

# Children Of The Chrome Womb

They can only talk about problems as they see them—not as the people see them. And they can't see the problems any more because they are always in news conferences, "high level" meetings or negotiations. So leaders speak on issues many times which do not relate to the needs of the people . . ."

Within SNCC, which has no membership, only staff, a Quaker style of consent has evolved, whereby decisions are delayed until the dissenting minority is won over. Occasionally this method causes observers from traditional organizations to despair of SNCC's anarchy and confusion.

As for mounting insinuations of communist influence within SNCC, Garrett says:

"Man, the Communists, they're empty, man, empty. They've got the same stale ideas, the same bureaucracy . . . When he gets mixed up with use, a Commie dies and a person develops. They're not subverting us, we're subverting them."

Like most of the new left, SNCC is a-Communist rather than anti-Communist or pro-Communist.

Though less well known than SNCC, Students for a Democratic Society appears to be the most influential new left group outside the South. On March 19, SDS organiz-

ed a sit-in at the Chase Manhattan Bank on Wall Street to protest the bank's loans to the Union of South Africa, and 49 people were arrested.

The April 17th Vietnam march, sponsored by SDS, attracted students from approximately 100 different campuses. And this summer about 500 SDS members will live in eight Northern cities where SDS projects are attempting to organize poor Negroes and poor whites into a populist coalition of the dispossessed.

In 1962, when it was reconstituted after a long period of inactivity, SDS was dominated by graduate students, meetings were conducted in sociological jargon, and the membership included many ADA-oriented liberals. Today there are about 60 formal chapters and 50 staff members. SDS has evolved a way-out foreign policy that opposes the West in Vietnam, the Congo and Latin America.

Since these oppositions have not been accompanied by

## equal

criticism of the Eastern-bloc nations, SDS has come into increasing con-

flict with its parent organization, the League of Industrial Democracy, which is dominated by social democrats and is dependent on trade-union financing. SDS has also shifted its emphasis from campus recruiting to ghetto organizing and, in general, comes under SNCC's egalitarian and proletarian mystique.

The group, however, has not lost its original intellectuality. President Paul Potter divides his time between graduate school and the ghetto project in Cleveland. Past president, Tom Hayden, who did graduate work at the University of Michigan, is now an organizer in Newark. And one of the SDS organizers in Chicago is Richard Rothstein, a 21-year-old Harvard graduate and a former Fulbright scholar at the London School of Economics.

One of the major problems now confronting SDS is the role of those students who revived it in 1962 and who are now 24 to 26 years old. While they are eager for the newer recruits to become leaders, they themselves have no adult organization into which they can graduate. Lately, the SDS internal bulletin has been filled with soul-searching essays on whether one can be a radical within his chosen pro-

fession, or whether a true radical must devote his whole life to revolutionary organizing.

The long-range impact of the new left may ultimately

## hang

on whether or not the new crusaders can fashion in the next few years a new radical, national organization into which students can be funneled.

The Northern Student Movement started in 1962 as a band of students involved in the dual programs of fund raising on campuses for the movement in the south and the running of tutorial programs for Negro school children in the North. Gradually NSM realized the tutorial approach "treats symptoms without affecting causes," and today its field projects in Harlem, Boston, Hartford, Detroit and Philadelphia are engaged in rent strikes, block-by-block organizing and attacks on middle-class control of the war on poverty.

NSM executive director, William Strickland, who wrote his master's thesis on Malcolm X, insists: "We're not a new left because we're not interested in a guy's memorizing Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution or some Stalinist with a line. We're interested in creating new forms and new institutions, like the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. We're interested in liberating energy, in people affecting the decisions that control their lives. Calls us the new democrats, or the new realists."

Like most movements, the new radicalism has generated its own extremist fringe—a pot left, or perhaps more precisely, a pop left. This extremists tail of the new left is seen in its most advanced form in the new bohemia of the East Village, in New York, although Berkeley's Dirty Speech Movement appears to have the flavor.

It is in the East Village that several thousand dropouts from society have coalesced to cheer LeRoi Jones's scorn for Mickey Schwerner and Andrew Goodman; to join the Peking splinter, the Progressive Labor Movement to confuse drugs and homosexuality with political actions, to buy "Support the National Liberation Front" buttons for a quarter.

So far the pop left seems far more interested in style, shock and exhibitionism than in any serious program. Maoist or otherwise. Their gurus, playwright LeRoi Jones and writer Marc Schliefer, put SNCC down as nonviolent and middle class; Schliefer claims he is "left of anything that exists in the world today," and that "Khrushchev is the symbol of white liberalism." They'll picket to legalize marijuana, but not for much else.

Determined to write their own philosophy and their own history, the new insurgents have become isolated from all previous generations of American dissenters.

Already many of the 1930s revisionist liberals, once burned by Stalinism, have issued polemics of scorn and skepticism against the New Left. John Roche, former chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, accused the student zealots as early as 1962 of "naivete

about the intentions of the Soviet Union," and of "escapism and other-worldliness." Other Polonius-styled essays have followed from Daniel Bell, Max Lerner, Lewis Coser, Nathan Glazer, Irving Howe—and, of course, Sidney Hook, who recently issued a stern rebuke to the Berkeley insurrectionists. Many of the same writers and critics who recently eulogized the dead wobblers ex-coriolate the much less violent SNCC workers.

Unfortunately, these unfounded attacks, plus a fierce identity of generation, have manoeuvred the students into estrangement from the handful of radicals who fought so bravely through the 1950s, so that there might be a New Left today.

Immediate predecessors like socialists Bayard Rustin and Michael Harrington are repudiated on the absurd ground that they have "sold out to the Establishment"—Rustin because he supported the 1964 moratorium on street demonstrations and the compromise offered the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party at the 1964 Democratic Convention, and Harrington because he is a consultant to Sargent Shriver and Walter Reuther. The new radicals also reject the Rustin-Harrington theory that social change is achieved by an institutionalized coalition of church, labor, Negro and liberal groups reforming the Democratic Party.

The new left sees institutions like the NAACP and UAW as essentially important and believed that social progress can be won only by insurgent forces disrupting society.

The few older figures whom the new generation seems to respect come out of the radical pacifist tradition—men like Paul Goodman and the 80-year-old A. J. Muste.

The once-strong influence of C. Wright Mills appears to have diminished since his death in 1962. And although they have a great admiration for Martin Luther King, the young anti-heroes recoil from the "cult of personality" that has sprung up around the Nobel laureate.

Five years ago, academics and liberals hunted frantically for heirs to the flickering

## torch

of American radicalism. Now that a new generation has finally materialized, the liberals suddenly wish it were more anti-communist, more middle class and less anti-liberal.

The strategists of the emerging radicalism dream of an anti-Establishment alliance of southern Negroes, students, poor whites, ghetto Negroes, indigenous protest movements and SNCC—all constituting an independent power base of millions. Most likely they will fail in the utopian vision; certainly they will blunder as they grope for it.

Perhaps the final impact of their rebellion will be small. But the impulse that drives them into the lower depths of America is the same one that motivated the Abolitionists and the wobblers. Like the anarchist strikers at Lawrence, Mass., in 1912, the new radicals want "bread and roses too."

# Our Campus An Image

(down 130,000 in the last quarter) and her stock definitely needs a bit of pot. Clamp your twelve cents in your hand and get down to Mike's before they're all gone.

A campus without a political org of a major nature is definitely without. The U.S. kids have got SDS and SNCC, and a couple of hundred other acronyms. We have our acronyms to, but most of them are old hat. What I suggest is a League of Social Democracy. It's got everything it needs. League is a very camp word, recalling as it does the ill-fated days before the Nazis came to power in Germany. Social is a very image laden word, rich with associations, suggesting just a shade of the left, intimating that the sexual revolution might be mixed up in it too. Democracy is very necessary. Just about as important as freedom, but it hasn't got the same ring. The League for Social Democracy, LSD, for a vision of a better world to come, a placebo for the horrors of the age.

Music is important, I've been trying to push the gamelan without much success. Moondoy hasn't been heard from since about 1955 so he might be apropos. Anyone want to try to get him for a conhall

concert? You've got my blessing.

The campus magazine will be Fortune. We've hated Henry Luce long enough, and it is a beautiful magazine. It's metaphysical disquisitions on the subject of planning must be read to be believed. Subscribe today or you'll be left out at the roundtable in Tuck.

(By the way, Tuck isn't part of the image. The place is Windsor Bowl, if you really want to know.)

Sociology courses will not be taken by anyone. (What else would you expect me to suggest?) We will be the first non-sociological campus in North America. If you've already registered before this guide reaches you, withdraw immediately. Register for Jolly Numbers or Art 100. They may not be as easy as any sociology course but you're here for the challenge, remember.

That is my plan for a mod if not a modern campus. If you're still a rocker, you can always hand in your black leather jacket to be sent as a relief measure to the Mario Savio school for intellectually undernourished freedom lover at Berkeley.

And boycott Thunderball when it comes; if you can.

