

A HISTORY OF THE NEW LEFT, 1960-1968

James O'Brien

James O'Brien is active in Connections and Madison SDS, and is a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin doing doctoral work on the history of the New Left. He would appreciate comments and leads for sources (especially primary sources) being sent to him c/o Radical America, 1237 Spaight, Madison, Wis. 53703.

This article originally appeared in three installments in the May-June, September-October, and November-December 1968 issues of Radical America.

published by
New England Free Press
791 Tremont St.
Boston, Mass. 02118

35¢

Roughly since 1960 there has been a social movement, composed mainly of students, which has threatened the equilibrium of American society. This threat was not, at first, unambiguously radical: it was liberal in the nature of its surface demands (such as racial integration, an end to nuclear testing, and free speech) but radical in its distrust of compromise and in its proclivity for direct action. Over a period of years, form and content merged, and the result was something that could legitimately be called a New Left. The concept of participatory democracy, as evolved by SDS and SNCC, offered both a mode of operation and a critique of welfare-state liberalism. Moreover, it furnished the basis for a revolt against the university environment in which most New Leftists found themselves. The idea that the 'normal channels' are instruments of manipulation, and that people must be motivated to make decisions for themselves, was clearly applicable to the university as well as to other areas of society; this is what made student radicals realize that they no longer had simply to fight other people's battles.

Since 1965, the New Left has undergone a number of changes, both in its conception of society and in its strategic thinking. Draft resistance, underground newspapers, guerrilla theatre, and above all black power, are terms that would have evoked few signs of recognition three short years ago. But none of them should be surprising in the light of what the New Left had become by 1965. For they are all variations on a theme: the recognition that American liberalism was not enough, that the good society was one in which people shaped their own institutions to meet their own needs.

1960-65

As originally conceived, this article was to be strictly a bibliographical essay, in which I would point out some books and articles helpful in explaining what the New Left is and how it developed. It became clear, however, that in order to make it useful to anyone but scholars (with the time and the library facilities to chase down the sometimes esoteric materials listed here), I would have to write it as a narration, with bibliographical notes. Thus the article is much longer than I had envisaged. The bibliographical references are handled in an arbitrary, if not actually a whimsical, way, some of them being incorporated into the text and others being relegated to a long footnote section at the end; the only criterion was whether they tended to interrupt the narration.

Every generation likes to feel it is doing something different, and the perspective of this article - I believe that the New Left is qualitatively different from radical movements in the past - may very well be distorted by the experience of its author. I lived through the entire decade of the 1950s without once hearing the words 'socialism' and 'communism' spoken in any but a pejorative sense; my first political act was as a college freshman in the spring of 1960, when I joined a picket of Woolworth's in support of the southern sit-in movement. Because I have experienced the New Left directly, and have only read about the Old Left, I may have tended to exaggerate the difference between them.

There are four books which attempt to give an overall picture of the new radicalism of the 1960s. All of them were published in 1966 (and therefore presumably conceived in 1965, when the mass public first became aware of the New Left); none of them is really satisfactory. One, Phillip A. Luce's The New Left (D. McKay), can be dismissed at the outset. It consists of bitter recollections of the author's days as a leader of the sectarian Progressive Labor Party, information on the DuBois Clubs furnished him by a researcher for the House Un-American Activities Committee, and virtually nothing at all on the two most important New Left groups: Students for a Democratic Society and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. A far better book is Jack Newfield's A Prophetic Minority (New American Library), which is devoted almost entirely to the latter two groups (Newfield was once an active member of SDS). The problem with this book is Newfield's tendency to romanticize, to telescope the complex events of 1960-65 and to write glowingly about the 'spirit' of the movement without trying to take seriously its changing ideas. Newfield is attracted, above all, to style: that is why it has been possible for him to write enthusiastically about both the New Left and Robert Kennedy. Mitchell Cohen and Dennis Hale edited a useful book of readings, The New Student Left (New American Library), which consists mainly of SDS working papers and articles from The Activist, a quarterly magazine of which both Cohen and Hale had been editors. Like the magazine, this anthology may err on the side of dullness. There is no real sense of the dynamics of the New Left, and thus the book was somewhat dated even at the time it appeared. Further, the selections are far less anti-liberal and more anti-communist than the movement had become by 1966. Finally, The New Radicals, edited by Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, in Vintage paperback, offers a collection of readings that supplements those in the Cohen-Hale book. Unlike the other, The New Radicals has many of its documents in abridged form, which is unfortunate. The 83-page introduction, which is written from outside the struggle, somehow does not ring true.

The 1950s

The annals of the American Left in the 1950s are short. The Communist party and all organizations tainted as 'socialistic' had been isolated and discredited by the end of the previous decade; the Korean War and McCarthyism finished the job, making political unorthodoxy of any sort dangerous. By the middle of the decade the Communist, Socialist, and Socialist Workers parties stood as hollow caricatures of left-wing parties -- and they were the Left. Clancy Sigal's personal novel, Going Away, written in 1956, vividly portrays an ex-Communist traveling across the country, encountering his past at every turn and finding nothing but futility. It is probably the best single work to read on radicalism in the 1950s.¹ Toward the end of the decade there were signs of polite dissent on the issue of nuclear weapons policy, symbolized by the formation of the National Committee for

x 1778

a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) in late 1957. Two congressmen elected in the Democratic landslide of 1958, William Meyer of Vermont and Byron Johnson of Colorado, raised the 'peace' issue in Congress before being defeated for re-election in 1960. A few pacifists grouped around Liberation magazine engaged in small-scale acts of civil disobedience which were endlessly reported and analyzed in the magazine. In the area of civil rights, since the successful Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott of 1956 (which saw the rise of prominence of Martin Luther King, Jr.), there had been no large-scale movement anywhere in the nation. Twice during the school year of 1958-59, southern black high school students (plus assorted students from the North) took part in Washington, D.C., marches for integrated schools organized by Bayard Rustin. They drew 10,000 and 25,000 respectively, but caused little splash and have since been all but forgotten.

The academic world in the 1950s was in a state that is difficult for present-day undergraduates to conceive. There was a virtual absence of radical social theory, the most important exceptions being the much-persecuted Marxist economist Paul Baran, who was lucky enough to have tenure at Stanford, and the independent radical C. Wright Mills, who during the course of the decade turned from social theory (White Collar, 1951; The Power Elite, 1956) to a polemical attack on American foreign policy, The Causes of World War Three. Mills was certainly the intellectual with the greatest influence on the emergence of the New Left, but during the '50s he had few followers. The state of student uninvolvedness on the nation's campuses is pictured very well in three annual symposia published in The Nation: 'The Careful Young Men', 9 March 1957; 'The Class of '58 Speaks Up', 18 May 1958; and 'Tension Beneath Apathy', 16 May 1959. The campus mood is also depicted in a book of frank, anonymous essays written by a Princeton senior and published in The Unsilent Generation, edited by Otto Butz (Rinehart, 1958). The book, which cost Butz his job as a Princeton faculty member, showed some of the writers to be cynical, even desperate, about the lives that lay ahead of them -- but none of them willing to put his malaise in political terms. Similarly, the popularity of J.D. Salinger's novel of innocent youth in a crass society, Catcher in the Rye (the novel for young people in the late 1950s) was another indication of a vague discontent without any political outlet. The only real signs of change on the campuses were cultural rather than political: the beginnings of a folk music revival (spread mainly by students from New York City), and the popularity of Beat writers such as Jack Kerouac and Allen Ginsberg.

The Beginnings

The importance of the southern sit-in movement in bringing political awareness to the campuses would be difficult to overestimate. In the South, the sit-ins transferred the initiative in the civil rights struggle to a new generation which has retained it ever since. For thousands of students, in the North as well as the South, they were the first hint that there was a world beyond the campus that demanded some kind of personal response.

The sit-ins were touched off by four freshman students at an all-black college in Greensboro, N.C. On February 1, 1960, they sat at a whites-only lunch counter in a local Woolworth's store, politely requesting coffee and refusing the leave until the store closed at the end of the day. Students at other North Carolina colleges quickly picked up the idea, and within two weeks there had been sit-ins in fifteen cities in five southern states. (Within a year the number of participants in sit-ins and other demonstrations touched off by them had grown to more than 50,000 in a hundred cities.) The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee was set up in April 1961, with help from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, as a loose liaison of sit-in leaders from across the South.

The best account of the birth of the southern student movement is Howard Zinn's SNCC: The New Abolitionists, which covers SNCC up to the time of its writing in early 1964. Zinn taught at Spelman College in Atlanta during this period, and he had a first-hand acquaintance with the sit-ins and with the SNCC leaders. There were good contemporary reports on the sit-ins by Michael Walzer in Dissent ('A Cup of Coffee and a Seat', Spring 1960; 'The Politics of the New Negro', Summer

1960) and by Helen Fuller in the New Republic ("We Are All So Very Happy", 25 April 1960; 'Southern Students Take Over', 2 May 1960). A special report by the Southern Regional Council, The Student Protest Movement: A Recapitulation (29 September 1961), has some useful factual information. I have not come across anything (except scattered allusions, all reporting essentially the same experience) about the impact which the sit-ins had on northern campuses. Yet it appears that more than a hundred northern colleges had some kind of demonstration in support of the sit-ins. It seems safe to say that for most campuses, these were the first political demonstrations in years.

Something else happened in the spring of 1960 that was to have a profound influence on the stirring of campus political interest, although in this case the effect was a delayed one. In May of that year hundreds of Berkeley students joined in a demonstration at the San Francisco City Hall against the House Un-American Activities Committee, which was conducting catch-all hearings on communism in the San Francisco area. One of the subpoenaed witnesses was a Berkeley sophomore. San Francisco police turned fire hoses on seated demonstrators, dragged many of them down the full length of the City Hall steps, and arrested sixty-eight. (Charges were later dropped against all but one, who was acquitted.) Within months, the Committee had impounded enough TV film to produce a lurid, gerrymandered movie entitled 'Operation Abolition', in which J. Edgar Hoover and HUAC members claimed to offer documentary proof that (a) the Communists had planned the demonstration in order to subvert students and get rid of their enemy the Committee, and (b) the violence had been started by the student demonstrators. The background music was reminiscent of World War Two patriotic movies.

For the next year and a half, 'Operation Abolition' was a staple item on the right-wing banquet and camp meeting circuit. More importantly, however, it served to discredit the Committee (and J. Edgar Hoover) among students on scores of campuses. The Bay Area Student Committee for the Abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, formed in September 1960, sent speakers and literature around the country pointing out distortions and inaccuracies in the film. The American Civil Liberties Union made a film of its own, supporting the student version and calling for the Committee's abolition. On campuses where both sides of the story were heard, the Berkeley students emerged a clear winner.²

Peace Issues

For a number of reasons, one of them undoubtedly being the distraction of the Kennedy-Nixon presidential campaign in the fall, there was less campus protest activity in the 1960-61 school year than the previous spring. Sit-ins continued in many areas of the South, but the idea of sit-ins had lost much of its early excitement. The sit-ins had, however, helped to open the campuses to new ideas, and during this period the thinking of many students was being changed by these ideas. 'Operation Abolition' and its critics made their way eastward from Berkeley; chapters of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee were started on a few campuses; the number of 'controversial' speakers on campus multiplied; and student governments began considering resolutions on national affairs. President Kennedy's proposal of the Peace Corps may have been one factor in the injection of off-campus concerns, and his attempt to overthrow the Cuban government at the Bay of Pigs may have been another.

It was after the Berlin crisis in the summer of 1961 (when the East Germans erected 'the Wall') that the groundwork was laid for a fair-sized campus peace movement. In the tense atmosphere created at that time, the Soviet Union broke its moratorium on nuclear testing; a few days later the U.S. announced that it would resume underground - but not yet atmospheric - testing. In addition, the administration decided to push for a massive civil defense program, stressing fallout shelters even in private homes.

The two organizations which were most active in agitating on the peace issue among students were the Student Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (Student SANE) and the Student Peace Union (SPU). Student SANE was an appendage of national SANE, an

affiliation which proved fatal to the student group. Following a threatened expose of alleged communists in SANE by Senator Thomas Dodd in 1960, the national board had adopted a policy of excluding persons with 'totalitarian' sympathies. The leaders of Student SANE refused to apply this policy to their own organization, and after much futile sparring, voted to disaffiliate and disband in February 1962.³

The Student Peace Union had been formed by students at a number of midwestern colleges in 1959, at which time campus peace activity was at a very low level. In the early spurt of student political interest following the sit-ins, SPU had collected 10,000 student signatures for a petition to the world leaders gathered at the 1960 summit conference. By the summer of 1961, SPU's national office had come under the control of members of the Young People's Socialist League (YPSL), the youth affiliate of the Socialist Party. Under this leadership, SPU adopted a 'third-camp' position, to the left of SANE but still attempting to assess equal blame for the cold war to the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

During the 1961-62 school year, SPU chapters organized demonstrations and educational campaigns against nuclear testing and against fallout shelters (which it said made nuclear war more likely by fostering the illusion that casualties could be significantly cut). In the fall of 1961 students from Grinnell, Carleton, and a few other colleges fasted and picketed at the White House against the resumption of above-ground nuclear testing, and in February 1962 more than 5000 students went to Washington to picket the White House (and the Soviet embassy) and to attempt to persuade government officials to their point of view. They were met by condescension and skepticism, as when Chet Hollifield, a leader of the liberal congressional bloc, called their position paper 'a bunch of baloney'. Atmospheric testing was resumed within a few weeks. This march, though supported by SPU, was initiated by the Harvard-Radcliffe peace group, TOCSIN. It is described in Steven V. Roberts, "'Something Had to be Done"' (The Nation, 3 March 1962).

By the end of the 1961-62 school year, SPU's membership had tripled to more than 3000, which meant a far larger number of students involved in local chapter activities. Still, it would be easy to overestimate the extent to which the peace movement actually permeated the campuses. More often than not, the peace activists were regarded with indifference or distaste by the majority of students. Moreover, while the people who engaged in peace activities were also the ones most interested in civil rights, these concerns were rarely linked together. And, there were only scattered instances of students taking action on issues that directly involved the university. (Exceptions were a sit-in at the University of Chicago demanding an end to discrimination in University-owned tenements and a successful student strike at Queens College protesting a ban on communist speakers.) At many colleges, the closest thing to a synthesis of on-campus and off-campus concerns was the formation of liberal political parties stressing both types of issues. These included SLATE at Berkeley (the first), POLIT at Chicago (whose slogan was 'A Free University in a Free Society'), VOICE at Michigan, the Progressive Student League at Oberlin, ACTION at Columbia, and a score of others. For the most part, however, these parties included people ranging from liberal Republicans to Trotskyists, and they hashed out stands on individual issues rather than developing a general critique of society.

Enter SDS

It was in early 1962 that Students for a Democratic Society began to emerge as an important source of strategic thinking for campus activists. SDS grew out of the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID), the insignificant youth affiliate of the social democratic League for Industrial Democracy. Although James Farmer and Gabriel Kolko had each held the office of executive secretary of SLID during the 1950s, it had never made any appreciable headway against the prevailing deadness of campus life. Despite a change in title in 1960, and despite the growth of student political interest that spring, SDS was still more dead than alive in 1961. What brought it to life was the work of two leaders who emerged from the University of Michigan, Al Haber and Tom Hayden. Haber, as president of SDS in 1960-61, led a fight within the organization to change its emphasis away from study groups. He and Hayden, who was a founder of VOICE, developed contacts with student acti-

vists elsewhere in the country, arguing that SDS could play an important role: that major political issues were interconnected (e.g. Southern Democrats in Congress were supporters of the Cold War as well as being segregationists) and that a movement had to be created to work for social change on a broad front. A preliminary meeting in Ann Arbor in December 1961 resulted in a call for a founding convention in June. Hayden was commissioned to draft an SDS manifesto, which has become known as the 'Port Huron Statement' because the convention was held at a United Auto Workers center in Port Huron, Michigan.

Along with two other early documents, a Hayden speech at Michigan in March (reprinted in the Cohen-Hale anthology as 'Student Social Action') and Al Haber's pamphlet 'Students and Labor', the Port Huron manifesto stands as a remarkable statement of the social analysis which SDS brought to the new student movement. It ran to 64 single-spaced mimeographed pages. Its main thrust was our generation's discovery of the hollowness of the American dream. It called for massive public pressure to make the American government and economy responsive to popular control, and declared the bankruptcy of America's Cold War policies. It argued that 'not even the liberal and socialist preachings of the past seem adequate to the forms of the present', and pledged SDS to work for the creation of a 'new left'. While speaking hopefully of the growth of the civil rights and peace movements, and cautiously of organized labor, the Port Huron Statement put special emphasis on the potential of the university as a radical center. 'Social relevance, the accessibility of knowledge, and internal openness -- these together make the university a potential base and agency in a movement for social change.'

SNCC and the South

At the same time that SDS and the new campus political parties were stressing the potential of the university, SNCC was moving away from its original university base and toward grass roots organizing in the worst areas of the South. The period of direct action which had started with the sit-ins came to a climax in the late spring and summer of 1961 with the freedom rides, integrated bus trips into the South during which many of the riders were brutally beaten while local police stood by. SNCC people helped lead and sustain the freedom rides, but in a series of discussions over the summer they weighed the advantages of undertaking voter registration work as well as direct action, this step was indirectly encouraged by the Kennedy administration. In the fall the decision was made to take this step. Robert Moses had gone into Mississippi in the summer and was already conducting a voter registration school in McComb. He was joined by others, while another group of SNCC workers moved to Albany, Georgia, to begin a city-wide mass movement among the Negroes there. In all, sixteen decided to drop out of school and do full-time work for SNCC, living at a subsistence level among the people they were trying to organize. They were joined by an increasing number of others, until by the fall of 1963 there were more than 150 full-time workers, most of whom had come from college campuses. Meeting with violence and police brutality in McComb and Albany, SNCC only persisted and even spread out further into the Mississippi delta and southwestern Georgia.

Although the Kennedy administration had encouraged SNCC to emphasize voter registration, it was not willing to provide protection for those who went out and engaged in it. The pattern which was to become so common in the South -- local authorities permitting, or taking part in, beatings while FBI men looked on and took notes -- became established during this period. Each of these episodes, and each futile telegram sent to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, increased the cynicism of the SNCC workers about the administration's sincerity. The limited coverage which the beatings got in the northern press also fed the bitterness.⁴

As SNCC's organizing drives caught hold in 1962 and early '63, it took on a new importance in the North as well as the South. The peace movement, which had seemed so promising on the northern campuses during the 1961-62 school year, lost much of its steam. SPU membership climbed slightly, and most of its chapters engaged in some kind of protest activity at the time of the Cuban missile crisis in October, but the excitement of the previous year was soon dissipated. Many students had worked hard on behalf of 'peace candidates' in the November elections; the results

were almost uniformly disappointing. Some of the SPU chapters became embroiled in factional disputes between members of YPSL and the Trotskyist Young Socialist Alliance, climaxed at the national convention in June when the leadership won a pyrrhic victory. The signing of a limited test ban treaty by the U.S. and Russia in June only ratified the decline of the peace movement as an important factor on American campuses.

At the same time, SDS was making steady but unspectacular progress in recruiting new members. By the end of the school year, there were still fewer than a thousand members. Particularly after the missile crisis and the November election, campus political activity in the North came to be centered almost exclusively in civil rights. There was a great increase in fund-raising in support of SNCC, undertaken partly by SDS and the fledgling Northern Student Movement and partly by student governments belonging to the National Student Association. SNCC made effective use of the annual NSA congresses to inform northern student leaders of its work and to lay the groundwork for fund-raising. The Northern Student Movement undertook tutorial programs in northern ghettos and also aided in efforts to force companies to hire more Negro employees. In the early spring, students on northern campuses collected food and clothing for poor Negroes in Leflore County, Mississippi, after the county supervisors cut off all welfare payments. Civil rights songs, often popularized by the SNCC Freedom singers, became popular at many colleges. These songs, typically, were adaptations of songs used in the labor union drives of the 1930s (which had in turn been based on Negro spirituals). However, Josh Dunson's Freedom In the Air: Song Movements of the Sixties (International paperback, 1965) shows the impetus which the civil rights movement gave to the popularity of topical folk songs in the middle of the decade.

There are very few sources on student political activity in the North in this period. SDS had a mimeographed discussion bulletin by this time, and SPU continued to publish its own monthly bulletin. The Northern Student Movement is discussed in an article by Harlan Randolph in Educational Record, Fall 1964. Philip Altbach, former SPU head, discussed the status of the campus peace movement in 'The Quiet Campus', New Leader, 5 August 1963. The title was apt.

Crisis in Civil Rights

In the late spring and summer of 1963, the civil rights movement thrust itself upon the nation's consciousness with a new intensity. There were hundreds of demonstrations, triggered by a protest led by Martin Luther King in Birmingham. Civil unrest became so widespread by the early summer that President Kennedy, who had been extremely cautious in taking any action on civil rights, was forced to make a special address to Congress in which he proposed a comprehensive bill including a ban on segregation in public facilities, under the commerce clause of the Constitution. This bill was finally passed, after being strengthened on its way through Congress. In the course of 1963 more than 20,000 civil-rights demonstrators were arrested, and the pressure of the mass protests forced some degree of integration in scores of southern communities in advance of passage of the federal law. Civil rights became the primary topic for newspapers, mass magazines, and radio shows, and foundation money was suddenly made available to the leading civil rights groups. SNCC moved into Alabama for the first time with a voter registration project in Selma, pushed further into southwest Georgia, and continued its work in Mississippi. In the winter of 1962-63 the pioneer SNCC workers in that state had helped to form the Council of Federated Organizations (COFO), in which SNCC, the NAACP, CORE, and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference joined together to support the voter registration effort. The main force within COFO, from the beginning, was SNCC, since it was SNCC which provided the shock troops to organize in the most hostile areas. (This was the general pattern during the early '60s: young people from SNCC, and to a lesser extent CORE, did the most dangerous and least-publicized work.) In the fall of 1963 COFO, aided by Yale and Stanford students, sponsored a 'freedom ballot' in which over 80,000 black Mississippians 'voted' for state NAACP leader Aaron Henry for governor. It was out of this experiment that the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party was to grow the following year.

At this stage in SNCC's existence it tended to be lumped together in the public

mind with the older, established civil rights groups; the familiar spectrum, right to left, was the Urban League, the NAACP, King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, CORE, and SNCC. At the end of August, however, at the gigantic March on Washington organized by Bayard Rustin and supported by all the civil rights groups, chairman John Lewis of SNCC briefly disturbed the image of harmony. In his speech he denounced the Kennedy administration for failing to enforce existing civil rights laws, and in particular for not protecting southern Negroes against violence.⁵

ERAP

The burgeoning of civil rights activity in 1963 helped lay the groundwork, within SDS, for the emergence of a new political strategy. In a sense, SDS prepared to follow SNCC away from the campus. America and the New Era, a 30-page position paper adopted by the June 1963 SDS convention, was in effect an attack on the New Frontier and a call for grass-roots insurgency focusing particularly on economic issues. The New Era document charged that '70 million Americans are living below officially-defined minimum standards of decency -- with incomes of less than \$100 a week for families of four.' Of organized liberalism the document said: 'A style of politics which emphasizes cocktail parties and seminars rather than protest marches, local reform movements, and independent bases of power, cannot achieve leverage with respect to an establishment-oriented administration and a fundamentally reactionary Congressional oligarchy.'

Still, America and the New Era was eclectic in its proposals for action. The most important catalytic agent in shifting SDS's attention to the organizing of poor people came later in 1963 as the result of the experiences of its Swarthmore affiliate. In the late spring and summer, members of the group worked in the SNCC-initiated civil rights movement in Cambridge, a tightly segregated Eastern Shore town in Maryland. At the start of the following school year, a number of them decided that their Cambridge experience could be applied closer to home. They started an organizing project in the economically depressed Negro section of nearby Chester, Pa. The demonstrated ability of the Swarthmore students to work closely with urban poor Negroes in Chester exerted a powerful influence within SDS. Two papers by Carl Wittman, head of the Swarthmore group, illustrate the optimism which the Chester project engendered. Both are reprinted in the Cohen-Hale anthology: 'Students and Economic Action' and 'An Interracial Movement of the Poor?' (written with Tom Hayden).

The Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP), set up by SDS largely as a study group, became converted during the course of the year into a major organizing program. By the summer of the following year, SDS had decided to make ERAP the main focus of its activity and to initiate projects in six to ten northern cities. Most of these were in poor white areas, but the largest one was in the all-black Clinton Hill section of Newark.⁶

Mississippi Summer

Of the Mississippi Summer project of 1964, little needs to be said here. Early that year, SNCC workers in COFO decided, after much hesitation, to issue a call for a thousand northern college students to spend the summer in Mississippi -- helping with voter registration, teaching in improvised 'freedom schools', and sharing the physical danger that is part of every black person's life in Mississippi. Approximately 800 students responded to the call, representing a wide variety of backgrounds and political attitudes (though most of them saw these attitudes swing to the left over the course of the summer). Two of them were killed, along with a black Mississippian working on the same project.⁷

During the summer the COFO workers built up a movement known as the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP), in which all Mississippians were eligible to participate (though of course in actual practice scarcely any whites chose to). Delegates were elected in grass-roots caucuses, and a full delegation was chosen to demand seats at the Democratic Party convention in Atlantic City. Lawyer for the

MFDP was Joseph Rauh, Jr., of Washington, a long-time leader of the Americans for Democratic Action. When it appeared that a bitter floor fight might ensue, with northern delegations having to vote for or against the MFDP, liberals within the party arranged a compromise by which the regular delegation would retain its seat and the MFDP would get two of its leaders seated as delegates at large. Rauh advised the MFDP to accept, making it clear that northern liberals in the convention would not support them if they refused the offer. Martin Luther King and Bayard Rustin also appeared before the delegation and advised accepting the compromise; Moses and James Forman of SNCC spoke briefly, urging a stand on principle, and they were overwhelmingly supported. More than any other single event, this dramatized the readiness of militants in the civil rights movement to break away from the liberal coalition of the Johnson administration. Pleas that unity was needed in order to keep Barry Goldwater from being elected President meant less than their just claim to the seats.⁸

Return to Campus

For a variety of causes, not the least of which was the experience of hundreds of northern students with racial oppression in the Deep South, the 1964-65 school year was one of unprecedented ferment on the campus. The symbol, above all, was Berkeley. Nothing else that happened in the 1960s did so much to focus public attention on college students than did the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley. Touched off when the Berkeley administration clamped down on campus recruiting for off-campus civil rights activities, the movement developed into a major challenge to the University's status quo. Mario Savio, leader of the FSM, hit a responsive chord among the demonstrators when he said, just prior to the Sproul Hall sit-in in which nearly 800 were arrested:

There's a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, you can't even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus, and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free, the machine will be prevented from working at all.

It is significant that the Free Speech Movement grew out of a struggle for civil rights, the one issue which had proved capable of arousing the moral fervor of students in the early sixties. Militant demonstrations against large discriminatory hiring practices by Bay Area employers had brought arrests and had also brought pressure on the University to clamp down on its students. Within the FSM it was believed that the ban on on-campus recruiting came as a result of picketing against ex-Senator William Knowland's Oakland Tribune. In the course of their confrontation with the U.C. administration, however, many of the Berkeley students had to confront for the first time their own place in society. Savio, a veteran of Mississippi Summer, made the connection this way:

In Mississippi an autocratic and powerful minority rules, through organized violence, to suppress the vast, virtually powerless majority. In California, the privileged minority manipulates the University bureaucracy to suppress the students' political expression. That 'respectable' bureaucracy masks the financial plutocrats; that impersonal bureaucracy is the efficient enemy in a 'Brave New World'.

The FSM, of course, was not simply based upon an intellectual critique of the University, or the 'California power structure'. There was a flair to the protest - and a sense of humor - that showed something more. The FSM rebels showed a creative and innovative ability that was typified both by their satirical songs and their establishment of a 'Free University of California' during the Sproul Hall sit-in. In the aftermath of Berkeley, the mass media cast worried looks at the American campus; they discovered, for the first time, that a new sub-culture had

emerged, one that was both freewheeling in its life style and serious in its political beliefs. Berkeley symbolized a union, however frail, between bohemianism and political activism.

Partly because the FSM had a number of articulate spokesmen and partly because the Berkeley campus was full of faculty pundits, there is a vast literature on the episode. An excellent account by a non-student participant is Hal Draper's Berkeley: The New Student Revolt (Evergreen paperback, 1965). There are two paperback anthologies, one edited by Michael V. Miller and Susan Gilmore (Revolution at Berkeley, Dell, 1965) and the other by Seymour M. Lipset and Sheldon S. Woldin (The Berkeley Student Revolt, Doubleday Anchor, 1965). Both are good, but the Lipset-Woldin collection is more comprehensive. The Trouble at Berkeley (text by Steven Warshaw, Diablo Press, 1965) is a fine book of photographs with some commentary. Finally, there are two magazine articles, not included in either anthology, which deserve reading: Gerald Rosenfeld's 'Generational Revolt and the Free Speech Movement' (Liberation, December 1964 and January 1965) and Michael Rossman's 'Barefoot in a Marshmallow World' (Ramparts, January 1966). Both are excerpted in Jacobs and Landau, The New Radicals.

Participatory Democracy

The FSM was not duplicated elsewhere during that school year, though there were widely reported incidents of student protest on other campuses later in the school year -- as at normally placid Yale, when students picketed against the dismissal of a popular philosophy professor. During this period of late 1964 and early 1965, however, there were four other developments that were to play a highly important role in giving shape to the New Left which may be said to have finally emerged as a distinct entity. These developments had to do with changes in SNCC; parallel changes in the ERAP projects; the sudden growth of protest against the Vietnam War following the initiation of regular bombing raids over North Vietnam in February 1965; and the growth of a small but active tendency centered in the May 2nd Movement which might be called the 'new ultra-left'.

SNCC did not accept as final its rebuff at the Atlantic City convention. Although it knew that its northern liberal 'allies' were eager to bury the issue, the MFDP collected evidence of voting discrimination in Mississippi, and mounted a challenge to the seating of that state's Congressional delegation when Congress convened in January. It took an intensive publicity campaign by SNCC even to get the issue before the House, and the 140-odd northerners who voted against seating the Mississippians did so, for the most part, reluctantly. Members of Congress depend on each other for favors and thanks to the seniority southerners tend to occupy the most powerful positions when the Democrats are in power. Thus, despite the fact that this was easily the most liberal Congress since the days of the New Deal, the MFDP could obtain nothing more than a perfunctory referral of their protest to a special House committee. The MFDP persisted, even after this rebuff, and did everything it could to keep the issue alive during the spring and summer; SNCC attached far greater importance to this than to President Johnson's voting rights bill, passed that summer. In September the Mississippi challenge was definitively rejected by the House, as it accepted the special committee's conclusion that it was powerless to bar the Mississippians. This time the MFDP got 149 votes for its position, a miniscule gain over the January vote.

Largely as a result of its bad experiences with liberal Democrats, as well as its success in organizing the grass-roots MFDP, there was an increasing tendency in SNCC to elaborate a strategy of participatory democracy, in which people would organize to make decisions for themselves without manipulation. The model was the MFDP, in which SNCC workers had tried to avoid imposing their own ideas of which direction the movement should go. Gradually it became clear to white liberals and radicals that SNCC was not simply the 'most militant' of the civil rights groups, but had a set of distinctive ideas about how change would come about in society.

The trend in SNCC away from liberal compromise and toward participatory democracy

was paralleled by a similar change in the ERAP projects initiated the previous year by SDS in the North. In 1963, when ERAP was originally conceived, its founders had believed that the American economy was in a state of deepening crisis and that the threat of mass unemployment - especially among the young - was real. The ten original ERAP projects in 1964 had gotten much of their impetus from this analysis: the name of the Chicago project, J.O.I.N. (Jobs Or Income Now) was symbolic. The early experience of organizing around this issue proved, however, to be discouraging. In 1964-65 the emphasis shifted toward building 'community unions', in which people in the poor neighborhoods would be mobilized on issues like garbage removal, better schools, traffic lights, etc., and through these struggles would gain an understanding of the ways in which power is wielded in society. These community unions, run democratically (and without parliamentary procedure), were also viewed as forming the basis for an alternative center of power: people would look to them rather than to the city authorities for programs to meet their immediate and long-range needs.¹⁰

Vietnam

It is hard to say why there was so little public protest over U.S. policy in Vietnam before February 1965. It is true that few American troops were in Vietnam (16,000 in mid-summer 1964) and that they were euphemistically known as 'advisers' but the broad outlines of the conflict were not at all unknown: an unpopular conservative government in South Vietnam, an indigenous guerrilla movement getting most of its arms by capturing American weapons from government troops, and systematic terror campaigns against the guerrillas. In the fall of 1963, before President Diem was assassinated and replaced by the next in a series of American-based regimes, the Student Peace Union held small demonstrations at places where Diem's sister-in-law, Madame Nhu, was speaking; and the following spring the May 2nd Committee (later the May 2nd Movement, M2M) was formed as a result of a student conference at Yale. M2M viewed the Vietnam war as a natural outgrowth of an imperialistic foreign policy (a view shared by the Young Socialist Alliance but not - at that time - by other young radical groups). At its meeting in December 1964, the National Council of SDS decided to call for an anti-war demonstration in Washington, D.C., in April, but there was no expectation that this protest would attract more than a few thousand students. It was in early February 1965, when the U.S. began daily bombing raids in North Vietnam - and made it clear that American troops would be sent in whatever number necessary to win the war - that protests became widespread. The SDS march in Washington drew over 15,000, most of them students, the response being far greater than any of the SDS leaders had thought possible. (See Jack Smith, 'The Demand is "Peace"', National Guardian, 24 April 1965, and 'Report from the Editors: The SDS March on Washington', Studies on the Left, Spring 1965.) Starting at the University of Michigan, teach-ins were held at a number of colleges and universities in which speakers, most of them faculty members, dealt with various aspects of the Vietnam war. At their best, the teach-ins went beyond the immediate issue of the war and confronted questions about the nature of American society. At the teach-ins there was a rapport and an eagerness for learning that is rare on university campuses. The largest, Vietnam Day at Berkeley, drew up to 15,000 students at a time during the thirty-six hours it lasted.¹¹

The most militant wing of the Vietnam protest was represented by the May 2nd Movement. Although M2M was still small, and was under strong influence from the Progressive Labor Party, it was quite active on eastern campuses and was ahead of its time in stressing two themes that were later to become extremely important of the New Left. Its anti-imperialist critique of American foreign policy denied that Vietnam was an 'aberration' and insisted that Vietnam had to be understood in the light of American economic expansion. M2M identified with the Vietnamese (and Cuban) revolutionaries, and viewed them as fighters for national liberation from foreign capitalist control. And, M2M circulated a statement indicating that its members would refuse military service in Vietnam because of their opposition to the war. This was a precursor to the present draft resistance movement, although M2M was so small that its statement received little attention at the time.

1965-67

SDS and SNCC

By the fall of 1965, the two organizations which more than any others have defined the New Left - Students for a Democratic Society and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee - had undergone marked changes which did a great deal to shape their subsequent histories. For SDS, the Johnson administration's decision to begin systematic bombing of North Vietnam in February 1965 was extremely important. Previous to this step-up in the war, Vietnam protests in the U.S. had been few and had attracted little interest. When, in December 1964, the SDS national council had scheduled a protest march in Washington for April, no one had anticipated a large turnout. Yet more than 15,000 people came, most of them students. The march gave a tremendous boost to anti-war sentiment, and at the same time it made SDS widely known for the first time. The number of SDS chapters grew from around 35 to over a hundred within three months, and membership multiplied to several thousand. At the same time, ERAP voted in the spring of 1965 to disband itself as a nationally coordinated program; the national ERAP office in Ann Arbor was closed down, and director Rennie Davis went to work in the JOIN project in Chicago. This did not mean a retrenchment of the community organizing program, since the early death of a few ERAP projects was more than overbalanced by the burgeoning of JOIN and by the initiation of new projects in San Francisco, Oakland, and elsewhere. Nearly two hundred summer volunteers worked in the various projects in 1965. But the tendency in the most successful projects, such as those in Cleveland and Newark, was for the ERAP organizers to encourage indigenous leadership among the poor people themselves. The role of SDS in furnishing national coordination and leadership to the projects was correspondingly diminished. Thus, although a welfare mother from Cleveland was among the speakers at the SDS Vietnam march, and although SDS president Paul Potter stressed in his speech that grass-roots organizing was the key to changing the system that produced Vietnam.¹² SDS was already coming to be characterized more by its anti-war stand than by its community organizing activities. It may be significant that Potter, who worked in the Cleveland project, was succeeded as SDS president in June by Carl Oglesby, one of the originators of the teach-in movement and best known as an eloquent speaker and writer against the war.¹³

SNCC, at this time, was also in a period of reorientation. Escalation in Vietnam had less immediate impact on SNCC than on SDS, partly because there were far more pressing issues in the South and partly because SNCC workers by 1965 had already become highly skeptical about the Democratic administration. SNCC co-sponsored the April 17 Vietnam protest, but during 1965 its skepticism was exacerbated more by its own direct experiences than by concern over the war. The Child Development Group of Mississippi (CDGM), formed early in the year by persons close to SNCC, ran an imaginative Head Start program but had to fight for its life against a War on Poverty bureaucracy fearful of offending Mississippi politicians.¹⁴ More important was the fate of the Mississippi Challenge, in which the MFDP had hoped to unseat the state's congressional delegation. The challenge ran into quiet opposition from the White House as well as from the congressional leadership, and after nine months the MFDP was able to secure only 140-odd votes, far short of a majority.¹⁵ SNCC's impatience and unwillingness to work in harmony with the Johnson administration began to worry many liberals, and its image as one of the five 'respectable' civil rights groups (along with the NAACP, Urban League, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and CORE) began to be eroded.¹⁶

This was also a time when the role of whites in the civil rights movement began to be re-evaluated within SNCC. The experience of the Mississippi Summer project in 1964, when most of the summer volunteers went back to the comparative safety of the North after the summer was over, had created some resentment. No program on that scale was planned for 1965, though volunteers were welcomed in the SNCC projects (which operated at that time in Arkansas, southwest Georgia, and the Alabama black belt, as well as Mississippi).¹⁷ The summer of 1965 also saw the large-scale rioting in Watts, Los Angeles, in which over thirty Negroes were

killed by police and national guardsmen. For many militants Watts must have seemed like the death knell of the nonviolent civil rights movement. Los Angeles already had all the civil rights laws which anyone had asked from the federal government, but black residents had still thought it necessary to rise up against the racism and poverty in which they lived.¹⁸

Outside of SDS and SNCC, there was a scattering of other New Left groups active in 1965. The Southern Student Organizing Committee (SSOC) was close to both SNCC and SDS. Founded in 1964, it worked mainly among southern white students. The Northern Student Movement continued small-scale organizing activities in northern cities, often in cooperation with SDS. The W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, founded in California and under strong Communist Party influence without being a classic 'front group', attracted some following but did not seriously rival SDS anywhere but on the West Coast. Much less of a New Left group in orientation, but more important than the DuBois Clubs, was the Trotskyist-oriented Young Socialist Alliance (YSA). The YSA worked within local anti-war committees and campaigned to have the anti-war movement as a whole adopt a position favoring outright American withdrawal from Vietnam rather than negotiations. The May 2nd Movement, though largely controlled by the Maoist Progressive Labor Party, exercised an influence on the New Left that was out of proportion to its numbers, since it was the only group which put major stress on the Vietnam war as an example of a generalized American imperialism.¹⁹

One of the most surprising aspects of the New Left as it stood in mid-1965 was that very little had been done in the way of building on the experience of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley. The FSM in late 1964 had laid bare the relationship of the modern American university to maintenance of discrimination and privilege in society. It had also brought out into the open the disgust which increasing numbers of students felt at the impersonal and purposeless routine of academic life. Moreover, during the 1964-65 school year the campuses had been shaken by numerous teach-ins and demonstrations against the war, as well as by protests centered around such issues as social regulations or the firing of popular teachers or student suspensions. Yet there was almost no organized response on the part of New Left groups. SNCC was off campus entirely at that point, except for fund-raising and recruiting; SDS organized new chapters and distributed its Port Huron Statement, but provided little in the way of organizational direction. A handful of free universities were established, some under impetus from SDS, but none really caught on. The Free University of New York, the biggest, was established in the summer of 1965 and encouraged 'passionate involvement, intellectual confrontation, and clash of ideas', but enrollment never got beyond a few hundred.²⁰ Nowhere on the Left was there a program for organizing students at regular universities around the quality of their education. By the fall of 1965 it was the war in Vietnam that was paramount.

New Stage of Protests

Quaint though it may have been, the 'Assembly of Unrepresented People' in early August of 1965 marked the beginning of the intensification of the anti-war movement in the fall of that year. Led by Staughton Lynd, Liberation co-editor Dave Dellinger, and Robert Parris (who under the name of Robert Moses had headed the Mississippi Summer project), the August protest brought about two thousand demonstrators to Washington for the purpose of declaring peace with the people of Vietnam. More than 350 people were arrested for committing civil disobedience on the final day of the protest. Though supported by hardly any groups except the pacifist Committee for Non-Violent Action, the Washington action drew a wide variety of participants and had a strong effect on many of those involved in it. At one of the meetings held during the protest, attended mainly by non-pacifists, it was voted to establish a National Coordinating Committee to End the War, with headquarters in Madison, Wisconsin, and with the immediate goal of helping plan for anti-war demonstrations which SDS and the Vietnam Day Committee of Berkeley had called for October 15 and 16.

As it turned out, the mid-October protests, in which demonstrations of varying sizes were held in at least 93 cities throughout the country, succeeded in bring-

ing the anti-war movement emphatically to the attention of the U.S. public.²¹ It was the first real indication, since the Washington march and teach-ins the previous spring, that large numbers of people would refuse to be swept up into the war effort. Charges of 'treason' were rife; SDS, which had already become cool to the idea of large demonstrations though its chapters provided most of the turnout at many of the local October 15-16 protests, soon found itself in the center of public attention. The SDS national council in September had voted for a national draft program, in which young men would be encouraged to apply for Conscientious Objector status in large numbers, in an effort to clog up the Selective Service System. Although this was to be submitted to a membership referendum (which ultimately defeated it), the press picked the story up in mid-October, and Attorney-General Nicolas Katzenbach announced he was having SDS investigated. This resulted in the second great spurt in SDS membership, in which the number of chapters increased from around 100 to 180. This increase came without encouragement from the SDS national office, which was in a state of acute disorganization, and it primarily represented a show of solidarity among the student left. SDS's position was reaffirmed in November. The National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) had scheduled a Washington march for November 27, built around a series of approved slogans calling for 'steps to peace' which specifically excluded American withdrawal. In order to prevent the march from having a disappointing turnout, SANE was forced to allow SDS to issue a separate call, far more militant. Carl Oglesby's speech at this march, an eloquent attack on the liberal architects of American foreign policy, drew a standing ovation.²²

The outcry against SDS's proposed anti-draft program (even the general board of the most liberal Protestant denomination, the United Church of Christ, denounced SDS's plan) showed clearly the sensitivity which was attached to the draft. When David Miller, a young Catholic pacifist, burned his draft card at the Whitehall Induction Station in New York, in violation of a law passed by Congress that summer, the clamor was equally great. Undoubtedly fear of legal repression was an important factor in the decisive vote which the SDS membership cast against the anti-draft program.

With more members than ever before, and with greater prestige within the anti-war movement than any other group, SDS was nevertheless in a state of confusion about its identity. Distrustful of large marches, which seemed chiefly to boost the morale of the already committed, and unwilling to confront the government directly on the draft issue, SDS was without a real program.²³ This, coupled with a breakdown in communication between the national office and the chapters during the crisis period of late October and early November, lent greater urgency to a four-day membership conference scheduled for Christmas vacation at the University of Illinois. This meeting had been called at the request of Al Haber, who along with Tom Hayden and a handful of others had made SDS into a viable organization in 1961-62. It was hoped that the December Conference would help pull the organization together and enable it to discuss the basic issues involved in its organizing activities. Instead, the conference involved little more than a series of frustrating and sometimes acerbic discussions and a decision to replace the mimeographed monthly Bulletin with a printed weekly, New Left Notes.²⁴ It has been almost universally true of SDS national meetings, since the productive Pine Hill convention of 1963, that the only benefits have come from informal discussions outside the framework of the meeting itself. Be that as it may, SDS entered the new year, 1966, with no very clear idea of where it was going. The Progressive Labor Party's decision to dissolve the May 2nd Movement and send PL members into SDS could hardly have been much consolation.

Black Power

In January 1966, SNCC took a further decisive step in its break with liberal respectability by denouncing the Vietnam war in terms that seemed to put it in the position of encouraging draft resistance. The statement, adopted at a SNCC conference in Atlanta, attacked the government for its hypocrisy in claiming to defend

freedom in Vietnam. It went on to say that 'We are in sympathy with, and support, the men in this country who are unwilling to respond to a military draft which would compel them to contribute their lives to United States aggression in Vietnam in the name of the "freedom" we find so false in this country.'²⁵ Concrete response to this statement came within days, as the Georgia House of Representatives refused to seat Julian Bond, SNCC's communications director who had been elected to the House from a Negro district in Atlanta. Bond, excluded solely on the basis of the SNCC anti-war statement, appealed his case and eventually won a 9-0 verdict from the Supreme Court,²⁶ that the legislature had violated his freedom of speech.

At the same time, discussions were taking place within SNCC which led to its emergence in the summer of 1966 as a 'Black Power' organization. At a conference in the spring, after long deliberation, Stokely Carmichael was elected SNCC chairman to replace John Lewis. Part of the issue was that Lewis insisted that he would attend the forthcoming White House Conference on racial problems, against the wishes of other SNCC members, but a more basic issue was the question of the role of whites within the civil rights movement. Carmichael was closely associated with the Lowndes County Freedom Organization, which he had helped to found and which was attempting to elect an all-black slate of officeholders in Alabama's most dangerous county. The Lowndes County group's symbol was the black panther. Lewis was much more favorable to the idea of alliances with liberal white groups in order to win a share of power in the South, while Carmichael considered the basic problem to be one of organizing black people, with alliances merely being a hindrance at that point. In addition, Lewis was wedded much more closely to the idea of nonviolence, even under provocation, and Carmichael's election was widely interpreted as a break from that tradition by SNCC.

It was on the 'Meredith March' in June that the changes in SNCC became crystallized, and the split between SNCC and other civil rights groups came into the open. James Meredith, the Air Force veteran who had integrated the University of Mississippi in 1962, had now announced his intention to walk alone through Mississippi to help encourage the state's Negroes to stand up against oppression. When Meredith was gunned down and hospitalized on the second day of his march, other civil rights leaders hastened to Mississippi to resume the walk where Meredith had been forced to leave off. The march from that point was marked by frequent instances of tension between Carmichael and other SNCC leaders and Martin Luther King and other leaders of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. It was on this march that SNCC first popularized the slogan of 'Black Power', a slogan which was deliberately counterposed to the old rallying cry of 'Freedom'.

From that point on, Black Power became a bone of contention within liberal and radical circles, as Martin Luther King and other moderates criticized the new course taken by SNCC. Carmichael defined the concept differently at different times, often refusing to give it any definition; if this was not a deliberate effort to make the white press look foolish as it tried to interpret 'Black Power', it nevertheless had that effect. SDS and the Southern Student Organizing Committee accepted SNCC's new course as a challenge to them to step up their organizing efforts among whites. In programmatic terms, SNCC was banking heavily on the success of the Lowndes County Freedom Organization in the November elections.²⁷ In the urban areas of the North, where black consciousness had already gone beyond the old civil rights formulas, SNCC's new militancy had a certain appeal, but SNCC had no real organizational base.

At the end of the summer, SNCC got a taste of what its new program and its new image could mean in making it vulnerable to police harassment. It had already experienced plenty of this in the Deep South, but now had to face it as a fact of life everywhere. A miniature riot in the Vine City area of Atlanta was blamed on SNCC workers by the mayor of that city, while in Philadelphia the police charged three SNCC workers with possession of dynamite. SNCC was not driven out of Vine City, where it had a solidly established organizing program, but in Philadelphia the dynamite accusations - though they were subsequently dropped - were enough to squash the organization.²⁸

SDS vs. S.S.S.

For SDS in early 1966, the most important thing that happened was the Selective

Service System's decision to give special standardized exams to male college students to help determine eligibility for the draft. The SDS national office drew up its own 'Vietnam Exam' with multiple-choice questions about the war and American policy. On the first examination date, in early May, these were distributed to students at nearly 800 colleges. SDS had considered a call for a boycott of the Selective Service exams, but had turned this down on the realistic grounds that few students would be likely to jeopardize their II-S deferments to vindicate a moral principle. A more popular issue was that of class ranking, by which universities furnished draft boards with information about the class standing of male students. The idea was that local boards would be able to pick off students in the bottom one-third or one-quarter of their class. Late in the spring there were sit-ins against class rank at Roosevelt, Chicago, Stanford, the University of Wisconsin, and several other schools. This was the first time that the issue of the Vietnam war had been tied up with the universities, and at places like Wisconsin the sit-ins attracted a much greater variety of students than had taken part in demonstrations in the past.²⁹

Otherwise, things were relatively quiet among the white New Left. A second wave of nationally coordinated local Vietnam protests in late March drew more participants than in October but created much less of a stir. Student activists in Berkeley were drawn in large numbers into the campaign of Ramparts managing editor Robert Scheer to win the Democratic nomination for Congress. Running on a strong anti-war platform against a liberal incumbent, Scheer got 45% of the vote, including a majority in the Oakland ghetto. The local SDS group did not support the Scheer campaign, on the grounds that long-term organizing and educational efforts were being sacrificed to electoral success.³⁰ In Massachusetts, SDS members did take part in the independent senatorial campaign of Thomas Boylston Adams; the Adams campaign was more radical than was Adams himself. Other electoral campaigns which attracted the energies of New Left activists included one waged in Manhattan's 19th Congressional District, in which the Committee for Independent Political Action ran James Weinstein of Studies on the Left, and a scattering of others.³¹ Of the old ERAP projects, JOIN and the Newark Community Union Project (N-CUP) continued to be quite active, while in Cleveland and to a lesser extent Boston former ERAP workers continued to play important organizing roles in the poor communities. One new program was initiated in the summer of 1966, the Minneapolis Community Union Project.³²

The SDS national convention, held in late August at a religious camp near Clear Lake, Iowa, was the largest that had so far been held, and it was certainly one of the most important. Coming after a summer in which SNCC had called on the black community to organize itself, and in which the proportion of SDS members engaged in community organizing among the poor was much smaller than a year earlier, the convention had to confront the fact that ERAP-type organizing no longer defined SDS. At the same time, the mood within SDS was hostile to large anti-war demonstrations and also, generally speaking, to anti-war electoral politics. What emerged at Clear Lake was a 'return to the campus' as the focus for organizing. This turn had been presaged by the Vietnam exams and class-rank sit-ins the previous spring, but the national office under Paul Booth had been attracted to the idea of 'new politics' campaigns such as Scheer's. At Clear Lake the most influential position paper was one authored by Carl Davidson, campus traveler in the Great Plains region, entitled 'Student Syndicalism, or University Reform Revisited'. Davidson, who was elected vice-president of SDS largely on the strength of this paper, argued in it that SDS chapters should initiate campus-wide movements to gain what later came to be called 'student power'. He held that society was dependent on a constant supply of pliable manpower in order to carry on activities like the Vietnam war, and that in loco parentis regulations were an important factor in enabling universities to turn out graduates who could fit uncritically into the system. Therefore, a fight for power within the university, in which students would demand the abolition of grades and of interference with their extracurricular lives, could be an important means of changing society. Davidson's paper was an important attempt to apply to a university environment the SDS-SNCC concept that people should have a meaningful voice in the 'decisions that affect their lives', which had mainly been developed in organizing among the poor.

There was recognition that the draft would be an important issue during the ensuing school year (hence, in part, Davidson's stress on abolishing grades, which would eliminate the basis for class rank) but the basic issue was held to be power within the university. SDS was not, at this stage, ready to go ahead with even the relatively mild anti-draft program which it had turned down in the fall of 1965.³³

What happened in late 1966, in a sense, was that the war sneaked up again on SDS. Although unsuccessful attempts were made at Penn State, Wisconsin, and elsewhere to put the ideas of 'student syndicalism' into effect on a campus-wide basis, and although most SDS chapters probably were involved in one form or another of 'student power' agitation, this did not become the main thrust of SDS as an organization. Instead, draft resistance - in a much more radical form than previously contemplated - became dominant. A secondary theme was a growing number of actions taken by SDS chapters to protest or disrupt campus appearances by representatives of the military or of war contractors. Thus, although SDS furnished some of the basic ideas behind the 'student power' fight, as well as much of its campus leadership, SDS as an organization did not serve as any kind of national coordinating body in this respect.

Draft Resistance

Draft resistance prior to the winter of 1966-67 had been almost entirely an individual matter. The stress had been on individual gestures of opposition to the war, and except for the abortive SDS program in the fall of 1965, there was no strategy for using anti-draft activity either to stop the war or to bring about basic changes in society. The May 2nd Movement, as early as 1964, had circulated statements of refusal to fight in Vietnam, and had gotten signatures from over a thousand draft-age men. In the spring of 1965 a number of veteran leaders of the peace movement, including Bayard Rustin, had signed an advertisement in Liberation calling on men who were opposed to the war on grounds of conscience to refuse induction. Neither of these attracted much attention. A flurry of draft card burnings in the summer of 1965 had led Congress to pass a law against this practice, and in the fall of that year David Miller and then a handful of others had defied the law by burning their draft cards. David Mitchell, a young New Yorker, refused induction in 1965 and then appealed his conviction on the ground that the Vietnam war was illegal under the terms of the Nuremberg trials. Though Mitchell got short shrift from the federal courts, he used the publicity from his case to stir up opposition to the war and the draft. A group centered around him published a bulletin, Downdraft, which had news of anti-draft activities as well as of Mitchell's own case. In the summer of 1966, three young soldiers at Fort Hood, Texas, refused orders for duty in Vietnam. The three - James Johnson, Dennis Mora, and David Samas - received considerable publicity within the anti-war movement as the 'Fort Hood Three'. By the end of 1966 there had been isolated instances of other soldiers refusing to go to Vietnam, as well as a growing number of court cases of men who refused to submit to induction. All the time, the number of American troops fighting in Vietnam continued to swell, despite optimistic reports by administration and military officials about the progress of the fighting. By the late fall of 1966, there were 350,000 American troops already in Vietnam, and monthly draft calls were running at about 40,000 per month. In December 1966 the SDS national council, after nineteen hours of debate on a draft resolution, passed by 53-10-3 a radical version of it. The wording of the resolution was important, both because of the program it called for and the grounds it gave for opposition to the draft. It attacked the Vietnam war as being directed against the 'Vietnamese people in their struggle for self-determination', and it went on to argue 'that conscription in any form is coercive and anti-democratic, and that it is used by the United States Government to oppress people in the United States and around the world.' It announced SDS's opposition to all attempts to reform the draft, such as by a lottery, since none of the proposed reforms would change the basic nature or purpose of the draft. It urged formation of anti-draft unions, composed of people pledged to resist conscription, with a program aimed at reaching out to the community as a whole. The resolution also pledged national SDS to assist all efforts to organize within the armed forces, but this was outside the main drift of the document as a whole.³⁴

Although a few campus anti-draft groups had gotten started before the SDS program was adopted, such as a group of 32 who signed a 'We Won't Go' statement at the University of Chicago, it was SDS which gave the resistance movement its greatest impetus. Jeff Segal, Dee Jacobson, and others from the SDS national office worked closely with local anti-draft groups, which picketed and leafleted at induction centers, offered draft counseling for local youths, and had members speaking wherever they could find an audience on 'Why I Won't Go'. At this time there was great uncertainty as to whether the federal government would prosecute people who signed 'We Won't Go' statements or who urged others not to cooperate with the draft. There was an atmosphere of risk and determination in the anti-draft unions, as well as a hope that the war might be forced to a halt by the refusal of a sufficiently large number of men to submit to induction.³⁵ At the same time, SDS organizers constantly pointed out the relation of the draft to the structure of society, and quoted the Selective Service System as boasting that the draft was a means of thrusting people into deferable jobs which were in the 'national interest'.³⁶

The first sign that there was a divergence of viewpoints within the draft resistance movement came in April in connection with the 'Spring Mobilization' against the war. The Mobilization itself had been viewed with a great deal of skepticism by SDS -- it was the largest of all the large Vietnam demonstrations, with more than 200,000 marching in New York and 65,000 in San Francisco -- but the national council meeting in early April had reluctantly endorsed it. The Cornell SDS group, which at that time was running the most extensive draft resistance program in the country, put out a call for five hundred men to burn their draft cards at the New York march. The proposal ran into a great deal of opposition from other anti-draft groups, on the grounds that draft card burning was a symbolic gesture which was of no practical aid in day-to-day organizing, and that there was no point in confronting the law unnecessarily. This criticism expressed a viewpoint which was to become general within SDS. Although it received only a small response to its call, the Cornell group decided to go ahead with its plans, and something like 150 men burned their draft cards on the Sheep Meadow in Central Park on April 15. At the time, together with the large turnouts for the New York and San Francisco protests, the mass card burning probably was important in making the anti-war movement visible once again to the public.

Whereas the draft resistance movement was in large part nurtured by the national SDS leadership, another form of campus resistance to the war grew up with scarcely any national coordination at all. Beginning at Berkeley in December and continuing through the spring of 1967, there was a series of confrontations between students and recruiters for the armed services, the CIA, and the Dow Chemical Company, makers of napalm. At Berkeley, students attempted to set up an anti-draft table next to a Navy recruiting table in the student union building. After police were called in and nine arrests made, over 10,000 students rallied and formulated demands for a strike, which went on for five days. Shortly before, Harvard SDS members had surrounded the car of Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and forced him to engage in a hectic question-and-answer session, during which McNamara boasted that at their age he had been a lot tougher. Dow Chemical recruiters were confronted by students at a number of campuses during the winter and spring, beginning at Brown University in January. There were major sit-ins against Dow at the University of Wisconsin and at several California schools. Although Todd Gitlin wrote an article in New Left Notes in March calling for a national SDS program of severing universities' ties with the military, and although many of the local confrontations were reported in New Left Notes, they got little national publicity and were far from being part of any SDS strategy. They did, however, show that anti-war sentiment on the campuses was stronger and more militant than before, and that issues which linked the universities to the war were capable of arousing a wide response.³⁷

1967-68

Black Power Comes to the Campus

The stirrings of militant, sometimes disruptive student protests in the winter

and spring of 1967 were not confined to Northern campuses. This was a time when Southern black colleges, almost for the first time since the sit-ins began in 1960, began to show signs of life.

There were student protests, with widespread support, at South Carolina State College in Orangeburg, at Howard, at Texas Southern, at Jackson State, and at Fisk. Police fired on students in the last three places. After the Texas Southern confrontation, in which students returned fire and a policeman was killed, five students were arrested on conspiracy charges.

During most of the '60s the civil rights battle had seemed to be off-campus, as SNCC workers and other activists left school and went to organize among the Negro lower classes. Now, especially after the defeat of the Lowndes County Freedom Organization in the November 1966 elections, that phase of the Movement seemed to be at an impasse. Many SNCC people were now back on the campus, and partly because of their leadership black students were no longer willing to put up with paternalism and repression.

There are several descriptive accounts of these protests: 'Eight Hundred Black Students Sit In' (The Movement, March 1967), 'Black Power Revolt at Texas Southern' (The Movement, May 1967), 'Cops Attack Black Students' (The Movement, May 1967), and Mona Schacht's 'Negro Students in Texas Press Demand for Power' (National Guardian, 20 May 1967). See also a brief interpretive interview, 'Nathan Hare on Howard U.' (Washington Free Press, 22 May 1967) and an eloquent speech by Stokely Carmichael to students at Morgan State College in Maryland: 'You Better Come on Home' (The Movement, June 1967). The new militancy on black campuses deserves far more attention than it has generally been given. For a picture of the repressive conditions which the students have had to contend with, see Staughton Lynd and Roberta Yancey: 'Southern Negro Students' (Dissent, Summer 1964).

Cross-currents in SDS

When the 1967 SDS Convention met in Ann Arbor at the end of June, the participants were confronted with a sometimes bewildering variety of viewpoints and of suggested programs. To mention them here is not to imply that Convention delegates paid much attention to them - people were there basically to relax and see old friends but only that the superficial conflicts at Ann Arbor provide a convenient way to structure a discussion of the different trends which existed in SDS at that time.

By the time of the Ann Arbor Convention there was one disagreement within the organization with regard to general social analysis. On one side was the position advanced most strongly by members of the Progressive Labor Party who were active in SDS. It stressed the importance of the traditional Marxist class struggle, and said that the industrial working class - especially workers in production, transport, and communications - is crucial to a revolution. It held that students had to try to form an alliance with these workers if they were to build a serious radical movement. Counterposed to this was the 'new working class' position, first developed by Bob Gottlieb, Gerry Tenney, and Dave Gilbert at an SDS conference at Princeton in February, though SDS national secretary Greg Calvert and SDS vice-president Carl Davidson were to become its most influential exponents. Briefly, the 'new working class' viewpoint was that technology had transformed modern capitalism to the point where the traditional working class was less central to the production process than it had once been. This theory placed great stress on the role of college-trained workers such as engineers, technical workers, and teachers, and said that this was the crucial sector of society that had to be organized. Greg Calvert, in a speech to the same Princeton conference, linked the 'new working class' theory to the discovery by white radicals that they could no longer fight 'other people's battles'. If students saw themselves as being channeled by their universities into jobs that were both oppressive and crucial to the functioning of society, they would no longer think of themselves as missionaries reaching out to help other people, such as Negroes or workers. Rather, they would see themselves as fighting to free themselves through a general revolutionary movement.

Calvert's speech was printed in the National Guardian as 'SDS Official Analyzes Struggle for Freedom' (25 March 1967). Lengthy statements of the 'old' and 'new' working class positions appeared in New Left Notes before the SDS Convention: Robert Gottlieb, Gerry Tenney, and Dave Gilbert: 'Toward a Theory of Social Change in America' (vol. 2, #20; 22 May); and Bob Schwartz, Ted Bayne, and Jared Israel: 'U.S. Capitalism--Prosperity or Crisis?' (vol. 2, #21; also dated 22 May). Carl Davidson's pamphlet, 'The New Radicals and the Multiversity', first printed in the fall of 1967 and available from SDS, puts the 'new working class' theory to creative use in formulating a strategy for radicals working in large universities. Recently Greg Calvert and Carol Neiman have written a four-part article in the Guardian which, under the somewhat misleading title 'Internationalism New Left Style', sets forth a revised 'new working class' position. This appeared in the issues of 8, 15, 22, and 29 June 1968, and is well worth reading.

In terms of program, differences between 'PL' and 'non-PL' tendencies in SDS flowed largely from these differing perspectives. Progressive Labor members proposed a resolution on the draft which stressed the imperialistic nature of the Vietnam War and did not state unequivocal opposition to conscription as such; they lost badly. The PL program of a summer work-in, with student radicals getting factory jobs in order to get acquainted with the concerns of workers and win a hearing for their views on Vietnam, was discussed but was not proposed as an SDS program. Instead, the Convention did adopt a motion by Carl Davidson giving tentative approval to a nationwide student strike in the spring of 1968 against the war and against university complicity with the military.

In many ways, the most dynamic force at the SDS Convention was a new organization formed on the West Coast at the end of the spring, called the Resistance. Members of the Resistance, many of whom were also in SDS, believed that it was necessary for young radicals to force a confrontation with the Selective Service System by destroying or turning in their draft cards or voluntarily giving up their II-S deferments. They argued that only in this manner could they convince other Americans of their sincerity in agitating against the war and the draft. They planned a nationwide turn-in of draft cards on October 16th, and hoped that the movement would build momentum so that the government would be faced with a choice of ending the war or jailing a steadily increasing number of people. At this time the cleavage between the Resistance's approach and what came to be a majority approach within SDS was not clear, and 'October 16th' buttons were common at the Convention.³⁸

Less indigenous to SDS, and correspondingly less warmly received, were two other groups with different approaches to the problem of organizing against the war. The Student Mobilization Committee, which grouped Trotskyists, radical pacifists, and Communist Party and DuBois Club members in an unusual coalition, had voted in May to call for a mass demonstration at the Pentagon on October 21st. The Spring Mobilization had brought out more people than had been expected, but enthusiasm within SDS for the Pentagon march was low, and no endorsement was voted. As for Vietnam Summer, a program of community education on Vietnam which was getting heavy financing (some of it, according to rumors which were common at the time, from the Kennedys), it was considered too liberal for serious consideration.³⁹

Explosion in the Ghettos

In the summer of 1967 urban violence reached its greatest level of the 1960s. In both Newark and Detroit police and National Guardsmen opened fire wantonly, resulting in the deaths of twenty-seven persons in Newark and more than forty in Detroit. By late August there had been incidents of one sort or another in dozens of cities, and at least eighty-one persons - nearly all of them Negroes - had died.⁴⁰ Attention focused on SNCC as a scapegoat for the violence, and strenuous efforts were made to put H. Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael's successor as head of SNCC, behind bars for making inflammatory speeches. Eventually he was the victim of a brilliant one-two punch: under indictment for inciting to arson in Cambridge, Maryland, he was arrested under an obscure Federal law forbidding persons under indictment to carry firearms across state lines.

Carmichael himself spent much of the summer abroad. His speeches at the OLAS conference in Cuba, in which he identified American capitalism as the common enemy of oppressed people around the world, led to demands for punitive action, but there were no laws available under which he could be charged. Earlier in the summer, SNCC had alienated a great deal of its remaining liberal sympathy when its newsletter carried an item strongly favorable to the Arab side in the Middle East crisis.

But by this time SNCC as an organization had lost much of its strength; its members were playing an active role in bringing black college students out of apathy, but aside from the personal appeal of Brown and Carmichael, SNCC had failed to develop any kind of base in the ghettos. Within a matter of months, SNCC stood to be eclipsed by the Oakland-based Black Panther Party as the most dynamic voice of radical black consciousness.

For the white New Left, the problem of how to relate to black rebellions was an extremely vexing one. It was this problem, more than any other, which made the 'New Politics' convention at the end of the summer in Chicago an almost total failure. Organized by the National Conference for New Politics, an organization of left-liberals and radicals whose nominal co-chairmen were Si Casady and Julian Bond, the Convention was an attempt to pull together the disparate groups working against the war and racism. It was held in the swank surroundings of the Palmer House hotel in Chicago. Almost at the outset a black caucus was formed, and it demanded fifty per cent of the vote on all matters before the plenary, as well as adoption in toto of a fourteen point platform worked out within the caucus. At the insistence largely of Old Left groups, the Convention voted to meet these demands. Proposals for an independent national Presidential ticket for 1968 were, however, narrowly defeated. Most participants left the Convention with a general sense of frustration at its inability to talk seriously about problems facing the Left. Complaints about 'white guilt feelings' were common. If anyone had suggested that within months middle class white students would be engaged in violent confrontations with the police, he would not have been taken seriously.

On the New Politics convention, see Marvin Garson: 'The Whites: A Clown Show' (Los Angeles Free Press, 22-28 September 1967). A good statement of the reaction of most New Leftists to the Convention and to the proposal for an independent Presidential campaign is in a two-part article by Rennie Davis and Staughton Lynd in the National Guardian: 'New Politics Versus a Movement in Revolt' (26 August 1967) and 'New Politics and the Movement' (2 September 1967).

Violence on the Campus

Given the mood of frustration on the nation's campuses, greater than even most radicals had suspected, three factors came together to give concrete shape to the events of the fall. One was the Stop the Draft Week, planned mainly by the Resistance for October 16-21; another was the big Pentagon demonstration scheduled for October 21; and the third - which varied from campus to campus - was the schedule of recruiters for the Dow Chemical Company.

It is not easy to pick through and re-create a chronology of events, but it went something like this: Starting on October 16th, there were ceremonies all across the country in which draft cards were collected from protesters to be handed over either to Federal authorities in Washington at the end of the week or to local representatives of the Justice Department immediately. At the Oakland Induction Center, Berkeley and San Francisco State students, as well as other opponents of the war from the Bay Area, conducted demonstrations throughout the week. Arrests and beatings worked to swell the size and militancy of the Oakland protest; and on Friday, the final day, something like twenty thousand battled police for hours for control of a twenty-two block area around the Induction Center. Meantime, students at the University of Wisconsin in Madison sat in against Dow Chemical recruiters on Wednesday, October 18th; riot police were sent to break up the protest; and more than 60 students - as well as eighteen policemen - were injured. At Brooklyn College the following day, police arrested Jeff Gordon for setting

up an SDS table next to a Navy recruiting table, and scores of students were beaten and over forty arrested in trying to prevent Gordon's arrest. All this set the stage for the Pentagon confrontation, and for mass protests on other campuses later in the fall.⁴¹

The Pentagon march had something for everybody. For those who like big demonstrations, there were perhaps seventy-five thousand people, a very respectable turnout. For the Resistance, it was the climax of a week of symbolic acts of draft refusal, and adult supporters attempted to turn nearly a thousand draft cards in to the Justice Department. There was civil disobedience at the Pentagon itself: areas where protesters could or could not legally sit had been carefully delineated, as had the expiration time of the march permit. Finally - giving the whole affair its distinctive flavor - there were attempts to force entry into the Pentagon building. These were led by SDS, which had announced its support of the October 21st action only weeks before when it appeared that the Government would refuse all permits, and by a New York group called the Revolutionary Contingent. Despite one or two temporary successes, these efforts failed; but they marked a distinct change from previous anti-war mobilizations. The whole affair, with middle class Americans face-to-face with Federal marshals and soldiers, had a nightmarish quality that seemed to drive home the point made in Calvert's earlier speech about radicals fighting for their own liberation.⁴²

For the rest of the fall, campus confrontations seemed to come one right after another: at Oberlin against Navy recruiters, at Iowa against Dow, at Princeton against the Institute for Defense Analysis, at Harvard and Boston University against Dow, at San Francisco State against ROTC... and on it went. There was no national coordination of these protests; hardly anyone at the SDS National Council meeting in early October could have guessed that the campuses would come alive to the extent that they did.⁴³

The Resistance tried to follow up Stop the Draft Week with a second wave of draft card returnings in early December, but the response was not great. The Student Mobilization Committee began to talk about a student strike for the spring, at just about the same time SDS was concluding that the strike might not be feasible. SDS itself, at its National Council meeting at the end of December, adopted instead a program suggested by Greg Calvert and Carl Davidson, ambitiously called 'Ten Days to Shake the Empire'. This proposed actions all across the country during the last week in April, aimed at agencies and institutions that played key roles in American domination of underdeveloped countries in the 'free world'. But as a national program it had little substance.

Peace, Freedom, Panthers, Yippies

While the new militancy was getting most of the attention, and different groups made their plans to give it a direction, two developments were taking place in California which were to have significance for the New Left. One of these was the formation of the Peace and Freedom Party; the other, and more important, was the coming to prominence of the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense. Peace and Freedom was started in the early fall, with members of the Independent Socialist Club at Berkeley playing a key role. Within a few months it succeeded in getting 107,000 persons registered, enough to win a place on the ballot for 1968. The two basic planks in the Peace and Freedom Party were an end to the Vietnam War and self-determination for the black ghettos. More specifically, P & F pledged its support to efforts to free Huey Newton, founder and leader of the Black Panthers, who was being charged with murdering one police officer and wounding another after they had stopped him for questioning on October 28th. Newton's case, which ended with his conviction for manslaughter in September 1968, became the biggest judicial cause celebre for the Left in the entire decade.⁴⁴

The Panthers made very effective use of a 'Free Huey' campaign. Rather than simply focusing on the numerous weak points in the case against Huey, they used the case politically both to strengthen their roots in the black community and to educate white people about ghetto conditions and the pervasiveness of racism in American public life. Largely because of the Huey Newton case, the Panthers have

gone in less than two years from a small and unknown local group (which attracted no attention until members went to the state legislature in Sacramento carrying guns in the spring of 1967) to a burgeoning national movement. There are now Black Panther groups in New York, Seattle, and numerous other cities.⁴⁵

Last February (1968), a merger of the Panthers and SNCC was announced by the leaders of the two groups, but it was at best only an uneasy alliance. Now there is intense feuding between the two groups, and SNCC has to a large extent been pushed into obscurity -- an unfortunate situation, since many SNCC people are still in the South and being subjected to vicious repression by Southern courts. The case of Lee Otis Johnson, sentenced to thirty years in prison for possession of marijuana, is not untypical of the plight of SNCC workers at the present time.⁴⁶

The prospects for the Peace and Freedom Party do not look hopeful at this stage. There has been factional controversy between members of the Independent Socialist Club, the Communist Party, and Progressive Labor, with the majority of PFP activists being unaffiliated with any ideological group. Parties were started in enough other states to hold a national convention in Ann Arbor this August. Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information of the Black Panthers, was nominated for President over Dick Gregory, but the Convention refused Cleaver's request that Jerry Rubin of the Yippies be named as his running mate. Each state party was then free to nominate its own candidate (for either office -- in fact some PFP groups went ahead and named Gregory for President). As of election time, it did not appear that the PFP groups, even in California, had used the election campaign successfully enough to be able to carry on active organizing efforts after the elections.

There was yet a third group which came into prominence in the late fall of 1967, the 'Yippies'. The chief organizers of the Yippies have been Jerry Rubin and Abbey Hoffman, both of whom have been active in radical politics for years but have felt that the Left is too dull and conventional. They have argued that there is a cultural revolt going on in American society which the Left has been unable to relate to or even understand. The Yippies emerged in the late fall, not long after the Pentagon demonstration, with a manifesto urging a gigantic festival in Chicago at the time of the Democratic Convention. This would be a 'Festival of Life' to contrast with the 'festival of death' inside the Convention hall. This Yippies' call, signed by Rubin, Hoffman, Paul Krassner of The Realist, and a handful of others, was aimed primarily at hippies, rather than political radicals, and radical groups never really managed to come to terms with the Yippies' spirit.⁴⁷

The center spread of the Washington Free Press for 29 February 1968 not only makes a nice poster but tells as much about the Yippies (officially known as the Youth International Party) as any more formal account. Sally Kempton's 'Yippies Anti-Organize a Groovy Revolution' (Village Voice, 21 March 1968) is also worth reading. The Berkeley Barb printed a number of Rubin's speeches and articles, before as well as after the formal launching of the Yippies. Although you wouldn't want to read more than one at a time, they are: 'Look Forward in Anger' (17-23 November 1967), 'War's End Blows Minds, Frees Spirits' (1-7 December 1967), 'And In America We Are All Learning to be Vietcong' (5-11 January 1968), and 'Elvis Kills Ike' (8-14 March 1968).

Beneath the flamboyance and the shock effect of the Yippies' proclamations lay a two-sided critique: first, that American culture, which is the focal point for non-political alienation in this society, is inextricably related to the way in which society is run and the privileges which it preserves; and second, that people who are personally oppressed by the society need an alternative way of life rather than simply the chance to take part in political meetings and protest demonstrations. Indeed, it was clear to people in Chicago that most of the participants in the Convention Week activities had come not because of the massive publicity put out by the National Mobilization Committee, but because of the Yippies. In nominating a pig for President, and threatening to dump LSD in the Chicago water supply, the Yippies added a note of excitement to a week whose only other source of excitement was the Chicago Police Department. What will become of the Yippies now that Chicago is over is unclear. After the Wallace campaign, the New Left is more conscious than ever of the need for a radical movement in the working class,

and there is much uncertainty about the degree to which this requires organizers to adopt a more 'straight' life style.

Ballots and Buildings

For the New Left in the spring of 1968, there were two events which were of immeasurable importance. One was the campaign of Senator Eugene McCarthy for the Democratic Presidential nomination, and the other was a complex of events that is usually referred to simply as 'Columbia'.

The McCarthy campaign began in a modest way in late November when, after sending up a series of trial balloons, the Minnesota Senator told a meeting of anti-war Democrats in Chicago that he would challenge President Johnson for the Party's nomination. At that time this seemed an impossible goal: LBJ was unpopular, but solidly entrenched, and the only one of McCarthy's stated objectives which seemed attainable was the restoration of young people's faith in the political system. But this was at the peak of the militant campus demonstrations against Dow and Armed Services recruiters, and it seemed unlikely that a quixotic Presidential campaign would attract much youthful support.

What happened to change this was that the Vietnamese Tet Offensive in early February called into question the Administration's claims of military success, and the New Hampshire primary a month later showed that McCarthy's campaign did have an outside chance of success. It began to catch fire among college students, especially in states with Presidential primaries -- such as Wisconsin. The McCarthy effort in that state depended very heavily on student volunteers, and it was apparently the prospect of a lop-sided defeat that led President Johnson to withdraw from contention two days before the primary.

Although some SDS chapters did go into the McCarthy campaign, there was a clear consensus on the national level and in the larger chapters that it should not be supported: first, because McCarthy did not commit himself to a policy of withdrawal even if negotiations should fail; second, because the New Left distrusts hero worship and opposes the notion that society can be changed simply by choosing different leaders; and third, because the campaign seemed to many an attempt to co-opt radical students by convincing them that sweeping change was possible within a political structure that contains innumerable safeguards for the status quo.⁴⁸

Still, it was obvious throughout most of the spring that SDS had no real alternative for young people who felt that working for McCarthy was the most effective way of stopping the war. That is why the Columbia affair, when it began at the end of April, was seized upon with so much interest by New Left groups across the country. The lesson of Columbia seemed to be that a strong action such as the occupation of a building, centered around radical issues, could attract support among the students and force the Administration into making mistakes that would increase this support.

What was not clear at the time, but has become very clear since, is that such a militant action has no built-in guarantees of long-range success. By all accounts, the Columbia campus is quiescent this year (1968-69). The SDS chapter has been baffled by a liberal new president and by a proliferation of student proposals for structural changes in the University that have little relevance to the questions (still raised by SDS) of the University's relationship to society. 'Columbia' was certainly a moment of grandeur and of ingenuity for the New Left, and it is not a condemnation of Columbia SDS to say that its experiences have been misunderstood.⁴⁹

One salient point about the wave of student seizures of university buildings in the late spring of 1968 is the key role played by black students. A massive student sit-in at Howard University, in fact, pre-dated the Columbia affair by a month. Later in the spring students at Tuskegee Institute held the school's board of trustees captive over a period of hours. At Columbia itself, black students had traditionally been very unpolitical, but they played an indispensable part in

the 1968 uprising. It seems likely that the New York police would have been called in much earlier had the Administration not feared that violence against black students holding Hamilton Hall would bring reinforcements from Harlem. At Northwestern, Ohio State, and elsewhere, black students with some white support took over buildings in efforts to force university administrators to grant such demands as the admission of more minority group students. The new mood among black university students marked a tremendous change from the situation that had existed even one or two years earlier.⁵⁰

East Lansing, Chicago and After

Although there were good talks in many of the workshops about chapter organizing experiences, the June 1968 SDS Convention at Michigan State University managed to evade most of the central questions that had been raised by the previous year's experiences: relationship of whites to militant black groups, cultural rebellion, attitude toward the 'McCarthy kids', and role of Columbia-style militancy in building a campus movement. Instead, the Convention resolved itself into a feud between supporters and opponents of the Progressive Labor Party. PL pushed very hard for its 'Student-Worker Alliance' idea, and the other side charged that PL was an 'external cadre' trying to manipulate SDS. When the latter issue was brought brought out into the open, supporters of PL clearly had the sympathy of most delegates, simply because their arguments were better. Only the disruptive antics of the 'Up Against the Wall Motherfucker' Lower East Side chapter made the plenary sessions worth attending. What was obscured by all the debates was the fact that SDS was strong, was getting stronger, and was reaching campuses which had had little contact with radical ideas in the past.

(On the SDS Convention, see Bruce Detweiler, 'Following the Old Left Back into the Factories' (Village Voice, 27 June 1968), and Ann Gordon's enjoyable 'Conventional SDS' (Connections, 1-22 July 1968). James Jacobs' article, 'SDS: Between Reform and Revolution' (Nation, 10 June 1968) is a very important survey of SDS and its problems in mid-1968.)

The important thing about Chicago, since not that many radicals showed up there, was that it was televised. The defeat of McCarthy, the harassment of newsmen and dissenting delegates, the wanton clubbings by Chicago police, and above all the arrogance or (in Humphrey's case) mock humility with which it was all done made indelible impressions on millions of young people.

In Chicago itself hippies, SDSers, and 'McCarthy kids' had stood together against the police. Across the country the same kind of alliance seemed possible; nearly everywhere, SDS chapters reported in September that attendance at their first meetings was greater than ever before, and the SDS national office was swamped with literature requests.

The fall SDS National Council meeting, held in Boulder, Colorado, in mid-October, drew more than 600 people, and by all accounts was the best national SDS meeting in years. An ambitious program calling for a nationwide strike of high school and college students, together with local demonstrations aimed at showing disgust with the Presidential elections, was approved. In place of polemics between PL and anti-PL delegates, there was the best discussion ever held in SDS on strategy for developing a radical working class movement. PL's proposal for a Student Labor Action Project was decisively beaten, but this did not mean that the importance of reaching blue-collar and other workers was ignored.

The success of George Wallace's effort to attract support in working class areas has been taken both as a sign of hope (because Wallace has appealed to the workers' sense of powerlessness) and, for obvious reasons, as a warning. The meeting also - for the first time at a national SDS conference - talked seriously about organizing in the Armed Forces, through participation in a 'National GI Week' on 1-5 November. Although the past year had seen a burgeoning of anti-war coffee houses near military bases, as well as the growth of Vietnam GI and other anti-war papers distributed to servicemen, these programs had gotten more support from Old

Left than from New Left groups, mainly because of the New Left's advocacy of draft refusal. Finally, the Boulder Council also passed a resolution, submitted by High School SDS of Los Angeles, calling for an intensification of organizing efforts among high school students.

SUMMARY

It is hard to get a clear overall picture of the new radical movement that has developed in this country during the 1960s. It started nine years ago, when the first Negro college students, wearing coats and ties, began to sit in at Southern lunch counters, and the first Northern students began to startle their classmates by carrying picket signs in support of the sit-ins. Today there is an incredible proliferation of activities that make up what we can call the New Left. While keeping in mind that historical delineations are never exact, it may be possible to distinguish four or perhaps five periods in the development of this New Left.

First was a period in the early 1960s when liberal issues were dominant: segregated public accommodations, nuclear testing, the House Committees on Un-American Activities, and scattered violations of academic freedom. This was a period above all of single-issue movements and a pervasive mistrust of political ideologies. The largest student protest organization was the Student Peace Union, which was so closely identified with the issue of nuclear testing that it almost entirely collapsed after the signing of a limited test ban treaty in 1963.

Then came a period, perhaps roughly delineated by the years 1964 and 1965, when the issue of participatory democracy came to the fore in the new radical movement. SNCC and SDS emerged as the two most vital groups, and both of them put great stress on building a movement that would give ordinary people a real voice in the decision-making process. The Federal Government's liberal bureaucracy, as typified by the Justice Department and the War on Poverty, was viewed with increasing impatience and mistrust. The new radicals came to regard the liberal style as a series of back-room deals among 'leaders', in which decisions were made without the participation of the governed.

The third phase was one which lasted for about a year after the intensification of the Vietnam war in early 1965. At this time the war itself, rather than the draft or overall US foreign policy, was the focus for radical activity. SDS enjoyed its greatest period of expansion, largely because of its identification with opposition to the war. Vietnam, because American soldiers were fighting there, was much more of an emotional issue than nuclear testing had been earlier in the decade, and the mere act of protesting the war often involved risks. Peaceful protest had not been absorbed by the society, nor had the protest movement evolved into a generalized critique of the society.

The fourth phase is one which may be dated from the spring and early summer of 1966, when SNCC formulated the Black Power concept and campus sit-ins took place against the furnishing of draft boards with class rank information. During this period the New Left has increasingly connected broad societal issues - such as the war and racial exploitation - with the conditions of life in middle class as well as lower class America. Student radicals have come to feel, as Greg Calvert has expressed it, that they are engaged in an effort to liberate themselves through an overall transformation of the society. The two are seen as opposite sides of the same coin.

What will happen next is hard to predict; the only thing which can be said with any certainty is that in nine years the Movement has come a long way.

FOOTNOTES

1. Almost no historical material has been written on the Left in the 1950s. The best thing I have seen is Andre Schiffrin's 'The Student Movement in the 1950s: a reminiscence', in Radical America, May-June 1968 (available from New England Free Press).
2. David Horowitz's Student, written while the author was a graduate student in English at Berkeley, tells the story of the growth of student protest there through 1961, highlighting the central role of the HUAC episode. It is an impassioned but well-written account. Also good, though much shorter, is a report by Jessica Mitford in The Nation of 27 May 1961 called 'The Indignant Generation'.
3. See Barbara Deming, 'The Ordeal of SANE' (The Nation, 11 March 1961) and Donald M. Bluestone, 'Unity in the Peace Movement' (Sanity, Spring 1962). An excellent article that traces the peace movement through the middle and late 1950s is Philip G. Altbach, 'Concern in the Midst of Apathy: The Post-McCarthy Era' (Fellowship, December 1965).
4. The story of this early period of SNCC is related very well in Howard Zinn's book, SNCC: The New Abolitionists, mentioned above. Tom Hayden wrote a pamphlet on the McComb activity in the fall of 1961, called 'Revolution in Mississippi'. Zinn's special report for the Southern Regional Council, Albany: A Study in National Responsibility (1962) is a telling critique of the federal government's role. The weekly Mississippi Free Press, started in the winter of 1961-62, is an excellent source, as is SNCC's own monthly publication, The Student Voice.
5. Aside from Zinn's book, two good sources on SNCC in 1963 are Charles Jones, 'SNCC: Nonviolence and Revolution' (New University Thought, September-October 1963) and Anne Braden, 'The Students: A New Look' (The Southern Patriot, May 1963).
6. There are two recent articles dealing with the purposes which the ERAP organizers had in mind, and both articles are quite good: Todd Gitlin, 'The Radical Potential of the Poor' (International Socialist Journal, No. 24, 1967), and Richard Rothstein, 'ERAP: Evolution of the Organizers' (Radical America, March-April 1968).
7. Much has been written about Mississippi Summer. Len Holt, a veteran civil rights lawyer, gives the best overall picture of the project in The Summer That Didn't End (Morrow, 1965), while Sally Belfarge's Freedom Summer (Viking, 1965) is an often moving account of one volunteer's experience. A 'Letter from Jackson' by Calvin Trillin (New Yorker, 29 August 1964) tells a great deal about the thinking of Bob Moses, the original SNCC worker in Mississippi and head of the summer project. Staughton Lynd, who was in general charge of the freedom schools, wrote about them in 'The Freedom Schools: Concept and Organization' (Freedomways, Spring 1965); see also Florence Howe, 'Mississippi's Freedom Schools: The Politics of Education' (Harvard Educational Review, Spring 1965). Letters from Mississippi, edited by Elizabeth Sutherland (McGraw-Hill, 1965) is a good source on the thinking of the northern students.
8. Len Holt's book has a long account of the Atlantic City episode. There are also articles by Jack Minnis, a white SNCC worker, in 'The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party: A New Declaration of Independence' (Freedomways, Spring 1965), and by Murray Kempton in 'Conscience of the Convention' (New Republic, 5 September 1964).
9. A number of analyses appeared which are worth reading in order to get a picture of the civil rights movement in 1965 and SNCC's relationship to it. The longest and best was Anne Braden's 'The Southern Freedom Movement in Perspective' (Monthly Review, July-August 1965). The Movement had a good article on the MFDP in its May issue. Tom Hayden and Norman Fruchter wrote sympathetic reports in Studies on the Left (Winter 1965), and Jack Newfield a somewhat hesitant one in The Nation (19 July 1965). The most extended analysis by a worried liberal was Pat Watters' 'Encounter with the Future' in New South (May 1965). Two other articles that are worth reading are Andrew Kopkind, 'The New Radicals in Dixie' (New Republic, 10 April 1965), and Bruce Payne, 'SNCC: An Overview Two Years Later' (reprinted in the Cohen-Hale anthology).

10. Andrew Kopkind's 'Of, By and For the Poor: The New Generation of Student Organizers' (New Republic, 19 June 1965) describes the ERAP projects. Studies on the Left, which concluded after the Johnson-Goldwater election that the future of the Left lay with 'the movements', had a number of excellent reportorial pieces during 1965, including coverage of the Newark, Chicago, and Cleveland ERAP projects. Toward the end of 1965, the New Republic performed a valuable service by inviting a group of New Left activists (Charlie Cobb, Stokely Carmichael, Jean Smith, and Casey Hayden of SNCC, and Todd Gitlin, Tom Hayden, and Richard Flacks of SDS) to write out their thoughts on contemporary society. These essays, subsequently published as Thoughts of the Young Radicals (New Republic paperback, 1966), are perhaps the best expression of the New Left philosophy as it had developed at that point. As Carmichael summarized, 'I place my own hope for the United States in the growth of belief among the unqualified that they are in fact qualified: they can articulate and be responsible and hold power.' This book also contains a series of critical commentaries on the New Left, but Irving Howe's arrogant 'New Styles in "Leftism"' (Dissent, Summer 1965) is a more important critique. The same issue of Dissent contains a short article by Staughton Lynd, 'The New Radicals and "Participatory Democracy"', probably the best exposition of this key New Left concept.

11. The teach-ins are discussed in 'Teach-in: New Forum for Reason' (The Nation, 31 May 1965); Mitchell Lévitás, 'Vietnam Comes to Oregon University' (New York Times Magazine, 9 May 1965); and in two excellent articles by James Gilbert and Joan Wallach Scott in Studies on the Left (Summer 1965). See also Louis Menasche and Ronald Radosh, eds., Teach-ins U.S.A.: Reports, Opinions, Documents (Praeger, 1967).

12. Potter's speech, a very important statement of SDS thinking on the war, was later printed as a pamphlet and widely distributed by SDS.

13. See especially his The Vietnam War: World Revolution and American Containment, printed by SDS in April 1965, as well as his speech in November of that year, cited below.

14. See Andrew Kopkind, 'Bureaucracy's Long Arm: Too Heady a Start in Mississippi?' (New Republic, 21 August 1965). For subsequent reports on the trials of CDGM, see Gerald Rosenfield's three-part article in The Movement, 'What Happened to the Mississippi Child Development Group' (March, April, and June 1966), and Pat Watters, 'Mississippi: Children and Politics' (Dissent, May-June, 1967).

15. There is an excellent article with a long title beginning 'The MFDP Challenge...' in The Movement (July 1965). Andrew Kopkind, 'Seat Belts for Mississippi's Five' (New Republic, 27 July 1965) is also a good summary.

16. The sorrow with which liberals viewed developments among young civil rights activists is ably expressed in Pat Watters, 'Encounter with the Future' (New South, May 1965).

17. See Elizabeth Sutherland, 'Mississippi: Summer of... Discontent' (Nation, 11 October 1965), as well as numerous articles in The Movement for 1965. Over the last four years The Movement, published monthly in California, has been the best single source of information and commentary from the New Left.

18. For a sympathetic account of Watts by a SNCC worker, see Jimmy Garrett, 'The Negro Revolt in L.A.--From the Inside' (The Movement, September 1965).

19. There has been little outside commentary on any of these groups, so that their own publications are the best sources of information on them. SSOC's New South Student has been consistently interesting, while May 2nd's Free Student published several issues of high quality -- the paper kept up publication even after May 2nd itself had been dissolved. The Northern Student Movement put out Freedom North, Y.S.A. the Young Socialist, and the Dubois Clubs The Insurgent. Doug Jenness's well-done pamphlet War and Revolution in Vietnam, printed in 1965, gives the YSA perspective on the war. Writers such as Jack Newfield, in A Prophetic Minority, and Paul Jacobs and Sau Landau, in The New Radicals, have been quick to dismiss the Dubois Clubs, YSA, and May 2nd as being simply hereditary remnants of the Old Left. I am reluctant to do this. Granted that the rhetoric and style of these groups may in varying degrees be foreign to New Leftists, it is still true that the DuBois Clubs provided an organizational vehicle for many New Left activists, and that the YSA and May 2nd have influenced the thinking of thousands of young radicals outside their own ranks. YSA's work in building up anti-war committees has been important. May 2nd played a vanguard role for the New Left in some ways, by

raising issues such as imperialism, the draft, and university involvement with the military in advance of their being pushed by SDS.

20. A sympathetic inside view of the Free University of New York is Will Inman's 'The Free University of New York: One Man's View' (The Humanist, May-June 1966).
21. The 23 October 1965 issue of National Guardian has several articles on the protests. There is a fine movie on the October anti-war march from Berkeley to Oakland. It is entitled 'Sons and Daughters', and was written and directed by Jerry Stoll.
22. Oglesby's speech was printed in a number of liberal and radical journals, including Liberation (January 1966), and was also printed as an SDS pamphlet under the title Trapped in a System. See also Andrew Kopkind, 'Radicals on the March' (New Republic, 11 December 1965).
23. The closest thing to an 'official' SDS program may have been a document which national secretary Paul Booth and former national secretary Lee Webb presented to an anti-war conference in November. Reprinted in Our Generation (May 1966) as 'From Protest to Radical Politics', the paper argued that the anti-war movement had to build a broad social movement that would reach people on issues that affected them directly. This approach was nothing new to SDS.
24. See Todd Gitlin's perceptive 'Notes on the Pathology of the N.C.' (New Left Notes, 4 and 11 February 1966). Jonathan Eisen also had a critical article in The Activist (March 1966).
25. SNCC's statement is printed in The Movement, January 1966.
26. See Herbert Shapiro, 'Julian Bond: Georgia's "Uppity" Legislator' (The Nation, 7 February 1966).
27. There are several articles worth reading on the development of the Black Power concept within SNCC in 1966. Of special interest are 'Interview with the Alabama Black Panther Party Organizer' (The Movement, February and March 1966); Stokely Carmichael, 'What We Want' (New York Review of Books, 22 September 1966; available as a pamphlet from New England Free Press); Black Power, a position paper for the SNCC Atlanta Project (now available as a pamphlet from SSOC); Andrew Kopkind, 'The Future of Black Power' (New Republic, 7 January 1967); and 'Stokely Carmichael', an interview in The Movement (February 1967). Harold Jacobs' later analytical article, 'SNCC and Black Power' (International Socialist Journal, August 1967) is certainly worth reading. Ed Clark, 'Black Panther's Power' (Progressive Labor, October-November 1966) is an extensive article on the Lowndes County Freedom Organization. On the Meredith march, see Paul Good, 'The Meredith March' (New South, Summer 1966). Bayard Rustin gave the moderate Negro leaders' case against SNCC in '"Black Power" and Coalition Politics' (Commentary, September 1966). For the response of the white New Left to SNCC's new course, see 'SDS Statement on SNCC' (New Left Notes, 27 May 1966); Ed Hamlett, 'Black Consciousness' (New Left Notes, 27 May 1966); and Mike Miller, 'Is There a Change in SNCC?' (The Movement, July and August 1966). Julius Lester's new book, Look Out Whitey, Black Power's Gonna Get Your Mama, is very good. The best collection of documents relating to Black Power is, oddly enough, in Italian: Roberto Giammanco's Potere Negro.
28. See Paul Good, 'A Tale of Two Cities' (The Nation, 21 November 1966); Patricia Waters, 'SNCC in Trouble: A Report from Atlanta' (Dissent, November-December 1966); and Bill Wingell, 'SNCC in Philadelphia: The Cops Declare War' (National Guardian, 27 August 1966).
29. See particularly Jack Kittredge's report on the Wisconsin sit-in (New Left Notes, 27 May 1966).
30. See Andrew Kopkind, 'Anti-Vietnam Politics' (New Republic, 4 June 1966), and Buddy Stein and David Wellman, 'The Scheer Campaign' (Studies on the Left, January-February 1967). The Stein-Wellman article, now available from the Radical Education Project, has been very influential in warning of the dangers in electoral politics.
31. CIPA published an excellent biweekly newspaper in connection with Weinstein's campaign, entitled simply 19. It folded right after the November election, but in its five

or so issues it achieved some of the best radical reportage and analysis geared to a general community readership, that the Left has come up with in the '60s.

32. See Mike James, 'ERAP Report: JOIN' (New Left Notes, 24 August 1966); 'Cleveland to Build Democracy' (New Left Notes, 24 April 1966); 'M-CUP' (New Left Notes, 1 October 1966).

33. Davidson's paper is printed in New Left Notes (9 September 1966). For a report on the Clear Lake Convention, see Jack A. Smith, 'SDS Heads Back to the Grassroots' (National Guardian, 17 September 1966). Incidentally, Paul Booth's 'National Secretary's Report' (New Left Notes, 17 June 1966) gives a good picture of where SDS stood in the summer of 1966.

34. Not much has been written about draft resistance efforts prior to 1967. 'Make Love, Not War: The Campaign Against the Draft' (Liberation, December 1967) is worth reading, as are several articles in the National Guardian: Jack A. Smith, 'Support Mounts for GIs Refusing to Fight in Vietnam' (9 July); William A. Price, 'Resist-Draft Cases Soar' (20 August); Jack A. Smith, 'War Foes Move Toward Confrontation on Draft' (5 November); and William A. Price, 'Negroes Resist Fighting a "White Man's War"' (5 November). Bernard Weinraub wrote a warm account of one draft refuser in 'Four Ways to Go: Tommy Rodd Went to Jail' (Esquire, September 1966). Staughton Lynd's article, 'A Time for Compassionate Solidarity' (National Guardian, 6 August 1966) was an important plea for the initiation of a draft resistance movement.

The SDS resolution is printed in New Left Notes (13 January 1967). National Secretary Greg Calvert has an article in the same issue, 'From Protest to Resistance', which expressed the romantic way in which many in SDS saw the new program.

35. See 'The Wisconsin Draft Resistance Union', an interview with Jody Chandler in Connections (25 March 1968), and the special issue of New Left Notes on Draft Resistance (27 March 1967), especially the article on Cornell: 'We Won't Go: A Case Study'.

36. See Peter Henig's excellent article, 'On the Manpower Channelers' (New Left Notes, 20 January 1967).

37. On the Berkeley strike, see Sheldon S. Wolin and John H. Schaar, 'Berkeley: The University Revolution' (New York Review of Books, 9 February 1967); James Petras, 'The Politics of Bureaucracy' (Liberation, February 1967); and Jeff Lustig, 'Berkeley Student Strike' (The Movement, January 1967). See also Robert M. Greenstein, 'The McNamara Incident at Harvard' (Dissent, March-April 1967); John Fuerst, 'Columbia: How It Happened' (New Left Notes, 1 May 1967); Todd Gitlin, 'Resistance and the Movement' (New Left Notes, 20 March 1967).

38. On the Resistance, see H. Lawrence Lack: 'Resistance Forms to Fight Conscription' (Los Angeles Free Press, 2-9 March 1967), and David McReynolds, 'The Resistance' (New Politics, Winter 1967). Steve Hamilton, one of the four original founders of the Resistance, wrote an article in New Left Notes which ably expresses the second thoughts which many SDS people came to feel about it. His article is entitled 'October 16th... A Moral Witness?' and appeared in the October 2, 1967 issue. An excellent article contrasting the Resistance with the Boston Draft Resistance Group, which works mainly with lower-class young people, is Robert Pearlman's 'Two Worlds of Draft Resistance' (Paper Tiger, March 1968).

39. For a strong - unduly strong - attack on Vietnam Summer, see Leif Johnson, 'Vietnam Summer: Liberal Protest or Radical Action?' (New Left Notes, 26 June 1967). There were many serious radicals in the program, both in the national office and in the field, despite its predominantly liberal sponsorship.

40. Tom Hayden's Rebellion in Newark: Official Violence and Ghetto Response (Random House paperback) is an excellent account. Hayden had been in Newark with the Newark Community Union Project since the summer of 1964. The Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, or Kerner Report (Bantam paperback) is an important document.

41. There is full coverage of the Oakland confrontation in the November 1967 issue of The Movement, several of whose editors played leadership roles in the Stop the Draft Week Committee and were later indicted for conspiracy. On the Dow protest at Wisconsin

and the student strike which followed, see the November special issue of Connections, the local underground newspaper, and a pamphlet published by the Teaching Assistants Association entitled Strike. On the Brooklyn College incident, see Jeffrey Gordon, 'Notes on the Brooklyn Strike' (New Left Notes, 13 November 1967).

42. Norman Mailer's brilliant book, The Armies of the Night, will certainly be the best-remembered account of what took place at the Pentagon. There is a special issue of the Washington Free Press, put together with the help of staff members of the Austin Rag, which has a number of good articles and is probably the best treatment from a New Left perspective. See also Mike Goldfield's excellent 'Power at the Pentagon' (New Left Notes, 30 October 1967).

43. For accounts of some of the confrontations, see the special issue of Middle Earth (Iowa City) (December 1967); Mark Kleiman, 'How the West Was Won' (The Rag, 11 December 1967); Robert J. Samuelson, 'War on Campus: What Happened When Dow Recruited at Harvard' (Science, 8 December 1967); and Brooks Penney, 'The Battle for San Francisco State' (The Movement, January 1968). Also, three analytical articles on the campus confrontations are well worth reading. They present distinct perspectives, and argue for them very ably. Howard Zinn's 'Dow Shalt Not Kill' (printed in New Left Notes, 20 November 1967, and in many other papers) argues that obstructive sit-ins against Dow recruiters are not an interference with free speech, and that the horrors of napalm and the ineffectiveness of normal protests outweigh the arguments for taking punitive action against students involved in these sit-ins. Carl Davidson's 'Toward Institutional Resistance' (New Left Notes, 13 November 1967) summarizes the development of a student movement against university complicity, lists various tactics that had been tried, and suggests general guidelines for their use. Jeff Gordon's article on the Brooklyn College strike, previously cited, appeared in the same issue of New Left Notes and argued that radicals must concentrate on building a base of support in the student body, even if this meant embracing liberal issues.

44. Two generally favorable accounts of the Peace and Freedom Party are Reese Erlich's 'Radicals and the 1968 Elections' (The Movement, May 1968) and Michael Freedman's 'The Peace and Freedom Party' (New Politics, Spring 1968). See also 'Peace and Freedom: A Report' (Los Angeles Free Press, 22-28 March 1967). Probably the best analysis of the strains within the nationwide Peace and Freedom movement is Barry Greenberg's 'Reform Versus Revolution, Yuppies Versus Workers' (Midpeninsula Observer, 26 August-9 September 1968).

45. So far as I know there is no single 'best' account of the Black Panthers, although the Midpeninsula Observer and other underground papers have had some good articles. SDS distributes a pamphlet, 'Huey Newton Talks to the Movement', presenting an interview that appeared in the August 1968 issue of The Movement. Another good interview with Newton appeared in the San Francisco Express Times (14 March 1968). See also Marlene Chayne, 'Whites Fight to Keep Power in Ghetto, Make Outlaws of Panthers' (Midpeninsula Observer, 22 April-6 May 1968); 'Panthers Sue Oakland' (a four-page supplement to the Midpeninsula Observer, 6-20 May 1968); Andrew Kopkind, 'The Lair of the Black Panther' (New Republic, 13 August 1968); RKH, 'Were Cops Gunning for Huey' (Berkeley Barb, 3-9 November 1968); and 'Panthers, Politics, and Pigs' (The Movement, July 1968).

46. For other examples, see Randy Furst, 'Orangeburg After the Massacre' (The Guardian, 24 February 1968), and P. K. Brown, 'SNCC Members Shafted' (Dallas Notes, 18 September-1 October 1968). Incidentally, an excellent discussion of Black Power, two years after the concept was first publicized by SNCC, is Robert L. Allen's pamphlet 'The Dialectics of Black Power' (available from the Guardian, the New England Free Press, and the Radical Education Project).

47. The hippies, or 'flower children', were regarded with distrust by Old Leftists and by many New Leftists as well. Although a number of SDS chapters, starting with the Austin, Texas group, had held 'Gentle Thursdays' in the spring of 1967, and although student radicals are generally not puritanical about marijuana whether or not they themselves turn on, the 'hippie rebellion' had been almost entirely separate from political radicalism. There are several articles on the hippies which seem useful. These include 'The Digger Papers' (special issue of The Realist, August 1968); Leonard Magruder, 'A Middle-Aged Beatnik Among the Hippies' (Notes from the Underground (now Dallas Notes), 17-31 January 1968); Jack Newfield, 'Two Cheers for the Hippies' (The Nation, 26 June 1967); Thomas Pepper, 'Growing Rich on the Hippies' (The Nation, 29 April 1968); and Don

McNeill, 'Saga of the Free Store: Death of the Diggers?' (Village Voice, 28 July 1967). Opposing viewpoints are given by Ralph J. Gleason, 'The Power of Non-Politics or the Death of the Square Left' (Evergreen Review, October 1967), and by New Left Notes: 'Hippies and the Revolution' (6 November 1967). A good account of the first 'Gentle Thursday' is Gary Thiher's 'Gentle Thursday as Revolution' (The Rag, 24 April 1967).

48. Two good articles which set forth a New Left perspective on the McCarthy campaign are Joe Davidson, 'McCarthy's Circus' (Connections, 12-26 March 1968), and Clive Jones, 'Who is Eugene McCarthy?' (The Rag, 29 January 1968).

49. The two best articles I have seen on Columbia are Peter Shapiro, 'Columbia: A Study in Successful Environmental Adaptation' (Open Process, 9 May 1968), and Eric Mann, 'Columbia Exam: A Special Supplement' (The Movement, November 1968; an earlier version appeared in Our Generation). The New York Newsreel's fifty-minute film on Columbia is worth seeing. A miscellany of fairly good writings includes Paul Spike, 'We Don't Want to Be Educated for the CIA!--An Interview with Mark Rudd', and Dotson Rader, 'Up Against the Wall' (Evergreen Review, August 1968); Marvin Harris, 'Big Bust on Morningside Heights' (The Nation, 10 June 1968); the Cox Commission, Crisis at Columbia (Vintage paperback); 'Columbia' (The Rag, 6 May 1968); and Dankwart A. Rustow, 'Days of Crisis' (New Leader, May 20, 1968). Two excellent statements of the SDS case against Columbia as an institution are Who Rules Columbia?, a thick booklet prepared by staff members of the North American Conference on Latin America, and 'The Columbia Statement', drafted by Paul Rockwell and approved by Columbia SDS in September 1968.

50. See two excellent articles by Robert L. Allen - both written before the series of building seizures - in Guardian: 'Black Students Seek Role' (2 March 1968) and 'Black Campuses Today' (9 March 1968). See also Sanders Beburna and Brenda Adams, 'Howard University Students Take Over' (Washington Free Press, 27 March 1968); Roger Friedman, 'NU Black Power Victory' (New Left Notes, 6 May 1968); and David Steinberg, 'Black Power on Black Campuses' (Commonweal, 19 April 1968).

