

NEW LEFT NOTES

SDS · 1608 W · MADISON · CHICAGO · ILL.

Volume 2 Number 43

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE

December 4, 1967

SDS JOINS SUIT AGAINST HERSHEY

The Case for the Case: Fighting Political Repression

On Oct. 26, General Hershey of SS fame stated in his infamous letter to draft boards "...deferments are given only when they serve the national interest. It is obvious that any action that violates the military Selective Service Act or the regulations or the related processes cannot be in the national interest. It follows that those who violate them should be denied deferment in the national interest. It also follows that illegal activity which interferes with recruiting or causes refusal of duty in the military or naval forces could not by any stretch of the imagination be construed as being in support of the national interest...."

The first major national attempt at the political repression of the New Left had begun. On Monday, SDS and a broad spectrum of liberal student organizations filed suit against General Hershey, suing to enjoin him from enforcement of his statement.

Given the rather unique style of SDS and its general aversion to becoming involved in any political activity which is defined by the liberal establishment, the decision of the National Interim Committee to enter a legal suit against anyone might seem contradictory. (Take for example Carl Davidson's statement at the National Guardian's conference that if Joe Pool of HUAC served him a subpoena,

he—Davidson—would tell hairless Joe "to shove it up his ass".) That attitude reflects an almost instinctual guerrilla tactical sense in SDS that "you don't let the enemy define the battleground".

In general, that New Left sense of tactics has been sound. Why then did the NIC decide to become engaged in a court battle?

First, it is essential to understand that General Hershey's threat is not an isolated case of local harassment but rather an all-out attempt at the national level to use a powerfully organized system of coercion to destroy the New Left. As such, it constitutes the first systematic attempt at the political suppression of our organization and the suppression of that broad range of disruptive activities in which we have become engaged. In the face of repressive power, the last thing to do is to back down—particularly if the form of repression leaves the enemy totally vulnerable.

Secondly, in the light of our recurring paranoia about the inevitability of the "repression", we have been offered a unique opportunity to fight repression on the best grounds available: openly, publicly, nationally. By entering a suit against Hershey, we engage in a political offensive. Furthermore, the real beauty of the "SDS et al versus General Hershey" case is that we cannot possibly lose. Hershey's arguments are such a clear violation of the most clearly guaranteed

civil and political freedoms that either the rulers of America must back down or they must abrogate bourgeois civil liberties and resort to open fascism in order to control political opposition. Somehow we had all assumed that the New Left would be picked off—one by one—that we would be destroyed as isolated individuals or in small defenseless groups. General Hershey has offered the opportunity to break out of our isolation and to build the kind of public legal barriers against repression which provide the kind of intermediary buffers necessary to sustain our political work in a non-revolutionary situation.

News Release on the Hershey Case

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

Delivery of manpower for induction, the process of providing a few thousand men with transportation to a reception center, is not much of an administrative or financial challenge. It is in dealing with the other millions of registrants that the System is heavily occupied, developing more effective human beings in the national

interest. From the point of view of America's ruling class, Hershey's statement can only be regarded as a colossal blunder. For us, blunders by the ruling class and its lackeys, their contradictions, must always be an opportunity to move ahead.

Many SDSers will ask themselves why we have become involved in a legal action which involves, as co-plaintiffs, a broad range of corporate liberal and left-liberal organizations including the National Student Association, the Campus ADA, UCM, and a large number of student council presidents. Are we selling out to the liberals? Are we becoming engaged in coalition politics which will inevitably water-down our radicalism?

No. On the contrary. Our opposition to the liberal civil-libertarian politics is not based on formalistic arguments regarding legality versus illegality. Our radicalism is based

continued on page 3

The International Days of Resistance or 10 Days to Shake the Empire

by Carl Davidson and Greg Calvert, NIC

The discussion of the National Mobilization Committee (NMC) during the NIC meeting was, in many ways, a microcosm and repetition of the debate going on within the SDS membership for the last two years. However, there were significant differences. Most of us felt a new responsibility for SDS to respond creatively and constructively to a growing anti-war movement which had reached a new level of development.

In the past, national SDS stood apart from the wheelings and dealings of the various mobilization committees. Somehow, we felt the tactic of big demonstrations inadequate; we talked about "organizing to stop the seventh war from now". We separated ourselves from the anti-war marches by insisting on a program of on-going multi-issue, local organizing. Our rhetoric called for the development of permanent radical constituencies with a capacity for long-term resistance, rather than the broadening of an anti-war constituency committed mainly to protest activities.

Our program was never real. To be sure there was JOIN, a community union of poor whites in Chicago, or a union of hospital workers in Boston. But projects of this sort were exceptions, the work of a dedicated few. The mass of SDS members on the local level, as well as the younger students just entering the movement, were mainly involved in the anti-war programs emanating from the mobilization committees. Of course, SDS politics had an effect on the mobilizations. The marches were larger and more militant

due to the participation of our local membership. The draft became a major issue at our insistence. And the themes of black liberation and the powerlessness of the poor were woven into the movement rhetoric partially as a result of our pressure.

Nevertheless, we made several serious political mistakes. First, we assumed that since we had tired of marches and protests, then everyone else had grown weary of these tactics as well. We failed to grasp the importance for others to

continued on page 2

PLAN FOR THE
DECEMBER NC
BLOOMINGTON IND.

DETAILS - PAGE 2

interest.

Educators, scientists, engineers, and their professional organizations, during the last ten years particularly, have been convincing the American public that for the mentally qualified man there is a special order of patriotism other than service in uniform—that for the man having the capacity, dedicated service as a civilian in such fields as engineering, the sciences, and teaching constitute the ultimate in their expression of patriotism. A large segment of the American public has been convinced that this is true.

It is in this atmosphere that the young man registers at age 18 and pressure begins to force his choice. He does not have the inhibitions that a philosophy of universal service in uniform would engender. The door is open for him as a student to qualify if capable in a skill badly needed by his nation. He has many choices and is prodded to make a decision.

The psychological effect of this circumstantial climate depends upon the individual, his sense of good sportsmanship, his love of country and its way of life. He can obtain a sense of well-being and satisfaction that he is doing as a civilian what will help his country most. This process encourages him to put forth his best effort and removes to some degree the stigma that has been attached to being out of uniform.

In the less patriotic and more selfish individual it engenders a sense of fear, uncertainty, and dissatisfaction which motivates him, nevertheless, in the same direction. He complains of the uncertainty which he must endure; he would like to be able to do as he pleases; he would appreciate a certain future with no prospect of military service or civilian contribution, but he complies with the needs of the national health,

continued on page 2

LETTERS

Editors:

Brother Clarence Major's piece on "Hippies" on the Lower East Side was informative, but incorrect in major facts which were omitted. The Hippy phenomenon is basically a combination of revolt against the hypocrisy of this system, and revolt against regulations forced upon youth by the Establishment, and a desire to avoid responsibility as long as possible while trying to determine a non-compromising role in the framework of society (in the context, primarily of earning a living).

Unfortunately, the leadership/Gods of this group (Abbie Hoffman, Dana Beil) have no concern with this group of kids' (that's what they are) welfare or life. They encourage youths to run away while failing to provide adequate shelters or food for them. Since no employer will employ an underage high-school drop-out, most of these kids are forced to become nickel-dime dealers or into subtle forms of prostitution (Live with Me)—in fact they become part of a society which is harsher, crueler, and rougher than the worst that the Establishment has to offer.

Whenever large quantities of drugs are dealt, "Love" loses its significance and "bread" gains. The Lower East Side drug scene is a jungle since it is one of the main distribution points nationally. Don't be afraid to make that statement in print—even the feds know that. Like any jungle it hardens people up—or fucks them up. Those who become good dealers are fit to enter any business on management level—There are busts, burns, and breaks in the line.

Something should be done to provide an orientation to get the kids to see the hypocrisy of their leaders/Gods and to prevent them from falling into a new set of false values. Drugs can give a new outlook on life by setting aside certain set perceptions and allowing new ones to form. And drugs are enjoyable—they do not act as Marx thought of alcohol—making people content with the system. They do allow individuals to see the triteness of dogmatism and the ego-games and political games that stem from them.

In the past year or two SDS has taken a very dogmatic line. It pretends to know what is wrong with this society, what it should be like, and how it should get there. It talks of revolution, but when has that ever achieved anything? I always get frightened when I hear someone who claims to "know" just how to change things. Our society is so complex that the effects in one sphere affect totally unrelated spheres. An example: integration of restaurants in some Southern towns has meant the bankruptcy of some Black restaurants as Blacks preferred the white ones when they could enter.

Although SDS claims that it is useless to try to treat just the symptoms of the illness of our society, and the significant change will come only with revolution, it forgets that technological progress and attitudes of individuals can and must have effect on society. We have forgotten that. The "Hippies" say if this society is corrupt we will drop out of it. Then it will change because they will want us back because we love and broadcast love and

goodness. It works, I have even seen it work on cops.

When we have power we play games with it and work with it like any old-line politician. In that sense then, we are still playing the same old game of politics. These innocent kids see it and sense it. When we act trite they see our hypocrisy and tell us, but we say they do not understand—They understand only too well. We often laugh at these things among ourselves later, much later. But being the big tough men and women we are we will never let the world know, we might have to laugh at ourselves. Well the "Hippies" are laughing because they can see through a facade.

Viva Love,

Ed Rosenthal
N. Y. Regional SDS
Youngstown State U. P.O.D. 67'

Dear Editor,

Thad Marty's article "On Resistance Strategy" (11/20/67) made interesting reading, but there is a gross mistake at the end that I wish to comment about:

...as American capitalism loses the world struggle of competing economic systems it will become ever more hysterical, it will thrash about more wildly, it will act more and more short-sightedly.

I maintain that "loses" should be changed to "wins", because information from almost any source (except Marty's) clearly indicates an ever increasing American economic triumph in Europe. (Witness socialist England devaluating and France, Germany, etc. becoming more dependent than ever before on the US advanced technology.)

Conall O'Leary
Kansas University SDS

News Release

continued from page 1

safety, or interest—or is denied deferment.

Throughout his career as a student, the pressure—the threat of loss of deferment—continues. It continues with equal intensity after graduation. His local board requires periodic reports to find out what he is up to. He is impelled to pursue his skill rather than embark upon some less important enterprise and is encouraged to apply his skill in an essential activity in the national interest. The loss of deferred status is the consequence for the individual who acquired the skill and either does not use it or uses it in a non-essential activity.

The psychology of granting wide choice under pressure to take action is the American or indirect way of achieving what is done by direction in foreign countries where choice is not permitted.

It should be clear to all of us that the Selective Service System is one of the most powerful instruments in American society for determining the life-choices of young Americans. Deferments, like 2-S, are an essential part of this gigantic system of manpower channeling. The 2-S deferment ensures that millions of young Americans will accept a choice which is within the spectrum defined as the "national interest". They are told, in effect, that they will have the privilege of not being forced to kill or to be killed in the armed services if they will undertake a course of training and occupational activities which have been defined as "essential" in relation to this pre-defined "national interest". We are forced to ask: What is this "national interest" and who defined it? The answer is clear: it is the interest as defined by what President Eisenhower termed the military-industrial complex. This interest can only be termed "national" if we assume that the interests of the military and corporate industrial leadership are equivalent to the interest of the nation.

This system of indirect coercion has been in operation for a long time. What is new is the recent threat by General Hershey to extend the scope of the coercion. General Hershey has suggested

that those of us who disagree with the definition of the national interest given by the military-industrial complex, and who choose to engage in political action which is directly opposed to that definition, should be coerced in a new fashion. Hershey has said, in effect, that those of us who oppose the channeling of manpower for the ends and interests which he represents are going to have our energies channeled back out of university training for industrial-productive ends and interests, and into military training for repressive-destructive ends and interests.

In fact, General Hershey is threatening our right to engage in active political activity which opposes the given definition of the national interest and attempts to redefine that interest. His threat is an outright attempt to suppress political dissent and active political opposition.

The threat behind any deferment, student or otherwise, is that of being punished for not fitting into the channeled modes of behavior. General Hershey's new threat is that of being punished for explicitly political behavior which opposes the defined modes. It is a direct violation of constitutionally guaranteed political freedoms and is the first major attempt at the political repression of the New Left.

SDS wishes to make it clear that it does not support the existing system of deferments. We have publicly denounced the 2-S as representing the special privileged status of those whose cultural or economic background enable them to engage in university training. SDS opposes a system of privilege which permits middle-class white students to pursue their training while obliging poor Americans, both black and white, to fight and die in Vietnam. SDS has opposed the draft both because of its coercive nature and because of the political ends which it serves. SDS will continue to oppose the use of young America's manpower for interests and ends which it feels are not those of the nation. Furthermore, it will fight against this attempt to repress the political opposition of the New Left.

At present, that opposition has mainly manifested itself in our struggle against the war in Vietnam. It is our firm belief that the U.S. government's genocidal war of aggression against the Vietnamese people and its imperialist foreign policy in general are not in the best interests of the American people and the people of the Third World. We will continue our resistance to that foreign policy, to the Selective Service System, and to all other institutions that make those actions of the government possible.

We want once again to make it clear that we are entering this case not to protect the privileged status of students or the system of manpower channeling, but to resist this attempted escalation of the repression of political opposition in America.

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

DECEMBER 27 - 31 NATIONAL COUNCIL BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA

CHAPTERS WISHING TO BE REPRESENTED AT THE NC SHOULD ELECT THEIR DELEGATES AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, AND SEND THEIR NAMES IN TO THE NATIONAL OFFICE BY DECEMBER 20TH.

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

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

Chapters that are recognized at the NC will be eligible to be represented there by voting delegates (the number of delegates is determined by the number of national members there are in the chapter — one delegate for the first 5 to 25 members or part thereof — i.e. 51 national members—3 voting delegates.)

WATCH NEW LEFT NOTES FOR FURTHER DETAILS

new left notes

Published weekly by Students for a Democratic Society, 1608 W. Madison Street, Chicago, Ill., 60612, except July and August when publication is bi-weekly. Phone 312/666-3874. Second class postage paid at Chicago, Ill. Subscriptions: \$1 per year for members, \$10 a year for non-members. Signed articles are the responsibility of the writer. Unsigned articles are the responsibility of the editors, Carol Neiman and Lyn Kempf.

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Carl Davidson, Inter-organizational secretary; Robert Pardun, Internal Education secretary; Mike Spiegel, National secretary.
National Office: 1608 W. Madison St, Rm 206, Chicago, Ill. 60612 (312/666-3874)
New York City: 41 Union Square West, Rm 436, NYC, NY 10003 (212/675-2626)
Niagara Regional Coordinating Comm.: 1504 E. Genesee St., Syracuse, N.Y. 13210
Southern California: PO Box 85396, Los Angeles, Calif. 90072
New England: 102 Columbia St., Cambridge, Mass. 02139
Washington, D.C.: 1779 Lanier Pl., N.W.
Northern California Region: Box 7333, Stanford California, 94305

The Case for the Case

continued from page 1

on a historical-moral certitude that we are "right"—in our analysis, our vision, and our actions.

In abstraction, sincere liberals agree with our vision, our goals. In action, these liberals believe that the values which we may share can be realized within the defined limits of political activity which are given to us. Radicals share a conviction that those values cannot be realized except in a totally new context of political action and social reality. The "Hershey Case" is our opportunity to join with them in the testing of our premises—and theirs.

The liberals will argue that the case involves the "constitutional right to dissent". We argue (see the press state-

ment) that it involves the (equally constitutional) right to political freedom—the right and the duty to find a revolutionary alternative to the "national interest" as defined by General Hershey and the empire—interests which he represents.

It is true that the liberals may desert us. The "Hershey Case" offers us the opportunity to talk about that possible desertion as a public, a political act.

She says that as long as people believe in certain institutions we must work with them within those institutions until either their belief or our critique proves itself to be historically viable.

Mike Spiegel
Greg Calvert
National Interim Committee

NEW LEFT NOTES
SPECIAL ISSUE**National Secretary's Report
On Organizational Responsibility
and Political Maturity**

Featuring:

A Summary of the New Draft Laws
by Jeff SegalIMMUNITY: Student Organizing
by Carl DavidsonA Radical Speaks in Defense of SNCC
by Staughton LyndVIETNAM: This is Guernica
By Carl Oglesbyand a list of universities granted
PROJECT THEMIS research contracts
by the Department of Defense.LARGE QUANTITIES FREE TO CHAP-
TERS FOR COST OF SHIPPING
Write Lit Secretary c/o SDSMike Spiegel
National Secretary

By this time, most of you should have received a fundraising appeal from the National Office, asking you to financially support an expanding national operation. We are attempting to break through what has become a vicious circle—the lack of relevance which the N.O. has for many members, and the consequent lack of financial support for the national organization which reinforces the inability to establish a real relationship. In order that the N.O. function as a clear reality with political responsibility to the membership, the office must spend most of its time in direct political service to

a rapidly growing membership. Instead, while political duties remain, the office must spend an inordinate amount of time insuring its own survival. When the latter is the case, there is the inevitable tendency for the N.O. to become further and further alienated from the membership; it takes on an internal logic of its own.

Obviously, this is a harmful situation for the organization. The political duties which the office must fulfill are growing as the movement grows and matures—to carry them out with less than complete contact with the membership and its political direction cannot realistically reflect the state of the movement. One role of the N.O. is to represent the attitudes of the membership in its opera-

tion on the national level—to help set the national context for local actions. The broad (and sometimes fairly specific) outlines of programs and policies are set by the National Councils and Conventions, but the N.O. is mandated to carry them out, and that job demands a realistic appraisal of where SDS is at. Relationships with other groups and mass organizations are established, and a political stance is put forward which can determine certain contexts. Unfortunately, the case is now that those decisions on how to deal with specific situations have been made and handled with too little knowledge of the state of the membership.

Is it conscious elitism which motivates such methods and processes of decision-making? That is merely silly, since if anyone has a consciousness of the problems of elitism, it is they who are constantly attacked on those grounds. There are objective conditions and contradictions within the organization which give rise to such phenomena. The decisions which the national officers face are always going to be there; to ignore the making of those decisions or the taking of a course of action, though organizationally pure in our present state, is politically immature. The solution is not to take no course of action, but rather to make courses taken responsible to an active membership. To take no course on the national level is to take a course of total unintentionality about the history which we are creating and living through. We must have sound political reasons for not acting as well as acting—an intentional attitude toward SDS's role in a political situation. This means that we cannot permit an organizational breakdown to inhibit our political maturation and involvement in politically significant courses of action—it must be repaired. To make those decisions and to represent SDS on the national level without complete cognition of the state of the membership and, from that, the probable directions in which we are heading, places illegitimate authority in individuals who are without the benefit of real contact with the membership.

The analysis is theoretical and somewhat abstract—the problems are real, and their causes are clear. An N.O. which is forced to concern itself with its own survival as a paramount consideration cannot psychologically or politically be

continued on page 4

10 Days to Shake the Empire

continued from page 1

go through the experience of the mass protest actions of our political past. Secondly, we failed in offering a counter-program capable of involving a mass student movement. Our organizing projects were geared mainly toward a politically sophisticated and highly committed minority of the radical student movement.

Both of these mistakes grew out of a failure on our part to understand the significance the war in Vietnam has had for American political life. Much of our political discussion was prefaced with remarks like, "What if the war ended tomorrow, where would we be then." Despite our analysis of the war's not being an aberration or a mistake, we failed to see that Vietnam was symptomatic of a general political crisis in American foreign and domestic policy, a crisis that would continue even if this particular war were to end. The crisis we are confronting is the disruption and dislocation of the political economy of imperialism in the face of wars of national liberation, of which Vietnam is only one front. The struggles of Third World movements abroad and black America at home have marked the beginning of the end of U.S. corporate capitalism. This is not to say that the political and economic struggles of the white poor and working people of the United States are irrelevant at this point. Quite the opposite. What we must understand, however, is that the conditions from which the struggle of white America has developed have been initiated by the actions of liberation movements abroad. The cost of the war in Vietnam bankrupts the war on poverty. Defense production requires anti-strike legislation. An inflated war economy requires wage freezes, and so on.

None of this is new to us; we have made these "connections" in our analysis before. However, while we have made the connections in analysis, we have yet to make them in strategy. The conclusion we must draw is that the primary task for the radical student movement at this time is to develop a political strategy of anti-imperialism. We must see the Vietnam war and the black rebellions at home as a general crisis for the next period of our work. Many aspects of an anti-imperialist strategy are still undeveloped or unclear. In the ghettos, we support the black liberation movement; we fight racism by organizing the white community into radical politics. In the university we at least continue our struggle against the military. In high schools and poor and working class communities we at least develop draft resistance projects. Finally, we must begin a new relationship with the anti-war movement.

How is that to be done? First, we should realize that our past mistakes have grown out of a general failure of SDS to plan, advocate, and coordinate a national program of opposition to the war in Vietnam. It is true that SDSers have taken active roles in the Pentagon confrontation, the Oakland Stop the Draft Week, and a host of resistance activities involving war recruiters and institutional

complicity with the war machine. Unfortunately, much of the potential impact of those activities was lost on both the American public and on the participants themselves. This state of affairs is mainly the result of the unwillingness of SDS to take a position of political leadership which would have permitted an effective programmatic propaganda to make our political message clear. Furthermore, a coordinated program would have established a more coherent picture of the relationships between a wide variety of activities which, on the surface, seemed disparate and unrelated.

The time has come for SDS to assume a leadership position within the anti-war movement. It is the political responsibility of the organization to develop a coherent program of interrelated activities at the local and regional level which will be accompanied by a major propaganda effort at the national level. The failure of SDS to assume this responsibility would be a serious retreat on several fronts.

1) Political leadership. SDS must take responsibility for making its radical anti-imperialist perspective clear to the nation. We must attempt to demonstrate, to as many Americans as possible, both inside and outside the anti-war movement, that the perspective of the New Left offers the only real hope for the country. The present imperialist crisis has resulted in tremendous economic, social, and political problems for ordinary American people. We must make known to the American public the difference in solutions offered to those problems by liberal analysis and dissent, on the one hand; and a radical analysis and resistance, on the other hand.

2) Propaganda. Related to our other mistakes has been our failure to develop an effective propaganda apparatus for the dissemination of our ideas. Much of the SDS experience with the establishment press has led to our disillusionment of getting our perspective across through any of the public media. Since "the bourgeois press lies", SDSers have preferred to ignore its existence. The result has been a persistent failure to make clear the politics of our actions which are constantly reported in the press.

3) Communications. Along with the weakness of our public propaganda effort has gone the inadequacy of communication within SDS. It is a sad fact that we are forced to read the New York Times to learn about the activities of our local chapters. We badly need a radical news service to link our organizers and information sources and coordinate their work with the work of those newspapers which share our perspective (New Left Notes, The National Guardian, The Movement, etc.). Liberation News Service, which has made a beginning in this direction, has been inadequate to the present needs of the movement.

4) Coalitions. SDS must develop a positive, although critical, view toward relating to other groups or coalitions within the anti-war movement. To continue our previous position of separating ourselves from other anti-war forces, without ad-

vocating an independent program of our own, would be an indulgence in a sectarianism which neither we nor the movement could afford. This does not mean we should submerge political differences. On the contrary, SDS should have enough confidence in its power and politics to enter into relationships with other groups for the purpose of winning people over to our perspectives, strategies, and tactics. When persuasion fails within certain groups, we should make further efforts within those coalitions to co-opt, neutralize, or contain their politics under the hegemony of our own perspective. However, before we can engage in this kind of political work, it is imperative that we develop a clear, independent program and the apparatus needed to make that program operational.

PROGRAM

In light of these problems and with a view to the necessity of meeting these new demands placed on SDS, we propose that the National Council adopt the following program for the spring of 1968.

SDS will initiate a call for a ten-day program of actions in resistance to the war in Vietnam centering on the period of April 10-20. The action will be subsumed under the title "Ten Days to Shake the Empire" and/or "The International Weeks of Resistance". A variety of targets for direct action on and off the campus, as well as the tactics for dealing with them will be chosen, not only for their moral symbolism, but mainly for their effectiveness in developing a more sophisticated political consciousness regarding the operations of American imperialism at home and abroad. Where possible and appropriate, financial and corporate industrial targets should be attacked, rather than a single aspect of imperialist repressiveness such as the Selective Service System. This is essential if we are to develop a focus on the economic aspects of corporate capitalist imperialism. The cooperation of NACLA and other radical research groups should be solicited to help pinpoint those targets.

The international aspects of the program should be developed 1) through coordinated speaking tours by those who will have traveled to North Vietnam and Cuba, and 2) through encouraging anti-imperialist youth groups abroad (e.g. German SDS, French UNEF, Japanese Zengakuren, etc.) to plan direct action in their own countries to coincide with ours.

The National Office will assume responsibility for the coordination of the program and the development of an effective propaganda campaign stressing the anti-imperialist perspective of the program and the necessity for building a radical grass-roots resistance in America.

Finally, National SDS will attempt to persuade other organizations, such as the National Mobilization Committee, to adopt, endorse, or participate in all or certain parts of SDS' program. In dealing with other groups, we must keep in mind the importance of 1) the political inde-

pendence of our program and all that goes with it, and 2) the importance of developing a variety of secondary programs for those less radical groups and sectors of the anti-war movement. At this point, when tremendous efforts are being made to divide the anti-war movement along "responsible" and "irresponsible" lines in the eyes of the American public, SDS should make every effort, short of watering down its own radicalism, to enable those who will be involved in moderate liberal protest activity to identify themselves within the overall scope of our program.

IMPLEMENTATION

In order to render the actions of April 10-20 as effective as possible and to strengthen our communications and propaganda apparatus on a long-term basis, the National Office, under the supervision of the National Interim Committee, and within whatever guidelines are established by the National Council, should proceed to:

1) establish a Radical Press Service which would provide for the coordination and exchange of information sources and articles between New Left Notes, The Movement, The National Guardian, Liberation News Service, and other publications within or sympathetic to the movement.

2) publish a news monthly designed to propagandize our program and analysis to the largest possible audience.

3) send travelers out to coordinate information and encourage participation in the program.

Free Speech and Left Authoritarianism

Pat Probst
Houston

I read with much obfuscation Carl Davidson's remarks to the National Guardian anniversary dinner concerning deobfuscation of the bourgeois trick calling for free speech for CIA, Dow, etc., recruiters on campus. Davidson advocates for us not to be duped by the administration's call for free speech for these ogres. It is, as he points out, a game that the bourgeoisie plays with us. But by merely putting the label of "bourgeois" on it (ergo free speech is a game of the devil), this does nothing to 'deobfuscate' anything. In deed what it does do, is establish a legitimacy among us radicals to the so-called "vanguard" infallibility. Not being a believer in this infallibility, whether Davidson's or anyone else's, I wish to examine this issue to perhaps deobfuscate brother Carl's intentions.

If we take his remarks to their obvious logical conclusion we end up with some rather perplexing (obfuscating) contradictions. If we do not let CIA, Dow, etc., have free speech because they are anti-democratic (which they are without doubt) then we come to the dilemma of choosing who is a democrat and who isn't. One step further we then fall in the bourgeois role in which it boils down to—not who is anti-democratic or democratic—but rather who is on our side and who is against us. The former can have free speech, the latter can't. Voila! It's no longer free speech in any sense of the meaning of freedom!

Second, who is to choose who is the democrat and who is the anti-democrat? In the two cases mentioned it is easy to choose—both are anti-democrats. But the choice may not be so simple in future encounters. In fact, by following this line of thought, it seems that free speech must take a back seat to social justice (if I read Davidson's remarks correctly). I say NO! We as radicals must hold out for both, in other words, "have our cake and eat it" too. And this cake bit is one more connotation of what a radical is—in counterdistinction to the bourgeois authoritarianism and the social democrat's failing.

The social democrat says we can only have our cake (usually he will side with the free speech over the social justice) while the bourgeoisie allows free speech as long as it remains innocuous and is not effective in tampering with the status quo. If it does pose a threat (real or perceived) then he (the bourgeoisie) squelches it. A recent good example of this is the Chicago police's raid on JOIN hdqtrs. Evidently, either real or perceived, JOIN has become an effective threat—therefore the squelch raid. The Washington Mobilization was also an example of "just in case it becomes a threat" squelch of free speech and assembly.

There is only one more defense for blocking the free speech of anti-democrats. That is to assume that the campus recruiters are there without the consent or assent of the students. In judging this we have only one way to follow—to stay democratic and not lapse into Right or Left authoritarianism—that being majority rules. It is obvious that on most campuses the majority of students do not disfavor the recruiting of CIA, Dow, etc. We are in the minority and have only one course—that of trying to persuade other students that the recruitment is not in their or humanity's best interests. Otherwise we fall into the same boat with the Right authoritarians whom we despise and the Left authoritarians who have forsaken the revolution. Let us have our cake and eat it. Let the people decide.

Revolution is the complete turnover of structural and cultural relationships.

Reform is only a temporary palliative to the existing relationships. If we replace Right authoritarianism with Left authoritarianism we have made a great reform movement, not a revolution—the structural and cultural relationships remain the same with a few changes in the legal fictions.

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

I have been increasingly dismayed at the authoritarian tendencies and te authoritarian rhetoric that has been creeping into our movement especially from SDS. It is understandable. The constant frustrations that fulltime movement people are confronted with sometimes are overwhelming. After knocking ourselves out in full dedication to our revolution we see little concrete results, little that we can call successes, and thus little fuel to keep our faith burning. In moments of despair we let dogma creep in cloaking it with pseudo-divine authority to justify ourselves and our actions. It gives us an air of unreal predestination or divine mission. If this happens to the movement—if we need a "history will absolve us" clause—then we like the Bourbons have learned nothing. We are doomed to make the same mistakes and create the same monsters as the so-called revolutions of the past. We are no longer the New Left but back in the Old Left bag.

The revolution we fight for in America is unlike in means and goals any revolution in history. The only guideline we have is not to make the same mistakes. The origins of our movement were in rebellion against authoritarian structures and institutions and their subsequent social injustice, and led to the realization of the sickness of our society exemplified by racism, imperialism, and selfish aggrandisement of the establishment at the expense of rank&file Americans and the Third World. If we forget these origins our revolution is doomed—even if we win the battle—to another First or Second World grotesque abnormality.

The deobfuscation of the free speech and assembly crap lies not in crushing anti-democrats. And surely it is not a free speech issue. We put our minds and bodies on the line for a much different reason. THE CIA, DOW, etc., AND THEIR ACCOMPLICES—either by commission (the administration) or by omission (the apathetic students)—ARE MURDERERS. It makes no difference if murderers are in the majority or minority. Murderers must be stopped. It is for this reason we commit ourselves.

The above critique was written before Davidson's article "Resistance and Bourgeois Civil Liberties". It stands, I think, more confirmed by Carl's statements in this article (NLN Nov. 13).

No amount of rhetoric on "legitimacy" can be of any use. Legitimacy, like pornography, is in the mind of the beholder. In deed, legitimacy is established by and means no more than who holds the reins of power.

Davidson says, "Our critique argues that the social order we are rebelling against is totalitarian, manipulative, repressive, and anti-democratic." So is the U.S.S.R., China, Mexico, and Great Britain. In fact, in more or less degree so is every other established social order in the world. To call civil liberties and rights, free speech and assembly "bourgeois" is as fruitless as calling their abolishment "revolutionary". Civil liberties and rights, free speech and assembly, as pointed out above, do not exist in their true sense in a bourgeois social order or any other social order that is totalitarian, manipulative, repressive, and anti-democratic. Our revolution is to build a new social order in which they do exist; not another totalitarian, manipulative, repressive, and anti-democratic social order.

★ ★ ★

I DON'T THINK he meant it this way, but this is how it came out dept. (Sargent Shriver on Merv Griffin's show): "The War on Poverty is doing a great job. We had hundreds of boys who couldn't even qualify for the army—now with the help of the anti-poverty program we have been able to send 600 of these boys to Vietnam and six have been killed already."

Herb Caen, SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Organizational Responsibility

able to devote itself to the overwhelming primary task at hand—servicing the membership by fulfilling its bureaucratic needs and maintaining contact with the membership in order to reflect its needs and direction at the national level.

The problem of financing has its own internal political logic also. It is foolish to think that the sources of income can help but reflect themselves politically. Not that there are any strings attached to money which we solicit and/or receive, but subtle mechanisms must come into play which make those receiving the income conscious of how the movement survives financially. Anything but reliance upon that movement itself is politically unhealthy. About a month ago, Leif Johnson from New York and I carried on the following correspondence:

Dear SDS,

I noticed in a recent NAC Minutes that Mike Spiegel had collected \$12,000 during a recent fundraising drive, but there was no indication as to where this money was collected. Was it collected from the membership or, as I suspect, from rather well-to-do friends? Was the money a charitable handout from the middle class which likes our libertarian ideas?

It seems to me that this is the least desirable way of raising money. You cannot avoid becoming beholden to that money; its easy collection destroys initiative to find other money.

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

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

Very truly yours,

Leif Johnson

Dear Leif,

Your letter disturbs me very much, not because I disagree with it, however, but because I agree very much. The problem of how to finance our activities is one of my central responsibilities, and the problems you raise are central to that.

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

Well, what to do about money from the membership—it undoubtedly exists out there, but getting it from there to here is the problem, one which has plagued every National Secretary and N.O. staff. The membership apparently does not feel the urgency of self-financing which you do, and would rather let the N.O. spend its time hassling contributions from people than respond to a fund-raising letter in any real sense. The pledge system never worked very well; there are perhaps ten other people beside yourself who actually follow up on pledges they ever made. A chapter tax was passed in April, and a total of \$1600 came in, \$750 of it from one chapter. In May a membership mailing was sent out, netting \$1000 after the costs of mailing. Our annual budget

this year will run somewhere around \$100,000. The problem is apparent. NC's and Conventions will continue to mandate the N.O. to carry out certain activities, without giving much thought to the need to finance those projects. We are attempting to expand our printing operation with the thought in mind that it will be self-supporting from doing outside jobs, while perhaps providing a small profit for us. This then presents the problem of the N.O. being partially self-sufficient financially without actually being beholden to the membership....

For more membership participation, Mike Spiegel

Dear Mike,

Thanks for your answer to my complaints about SDS financing. It is something that has bothered me for two reasons. First is the obvious one of what would happen if the "easy money" were gone. We've seen how the finances of SNCC were destroyed when they became more radical. What would happen to SDS with its growing membership and activities if the government were to begin a drive to suppress us and our easy money dried up? Or if we began a large organizing drive and our finances were unreliable? I think we would be seriously hurt by our lack of foresight.

The other factor is the SDS membership. A radical organization is not built upon mystical ideas of "correct objective conditions" or "mass alienation" of people. It is built because certain students and workers perceive the need for a radical force and then decide to do whatever is necessary to build it. The organization requires its members to contribute analyses of social conditions and movements and description of radical activity, to organize other students and workers, and to contribute money so that we may have full-time organizers and a newspaper. Every SDS member should feel (in addition to organizing and contributing ideas) an obligation to contribute financially. Yours for more money now, Leif Johnson

None of this is to say that any change should take place in political priorities which we have set—priorities which place the greatest emphasis on grassroots activity. The political role of the N.O. has been defined, but the financial support for it to carry out that role has not come forth. Consequently, because of the lack of financial support and because the N.O. and its role do exist, it has attempted to fulfill that role in what cannot help but be a distorted fashion.

As SDS grows and assumes a more primary political role on the left, its internal structure must be examined. We cannot afford to become more mature politically while permitting a weak spot in our internal structure to continue to hold us back. It presents us with the problem of taking ourselves seriously as a political organization. We must take the responsibility for seeing that within SDS we reflect the kind of politically responsible organization which we hope to build in a future society. For within an organization as aware of the evils of elitism as SDS, people must realize individual and collective responsibility for seeing that conditions cannot arise where elitism is possible. Starving the N.O. has perhaps been the unconscious

continued next page

New Left Notes needs other things besides articles—like artwork (political cartoons, all-purpose illustrations, etc.) and photographs of action in your area. Not returnable.

Institutional Resistance Response to Davidson

Mike Meeropol
Madison, Wisconsin

Jeff Gordon's thoughtful article on the Brooklyn situation is in sharp contrast to the rambling self-contradictory article by Carl Davidson in the same issue. Where Carl is all in favor of institutional resistance and glowingly catalogues all our impressive tactics, Jeff is explicit in stating that "We could have gotten 100-150 people to sit in. But our goal was to win over thousands of other students to our position." (NLN, Nov. 13) The conflict between two different approaches is even apparent within Carl's article. He says, "As radicals, we unequivocally celebrate the recent events at the Universities of Wisconsin and Illinois, and at Brooklyn and Oberlin Colleges." Later he warns "...a resistance must grow; both in numbers and in depth of commitment,...and most important in this area is political education for both ourselves and our potential constituency." At one and the same time he cautions us both to keep from being isolated and

to remember that since our potential constituency is small we shouldn't try to please everyone.

This conflict is basic to the problem that is trapping the white left. We know we do not yet have the numbers on our side to win. The question is, do we emphasize convincing people or do we emphasize putting our bodies on the line as an irritant to slow down the machine. Jeff Gordon is unequivocal and I want to second him. If we chase the recruiters away they will come back. If we build a movement encompassing half of the student body of a given school, we can apply an overwhelming ratio of forces in a true guerrilla strategy to really keep them off the campus. A perfect example is presented by the contrast between the situation here at Wisconsin and the one described by Jeff Gordon at Brooklyn. At Brooklyn understanding has increased; the number of potential resisters is higher as a result of what has happened. At

Wisconsin, the hard core that got their heads bloodied on October 18th, remains just what it was. The many liberal students and faculty members who struck against police brutality are still not convinced that Dow or the CIA should be thrown off the campus. They don't believe the university is part of the corporate hierarchy that rules America; they don't even believe that a corporate hierarchy DOES rule America. In fact, they believe that because of what the "extremists" did, the liberal administration is vainly trying to save itself from the moguls in the State Legislature. Sympathetic students actually feel sorry for the Chancellor of the Madison campus—the very man who ordered the cops in. I'm not happy to report this but here in Madison, the left is as isolated and frustrated as ever. Perhaps the most unfortunate aspect of this situation is that the students have NO positive influence off the campus. This would not be so terrible if the students were continually recruiting more radicals on the campus. However, in the year I have been here, I haven't seen any substantial change in the percentage of radicals on campus.

It may be different elsewhere. Through the correct actions of Brooklyn SDS, consciousness has been heightened. Other universities also might possess the right confluence of forces. The report from Oakland seems to indicate that this is the case in the bay area. In the light of the various stages of development that exist in different parts of the country, I urge a rejection of the "unequivocal celebration" proclaimed by Carl Davidson. In its place, I urge on the spot observers from other schools to take a good hard look at what happened. NLN has taken too positive a line on Madison occurrences in the past; I have no way of knowing if this was the case elsewhere. Let's hear from the people!

In the final analysis, we must recognize that even convincing students will be a dead end unless radicals move off the campus and into the community. I do not refer to radicals in the professions. I mean convincing ordinary people that they have been sold a bill of goods about America on TV; that the things that upset them in the country are not the result of Negroes getting too much welfare or because of Communist contamination, but because the corporate structure of our country makes every man a prisoner. A version of this approach is the PL worker-student alliance. The more general approach is that every radical person and organization should be concentrating on ordinary people in their various communities, not just the factory. Face to face attempts to convince people do not seem to show as dramatic a commitment as a busted head or thirty days in jail, but in the long run THIS is what counts.

A recent issue of NLN had a very exciting article which attempted to suggest ways for students to become relevant to the extra-campus community. We must learn to look upon the campus as a semi-liberated area and sally forth to help other groups. You cannot do this if institutional resistance takes up all your time and permits the local dinosaurs to isolate you. For example, in Madison the bus drivers were on strike for sixty days.

The left did absolutely nothing to help—did not even issue a statement in support. One left-leaning professor published a proposal for a city-run bus company controlled by bus drivers and citizens financed by a progressive tax on the profits of those who benefit from the bus service. Reformist you say? True, but all actions up to the final revolutionary overthrow are reformist in the sense that the power structure can offer concessions as a way to make their situation more secure in the face of irritants. Thus, industrial unionism was won through long hard struggle, but its victory did not weaken the power structure. By coopting the newly formed unions, the solidified their hold on their positions. Our job is to give each reformist push a radical understanding, not to ignore reformism altogether.

The point of this example was to show that all the useful suggestions made in that issue of NLN which showed the myriad ways that a campus as a semi-liberated area might function will remain nothing more than words on paper if our primary concern becomes "institutional resistance." The Madison radicals concentrated on the Dow Chemical Company and ignored the bus strike. They are now preparing for the CIA interviews. At the same time, members of the community are trying to use a referendum campaign as the beginning of some meaningful community organization. The choices are obvious; just as SDS has preferred local activities to large demonstrations because you can't do both, SDS people must now seriously rethink the resistance versus organizing problem.

As Jeff Gordon and the Brooklyn events have shown, it is not necessarily an either-or choice; but as Madison, Wisconsin has shown, it can become that, and the wrong choice of action can mean, as has been the case in Madison, a result worse than would have occurred if there had been NO ACTION. The response that we must "do something" has an obvious answer; do something less dramatic but more lasting. Let's use our brains and vocal chords; not our skulls and saliva glands!

LOCAL BOARD

RECLASSIFIES

CATHOLIC PRIEST

Liberation News Service

ITHACA, N. Y. — A Roman Catholic priest who turned in his draft card on Oct. 16th, the first day of The Resistance, was reclassified 1A, delinquent, last week.

The Reverend David Connor, 30, a member of Cornell United Religious Work, received both a notification that he was "draft delinquent" (making him liable for 1A reclassification) and a new draft card with a 1A reclassification from his Geneseo, N. Y. draft board.

Asked about the significance of his re-classification to the anti-war movement, Reverend Connor said, "I thought it was great. They don't realize the full ramifications; I think they were trying to scare us."

Although he did admit to "having a plan," Connor would not say what he intended to do if called for induction.

"The next move is up to them," the Reverend said. "I am very much prepared to go to jail; if they put me in jail, that could be fantastic. I don't think they're that naive, though I wish they were."

continued on page 8

ATTENTION STUDENT STRIKERS

At the National Convention where the Student Strike was proposed it was decided that the final decision on whether or not to call for the strike would be made at the December NC. One of the prerequisites for calling the strike is that at least ten campuses have to declare that they will try to pull it off. So—chapters should begin discussing the possibilities of a strike on their campuses. Then come to the NC so that we can make a realistic estimate of where we stand on this issue.

Beginning of the Struggle

Vernon Urban
REC Director

Left—liberal, revolution—nonviolence, overthrow—work within, guerrilla warfare—peace. Where are we?

Provos—black revolutionaries, liberals—student radicals, pacifists—guerrillas, hippies—politicos. Who are we? Many thoughts and almost no ideology. What is our next step?

It has been stated, I have forgotten by whom, that our actions are our thoughts. If that is the case then this "thing" we call a movement can be analyzed and some projections made about its future.

Sometimes by myself and often in the company of others, a recurrent theme is voiced. How can so many different people, with such divergent backgrounds, and with so many different ideas ever get together and organize to bring about revolutionary change in this country, in a culture-system-society that we don't as yet fully understand, yet we know must be changed...soon.

Four years ago it was said by many in the movement that "we must work within the system for change." Now thought is toward revolution.

NATIONAL

SECRETARY'S REPORT

solution in the past—but it fails since it only helps to alienate the N.O. from the membership, making it, by necessity, less politically responsible to the membership.

Obviously, we are hoping for a response to the present fundraising mailing. In addition, people can get more national memberships, which have a double effect. They strengthen us financially while also broadening the audience of New Left Notes—an internal organ which can be of tremendous value if members contribute to it and we can support it as more than a four-pager. Speak to those people in your chapter who are local members but who don't have national membership; it is a painless way of strengthening SDS. Also, we are attempting to compile a fundraising guide for the local level, to give some ideas on how a chapter can raise its chapter tax. Finally, one can make a pledge (starting this month) and conscientiously contribute each month.

We must confront the political implications in the present organizational and financial situation if we are to become a politically mature organization both in theory and practice. To continue without realistically facing those implications creates a dangerous situation within SDS—one where the kind of political alienation typical of American society can occur in our own organization.

Three years ago the theme was that the "civil rights and the peace movement must be separated. Their goals are different." All is changed. The goals are the same for the enemy is the same.

Two years ago the tactic was to "educate" everyone. Teach-ins, write your congressman. Let him know the truth. A mistake has been made. There were no mistakes made.

One year ago we protested. Decisions were being made and carried out without the consent of the people. Now we realize it has never been otherwise.

Yesterday we moved yet further down the road towards our goal. We have moved from protest to resistance. The word is revolution.

Where are we?

We are different yet we were always the same. We all wanted change. "Things have to change." We began to act. Hesitant at first. Peaceful. Civil-rights, equality for 22 million black men. Peace, an end to a war that possibly was not necessary. Student power. All is ancient history now.

We have been so busy that we have failed to grasp fully what has taken place about us and within us. The movement has reached a crucial stage. Like all other movements in the past. Civil-rights has passed into the black liberation movement. The peace and student power movements have just now reached this stage. The word is that the movement is dead and the revolution has begun. That is where we are.

Perhaps I should have entitled this work where we must go, for that is the next important phase.

Washington D.C. was that rare sort of happening. A clarification of many things. On that day, October 21, many realized that change in America will come only through revolutionary struggle.

A new seriousness has overtaken the movement in the U.S. Increasingly the slogans are "we gotta organize" and "we gotta get out into the working class." Black—white, students—labor. Not just student power, i.e. reformism. The most important realization to come about is that only through mass revolutionary organizing can our goals be realized, that this movement must attempt to encompass everyone if it is to be successful. And encompassing everyone in reality means getting out and organizing where that "everyone" lies. The working class. The most potentially revolutionary class in America.

We are at a starting point once again. Where are we? We are at the beginning of the most crucial phase of our struggle. The revolutionary organization of the working class. And we have a long way to go, brothers.

a letter to the women's liberation groups

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

1. I am generally in agreement with the principle enunciated in your point #1, but I think you have to be aware of the danger of putting women in leadership positions who are sufficiently undeveloped, precisely because of women's historical lower caste position, that the experience will lead to an erosion, rather than a development, of their self-confidence. I can see a situation where a woman, when put in such a position and finding herself not in fact a leader, would see it as a confirmation of what she has been taught all her life—that she is inferior, inherently.

2. This is connected with the above and is, I think, the fundamental theoretical problem which women's liberation groups must face. Namely that, unlike any other repressed people in history, e.g. colonial peoples or blacks in the U.S., it is not possible for women to separate themselves fully from their oppressors, or at least nowhere as fully as other oppressed people have been able to. Obviously, in the nature of social relationships and emotional needs, of women and men both, there must be a constant interaction between the oppressed and oppressor. The dilemma that this brings up, it seems to me, is that women must seek their liberation in the very midst of oppression, and that women must be more 'understanding' and 'accepting' in the situation than men. That is, as women struggle for liberation, and tensions occur, women cannot expect men to accept the fact—not really, though in some cases rhetorically—that it is the sexual caste system which is an important part of the

tensions. (Needless to say, all men, whether we like it or not, bear the burden and the stigma of being oppressors.) What this implies to me is that when you're thinking programmatically you should think primarily of programs which improve women's development of their capabilities, and only secondarily of programs which point out to men the many manifestations of the sexual caste system. This is of course totally unreasonable—but then caste systems aren't particularly reasonable.

As I re-read the above paragraph, I had the somewhat chilling thought that oppressed peoples unable to separate themselves from their oppressors are usually assimilated.

3. The above notwithstanding, I think it is important to be as specific as possible about the particular manifestations of the sexual caste system, in men's attitudes and actions. Aside from writing about such things yourselves, it might be a good idea to get some guy to write something like 'Confessions of a Male Chauvinist'; it would be somewhat less threatening, I would think, to other guys.

4. Lastly, and this is a random thought: I think the fact of women's changing their names on marriage is one thing that should be mentioned loud and long. Incredible, that an aspect of a person's identity so central to herself should be changed!

ED. NOTE: The address of the women's group in Chicago which authored the original article is: Joreen, 1470 W. Erie, Chicago, Ill. 60622. (312/243-1862). For New York Groups, contact the N.Y. REGIONAL OFFICE.



Nov. 10 at UC Irvine; SDS "Marines" launch attack on "Vietnamese" village.

GUERRILLA THEATER - USED AGAINST MARINE RECRUITERS

Tom Wayman UC Irvine

One student was arrested following an SDS guerrilla theater confrontation with Marine recruiters on the University of California, Irvine campus Nov. 15.

Ron Pezenas of Anaheim will appear in court Nov. 30 on charges of assault and battery and resisting arrest. He allegedly heaved a water balloon that struck one of the staunch defenders of the American Way in the chest and got government property (one Marine uniform) all wet.

The scenario of the guerrilla theater skit at the southern California campus of 2,300 was simple enough: about 15 SDS members and friends dressed in cast-off USMC fatigues and attacked about six "Viet Cong" (more SDSers) in their marked-off "village" directly in front of the Marine recruiting table.

A couple of Sunday rehearsals ensured a smooth performance. The "Marines" began to march across campus at noon, shouting and singing to attract attention and leading a crowd to the campus' Gateway Plaza where the pantomime actions of the black-pajama-clad "Vietnamese villagers" planting rice, etc., had already attracted about 200 students and faculty from the nearby eating facilities.

An hour earlier, a leaflet drop (off the tops of buildings) had warned "villagers of the hamlet of Irvine" that they should assemble at the Gateway Plaza at noon to be moved to resettlement camps on the coast, since regrettably the campus had to be bombed by B-52s in the interests of preserving freedom, democracy, liberty, etc., "as we explained to you illiterate peasants in our last leaflet drop".

The battle between pseudo-Marines and NLF forces was short and sharp, utilizing water and water-and-ketchup balloons, toy and cardboard guns and sound effects tapes of combat noises. The NLF repulsed the Marines, but air support in the form of a napalm raid (more balloons from a couple of student "airplanes") finished off the villagers. The last-to-die fell all-ketchupy across the Marine literature table, as a "peace" version of the Star Spangled Banner brought all the actors to their feet to end the skit.

just shortly before he would have killed Fidel). In addition, Debray, even more valuably, advises us that—for reasons of the peasants' as well as the guerrillas' safety—while territory is controlled by the forces of oppression, the guerrilla band should be extremely discreet in its relations with peasants in a village. Contacts with individual peasants should be made clandestinely, outside the village; mass meetings in villages should appear "forced" so that when the government forces come around the peasants can all claim that they were coerced into attending the meeting; on entering villages guerrillas should stop at all houses so that no one peasant appears to be getting special attention; in short, peasants are, in Debray's apt phrase, 'eternal victims-by-substitution', and the guerrillas must be aware of this. (See also William Hinton's Fanshen for a similar indication of the Chinese CP's secrecy in a village in an area not yet securely liberated from the Kuomintang forces.)

But elsewhere, Debray, like the rest of us, refers to the guerrilla-peasant relationship as very close. The problem

But not the action. As the SDSers moved off toward the sidelines, a water balloon came sailing out of the blue and struck one of the trio of Marines.

Instantly, a group of about five campus basketball and/or water polo players tore through the crowd after Pezenas, and a short shoving match ensued. The jocks had already distinguished themselves by having one of their members knock down Ken Cowan, an ASUCI senator and SDS member who had been heaving balloons near them during the skit. An uptight Dean of Students managed to quiet the post-skit hassle between Pezenas, other SDSers and the jocks. But five minutes later, when a number of SDS people (including Pezenas) had left the by-now-considerably-stirred-up crowd in the Plaza and were in an upstairs room in the Commons changing, in walked the campus police chief and one uniformed goon and arrested Pezenas.

After a loud argument with the guerrilla actors about rights, lawyers, and so on, the cops took hold of Pezenas and worked him down the outside stairs to the Plaza again. The attention of the still-arguing crowd was drawn to Pezenas' arrest, and a couple of SDS girls grabbed the prisoner to try to instigate that kind of spontaneous protest by students against on-campus arrest of demonstrators which seems to be happening all over.

Not so in the midst of conservative Orange County, however. But with the attention of the cops distracted by the passive, but encircling crowd, Pezenas broke and ran only to be knocked down a few paces away by the same jock who had earlier clobbered Cowan. Another pushing, shoving argument between SDS and the basketball stars and everybody's friends began, but without positive effect. The police handcuffed Pezenas and hauled him off to Orange County Jail.

The top rank of the UCI administration claims to be upset by the incident. Chancellor Dan Aldrich was out-of-town that Wednesday, and after his speedy return, told student government wheels he had berated the vice-chancellors responsible for deciding to proceed with an arrest, and was attempting to placate the local DAs. So far without tangible success, however.

For students, the total effect of the incident was an increased discussion of the issues of war-machine recruiting and use of the universities. A neutral student newspaper, a sympathetic (to SDS) student government executive, and much person-to-person confrontation with other students by guerrilla theater actors are keeping the subject hot, and of course Pezenas' trial will provide an ideal background against which to push both discussion and demands. An added bonus for the campus SDS chapter was a new enthusiasm for the guerrilla theater tactic, with everybody looking forward to the DOW recruiters scheduled for January.

is not that this doesn't occur (of course it does: cf. China, Cuba) but that Debray does not tell us in any specific terms at all how this transition takes place. Partly the relationship of solidarity is a result of success—but even more importantly it is a cause of success. And while each of us can envision in general terms the developing guerrilla-

continued on page 7

Regis Debray: Historical Truths and Historical Aberrations

Don McKelvey
REP Staff

The dialectics of history (and therefore of knowledge) often dictate that in the midst of important struggles basic truths be articulated broadly, sometimes even crudely. Such is the case with Regis Debray's "Revolution in the Revolution?", whose character as a semi-official statement of the views of the fidelist revolutionaries of Cuba make it an extraordinarily important document.

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

The most important section of this review will be devoted to a critical examination of one aspect of Debray's book which he clearly feels is secondary but which I think is so fundamental that it warrants close scrutiny: namely, the overall (or historical) function of a political party in the Latin American revolutionary movement, and by extension in any revolutionary movement. But—I MUST EMPHASIZE AT THE OUTSET THAT I AGREE WITH DEBRAY'S MAIN POINTS, as I summarize them above. The correct form of struggle in Latin America today, and throughout the non-socialist imperialized world, is the de-

velopment, among them masses in the countryside, of popular revolutionary (and ultimately socialist) movements—and clearly this will involve violent struggle by guerrilla forces. A popular revolution must be centered where a majority of the population is to be found; without a close relationship with the masses, built on long experience and contact and on common struggle, any future revolutionary government will have to resort to coercive and manipulative measures once state power is taken. Such measures would be the death of the revolution.

As to Debray's second main point: for many reasons—moral (participatory democracy), political (who else understands the struggle so well?), and tactical (how else avoid potentially fatal errors?)—it is clear that any struggle must be controlled by those who are doing the struggling. If the reader doubts this, I can only suggest that he or she read Debray (at least for reference to guerrilla struggles: "Revolution in the Revolution?" is chockful of excellent reasons buttressing this principle) and reflect on the meaning of participatory democracy.

Debray says some very important and helpful things about the development of the relationship between guerrillas and peasant masses. His words, first of all, are a pleasant antidote to what can only be called revolutionary romantic views about how the struggling guerrillas are immediately taken in hand by the solidly revolutionary peasantry. Rather, Debray tells us of how, frequently, guerrilla bands in various Latin American countries have been betrayed by peasants they thought they could trust (including one instance where the intentions of a well-trusted peasant guide were discovered

War-Bound GI's Riot at Fort Hood

Allen Young
LIBERATION News Service

Hundreds of soldiers went on an authority-defying rampage at Fort Hood, Texas last month on the eve of their being shipped to Vietnam.

Thousands of dollars in property was damaged and an undetermined number of troops ended up in the stockade. A second lieutenant, part of a contingent of military police who attempted to bring the riot "under control", was severely beaten by the troops. There was an unconfirmed report that he later died.

News of the rebellion was first released by The Rag of Austin and Houston Texas in its November 6 issue in a story written by Pvt. Scotty Frame, who is stationed at Fort Hood.

Rag staffers said they confirmed the essential facts in Pvt. Frame's story in conversation with several other GI's. It was clear, they said, that sophisticated political considerations were not the primary motivation of the soldiers.

It was equally clear, however, that a widespread feeling of desperation regarding the war was involved. Certainly, the Fort Hood riot is part of a growing determination among U.S. soldiers not to kill or be killed in Vietnam.

Pentagon spokesmen, questioned about the incident, at first denied everything. Later, a Colonel Alabaster admitted there was a "beer brawl" on the night of October 3. Then, a Colonel Comer said he had read a report in the "psychedelic press", and passed the buck to Col. Robert Berens.

Berens said it "was blown clear up." He added the incident started when beer sales were ended early at a party. The soldiers became annoyed, he said, and there was a "scuffle." This same tale was told to the Austin American, an establishment daily which competes with The Rag. But Berens admitted to LNS



Ft. Hood GI's don't want to come home in these boxes.

that the MP's had to be called out and that a second lieutenant had been "slightly injured."

The text of Private Frame's article is as follows:

"On the night of October 3rd many of the men of the 198th Light Infantry Brigade decided that they would rather go to the stockade than leave for Vietnam on the following day.

"By early evening a feeling of tension had engulfed Fort Hood. The men of the 198th, though officially confined to their company areas, were wandering around the base looking for trouble. Later that night rioting broke out. An estimated \$150,000 worth of damage was done to personal and government property. Two delivery trucks belonging to an on-post private business were heavily damaged. A new privately-owned car was demolished by the rioters. The windows of the

Enlisted Men's Club as well as scattered windows and glass doors were broken. Two buses loaded with men returning to the base from Killeen were stopped and their windshields smashed. One bus driver entered the hospital with glass embedded in his eyes.

"At approximately the same time as one group of men were conducting a party raid on the WAC barracks another group was beating a Second Lieutenant to death.

"One well founded rumor is that several shooting sprees took place but the 'authorities' won't verify the fact that the rioting itself took place, much less give specific information about it.

"The number of men that were arrested by the Military Police has not been disclosed and no one seems to know any of the names of the men arrested, therefore making it impossible to interview any of the men in the stockade to

gain a closer look at what happened.

"During the weeks before Oct. 4th I'd talked to many of the men in the 198th and not one of them felt they'd had adequate time and training to go into combat. Most of them felt that this was due to the incompetency of the leaders. They knew that going to Vietnam meant almost certain death for many of them, and as the rioting proved, the men don't want to die needlessly.

"Even by the 'rules' of the system the 198th is not prepared to go into combat, but on Oct. 4th, the men who weren't in the stockade left for Vietnam, and, for many, death. This proves that the system doesn't care how many of its own soldiers are hopelessly slaughtered just as long as it has a ready supply of bodies to be thrown on the burning fires of imperialism.

"The men of the 198th Light Infantry Brigade know that they are going to die needlessly, but for them it is too late. Already their advance party has been attacked and many of its men killed or wounded.

"The information contained in this article was gathered from men that had seen the rioting or had actively participated in it. Exact facts and figures are in the hands of the Fort Hood authorities but will not be released to private individuals like myself.

"Censorship such as this is rampant in the Army, and until this is stopped, this is the most accurate account of the rioting that I can give.

"If only every GI could realize that he is not fighting for his country—that he is fighting and, perhaps giving his life so that the war industrialists can make money and the politicians can make 'political hay.' If he could only realize that the patriots of this country are fighting against the war rather than in it."

DEBRAY

"Any struggle must be controlled by those who do the struggling"

continued from page 6

peasant relationship and its impediments, a more exact understanding of the dialectical development of this relationship awaits either direct experience (not likely to be granted us norteamericanos) or (less satisfactorily) an accounting of others' experiences in this respect which has the day-to-day quality of Fanshen.

A point underpinning Debray's book—and, appropriately, articulated toward the beginning and then exemplified at various points—is his assertion that the mechanical copying of others' experiences is likely to do great harm to a fledgling guerrilla force. This principle can scarcely be gainsaid—and I do not intend to do so—but unfortunately Debray also says, in almost this extreme a way, that others' experiences aren't any good at all. Though he is clearly not hostile to the Chinese and Vietnamese revolutions, it is specifically against the viewing of their experience as prototypical for Latin America that he argues. On the other hand, despite his own injunction, he seems to be saying that the fidelist revolutionary experience in Cuba is prototypical for the rest of Latin America, and, in some important ways, most particularly with respect to the proper role of the political party. (In fairness, I should note that Debray argues both from the Cuban experience and from the objective conditions of present-day Latin America, but those specific conditions are not sufficiently uniform to warrant the violation of his own injunction.)

What Debray fails to say is: while (a) one should not mechanically copy others' experiences, (b) one can tentatively apply general models and, more important, (c) apply others' experiences and insights selectively, discarding the aspects irrelevant to one's own situation and using the aspects which would be helpful to one, while recognizing (d) that some general principles are universal for a socialist revolutionary.

One unfortunate result of the notion of having no preconceived notions whatever ('One may well consider it a stroke of good luck that Fidel had not read the military writings of Mao Tse-tung before disembarking on the coast of Oriente': Debray—but N.B. that all of Mao's 'military' writings are fundamentally political writings) is what I call the celebration of tactics (see p. 60 of the paperback edition especially; it is more a tone to which I object than a particular quote). Again, Debray's problem is that in polemicizing (against the many evils done the development of the Latin American revolution by citified ideologues) he has thrown the baby (or perhaps better put, the bathtub) out with the bathwater.

Because Debray is so caught up with a particular historical circumstance, in which the political parties of the Latin American Left have been singularly unrevolutionary, he universalizes a particular political point, with potentially serious consequences. Specifically, he (implicitly and unjustifiably) applies to political parties in general the justified criticisms of a particular genus of political party. What this results in, in "Revolution in the Revolution?" is discussions of minor functions of political parties (i.e. political strategy and political education), except for the correct point that Latin American revolutionaries must not be tied down by legal forms of struggle.

In seeking to liberate the Latin American Left from the unhappy influence of respective CPs, Debray has subordinated political tasks to military tasks. Or, rather, he has so overcompensated that he has failed to discuss genuinely political tasks at all, except in the most general terms in a very limited portion of the book. The celebration of tactics mentioned above is one aspect of this: the quote about Fidel's not reading Mao is incredible in itself, and even moreso

when you notice that it is followed immediately by a statement that Fidel et al discovered, when they did read Mao, that they had eventually developed a modus operandi very much like Mao's. There is a difference between the necessity to learn through one's own experience and the making of one's own mistakes, and jettisoning all previous experience.

Debray says, in one of his most important summation statements, "The people's army will be the nucleus of the party, not vice versa." On one level he is correct: the struggle cannot, and should not, be directed by those not involved in it. But he is wrong more fundamentally, by failing even to discuss the central role of the party: that of political direction and political education. This failure is an important drawback to Debray's book, especially since he writes constantly about political parties and their transgressions, and how the party's functions must be taken over by the guerrillas. But what are these functions? Can they be performed by just anyone? Again, there is a celebration of tactics: the most frequently mentioned aspect of a party's function is the tactics direction of the struggle. But he fails to say that this is only a part of the whole function, and a relatively unimportant part at that.

Rather than Debray's quote on party-guerrilla relations, I would say: "The experience gained through activity in the people's army will provide the basis from which some members of the army will form the nucleus of the party, which has the function of giving basic direction to the struggle." This is a much more precise formulation of the relationship between revolutionary action and revolutionary political work and clearly recognizes that politically-determined strategy directs day-to-day activity and puts it in perspective. It is one thing to say that experience, action, struggle are the sine qua non for the development of political

consciousness—this is absolutely true. It is quite another to say that these are the only, or even always the primary, forms of political education.

At issue here is the question of how consciousness develops among the masses. I have heard Debray accused of elitism—of believing that revolutionary change will come about solely or primarily through the efforts of the guerrilla band and not through the development of a mass movement—but I find this criticism misdirected. It is more likely that Debray believes that consciousness develops spontaneously, and that therefore a strongly political party is unnecessary. In doing so, he assumedly is referring to the Cuban experience over against—and he is specific about this—the Chinese and Vietnamese experiences, both of which included a strong role for the C.P. But it is no criticism of Fidel Castro to point out that where he and his comrades were engaged in revolutionary struggle for years, the Chinese and Vietnamese were (and are) engaged in struggle for decades, literally decades, before taking state power. Furthermore, here the Cuban experience is not prototypical for Latin America: never again will the U.S. allow a Cuban-type revolution to 'just happen', as it did in the Cuban case; this has been demonstrated amply.

It is precisely the fact that we do not know Debray's view of consciousness development that is important, for he fails to mention it. An entire book on how to make revolution, and scarcely a word on the development of political consciousness!

But maybe (and this has been suggested also) Debray is not writing the primer on the total revolutionary process, but has intended to concentrate (as he does almost totally) on the very difficult task of mere survival during the initial stage of establishing a revolutionary base (of whatever kind). Maybe so, but if this is

continued on page 8

Book Review

Revolution in the Revolution

Staff of growing radical news service desperately needs a car to navigate the unfriendly streets and skirt the moral pollution of Washington, D.C. Spending whatever money we have on building a militant public consciousness; but we will drive the auto from anywhere to here. Contact Ray Mungo or Elliot Binder at Liberation News Service, 3 Thomas Circle N.W., Washington D.C., or call 202-234-4837.

LOCAL BOARD RECLASSIFIES CATHOLIC PRIEST

continued from page 5

Reverend Connor said he "would consider" taking sanctuary in the Church, although he does not plan to do so at this time. The Reverend, who insists that his action was taken more "as a citizen than a representative of the Catholic Church," has received no word from his Bishop, Fulton J. Sheen of Rochester, N. Y., who has recently taken a vanguard position among Catholics against the war. Reverend Connor added that he believes that all members of the Resistance, students, faculty, and clergy, "should be treated equally."

Connor said that there were other members of the clergy in the area who also returned their cards to the Selective Service System in support of the resisting students. He said he was the only one who has as yet been reclassified, explaining that "others have draft boards that are bigger or farther away than my own."

Communications

Marilyn Buck
REC Staff

What is the movement? It is people moving together. Together for change in the social and economic structure of our society.

How do we build movement? We begin by talking to people, showing and explaining to people how they are not free, why they are not free. We organize people into the movement. They then organize more people.

If this movement is to succeed it must become a national movement. The local organization is not going to organize a local revolution, much less a national revolution. Fragments of the movement cannot function in a complete vacuum. In order to develop a national movement people have to communicate with each other. We must convey program, strategy, and tactics to each other. We have to talk to each other.

Each local organization, or local part of a national organization must have access to a communications system from which they can find out about what kinds of issues other people in the country are organizing around, what kinds of methods they are using to organize, and what kinds of successes and failures they have had. We cannot afford to keep making the same old mistakes, if we are to keep moving and organizing a mass movement.

We must get our shit together and communicate. One of the best and at this point fastest ways to do that is to write about your organizing experiences. Write for the movement press. Write for your own organization's newspaper New Left Notes. Send copies to the Liberation News Service, to be distributed to other movement press sources. Read what you have written, what your brothers and sisters have written. Get informed about what is happening throughout the country. But nobody is going to know how your area is changing, revolting, and/or organizing unless you write about it. Analyze your local situation. How like other areas is your town, your chapter, your university? Let's pull our information about the country together and see where we stand. Maybe then we can deal with a real program which can be effective.

continued from page 7

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

"Revolution in the Revolution?" is in fact a very narrow book, for it concentrates on a very limited period of time in the revolutionary process. This does not make it bad or worthless—quite the contrary. But it is a vast mistake—indeed a historical aberration—to apply universally the truths and lessons of that limited period.

There are two other aspects of the role of a political party—i.e. of these people whose task is the determination of strategic direction and the enhancement of political consciousness. One aspect can best be examined in the light of the Cultural Revolution in China, a process of fundamental significance for any revolutionary; the other I would like to discuss in relation to the radical movement in the US.

The writings—and especially the actions—of the Chinese indicate clearly the strength of their emphasis on the Party as the agent whose task is to sum up and crystallize the experience of the Chinese people, obviously an important and active task. As I said above, if the Party fails to remain in the closest possible contact with the masses, a very serious situation can develop: the rulers of a country will develop coercive and manipulative techniques of governing; more important, because more insidious, those rulers will fail to be constantly encouraging the masses to take the most active part possible in the running of—their lives, in every way. The most important of the charges against Liu Shao-chi and many others in the Chinese C.P. is precisely this—their failure to encourage the masses' active involvement. The dead weight of the entire history of the human race in this respect—a history characterized by nature's tyranny of necessity and man's tyranny of class—lies heavily on us: we don't really believe in ourselves, in the possibility of democracy and participation. This is as true of us in the 'advanced' countries as of the

inhabitants of imperialized poor countries. Perhaps it is more true of us: the combination of greater potential (as a result of material advancement) and continued powerlessness may in the end be fatal.

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

Why do I go through all this? Because there is in Debray's book not the first hint of a recognition that a party has this kind of all-important function to perform—and he writes at the time of the Cultural Revolution in China, an experience and example from which all revolutionaries should learn a great deal.

But I am most concerned about the potentially deleterious effect of Debray's thinking on the movement in the U.S. On a traditional level (leaving aside, for now, Cultural Revolutions), there are two kinds of political education. From action, especially struggle against the ruling class and their agents, we learn who our enemies are, who our allies are (and aren't), and we learn about alliances with other sectors and classes. And we learn something of how 'the system' works, what some of the interconnections

are, how power is wielded at the lower levels of oppression (i.e. to control such pipsqueaks as we). All of these are extremely valuable lessons to learn, and form the basis without which all other forms of learning are, substantially, useless.

But there is another form of political learning, built upon but concurrent with learning through action: it is the development to a higher level of generalization of the principles and insights we have gained in learning through action. If we are ever to think about social change—in a long-term, strategic, historical sense this ability to generalize from our (and our comrades') particular experiences is absolutely vital—but it is a skill too often disparaged and much too little practiced in our movement.

The point has been frequently made: movement people are too often un- or anti-intellectual, we lack historical roots and solid radical scholarship. These charges are too true, and I greatly fear that the result of what seems to me to be Debray's celebration of activism as the main—nay, sole—form of political education will be to encourage these unfortunate traits among New Leftists.

* *

But I must repeat, in closing, that Debray's main point must be affirmed and re-affirmed, with respect to both Latin America and the U.S.—only those involved in a struggle have the moral right, the tactical understanding, and the political experience to determine the direction of that struggle. And let me add a last, corollary point: when a group arises who, due to their superior political and ideological development and consequent elevation by the movement to leadership positions, perform the roles of political direction and political education, they must arise from the midst of the masses' struggle, not from comfortable North American armchairs or Latin American CP offices.

NAC Minutes

November 28, 1967

Members Present: Tim McCarthy, John Rossen, Carl Davidson, Karen Gellen, Carol Neiman.

Members Absent: Earl Silbar, JOIN, University of Chicago, Mike Spiegel, Bob Pardun.

Others Present: Boe Shomer, Bruce Pohlman.

AGENDA:

- LADO Typesetting
- Magazine Ads
- Financial Report
 - LADO - Latin American Defense Organization, a Latin American Community organization on the West Side is going to start putting out a bi-weekly, bi-lingual newsletter. They want to have it printed here and they requested that their typesetter be allowed to use our equipment. Since our typesetter has no experience setting Spanish, and since theirs has a lot of experience on Friden equipment the NAC agreed to this request—setting a fee of \$7.00 for use of the equipment.
 - Carl Davidson presented the re-worked ad, and it was accepted by the NAC and sent to New Republic. So all the members can steal someone's copy, read our creation, and send money.

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

Second-class postage rates paid in Chicago, Illinois

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

3. Financial Report:

N.O. BREAD: Tues, Nov. 21 to Mon, Nov 27

INCOME:		EXPENSES:	
Dues and Subscriptions	\$ 604.00	Petty Cash	\$ 18.10
Literature	195.59	Travel	20.00
Contributions	226.91	Subsistence	395.00
Pledges	15.00	Office and REC Supplies	36.64
Sales	60.39	Printing Supplies	91.01
Miscellaneous	506.50	Equipment	55.00
Exchanges	00.00	Exchanges	00.00
NLN Ads	00.00	Cars	8.00
Printing	273.00	Typesetting	00.00
Loans	00.00	Postage	33.40
Chapter Tax	00.00	Debts	45.00
Journal A	00.00	Miscellaneous	00.00
Total	\$1881.39	Total	\$ 742.15

Beer Money: \$1139.24
Balance: \$2679.62

submitted by Tim McCarthy