

1st. Edition
 3rd. Edition
 207. 206
 Amsterdam - C.

N.C. Toledo & Dow

SDS NATIONAL COUNCIL APRIL 2 - 5

SUNDAY APRIL 2

2:00-5:00 Registration
 7:00-10:00 Showing and Discussion of three films: "Black Natchez", "Troublemakers", "The Inheritance"

MONDAY APRIL 3

10:30-12:30 Panel Presentations and Discussions: "Problems of the Campus movement; Long range perspective for student radicals". Hal Benenson and Paul Potter.
 2:00-6:00 Small group discussion of the above
 7:30-10:00 NIC NAC Agenda Meeting
 7:30-10:00 REP Workshop
 8:00 Party

TUESDAY APRIL 4

10:30-12:30 Panel discussions and presentations:
 1. Students and the Labor Movement.
 2. Students and the poor Communities.
 3. Students and the Middle Class Communities.
 4. Students and the Draft.
 2:00-6:00 Small group discussion on the above
 7:30 National Council begins Agenda debate.

WEDNESDAY & THURSDAY APRIL 5-6
 National Council

Irvin Schonbrun
 Toledo SDS

Despite the 'freedom' lost from not becoming an official TU club, we proceeded with our project. On Feb. 23, '67, a representative from the Dow Chemical Company interviewed students on the campus for prospective employees of the company. From 8:00 a.m. until approximately 4:00 p.m. that day we distributed leaflets stating that Dow was the manufacturer of polystyrene "a major constituent of Napalm B". The leaflets also mentioned that napalm was used in an "illegal and immoral war". We asked the recipients of the leaflets (who were not only students but also whoever happened to walk into the union at that time) to join with us in protesting the use and manufacture of napalm and to write to Dow demanding the halt of its production.

Despite our not being a recognized campus organization, we got our leaflets 'registered' so we could 'legally' pass them out on campus. There were really no incidents except for the verbal harrassment of about five fraternity clowns who shouted such platitudes as "don't take the leaflet . . . they're Communist inspired"; "don't take the leaflet . . . they're anti-American"; and "don't take the leaflet . . . they're backed by the ICA". (???CIA???)

We were going to have some people sign up for the interview and after five minutes of conversation with the interviewer question him as to their involvement with the government on the war, etc. This, unfortunately didn't come off. There were no coverages of the event, either in the city paper or the campus paper. We do hope to become an on-campus organization someday . . . when we get enough students in Toledo SDS.

new left notes

1608 w. madison, rm. 206
 chicago, ill. 60612

VOLUME 2, NO. 10 let the people decide MARCH 13, 1967

U. of Iowa Bans Recruiters

Roy Harvey

IOWA CITY, IA. - Recruiters for the armed services will not be allowed to operate in the University of Iowa Memorial Union under a new university policy.

Two Marine Corps recruiting officers, Capt. C. J. Johnston and Capt. Bruce A. Tester, both of Des Moines, said Tuesday they were told that they could no longer set up their desks in the union.

Captain Tester, Marine officer selection officer for Iowa, said university officials told him that he could set up headquarters in Gilmore Temporary Barracks.

This is where representatives of business and industry interview job applicants and where a representative of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was picketed last month during an interviewing session.

According to university officials, the new policy treats armed forces recruiters and representatives of VISTA and the Peace Corps like all other recruiters.

"Walk in" Business

Captain Tester complained about the new policy, saying that 97 per cent of his business in the past has been "walk in." He said he must have a location where there is much student traffic.

The only other campus he knows of that doesn't permit recruiters in the union is Michigan State University at East Lansing, Mich., he said.

Tester said that University of Iowa President Howard R. Bowen told him that recent demonstrations* on campus had caused the university to re-examine its policy of allowing service recruiters to operate in the student union.

Tester said Bowen said he did not think the services should have preferential treatment.

Williard Boyd, vice-president of faculties, denied that the demonstrations are responsible for the new policy.

Gives Reasons

He said he thought the university's placement facilities should be improved and consolidated and that the new policy was simply a result of this.

Captain Tester said he has taken out an advertisement in the Daily Iowan, the campus newspaper.

He said he is interested in getting all the publicity he can so that students will know his new location. He said he will be on campus until Friday.

Captain Tester said that after he was told he could not work in the union, officials there made six posters telling of his new location but that "after an hour all of them had been torn down."


*"Recent demonstrations" refers to an SDS demonstration a month ago in which 20-30 students surrounded a marine recruiting table and caused the recruiters to leave.

I suggest we make it an SDS project to see how many other Unions we can get recruiters banned from.

inside this issue	
BEHIND THE CIA	P. 3
DOW RECRUITERS IN TROUBLE	P. 2
ON THE DRAFT	p. 3
AUTOMATION - III	P. 6
SUMMER CONFERENCE	P. 5
FILM TIPS	P. 5
AN OPENING TO THE RIGHT	P. 6

WANTED

SCOUNDREL OF THE WESTERN SAT



SCOUNDREL OF THE WESTERN SAT

DEAN RUSK

ORNERY, IMPERIALISTIC SCOUNDREL! LACKEY OF TEXAS FEUDAL LANDLORD!

BUM: LOITERS AROUND PUBLIC BUILDINGS **BOLD-FACED LIAR:** SPEAKS WITH FORKED TONGUE

YOUTH CORRUPTER: ENCOURAGES YOUNG MEN TO ENGAGE IN EXOTIC ACTS OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOR IN DISTANT NATIONS.

BANDIT: ROBS FROM THE POOR AND GIVES TO THE RICH YANKEE WAR-MONBERS.

UN-ASHAMED STATIST: SUPPORTS COWBOY BARONS AT HOME AND DICTATORIAL BULLIES ABOARD.

SHADY CHARACTER: CONSORTS WITH THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE. CHILD OF SATIN! SCHEMING CONNIVER!! DIRTY CLOD!!!

Made in Texas by Kalle Anarchists

If you want more on the Dean - See p. 6.

SDS PICKETS BROWN and his friends — S.F.S. leaflet

Tam Candit
California

TUITION'S NOT THE MAIN ISSUE

SDS members at San Francisco State College gave ex-Governor Pat Brown a lively reception when he spoke before a closed meeting of the Student Symposium on State Government. Thirty demonstrators marched outside the room as the faculty advisor to the symposium refused to admit those who "were only going to cause trouble" to the empty seats in the meeting. The demonstration was primarily called to protest the granting of honorary membership to Brown by the Associated Students Legislature, and demonstrators cited Brown's ordering of troops into Watts and Hunters Point, and his handling of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley as examples of the conservative character of his administration.

The next day SDS joined with other campus groups to protest the presence on campus of Marine Corps recruiters. They began with a rally at State's outdoor Speakers' Platform (a Hyde Park-type free speech forum with p. a. equipment) which ended with a heated debate on the war. Following the rally, demonstrators approached the gym (site of the recruiting) to picket the Marines. Athletes and P. E. majors, resenting the intrusion on

their "turf", moved to block the demonstrators. A group of demonstrators made their way into the gym thru a side entrance, but were attacked by jocks as they chanted "Get out of Vietnam and Get out of State". The situation had approached near-riot dimensions, as nearly 100 people of both persuasions milled around and several fistfights broke out, when campus police intervened.

The school paper, *The Daily Gater*, later attacked the pickets for failing to respect the right of "free speech" of Marine recruiters, but SDS members pointed out that it was not the protesters who chose violence as a way to express their disapproval of the views of others.

We've come together to protest Governor Reagan's attempted assault on higher education. The threats of tuition in the state colleges and university, and of an "investigation" by John McCone, are merely the tip of the iceberg. The real issues are the priorities of allocation of resources and distribution of wealth in California, and the ability of individuals to make the decisions affecting their lives. These issues were evaded during the 8 years of the Brown administration, but now they must be faced . . .

WHO SHALL MAKE THE DECISIONS?

Governmental and social institutions in America have slipped far from the control of those whose lives they affect. We propose a radical democratization and decentralization of our institutions, beginning with those which most directly affect us, the university, state college and junior college systems. "Our" higher education system is controlled by boards of political appointees, primarily members of the "corporate elite". The only interest these men have in education is to keep the university and colleges subservient to business interests, and to ensure a pool of potential managers and technicians. If we are to have education which meets the needs of scholars and students, rather than those of corporations and politicians, then it must be controlled by scholars and students. Both curriculum and campus regulations must be placed under the control of democratic bodies of students and faculty which have real power, not the sandbox imitation of it presently enjoyed by "student governments" and "academic senates". All outside restrictions on academic freedom and student activities, such as the Levering Oath and the Mulford Act, should be repealed.

We seek the democratization of education not just as a goal in itself, but as a step toward restructuring our society as a whole. We therefore view the problems of students in economic as well as educational terms. We seek the abolition of existing student fees as well as a ban on tuition. We need to organize to obtain a decent minimum wage and collective bargaining rights for both student and non-student campus workers. We need to carry the principle of free higher education forward, and obtain a living subsidy for students linked to preferential admission of Negro and Spanish-speaking youth.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE WAR

The "defense" budget drains more than \$75 billion a year from the economy, money sorely needed for schools, housing and medical care. Money from war contracts and research grants is an illusory benefit to a university, since accepting it means support of the greatest single barrier to adequate financing for education, as well as a diversion of programming and research priorities into essentially antisocial channels. We must therefore oppose university acceptance of "defense" contracts and research work, presence on campus of military and CIA recruiters, and all university cooperation with the draft (forwarding of student grades and class ranks, etc).

DON'T WAIT FOR FAVORS

Whenever people get together to demand social justice, attempts are made to lead them off into dependence on one or another group of politicians instead of organizing, pressing their demands, and relying on their own strength. The Democrats gave us 8 years of the runaround and paved the way for Reaganism. Now they're getting ready to collaborate with him in putting thru new regressive taxation, while they tell us that there's nothing they can do about it until we elect a Democratic governor again. If we are to succeed in stopping tuition and reversing the present conservative trend, we must begin by organizing ourselves school by school and dorm by dorm, until we have formed a solid power bloc which can realistically seek allies among all those dispossessed from this society — the poor, Negroes, Mexican-Americans and all others who have an interest changing the oppressive conditions under which we all live. When we have that power, then instead of begging for our rights, we can reach out and take them.

NLN has received newspaper status from the Post Office this week. When the details are worked out, this status will mean that almost all NLN subscribers will receive the paper THE SAME WEEK IT IS PRINTED.

to the editor

Dear SDS,

I am writing a paper on SDS as a political force in the American political and social system. Subtopics would include such things as SDS in relationship with the two-party system, and SDS as an alternative to contemporary American politics. Also ideas on SDS as a political organization and its effects on the community, the campus, and people will be covered. If any of you have any

information or thoughts on these topics please write to me at Sweazy Hall, Westminster College, Fulton Mo. This paper will also be used as a term paper in political parties (It's better than writing on Bobby Kennedy or the Democratic Party) so I will need several concrete arguments and examples.

Peace and Freedom
Paul J. McKibben

IOWA GREETES DOW

The following leaflet was distributed when University of Iowa students protested the appearance of Dow Chemical Co. recruiters.

NAPALM: THE AMERICAN WAY

Napalm is one part benzene, one part gasoline, two parts polystyrene; it is a highly incendiary jellylike substance which sticks to anything it touches; it is dropped in thousand pound bombs.

"Napalm's fatal effects come not only from burns. Suffocation can be caused by the sudden exhaustion of oxygen, and heat up to 2,000 degrees can claim victims not touched by the jelly." (New York Post, August 26, '966)

Recently an "improved" napalm was developed and is being produced by DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY. Napalm-B uses polystyrene as a thickening agent. DOW'S napalm-B is far more adhesive; it has replaced the former kind.

Napalm was developed at the end of World War II. According to Louis Fieser, professor of Chemistry at Harvard and an inventor of napalm, "Napalm was originally developed to be used against military targets. NO ONE EVER THOUGHT IT WOULD BE USED AGAINST HUMANS."

American planes are loaded with napalm bombs. The pilots are "given a square marked on a map and told to hit every hamlet in the area." (Washington Post, March 13, 1965) After the area is bombed with conventional bombs, it is strafed with 20 mm. shells, then the area is napalmed. The napalm spews out in all directions like a molten geyser.

Congressman Clement Zablocki, returning from Vietnam in 1966, reported that "search and destroy operations have resulted in six civilian casualties to one Viet Cong." According to Special Forces officers this strategic bombing kills "ten civilians for every VC." (Newsweek, March 14, 1966)

In '64, according to a UNESCO population study, 47.5 percent of the people of Vietnam were under 16. Today the figure is certainly over 50 percent. Since the males over 16 are away fighting — on one side or the other — it's clear that in the rural villages which bear the brunt of napalm raids, at least 70 percent of the residents and probably more are children." (William Pepper, Director of the New Rochelle Commission on Human Rights, Ramparts, Jan. '967)

We alone possess and freely use this weapon in South Vietnam. Burns are deadly in relation to their depth and extent. Bodies of babies are especially vulnerable — a large part of their bodies is melted when the most minimal contact with napalm-B occurs. If the open wounds are treated within 24 hours, the napalmed victim has some chance of survival if the napalm claimed flesh can be amputated.

"I saw these children burned by napalm and it is absolutely true. The chemical reaction of napalm does melt the flesh, and the flesh runs right down their faces onto their chests and it sits there and it grows there. These children can't turn their heads, they were so thick with flesh. And when gangrene sets in, they cut off their hands, their fingers, or feet; the only thing they can not cut off is their head." (A New Jersey housewife, reported in *Ladies Home Journal*, Jan. 1967, p. '09)

"The Air Force has clamped a tight security lid on the napalm-B program, chiefly because of fear of picketing by anti-war demonstrators." (Chemical & Engineering News, March 14, '966)

Wisconsin & Dow

nlm news service

MADISON WISCONSIN: Members of SDS from the University of Wisconsin have been engaged in a prolonged struggle resisting the presence of Dow Chemical recruiters on the Campus. NLN of February 27 carried the start of the saga. More recently, on the third day of the protest, there was a march on campus to protest the arrest of a total of 16 persons in the past two days. During the course of the proceedings about ten more people were arrested.

Also during the course of the day Marty Tandler, SDS regional traveler was conducting negotiations with the Chancellor of the University and the Dean of Students. Among the demands for which he was speaking, he urged that the University no longer allow Dow recruiters on campus, or for that matter any recruiters as they perverted the meager attempts for real education. After about five minutes of these negotiations, about 60 adamant SDS people burst into the office. At that moment the Dean lost his cool and started frothing at the mouth and sputtering that the intruders weren't going to let them out of the office. And indeed, those

present informed him that they had taken a vote — along with the three hundred outside, and he and the Chancellor would not be allowed to leave. Trusty Chancellor, however, did not lose his cool and proceeded to dwell on the possible legal ramifications of the students' actions which would be taken by THE SYSTEM if they persisted. And THE SYSTEM as we all know strikes fear in many hearts . . . After many deliberations, an evening meeting for dialogue was set up.

Back at the legislator, many concerns were being forcefully voiced about the disrupting forces on the Wisconsin campus. It is rumored that several notables have called for the dismissal of the entire upper echelon of the U. of Wisconsin administration for allowing SUCH A THING to happen.

At the meeting with the chancellor that evening, many issues were brought up; a far ranging resolution to the crisis was impossible, however, as the Chancellor was seized by a fit of outrage and had to leave after an hour. At a still subsequent meeting that eve, students decided to continue picketing for the last day of the Dow recruiters.

NEW LEFT NOTES

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

STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

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

National President's Report

behind the C.I.A.

NICK EGELSON

You say the stories about the death of Feerie in New Orleans sent your paranoia tugging at your thoughts again? And the CIA - NSA story broke and you started making jokes about forming a paranoia club? Only when you got thinking about it, you were not sure who else you wanted in it? That is about the condition I was in when I started out for Washington, D. C. to attend the executive meeting of the U. S. Youth Council (USYC). USYC, an organization so big that NSA is a member of it, is one of the groups which had been accused of taking money from the CIA.

Through the experience of that meeting, I've put my paranoia to rest. Or rather, it has been replaced by something more troubling.

I. CONSPIRACY AND PARANOIA

When I first heard of the whole business, it seemed too simple to be important. The NSA had been receiving funds from the CIA. So what else was new? What NSA did never seemed to matter much. What difference did it make whether they got their money from the CIA or from the Ford Foundation?

Subversion in NSA: Paranoia begins

The Thot Plickened rapidly. It soon appeared that funding was not the only connection between NSA and the CIA. The CIA dominated the choice of officers and other personnel. By these and other means, it managed much of NSA's international affairs. The controls had steadily deepened in the years since the funding started, back at the beginning of the Cold War.

As far as can be judged, NSA held the upper hand in the NSA-CIA partnership during the early years. The CIA had turned to NSA because NSA knew more about international student politics than the agency. As long as the student group knew more, it could determine the direction of its own programs, no matter who footed the bill. The focus of knowledge shifted, however, because NSA staff and officers change every year, and knowledge passed out of the organization. At the same time, knowledge accumulated in the files of the CIA's Covert Action Division #5, and in the memories of agency personnel. In time, it was the agency which briefed NSA on the intricacies of the international student world, and it was the agency which knew what needed doing where. Although important, the change in the balance of knowledge from NSA to CIA was the least direct means of CIA control.

In time, the CIA came to control the choice of NSA personnel. Officers of NSA came by tradition to be chosen from the participants in the International Student Relations Seminar (ISRS) which the association ran every summer just before its National Congress. Most of the applicants for the much coveted seats in the seminar were officers of local student governments. They were, therefore, people already chosen for their ability to work within the liberal ideology and to maneuver in the world of compromise known as student campus politics. Less than one fifth of those who applied were chosen: the applicants were sifted by NSA personnel already working with (and under the influence if not the control of) the CIA men in CAD #5. During the seminar, as the participants grew to know each other, the NSA officers and CIA agents looked over the group. By the end of the seminar, it was usually clear to everyone who would run for office in the NSA elections. The members of

the seminar formed the only significant caucus, informal and unwitting as it was, at the NSA Congress. And their informal choice prevailed. After the elections, the officers (The President and the International Affairs Vice President) as well as some of the members of the staff for international affairs, were taken out to lunch, asked to sign national security oaths, and then made 'witting': let in on the financial and other connections to the CIA.

SUBVERSION SPREADS TO USYC

NSA was not the only organization of American youth infiltrated by the CIA. Early newspaper stories reported that the U. S. Youth Council had received funds from one of the groups named by NSA officers as a CIA front: the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs (FYSA). The USYC is composed of other organizations, ranging from the YWCA's through NSA to YPSL, and, until two weeks ago, to SDS. As a result of the disclosures of possible financial links, the National Interim Committee of SDS voted to withdraw from USYC (See press statement, last NLN). It appears that there are indeed ties between USYC and the CIA, and that in this case too, the links go beyond financial support.

There is no hard proof, that is to say no admission, that the CIA financed USYC. But the conclusion is hard to escape given the wealth of evidence.

a) USYC's financial statement for '65-66 shows that the organization got 91% of its total budget from FYSA.

b) Gene Groves, current President of NSA, and Rick Stern, current International Affairs VP, told the USYC executive meeting that they had personally dealt with FYSA to get their (USYC's) CIA funds.

c) In the light of the disclosures, the FYSA was a front at least some of the time, it becomes even more suspicious that USYC got such a large percentage of its money from the one source.

d) A closer look at the budget reveals that FYSA gave USYC '00% of its administrative expenses (more than \$75,000 a year; half of USYC's total budget). Administrative expenses are usually the most difficult finance; most organizations finance their administrative expenses out of grants for specific programs.

e) Harry Lunn, executive director of FYSA has made only one statement to the press. It says little more than what he did was his own business.

f) The Internal Revenue Service (would you believe IRS?) maintains that FYSA did not file form 990 until 1965. The form, which gives an accounting of expenditures, is required of all foundations, with certain exceptions. IRS told an NSA investigator that FYSA did not file under a clause giving exemption for those organizations receiving part of their income from the Federal Government.

g) FYSA insists that it did file the form.

h) Greg Gallow, current International Affairs VP for USYC, did not attend this USYC exec meeting which devoted all its time to the CIA question. The other officers explained that Greg 'chose not to come'.

As in the case of NSA, funding seems to have been only part of the CIA connection. The CIA maintained control of USYC through NSA on the one hand and FYSA on the other. The case of Harry Lunn is typical. He was President of NSA in 1954-55. He was, it can be assumed, witting of the CIA involvement and of FYSA's (Continued on page 4)

WHAT THE ARMY'S ALL ABOUT

from vietnam

on the DRAFT

GENERAL GEORGE S. PATTON, JR., ADDRESS TO HIS TROOPS, (1945)

"Men! This stuff we hear about Americans wanting to stay out of this war - not wanting to fight - is a lot of bullshit. Americans love to fight, traditionally. All real Americans love the sting of clash of battle. America loves a winner. America will not tolerate a loser. Americans despise a coward. Americans play to win. That's why America has never lost and never will lose a war, for the very thought of losing is hateful to an American.

"You are not all going to die. Only 2% of you right here today will be killed in a major battle. Death must not be feared. Every man is frightened at first in battle. If any man says he isn't, he's a goddamned liar. But a real man will never let the fear of death overpower his honor, his sense of duty to his country and to his manhood.

"All though your army career, you've bitched about what you call 'this chicken-shit drilling.' That drilling was for a purpose: instant obedience to orders and to create alertness. If not, some sonofabitch of a German will sneak up behind him and beat him to death with a sock full of shit.

"An army is a team. It lives, sleeps, eats, and fights as a team. This individual hero stuff is a lot of crap. The bilious bastards who wrote that kind of stuff for the Saturday Evening Post don't know any more about real fighting under fire than they know about fucking.

"Even if you are hit, you can still fight. That's not bullshit either. . . . Every damn man has a job to do. Each man must think not only of himself but of his buddy fighting beside him. We don't want yellow cowards in this army. They should be killed off like flies. If not, they will go back and breed more cowards. We've got to save the fucking for the fighting men. The brave men will breed more brave men.

"Remember, men! You don't know I'm here (Continued on page 7)

(The following manuscript was found on the body of a young Texas soldier, lately killed in the Vietnam War. It was folded within the pages of a copy of the *New Statesman*. His name is being withheld for the sake of his family. His ambition was to be a writer, but he did not achieve publication in his lifetime.)

It's justifiable to equate man's ugliness, the physical ugliness of civilized man (conceive the horror of a street of people suddenly unclothed), with the wretched state he has got the world into. Dissension, oppression, exploitation, superstition, wars, human enslavement practised and defended on grounds of pigmentary difference, world-

wide prejudice and discrimination pursued for no greater reason than dissimilarity in angle of eye socket - all that is anti-social, conservative, hence self-corrupting, man applies himself strenuously to. Of all living creatures he is ugliest, most unnaturally so.

And, considering the supremeness of his equipment, inexcusably. Blessed above others by Nature, he opposes Nature. Alone empowered to order her, he seeks to pervert her - perverts himself instead. Shunning reality, he gives play to aberrations, calls them gods, or royalty, nobility, dictators, presidents, the like, and genuflects before them like a man doubled over with cramps. Not content with that, corrupts others - even his presumed beloveds - in their name. Presumed beloveds - can they be other to him who despatches them on children's crusades to Vietnamese wars? Precisely

"army life"

You printed a letter from Tom Jepson to Bill Hartzog in NLN of February 27, 1967. In this letter was mention of an "army life" statement enclosed with the letter. Would you please reprint this statement as a guide for induction center leafletters?

Fraternally,
Howard Strange

The U. S. Army does many things. It is a place where people learn trades, get a chance to see the world, research, earn a living. Most importantly it researches death, the best way to kill whoever we feel to be our enemies. You are now being considered for a place in the army, building machines, peeling potatoes, carrying a gun.

Earlier this morning Tom Jepson refused induction into the army. Tom doesn't believe in war or any need to kill people. We ask you to stop and think about what going into the army means. It can mean a good job, or just two years of unpleasant shit-eating, or it can mean killing other human beings. Whether you personally carry a gun or not, you are still part of the whole business. Is that really what you want to do?

Want to talk to someone about it? Phone 913-2809, or write Box 403, Lawrence, Kansas 66044.

where is the dividing line between love and hate? Who should love whom? Is it 99 per cent of us born of accident? - or '00? How many are failed abortions? Long live wars! When will youth wake up? When will it waken to the fact that it's unwanted? And not so much hated as despised?

Beetles belong to the cockroach family - or is it vice versa? A little delving only shows that long hair, in its present-day context, was devised by youth's elders. Proof is that they got it on an honours list. Thus was set a weak trend - a trend of weakness, rather. 'We got 'em controlled.' Like that. Same as the yacking American general's 'Gimme two years of their lives and I'll make dogs of the lot.' And they don't even give them the respite of a sea trip to Vietnam: they're flown. 'On flew the six hundred (thousand). Ours not to question why That Tennyson, now, a real mercenary's mercenary. Aussies even let themselves be conscripted.

'Fellas, y'all jes' gotta go, ah jes' cain't stan' 'em Reds,' mourns LBJ, whining eyes wetting a welt on the belly. 'Anyways, we got 'm whupped. Son's me 'n Mac realized a Buddhist's no more'n a gook Baptist, we-knew whutta do. Git at their wimmin. In Texas we snick up on 'em. All y'all gotta do is nappalm the mommas. Yuh cain't nurse brats fried, kin yuh? Sooner or later they won't be nobody to fight, will they? It's a cinch - easier 'n foolin' niggers. It's whut's known as Southern determinism: lynchin', same as. Na, y'all do the nappalmin', lee me the worryin'. Onward Christian Soldiers. Anyways, Lodge and Westmoreland tells me 'm gook gals ain't bad. Ah cud do with some m'sef, only for this presidentin'. Gotta keep 'm slopes free in a free world - see whutta mean?

The whine lifts to a screaming howl. 'All ready now! On y'all's knees to der fuehrer Cyl 'N Ah mean Ky! as in sky; Cy sounds too much lahk a sody-jerk.'

(New Statesman, December 23, 1966)

BEHIND THE C. I. A.

(Continued from page 4)

role. In 1965, Lunx became executive director of FYSA — and now gives USYC more than 90% of its money. Greg Gallow connects USYC to the CIA even more closely. In '64-65, he was President of NSA — and therefore witting. Now he is I. A. V-P for USYC. One does not lose one's loss of innocence. Reed Martin, now assistant executive secretary to USYC, was last year assistant to the international NSA President. Jim Fowler, current USYC President, served in NSA's International Commission for two years.

On the floor of the USYC meeting, Mike Wood, who made the original disclosures to Ramparts, charged the USYC leadership, Jim Fowler and Reed Martin, with having signed national security oaths for the CIA. Both denied the charge in a dramatic confrontation before the assembled body of USYC delegates. Mike Wood said his information came from Phil Sherburne, a past President of NSA and an admitted accomplice to CIA activity. Later in the USYC meeting, Gene Groves (NSA President) implied that he concurred with Wood's charges.

SUBVERSION IN SDS?

Mr. Brown (I'm sorry, but I have to refer to my pet paranoia by a code name) now started asking embarrassing questions about SDS? Weren't there personnel interlocks between NSA and SDS? I've checked, and am satisfied for the moment. True to their analysis, the left wing of NSA in the early 60's was primarily concerned with the domestic front. The ties between us and NSA tie us to the national rather than the international programming. Paul Potter, President of SDS in 65-5, was National Affairs VP of NSA in 196'. The CIA, on the other hand, was interested in international affairs.

SUBVERSION GROWS

Mr. Brown had plenty more to keep him busy. I read and listened a little further, and the infiltration of NSA and USYC began to fall into a pattern. It began to look — perish the thought — like an international conspiracy.

In the years immediately after World War II, the U. S. Government found that the Cold War was not going to be fought just on the military front. The U. S. and the Soviet Union developed pairs of institutions in each of the several theaters of international confrontation. Counterposed to the Western military alliance, NATO, was the eastern alliance of the Warsaw Pact. International labor, after a fleeting unity, was soon split between the eastern and the western International Conference of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU). It appears that the U. S. was hard put to develop the student side of its competition. The eastern bloc gained control of the International Union of Students (IUS). The government, through the CIA, helped NSA to pull together the western counterpart, the International Student Conference (ISC).

There was still one more Cold War arena for which a western contender had to be found: the arena of international youth politics. The U. S. constructed the World Assembly of Youth (WAY) to counter the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY). The U. S. was represented in WAY by the U. S. Youth Council.

In both theaters, NSA was the kingpin. The CIA worked through it in international student politics, and, through NSA and then USYC, in international youth politics.

THE PARANOIA OF SUBVERSION

Seeing the whole conspiracy laid out that way, and the total penetration of U. S. dealings in international youth and student affairs by the CIA, set Mr. Brown into a virtual panic of activity. Along about this time, Mike Wood brought it all home with his charges about USYC officers Fowler and Martin, right there before the whole Youth Council. The confrontation between Fowler, Martin, and Wood, however, was not quite the climax of the Bond-style drama. The most shaking episode occurred about a half hour later when Martin, who had been silent until then, gave a five minute speech. He told with conviction and sincerity how he could not possibly have been an agent of the CIA. In retrospect, I can see problems with his speech: it was devoted entirely to a description of how he had not done anything connected with international affairs for NSA, and therefore, would not have been useful to the 'firm', as conspiratorial jargon termed the CIA. One could come to think such an explanation, which said little of principles or values, not quite the defense of a truly impassioned man. But at the same time, it was very disturbing to suspect that someone could talk with such sincerity — and lie. If the conspiracy was real, it was now doubly troubling, because it now had to be coupled with brilliant mendacity.

II. COMPREHENSION AND PESSIMISM

Since that incident, my pet paranoia has been less active. I have come to a deeper understanding of where the student government is at. What I have come to think does not make me any happier. In fact, at times I wish I were back with Mr. Brown. I could make jokes or form clubs to commiserate about him. But it appears that the real problem is not the conspiracy, but the existence of a youth movement in the U. S. with a political tradition that could allow such covert activity to go on. The way people acted at the USYC sessions showed up the true problems.

FAILURE OF DEMOCRACY

It was, first of all, the absence of any sense of participatory democracy among the liberal members of USYC which set the stage for CIA involvement. At the USYC exec meeting, I asked how many delegates felt they knew enough about the politics of Malasia or Singapore — where USYC had sent a training delegation last year — to feel competent to judge whether a training delegation was warranted or who it should train. Of the more than fifty people in the room, only one raised a hand. The chairman, a USYC officer, thought he knew enough. I asked the same question about Western Africa and Guyana (the only other areas for USYC programming that year) and got precisely the same response. Few at the session flinched at the disclosure of such ignorance. Only one person responded from the floor. Said she: 'We can't be expected to know everything. That's what we elect leaders for.' Since no one in USYC felt strongly about having active democratic control over programming, it was a pushover for the CIA to run the show.

FAILURE OF POLITICS

If a faulty sense of democracy opened the door for clandestine CIA involvement, a crude sense of politics made the secrecy almost unnecessary. Since the USYC delegates didn't know much about their organization's programs, it is hard to know what they would have thought of the infiltration. Some, the more conservative, may actually have had an opinion based on a notion of social change: there are the Communists, and then there are us good guys. So anything done in the name of anti-Communism or western democracy must be good, and it is not too important, with the world so black and white, to know what one's leaders are doing. Others, the more liberal delegates, saw the thing in much less political terms: of course student leaders need training to 'help them run their organizations'. Of course, student delegations must go out: they 'promote international

understanding'. With either the politically conservative or the apolitical liberal view, most of what went on with CIA directives was perfectly in tune.

FAILURE OF INDEPENDENT THOUGHT

USYC did not keep democratic checks on its programs. USYC probably agreed with what the CIA was getting it to do anyway. If USYC as a body was going to have any disagreement at all, it would probably have objected only to the secrecy of the influence. But USYC seems to be incapable of realizing that subversion was there at all.

Wood's charges alone might not be enough to convince anyone of USYC complicity with the CIA. Wood's testimony, supported by the admission on the part of NSA officers that FYSA is a front, is much harder to dismiss. The peculiar circumstances of the USYC-FYSA relationship, as well as the implicit corroboration of Wood's charges by Groves, head of NSA, makes the case just that much tighter. And there is, behind all the specific charges, the fact, admitted by the U. S. State Department, that NSA was indeed penetrated. And USYC is a counterpart, almost a big sister organization to NSA.

In the face of all this evidence, USYC would not even pass a resolution condemning FYSA as a front. Groves stood up on the floor and said he knew because he had dealt with them to get CIA funds. So did Stern. And still USYC protested that they did not have concrete evidence. Often USYC delegates argued that the evidence was purely circumstantial and that the NSA officials were indulging in reverse McCarthyism. Why the blindness?

It rests in the assumption that the international Communist conspiracy has a monopoly on subversion. The idea that one of one's own leaders might be lying is never more than a theoretical possibility. Charges just slide off. And a very strict standard of evidence is brought into play just to make sure all allegations are dismissed.

Throughout the sessions of the executive meeting, delegates rose to object that there was no concrete evidence. Anything more than circumstantial evidence, however, is not going to be available. That is the nature of subversion. Compare the case against USYC to the case against the NSA. From the time of the first hint of NSA-CIA connections, NSA staff have sifted NSA records. There is not one shred of direct evidence of the ties. There are strong circumstantial indications, just as there are against USYC. Mike Wood, when he was fund-raising for NSA, found that prospectuses that would have brought laughs from most foundations kept money rolling in from FYSA. Direct proof of CIA involvement? No. There is only one kind of evidence available in the NSA case not available in the case of USYC: Phil Sherburne made an admission to Wood. If Jim Fowler and Reed Martin are indeed in touch with the CIA, they are not about to admit it. They know what happened to NSA.

If there are ties between USYC and the CIA, USYC delegates will never become convinced. They rule out as circumstantial the only available kinds of evidence. They have even set us a commission to search for the kinds of evidence they should know could not exist. If USYC does break its ties with FYSA, a possible, although not very likely outcome, you can bet it will be because of the need to remain above suspicion, rather than out of any conviction of monkey business.

There you have them: the representatives of the major youth groups in the country: YWCA, YM's, Young Dems, youth groups of the NAACP, Newman Clubs, and many others. They are satisfied to let their leaders make decisions. They act out of cold war presuppositions or liberal good will. They are blinded to the pos-

(Continued on page 5)

New York At-large RESOLUTION

N. Y. At-Large Chapter SDS
Submitted by Steve Max

The enclosed resolution on SDS and the U. S. Youth Council was passed at a regular meeting of the N. Y. At-Large Chapter on February 23, 1967.

Although the resolution deals with questions of democratic procedure within SDS, the members also voted to express the following views on another serious aspect of Nick's statement.

Many of us are critical of some aspects of USYC's program, and some have questions about the validity of this type of organization. But our feelings about USYC are not the issue. What is at stake are two underlying political attitudes: guilt by association and the double standard.

The President of USYC, Jim Fowler, and its other current officers have asserted that although USYC did receive money from a foundation identified as a CIA conduit, to their knowledge, no CIA funds went to USYC and the CIA had no influence on USYC program. Furthermore, USYC officers have publicly denounced, in the strongest terms, overt and covert CIA subsidization of and interference with private organizations, student or non-student.

In view of this, it seems to us that Nick's statement to the Times that he had no proof, but only "a pretty good idea" that USYC was a "government front", did an injustice to open political confrontation and debate. If Nick had definite knowledge, it should have been referred to or divulged; but SDS should not utilize such tactics as insinuation and guilt-by-association. We disdain such tactics when they are used against our organization, and they are no more palatable when used against another.

We also find a double-standard evident in SDS staff's immediate renunciation of membership in USYC. SDS once applied for a grant from Kaplan, as did NCUP. In fact, one of NCUP's films was financed largely by Kaplan. Furthermore, we all are aware that many SDS people were active in NSA

while it was receiving CIA funds. We certainly do not believe that NCUP or other SDS people were linked to the CIA. However, to assume our own people's innocence and USYC's guilt is to apply a double standard. This is not to say that we should renounce NCUP, or former NSA members, but merely that we must not allow personal or organizational biases to obscure our political judgment.

We urge, then, that a more sober and open-minded view be taken toward the USYC-CIA question. If the only reason for our withdrawal was possible CIA influence, then we must make known facts about such influence, or withhold judgment until such facts are made available. If there is no evidence, then it seems that we owe USYC a public apology. The enclosed resolution deals with other recommendations for future relations with USYC, as well as for more democratic decision-making procedure.

Sincerely,
N. Y. At-Large

The New York At Large Chapter at a regular meeting on Feb. 23, passed the following resolution:

1) The New York At Large Chapter protests the action taken by president Egelson in announcing the disaffiliation of SDS from the United States Youth Council to the press.

2) Requests that the question of SDS affiliation to USYC, be placed on the agenda of the next National Council meeting of SDS and that an announcement be placed in *New Left Notes* of this action.

3) Requests that an officer of USYC be invited to the SDS National Council to present USYC's case.

(SDS withdrew from USYC as a result of a unanimous vote of the NIC. — ed.)

SUMMER CONFERENCE ON "RADICALS IN THE PROFESSIONS"

Dick Mogidoff
2070 West 26th St.
Cleveland, Ohio
44113

For about two years now, one of the most frequently discussed topics among student activists, in SDS, SNCC, SSOC, in various peace groups, etc., has been "What can we do when we graduate (grow up, enter the real world)? Or, "How can we be radicals for a lifetime, how can we find satisfying roles in this society, yet maintain our integrity and be effective in implementing our values? As the somewhat older generation of the New Left has started to deal with its adulthood, the problem has become more pressing. But concrete attempts to cope with it have been forthcoming. The attempt to define satisfying and radical roles, using the skills and training of the traditional professions, has been a prevalent theme for those concerned with these questions.

STATE OF THINKING ON THE CONFERENCE

When one has thought about and talked to many people about something like this conference, it is hard to separate out what came from conversations with others, and what is from my own mind. So I had better take full responsibility for what I write here, though substantial parts of come from recent conversations with Nick Egleson and the REP staff.

Auspices: As yet undecided, and for my part, not that important. The REP staff is very interested in this idea, which has been floating around SDS for a long time. REP might have some money to support it. There may also be other groups interested in co-sponsoring such an event. I think this will be a minor problem.

Timing: Early summer would be good. The conference should be seen as one part of a broad program of summer activity being planned for radical students. It could last anywhere from four days to ten days or two weeks, depending on resources, interest, and how grand a vision we might have about what should come out of it.

Constituency: The participants should be people seriously engaged in thinking about roles for themselves in one of the professions to be dealt with at the conference, rather than those still simply "searching for a role in life." Hopefully we can appeal to those already committed to pursuing training and developing skills in a chosen vocation whether undergraduates, professional students, or even practicing young professionals. To the extent that this is the case, the conference can be a real working conference, with a problem-solving atmosphere about it. Hopefully, substantive and concrete programs and career alternatives will come out of it. It should not be just a theoretical or question-raising session.

Other participants might be called "resource" people, that is people already engaged in a profession, or soon about to be, who would be willing to describe their experiences for discussion and evaluation. Resource people might also include people with little active experience in their profession, but who have well thought out models for future activity which they can offer to participants as alternatives, as well as for critical response.

In a relatively new area of discourse as this, the line between resource people and participants will be a thin one. The main function of the former will be to formulate statements to focus discussion.

Format: At this point, I have thought to limit the subject of the conference to the "human service" professions: Law, Education, Health, Urban planning, Journalism, Social work, and the Ministry. These are to be distinguished from the technical and academic professions. The limitation is largely for the end of a more manageable conference. The line between the service and "academic" professions (economist, sociologist, etc.) is thin, and should probably be closely examined. But I also feel that I can make a substantive argument that would warrant distilling out what I have called the service professions from the professions

BEHIND THE CIA

(Continued from page 5)

sibility that their leaders could have undemocratic connections. They are supported in their blindness by blind rules of evidence.

Grounds, I think, for pessimism about the direction of American youth.

FAILURE OF THE LEFT LIBERALS

The problems of youth politics extend into the 'left' end of the political spectrum to those people who probably term themselves left-liberals. The leadership of NSA is a case in point.

They had, first of all, enough of the failings enumerated above to go along with the CIA. They were, to be sure, under pressure once they had signed oaths. They could certainly ruin their careers in government by revealing the truth; they might expose themselves to prosecution. The pressures don't excuse the crucial failing. It is just such willingness to put personal career ahead of political integrity that is near the heart of American corruption, and that has doomed most liberal movements. The fact that NSA leaders admitted at least some of the truth is not, given the circumstances, an indication of a change for the better. The admissions came only after very specific and well-documented descriptions of the subversion had been made public.

Another failing has come to light since the admissions. It was my feeling that our only hope at the USYC meeting was to expose as much as possible of USYC-CIA interaction. I thought it might be possible then to cut through the liberal myopia and seed, if not conviction, at least strong doubt. But I did not have the facts. Mike Wood had some of them, and he spoke them. Gene Groves and Rick Sterns of NSA, had more. Yet, they said only that they knew FYSA to be a front, and did no more than imply concurrence with Wood's charges. (In private, both would state additional facts, and in public, Groves would admit to having them). Sam Brown, head of the National Supervisory Board (NSB) of NSA, had still more information. Groves repeatedly put off calling back Brown to ask him to come to the sessions. When he finally called, Brown had gone out. Their testimony might not have made the difference, but it was the only hope. Why did they hesitate?

Perhaps the hesitation came from a conviction that exposure would be useless. Such reasoning did not figure much in our discussions. Some hesitation might have been the result of pressure. It was thought for a while, for instance, that NSA officers might be granted draft deferments, in spite of their admissions. But the possibility seems to have fallen through before the USYC meeting. The most often voiced reasons for hesitancy center on the demands of friendship. Old friendships bridge the gulf between those who have admitted ties to the CIA and those who have not. Where there are no ties of friendship, there are those of amicable acquaintance. In these circumstances, to choose to expose the facts is to choose to hazard the career of a friend or acquaintance. Even when it is clear - as it ought to be - that one man's career with the U. S. Government is less important than the freedom of U. S. youth groups, the act of personal confrontation necessary to bring out the truth is still difficult. Accusations don't allow courtesy, yet courtesy is the style (and sometimes the content) of American student politics. Subversion, of course, isn't terribly polite, but at least it allows the outward forms.

There is another possible explanation of the hesitation. (This one may be more the product of still-not-quite-controlled paranoia than of the facts). Suppose that, as has been rumored, a full disclosure of the facts of CIA involvement would completely break USYC and NSA. Hesitancy on the part of current NSA officers would then be understandable. It would also be a major fault in a supposedly democratic philosophy. Sometimes, it would say, one must hide the truth from the people - even truth about subversion - in order to preserve democratic organizations.

The left liberals: in the end, they had no conviction of democracy that could outweigh the lure or pressure of the CIA, and no program that fixedly opposed the agencies programs. Student leaders?

III. TOWARD HOPE

A youth movement with corrupted values, a student leadership with seriously faulted politics - these are the grounds for pessimism. They are not reasons for despair. They indicate that we have a long way to go before we have a real student or youth movement. They show that the impediments are built in to the politics of leaders and followers alike. The impediments are no less than the major elements of the political culture. The dismantling of a culture and the construction of a new one is a process that must go on from the ground up. Every individual must realize a new definition of democracy, a new concept for politics.

In the kinds of movements we are developing on campuses - around the war, the draft, student rights and power - we are beginning to raise points of view which can underpin a new political life. We insist in our criticisms of the university and society, that an organization must be democratically controlled. And we work that way. It will be a long time before those values and the others we hold become dominant on the campus. Our analysis dictates that building those values thoroughly - locally and slowly - is the only road to a radical student movement.

We will have to avoid thinking we are farther along than we are. It is easy, for example, to look at the crumbling of NSA and say "Now is the instant to pull together a really radical student organization - a national student union." The actual state of student consciousness, as I have described it around the USYC-CIA affair, is proof that the base does not yet exist.

In time, it will.

more broadly defined.

One way to structure the conference is to devote a large part of the time to simultaneous parallel conferences. Participants would divide themselves into groups interested in one of the particular professions. At other times they would come together in full sessions for some speaker, panel, or discussion of common interest. For example, some time would have to be devoted to the general question of how insurgency in the professions relates to other programs and activities aimed at bringing about social change.

This conception may be a bit overschematic since it is probably foolhardy to think that each person who comes will already be committed to one specific profession. However, whether in separate, simultaneous groups or not, a significant portion of time would consist of the presentations by and the responses to the resource people's experiences or models for action within their professions. I hope the discussion would re-

main quite specific and concrete so as to give participants a sense of real alternatives to think over and discuss.

Another important aspect of the conference would be the contrast among the representatives of each profession regarding the critical, though too-often bastardized question, of working within or outside of the established institutions. Thus among journalist resource people should include some who work for established publications, and some working in the "underground press;" among teachers, some working in established schools, on all levels, and some who are trying to set up experimental "counter-institutions" whether free universities or community schools. These distinctions can be made for the other professions as well. The point is that even those who are working outside the established institutions are non the less "within" the profession in the important sense that they are putting to satisfying use some par-

(Continued on page 8)

FILM TIPS

(This week's "FILM TIPS" is the first of a regular weekly column in NLN. While working for REP, Pete Henig made a preliminary catalogue of available films in different categories. Many are missing - especially films produced by students or others around the universities. To my knowledge, there are a large number of films all over the country of which only a few people are aware. Would all people who know of films interesting or useful to people in the movement PLEASE send information to Pete Henig c/o NLN. This is the ONLY way a central catalogue can be created. - ed.)

THE FILM AT WORK - PROPAGANDA

Because of their great potential for engaging the senses and gripping the emotions, motion pictures are often made for the purpose of legitimizing or perpetuating particular ideas and policies. Since the production of a film demands much in the way of money and equipment, the propagandistic value of films is most fully realized by governments, political parties, corporations, unions, and other institutions which can afford to pay. The following films are especially successful in realizing the intent of their important sponsors.

Operation Abolition

45 minutes. Available from the UAW Film Library

This notorious propaganda documentary was made for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It includes footage of police violence against peaceful student demonstrators protesting HUAC hearings in San Francisco in 1960. The demonstrators are represented as being either communists or "dupes" of communists and the message of the film is that the HUAC is worthwhile because the communists have supposedly developed an "Operation Abolition" to do away with it. As it happened, all of the allegations in the film have been refuted either in respectable journalistic sources or in a court of law. "Operation Abolition" should be part of the education of every American radical because it represents the first confrontation outside the south of the student movement with the repressive and propaganda apparatus of cold war America. Many discussion materials are available for use with the film.

Why Vietnam?

32 minutes. Available free at the nearest U. S. Army Audio-Visual Support Center.

On Sept. '5 of last year THE WASHINGTON POST reported that "Why Vietnam?" has been shown to armed forces personnel in the United States and elsewhere, and to a gradually widening audience of church groups, school students and other civilian bodies." The film, which is described as "loud, clear and unsubtle" was made by Hearst Metrotone News for the Defense Department's Directorate of Information and Education at a cost of \$15,000. It marshals Chamberlain at Munich, Haile Selassie, the invasion of Manchuria, Dienbienphu, the Geneva Conference of 1954, and the mortaring of Bienoa airbase as reasons for the U. S. presence in Vietnam. The POST story reports that after the first draft of the script was completed "the face and voice of former President Eisenhower were written in, to tie in the now familiar Administration theme that the commitment in Vietnam was originally a Republican one, which Democrats are proud to honor."

The "Why We Fight" Series

"The draft makes soldiers of civilians regardless of their attitudes toward war and its causes, and with little time for the adjustment of those attitudes. The quick recognition of this fact after Pearl Harbor led to the making of the famed "Why We Fight" film series, produced by Col. Frank Capra for the War Department in the belief that a man who knows whom he is fighting, what led up to the conflict, and what he is fighting for, makes the best kind of soldier. . . . The formidable power of the film medium can

(Continued on page 8)

Opening to the Right

by Gus diZerego

A development of possibly momentous importance is the simultaneous splitting of both the "left" and the "right". We are aware, of course, of the radical difference between the New Left of SDS and SNCC and the authoritarian and often statist old left, but equally important, perhaps, is a growing schism among the ranks of the Rightwing.

To the outside observer the Right often appears as a rather homogeneous body typified by militarism, an unfriendly attitude toward civil liberties, and lip service to private enterprise. Reality is not so simple, however. The Right has been and remains a coalition of radically dissimilar groups united by various degrees of opposition to the present system. However, the reasons for their opposition vary widely.

The traditionalistic militarists of the "New Right" such as Buckley combined with fundamentalist fanatics such as Billy James Hargis make up the common image of the Right. They oppose the Establishment because it is soft on communism (!) and is moving too quickly towards a welfare state.

There are other elements, however. The "Old Right" continues the anti-statist, anti-imperialist and pro-civil liberty traditions of men such as Albert J. Nock and H. L. Mencken. Perhaps their most recent political representative was Bob Taft, senior. Their ideals are remarkably similar to those of the New Left.

The "Old" or libertarian Right until recently was content to cooperate with their more militaristic "allies" and allow the apostles of authoritarianism and war to speak relatively unchallenged for the Right as a whole. After all, they thought, weren't Buckley et al against "Big Government"?

The Vietnam war, conscription, and the growing authoritarianism of the New Right

has done much to open rightwing libertarian eyes. Thus a sizable portion of the Right is either moving ever closer to a consistent radical pro-liberty anti-statist position or is decidedly uncomfortable with its Buckleyite colleagues.

Here lies a valuable opportunity. If a dialogue of ideas could be opened between the New Left and the libertarian Right, the results could not help but be mutually beneficial. Each has much to offer the other, and the strength of the radical movement could be enhanced.

There are differences between the New Left and the Old Right. Right wing libertarians are more generally committed to a free market economy than the New Left, tend on the whole to be less revolutionary in their approach to modern problems, and in a few cases still have an unfortunate emotional hang-up with anti-communism. These are generalizations and there are many exceptions.

Despite differences, the similarities and common basic commitments make us more allies than enemies. This has not been lost on some of the libertarian Right. Ronald Hamowy, a former editor of the anti-conservative *Old Right New Individualist Review* had this to say about the New Left: "Proponents of a voluntarist society cannot help but be pleased at the emergence of a movement like the New Left. For both share an emotional and moral commitment to the individual and believe that the dehumanization of contemporary society is at least largely, the result of government encroachment into areas which are less and less controlled by the individual."

Kerry Thornley, a contributing editor to *Innovator*, an Old Right radical libertarian publication in California, has written that "The New Left is at the moment the most effective" (Continued on page 8)

CONTAINMENT AND CHANGE

HERE NOW

by Carl Oglesby
and Richard Schaul

AVAILABLE — \$1.45

write: Book Service — c/o SDS

DEAN RUSK in Texas

DEAN RUSK POSTER

Jeff Shero
Texas

Dean Rusk's visit to Austin prompted the usual fury of activity — people felt that they'd be letting down all the other protestors around the country if they didn't make the Secretary as uncomfortable as possible. Our demand was that he confront the young people who actually fight the war and answer our questions. A leaflet was produced with statements of fact followed by questions asking how these facts could possibly coincide with

the administration's avowed aims. A wanted poster was published. And of course when Rusk refrained from taking the pleasure of meeting with us, a demonstration and a march were held.

The notable aspect of our activity was the production of a hippyish Dean Rusk Wanted poster. The poster provoked heated debate within our own ranks, and serves as a case example for the investigation of new forms of middle class organizing. The debate which is continual here, deals with the question of what forms of resistance and education expose the reality of America best for middle class people. Most feel that the tactics which have been passed down from the civil rights movement are inadequate to reach young people and those in a university setting, that they often alienate rather than educate. Much of our thinking has been stimulated by the Provo in Amster-

dam and elsewhere.

Critics of the poster argued that the war in Vietnam was a deeply serious affair and that people would be negatively impressed by our seeming frivolity. The frivolous nature of the attack was seen to confirm the public's suspicion that we were merely attention seekers lacking a rigorous intellectual position. The war they said, could be carried on because people didn't treat it in a serious way, but thought of it as a contest, an abstract problem of power diplomacy, or worse, as an absurdity warranting cynicism. The poster as a protest form, they continued, contributes to the unreality of the Vietnamese war, and as war comics, TV and movies, makes it that much more easy to sell. During the arguments, advocates of this position would at times become indignant and shout things like, "Godamnit. Those are real people getting bombed. Let's show them some burned children. None of this psychodelic crap."

The counter thinking ran like this: The brutality of the war isn't conveyable and neither is a sophisticated analysis counter to the administration's line. Both leaflets and brutality pictures make people psychologically withdraw. Yet, there is a general awareness of the contradictions in the war. People's misgivings resulting from these contradictions aren't sufficient to compel them to refuse to fight in Vietnam or become openly hostile, because authority figures like Rusk reiterate the war's legitimacy. The average person will not dare dismiss the illogical and contradictory arguments of his leader. They have been trained to "respect" authority and will go kill in Vietnam because of it. The poster attacks Rusk's dignity and expertise in a basic way, and brings into question the sanctity of institutionalized authority. Once a person realizes that Rusk could be a "scheming conniver" or a "boob", he is unlikely to believe Rusk's contradictory arguments about the war, and is likely then to become an opponent of it. The thrust of his argument was that people in general have developed feelings about the war which are not likely to be unsettled by a leaflet or demonstration. They are still open though, to attacks on the American mythology, the real foundation, on which the politicians rely to carry out their policies.

Supporters of the poster stressed that people were so open that most would react to this type attack on the Secretary of State as fun. They said, "Look. Everybody will dig it. It will be put up in apartments. It ridicules Rusk and still turns people on." "The movement has to turn people on . . . it can't be a bore."

The posters were used in conjunction with other activities. They were nailed up on telephone polls throughout the town, they were placed all around the university, and some were even glued on the walls of the bathrooms of the state capitol building. The police spent a busy morning the next day searching them out, and destroying them. They were also passed out from a booth, with younger people responding favorably and many older people thinking it was negative, disrespectful, and rather stupid.

A firm conclusion hasn't been reached. SDS people here continue to discuss better means of communications, and increasingly feel uncomfortable in the picket sign marching syndrom. Movement people are slowly awakening to the fact that if they don't find new forms to express their understanding and discontent, they will never be able to become the major force in the middle class community.

AUTOMATION - III

Ed Jahn

Rates of Productivity

Fifty years ago, white-collar workers made up less than a fifth of the work force; today they make up nearly a half. This enormous historical growth of white-collar labor gives the advent of white-collar automation a special significance.

Writes C. Wright Mills in his classic work, *White Collar*: "Three trends lie back of the fact that the white-collar ranks have thus been the most rapidly growing of modern occupations: the increasing productivity of machinery used in manufacturing; the magnification of distribution; and the increasing scale of co-ordination." Of these three trends, the first is by far the most important.

The growth of employment in any given field results from the interaction of economic demand and the productivity of labor. As productivity goes up, fewer workers are needed to produce the same output; but as the demand for this output goes up, more workers are needed. If employment in one particular area is going up, therefore, it means that demand is rising faster than productivity.

Studies have shown that, by and large, the demand for the goods produced by basic industry and the demand for the services produced by white-collar workers have gone up at about the same rate. If white-collar employment has been going up faster than blue-collar, therefore, it is mainly because of the lower productivity of white-collar labor.

Assembly-line methods, powered machinery — the great advances of industrial technology of the past 200 years — have destroyed blue-collar jobs at an enormous rate. Weavers and blacksmiths were replaced by machines; but to replace clerks, bookkeepers, teachers, was not so easy.

But now it has become easy. A computer can do everything an accountant can do, and better. That there are still jobs for accountants is due solely to the fact that not all companies have the computers. That there are still jobs for draftsmen is due solely to the fact that not all companies have computerized visual-display design systems. Not all white-collar jobs are so easily eliminated — yet. But the development of new systems for automating clerical, managerial, and professional jobs is moving at a startling rate of speed.

The Federal government recently released figures on the growth of productivity in four government agencies — two of which have been automated, and two of which have not. The contrast could hardly be more dramatic. The figures cited below are the average rates of increase in labor productivity, over the period of years given, in per cent per year:

Agency	Period	Productivity Increase (per Year)
<i>Automated:</i>		
Veterans Administration Dept. of Insurance	1955-62	9.8%
Treasury, Division of Disbursement	1949-62	9.4%
<i>Non-Automated:</i>		
Post Office	1953-62	0.3%
Federal Aviation Agency, Systems Maintenance Service	1958-62	(4.0% decrease)

Source: Bureau of the Budget, *Measuring Productivity of Federal Government Organizations*.

For certain years, the VA Insurance Department registered rates of increase as high as 23.3%! Compare this with the stagnant or declining productivity of the non-automated agencies, and you get some idea of the enormous impact white-collar automation can have.

NATURE OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

White-collar jobs are middle-class jobs; white-collar workers are middle-class people. From a strict Marxist point of view, to be sure, a stenographer and a truck driver are both proletarians — since both make their living by working for an employer. Indeed, stenographers are economically more exploited than truck drivers — since the average stenographer's paycheck is smaller than the average truck driver's. Nonetheless, in their social attitudes, aspirations and way of life, most stenographers act and think in "middle-class" ways, while most truck drivers act

and think in "working-class" ways.

White-collar workers are more middle-class than blue-collar workers for reasons like these:

1. Some white-collar groups are paid more than blue-collar workers. Income statistics, however, show that many white-collar people make less than many blue-collar workers. Income is not the main difference between the two groups.

2. White-collar workers have much less unemployment than blue-collar. They may not earn as much, but their jobs are more secure — no layoffs, no seasonal unemployment.

3. If a truck driver makes more than a stenographer, it is because he belongs to a union. Blue-collar workers organize and fight for higher wages through their unions; most white-collar workers have not gone through this experience of organized struggle against the employers.

4. Blue-collar workers are constantly under pressure to produce more, work faster, and work harder. The pressure of work is less intense for white-collar workers; white-collar work is largely *bureaucratic work*, and while bureaucracy is psychologically oppressive it does not demand speed and efficiency.

All of these are direct or indirect results of the low level of productivity, the low efficiency, of white-collar labor. Because of this low productivity, the number of white-collar salaries tend to go up. The inefficiency of white-collar labor is reflected in bureaucratic working conditions — a slow, stultifying routine being a necessary part of low productive efficiency.

But automation is bringing the efficiency of the machine into white-collar work. It will cut down the growth of white-collar jobs; it will undercut job security; it will create white-collar unemployment. It will transform white-collar working conditions by tying the pace of work to the pace of machinery. Furthermore, it is the most "middle-class" types of jobs — clerical, managerial, lower-executive jobs — which are likely to be first and hardest hit.

WHITE COLLARS IN TRAINING

The business-school students you see around campus, who love the Free Enter- (Continued on page 8)

NAC MINUTES

submitted by Cathy Wilkerson

Members Present: Dee Jacobsen, Greg Calvert, Jean Tepperman, Steve Goldsmith, Cathy Wilkerson, Rich Berkowitz, Earl Silbar.

Others Present: Art Rosenblume, Jeff Segal, John Venezia, Fran Lathrop, Jean Venezia, Dick Shumann.

AGENDA

- 1) Finances
- 2) N. C. and Conference
- 3) National Draft Resistance Coordinator
- 4) Report on Draft Resistance
- 5) Request from Student Mobilization Committee.

1) FINANCES: The National Offices was compelled to borrow \$1,000.00 last week in order to pay back bill for New Left Notes. The paper nearly had to cease publication last week. We still owe over \$600.000 in back phone bills. Staff has not been paid full salary for five weeks now. Two recent fund raising mailings had poor returns and did not even pay for cost. Jean Venezia, the new national fund raiser for SDS has composed a strikingly original letter which will be sent out to another list. Copies may be obtained from her for a small donation.

2) N. C. AND CONFERENCE: The dates have been changed once again. See announcement, this issue, for details. A mild, restrained "I told you so" was offered to those who had previously voted against hiring a full time person to organize the N. C. in order to prevent this "tenuousness". The trouble came when Tufts was supposed to have it and at the last minute could not.

The NAC resolved that the planners of the N. C. should insure the availability of facilities all during the N. C. for workshops in the event that this type of format was deemed most advisable by the participants.

The NAC further resolved that two alternate agendas should be drawn up, each with supporting arguments, to be sent out in the first class chapter mailing with the announcements of the N. C. Please consult your local chapter contact if you have not yet read them. It was hoped that this would help further a reasonable (and therefore not prolonged and recurring) agenda debate and decision.

3) NATIONAL DRAFT RESISTANCE COORDINATOR: Jeff Segal was hired as national draft resistance Coordinator and will be working out of the National Office from now on.

Jeff was arrested for refusing induction in May, 1965 and sentenced to four years in prison October, 1966. The case is currently pending in the Illinois Appellate court and scheduled to come up for several months. Jeff will be writing for NLN in the near future.

4) A REPORT ON DRAFT RESISTANCE activity was given by various people - which deferred to increasing activity around the country.

5) STUDENT MOBILIZATION REQUEST: The student mobilization committee requested permission to put a phone in the SDS office so that they could have a central phone number for information etc. for the April 15 mobilization. The request was unanimously refused.

ON COOPTATION AND DISSENT

AN OPEN LETTER TO PAUL BOOTH

Paul,

I was shocked to learn of the telegram you sent to the Moderator people. What you said in the telegram didn't surprise me, for we are all pretty well aware of your position on national servitude. What bothers me is that you sent the telegram at all, knowing full well the people who would use it would include the fact that you are the former National Secretary of SDS. You also knew that our program of draft resistance and organizing is hardly compatible with the Moderator program.

If you feel that the New Left can work with the Moderator program, perhaps you feel that SDS no longer represents the New Left. Of course, you had a right to send that telegram, but you also had a responsibility to consider your action in the context of your having been National Secretary. Being neither Social Democratic nor Leninist,

ON COOPTATION AND DISSENT

NAC STATEMENT ON THE MODERATOR CONFERENCE

At the NAC meeting this week, the NAC also voted to submit the following statement to NLN in response to a few expressions of anxiety that the National Secretary's response to Paul Booth's telegram at the Moderator Conference (see NLN, Feb. 13, p. 11) was not entirely appropriate. Since the National Secretary was "acting on a clear mandate from the December N.C. and the NAC (see NAC minutes, Feb. 13, p. 12), the NAC decided that it was the NAC's responsibility to respond.

First, a brief review on the background of the Conference. To any but a casual observer, the purpose of the Moderator Conference was apparent; to try to incorporate the broadest possible range of student support - especially those elements of dissent - behind a strong endorsement of the concept of "voluntarism" as it was understood in the Moderator program. Previous to the Conference, Chairman Chickoring expended tremendous energy in trying to assure that an SDS officer would be present, as he seemed to think that SDS support would give the Conference a decided advantage in furthering its cooptive goals. (Chickoring knew of the draft resolution before the Conference and we can only wonder at his reasons for refusing to acknowledge that this resolution would inevitably be antagonistic to the Moderator proposal. Yet, Moderator statements previous to the Conference strongly implied that both SDS and SNCC would be in sympathy with the Moderator proposal.)

Furthermore, the agenda of the Conference manifested no real concern for allowing for any real decision-making sessions. It provided time only for STATEMENTS by various student group LEADERS or OFFICERS. When the NAC mandated the National Secretary to attend the Conference and represent the views embodied in the December N.C. resolution, it did so with the clear consciousness that to do that, the National Secretary would have to clearly dissent from the Moderator's position in order that his words not be distorted so as to imply support for the Moderator position. The format of the Conference was such that it was obviously structured to get at much support as possible for its proposal and to allow as little else as possible to occur.

The National Secretary's response to the telegram therefore, was determined by two basic issues. First, as a past officer of SDS and one who is identified with SDS, Paul had the clear responsibility to consult with the

current officers of the organization before he issued any statement which implicitly represented the members of the organization. Especially in this case, where the politics of the Conference were so clearly to coopt dissent and especially to try in any way possible to gain SDS endorsement of their "voluntarism" position. (Sherman Chickoring had solicited the telegram from Booth sometime after the first session of the Conference. His introduction of Paul as "past President of SDS" even though that was not on the telegram and the timing of the presentation are both indicative of Chickoring's desire to use a less precisely worded statement to undermine the clear - and disrupting - position of the National Secretary.)

Secondly, the NAC regrets the lack of sensitivity on the part of some of the "anxious", to the National Secretary's satirical humor in his use of the "Booth-McNamara proposal", in which he was clearly not equating Booth with McNamara, but again referring to the ability of the establishment to coopt the rhetoric and thereby the dissent of radicals. The Booth-Oglesby speech of 1965 very clearly intended something different by the concept of "Build, Not Burn" than McNamara did when he coopted the concept. That is not the issue here, just as Booth's political interpretation of the telegram in question is not the issue.

Rather, the question is: do we articulate our own position, that of the N.C. resolution in this case, clearly, through confrontation with the system and its lackeys, or do we allow ourselves to make statements which will be inevitably coopted and turned to the support of politics with which we clearly disagree. Note well, that despite the very clear confrontation which the National Secretary forced, the press release issued by Moderator after the Conference, which has been run in several college papers, DID imply general support - not excluding SDS - for the "voluntarist" position "AS OUTLINED BY MODERATOR." To turn upon each other and argue that "This is what I mean" is hardly constructive at this point. Rather, it is only through specific actions and confrontations that we can successfully insist upon our definitions of terms and issues.

In the opinion of the NAC, the National Secretary was striving to do this, and his response to Booth's telegram in his NLN report was clearly not a personal or factional attack at all - but was rather, an attempt to say: Brothers - shall we finally learn this lesson . . .

ON COOPTATION AND DISSENT

Dear Greg:

I joined SDS in the summer of 1963. For the first time since then, I felt ashamed to be a member when I read the last six inches of your piece on the draft issue in the February 13 NLN. The reference to a "Booth-McNamara Proposal" is really an abomination, and the most repulsive sort of unwarranted political attack from someone who as SDS' national secretary should feel responsible to nurture and protect - to criticize, but fairly and without venom - every part of the movement.

I don't know whether you ever saw the statement Booth and Oglesby read to the press in Washington in 1965, but it can hardly be described as McNamara-ist in policy or tone. (And by the way, I find it interesting that some people conveniently forget that Oglesby joined in the statement.) The statement began with a bitter attack on the Vietnam war, and ended with a proclamation of resistance to and refusal of the draft - hardly

we don't expel people for arguing an "incorrect" political line. Since SDS does not discipline its members, perhaps the best we can hope for would be some self-discipline on your part. I would point out to you that SNCC people who have disagreed with major policy decisions have made those disagreements public, rather than using the insidious tactic of implicitly claiming to represent their organization while they set about to undermine their position.

Freedom,
Mark Kleiman

McNamara's positions. And the build-not-burn proposal was not McNamara's notion of putting a system of conscription into the non-military services on top of conscription into the military, but a proposal for absolutely free choice as to whether anyone would enter the military at all, or if he did would fight in Vietnam; and it suggested that work for SNCC, SDS, and other parts of the movement would be the best kind of national service, which seems to be your own position.

The fact that McNamara, long after the Build-Not-Burn statement, tried to coopt some of the political sentiment and energy focused by the Build-Not-Burn statement without adopting the position of the statement, is no more surprising than that Lyndon Johnson should try, long after Bob Moses started a voter-registration project in Mississippi, to coopt that sentiment through his Voting Rights Act; and neither attempt at cooptation gives reasonable ground for criticism of Booth or Moses.

As for Booth's telegram to the Moderator meeting which upset you so, it sounds to me as if you found it sinister for reasons not intrinsic to the telegram. Do you think the Left cannot work with any "voluntarist position on service" whatsoever? A "voluntarist" position would mean to me, for example, the total abolition of conscription; I'm sure it means that to Booth; can the Left not work with that? And strategically, what could be better than getting a "nationwide open student convocation for Spring," which would

Foreign Policy Advisors

Paul Booth
Chicago

On October 18, 1966, the Department of State announced the creation of a series of civilian panels to advise on foreign policy.

Given the Executive Branch's tendency to make foreign policy with only perfunctory reference to Congress nowadays, SDS members should be aware of the names of these advisors as they are of the names of members of Congress.

They are being printed in NLN as a result of a large number of requests that have come to NLN for them.

ADVISORY PANEL TO BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS

Harding F. Bancroft, Executive Vice President
The New York Times

Andrew W. Cordier, Dean, School of International Affairs, Columbia University

Richard N. Gardner, Columbia University

Ernest A. Gross, Partner, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt and Mosle, New York, New York

Arthur Larson, World Rule of Law Center,
Duke University

Marshall D. Shulman, Fletcher School of Law
and Diplomacy, Tufts University

Francis O. Wilcox, Dean, The Johns Hopkins
University, School of Advanced International
Studies, Washington, D. C.

Joseph E. Johnson, President, Carnegie Endowment
for International Peace, New York,

Vernon McKay, The Johns Hopkins University
School of Advanced International Studies,
Washington, D. C.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, Partner, Debevoise,
Plimpton, Lyons and Gates, New York.

Kenneth W. Thompson, Vice President, The
Rockefeller Foundation.

Charles W. Yost, Senior Fellow, Council
on Foreign Relations, New York.

(to be continued in a future issue)

Gen. Patton

(Continued from page 3)

... Let the first bastards to find out be the goddam Germans. I want them German bastards to raise up on their hind legs and howl: 'Jesus Christ! IT'S THE GODDAMNED THIRD ARMY AND THAT SONOFABITCH PATTON AGAIN!'

"We want to get the hell over there and clean the goddamn thing up. And then we'll have to take a little jaunt against the purple pissing Japs and clean them out before the Marines get all the credit.

"There's one great thing you men will be able to say when you go home. You may all thank God that thirty years from now, when you are sitting at the fire with your grandson on your knee and he asks you what you did in the Great World War II, you won't have to say: 'I shoveled shit in Louisiana'"

almost certainly be totally opposed to conscription, to the war, and to any compulsory national service plan?

Perhaps my merely humanist-liberal brain cannot detect the real problems in these proposals, and I would be glad to have you or anyone else in NLN explore them. But you did not do so, and resorted to mere name-calling instead. I think you owe Booth an apology and all SDS members an intelligent critical examination of the issues.

Sincerely,

Arthur I. Waskow
Resident Fellow,
Institute for Policy Studies

FILM TIPS

(Continued from page 5)

be seen at its source in these elementary examples of the effects to be gained by the composition of images in counterpoint to sound, music, and speech." - the Museum of Modern Art Film Library. The "Why We Fight" series consists of *Prelude to War* (1943); *The Nazis Strike* (1943); *Divide and Conquer* (1943); *The Battle of Britain* (1943); *The Battle of Russia* (1944); *War Comes to America* (1945). The films are available from the Museum of Modern Art Film Library.

Triumph of the Will

Direction, artistic supervision, and editing by Leni Riefenstahl. German dialog with English sub-titles. 120 minutes.

It is difficult to say whether this is a film or a political event, for the 6th Annual Congress of the Nazi party was orchestrated in such a way that Leni Riefenstahl and her crew of no less than thirty camera men could film it. The film is a technically brilliant masterpiece, the crowning achievement of Nazi propaganda, the official propaganda film of the Nazi party. No one who has seen it can ever forget it. Of it Siegfried Kracauer, the historian of the German cinema, has written:

"This film represents an inextricable mixture of a show simulating German reality and of German reality maneuvered into a show. Only a nihilistic-minded power that disregarded all traditional human values could so unhesitatingly manipulate the bodies and the souls of a whole people to conceal its own nihilism. The Nazi leaders pretended to act in the name of Germany. But the Reich's eagle, frequently detailed in the film, always appears against the sky like Hitler himself - a symbol of a superior power used as a means of manipulation. Triumph of the Will is the triumph of a nihilistic will. And it is a frightening spectacle to see many an honest, unsuspecting youngster enthusiastically submit to his corruption, and long columns of exalted men march towards the barren realm of this will as though they themselves wanted to pass away."

The Audio Film Center, distributor of Triumph of the Will is restricting use of this film to "film study groups and educational institutions." If you want to exhibit the film you should make appropriate arrangements.

The Silent Village (Great Britain)

33 minutes. Produced by the Crown Film Unit, 1943.

"The crime of Lidice, in which an entire Czechoslovak village was wiped out in an act of Hitlerian vengeance, is recreated as if it had happened to a Welsh village. Much of the dialogue is in Welsh." Available from the Museum of Modern Art Film Library.

The Plow That Broke The Plains

25 minutes. Produced in 1936 by the U. S. Farm Resettlement Administration. Written and directed by Pare Lorentz with music by Virgil Thomson.

"A dramatic exposition of the social and economic history of the Great Plains, from the settlement of the prairies by cattlemen and farmers through the World War I boom to drought and depression. This famous film gave the initial impetus to the American documentary film and established its director as one of the important film talents." Available from the Museum of Modern Art Film Library.

The River

30 minutes. Produced in 1937 for the Farm Security Administration. Written and directed by Pare Lorentz with music by Virgil Thomson.

The "story of the Mississippi River basin, of the vast industrial and agricultural expansion which led to its exploitation and ruin, and of the later efforts to control its floods by reforestation and the TVA. Beautifully photographed, and with a much-quoted lyrical commentary, this film has come to be considered a masterpiece of the American screen." Available from the Museum of Modern Art and from most university film libraries.

Louisiana Story

77 minutes. 1948. Directed by Robert Flaherty with music by Virgil Thomson.

This romantic story of the coming of oil drilling to rural Louisiana was sponsored by the Standard Oil Company and has become an American classic. Available from most university film libraries.

The Best Source for Good, Cheap Information on Films

NATIONAL CENTER FOR FILM STUDY
1307 South Wabash Ave., Chicago, Illinois, 60605.

The National Center for Film Study, an affiliate of the National Catholic Office for Motion Pictures, prepares and distributes study materials needed by those who wish to begin film programs in their group. The Center will supply those interested with a packet of its film study material (bibliography, glossary of film terms, starting a film society, sample study guide, etc) for fifty cents. The Center also provides excellent study guides for more than one hundred and twenty movies which are significant examples of various aspects of the film art. An index and supplement listing information about films for which guides are available will be sent on request.

WHY NOT . . . ?

SUMMER CONFERENCE

(Continued from page 5)

ticular vocational skill or interest.

A critical point here is that the conference not be seen by the "resource people" as a chance to proselytize or recruit for their particular program or method of operating. I think we need sober and thoughtful critical descriptions and evaluations of work being done or contemplated. Everyone should feel open to strong criticism, and be humble in their approach to an important and challenging problem.

Working Papers: Too often these are just items to be picked up and taken home unread by conference participants. A lot of thought is needed to figure out ways to make these papers integral parts of the conference. I must say I have few ideas worth mentioning on this score. One important element is that the papers that are written be used in such a way that they promote a certain uniformity of background among the people who attend. This is bound to be a quite heterogeneous group.

Recruitment: A number of possibilities: advertising in *New Left Notes*, the *New South Student*, and many other organizational publications. Mailing through REP, SDS, SSOC, SUPA, etc. The conference should be described at the SDS National Council meeting so delegates can take the ideas back to their campuses to gauge response. Perhaps most important is the need for people to travel around speaking about the conference.

Recruitment of the resource people must also be done thoughtfully, though I have less ideas on this score. A major question is whether we want to deemphasize "big name" people who might tend, willingly or not, to dominate the conference. Finally it is important that in terms of both resource people and participants, there be a good distribution among the various professions, and we should be flexible about changing the content of the conference depending on the response.

A Final Point: This conference is at best a small beginning towards dealing with the question of radicals in the professions. Especially given the quite limited pretensions of this conference in terms of scale, purpose, substance, and constituency, it is no substitute for the greater program need: that of establishing a broader community of dialogue among those already trying to be "radicals in the professions" who may desire and need the kind of communication I am here mainly concerned with regarding younger activists.

Hopefully this short piece will prompt response. Certainly I myself feel like responding to it just a day after I first wrote it. By March 18th, I will try to have a more detailed prospectus for the conference, and maybe one of those good working papers I mentioned. Maybe some of you will too . . .

OPENING to the Right

(Continued from page 6)

and popular radical opposition to this Establishment power structure. Its main weakness continues to be lack of a long range program. The Old Right, on the other hand, is strong on theory but feeble on action - it remains largely an ivory tower for disestablished economists and passive pacifists." If these two can be united "a genuine and lasting resistance to the American Welfare-Warfare State will emerge."

One of the most eminent of former Old Right economists, Dr. Murray Rothbard, along with two other libertarians, Leonard Liggio of the Free School of New York and the American Liberation League, and H. George Resch has established *Left and Right*, perhaps the first magazine to bridge the communications gap of those on Left and Right. In their inaugural issue, they stated:

"The present day categories of 'left' and 'right' have become misleading and obsolete, and . . . the doctrine of liberty contains elements corresponding with both contemporary left and right . . . Hence a creative approach to liberty must transcend the confines of contemporary political shibboleths."

In a later issue Rothbard went on to say:

"The crucial contribution to both ends and means by the New Left as well as its most direct form of confrontation with the Old Left is the concept of 'participatory democracy!' In the broadest sense, the idea of 'participatory democracy' is profoundly individualist and libertarian: for it means that each individual, even the poorest and most humble, should have the right to full control over the decisions that affect his own life. Participatory democracy is at the same time . . . a theory of politics and a theory of organization, an approach to political affairs and to the way New Left organizations (or any organizations, for that matter) should function."

Can libertarians of left and right unite? The advantages of success make it worth the effort.

AUTOMATION

(Continued from page 6)

prise System, fly Confederate flags, and join the YAF, are like sheep being fattened for the slaughter. Today they dream confidently of an easy life of money-making; it is a sordid dream, but it is all they have; they will live to see it smashed by the computers.

We, as college students, and all the college students around us, are nothing but white-collar workers-in-training. Most SDS'ers are liberal-arts or science majors; we are being trained for fields which are not likely to be automated as soon or as thoroughly as office work and management. But anyone who has read of the experiments in automating teaching, laboratory procedures, engineering, and even psychiatry, must realize that virtually every profession will eventually be automated - partially if not completely.

For us, "partial" automation may be worse than complete automation. The teaching machine, for example, will probably not eliminate human teachers completely. But those of us who become teachers will be forced to work with teaching-machine methods - to become accomplices in the mechanical stultification of children's minds.

For us, then, this is perhaps the most important thing about automation. Of the issues radical politics is concerned with, automation is one most likely to affect us in our daily lives - not for the few years we spend in school, but for the next ten, twenty, thirty years we will spend working for a living.

"What will you do when an electronic circuit learns your job? . . . We are not used to the idea that we might have to ask ourselves this question. Indeed, we may not have to for the next ten years, or even twenty. But, eventually, we will.

send news to nln now

NEW LEFT NOTES
Room 206
1605 W. Madison
Chicago, Ill. 60612
Return Requested

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

Jill HAMBERG
710 Willow ave
Hoboken N J 07030

STARVING BILLIONS BRIGHTEN OUTLOOK FOR U. S. AGRIBUSINESS

from: NACLA Newsletter
North American Congress on Latin America
Room 924, 475 Riverside Drive
N.Y. C., 10027

The prospects in the Third World for U.S. agribusiness have recently drawn much attention from the business press. FORTUNE and FORBES have run lengthy articles on how, as FORBES puts it, "the world's starving billions mean millions for U. S. corporations."

Most Americans don't realize that agribusiness (i.e., the sum total of all operations in the manufacture and distribution of agricultural products and supplies) accounted for \$271 billion in transactions, employed about one-third of the American labor force, and involved more than 50% of all corporate and agricultural investment.

An increasing squeeze of population growth against food production in the Third World has stimulated U. S. producers of food crops, cattle, fertilizers, drugs and food processing equipment to make their moves abroad. Now such household favorites as Campbell, Beech-Nut, Borden, General

Foods, Heinz, Green Giant, General Mills, National Dairy, and Pepsi along with such industrial giants as American Cyanamid, Cities Service (oil), Continental Oil, John Deere, W. R. Grace, International Harvester, Olin-Mathieson and Upjohn are increasing overseas agribusiness operations. Their activities have been facilitated by the foreign aid and economic development funds that are supposed to be "helping others to help themselves." An aid program is at work here, to be sure. But it is an aid program in which the actual beneficiaries are generally overseas extensions of U. S. corporations. According to the investment house of Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith*, U. S. companies which are in a position to take advantage of foreign aid subsidies are showing signs of tremendous growth.

*"FOOD AND THE WORLD'S NEEDS, a 32 page resume" available free on request from Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and Smith, Inc., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022.