

IT'S LATER THAN YOU THINK

THE

fall '61

vol 3, #1

Journal of the new student awakening

25¢

the Past Two Years
Jonathan Eisen

: CRISIS AND THE INDIVIDUAL
: by Gene Keyes

Editorial notes:
memo; tips; consignment

: In recent months, an increasing number of
: students and other people have been leaving col-
: lege or their jobs to work full time on behalf
: of their convictions concerning the unlimited
: world emergency created by the arms race and the
: need for a more realistic and constructive

Left in Britain
Marty Oppenheimer

: strategy of conflict. One such group, called
: Polaris Action, is based in New London, Connecti-
: cut. Polaris Action is perhaps best known for
: its mouse-and-elephant harassment of several
: Polaris submarines. However, this is only the

Spiritual and Moral
Aspects of the Student
Non-Violent Struggle
in the South
Charles McDew

: most conspicuous phase of a broad spectrum of
: activities and ideas with a dual purpose: to
: shatter public apathy about the arms race and
: to make clear the necessity for a choice of a
: practical means of defense having social, economic
: and moral consequences consistent with our demo-
: cratic and human and religious beliefs.

Crisis and the Individual
Gene Keyes

: Experience shows that people otherwise
: sympathetic to the ultimate aims of such groups
: may have either of two reservations. One is
: that Polaris Action and related groups espouse
: "unilateralism." The other concerns effective-
: ness. In regard to the first, critics assert
: that unilateralism is a simple matter of dropping
: our weapons, and hoping that the Soviets do likewise. In general, it is a
: doctrine summarily pigeonholed as a Pax Sovietics at best, surrender at worst.

Critical analysis of
the US peace movement
Dick Kern

The "New" Conservatism
Usher Ward

: While such arguments would have validity if they fully stated the uni-
: lateral case, in fact they misrepresent and take out of context a single phase
: of unilateral theory. True, a "unilateralist" is one who advocates renuncia-
: tion of defense based purely on threats of destruction and with America
: necessarily taking a calculated and heavily publicized lead toward total dis-
: armament. However, the main thrust of the so-called unilateralists' argument
: has to do with making the world-wide promulgation of the Four Freedoms an
: effective reality. Simultaneously, they propose a multi-faceted defense-
: offense program including national preparations for massive non-violent re-
: sistance (which might embrace elements of the French and Danish resistances,
: the Gandhian campaign to free India, the Southern non-violent integration
: efforts, etc.) plus psychological warfare, moral karate, American leadership

Help dispel public apathy!

Distribute THE ACTIVIST

uncompromised by military necessity, and mobilization for the oft-heralded world war on want.

People in Polaris Action and similar undertakings have pledged their lives, their savings, and their sacred respectability to forward this prophecy and this program. Their physical risk may not at the moment be as immediate as that faced by a Hungarian or an Algerian or an Indian or an American revolutionary, but the goal is in the same spirit: freedom to realize the limitless potentialities of mankind. Yet the risk is explicit in both the theory and practice of nonviolent interjection, because the actionist does all in his power to place himself in a position such that the operator of a weapon cannot carry out his mission without first killing the actionist. In any case, they are risking and receiving imprisonment for acts of civil disobedience in protest of devices and policies whose use or threat to use they feel is not in freedom's best interest. Some follow Thoreau's example by refusing to pay the percentage of taxes which makes possible the injustices they strive to end. The peace actionists underscore C. P. Snow's observation that throughout history, more horrendous crimes have been committed in the name of obedience than by disobedience.

Yet even those who may agree with the case for an American disarmament offensive have a reservation: they question the effectiveness of such an extreme position. Those who are acting like extremists reply that doubters cry "effectiveness" but have no such effectiveness. Weapons such as the Polaris missiles continue to pour forth and multiply with the money our taxes provide and with as much leeway to operate as our physical indifference allows. Moral and intellectual indignation has been shown to be without effectiveness if it is not backed with action consonant to the danger it protests. There are thousands in opinion who may oppose such weapons and the policies they represent, but only a few have gone to jail rather than remain bemused and helpless spectators reading about daily breakthroughs toward destruction because nobody stood up to stop them.

The rationale for civil disobedience is not glib or utopian, nor is it one invoked for light and transient causes. While this is not the occasion for me to expound upon the many rational, moral, practical and religious considerations which are the composites of an "extreme" course of action, I would like to emphasize the growing sense of urgency -- desperation, perhaps -- which prompts those who urge others to consider an all-out commitment. Coppenhagen's opinion warns that ten years is our most optimistic life expectancy if something drastic isn't done about the arms race. Kahn, Wayne Morse, and C. P. Snow among others cite this figure; Nehru allows "three or four years." The Merston National Security Report of June 28, 1960, published by Ohio State University, predicts an accidental nuclear war in the 1960's. Bertrand Russell thinks the situation is out of hand already and declares that "the effectiveness of (the disarmament movement) is becoming dependent on its endorsement of a program of civil disobedience. He and the Committee of 100 mobilized close to 4,000 persons for the sit-down at the Defense Ministry, the opening shot of the campaign.

It is becoming apparent that the Arms Control concept is a foreseeable official response to the arms race, although there is already doubt that such an attempt can provide even a reprieve. Perhaps others may be impelled at this point to reassess the gauntlet of effectiveness arguments that deter many from working toward what they regard as a more realistic approach than Arms Control.

It was very impressive and heartening when 25 Harvard and Radcliffe students -- in fact, I was one of them -- marched all day to demonstrate for some extremely moderate proposals on the Geneva negotiations. But if they were to say to me, don't you think, therefore, it is more "effective" to remain in Harvard to forward this important work, I would reply that I believe far greater effectiveness would result if a group of students were en masse to go on leave of absence from the University, and with a more far-reaching program, risk imprisonment to commit civil disobedience, say, by obstructing a Polaris submarine.

I do not have the space to extrapolate the results of a little action such as that, but I would urge one's imagination not to dismiss the ramifications lightly. It was not until the tour de force of four or five students committing civil disobedience at a lunch counter in February that "effectiveness" began to emerge from a widespread concern.

Today it is being asked whether analogous action on a much larger scale is necessary to secure these rights, life, as well as liberty, equality, and the pursuit of happiness. Having taken a leave of absence from Harvard to become an "extremist," I have tried to deal in this letter with the considerations which motivate those who seem to be eschewing effectiveness. Those who have gone to jail have suggested that moderate response does not adequately answer the call to duty if peace and freedom are to be preserved.

This is not to dismiss all of SPU's extraordinary accomplishments, or to bemoan general student inaction. The "silence" of any generation depends on the vigor with which a variable minority of political activists can make itself felt. It is to say that in order for a small group to be most effective in today's time-limited emergency, civil disobedience is what needs to be done. And more people are needed, and now.

As in a nightmare when an endlessly ringing phone makes one wonder why somebody doesn't answer it, and then wake up to realize with a start, "My God, it's for me," so the tocsins and alarums of catastrophe have been ringing, and clarion calls for the all-out response. Such calls have been issued at critical times throughout history, and they are being issued today. As more and more begin to realize that they are free to act and not doomed to being swept helplessly onward by the lemmings of the conventional wisdom; as more and more begin to realize "My God, it's for me!" then the next revolution in defense of human values and freedom will be effectively and nonviolent under way. Sincerely yours, Gene Keys '63. PS: Inquiries about Polaris Action should be addressed to the New England Committee for Nonviolent Action, 13 North Bank Street, New London, Conn. -oOo-

THE PAST TWO YEARS, we are told, have been for the students of this country times of the great Political Awakening. The analysts say that these have been the years of growing reaction to previous lethargy, apathy, fright, and conformity. Now, the American student is being compared seriously to his European counterpart, an astute member of his nation's social system; to the young Turks who hallantly overthrew their country's despotic regime; to Japanese youth who are able to effect sweeping changes in that land's foreign and domestic policies. The American student, yet a newcomer to the world of social reality, has shown that now he, too, can act and can influence. He, too, can look at his own National Student Association, and can listen to his

colleagues speak clearly on timely issues. His numbers are content no longer to graduate and become a serial number in the machine age. The last two years have been tremendously difficult, though, and the NSA is but an infant -- maturing is not an easy process.

The American student, however, has chosen to act on the basis of his impulse and his strong sense of ethics. He has seen the wasteland of segregation and has declared it an evil -- and then has acted on his declaration. He has seen the Cloud, and has reacted against it in ways that have been available to him. He has heard his own voice -- clear in the absence of weighty politics, unburdened by an ideological line. And there has emerged spontaneous action by students who are unafraid -- by young Democrats and Socialists, and Communists, yes (and some Republicans). And young people concerned with pressing issues, and worried about the fate of Man. The emotion is great; the real thinking will come later -- if indeed it does come at all. It is this point that I wish to explore.

That the American youth is concerned deeply with the tremendous anxiety of the Cold War is unquestionable. That he is prepared or willing to prepare himself for the intricacies of its solution is doubtful at best. Americans are totally ignorant of the myriad problems surrounding them. They have been fed on the milk of patriotism for so long that they have forgotten how to think. They have been intimidated to the point of renunciation of their democratic ideals. Our newspapers, nearly all responsible to the large vested interests of this country, have long since ceased presenting intelligent discussions and varied ideas, and, as our other mass media, are geared to the art of pacification and agitation (alternatively). As George Orwell before them, they, too, have found that fright and intense loyalty make excellent partners.

And for the student, our colleges and universities have failed to instill in us the desire to question resourcefully in areas in our proximity. Our 'probings' have been rudimentary and have either followed the pack of Republican editorialists or have failed to crack the surface of the time-worn cliches. We have been led. All of us.

All this reflects on the Student Movement of this country. We have acted clearly and movingly, but without the political acumen it takes to build an influential core of thought and opinion on major issues such as the problems of peace, the civil rights battle, and the sterility of our society. It is precisely the students' inability to delve deeply into looming questions, and participate in an exchange of meaningful ideas that has severely limited them in the fields of action. The student is just now beginning to realize that there are, in fact, many problems that he never even thought existed. The pervading intellectual sterility will lead eventually to either blind activism or dogmatic slogan screaming. And neither is the student that can build an effective, respected student movement in this country. Activism is a good thing, but blind activism, even of the highest morality, is foolish. But activism is easy; knowledge and participation are difficult. The students must choose. They must learn to relate their ideals to the world of realities, and learn that battles are won not only with pickets and petitions. They must learn that issues involve people -- people with emotions and feeling like their own. They must come to know that peace is finally

gained through working and communicating thoughtful ideas and tolerant attitudes -- not only through transcontinental walks and CIA pickets. Above all, however, the young people must know that their duty as world citizens is to judge from facts and values, not only impressions and political theories, and to criticise with the ultimate purpose of rebuilding in a better way. The times we live in are bringing us closer to the Final Moment, but the goals to which we aspire are the goals of the ages. If the truth shall make us free, let us know the truth, and let us use the power of freedom in the most effective ways. -oOo-

THIS ISSUE OF THE ACTIVIST is dedicated to the American student in the hope that in coming of age he will help bring this country to the knowledge that nuclear weapons do not achieve peace, that military treaties and defence pacts do not win friends, that power politics is the wrong direction to take for the establishment of world freedom. Let our voices be heard in the growing cry against the universal terror which coinhabits our globe.

We students are next in line, and it will be our children who will have the leukemia if nations persist in testing their Bombs -- if we are still around to procreate. A great pressure is on us: we must educate ourselves to take a responsible place in a progressing society; we must also take a leading role in insuring the fact of a continuing society.

In a way we are old -- much too old for our chronological age. But in our premature weariness we yet grasp tightly to the love of life and the beautiful, and because there remains the freshness of youth within us, we retain the naivete to suppose that we can do Something About It. The peace groups, though, are almost politically impotent, and though we yearn and work and shout, little progress seems to be made. But our strength is in our inability to fear the hollow noises of the Walters and the Dodds; in our continuing expansion and development of the democratic rhetoric; in the transformation of words into deeds.

But as stated, there are a myriad problems and new ideas of which we are not aware -- so much of the world hasn't begun to touch us... And there is much within ourselves which hasn't found expression nor ventured to the outside. As suggested by M. S. Arnoni (Minority of One, July, 1961) if the Peace Movement is ever going to develop into anything more than a weak gadfly, we must find ourselves, and find within ourselves the means of expression; in every way we can, we must learn the truth and communicate. Only in this way can we grow and make the burdens have meaning in our time. -oOo-

PAID AD: The Greater New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to the Human Animal offers room and board to enable you to work full time for peace. (Anybody can die for his cause; the trick is to be willing to live for it.) An introductory brochure on the Society is free for a stamped, self-addressed large-size envelope. Among the Society's activities are the distribution of gummed labels which read "HELP STAMP OUT HUMAN BEINGS! For further details see your friendly recruiting sergeant." Suggested contribution: dime a dozen, dollar a big bagful. To inquire about working full time for peace, to request an introductory brochure &/or to order stickers, write Greater NY Society, 150 Nassau Street, New York 38, N. Y.

MEMO FROM THE EDITOR. This is the second issue of the "new" Activist. In it we try to give you an idea of current student political thought and interpretation. The contributing writers reflect the genre of current activities with which progressive students are concerned. Some, such as Gene Keyes of the Palaris Action group in New London, Conn., explain their Cause and solicit your sympathy; Marty Oppenheimer, contributing writer for New America --contemplates another political movement in the light of current social phenomena. We hope that this issue will begin to show the signs of the hard work inherent in improving the quality of The Activist. It is my wish that more people take an interest in the paper and submit their articles and creative works for publication.

In future issues we are planning to include more material if we are financially able. Which brings me to a sensitive point: aside from written matter, there are many items needed at the "office" with which our readers could help us. Volunteer distributors on campuses are of paramount importance; also needed are money and names. We will send a complimentary copy of The Activist to your friends. Our survival depends on an expanding list of subscribers and contributors. -oOo-

TIPS ON GOOD READING. One of the finest magazines of social criticism that we have seen is The Minority of One. We are confident that those who read it will find it a source of inspiration in a world of grey; a center of searing criticism in an apathetic society. Here is a magazine of rare beauty and intellect, largely the work of one man. "There was truth and there was untruth, and if you clung to the truth against the whole world, you were not mad" is the motto he has chosen for his masthead. For all who read TMO it is more than a motto. Send 50¢ to The Minority of One, Box 544, Passaic, New Jersey, for a sample copy. Subs are \$5 a year for this monthly

ON CONSIGNMENT. This summer I read Community of Fear, by Harrison Brown and James Real. Reinhold Nieburh wrote the foreword. It is an excellent pamphlet on armament, disarmament, and the impact that fear has had on our community. It discusses testing, economics of negotiations, deterrence and stability.

I wrote to the publisher, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, requesting 100 copies of the pamphlet which I have since received on consignment. This study of some of the most pressing problems of all history is worth the 25¢ it will cost you to order it from The Activist. The purpose of this venture is twofold: 1. You should read The Community of Fear for your own enlightenment; 2. We can't afford the shipping charges to send the batch back to the publisher! --je

editor: jonathan eisen
business mgr: chris williams
publicity: joel sherzer
helpful people: kathy coulborne, joe ball, dave finke, julie weinberg, habes

There are no restrictions on the use of the material in The Activist. Please credit us, though, when you steal the s

The Activist is associated with Students for a Democratic Society
112 East 19th Street, New York 3,
- - - and the Midwestern Students' Coordinating Committee - - NY

THE NEW LEFT IN BRITAIN, by Martin Oppenheimer

Since the Khrushchev revelations and the Hungarian revolution of 1956 a great deal of introspection has been going on among leftists of all countries. In this country, introspection has gone hand-in-hand with organizational reshuffling, with the formalities of negotiations often handicapping the attempt to go very deeply into the problems facing radicals. In Britain, on the other hand, because the Labour Party is recognized as the only realistic organizational framework for socialists, the formalities of organization have taken a back seat to some very earnest grappling with these concerns. This is particularly true for those of the Labour Party who address themselves to the problem of "Beyond the Welfare State," that is, the attempt to deal with those basic human problems that British welfare statism has not solved, and does not appear to be solving.

A magazine and two volumes of essays have come out of these efforts. The magazine, New Left Review, is a merger of Universities and Left Review, primarily an Oxford affair, and The New Reasoner, a periodical which came out of the Communist Party. They merged in late 1959. The books are Out of Apathy (New Left Books, Stevens and Sons, Ltd, 11 New Fetter Lane, London, 15 sh.), a selection of essays by various editors of the above periodicals; and Conviction (Monthly Review Press, \$4), a book of twelve contributions by young (all under 40) intellectuals of the left.

With but two exceptions, a stimulating essay on the role of the scientist by Nigel Calder in Conviction, and an interesting if somewhat thick piece on philosophy by Trotskyite Alasdair MacIntyre (the only non-NLR editor in Out of Apathy), the discussion in these two books, as well as most of the articles recently in NLR, falls into five broad areas:

Who Rules the Welfare State? The New Left is very much concerned with the realities of power in Welfare England. In distinction to the dominant thinking in the Labour Party, the New Left makes no automatic assumption that state control equals control by or for the British people. In the first place, as Peter Shore points out in Conviction, business and politics are becoming merged, so that the power of the State is often manipulated in the interest of a particular sector of business. The oil companies and their influence over foreign policy in the Middle East are an example. Secondly, nationalization, as with the Bank of England, often means little, since both the individuals that run it and those who benefit from its dividends remain about the same, and Parliament has little to say in the matter. Thirdly, public corporations, even assuming their independence, do not challenge private enterprise and its managerial power. There has been no decline in acquisitiveness, and class society remains.

Today, in other words, while the old capitalism has changed, a new form of it rules. Britain's 500 leading corporations, according to Ralph Samuel in Out of Apathy, employ 1/3 of the nation's labor force and account for half of its capital investment. Business leadership, as Mills has pointed out for the U. S., takes on an increasingly political character, and vice versa. The old "Establishment" of Victorian England is now the Establishment of the board room, proxy fights, public relations, recruitment from private schools to corporations, and the whole ethos of what Americans will readily recognize as the British variant on Madison Avenue. Furthermore, as Kenneth Alexander so well puts it in the same volume, the

power of capital is still in the hands of a minority of shareholders and directors, so that the aim of profit maximization still colors most business behavior. As in the U. S., managers run industry for those who own it. In the state serves the interests of the same property owners, since "its prime economic function is to create an environment within which profits can be easily expanded." The Labour government managed only to take over the worst-off sectors of private capital and underwrite some of the less healthy parts. It left all the strong points in private hands. Consequently nationalization dropped in public esteem and capitalism was able to make a strong comeback even before the Conservative government returned in 1951.

Welfare, For Whom? Why has the Welfare State become the Stalemate State? One reason is that the amount of social services, and the methods of their application, do not measure up to the public's hopes. Actually, according to Brian Abel-Smith in Conviction, post-war social services extension has been mainly to the advantage of the middle classes. The wealthier you are, the proportionally greater is the advantage you get from social services. Furthermore, taxation hits the lower income person harder so that he pays proportionally more for his social services. This is particularly true in view of the tax loopholes for upper income levels with which we are so familiar in the U. S. It works the same way in capitalist Britain.

But a more cogent argument is that social services themselves are woefully inadequate. There have been improvements since 1948 in hospitals, but the level of facilities is still very low, by British if not U. S. standards. Some accommodations are described as appalling by Abel-Smith. Yet in the midst of this, palatial office buildings and factories rise. A new bank building has Oran marble, black granite from Sweden, Italian glass mosaic. The budget for social services suffers from our conception that the State must do no more than provide a bare minimum. It suffers from a value system implicit in the new fancy office buildings.

All this boils down to what the New Left and Stuart Hall (in Out of Apathy) call the problem of public and private priorities. In the midst of plenty, the people are told they cannot afford social services, for which there is a growing and crying need. Spending on youth services does not keep up; the cost of health and dental care, school meals, eyeglasses, is rising; public housing is increasing in cost to the family and decreasing in availability. Government helps private enterprise expand, while it refuses to pay decent wages to workers in nationalized industry. Capitalism today sets the priorities. In the economic sphere, capitalism expands. In the social sphere, human needs suffer. The failure of the Labour movement "to pitch forward the aspirations of a new skilled working class, to re-order the priorities," the failure to cope with the myth of "getting on" -- Horatio Alger -- is one of the factors chiefly responsible for the apathy of the British electorate to the Labour Party and the system of values it once espoused.

The International Price. The New Left sees the inability of the Western world to deal with the rise of colonial independence movements, and with the evils of the Soviet totalitarian alternative, as a reflection of the workings of the system at home. Hugh Thomas and Peter Marris, in Conviction, describe some of their personal experiences, one in the Foreign Service, the other as a District Officer in Kenya. Common to both exper-

iences is the fetish of putting foreign policy at the service of military expedience, something which results in a failure to deal with some of the real needs of colonial peoples, especially the need for a sense of social identity. It is this latter which leads Marris to the interesting, and certainly by this time obvious, conclusion that good government is no substitute for self-government, "especially since good government, in the face of revolt, ends by using the methods which are used against it."

Peter Worsley in Out of Apathy, points out that traditional imperialism has, since Suez, taken a back seat to the needs of Natopolis. But there's not so much protest against the new imperialism from Labour benches as there should be. Everybody's boy has served in Africa or the East. And, "when we get Suez lunacies at the top, we get Notting Hill riots at the bottom. For imperialism pervades every sphere of our social life, from its impingement on economic and political institutions right down to the landladies who inquire if the colour will wash off on the sheets...and nobody protests much any more." Imperialism, old or new, continues to bring in huge profits for some people. The protest diminishes as the color of the pound notes rubs off.

The Cultural Price. But of all the costs of the statemate state (partly the cause of it as well) political disillusionment, apathy, and the degradation of culture take priority -- even more so than with U. S. leftist intellectuals -- among the concerns of the New Left. Four authors discuss it specifically in Conviction, and E. P. Thompson, founder of The New Reasoner, devotes to it perhaps the most significant statement that has come from leftist circles in many years.

What some of these authors attempt to do, in a way that has not been tried in a long time, is to attempt to get at, or into working class culture and understand it. Peter Townsend, Richard Hoggart and above all Raymond Williams (author of Culture and Society) have made a very good start in Conviction. Williams, of working-class background, brings to the discussion of mass culture some ideas that ought not to be new; but in the context of recent snob discussions of mass culture are a most welcome breath of fresh air. First, there are no masses. There are individuals, family and friends. Modern technology expands culture for all, and it isn't necessarily true that it has to be debased to a common denominator. Nor is all gadgetry necessarily bad -- a washing machine can be quite liberating for some people, especially one's mother. Culture is ordinary, and so is the education available to create it. The snobbism that says we must extend our ready-made version of culture to the benighted masses has to go, according to Williams. Some of what we happen to like may be rejected, or changed. But the most important thing to realize is that these rejections and changes, and in fact the total organization of "mass" culture today, are "so closely involved with the organization of capitalist society that the future of one cannot be considered except in terms of the future of the other." Most discussions of the centralization and commercialization of culture, and the lowering of it to a "common" denominator evade that basic issue. The discussions of culture by the New Left are quite a contrast to the increasingly sterile and superficial chats we get over here.

Mass culture is a result. It is also a cause, with many other things, of the political disillusionment and apathy of our times. The New Left has

probed that disillusionment deeply in order to find a way out of it. The editor of Conviction, Norman MacKenzie, points to several possible reasons for this mood of resignation in the midst of snobbery and false values. One of these is that Britain has become a second-rate power and hence British politics is to some degree irrelevant. Natopolis again. Another (echoed again and again by New Left writers) is that "the public as a whole became distrustful of any course...that might seem in the end to lead to a totalitarian tyranny," because of the frightening experience of those who looked to the Soviet Union as the camp of the future. At home the enemy is not defeat, then, but more dangerous by far, indifference, generated by a wedding of boom capitalism to social reform. The old causes withered, and we have achieved -- stalemate. A real change in the condition of man has not come, and radicalism has become colorless.

E. P. Thompson, editor of Out of Apathy, takes us a little deeper. First, what are the goals? "The distinction between socialist and capitalist society is to be found; not in the level of productivity, but in the characteristic relations of production, in the ordering of social priorities, and in its whole way of life." But this has not been achieved. The chief characteristic of apathy, of the apathetic decade, is that while there are plenty of public evils, people have sought private solutions for them. This has taken place for several cogent reasons -- in contrast to the fighting '30's, to which almost every New Left writer harks with a kind of tragic nostalgia; Spain marks the beginning of real life for many.

The most cogent of these reasons is a polarization of human consciousness corresponding to the polarization of the world. In the West, disillusionment with Communism has led to apologies for the status quo, accommodation to it, surrender to it. Thus the characteristic tone of the Natopolitan intellectual: tired disenchantment, with radicalism seen as the projection of neurosis. Thwarted aspirations lead to quietism, only a step from misanthropy. Human compassion becomes a waste of energy. One becomes detached from other things and persons, and one can, after a while, "regard with disinterest the preparations for a nuclear holocaust." Then it's easy. "If you write off all causes as swindles, and mutilate your own generous impulses, then there is nothing...to inhibit the fullest indulgence in material success." Moral issues are reduced to niceties in choices of expediencies.

But there are some possibilities, even with this, and even within its counterpart in the Soviet world. Now we know, according to Thompson, that there is no one way of making socialist human nature (for socialism is not only a way of organizing production). Our choices have to be based on real human needs and possibilities. Socialists have to humanize their ideas, or, in other terms, thrust "love" into the context of politics and power. The ideology of each power bloc is bound to create some levers for new thinking. Stalinism created its revisionists, rebels and nihilists, and Natopolis has generated the positive action of the Aldermaston nuclear disarmament demonstrations, and the revellious politics of anti-politics, the negatives of the beats. So, somehow, an area of political choice opens up again, and the moralist, because "love must be thrust into a context of power to mean anything, becomes a revolutionist.

The Way Out This, then, is the beginning of the way out for the

New Left. The old models of revolution -- piecemeal reform, or the cataclysmic destruction of state institutions -- have failed to work. Within capitalist society, as Thompson puts it, there are some countervailing powers: the public sector of the economy such as it is, trade unionism, welfare services. These need not remain simply countervailing. They can be driven into retreat, or thrust forward so as to become the active driving force of society. Thus certain socialist forms have been created within capitalist society, and when these become dominant, when private capital is subordinated to this socialist potential, the point of breakthrough is achieved. But it can't be confined to Parliament, or to some institutions. Attaining the point of breakthrough will require the whole political and industrial strength of the people, applied in many fields of life. A democratic revolutionary strategy therefore "draws into a common strand wage demands and ethical demands, the attack of capitalist finance and the attack on mass media," for instance.

Some New Left thinkers go further. Mervyn Jones, in Conviction, suggests that socialists rethink the uses of violence. "To be a Socialist today one must be a pacifist, in the broad sense -- one must be in total opposition to the beastliness that has absorbed what was once called war. And to be an effective pacifist one must be a Socialist, for one must seek to render powerless all those persons and institutions which hold for us no other promise than death."

For Paul Johnson (same volume) it requires a sense of outrage, one that cannot be achieved by piece-meal reform, but only by struggling to abolish many of the institutions of Victorian society at the same time. Abandonment of the traditional concept of fundamentally changing, rather than merely improving, society, has led modern socialism to stagnation, in his opinion. Iris Murdoch, on a different level, holds that the condition of life at the work-bench is basic to socialist theory. Nationalization is not enough. Inspiration for new thinking ought to come from the Guild Socialists, who were concerned also with the values of community life, the degradation of work, the division of man from man. Now that the Welfare State has been achieved (for some), it is time to go back and join to it ideas which have to do with the morality of socialism.

In a similar vein, Kenneth Alexander (Out of Apathy) suggests that reformism has reached the end of its road. Organization for new tasks is now the order of the day. Many of these tasks, having to do with the status of work, human relations, community life, are all-or-nothing demands, more revolutionary than the bread-and-butter issues of yesterday. The beginning of this moral revolution assumes that there is a revulsion with existing values, or that this revulsion will come about. Sooner or later, Alexander feels, the victories of reformism will pay off by bringing to light these new areas of struggle. The unions will be forced to fight in these areas if they are to continue as a significant part of society. They will have to take up the demands of workers for sharing power. Power is not something that can really be "shared" by giving a larger part, as with wages. Decision-making is a much more basic challenge to the control of industry. With the anger of the empty dinner pail subdued, these new, humanist values will come to the center of socialist concern.

Many of the problems that British left socialists face have close parallels in this country: the nature of the power elite; our 50,000,000 poor; the bankruptcy of containment and brinkmanship; the commercialization of culture; the loss of idealism of our trade union movement and the fragmentation of our left; the political apathy of our population, and the attendant party system which finds labor and much of the left in the same political party with economic and racial reactionaries. Perhaps the speed with which American radicals hastened to shaky half-way houses on the spectrum of the left actually served to delay their thinking about many of these real problems. Perhaps they are taken for granted. The British New Left has shown no such haste. It has thought more carefully, organized more slowly. The successes of the Aldermaston demonstrations, though limited, seem to have been at least in part a result of the New Left's work. The New Left does not concern itself much with the workings of Soviet society. But its standpoint is very clear nevertheless. It veers less from this standpoint, by and large, than do American leftists who spend a great deal of time discussing the Soviet Union -- and all too little time on their own weaknesses.

Conviction and Out of Apathy and the New Left Review deserve the most thoughtful and sympathetic attention of everyone who considers himself a dissenter in American society. -oOo-

SPIRITUAL AND MORAL ASPECTS OF THE STUDENT NON-VIOLENT STRUGGLE IN THE SOUTH
--speech by Charles McDew to the Antioch College Conference on Human Rights,
October, 1960.

The Nature of our Opposition. The system of Southern Tradition is a fabrication of wishful thinking, self-delusion, false values, outmoded beliefs, and pig-headed, deliberate ignorance. White supremacy is the foundation stone of the entire system. Our white supremacists forget that it was a doctrine of racial superiority that set off World War II, which killed more than 10,000,000, and from which many other millions will never recover. No doctrine of racial superiority will hold up in the court of modern world opinion.

I say that the system of Southern Tradition is fabricated upon wishful thinking and self-delusion because our detractors insist on believing that Negroes are satisfied with second class citizenship and inadequate wages and education and opportunities. They say this even in the face of our demonstrations, our intelligent use of the franchise, and our evident love for democracy.

I say that the system of Southern Tradition is founded on pig-headed deliberate ignorance because they legislate their prejudices, prostitute justice -- where Negroes and whites are involved, and will not even consider the idea that Negroes share the same quality of humanity which they possess. The educated and the unschooled cherish the same stereotyped notions about Negroes. This is one of the reasons our non-violent sit-ins have left them as we say, "all shook up." They think of us as ignorant -- and we display a level of intelligence that few of them practice. They think of us as slovenly, unkempt, and boorish -- and we march among them well-groomed and in quiet dignity. They think of us as irresponsible -- and we show that

we are willing to go to jail if we violate any laws in our campaign of civil disobedience. They say we want to marry white women -- when the truth is that we only want a cup of coffee.

You would be surprised at how far white Southerners are willing to go to preserve a system which is both un-Christian and undemocratic. I know school teachers who will not register to vote because they think their trustees might not like it. I know others who continue to patronize stores we are boycotting for fear the manager will call the trustees and report that certain teachers are supporting the student movement. In Orangeburg the white school property is valued at five and a half million dollars and the Negro school property is valued at five million -- but the white schools have only 6,500 pupils, and the Negro schools have 13,500 pupils. This is what they call "separate but equal" schools. And the thinking is that Negroes don't need as much, because Negroes aren't as as much, can't learn as much, and in the system of Southern Tradition will not be given the opportunity to use as much. So, in their thinking, the schools are really "separate but equal."

This is the nature of our opposition. Any tactics short of violence may be used to preserve the status quo. But the outlawing of violence is not the basis of their respect for human life and values, but, they say that if they commit violence it will be used as propaganda in the North and by the NAACP. This, they do the right thing -- for the wrong reason. In the September term of court in Orangeburg, a Negro was tried for killing another Negro. Shot him five times on a downtown street. A number of white persons appeared in court on his behalf -- and the presiding judge, T. B. Greneker, in his acquittal remarks, said: "When I see all of these white people appearing here on behalf of this boy, I wonder what all the demonstrations and things were about last spring? When white people people are this good to Negroes, what else can they possibly want?" Now, the trial brought out that the man who got killed wasn't even armed. So it was murder. But it was only a Negro who was killed. So the murderer wasn't fined as much for murder as we students were for marching up Russell Street. One of the ironies of this incident is that the same judge is the one who must hear the appeals from our sit-in convictions. Frankly, I do not believe that a judge who believes as he does is capable of ruling impartially in our case, and he ought to disqualify himself.

This is the nature of our opposition. When an announcement says that something is open to the public, the word public does not include Negroes. When we were on trial in Orangeburg, the judge tried to segregate us in the courthouse. When we stop at a service station, we find one rest-room marked "White Ladies," one marked "White Men" and a third one marked "Colored," just as if Negro men and women are of the same sex, and it's perfectly natural to send them to the same public toilet.

In our section half-truth is taken as truth, patronage masquerades as friendship, chauvinism is called democracy, and God is thought of as a Southern white man.

This is the situation -- the system which we feel obligated to correct -- not only because it disadvantages Negroes, but because it blights everything

it touches; it stunts the growth of a third of the States of this nation; it prevents realization of the American dream for millions of our citizens; it jeopardizes the good name of America around the world; and it causes the Southern white man to lose his soul -- for he says something bad about God.

What is the nature of our opposition? In the words of the Apostle Paul: We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world; against spiritual wickedness in high places. (Ephesians 6:12)

Now this quotation brings us to our next major questions:

What is the Nature of our Fight? It may be stated in many ways. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., contemporary prophet and disciple of Christian non-violence, calls it "the withdrawal of support from evil." In other terms it is called seizing the moral initiative, "The use of moral force against immoral force," and "The attempt to create the beloved community" or to "build the city of God." The organization called "The Fellowship of Reconciliation" refers to our process as introducing a redemptive element into an otherwise explosive or "intolerably immoral situation."

At this point I'm reminded that a minister friend told me recently that the "sit'in" dates at least as far back as the times of Christ, for, one day he sat down beside a well in Samaria and when a woman came to draw, he said: "Please give me a drink of water" and this simple request shook both her life and her society to the very foundations. "How is it that you, being a Jew, and a man, say to me, who am a Samaritan, and a woman, "Give me a drink." Don't you know that Jews and Samaritans have no dealings? And Jesus saw immediately the evil of this situation, and its potential explosiveness, and spoke these redeeming words: "If you knew the gift of God you could not feel this way." And what is this "gift of God?" The gift of eyes that see life as others see it. The gift of ears that hear the hidden rebuff as the underprivileged hear it. The gift of a heart that feels another's care. "If you knew the gift of God, you'd know that there is enough water in this well for both of us, and that God blesses us with blessings which would enrich us both if we shared them.

Jesus asked for a drink of water, and all the old antagonisms of the centuries came to the surface: Negro students in our South can walk into a drug store and ask for a cup of coffee -- and the entire fabric of our Southern civilization trembles to the foundations.

Now, it is axiomatic that you cannot draw a man to you by striking him a blow. Neither a left uppercut nor a right cross nor even a haymaker can win a man's love or admiration or cooperation. On the other hand, we go along with the Book when it says, "A soft answer turneth away wrath; but grievous words stir up anger." The story is told of an officer who once faced a personal enemy who, in an impulsive moment of anger, spat in his face. (This is not a pretty story.) But instead of striking back, the officer calmly reached into his pocket for his handkerchief, wiped off the spittle, and said, "If I could wipe your blood off of my soul as easily as I can wipe your spit off my face, I'd kill you." The angry one repented and the two became fast friends. "A soft answer," indeed, "turneth away wrath," but a blow by the officer would have made them enemies for life.

Our fight is not against persons, but persons are involved in the

promotion and perpetuation of the system we would revise. The present system is an affront to the Christian doctrine of man -- or perhaps I should say "the Judaeo-Christian doctrine of man." The affirmations that "God created man in his own image" as Genesis 1:27 says, and "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living sou." as Genesis 2:7 declares, are foundations of our belief in the dignity and worth of each man and all men. The Southern doctrine of white supremacy calls Genesis a lie, and the man who excludes me from his lunch counter says something bad about God, for he says that God created me unworthy to be with certain others of his creatures in the universal need to fill the stomach with food. The man is saying: "God shouldn't have made you that way. If he'd made you like me I'd let you in." No conscientious Christian can stand idly by and see God demeaned in such a way.

This mention of the dignity of man as conferred by God's creation reminds me of something a minister said at one of Dr. Martin King's meetings last year. This was not the most handsome man you ever saw, so it was very striking to see him stand until everyone was absolutely quiet, and then say in a booming voice: "I want you to know that when God made me -- He was at His very best." Audience reaction was thunderous and prolonged. Now, this is just where we students stand! When God made us, he was at his level best. And we want to create a society which will both offer the best and bring out the best in us. We believe that a society that keeps us out of the best schools, hotels, culture centers, the best jobs, housing, hospitals, libraries, recreation places, churches, and organizations is one which does not deserve to live, for it dehumanizes us by such stupid discrimination.

Now, let us turn to another facet of our struggle. We are often accused of engaging in a fad -- like the hula-hoop craze, says Gov. Hollings of South Carolina. But I have seen with my own eyes evidences that the spiritual roots are deep, and that young students are more sincere about the Christian faith than they have ever been before. When we marched on Orangeburg on March 15th some 800 strong, there were many students who felt that they were not well enough grounded in non-violence; that they might fight back on provocation. What did these two or three hundred do while we marched? They went to the church across the street and held a prayer meeting. The ministerial alliance of our town says that this is the most hopeful thing they've ever seen -- just as the non-violent demonstration was the most inspiring experience of their lives.

It seems that the fell clutch of circumstance closes in upon the Negro family about the time a child learns that he is colored, and that there is a certain limit to his freedoms imposed by the color of his skin. The parents' explanations are always a contradiction of precepts learned in church and in democratic family life. The child's idealism is shattered. His natural ambition becomes belligerence. His dream becomes a nightmare. And his budding Christian faith receives a serious jolt. This "killing of the dream" as Lillian Smith calls it, occurs in pre-adolescence. And by the time he comes to College, the Negro student is in dire need of a faith which he can practice as a part of his growth and his daily adventure. The sit-ins offered the students a chance for the "word to become flesh," as it were. The sit-ins have promoted a challenging philosophy -- the philosophy of

love overcoming hate, of non-violence conquering violence, of offering oneself as a sacrifice for a valuable cause. The sit-ins, too, offer adventure and an opportunity to live out the demands of decency and dignity. And who knows but that these same sit-ins may be the means by which the walls of Southern Tradition shall crumble far sooner than most of us had imagined.

The sit-ins have inspired us to build a new image of ourselves in our own minds. And, instead of sitting idly by, taking the leavings excreted by a sick and decadent society, we have siezed the initiative, and already the walls have begun to crumble.

The non-violent approach is designed to leave our opponent a face-saving device so that there will be little bitterness when the fight is over.

The non-violent struggle challenges us to live out the Golden Rule.

It has given us a new perspective and a new purpose -- a sense of mission, as it were.

And I can promise you, in the name of the militant Negro students of the South, that we shall not be satisfied until every vestige of racial segregation and discrimination are erased from the face of the earth. -00-

FACTUAL ACCURACY is the sole responsibility of the individual writers. -00-

ACTIVIST Readers: Got any friends left? Leftist friends? Send us their names! (The FBI will never know) Order a subscription for yourself, too. Only \$1.00 a year (four action-packed magazines for your reading pleasure). Contributions more than welcome -- we're not proud. --

names. * name of friends
* (her)
address. * his address.
*
. *

*
FOR TEXTBOOKS, ALL YOUR *
SCHOOL SUPPLIES, QUALITY *
TYPEWRITERS, AND A LARGE *
SELECTION OF FINE BOOKS, *
PERIODICALS, AND LITERARY *
MAGAZINES. *
*
CO-OP BOOK STORE *
OBERLIN, OHIO... *
* * * * *

The Activist
63 E. Lorain
Oberlin OHIO

non-profit org.
permit # 1626
postage paid.
New York,
New York

form 3547 requested