built an anti-war movement; we have built a civil rights movement; we have built the base of a slum movement: -- why? what have these accomplished? to what end are we spending these years? What are the concrete results: the war goes on, escalating in its unconsciously meandering way; discrimination now channels itself into more subtle forms, entrenching itself in the hearts of men and women victimized by a system which leaves them no other opening for self-respect; the slums now become prettier places to live out the day-to-day tedium, lifted only by death's coming. What do we want? What can we hope for--at best!--from the "movements" that we have built and are building?

It is difficult to criticize these "movements." They are certainly "moral", obeying the Kantian principle that men can be treated only as ends, and that it is the intention of the actor which makes the act moral or immoral. They are the immediate response to a systematic evil which demands a human response; they are human reactions to an inhumane structure. But, while these "movements" should not be criticized in this light, they can and must be examined in the glass

of history; we must ask the question, "What do we seek as a movement?"; and we must answer that question by situating ourselves within a historical continuum.

We are at a historical juncture which has rendered past ideologies effete and left us without any concrete direction to follow. We are entering a new era of history, the age of the "Space Revolution." By that I do not mean the conquest of atmospheric space, but the conquest of human space; the space revolution has changed the purely human rapports between the Ghanian and the Georgian, the Irishman and the Indian. We stand on the threshold of a new era; we are entering it blindly. Suddenly it will hit us; and that blow will finally render obsolete all past political and social organization. This revolution will engender a change in the world in which we live--not in the physical world so much as in our own proper world, our *Lebenswelt*--that world which is mine and and mine alone, constituted by the space which I make mine by my own physical and mental presence.

When we build a movement for change, say, in a ghetto, it is the *Lebenswelt* of the individuals directly concerned that we are trying to change. When we talk about "the power to make the decisions that determine our lives," this is a *Lebensweltlich* question

(continued on page 2)

The PEACE CANDIDATES Round II

by Roy Dahlberg
San Francisco, Calif.

The conference on Power and Politics, known to its friends and enemies as the "CLR Conference", turned out to be just that, a bunch of Californians trying to get more liberal representation.

The meeting grew out of a meeting of the peace candidates held way back last spring. That meeting saw a need to begin to consider a strategy for the creation of a new political force in California. The LA meeting was to be the beginning of that discussion. It wasn't.

There were a couple of reasons for the failure of the meeting to seriously talk about how one builds a popular, radical political movement in a state like California, the epitome of American domestic imperialism. One was the unique (?) character of the upcoming gubernatorial race: the liberals and CP'ers are scared that the good liberal they worked so hard to elect might be defeated by a rather stupid ex-soap salesman turned political opportunist, and that somehow that matters. The other was the nature of California's peace candidates. Perhaps the single most tossed-around phrase of the conference was "new politics". Their politics were old when Norman Thomas used them.

While there were a number of poor people at the conference, which was surprising given the almost total lack of effort to bring them to the meeting, they were ignored until their boycott of the sessions began to look embarrassing. Then they were given seats on a steering committee that had already done its steering. They made an honest effort to figure out how a bunch of rich liberals and a few students arguing over whether or not to publicly admit what everybody already knew was going to make them less poor. They weren't able to do it. Perhaps they could have understood the value, both educational and political, of organizing people around a boycott or write-in campaign, but it was clear that that couldn't happen in the few weeks between the conference and the election. And even at that, discussion should have been about how one does the organizing, not whether or not one corporate puppet is better than another.

Of course the conference, in deference to protest of the poor, did take time to listen to a hastily prepared list of demands from the caucus of poor people and vote to accept them, whatever that meant, sans discussion of either their desirability or implementation. The whole thing took about 45 minutes, including one half-hour speech. I hope that

(continued on page 12)

inside
this
issue

Chapter
Contact
List
page 6

V.P. report
page 3

our MAN
on the DRAFT
by Earl Silbar
page 5

University Reform
& Revolution
by Camilo Torres
page 3

No Comment
page 8

Student Strike
by Bettina Aptheker
page 11



Vol. 1, 40, 41 let the people decide October 28, 1966

national president's report BEYOND ANTI-DRAFT

At three of the large universities I have visited State University of NY at Buffalo, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, and University of Chicago, there has been both talk and action about the university's role with regard to the draft. One problem has become increasingly apparent: how does a movement against university participation in the Selective Service process grow into a movement for broader change? I want to talk about one possible way in which such a movement could expand.

Last spring the University at Buffalo was embroiled in a series of demonstrations against the universities cooperation with the draft exam. More than a thousand people participated. The demands were for student participation in the decision of whether or not the university should allow the exam to be held on campus, and for a general framework, in which this and other decisions could be made by the students. The university set up a task force on a decision making framework, gave the exam, and the term ended.

Over the summer the university hired a fellow named Meyerson as President. It seems not entirely coincidental that this same fellow had been hired by the U of California at Berkeley to replace Strong, and to help rid the university of the problem created by the Free Speech Movement. When the term began at Buffalo this semester Meyerson was quick to engineer a referendum on the question of whether the draft exam could be given on campus. He said he would accept the decision if more than fifty percent of the student body participated in the referendum.

The question posed for the chapter: Should they support the referendum, and work for a no vote, or should they try to get the referendum called off, and, failing that, boycott it? Those who argued that it was wise to participate thought the referendum was an important step forward in student participation in decisions which affect their lives. It was, they argued, a precedent on which they could build. Those who opposed participation argued that 1) there was not adequate time for discussion before the vote (three days) and the referendum would not therefore, be a truly democratic one; 2) that the cooperation between military and university violated a fundamental principle of the university (autonomy from the state) and therefore was a question which could not be decided on by a referendum; and 3) that Meyerson should not be allowed to sidestep the more basic demand of the previous fall, for a framework for all decisions, by dealing with one specific demand.

One thing before continuing. This specific issue furnished the grounds for one of the best discussions I have heard in a long while. The question - to participate or not - forced people to confront the question of the nature of democracy. Is a referendum necessarily democratic? If not, under what conditions is it acceptable? The question posed is immediate enough to avoid abstract arguments from democratic theory. Participants in the discussion had to keep relating ideas about democracy to what would happen at the Buffalo Campus. And yet the question was not so small that the discussion

(continued on page 12)

REACTIONARY RADICALS

that we are posing. And when we agitate for a civil rights bill, it is not the Bill itself, that piece of paper with LBJ's scrawl triumphantly affixed, that is our goal; the goal of political action is change in the world of the individual, of yours and my *Lebenswelt*.

In order to be able to cope with the revolutionized world, theoretical study will be necessary; we will have to understand the historical juncture at which we stand in order to begin to make a way toward a society which fulfills those basic needs of man within a socio-political structure which is adapted to the changing times. There has been little work in this direction in the U. S.; to my knowledge the only person who has made an important contribution is Herbert Marcuse.¹ In what follows, I should like to try to indicate just where we stand historically and to put forward some tentative ideas of where we will have to go from here. 2

*** *** ***

The term "ideology" has come to mean the certain orientation towards reality of different groups which makes them see the same reality in different ways. When SDS debated the question of whether it needed a specifically defined ideology, this interpretation, in a somewhat decrepit form, came to the fore; the feeling seemed to prevail that to adopt an ideology was to become selective in one's grasp of events and thereby to preclude certain possibilities of action. A discussion of what is meant by ideology and of some of the different ideologies that are still prevalent today would probably be useful; Karl Mannheim has given us this in his *Ideology and Utopia*. 3

Mannheim suggests that:

The concept 'ideology' reflects... that ruling groups can in their thinking become so intensively interest-bound to a situation that they are simply no longer able to see certain facts which would undermine their sense of domination. There is implicit in the word 'ideology' the insight that in certain situations, the collective unconscious of certain groups obscures the real condition of society both to itself and to others and thereby stabilizes it. (p. 40; my emphasis)

In contrast to ideological thinking, "utopian thought" reflects:

... that certain oppressed groups are intellectually so strongly interested in the destruction and transformation of a given condition of society that they unwittingly see only those elements in the situation which tend to negate it... They are not at all concerned with what really exists; rather in their thinking, they already seek to change the situation that exists. (p. 40)

Mannheim distinguishes five basic ideologies, and it would be well to review briefly the salient points of each of them. The first is Bureaucratic Conservatism, which, he says, "turn(s) all problems of politics into problems of administration." (118) The Bureaucratic Conservative "takes it for granted that the specific order prescribed by the concrete law is equivalent to order in general. He does not understand that every rationalized order is only one of many forms in which socially conflicting irrational forces are reconciled." (118) He, further, "tends to overlook the fact that the realm of administration and of smoothly functioning order represents only a part of the total political reality." (119) So doing, the Bureaucratic Conservative tends to overlook the irrational factors of politics, and, rends himself incapable of dealing with them. He is an administrator, a common figure in today's bureaucratic governmental set up. It is not hard to think of examples who are highly placed in today's governmental set up, such as Mr. McNamara. The Bureaucratic Conservative is just that—a bureaucrat nurtured within a system which is constructed to fit his capabilities and his needs. His way of life and his success testify to the kind of society that produces him and that he would produce.

The Historical Conservative is basically a phenomenon of the 19th century; Burke is probably the outstanding example of this type. The Historical Conservative recognizes that there are irrational forces in the sphere of politics, but "regards these forces as entirely beyond comprehension and infers that, as such, human reason is impotent to understand or to control them." (120) This

was the ideology of the nobility of England and Germany; it legitimized the claims of the aristocrats to political control on the grounds that since no one could understand the forces at work, those who had the most experience and were traditionally leaders, should lead the state. Mannheim comments that this is the feudal tradition become self-conscious (121). There is a great emphasis placed on the force of tradition in the affairs of the nation; it was within this school that the idea of the *Volkgeist* first came to prominence. It was certainly true of the old South that the class which governed was drawn from the ranks of this group. One wonders just how effective the Historical Conservative tradition is in the U. S. today. Certainly there are overtones of this ideology still at work, denying that anyone without previous political experience and training is qualified to serve; but it probably would be safe to say that as an explicit ideology, Historical Conservatism is a dying or dead phenomenon.

The Liberal Democratic Bourgeois thought springs forth within the same intellectual framework as does that of the Historical Conservative, though it represents a different interest group—the rising bourgeoisie. It maintains that if there is an irrational element in politics, it can be mastered by the intellect; it demands a scientific politics. This scientific politics was to be embodied in Parliament which was to be a debating center in which all points of view are brought forth so that the truth can be decided by intelligent men acting in the common interest. In its desire for rationalization in politics, it separates theory from practice, means from ends, and intellect from emotion. Liberal Democratic thought was unable to take into account the fact that its Parliamentarians were not pure intellect, that they could not keep separate theory and practice, means and ends, intellect and emotion; all were representing, consciously or not, interest groups of one or another sort; Parliament was thus unable to fill its planned function as the court of the disinterested intellect. Today, the same thing is true of our Congress; Liberals mark it up to the evil of the individual that there is vote trading, pork barreling, etc; the example of Sen. Fullbright shows only too well that it is the institution that shapes the man, despite all that liberal thought can do.

Mannheim treats Socialist and Communist thought as one, saying that he is not concerned with the historical manifestation, but with the tendencies which "cluster around the opposite poles that essentially determine modern thought." Of Marxism, Mannheim says that, "The great revelation it affords is that every form of historical or political thought is essentially conditioned by the life situation of the thinker and his groups." (125) Marx refused to make a differentiation between theory and practice, so common to liberal thought today. He refused to lay down an exhaustive set of objectives, maintaining that:

There is no norm to be achieved that is detachable from the process itself: 'Communism for us is not a condition that is to be established nor an ideal to which reality must adjust itself. We call Communism the actual movement which abolishes present conditions. The conditions under which this movement proceeds result from those now existing.' (126)

Marx held to the Napoleonic statement: "On s'engage, puis on voit" (One engages, then one sees); the dialectic shows that as soon as a theory is set up to explain the present stage, that stage is immediately transformed and requires a new theory to take account of it, and so forth; the solution finally working itself out in the *praxis* which ever-and-again shifts to meet the changes in the given.

Socialist-communist theory is then a synthesis of intuitionism and a determined desire to comprehend phenomena in an extremely rational way. Intuitionism is present in this theory because it denies the possibility of exact calculations of events in advance of their happening. The rationalist tendency enters because it aims to fit into a rational scheme whatever novelty comes to view at any moment. (128)

Further, the socialist-communist maintains the import of revolution:

It is especially revolutions that create a more valuable type of knowledge.

This constitutes a synthesis which men are likely to make when they live in the midst of irrationality and recognize it as such, but do not despair of the attempt to interpret it rationally. (128)

Marxism and Historical Conservatism are similar in that both see the irrational elements and do not try to hide them; but the Marxist conceives of this as relative irrationality which is potentially comprehensible through new methods of rationalization which follow in the dialectical process. Speaking generally, the Marxist analyzes and rationalizes the tendencies affecting the situation into three factors: that politics is based in economics; that economic change is connected with class change; and that the inner structure of the ideas dominating men at a given period can be understood in these terms and that the direction of change can be theoretically understood in these terms. (130)

Marxism is the ideology of the ascending classes. For this reason, it need not have a millenarian theory, but can bide its time and interpret history as an ever-flowing stream which moves the privileged classes closer to their goal. It takes advantage of every change that it is offered, yet it need not be an immediate success. It needs to have an understanding of history as a rational process, so that it can always evaluate where it stands and where it is going on the scale that is history.

Fascism is difficult to treat as an ideology since it refuses to have a concerted program (despite the nationalism which became prominent after the 1920's); it bases its programs on the significance of the DEED, on dealing only with questions of the hour, and on the absolute subordination to a leader or to a leading elite. Its psychology treats men as subjects for social mechanics, arguing that there is a collective unconscious possessed of primitive drives to which the leader must appeal. To this end the MYTH is appealed to to stimulate greater ACTION, and to show that all history is merely an illusion which stands in the way of the man of action.

... the conservative, the liberal-democratic... the socialistic conceptions (of history). All these theories, otherwise so antagonistic, share the assumption that there is a definite and ascertainable structure in history within which, so to speak, each event has its proper position... This idea of history as an intelligible scheme disappears in the face of the irrationality of the fascist apotheosis of the deed. (136-7)

The deed is that decisive factor which breaks through the tissue of historical circumstance, enabling the actor (and those whom he leads) to break the bonds that they think have been imposed upon them by historical law.

This theory is similar to the marxist theory in that they refuse to accept the liberal dichotomy between theory and practice:

the attractions of the fascist treatment of the problem of the relations between theory and practice lie in its designation of all thought as illusion. Political thought may be of value in arousing enthusiasm for action, but as a means for scientific comprehension of the field of 'politics' which involves prognostication of the future, it is useless. (145)

The relation of marxism-fascism does not extend too far: marxism never took flight into the irrationalism that characterizes fascism. While it pretended to speak for a minority (the workers) as did the fascist party (the bourgeoisie), the Bolshevik party could at least claim that it had history on its side, that it spoke for an increasingly class conscious proletariat; so it is impossible to point to too great a similarity between the two ideologies. Fascism made no claims to be the "voice of the people" as did the conservatives, liberals, and socialists; their intent was solely to supplant the existing ruling class with another, themselves. They represent a rising and a risen bourgeoisie:

Fascism finds itself serenely able to take over this bourgeois repudiation of history as a structure and process without any inconvenience, since fascism itself is the exponent of bourgeois groups. It accordingly has no intention of replacing the present social order with another, but only of substituting one ruling group for another within the existing class

arrangements. (146)

It is interesting to note that Mannheim makes little of the two ideologies that today are considered most important and typical of facism: its extreme and bellicose nationalism and its paranoiac anti-communism. Mannheim feels that these are only surface manifestations of the more important tendencies which show through in the consideration of the fundamental factors which affect the WELTANSCHAUUNG of a political force. It is easy to explain both nationalism and anti-communism: the former fits into the irrationalist idea of history, with its stress on the vital deed of the man (nation) of *virtu*; the latter is simply a revelation of the fact that fascism represents certain interest groups which would be endangered by a communist takeover.

Mannheim does not have a classification which would be called "Reactionary." This is a term which is bandied about a good bit today. It might be tentatively defined as the desire to return to the "good old days" and to institute laws to that end. There are, today in the US, two reactionary types. The first of these really fits into the Historical Conservative type. He wants to have a rule by the elite, a return to "the days which made this country great and strong, to the old laws and mores." The second type of reactionary is the romantic agrarian rebel who draws his inspiration from Jefferson and Paine, among others, desiring a return to the good old self-sufficient economy, etc. He wants to turn back the clock, somehow, and to return to a time that can no longer be. He has no concrete proposals, no political program to offer — though he is loaded with criticisms; he is not able to fit his program within a coherent theoretical understanding of the problems involved. He is a romantic and a utopian. As a political force he is doomed to the prophetic cry in the wilderness because of his lack of ideological grounding. At the same time this reactionary is a radical. He may call himself an anarchist, an individualist, or whatnot. He is *against*... He fears the great technological advances of the age as greater and greater encroachments on the little island that is the individual, or the "beloved community." This is what might be termed the reactionary-radical. It is a classification into which much of today's activism of the "New Left" would have to be placed, for lack of any other way to categorize it within the criteria used by Mannheim, such as a theory of the nature of the historical process, or man, and of the political process.

*** *** ***

All of these ideologies share an historical and intellectual background; they all grew up with or as rivals to the rising bourgeois industrial society. Their view is limited by this gestation inasmuch as each can only consider the political and social processes which existed during the period of the industrial revolution and subsequent growth on that foundation. This prejudice, inborn with the five ideologies (and their tributaries) makes them useless to us of the 1960's who are on the verge of a new era.

Perhaps the easiest way to point up the difference between the old and the new is to look at the notion of the MAN who is to enter into the society whose political superstructures are to be determined by the representatives of the differing ideologies. It will be seen that the old man is dead and that we are at the advent of the new, for whom we shall have to rethink the entire socio-political problematic. And we will see, in broad outlines, the terms in which this rethinking will have to be accomplished.

The classical model of society is set up in such a manner that the State exists to provide laws, restraints, on the individual citizens in order to protect the rights of private property. The laws are reified in the consciousness of the individual and take on a super-natural efficacy. In this way history is then thought of as the successive changes in the evolution of the legal superstructure; the changes are effected by men acting together in either a parliamentary, royal, or revolutionary political situation. Marx changed little of this by showing that the legal superstructures are just that — superstructures —, and that they are determined ultimately by the mode of production and distribution within the given society.

(Continued on page 4)

national v.p. report

An INTERNAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL

by Carl Davidson
National V. P.

The internal education of the SDS membership is clearly the first priority of the organization. As I see it, we need to move immediately on this issue from four different directions — individual, chapter, regional, and national.

I. *Individual Education.* Obviously no educational program can succeed without the commitment, sacrifice, and self discipline of each of us to the task of educating ourselves. And none of us are so bright that we can exempt ourselves from even the most basic political questions. We need to generate in ourselves a new spirit of thoughtfulness that has been lacking in the past few years of the organization's history. That, in itself, is a difficult task, but with the need for that spirit in mind, I can go on to offer a few practical suggestions.

(a) *Read Basic Documents.* An astonishing number of SDS people have never sat down and read the *Port Huron Statement* from cover to cover. We all ought to do that. Even if we have, we ought to read it again. Several other things, such as C. Wright Mill's *The Power Elite*; Jacobs and Landau's *The New Radicals*; Michael Harrington's *The Other America*; Paul Goodman's *Growing Up Absurd*; and Hal Draper's *The New Student Revolt*. All these and several others are basic works that ought to be well-worn parts of every SDS member's library.

(b) *Subscriptions and Mailing Lists.* Every member ought to subscribe to several publications like *The National Guardian*, *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, *The New York Sunday Times*, and *The Nation*. I don't mean to praise these particular publications, but considering what is available, they are probably the most satisfactory. Furthermore, I would advise every SDS member to get on every Left and Liberal mailing list possible, even the kooky ones. (Tom Condit and I will compile some addresses to print in NLN.) The content of most of the mail received this way may not seem to have much to do with internal education, but it does help, even if we only get a sense of what we shouldn't be doing.

(c) *Classroom Work.* Since most of us are still in school, we might incorporate "movement work" into our term paper assignments. For instance, why not write a 25 page paper on the Wobblies for an American History course? Also, when writing things of this sort, keep in mind the possibility of having them published as SDS pamphlets. Finally, we should constantly be raising "movement-oriented" questions in our classes.

II. *Chapter Education.* Since the chapter is the locus of the SDS reality, the main thrust of our educational program ought to be directed at this level. There are a multitude of approaches we can take to instill the spirit of education into the life of our chapters. I will list a few.

(a) *Chapter Programming.* We all agree that we must do something to express our outrage against the war in Vietnam. But too often our meetings for developing a program around Vietnam are nothing more than planning sessions for the mechanics of a demonstration and/or teach-in. During these meetings we need more discussions of strategy rather than tactics. I think it would be much more meaningful to debate within a chapter whether it should disrupt a meeting of the local Democratic Party and/or picket the Post Office, rather than to debate whether the picket signs say "Bring the troops Home Now" or "End the war in Vietnam."

(b) *Literature Tables.* Everyone in the chapter ought to participate in deciding what leaflets go on the lit. tables. This means that everyone will have to read all the literature and discuss it. Too often people come to our tables, ask a question about a particular piece of literature, and nobody at the table knows anything about it.

Also, everyone in the chapter ought to spend time at the tables. Too often each chapter develops a cadre of lit. table sitters while the bulk of the chapter put themselves either above or below confrontations with the public.


(c) *Chapter Meetings.* These ought to be made as interesting as possible. Chapters ought not to have meetings unless they can incorporate the showing of a film, or a local or outside speaker, or a general discussion of some political or social issue. Perhaps the reading of a certain pamphlet or a section from a certain book ought to be a prerequisite for attendance.

(d) *Hyde Park Forums.* Many campuses ought to have a weekly free speech forum. These can be created with SDS taking the initiative. One day a week, say from two to five in the afternoon, a P.A. system and platform ought to be set up in a well-traveled part of the campus. The platform would then be open to anyone to speak on anything for, say ten to fifteen minutes. SDS members should speak regularly and often. Being placed in this kind of situation pressures our members to become more well-versed and articulate in the issues of the day. It is important that these forums be seen as situations conducive to other forms of expression than verbal harangues. For instance, chapters could do art and photo displays, dramatic skits, poetry readings, and even musical presentations. Forums of this sort are also excellent times and places for setting up lit. tables and leafleting the audiences. Also, along this same line, SDS members should see the imperative of their attendance and participation in the meetings of other groups on campus and in town, such as dorm groups, fraternities, and churches. We should not worry too much about our ability to do this, for the only way to develop that ability is to plunge into the job.

(e) *Chapter Publications.* Chapters might publish a newsletter, or, better yet, a monthly "little magazine." These ought to contain literary as well as political items. Seeing their stuff in print is one of the best incentives for encouraging local members to study and write. It also encourages local members to criticize the thinking of other members. Copies of all such publications, even if only a leaflet, should be sent to the regional and national offices, so they can be passed on to other chapters.

(f) *Films.* Almost every campus has a weekly or bi-weekly foreign film series. Chapters might set up a radical film series, on a similar basis, complete with the sale of relevant literature at the door and discussions groups after the showing of each film. This could also be a good fund-raising project. Money made by showing the films could also be used to enable local members to make films of their own, if only with 8mm. home movie equipment.

(g) *Study Groups.* Every chapter needs to have several of these. It is important that they be fairly well structured; that is, something more than a Sunday afternoon bull session. However, at the same time, they should not be too esoteric. There should be a required reading list, and at each meeting someone should be given the responsibility for leading the next meeting. Groups could be set up around problems (Why are people poor?), seminal thinkers (What is Marx all about?), areas (History of American Labor), or special interests (Radical Poetry Workshop). It may help the study group a good deal if an occasional outside resource person is brought in, a film is shown, or a field trip is taken (i.e. five people in a study group on poverty might visit JOIN in Chicago for a weekend). It might also be feasible to organize a study group as a counter-course to one being offered by the university.



Two Military coos and a coo d'etat.

from L.A. Free Press

UNIVERSITY REFORM & REVOLUTION

(translations and notes by Matthew Edel)

Biographical note

Father Camilo Torres Restrepo (1929-1966) was chaplain of the National University of Columbia from 1959 to 1961, and was professor of Sociology there, and at the Escuela Superior de Administracion Publica in Bogota. He was the founder of the Columbian student community-organization movement (MUNIPROC). He trained several groups of students as community action promoters in a program financed by the government in the early days of the "Alliance for Progress" — some of these still work as individual and fortunately unseen agents of change within the public administration. He was the author of a number of important studies of Colombian social conditions, including "The Proletarianization of Bogota," and "Violence and Social Change." The respect and devotion that Colombian students felt for him is hard to convey. He was and is the hero to Colombian radical youth, both "new" and "old" left.

The two speeches that I have translated were made at university conferences on community development in 1960 and 1965, respectively, and show some of the evolution of Camilo's thought. In the first, he is concerned with changes in the students that will be brought about by their contact with poor communities. The themes of commitment, contact with the people, and the need to make the university experience more meaningful will be familiar to those who form part of the New Left in the United States, although it is interesting to note that unlike in Berkeley, the radical position in Latin America must favor more research. There is, in this speech, a call for social change, but there is no analysis of how the power structure is to be changed. By 1965, Camilo had come to a more direct concern with this problem. The answer that he presented to the students was that community organization could be a revolutionary force through the creation of a majority pressure groups, based in the poor communities, that could challenge the old power structure, and institute a democratic society, peacefully if possible, by force if necessary.

This more direct confrontation with the power structure implied in Camilo's later teachings brought him under attack from university administrators and the Church hierarchy. When, shortly after making this second speech, he called for collaboration between Catholics and Marxists, he was openly denounced by the Cardinal. In the summer of 1966, he issued a political platform calling for the unity of all dissenting groups behind a program of land reform, nationalization of banks, petroleum and medical services, and other sweeping changes. For several months he toured the country trying to organize a united front party. Under pressure from the Church, he asked to be relieved of his clerical obligations. Finally, after several rallies were broken up by the police, Camilo Torres disappeared. In January he was reported to have joined a guerilla movement, and on February 15,

1966, an army brigade reported that they had clashed with the guerillas, and that Torres had been killed. Although Camilo was in the end forced into an armed struggle before the masses could be organized sufficiently, as he had written was necessary, his writings remain as the basis for a New Left in Colombia.

by Camilo Torres

I. THE UNIVERSITY AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

A) STUDENTS AS A PRIVILEGED GROUP

In developing countries the economic structure is one of inequality in the ownership of the means of production and in incomes. We also find inequality in the educational opportunities of the population. We know that primary education is deficient. In Bogota in 1956, 59% of the children did not attend school and in the rural areas the percentage is greater. The rate of illiteracy shows this as well: 41% according to the last census in 1951. Private schools only serve 12% of primary school students, while public primary education is so limited that there are not sufficient schools. Secondary education is 82% in private hands, with the obvious effect on prices. Since there are no official subsidies for secondary schools, and most of these schools are really businesses, they charge a high price. Their profitability can be seen in the multiplication of private secondary schools. If they were not profitable it would be difficult to suppose that an apostolic spirit were so general among our entrepreneurs. The difficulties of university education are also clear. In 1958, 16,000 secondary graduates applied to the university, and only 9000 could be admitted. Although about half of university students are in public universities, the other 50% have to pay high tuition fees to be able to enter. The result is that only 5% of the Colombian population has secondary and university education. Therefore in a country like ours we can consider the university students as a privileged class, if not from an economic viewpoint, at least culturally.

B) Dissent and social change

A person's degree of conformity or dissent is related directly to two factors: his stake in the existing structure, and the consciousness that springs from the deficiencies of this structure. In the majority of the population there is a confused consciousness about the need for social change. In many sectors that are culturally deprived, there is an almost complete absence of conscious desire for social change. This is especially true in a country with as high a level of illiteracy and as large a rural population (more than half the total population) as ours. This rural population, physically and culturally isolated, lacking in social contacts, has less of a consciousness of its necessities, although it has been affected by the violence which in Colombia has been a factor of social contact and has

(continued on page 10)

Vice-President's Report

(Continued from page 3)

(h) *Research Projects.* Researching the nature of the local power structure is often a radicalizing experience for many SDS people. Chapters might publish reports of their university's connections with the Defense Dept., who the local political decision-makers are, the financial ties of their Board of Regents, and administrators. This can be even more significant if it is a part of an action program, such as South Africa demonstrations. Another approach is that might be taken is an investigation of the history of radicalism in a chapter's area. For instance, how many of us realized that the area within a 50 mile radius of Clear Lake, Iowa was the scene 30 years ago of organized farmer guerilla warfare against the local police and businessmen? Finally, if this sort of analysis was done across the country and co-ordinated through the REP office we might be able to produce quite a picture of American society.

III. *Regional Education.* There is little doubt that the infrastructure of SDS is in bad shape. Regional offices are often irrelevant to chapters within their regional. Neighboring SDS chapters have little contact and are often isolated from each other. This creates a problem of internal democracy as well as internal education for SDS. One way of re-evaluating the role of regional offices is to present a different image of those offices. In the past we have seen regions in the metaphor of a wheel, with the regional office as the hub and with the spokes leading out to chapters on the rim. To my mind, a much better metaphor is a web, with the chapters at the interstices and the connecting lines being defined as various functions. And one very important function for bringing chapters together is a regional education program. There are several ways this can be done, variations depending on the nature of the region.

(a) *A Rotating Regional Institute.* This set-up is modeled after a "floating crap game." One way of proceeding is for a chapter to call a meeting of chapters in the surrounding area, one chapter playing host for the weekend. At this meeting chapter representatives would draw up a schedule-curriculum covering the relevant areas of interest and ignorance, each chapter taking one area. What would follow would be a series of monthly weekend meetings with the conference site and responsibility for accommodations rotating among the various chapters. The host chapter would have the responsibility for drawing up a bibliography and gathering reading materials for distribution among the participants before the session. Films and outside resource speakers might also be used. Possible topics might include: "Churches and the War," "Movement Vocations," "Strategies for Social Change," "The Relevance of Organized Labor," "Art and the Movement," and "The History of Radical Farmer-Labor Movements."

It is sometimes wise to include an action program somewhere in the weekend schedule. For instance, a weekend conference on South Africa might include a film (*Fruit of Fear* is available from the American Committee on Africa), a teach-in (African students from several campuses could participate), a play (*The Blood Knot* might be put on by the local university theatre), and a demonstration (local banks and insurance companies financially involved in apartheid could be picketed). This is a very good way to strengthen weak chapters, who often don't have enough people for a healthy demonstration. A few "outside agitators" help a lot.

(b) *A Regional Forum.* The preceding outline is mainly relevant to rural or non-metropolitan regions. But for those regions contained within a metropolitan area (like New York) where members of different chapters are more apt to be in touch with each other, a different model might be better. That might be good would be a monthly forum, held regularly in a convenient hall or perhaps rotated among the student centers on campuses that have chapters. Various individuals, inside and outside SDS could then be encouraged by local chapters or the regional office to make use of the forum. There could be a variety of presentations, such as outside speakers, panels on various topics, films or individual SDS members delivering papers. The important thing is for the forum to become a regular event with wide participation. Regional REP (Radical Education Project) committees might be organized to insure the forum's functioning. However, it is also important that the forum not become dominated by any one "caucus" or "line."

(c) *Regional Publications.* This should be done for the same reasons as chapter publications - to encourage members to write and criticize the writings of other members. It can be handled in several ways. First, individual campus newsletters, journals, or magazines could be mailed to the membership in the entire region. Addressograph tapes can be obtained from the national office and publication dates could be obtained from the national office and publication dates could be co-ordinated among the various chapters. A second method would be for one chapter in the region to be responsible for the editing and soliciting of articles, another for the art work, and another for printing and mailing. Even these functions might be rotated. Finally, in some areas a regional publication might be best produced through the regional office, with the work being done by a publication committee that is responsible to the members of the region. At any rate, samples of all local and regional publication should be sent to the REP offices, so that they can in turn be given to SDS campus travellers to distribute in other areas. This way inexperienced or underdeveloped regions and chapters would have some models to work with.

(c) *Regional Research Groups.* This aspect of internal education is also analogous to research groups on the local level. However, some kinds of research might be done more effectively on a regional basis. What would probably work best would be for individuals in a regional area to work together in producing a certain documents, much in the same way the California region produced articles and pamphlets on the Grape Strike. For instance, the Great Plains region might find several people who would produce a pamphlet on the history of radical farmer's movements or on the problems of small farmers. Several people in the New York region might do an article on the power structure of New York City, etc. This sort of information should certainly be sent to the REP office and national office for nation-wide publication and distribution. Also once a group of regional research people had become reasonable articulate in a certain area, they might make a tour of nearby campuses for speaking engagements.

IV. *National Education.* The first task of National SDS, mainly the National Office and REP office, is to help the individual, local, and regional initiatives of internal education become concrete functional realities. I realize that this is no easy task, especially in the light of our current financial crisis. Anyway, I will offer a summary of what I see as some felt priorities.

(a) *Resource Material.* To begin, SDS needs a fairly extensive film library of its own. Many films could then be placed in the hands of campus travellers to insure their circulation. When a traveller arrived on a campus, plans could be made immediately for showing the film and holding group discussions afterwards. The traveller, being a veteran of many of these events, might become a good teacher in that area. We also need a comprehensive catalog of relevant films available from other sources. Every chapter should have a copy of the catalog.

Secondly, we need an extensive publications program along with a "where to get it" guide which would compile the addresses and relevant literature of other organizations. The National Office might also start a mail-order bookstore, distributing both single copies and quantity orders of certain books at discount prices. For financial reasons, we would probably have to implement this service on a cash-only basis. Regional offices might do this also.

Thirdly, the REP office should place a major priority on the production of study guides and course outlines. Many of these need to be centered around basic questions such as "Why are people poor?" rather than things like "The economics of neo-imperialism in Turkey in 1959". It would also be good to center the study guides around films and publications that SDS could make available.

Finally, we need a speakers bureau. This could partly be made up of the SDS and REP staff able to travel. In addition to helping our membership, it would also help to keep the staff of the various offices in touch with the SDS reality out at the local level. Also we should compile a list of addresses and prices of speakers from other parts of the movement.

(c) *National Newsletters.* The National staff should find certain individuals or groups who would serve as editors and producers of national newsletters on certain issues. The SDS Labor Newsletter is already being circulated. The old ERAP newsletter should be revived. An Arts newsletter called "Human Voices" has been started in California. We also need a newsletter on the draft and another on the student organizing/university reform project. Some of the articles in the various newsletters should certainly be printed in the *New Left Notes*. But much of the information would not concern the whole membership. However, each newsletter editor ought to make sure at least one person in every chapter receives a newsletter, in addition to those who subscribe to it.

Conclusion

Just a few brief notes:

- (1) Don't expect REP to serve as a panacea for all our problems. They can help (and we must certainly ask for it) but most of the initiative has to come from below.
- (2) Most of the above suggestions need money to become real. Send lots.
- (3) Ideologies are not sucked out of thumbs. Or books either for that matter. Rather, ideologies are the result of years of reflective thought and action. We must be thoughtful, active, and patient.

REACTIONARY RADICALS

(Continued from page 2)

These institutions had to be understood in this manner because man was defined as a man of scarcity. The Malthusian fear, though attacked over the years, still provides one of the pillars of the industrial society: there is not enough ... for everyone. Man, then, is to be considered as motivated first of all by his urge to have, to have enough to eat, a roof over his head, and so on. Man then becomes a *thing* against which, or on which, a society is erected which has as its chief function to control him.

Man is seen as subject to the State, to the laws that he has ordained for his own protection; the superstructure is reified and the created rules the creator. It may well be true that this type of order was "right" at that particular historical juncture. That is not what is in question here, today.

True or not, this conception of the relation of man and society certainly prevails in each of the five ideologies discussed above: man is considered as man of scarcity, and it is on the basis of this principle that the superstructure that is society evolves in time and is justified in its history; each is in its own way a "Robinsonade", and it is perhaps in Swift's wonderful myth that the clearest insight into this foundation is given.

But the material conditions on our little island are changing - rapidly; this is what I have called in one context the "Space Revolution", an appellation which will be justified below. Due to the great advances in productive science it is possible today to provide for the basic needs of all the men in the world, - if we use our productive capacity rationally. That we are not is a fact; why we are not is perhaps less of a mystery than some would hope. There are two reasons, I think, for our misuse of productive capacity: the first is that very nature of 20th century social situation, what Marcuse has called its "one-dimensionality", makes us blind to our own irrationality and the second - the Marxist explanation - is that the nature of the means of distribution in the society has not changed, and that therefore there can be no change in the superstructures, etc.

Obviously, then, the first stage of any revolutionary social change would be to eradicate those barriers which are preventing the complete utilization of our resources. Since this essay is only intended as a quick indication of possibilities, I shan't go into a discussion of which of the two causes (there may be others) is at the root of this contemporary failure, and how the change might be introduced. While this change might well be taken as an end in itself (certainly feeding and clothing the world's poor is no mean accomplishment!), there is the question of change to what? What sort of superstructures will evolve? What sort of relations will be entered into by the "new" man? What

kind of relation will exist between superstructure (State, law) and foundation (man)? It is in answering this question that we get involved in the problem of what I have called the "Space Revolution."

(It should be noted here that the considerations relevant to this second topic will have a function in the first, in the strategy for the revolutionary unblocking of the new technology. I say this because the main barrier exists in the affluent and technologically advanced nations. Within these technological giants - despite alarming reports about the "other" third - many of the post-space revolution conditions already exist in potentiality. If brought to actuality, it may be that these conditions when properly understood and used will lead to the revolutionary unblocking which will actualize worldwide the revolutionary potential of the "space-revolution.")

Why speak of the "Space Revolution"? The designation is chosen to illustrate a paradoxical point which must be cleared up before the consequences of the "Revolution" are understood. I have tried to show, historically, the change which has been wrought upon the subject, man. Man is no longer a *thing* whose actions can be defined in terms of his basic physical needs; man returns to the center of the stage in an anti-Copernican revolution. That is, if man is no longer a thing, what is he, what can be said about him? This is a properly philosophical point; it is a question now of talking not about what man needs in order to keep alive, but of what he needs to fulfill himself, to make himself more than just a well-fed housecat, purring in the sun. In order to talk about this question, it is necessary to become a RADICAL, that is, to trace back the question to its ultimate roots, using only Reason as a guide, and to erect, on the basis of Reason's investigations, a set of norms which can be taken as the ultimate nature of the fulfilled man in society. (This, incidentally, does not imply that the fulfilled man is in a certain state, is quiescent; that would be to return once more to a "thingified" conception of man. More probably we will find that man is in a continued state of striving, and that his fulfillment is in the act itself, not its results.)

The task of Reason is fulfilled by the philosopher and the social scientist in concert. The philosopher will have to take up a number of root questions in an abstract manner - the manner of the Kantian critical thought, demanding a "transcendental deduction" of the new social conditions, giving the justification in terms of Reason, which thus establishes these conditions as norms: he will have to consider such problems as the nature of intersubjectivity, the nature of meaning and signification, and the fundamental structures of these and other human activities, - all this in the light of the new

(Continued on page 9)

our MAN on the DRAFT

Earl Silbar (A) Report on East Coast Trip
(B) Reply to Davidson & Stu.
Syndicalism

I went to NYC on Oct. 1 with the expectation of participating in an anti-draft conference, leading a workshop on draft organizing tactics. On arrival I found that the conference had been postponed until Oct. 28th. I spent the weekend and the early part of the week visiting friends and meeting SDS'ers at several New York area schools. Last Spring the SDS chapter led a sit-in of several hundred students at Brooklyn College, protesting their administration's cooperation with the Vietnam war by compiling class ranks for Selective Service. Talking to several SDS'ers there I found that they had already begun a leaflet campaign against the war, exposing the hypocrisy of government rhetoric with documented quotes from Pres. Eisenhower, etc. Along with this basic anti-war education (Stressing the sources of the war in the needs of the domestic economy) they are planning to continue the anti-rank fight as the link between the war and students' lives. While I was on campus, discussions were going on with students who had been members of campus NAACP (recently changed to Friends of SNCC) in an attempt to get them to concentrate on an educational program of leaflets, seminars, speakers, debates on the reality of the ghetto and its roots. In the past few years, civil rights work had been attempts to do off-campus organizing. SDS'ers at Brooklyn however feel that on campus programs are very much needed to combat widespread racism and ignorance among the student body as well as to expose those profiting from racism.

The next school I visited was the Uptown campus of City College of New York (CCNY). Last Spring this campus also had a sit-in of several hundred against their administration's cooperation with the draft and the war thru compiling class ranks. Altho led mainly by SDS, the DuBois club on campus played a confusing role when they came out for the retention of the II-S student deferment among other things. Now, with SDS, the acknowledged political leadership at City, they have also begun anti-war education. Tying this in with the fight against the rank, II-S and the draft. SDS at City was planning how best to win the referendum on the rank which they had gotten as a result of their sit-in. They see this referendum as a means of reaching large numbers of students, attacking the administration with the hoped for victory and setting a precedent of letting the students decide on matters vitally affecting them. Besides this program, the chapter has several internal education workshops on such things as Marxism, US foreign policy, etc.

Several SDS'ers at the Columbia School of Social Work have begun a MDS chapter. They began in fall 1965 with a conscious cadre of four men, intent on radicalizing 20-40 students thru a program of attacking the war on poverty (they held a radical teach-in with hundreds of social work students attending) and demanding student control over their training program. This multi-issue attack was widely accepted by the grad students there. The cadre, now expanded, ran for the student government unopposed, thus running new student orientation.

SDS members at Columbia U. are running a large REP program, with several classes now running and good attendance. The Columbia Independent Comm. on Vietnam had its opening meeting with over 250 people. All programmatic suggestions dealt with the draft, the major contenders being an anti-rank approach as a part of mobilizing and educating anti-war sentiment on campus and a pressure campaign aimed at Congressmen and the Draft law which expires June, 1967.

Over the Oct. 8-9th weekend I attended the New England Regional Conference. There were 50-75 members from about 10 chapters. Workshops with most attendance were on the Draft and a discussion of Carl Davidson's paper on Student Syndicalism. In the first three-hour meeting on the draft, people talked mainly about the personal dilemmas which the II-S put them in. Discussion initially centered around individualistic ways for people to deal with opposition to the war from behind the student deferment. Getting a CO and CO counselling got strong initial support. However, further talk brought out the seeming impossibility of building a movement around this approach which could potentially unite students against their University's cooperation with the military, which could involve students as a group in an attempt collectively challenge the status-quo

in a manner that would be relevant to people other than students. In other words, we felt a need to channel our frustration and opposition into channels which we could use to break into off-campus alliances and/or organizing. With this need expressed, the group saw the need to reach high school people and hopefully their parents around the war and the draft. A show of hands found about 1/3 of those present either involved in anti-draft/anti-rank action or planning on their campus.

-- WORKSHOP ON "STUDENT POWER" --

The workshop on Davidson's paper (NLN 9/9/66) lasted several hours, was marked by participation of almost all those present (between 20-30) and by a recognition of the serious and far-reaching implications of the article. Remarkably, those present agreed that 1) the analysis given of the function of the educational system in our country was extremely insightful and politically relevant for developing programs aimed at building a revolutionary movement; and 2) that the criticisms of University reform programs were basically correct. However, those present also agreed that the major conclusion that students should attempt to build a long range movement to control their universities was incorrect. This seemed a startling conclusion for SDS'ers to reach. After all, some of our fondest mottoes are "Let the People Decide" and "People Should Control the Decisions That Affect Their Lives". Put into the University context, this is implicitly taken to mean that students should be at least, a strong force in determining University policy. As a strategy for building a multi-issue movement, it places heavy emphasis on the alienation of most Americans from any meaningful voice in power—whether in matters of national policy or on the job.

Indeed, I would go so far as to guess that the political thinking of most SDS leaders (oops, I mean activists) is basically syndicalist. That most of our concerns, rhetoric and programs attempt to lead people into struggle to control the institutions in which they live and work. Thus, community control of police, poor people control over welfare and war on poverty money, students and professors control in the Universities and heavy emphasis on workers control over job conditions.

While some people bemoan the fact of SDS' syndicalist ideology, I welcome it. Over the last year my experience has increasingly led me to emphasize the real need for programs built around people's felt problems in the institution that concern them most. The question of control is usually the link between the immediate grievance and its deeper roots in society's structure.

However, when the question of developing a program around campus issues for this semester came up at Roosevelt, we spent the first three meetings trying to deal with the ramifications of the student power corollary of the Syndicalist approach. First, the point was made that the Student Power position calls for organizing around a general demand while all of our experience showed that people move over specific grievances. Secondly, organizing against the grading system and its perverse effect as the primary emphasis was seen to contain the same errors as the syndicalist program against the wage system. That is, grades are a necessary tool within the educational machine which in turn suits the needs of American monopoly Capitalism—just as the wage system was and is an expediting tool for direct exploitation within that system. Education as to whom the grade (or wage-system serves is good, but it would be

(continued on page 11)

oops!

An old New Left Notes logo was inserted last week by mistake. This is the one that should have been run.

Apologies to the New England Region for running their old address and to Greg Calvert for saddling him with the responsibility of unsigned articles.

Sorry!
Thane Croston II
Editor

WE WANT BLACK POWER



PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

by Tom Condit

The second issue of *Levels* (211 Comstock pl, Syracuse, N Y 13210; 6 issues for \$2.50) has two articles on apartheid (by William Matabane and Kim Bush), a piece on "Who Owns Negro Music?", an article by a VISTA volunteer on why he quit, and a good review of Konrad Lorenz' *On Aggression*. There's also some poetry which didn't turn me on at all.

Another new magazine of the student left is *Alternatives* (University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, Calif. 92038; quarterly, \$2 per year). The first two issues serialized Herbert Marcuse's "The Individual in the Great Society" and carried articles on Vietnam, the social responsibility of scientists, the social function of the university, land reform in Ethiopia, and "Marxism and Christianity" (by a Jesuit). For the Fall issue, we are promised an English translation of the *Les Temps Modernes* article "The Americans in Vietnam".

The Summer issue of *Science and Society* (30 E. 20th st, NYC 10003; quarterly, \$5 per year) has articles on "Engels and the Historical Role of Ideologies" and "Marxist Humanism", and numerous book reviews.

The October *Southern Patriot* (3210 W. Broadway, Louisville, Ky. 40211; \$2 per year) has articles on the Atlanta "riots" and the Lowndes County Freedom Organization ("Black Panther Party"), as well as the usual roundup of civil rights news.

Another civil rights paper is *The Movement* (California SNCC, 449 14th st, San Francisco, Calif. 94103; monthly, \$2 per year). The September issue is "mostly about the police" (the Philadelphia SNCC frameup,

Oakland, the Watts Community Alert Patrol and the San Jose "riot"), but also has articles by Jack Minnis (on South Africa) and Stokely Carmichael (on "black power").

The October *News & Letters* (8751 Grand River, Detroit, Mich. 48204; 12 issues for \$1) has articles on China's "red guards", the Waseda University student strike, the North Nashville Project, "black power" and a wide coverage of rank-and-file labor activity.

The Militant (873 Broadway, NYC 10003; \$3 per year) also has a lead article on the "red guards" in Oct. 17th issue, as well as the last (third) part of T. Soedarso's "Views of an Indonesian Communist" (a critical analysis of the events leading up to the recent massacres) and an article on "The Sad Record of Gov. Brown."

The Oct. 15 *National Guardian* (197 E. 4th st. NYC 10009; weekly, \$3.50 student sub, \$1 trial sub) has reports on the Los Angeles conference on "Power & Politics", the Harlem school conflict, the independent Cook campaign in New Haven, and (once again) the "red guards".

By contrast, the "red guards", a main topic of discussion in the last 3 papers, are conspicuously missing from Progressive Labor's weekly *Challenge* (GPO Box 808, Brooklyn, N Y 11201; \$2.50 per year). Present are articles on rent strikes, the Harlem school boycott, union bureaucracy and military dictatorship in Argentina.

From Australia comes the new bi-monthly *Pacific* (Box 247, P O Haymarket, NSW, Australia; \$1.50 per year). The July-August issue has articles on the Indonesian massacre and the war in Vietnam.

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, Thane Croston

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: 1347-1/2 Riviera Ave., Venice, Calif.

New England: 138 River St., Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Chicago Region: 2059 N. Larrabee, Chicago, Ill. (312) 944-3624

Radical Education Project: 510 East William, Ann Arbor, Mich.

CHAPTER CONTACT

ALABAMA

Birmingham-Helena Chapter
Bill Edmundson
Rt. 1; Box 185
Helena, Alabama 35080

CALIFORNIA

Citizens for a Democratic Society
924 Howard St.
San Francisco, Calif. 94103

UCLA Chapter SDS
308 Westwood Plaza, Box 412
Los Angeles, Calif. 90024

Berkeley SDS
Kris Dymond
1912 Henry St.
Berkeley, Calif. 94709

U.C. San Diego SDS
J. M. Wagner
3044 Broadway
San Diego, California

Sacramento State SDS
Ken Duvse/Jon Jenkins
2526 "O" St.
Sacramento, Calif. 95816

U. C. at Davis
Steve Tachett
Davis, Calif. 95616

Stanford SDS
Barry Bunquist
415 Fernanda Ave.
Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

Stanford SDS
Dennis Sweeney
656 Channing Ave.
Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

COLORADO

U. of C. at Denver SDS
Derk Noble
115 Dudley
Denver, Colorado

CONNECTICUT

U. of Hartford SDS
Steven Fuhr
20 Nursery Dr.
West Hartford, Conn.

U. of Hartford SDS
Peter Thomson
115 E. Pershing St.
Bloomfield, Conn. 06112

Yale SDS
John Wilhelm
1204 Yale St.
New Haven, Conn.

Trinity College SDS
Jim Kaplan
Box 132
Hartford, Conn. 06106

DELAWARE

U. of Delaware SDS
Robb Bressler
Department of Political Science
U. of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

Washington Community at Large SDS
Mary Matteson
1736 18th St. NW, apt. 305
Washington D. C. 20009

FLORIDA

U. of Florida SDS
Bonni Greenspan/Al Levin
Freedom Forum
Box 13636 Univ. Stn.
Gainesville, Florida

ILLINOIS

IIT SDS
Dave Zuehsow
3901 West 31st St.
Chicago, Ill. 60623

Northwestern SDS
Leland Neuberg
1310 Chicago Ave.
Evanston, Ill.

Northwestern SDS
Dave Evans 1827 Wesley
Evanston, Ill.

Lake Forest College SDS
Carol Seligmann
Roberts Hall
Lake Forest College
Lake Forest, Illinois

McMurray College SDS
Dan Millstone
McMurray College
Jacksonville, Ill.

Northern Illinois U. SDS
Dick Glidwell
113 E. Roosevelt
De Kalb, Ill.

UICC SDS
Irv Himelblau
1321 W. Taylor
Chicago, Illinois

Ill. State Univ. SDS
Lee Hayward
610 Williams Hall
Normal, Ill. 61761

U. of Ill. SDS
Tim Keller
528 E. Green
Champaign, Ill.

Southern Ill. U. SDS
Mike Harty
311 W. Walnut #7
Carbondale, Ill. 62901

Roosevelt U. SDS
Bernard Farber
8421 N. Christian
Skokie, Ill. 60077

INDIANA

U. of Indiana SDS
c/o Student Activities
Indiana Memorial Union
Indiana Univ.
Bloomington, Ind. 47401

De Pauw U. SDS
Gregory D. Rodd
401 E. Hanna
Greencastle, Ind. 46135

Notre Dame SDS
Phil O'Mara
612 E. Washington
Notre Dame, Indiana

IOWA

Iowa State U. SDS
Don Siano
c/o Physics Dept.
Iowa State U.
Ames, Iowa 50010

State College of Iowa SDS
Chuck Ingensen
401 Hulin
Charles City, Iowa

Drake U. SDS
Jim Dunn
418 S.E. 3rd St.
Des Moines, Iowa

U. of Iowa SDS
Harry and Linda Mac Cormack
1217 Pickard St.
Iowa City, Iowa

KANSAS

Kansas U. SDS
Don Olson
841 Maine
Lawrence, Kansas

KENTUCKY

U. of Louisville SDS
Bob Denk
534 E. Jefferson St.
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

U. of Kentucky SDS
Box 5026, University STN.
Lexington, Ky.

MARYLAND

U. of Maryland SDS
Michael Weichbroad
8321 Tahona Drive
Silver Springs, Md.

John's Hopkins SDS
Charles Verment
John's Hopkins U.
Baltimore, Md.

Baltimore-at-large SDS
Don Bacheller
216 E. 22nd St.
Baltimore, Md.

MASS.

Smith College SDS
Catha Crowe
95 Round Hill Road
Northampton, Mass. 01060

Northeastern U. SDS
Activities Office
Northeastern U., 360 Huntington
Boston, Mass. 02115

Harvard-Radcliffe SDS
Eric Lessinger
48 Dana St.
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Mt. Holyoke College SDS
Beth Mandlebaum
Mt. Holyoke College
South Hadley, Mass. 01075

MICHIGAN

Oakland U. at Rochester SDS
Marc White
R. 614, Van Wagoner House
Oakland University
Rochester, Mich. 48063

VOICE

Student Activities Building
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Mich. State U. SDS
Kaye Bradley
614 Charles
East Lansing, Mich.

MINNESOTA

McCalister College SDS
J. D. Kendall
1532 Grand
St. Paul, Minnesota 55105

Carleton College SDS
John Newman
Carleton College
Northfield, Minn.

Moorehead State College SDS
Bryan Coyle
503 9th South
Moorehead, Minn. 56560

Minneapolis Community Union Project
1119 E. Franklin
Minneapolis, Minn.
(Doug Elliott)

Kansas City-at-large SDS
I. Epstein
1119 E. 11th St.
Kansas City, Mo. 64101

U. of Missouri SDS
Art Wilson
704 Maryland #1
Columbia, Mo. 65201

Washington U. SDS
Terry Koch
6275 Enwright
University City, Mo. 63130

Washington U. SDS
Jonathan Cohen
5915 McPherson
St. Louis, Missouri 63112

U. of Missouri SDS
Room 204, Haag Hall
U. of Missouri
Kansas City, Mo.

NEBRASKA

U. of Nebraska SDS
Al Spangler
3270 Starr
Lincoln, Nebraska 68503

NEW JERSEY

Princeton SDS
Dick Fried
511 Cuyler Hall
Princeton U.
Princeton, N.J. 08540

Rutgers SDS
c/o Ed Goff
Bc 2486
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ

Seton Hall SDS
c/o Michael Egan
123 Prospect Pl.
Rutherford, NJ

Drew SDS
c/o Peter Morrill
c/o Jim Sessions
Drew University
Madison, NJ

Hawthorne SDS
c/o Jeff Cosloi
169 Beverly Road
Hawthorne, NJ

Weequahic SDS
c/o Marshall Berzon
332 Wainwright St.
Newark, NJ

Bergen SDS
c/o Betsy Epstein
317 33rd Street
Union City, NJ

MAILING LIST

NEW MEXICO

U. of New Mexico SDS
Tony and Marla Mares
303 Harvard SE
Albuquerque, N.M. 87106

NEW YORK

St. U. College at Buffalo SDS
George Semerau
1721 Ashland Ave.
Buffalo, N. Y.

Vassar SDS
Kathleen McAfee
Vassar College
Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

SUNYAB SDS
Mike Sawnee
290 Minnesota Ave.
Buffalo, N.Y. 42125

Brooklyn College SDS
Susan Simensky
359 Wortman Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11207

NYU Downtown SDS
John Mason
511 University Place
NYC

Hunter College SDS
Larry Levine
3023 Avenue
Brooklyn, New York

Columbia SDS
John Fuerst
Apt. 4a
255 W. 108th Street
New York City, N.Y. 10027

Brooklyn College SDS
Ira Perelson
217 88th St. #9
NYC, N.Y.

Cortland State SDS
Anita Koppelson
Cheney Hall, Box 17
Cortland, N.Y.

Harper College SDS
Judi Bernstein
Harper College, Box 328
Binghamton, N.Y.

Syracuse U. SDS
Bob Tenney
841 University Building
Syracuse, New York

Cornell U. SDS
Joel Bernard
Cornell U.-Undergrad.
Ithaca, N.Y.

City College Center SDS
c/o Mike Rosenbaum
95 Christopher St.
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Adelphi University SDS
c/o NY Regional SDS
49 W. 27th St.
New York, NY

Bard College - SDS
c/o Bruce Lieberman
Bard College
Annandale-on-Hudson
New York

College of New Rochelle - SDS
c/o Sue Daly
College of New Rochelle
New Rochelle, NY

Manhattanville College SDS
c/o Mary Beth Corbett
Manhattanville College
Purchase, NY

SUNY at Sunnybrook SDS
c/o Lenny Shames

CCNY Uptown SDS
c/o Larry Rothfeder
213 Nagle Ave.
New York, NY 10034

New School SDS
c/o Gerry Tenney
311 East 3rd St.
New York NY 10009

Sarah Lawrence SDS
c/o Ruth Lazar
Sarah Lawrence College
Bronxville, NY

Queens College SDS
c/o Mark Feinstein
170 - 16 84th Ave.
Jamaica, Queens NY

Long Island U (Bklyn campus) SDS
c/o Mike Hirsch

NYU Uptown SDS
c/o Dan Werner
513 Silver Hall
Bronx, NY

C. W. Post College SDS
c/o James Everrett
Queens Hall
CW Post College
Greenwall, LI NY

Finch SDS
c/o Laurie Stark
60 E. 78th St.
NY NY 10021

Fashion Inst. of Tech. SDS
c/o Stephanie Rugoff
35-07 147th St.
Flushing, NY 11354

Free University of NY SDS
c/o Tuli Kupferberger
20 E. 14th St.
New York NY 10003

Hofstra SDS
c/o Steve Suffet
3434 77th St.
Jackson Hts., NY

Hunter Uptown SDS
c/o Greg Shifrin
875 Morrison
Bronx, NY 10472

Manhattan Community College SDS
c/o Terry Davis
c/o NY Regional SDS
49 W. 27th St.
New York, N. Y.

New York at Large SDS
c/o Steve Max
420 Riverside Drive
NY NY

CCNY Downtown
Ben Fernandez
2531 Steining St.
Long Island City, N.Y.

Robert L. Stevenson SDS
c/o David Kaplan
250 Riverside Drive
NY NY

Yonkers at Large SDS
c/o Laura Stilling
79 Eton Rd.
Yonkers, NY

Dalton SDS
c/o Juana Ponce de Leon
80 East End Ave.
NY NY 10028

Darrow SDS
c/o Basil Lamphin
Darrow School
New Lebanon, NY

Music and Art SDS
c/o Bob Tenney
2776 Jerome Ave.
Bronx, NY

DeWitt SDS
c/o Larry Granick
1705 Townsent Ave.
Bronx, NY

Midwood SDS
c/o E. Weverman
1080 E. 8th
Brooklyn, NY 11230

NORTH CAROLINA

Duke U. SDS
Box 4561, Duke St.
Durham, N. Carolina 27706

U. of N. Carolina SDS
J. Kahan
206 Carthage
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

NORTH DAKOTA

U. of N. Dakota SDS
Tim Stafslein
Dept. of Art, U. of N. Dak.
Grand Forks, N.D. 58202

OHIO

Antioch College SDS
Paul Millman
Antioch College Union
Yellow Springs, Ohio

Oberlin SDS
Bob Parker/Steve Ericson
318 Wilder Hall, Oberlin College
Oberlin, Ohio 44074

Toledo SDS
1013 Adams St.
Toledo, Ohio 43624

Dennison SDS
David Spritzer
302 Stone Hall
Greenville, Ohio

Cincinnati SDS
Bill Burge
2357 Wheeler
Cincinnati, Ohio

Cleveland Project-West
2070 W. 26th
Cleveland, Ohio

Ohio Wesleyan SDS
Roy Braverman
39 N. Washington St.
Delaware, Ohio

U. of Ohio
E. S. Rothstein
216 1/2 W. Washington St.
Athens, Ohio 45701

OKLAHOMA

Okla. State SDS
Mack Eakes
503 1/2 S. Washington
Stillwater, Okla. 74074

Central State SDS
Bill Perry
721 S.E. 60 Terrace
Oklahoma City, Okla. 73149

U. of Okla. SDS
Ria Moore
1009 1/2 S. Pickard
Norman, Okla. 73019

OREGON

U. of Oregon SDS
Jerry Simpson
PO Box 5009
Eugene, Ore. 97403

Reed College SDS
Bill Vandercook
Reed College
Portland, Oregon

PENNSYLVANIA

U. of Penn SDS
Jon Goldstein
447 Lippuneatt Men's Dorm
Phila., Penn.

Haverford Social Action Comm.
Haverford College Box 209
Haverford, PA. 19041

Bryn Mawr College SDS
Margaret Levi
Erdman Hall
Bryn Mawr, Pa. 19010

Bucknell U.
Jay Pagano
Box B 561
Bucknell U.
Lewisburg, Penn.

Temple SDS
Karl Bloomfield
2034 Wanamaker St.
Phila. Pa. 19131

F&M College SDS
Neil Sheneberger
130 College Ave.
Lancaster, Pa. 17603

Penn. State SDS
Jim Grant
10 C College
State 11, Pa.

RHODE ISLAND

U. of RI SDS
John Allen
PO Box 327
Kingston, RI

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clemson U. SDS
Jay Warren Coleman
Box 5704
Clemson U.
Clemson, S.C. 29631

SOUTH DAKOTA

Yankton College SDS
Lynn Henry Schumaker
408 Deral St.
Yankton, S. D.

TEXAS

Austin SDS
Box 7098
University Station
Austin, Texas 78712

VERMONT

Benninton College SDS
Nancy Seldin
Bennington College
Bennington, Vt.

Goddard College SDS
Daniel Tilsen
Northwood Campus
Goddard College
Plainfield, Vt. 05667

Lexington SDS
Robert John Scheelen
315 Jackson Ave.
Lexington, Va. 24450

U. of Virginia SDS
Steve Wise
211 15th St., S.W.
Charlottesville, Va. 22903

WASHINGTON

Wash. State SDS
Russ Hansen
604 High St.
Pullman, Washington

U. of Wash. SDS
Gary Craig
5503 30th N.E. #A
Seattle, Wash. 98105

WISCONSIN

Lawrence U. SDS
Bud Walsh
Trevor Hall, Lawrence U.
Appleton, Wis.

U. of Wisconsin SDS
Robert M. Stanton
214 N. Broom Street
Madison, Wis. 53703

U. of Wis. SDS
Henry W. Haslach, jr.
8 Francis Court
Madison, Wisc. 53703

U. of Wisc. at Milwaukee
Cornelius Likane
1311 W. Kilbourne, #N1
Milwaukee, Wisc.

TENNESSEE

SSOC
Ed Hamlet
Box 6403
Nashville, Tenn.

REP
510 E. William
Ann Arbor, Mich.

If your chapter is not on
this list,
notify the N.O.

NO COMMENT!

COLLEGE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF AMERICA
 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE
 1730 K STREET, N.W.
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

September 8, 1966

CHAIRMAN
 DALE E. WAGNER
 4149 Southern Avenue, S.E.
 Washington, D.C.

VICE CHAIRMAN
 HARRY G. SCOUFOS, III
 728 1/2 E. Seventeenth
 Ave., Oklahoma

RECORDING SECRETARY
 MIKE LENNEN
 Skidzie Apartments
 North College
 Wichita, Kansas

TREASURER
 BARRY S. LEVINE
 1720 E. 12th Street
 Brooklyn, New York

ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY
 LARRY SEGNERI
 Northern Illinois Univ.
 214 Lincoln Hall
 De Kalb, Illinois

- NEC MEMBERS AT LARGE
- ALAN BECHMAN
1817 W. Ninth Street
San Pedro, California
 - JOSEPH BERLANT
29 W. 11th Avenue
Horsick Falls, New York
 - DAVID BUSH
3725 Conover Road
Alexandria, Virginia
 - ANN CUNIFF
14 W. Superior Street
Chicago, Illinois
 - ROBERT MAHONEY
1054 Pennsylvania Blvd.
Washington, D.C.
 - MICHAEL D. MURPHY
805 S. Wilson Boulevard
Nashville, Tennessee
 - TIM PATTERSON
Seed College
Portland, Oregon
 - ROBERT ROWKA
Building Hall 311
Harvard Law School
Cambridge, Massachusetts
 - STEPHEN WEITMAN
318 S. 42nd Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
 - CHARLES T. WHITNEY
1607 Fincher Road
Des Moines, Iowa

Hon. John M. Bailey, Chairman
 Democratic National Committee
 1730 K Street, Northwest
 Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Chairman Bailey:

It has been brought to my attention through David Banks, Executive Secretary of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, that certain parties in the offices at the Democratic National Committee have denied our organization the right to reproduce and mail out through the Committee our latest group of resolutions and policy positions passed by a meeting of the National Executive Committee of the College Young Democratic Clubs of America in Nashville, Tennessee on September 2-4, 1966.

The explanation presented to our executive secretary, Gary Winget, was that due to the content of the resolution passed on Viet Nam, both the printing facilities and postage for the distribution of the resolution would be denied CYDCA. I am enclosing a copy of the "controversial" resolution on Viet Nam.

Several members of the National Executive Committee of CYDCA wish to make public any denial of Committee facilities for printing and distribution of any official policy resolutions passed by CYDCA. I would prefer not to do so, if at all possible.

I hope to hear from you on this matter at your earliest convenience. I would also be very willing to discuss this question with you personally or anyone of your choosing at the Committee.

Sincerely,

Dale E. Wagner
 Dale E. Wagner, Chairman

OFFICIAL STUDENT ADJUNCT OF THE YDCA. THE OFFICIAL YOUTH ORGANIZATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

COLLEGE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF AMERICA
 NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE—September 2-4, 1966
 Nashville, Tennessee

VIET NAM RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the National Executive Committee of the CYDCA assembled in Washington, D.C. on April 24, 1966 expressed its earnest and sincere disapproval of the present administration policy in Viet Nam, calling for immediate cease fire on the part of both combatants and a prior halt in American bombings of North Viet Nam; and

WHEREAS, since the time the Administration has increased and intensified the bombing of North Viet Nam even to the point of attacking strategic oil and power facilities in major cities of North Viet Nam, despite a gradual awareness on the part of an ever increasing segment of the American public of the misconceptions upon which the Administration policy is based; and

WHEREAS, present policy is embarrassing and distressing to many of our staunchest allies, especially the United Kingdom and Japan, who have felt increasing annoyances as the war has been escalated; and

WHEREAS, present Administration policy in Viet Nam hampers the efforts of our nation to improve living conditions in underdeveloped countries throughout the world due to the hostility towards official U.S. policy in Viet Nam on the part of most of the Governments of these countries; and


WHEREAS, the cost of the war effort in Viet Nam is being paid by the poor of America in that services and opportunities legislated and envisioned by the U.S. government, as recently as a year ago, are becoming symbols of an empty dream due to the government expenditures for the war which should more ideally and morally be channeled into giving aid and opportunity to the poor in our own nation; and

WHEREAS, the American college student is most directly affected by the course of the war, although he has had hardly any voice in deciding this policy due to his inability to vote;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the National Executive Committee of the CYDCA assembled in Nashville, Tennessee, do hereby assert that the administration policy is generally unsound; and we most vigorously call once again for an immediate end to the bombing of North Viet Nam, followed by the entrance of the United Nation's peace force to replace the American forces now in Viet Nam in order that a plebiscite be held as soon as possible under United Nations supervision in the Republic of Viet Nam to decide what status the southern half of Viet Nam shall have in the future and that this plebiscite be either simultaneous with or immediately preceded by a corresponding and plebiscite in North Viet Nam.

PASSED 10 to 3

THE MEAT GRINDER



REACTIONARY RADICALS

(Continued from page 4)

"Space Revolution" and its non-substantial understanding of man. The social scientist will try to provide the historical justification, to situate the new structures in relation to the old and to account for the changes. He will try to deal with the same problems as the philosopher, treating them on a more concrete level.

The main consideration in all of this is the oft-mentioned "Space Revolution." What this means, concretely, is that man is no longer forced to devote the major portion of his time and effort - his life - to keeping body and soul together. New possibilities are open for man. He will become, in a certain sense, a poet: he will be a maker of things, a creator. His life will be spent in a new and more-enriching manner; the days of the exploited animal are over. This will then make for different kinds of interpersonal relations; when there is not that ever-present pressure to earn a living, to possess material goods, there is more time to be human. Perhaps we will witness the appearance of the anarchist dream: societies based on voluntary free association among equals. This, obviously, would imply changes in the legal superstructures.

It would be easy to go on and on, but I think that the point should be clear. These changes will not come as manna from the beneficent heavens; they will be the fruits of a revolution - a revolution which will first have to have its path paved with ideas. By that I mean that, (1) the social scientist will have to show what the new structures will be and why they are historically necessary; (2) the philosopher will have to provide their foundation in Reason, explaining, "How is it possible that . . ."

It should be clear that what I am calling for is a change in priority in the program of the American left. Let us leave behind the old

ideological quarrels and recognize that there is an untouched frontier lying before us. We have to conquer that frontier if we are going to make possible the society of which we dream.

I said above, parenthetically, that perhaps work in this second direction would be a key to activity towards unlocking those flood-gates which are holding back the tide of material which should today be feeding a starving world. By that I mean to indicate one mode of radical activity that we have not previously utilized to its fullest capacity here in the U. S. The American "two-thirds", if you will, is at the stage where it has the material to live the "new" life, if it so chooses. That it doesn't may well be explained in the Biblical story of the Exodus, the first great Revolution: The Jews had fled Egypt and were making the long trek through Sinai. They grew thirsty and complained to Moses: "Though we were slaves in Egypt, at least we had water." And Moses, knowing not what to do, called upon God, who granted the Jews water with which to quench their thirst. Then it was food, and God gave manna. Then it was the monotony of the food. And so on. Finally, God spoke to Moses and told him that he must wander 40 years in the desert, that *no man who had tasted the bread of slavery might eat of the fruits of freedom.* And so it was.

My point is that we cannot hope for much from that affluent middle-class; but we can harbor great hopes for their children, our generation. To conquer them we will need more than just the "vague emotions" that we have been offering. We will need an "ideology", a "philosophy." We have got to be able to prove why it is that we are *right* that we can see the new society, and that with their aid and with the aid of those who refuse and have refused the bread of slavery, we can all enter the new land of freedom!

This is the primary task of any serious left in the US today. Anything else will simply fall into the class of worn-out ideologies, and, we will more than ever deserve the name: REACTIONARY RADICALS.

MIGRANT STRIKE

(Continued from page 1)

as long as 115 hours), that the exorbitant rents for the company houses be reduced (some families are charged as high as \$96 /mo. for 1-room shacks), and the allotment of rest and meal breaks. Burns has refused to recognize their independent union, Obremos Unidos, and now both sides are embroiled in a fever of strategy planning.

The background and specific determinants of the strike action are, aside from the omnipresent oppressive working conditions of migrants, unique, especially in regard to leadership and initiation. The strike has received most of its leadership from two students at the University of Wisconsin, 22 year old Jesus Salas, an undergraduate and native of the area, and Mark Erenburg, an economics graduate student.

They had been working in the area for the past three summers and organized a migrants' march in August to the state capital at Madison, 90 miles away. Many of the striking workers who at that time were on the cucumber harvest took part. The march received good publicity, lots of sympathy, but little concrete action. The workers then went into the potato harvest.

The spirit that that march had instilled in the workers surfaced at the Burns shed when they decided among themselves that they could no longer put up with the conditions and had the ability to make their own strike.

A group then went to see Salas and Erenburg and asked for help. A vote was taken in the shed and it was near unanimous to strike. They walked out seven days ago and have been picketing ever since.

Food for the strikers has been supplied by Salas' family who own a restaurant in nearby Wautoma. That family has been instrumental in its support. In addition to Jesus, two other sons are active as well as Mr. Salas, a former migrant worker himself.

Reaction when they walked out was immediate both in the area and around the state. Local Catholic and Protestant clergymen have been key in the support in playing

mediating roles, as well as providing meeting places in their churches. The county newspapers have attacked it as the work of "outside agitators" Salas and Erenburg who they snidishly refer to as the "soapbox twins." The police have on the whole been neutral and have not as yet been party to harassment.

State newspapers have been covering developments closely and through this publicity the strike has caught the imagination of many. Organized support is now growing. At Madison a coalition that includes student religious centers, the Wisconsin Student Association, SDS, and other groups has been collecting food and money. One truckload of food has been sent so far.

By far the most interesting reaction has been that of the state AFL-CIO which has been extremely enthusiastic in its support. At the state convention held in Madison today, Salas and 20 workers came to present their case. The speeches were broken frequently by applause and when they got through they received a four minute standing ovation. Many locals as well as the state organization have pledged considerable financial support.

But much more is involved than a strike with clear cut demands. On both sides the meaning is deep and the ramification of the outcome will be great.

James Burns, the owner, is a "self made" man. He has worked hard to build a stable financial operation, albeit on the backs of Mexican-Americans. He is a mainstay of the local community and, it is rumored, donates a large chunk of the running expenses for the Catholic diocese. He will fight to maintain his power.

The migrants, by making their strike, have in the words of Jesus Salas, "for the first time in their lives known dignity." And they will not easily give that up.

Both sides at this point so early in the strike have been only feeling out alternatives for the most part. Burns tried to evict the strikers from the company houses when they first walked out but was rebuffed because the rent was paid up for another week.

(continued on page 12)

UNIVERSITY REFORM and REVOLUTION

our MAN on the DRAFT

(Continued from page 3)

spread many ideas and put the peasants in communication with each other, as well as aggravating the needs of our rural areas and awakening a greater consciousness in the peasant. The general lack of a consciousness of the need for social change appears in many forms; the weakness of agrarian unions, systematic abstention from voting, or the election of candidates who are supporters of the current situation.

The consciousness of social change is closely related to the level of education. However of the 5% of individuals who have received a secondary and university education, the majority are professionals or bureaucrats who are compromised by the existing structures and depend on them for their livelihood. Thus, although their cultural level is high enough so they have achieved a social consciousness from their education, they become conformists. Their conformity is conditioned by their degree of dependence for subsistence or for the ability to further their careers.

Within the 5% to which we have been referring, we find the group of university students, who are less than 1% of the population. These students are unique in possessing a high level of education and probably a high level of discontent as well. This was shown in the study made by Dr. Robert Williamson and the Faculty of Sociology about the attitudes of the Colombian students, principally those at the National University. This study showed a high degree of discontent among the students (correlated with their cultural and educational levels) due to the fact that they were still not involved in the existing structures. The characteristics of irresponsibility often attributed to students are a symptom of their lack of concern with their place in the structure.

Student discontent varies over the period of study. If we graph degrees of nonconformity, we see a curve which is low at the beginning of study, because at that time the students are not yet acquainted with many new ideas, nor have they entered the culture of student nonconformity. In the second year, as they learn more and become more confident, they adopt more attitudes of rebellion. The third year is probably that of the greatest dissent, but afterwards it declines, because the individual begins to feel himself less sure in his judgements, less absolutist; but principally because in his last years he begins to worry about a place in the existing structures. He begins to pay attention to the professionals who can advance his career, he tries to get to know the professors, to find the way to place himself, once he leaves the university, to find the way to place himself, once he leaves the university, at a level which will be high in terms of accepted social values.

Thus we find ourselves confronted by the phenomenon that discontent is purely temporary for the students. Naturally this affirmation is an over-generalization. There are many students who acquire a dissenting outlook and maintain it during their professional life, but generally one sees it decay vertically as a student approaches the end of his university career. For this reason, we must study further student dissent, and for this we can distinguish three types - *utopian dissent; the dissent of frustration; and scientific dissent.* The hypothesis, which like all hypotheses is subject to debate, is that the majority of students have a utopian dissenting view, or dissent out of frustration, but that only a minority are scientific dissenters.

What I mean by utopian dissent can be illustrated by a personal experience. When I became chaplain of the National University in 1959, there was a student movement opposed to the increase in transit fares. I recall that on March 3, 1959, many students overturned buses, and burned a jeep on the main avenue. There were demonstrations against the increases not so much because there hurt the students directly, but rather as demonstrations of solidarity with the workers. In addition to being new at the University, I had only recently from abroad, so when I saw a large group of students at the entrance to the campus, I tried to elude them because I thought that due to my inexperience I should not get involved. But they called me, asking what I as chaplain thought, and what the Church thought of the student movement. In a slightly Machiavellian manner, I answered that I believed the Church was in agreement with the movement in its aims were just, but that if they wanted my personal opinion I could give it. When they said they did, I told them it seemed to me what they had done (without judging

whether it was good or bad) could have been done by people with less professional qualifications than they had, because to turn over a bus or burn a jeep or throw stones one does not need two, three or four years of higher education. But there were some unworked fields into which the students could channel their dissatisfaction. To help the workers and the poor. They became interested and asked how they could do this. I proposed that we find something in which each of us could give a little of his special scientific skills to help. They called a meeting and named delegates, who met and proposed the creation of a workers' university - a night school to be taught by students from the National University. But on considering the problems of transportation, of financing and of teaching qualifications we decided it was too complicated. So I proposed going to a poor neighborhood to see what we could do, not from a paternalist standpoint, giving professional help as a superior threatens an inferior, but from the viewpoint of brothers and true companions, to work together on some job for the good of all. They liked the idea, and called a meeting which thirty students attended. With these, we decided to go to a poor neighborhood, and selected the one known as Tunjuelito. We went to this section, and began to get acquainted with the people.

We saw how the sociologists and economists could study the people's problems; the medical students could provide systems of preventive medicine; the lawyers could help the residents in court to prevent their exploitation; the architects could make plans for submission to the city government, to help the neighborhood receive the government aid due to it; others dedicated themselves to community organization, and thus each in his field could do something. We worked on this program for two years, and founded an organization which was called MUNIPROC (University Movement for Community Promotion), and eventually an inter-faculty council on community development was organized after a seminar in which MUNIPROC collaborated.

This example shows what happened in the university. There was discontent; there was dissatisfaction. The students wanted to do something for the poor, but it was a utopian feeling, lacking the necessary scientific basis. If these students were asked how the national income was distributed, how economic development could be begun, what underdevelopment was, what social currents existed in the country, or how land was divided, they would not have known. They were dissenters by instinct, but they did not know that dissent in an underdeveloped country is something that can be sustained by knowledge and by technical ability, and that if each of us becomes more adept at his specialty, in agricultural production, sanitation, or some other field, we will see the structural defects that require attention. This desire for change is the true dissent. Utopian dissent is sentimental dissent, built perhaps of a spirit of charity, not in a theological sense, but that of social charities; or a spirit of human solidarity, of altruism, of youthful generosity; but not sustained by study and knowledge that could show us that dissent is not only a beautiful thing well thought of in the university, but is a necessary thing for a country which requires radical structural changes.

which is caused by the conditions in which many students have to live. In 1958 a survey was made by a group of social workers, of the socio-economic conditions of students, which showed that many have problems of housing, food, or problems in buying books. This takes place in an urban environment where there are so many contrasts; where we find elements of rural culture in the marginal slums, as well as elements of the most advanced industrial civilization. This produces a certain bitterness, a frustration in many students which is revealed in an often irrational dissent. This dissent is a little more realistic than that which we discussed before. At least it is based on personal experience. Nonetheless it is more emotional than rational. To these types of dissent, utopian and frustration-based, I attribute the fact that most students lose their zeal for change as soon as emotional factors or personal interest which favor conformity enter into play. When they begin to see the necessity of a job, the need to find work, to gain prestige, when they have their degree in hand, utopian dissent disappears. When the individual finds that he has passed the obstacles and that he has a certain

economic capacity thanks to being a professional, the dissent of frustration also disappears. For this reason the professionals are less active as an element of change than the students, but the latter are ephemeral agents because their dissent is based on an sentiment or personal frustration, and not on an authentic knowledge of Colombian reality.

II. THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

A. The Importance of Research

The university should build a scientific dissent in the students and naturally this should not only be done by community work. The entire orientation of the university in Colombia, in the underdeveloped countries and the Latin American nations, ought to be impregnated with the national reality. It is said, as a commonplace, that the university has its back to the country. I believe this is true in the first place academically. It is logical that in a developing country many elements will be imported. Our textbooks are generally written outside of the country; many professors have graduated abroad, at the risk of becoming professionals "not of Colombia." With the corrective activity of research, we can adopt all of the departments to the national situation. If we make all professors do research, so that their chairs are not only for the repetition of textbook theory, but rather the elaboration of new sciences based on the investigation of the problems and needs of the country, we will have an academic level and orientation fundamentally adapted to the national reality. Disgracefully, research at the National University is something exotic and officially "unforeseen". If you read the current budget of the university, you will find in the last section it says "unforeseen expenses" and one of the subtitles is "transport and research." Thus in the budget of the university we find that research is at the same level as transport among the unforeseen expenses. I believe that fundamentally every professional, in whatever field, ought to connect that science with national problems by means of research.

In the Middle Ages, when the universities were first organized, they were not considered primarily as centers of teaching, but rather, they were groups of investigators and professionals who studied, and around this professional or that master, people would gather who wanted to study with him, and see how he worked, and learn by seeing him do his research. Research was the nucleus. The elaboration of scientific thought was the center, and teaching depended on investigation.

The National University of Colombia is, in general, a machine for the transmission of texts, for the granting of degrees, but not for producing true Colombian scientists. Before anything else, we must insist that the problem is one of creating a true science, and that this science be what supports dissent, is one of unavoidable urgency given the need for structural change in this country. The scientists or men who have tried to do research on Colombian soil realize anew at each step, the necessity for change, and we verify it from an empirical viewpoint that is not demagogic, nor sentimental, nor the result of the bitterness of personal frustration, but rather the conclusion of a serious investigation and of scientific knowledge of reality.

B. Community Action

Disgracefully, we meet many intellectuals who can describe very well the state of the country, its institutions, the deficiencies in our socio-economic situation, and our position in general, but who lack an emotional element, who have no feeling toward change. We find this among professionals in all types of activities. Feelings and conviction may be different. A person may be firmly convinced of something, but without a will to act. Frequently people know the Colombian structure and the necessity for its change, and nonetheless, do not move a finger to realize these changes. We find that by their own personal experiences or by close contact with reality, they come to take an attitude of commitment to change. I remember that the first time we went to Tunjuelito, some of the students said, "We really did not know until now what misery was." These were students who had been shouting about the misery of the country, and they

misleading to educate people to think they are ending exploitation by attacking one tool or another. Rather, the key is the State.

Thirdly, it was argued that seeking to replace the administration with students controlling the decision making apparatus would put us in the impossible position of being responsible for the continued existence of Roosevelt U. In practice this would mean that we would have to get money from a) increased students tuition, b) wealthy corporate liberals, foundations, etc., or c) Uncle Sammy. In other words, we would have to become the pimps of our dream. In fact, any University is financially tied to the Corporate and/or Government purse-strings. And, as we all should know by now, you don't get money for nothing in this society. Even if we didn't control all the administrative functions, if we held real institutionalized power, we would constantly be faced with the real contradiction of having to 'balance' our desires with the realization that our school cannot have a 'bad image' to our sources of wealth. That is, the development of a truly radical, critical and activist student movement in power is in contradiction to the needs of the dominant institutions of our society, which needs Carl Davidson so ably pointed out in his article. Thus to raise the program of student power, of "participatory democracy" on campus does not correspond to our actual experience of attacking the administration over specifics and furthermore, it raises deep illusions about the nature of the university by raising impossible demands which, even if they were not impossible, would not begin to deal with the roots of injustice and alienation in American society.

The syndicalist approach raises even deeper problems when applied as a general strategy for social change. When the Wobblies lead militant strikes with brilliant successes against local bosses and for control of the local means of production, & against the wage system they consistently got smashed by the armed power of the State, either the Regular Army or the National Guard. In fact, this highlights (or rather blood-lights) the basic failure of the syndicalist approach, the failure to develop ideology and program which takes into account the fact that the State represents the interest of those benefiting from ownership of the economic bases of society (read Ruling Class) and that the State will stop at nothing to destroy movements seen as threats to the basic social relations. The syndicalist "Student Power" approach thus fails to give students who are upset about specific things in connection to and outside the University a perspective for the absolute need to hook up with powerful forces outside the campus. (Like trade unionist, organizing the unorganized, poor Whites and Blacks). Leading students towards goals which Established Power will not grant does not necessarily lead them to radical conclusions. Political leadership must articulately expose the nature of the enemy so that when the enemy acts, people learn the lesson. To think that people in struggle must become radicalized when they get crunched is a gross error of a mystical and romantic sort. After all, people struggle daily with cops, bosses and administrators, getting treated like dirt and are clearly without power. Yet large numbers of people do not come to revolutionary conclusions through life's experience alone. Even in collective movement at a moment of truth (confrontation with power) a majority of those involved may only draw the conclusion that those in power are irrational nuts who one had best leave alone or coddle, or they may more likely conclude that the game is not worth the price since those involved may conceive of themselves as playing only for limited and specific goals. To think that people in struggle must become radicalized is to ignore all the lessons of history in which mass movements have been utterly smashed and the millions demoralized for generations (e.g. the White Terror after the independent working class organizations and the Facist victory and consolidation in Spain.)

It seems to me that the role of political leadership is to fight like hell for the immediate victories in the issues around which people are moving while at the same time pointing out the links between the immediate fight and the need for a revolutionary movement of working people, poor Whites

(Continued on page 11)

(continued on page 12)

our MAN on the DRAFT

(Continued from page 5)

the colonized Blacks and students. So far as I can see, the syndicalist approach doesn't adequately deal with this need since it is basically lacking when it comes to the crucial point of clarifying in people's minds the fundamental class character of the State and the absolute need to smash it in defense of primarily nonstudent movement for a society of, by and for the people -- not of, by and for the owners.

To be positive for a little while, I think that we should constantly seek to mobilize students around such issues as University Cooperation with the war and the military machine. We should fight like hell to win, too. I mean we should constantly expose the basic hypocrisy of Liberal Rhetoric, expose those who the administration serves (thus getting beyond the phase of seeing the ad. as "the enemy") and lead students to force the administration to accede to our just demands. We should develop programs which both speak to the immediate grievance (e.g. distortions, competition, and divisions,

intensified by the class rank) and which show the need and potential of working off campus with sections of the population that share our concerns (e.g. working class high school students and ghetto kids against the war and the draft.

Fundamental to this general approach is the constant requirement that radical activists constantly and consistently educate those involved as to the basic nature of the grievances. Thus, anti-draft organizing must always have a radical critique of the war, altho not everybody who gets involved must agree with the radical analysis of radical prescription. Thus, leading a fight on campus against the administration necessitates constant exposure of who they serve and of the need to take power away from the masters of society before we can expect to see stimulating education which is truly relevant to peoples lives and not the mechanical training ground that it is and must remain so long as it serves the interests of bureaucratically controlled private property.

FRODO LIVES

MEMBERSHIP REFERENDUM BALLOT

Votes will be counted at the National Office.
Send your vote to the National Office immediately.

A. Constitution Admendment

"Amendment 2: Reward Sentence one, Section 3, Article V to read: 'Chapters shall elect Convention delegates on the basis of one delegate for every five members, each delegate to have five votes on the Convention. However, in order to be seated as a delegate with five votes, written notice of the delegate's election must be received by the National Office prior to the Convention.'

B. Draft Resolution

"... and urges young men to resist the draft."

(Text)

"SDS believes the war in Viet Nam (a clear and blatant example of the corrupt nature of the present American System. This war is not a war for freedom, but a war against the right of men to choose their own form of government.

We must bring people to challenge this war and that system. This can best be done by showing how this war affects their lives. For students and young people generally, the draft is a clear and very threatening effect of the war on their lives. SDS should organize around this concern of young people thru anti-war and anti-draft activity.

SDS opposes the draft itself, no matter what form it takes, because of it's undemocratic and coercive nature. SDS opposes the "conscription of all men for the war in Viet Nam and urges young men to resist the draft.

On campus, SDS will organize to end University cooperation with the war machine.

(1) Find at least one person to seek (and publish in *New Left Notes*) information on local draft programs; to gather relevant documents and travel.

A. yes _____
no _____

B. yes _____
no _____

Name _____

Address _____

Chapter _____

Proposal for a STUDENT STRIKE

Bettina Aptheker,
University of California, Berkeley

Over the past two years, tens of thousands of students have engaged in some form of anti-war activity. With a good deal of consistency, efforts to organize student opposition to the war in Vietnam have met with success. Sentiment against the war, against university cooperation with the Selective Service System, and/or university participation in war-research projects, is strong and growing. All too often, we have underestimated the opposition, and underestimated the numbers of students willing to do something against the war. We have also underestimated the depth of the sentiment and the militant if not radical actions students are willing to take against the war.

There are many campuses with only fledgling peace groups, and others where no organized peace forces exist. We have built large movements on a number of very important campuses. One of the major problems facing the student movement today is how to give new direction and strength to the student movement where it already exists, and how to begin the process of organizing on campuses where the movement is weak or non-existent. We need then to both broaden and deepen the student anti-war movement. There are at least two things required to achieve this: (1) to talk to students about the war, and the effects of the war on their lives--i.e., the draft, the corruption of education when universities are used to research new and refined techniques for killing; the degeneracy and destruction of ideals by a war such as the one being waged against the people of Vietnam. (2) We need a nationally co-ordinated student action to give focus and direction to the movement, as well as making it possible for students who are organizing on campuses with a small movement to feel a part of a national action, and less isolated. The primary object is to develop a militant, effective and broad united demonstration against the war commensurate with the escalation, cruelty and aggressive character of American foreign policy.

It is from such an estimate of student sentiment and confidence in students to respond, a general analysis of the present campus state of affairs, and the desire to mobilize the academic community against the war that the proposal for a National Student Strike for Peace is made.

Many of the left student organizations are now discussing fall campus activity. SDS has several ideas for organizing a national student referendum on the war, and actions against the draft. Some people have suggested making all of November a Month of Protest. None of the proposals for either local actions, or for a number of nationally co-ordinated efforts, seem to me to be mutually exclusive. In fact, each would help to build and strengthen the others. The strike is proposed for the Spring, 1967.

NATURE OF A STUDENT STRIKE

The measure of success for a strike would be the cumulative effect of students (and faculty) all over the country responding on the same day to ACT against the war. Therefore, the success of the strike is not the absence of people from the university, but the active and positive actions of students and others in the academic community. If 'only' 10% of the students participated in the strike--i.e., 550,000, it would be, I think, a tremendous success. When was the last time that anything approaching that number of people from one community nationally has been moved to act in unison? The tactics for each area and/or college should be devised by the local coalition planning for the action, and tactics would be as varied as the level of political development differs nationally. We could expect to run the gamut of tactics from a teach-in, to a referendum to a picket-line to etc... A group of colleges close to each other might decide to have one joint protest. There are many possible combinations. The strike should allow for maximum flexibility and initiative by local groups.

The emphasis of the political content of the strike should be on the war as it affects the university and education, which of course goes to a dialogue on the nature of this particular war. This is merely a suggestion, and demands and program should be formulated by a meeting representative of all endorsing and sponsoring organizations. However, the strong feeling it seems to me on a whole number of campuses is on questions of war-research projects, CIA undercover operations and projects, military recruiting, ROTC training, the draft, and the general militarization of educational institutions.

SPONSORSHIP, ENDORSEMENT, PARTICIPATION

Sponsorship should come from any and all organizations from the university community. In addition to national groupings which now comprise the main section of the present student anti-war movement, we should seek sponsorship from religious student organizations (or the formation of an AD HOC Committee of religious student groups), from faculty peace committees, local student governments, etc. Approaches in local areas could be made to all political and social groups into which students are organized--the Young Democrats, the glee club, the hiking club, ski clubs, the Sierra clubs--forcing them to confront the war and and as a group, make a decision for or against the strike. We should make approaches to living groups--perhaps on a given campus this or that dormitory or co-op would support the strike. In the very process, the dialogue on the war could involve groups we have never before approached.

Endorsements for the strike (and possible supporting actions) should come from every conceivable corner of the non-academic community, e.g. churches, the civil rights movement, trade unionists for peace (and in some local areas perhaps even some unions), Women for Peace, American Friends Service Committee, independent election campaigns, e.g. Sheer for Congress now called the Community for New Politics, and prominent individuals, e.g. Sheer, Ted Weiss, Don Duncan, Keating, Spock, Deutcher, Muste, King (as a Nobel Prize winner), Julian Bond, etc.

In terms of participation then, what is desired is the widest possible sponsorship and endorsement with a great many national organizations participating in the building of the strike. To achieve a strike, what is required is the united cooperative strength of the student organizations, and the movement's support. Of great importance as well, is the ability of each organization to be able to maintain itself, its own program and identity while joining in the strike effort. One might add here that the strike is not necessarily limited to Junior College, college and university students. It is conceivable that large numbers of high school students could participate, specifically on issues with which they have special concern. But as the main discussion so far has been on the college level, the possibility of high school participation is mentioned, but not developed. Ideas on this would have to come from the high school students themselves.

Very briefly, I sketched some thoughts on the student strike. If, within the next few weeks a number of people from various sections of the academic community will sign the call for a meeting in Chicago during the Christmas recess, the call will be printed, with the signatures, and mailed and distributed as widely as possible. As of now, the call has not been printed. I wish to emphasize that these ideas represent a personal conception of a student strike, and by no means are definitive. I sought to fulfill the request of a number of people in the N.C.C. and SDS, and I set down my ideas on the strike to further discussions on it, throughout those organizations and among many other groups and individuals. It is in that spirit that this position paper was written.

UNIVERSITY REFORM and REVOLUTION

(continued from page 10)

did not know it existed twenty blocks from the university. This attitude is illogical and inconsistent, because it was not based on personal experience.

So I believe we cannot evade contact with the masses. Nonetheless, this contact cannot be paternalistic. Many have had contacts of that sort. What is needed is to have an interaction, or as the psychoanalysts say, a transference with these people, to be able to feel their problems not only from a statistical, cold, external point of view, but from a human viewpoint that will condition our attitude of collaboration in social change.

Community action in the university can be the seed for two things—it can be the germ of an eventual reorientation of the university faculty toward the realities of this country, and it can be the seed that stimulates investigation in different fields, and connects the students with the socio-economic reality in these fields. And although it is still just a seed, community action is already creating contacts with the population on a plane of equality. The student cannot dedicate himself to community action in a self-contained manner, since he must take into account the respect due to persons with fewer cultural,

scientific and economic opportunities. To undertake community action is equivalent to valuing each man as a human being, respecting him as a person, recognizing his abilities, which are often significant, without looking ourselves with an outside academic criterion when we wind in the poor values which exceed some of those that we, who have studied for years, have.

To realize all of this it is necessary to achieve an attitude, a plane of feelings for integration, until we want to live with the people. The ideal would be that one day there would be established student communities in those environments, to share the same conditions, the same worries and the same aspirations. In any case to go to the slums, even if only on weekends, implies a contact, a beginning, that can create the factor we discussed of a commitment to change. I believe that community action or community organization can be for the university the real origin of scientific and practical dissent, based on contact with reality. And I hope that this human contact with the poor, the victims of the structures that we have a duty to change, will strengthen the urgency of our commitment to that change.

Migrant Strike

(Continued from page 9)

There are now rumors that he will bring in strike breakers. But Erenburg thinks that he won't be able to find any because of the severe labor shortage in the state. He can demand that the National Labor Relations Board call an election to determine recognition of the union as a bargaining agent, or try to starve the workers into submission. But each day he does this he loses immediate orders for the potatoes to his two competitors in the area — it is rumored that he is losing \$25,000 a day (Erenburg thinks that this figure is too high, but that the loss is still considerable).

Salas and Erenburg see as an eventuality petitioning either the Wisconsin Employees Relations Board or the NLRB for a ruling on the specifics of an election. This is a controversial point because Burns claims that the union doesn't represent a majority of his workers but just those who work in the shed, i.e. not those who operate the picking machines, or those who drive the trucks. This is technically true since those are the better and higher paying jobs that go to the "anglos." The strikers contend that the shed constitutes a legitimate unit for a union.

What about ties to the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, outgrowth of the NFWA? Obreros Unidos, everyone stresses, is an independent union at this stage. But it is no secret that it has been strongly influenced by the NFWA in the past. Salas had daily contact with Cesar Chavez during the Wisconsin march. If the union is reorganized, it will be in all probability affiliate with the UFWOC — but this will be a decision of the workers; Erenburg and Salas have sentiments in that direction.

Affiliation with the UFWOC would mean that the local would be directly responsible and tied to the AFL-CIO. Since the UFWOC operates as an organizing committee, the locals it organizes are tied to the executive committee of the AFL-CIO. The AFL-CIO in the state clearly would like to win the affiliation of the strikers. At this point though they cannot aid them to the point of strike pay since that would require NLRB recognition first. So far they have been providing legal aid in addition to the money pledged. This of course leaves us with the nagging question of cooptation of an independent movement by that pillar of the status quo in the labor movement, the AFL-CIO. But, I think support for the strikers is still clearly warranted by 1) the really heroic first step they are taking in overcoming the injustices of a whole life and, 2) they will make the UFWOC a stronger radicalizing force within the AFL-

CIO as was argued by *The Movement* in NLN 36.

Leadership within Obreros Unidos is still unsettled due to the crisis nature of the opening days of the strike. That is, at this point everyone has been involved with the economic questions of ensuring survival, and time has not come yet to consider the social makeup of the union. Erenburg and Salas, closely consulting the workers, are acting as their representatives at this moment. There are many articulate and able indigenous people who will assume leadership roles in time as the crisis nature is passed and because everyone seems to be strongly predisposed to real democratic control.

How long will the strike last? Depends on what Burns does. If he decides to wait them out or appeal an election ruling, it could last until January. A sustained strike of that nature would leave the strikers with two alternatives: they could work for another company, or return to Texas and then return for the election, as happened in Delano.

There is also the very real possibility that the strike may spread to other companies as there are many contacts in those sheds who are watching the Almond action.

Things are very much up the air now as far as determining the course and duration of the strike but one thing is clear and that is that a viable migrant labor movement is beginning to appear in America — first in Delano, then the Rio Grande Valley, and now, northern Wisconsin.

WELL, IT WAS A NICE THOUGHT

The strike has been called off. It seems that the strikers gave Burns a 24 hour ultimatum, but that fell thru since he was able to bring in scabs from Minnesota and Michigan. Since most of the strikers have to live out the winter what they earn during the height of the season, it was decided for them that unless they could receive strike pay equal to their wages, the strike should be cancelled. Even with over \$4,000 from the AFL-CIO, this couldn't be done.

Most of the strikers are now working in Oshkosh, Milwaukee or Ripon at much better jobs than they previously held. Some have returned to Texas.

Next spring 10,000 to 15,000 migrant workers will again return to Wisconsin, and Salas and Erenburg are preparing for a much larger, better organized, successful strike.

Peace Candidates

(Continued from page 1)

before they ask Lyndon to implement that guaranteed annual income proposal we get at least a little chance to discuss its administration.

This is not to say that no one had a program, they ranged from a group of atheists arguing that we write in Pope John to Bishop Pike arguing that we re-elect Brown, as if the collective we spoke for seabendy-leben hundred thousand votes, or armed revolutionists. Only delegates were allowed to vote. To be a delegate you didn't need to demonstrate a constituency, only to have gotten to the meeting before the afternoon of its second day.

By the last day of the conference a number of things had happened. The conference announced that 7/12's of its members weren't going to vote for either Reagan or Brown, much to the dismay of the more ahistorical liberals, the poor people had gone home and the National Guardian was writing articles about the "significant new departure in American politics". I went to the beach.

Now, you may ask, and rightly so, what all this has got to do with those of us who are trying to organize a radical, democratic movement to establish a different kind of relationship between people and power. Well, for one thing, they're using all the rhetoric we've developed over the last few years and we might be able to sue them. For another they're probably going to spend a lot of time and money trying to convince people that they've got a third party that knows how to make Keynes' theories work. That expenditure will, at best, bring the guaranteed annual income, a TV in every living room, allow Chancellor Heys to run the university with less interference from the state police, and democratize the draft. A smarter bureaucrat in every office. At worst, and more likely, it will further convince the poor people of the state that power is, by definition, somebody else's, draw money and people to more liberal peace candidacies, at the cost of the movement, and because it will communicate through somebody else's newsmedia it'll further convince the great unwashed that we're a bunch of kook agents provocateur of the Chinese come to take their freedom to kill themselves on freeways away.

It seems to me that the only body of people with the respect and understanding to argue to these folks that they had better begin to think about building a movement before creating ways to speak for it is that amorphous thing I like to think of as the movement. In it are poor people, students and a few sundry radicals. The poor will largely be enticed by the carrot, never seeing the stick and only a few of them will be willing to wade through the parliamentary quagmire only to find themselves co-opted on to one committee or other. Our role then must be to build the movement that can effectively argue when to enter into state and national politics through electoral media. We must find ways to build a movement that can be democratic and can answer the needs of an increasingly manipulated American public, we must look ever more deeply into the machinations of the American corporate state and find how and why it functions and where it's vulnerable and we must begin to think seriously about the kind of society we want to live in. Us.

NEW LEFT NOTES
Room 206
1608 W. Madison
Chicago, Ill. 60612
Return Requested

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

Nat'l. Pres. Report

(Continued from page 1)

centered only on the tactical considerations, such as the type of demonstration to mount.

I came away from the discussion convinced that cooperation with the referendum was not the answer. It would be too easy, in those circumstances, to neglect the essential demand: a structure for the university which permitted students to make decisions. Meyerson's permission to hold the referendum was not a structural change in the university, but simply a special dispensation from administrator to administered. Yet I was equally unhappy with the argument from fundamental principle. How can it be that some questions are too important, too fundamental, to be decided by the people. Don't let the people decide? The question becomes one of minority rights. Does a majority have the right to vote that the university should cooperate with the military (i.e., the Selective Service)?

Some answer, oddly enough, can be gathered from that model of anti-democratic process, the U. S. constitution and court system. There have been laws, I understand, in some southern states, which required that the names of people who registered to vote be published in the local newspapers for several weeks thereafter. Because of conditions in the south, the law interfered with the rights of a minority, the Negroes, to participate in the democratic process as even this country defines it. It was not illegal, in this case, for states to pass such a law. What could and did happen, however, was that the law be appealed in a court system until it could come up for judicial review, where it could be ruled unconstitutional in violation of minority rights.

The problem with the referendum at Buffalo takes on a new appearance in the light of this analogy. It is not necessarily undemocratic to vote on the question of university cooperation with the Selective Service. It is undemocratic to do so when there are no provisions for testing, either before or after the vote, whether the proposed action violates minority or other fundamental rights. There is no analogue, at Buffalo, to a judicial review Supreme Court, nor for that matter is there any constitution of student rights against which a review body could test any proposed referendum. Armed with this reasoning, worked out, incidentally, at a subsequent meeting with SDS chapter people in Ann Arbor, I felt much more comfortable attacking the undemocratic nature of the Buffalo referendum. The line of reasoning does take one from the specific issue of anti-draft exam on to the more general question of democracy in the university.

Whether or not this line of reasoning can lead to action is a matter that will have to be decided by experience. It does seem to me that in formulating strategies for dealing with the question of the university and the draft, it is necessary to set them in the context of democracy in the university and to make demands which can lead from the issue at hand to the broad issue of university control.

Next Week: Yes, Virginia, we do have an ideology.

Nick Egleson
National Pres.S.D.S.

Second-Class post-
age rates paid in
Chicago, Illinois