

The "New Radicals": An Exchange

Hal Draper's article "In Defense of the 'New Radicals' " (Volume IV, No. 3) provoked considerable discussion, as we thought it would. Below are a number of letters taking issue, in part or whole, with Draper's analysis, followed by Draper's reply. Mario Savio was a leader of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement; Jim Williams, an SDS activist, now works for the International Union of Electrical Workers; William Spinrad teaches sociology; Sidney Lens is an author and member of the Editorial Board of Liberation magazine; Michael Munk is a staff member of National Guardian; Martin Glaberman is associated with Facing Reality, published in Detroit. Hal Draper is an Editor of New Politics and author of Berkeley: The New Student Revolt.

MARIO SAVIO:

THERE IS A GOOD DEAL in Hal Draper's article, "In Defense of the 'New Radicals,'" with which I agree, although I should probably have put it differently. The article raises many important questions which I have long avoided answering for myself. In the space appropriate to a reply I shall be able to deal adequately with one point only.

Hal tells us that we require an ideology, that is a "system of ideas about the transformation of society," to determine that "this is wrong but not that" in our country's public practices and institutions. When the "new radical" declares that racial discrimination is morally wrong, he may believe he has made an autonomous judgment; in fact he has simply "absorbed and internalized" a "consensus-idea," an element of the prevailing ideology. The reason a coherent and full ideology has not been necessary (but rather that the unconsciously "absorbed" "consensus-idea" has been enough) to galvanize so many in the struggle for civil rights is that this issue is one "you don't need much of an ideology to feel deeply about . . ."*

Frankly, I am somewhat scandalized by this view. It suggests that to *feel deeply* about significant public questions one generally needs a "system of ideas about the transformation of society." It seems to me that if some issue of *fact* about our society does not arouse deep feeling on its own merits, then either we are lacking in moral sensitivity, or the issue is unworthy of deep feeling. Hal berates "non-ideological radicals" for making of peace "a moral issue *only*." Of course, it is obvious to "new radicals" that peace is an economic issue as well. However, *only* as a moral issue can it summon

* It is worthwhile to note that *enough* of an ideology in this case is not very "much" at all, just the *one idea* that racial discrimination is wrong. It would seem, then, that virtually any mental content relating to social or political questions is an "ideology." If this is so then Hal and I have no quarrel, but also he has no thesis.

our commitment. Instead we should berate *society* for recognizing only rarely that economics raises very serious moral questions. Indeed, ordinary textbook economics is pregnant with matters which must stir profound moral anguish in all but the totally blind.

That racial discrimination is wrong is a consensus idea. It is a good idea also. The American consensus abounds in excellent ideas. What Americans lack is seriousness, a capacity to feel deeply.

The desirability of democratic government is also a consensus idea. We should accept this idea, not by unconscious "absorption," but with full awareness of its source. Lyndon Johnson fancying himself a democrat is grotesque to be sure, but a hopeful sign also, and not something about which to be resentful. The important thing is not that there are bad ideas in the consensus—there are plenty of these—but that if Americans could feel deeply enough to take their own good ideas at all seriously, we should soon have the sort of society we greatly desire. Because Americans are not serious about being democrats, only very few recognize that American society is pervasively undemocratic, although many are familiar with the facts which prove it so. To be sure, this failure to recognize the ubiquitous evil is brought about in great part by the stranglehold the privileged have on the media of communication. But this cannot absolve all the silent ones from acting in accordance with what they claim are their principles; for the signs of gross inequity are on all sides and easily seen.

Let me illustrate with something less obvious than racial discrimination, but, if anything, more fundamental: in collective bargaining two parties come together to bargain over the incomes of one of the parties. This is undemocratic in principle, and must work to the systematic disadvantage of wage earners. To compound the evil the government sets "guidelines" to prevent increases in wages and prices from exceeding yearly gains in productivity. The alleged aim, to prevent inflation, is commendable; but because of the fundamental inequity of the institution of collective bargaining, these "guidelines" do not apply directly to the incomes of all Americans, only to those of wage earners. About all this the unions are silent as the grave. Perhaps, then, management regularly practices such restraint in profit-taking that dividends are subject to the same sort of "guideline." Would that virtue were so widely distributed! During the past year, with the "guideline" set at 3.2 percent, General Motors Corporation reported record profits which exceeded the previous year's record profits by *twenty-three percent*. These are very simple *facts*, and fairly widely known. Collective bargaining is perhaps the fundamental institution of our society. Yet although labor unions often complain that wage increases have been too low, or that profit increases have been too high, there are never complaints that the institution is undemocratic in principle. It is true that we shall have need of all sorts of ideas and theories to set right these wrongs; but it is quite false to suppose we require a theory to *see* them.

Many Americans who voted for Barry Goldwater in the last election are justifiably concerned that our traditional liberties have been much eroded by the unwarranted growth of the federal government, and especially of the executive branch at the expense of the other branches. As a democrat I

cannot help feeling the same deep concern. These libertarian conservatives see all too clearly an evil which those on the left very often fail to take adequate note of. We may still win some of these conservatives to the task of building a democratic society, as well as others whom we might never have thought allies, if we be willing to meet our fellow citizens half way, by showing how the ideals *they* cherish, if consistently pursued, lead to the society *we* want. This is not opportunistic, but honest. Perhaps this illustrates what it means to say the new radicalism is "broad." It has room for the frustrated aspirations of some Goldwater supporters; it has room for the poverty of suburban housewives as well as the not greater poverty of southern Negroes. In all three cases the evil is there to be seen—though it may take a bit of insight.

If we are correct in believing that the present social order is systematically—not just occasionally—unjust, then we should be able to illustrate our belief by simply *pointing* to the *facts of* American life. If these facts do not support our theories, so much the worse for the theories.

Hal seems to dismiss a fondness among "new radicals" for calling "their differentness a matter of 'style'." In some important respects I believe this accurately characterizes *my* "differentness." But perhaps 'temperament' is a better word: I have a deep-seated suspicion of anyone who requires a theory to show that some practice is morally wrong. This suspicious aspect of my temperament may derive from early and painful training as a Roman Catholic. The Church has a devious and elaborate "system of ideas" which goes to show *inter alia* that desiring pleasure for its own sake is evil! If something is *really* wrong, it *should* be enough just to point to it.

JIM WILLIAMS:

SUPPOSE I WERE TO CHARACTERIZE Brother Hal Draper as a "left-right-national-chauvinist-zino-trotskyist-splitter-and-wrecker."

Such a charge would not only be pedestrian and absurd, it would also be inaccurate and unfair. People would say "what proof—if any—do you present to uphold your preposterous charge." If I fumbled about and grudgingly admitted I had no grounds for my charge, I would then be rightfully held up to the scorn I would deserve.

Yet, that is exactly what Brother Draper did to me and my former associates in his piece, "In Defense of the 'New Radicals.'"

I think that there are many good things to be said for his article as a whole—and I intend to say them—but first let's deal with the substantive errors Brother Draper committed in characterizing my political perspective.

He writes:

The clash between these two political approaches ["permeationism" and "left opposition"—my note] has come to a head most sharply in SDS, for two reasons. First, SDS had from the beginning its own permeationist wing, led by Steve Max, Douglas Ireland and Jim Williams. In the 1964 elections this wing was given its head as leaders of SDS's Political Education Project (PEP), on the basis of a statement "SDS and the 1964 elections," which was clearly "coalitionist."

Draper neatly adds a footnote that,

(In current jargon, coalitionist—or 'realignment'—means the orientation toward subordinating the independent action of civil rights or other movements to the interest of strengthening the 'liberal-labor coalition' which is supporting the Johnson Consensus, and therefore orienting toward the Democratic Party as the decisive political channel for reform progress.)

Brother Draper's description is made also in the context of his prior assertion that "permeation" . . . seeks to adapt to the ruling powers and infiltrate their centers of influence with the aim of (some day) getting to the very levers of decision-making—becoming a part of the Establishment in order to manipulate the reins to the left.

Later on in his article, Brother Draper describes the controversy surrounding the efforts of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party to obtain its rightful place as the real representative of the *people* of Mississippi. This time, he chooses Old Timers Mike Harrington and Bayard Rustin to bear the "permeationist" label and serve as scapegoats-straw men—but whatever H & R's real positions were, (I doubt if Bro. Draper has characterized them correctly either) the label sticks, and the charge is cleverly dropped that the "permeationists" tried to sell out the MFDP.

I will not accept Draper's label of "permeationist" as accurate in describing my politics; neither would brothers Max and Ireland, I would suppose.

Let me also make clear my resentment of his thinly veiled insinuation that we three allied ourselves with attacks against the MFDP. If Brother Draper had made the slightest effort to learn the facts he would have found that:

1.) *Jim Williams* wrote and introduced the resolution of support for the MFDP's challenge at the 1964 SDS convention. The resolution was accepted unanimously;

2.) *Douglas Ireland* went on SDS staff to implement the motion and coordinate SDS's activity in support of the challenge;

3.) *Steve Max*, in December, 1964—after the challenge—wrote a definitive pamphlet (published by PEP) in defense of the continuing efforts of the MFDP challenge, defending the MFDP's refusal to accept the compromise and outlining courses of action for people to take in defense of MFDP. PEP conducted a mass petition drive in support of MFDP.

So, Draper's neat syllogism: Max-Ireland-Williams are "permeationists," "permeationists" fail to support the independent action of the MFDP, therefore Max-Ireland-Williams did not support MFDP, does not stand—simply because it has absolutely no basis in fact.

If it ended there, one could assume that Draper was honestly inaccurate, if hasty to characterize people. But, when he went ahead to slam us again by quoting (of all people!) Dick Flacks against us, he passed the line between hasty inaccuracy and intellectual renegacy and dishonesty.

Draper quotes Flacks:

" . . . the establishment-oriented people seem primarily moved by repugnance of the rabid right and by the possibility that radicals can win positions of *respect and voice* rather than villification in this society." (my italics.—J.W.)

Now Draper read that in the Spring, 1965, *SDS Discussion Bulletin*. Three

paragraphs down on that page, begins our reply to Flacks' friendly, but critical letter. If Draper was honest, he would report that we clarified our position, by disclaiming Brother Flacks' label—and asserting that we as radicals were concerned with “power,” not “respect” or “voice.” In that letter we stated our perspective firmly. It bears no relation to that straw-man “permeationism” that Draper has constructed.

Is it that Brothers Max, Ireland and Williams have been silent? Did Draper mistakenly characterize our position because he had no access to our writing or opinions? He could have read our articles in the various SDS *Bulletins*, he could have read Max and Ireland's paper *For a New Coalition*, or my paper, *The March On Frankfurt: A Study In Protest*, which described the problems of radicals in coalitions and advanced a critique of “permeationist,” “coalitionist” or “realignment” positions—at least in the sense that Draper chooses to use them. If he had done that, he would not have been limited to the weak device of taking documents endorsed by the whole SDS (such as the 1964 elections resolutions and the *Port Huron Statement*) and blaming them solely on us.

Why then, why on earth, did Draper choose to fall into such depths of dishonesty? Only he knows for sure—but the point remains that the rest of his article, a critical response to the “New Left,” *makes sense* and is *generally one I would agree with*.

Perhaps the Berkeley experience has made Brother Draper keenly aware of the mindless ferocity the so-called “New Left” can unleash when it feels slighted. If so, he neatly chose to cloak and cover himself by an unwarranted attack on three genuine radicals in order to protect himself from the slings and arrows. We can recognize this for what may be a necessary political gesture; but we cannot accept it as accurate or fair in any manner.

Brother Draper has written many cogent and thoughtful pieces for *New Politics* over the years, and I have always felt they influenced me positively, if not always consistently. Thus, it is difficult to convey my shock, not for my own ego, but for the respect I had developed for him.

Brothers Ireland and Max, I'm sure, have their own impressions of what Brother Draper has said, and will have their own thoughts in the matter.

Brother Draper's attack was inexcusable in its dishonesty as well as immoral in its intent. It is a tragedy.

WILLIAM SPINRAD:

HAROLD DRAPER'S EVALUATION of the “New Radicals,” as exemplified by much of the SDS leadership, is, in major theme, not too different from that of the critics he criticizes. The “New Left” is more than welcome; it has brought a renewed vigor to American radicalism, but it is rarely genuinely political. Although composed primarily of students and recent students, the predominant emphasis is, in Draper's language, on “styles” of action, with little attention to ideas. He may not agree with Tom Kahn and Irving Howe on

all the ideas they would have the New Radicals adopt, but he shares their pressing concern that some clear-cut political ideas be worked out pretty soon.

His article might have assisted that process. In part, as in its description of Stalinist tactics and its ringing proclamation for pluralistic democracy, it did. But, he has helped maintain the New Left's prevalent murkiness by accepting some of their hazy orientations, as both reflected in and stimulated by their cliché terminology. There are dangers in any political semantics yet devised, including those popular in the socialist tradition. Symbols are designed to excite as well as clarify. The language of the New Radicals is, however, inordinately hokey, with an uncomfortable resemblance to what emanates from Madison Avenue or the disciples of J. Stalin. That is why Tom Kahn identified so much of their message with pop journalism. Their formulations further obfuscate political discussion at a time when clarity and relevance are as much the order of the day as militant action.

Take one favorite, "establishment." Borrowed, I believe, from British complaints about traditional status snobbery, the same term is also popular with *National Review* writers, apparently to include anyone who doesn't agree with them. To the SDS, it comprises all who have "direct influence over government policies," while Draper adds "hangers on," "agents," etc. As thus stated, the "establishment" covers everyone who has any effect whatever on what any branch or level of government decides. If this makes it all sound so absurd, I am just following the script. If something else is meant, will somebody say so.

Note, the "establishment" is not located anywhere in society, it is simply those who have "direct effect." The use of such verbiage lends a respectable intellectual implementation to the most banal commonplace notions about the anonymous "theys" who run the show. Above all, it does not facilitate meaningful analysis. Despite Draper's ad hoc comments, it has nothing in common with the application of a seminal term like "capitalism," and is, if I may be pardoned, quite at variance with the genuine Marxist tradition. Does the "establishment" extend to the population of a town that determines, by referendum next year's school budget? Is the SDS in danger of assuming membership by affecting some aspect of the anti-poverty program or even, who knows, helping achieve a cease fire in Viet Nam? I would like to know. "Power structure" seems to imply a more limited version of the "establishment," sometimes preferred, ironically, out of wishful thinking—the desire to find those who "control the action" so that they can be made to set things right.

Another set of terms that leaves me queasy is popular with divergent elements of the "left"—"coalition" and "permeation." As far as can be gathered, the axis of the debate around these terms involves contrasting attitudes toward working with existing organizations or seeking new forms. The "coalition" seems even bigger than the "establishment," and I wonder which organized body can be left out. Obviously, most trade unions are included. Should one try to "permeate" or avoid them. Tom Hayden, the most publicized spokesman of the New Left, seems to advocate the latter. Draper

obviously does not. Yet, they seem to be joined by a common position on a substantive political issue—the appropriate posture towards the Johnson Administration, the Democratic Party, etc. There are thus two separate arguments involved, both very pertinent, neither properly posed with public-relations type lingo.

Draper further defends the “decline of the West” moods of some New Leftists, with the admonition that they are merely using a more vivid synonym for capitalism. Then why this peculiar substitution? Let me suggest one explanation. By the “West” they may mean much more than capitalism. They may be referring to the whole shebang—art forms, philosophy, the *tradition* of some civil liberties, even the “corrupted” working class. There is too much of the smack of romantic primitivism, which sees the robust “new world” as replacing the “decadent” advanced countries. I doubt that Draper wants to buy this; I wish he wouldn't ignore it.

Finally, Draper left out one important term, representing a valuable and necessary concept which he personally had much to do with developing. In his discussion of Stalinism, he did not refer to “bureaucratic collectivism.” Exposure to this formulation, not narratives about the Stalinists' antics in the American labor movement, is what more New Radicals need.

SIDNEY LENS:

I DON'T LIKE TO QUARREL publicly with Hal Draper, whose article “In Defense of the ‘New Radicals’ ” was excellent, but Hal is quite careless in paraphrasing my views and should be asked to be a little more tidy in his research. He says that he “found out from Sid Lens, in *Liberation*, that ‘participative democracy’ exists under Castro, Nasser and maybe even Sukarno *more* than in the U.S.”

The article itself says nothing of the sort. It never compares democracy in the U.S. with that of the other countries. What it says is that while American democracy ranks high if you think in terms of putting an “x” in the ballot box, “it ranks rather low” in terms of *participative* democracy. On the other side, I state that “there is more democracy in Castro's Cuba, many times over, than there was in the Batista government that preceded it,” and more democracy under Nasser than Farouk, under Sukarno than the Dutch. There is no attempt to compare a highly developed country like the United States, two centuries after its revolution, with developing countries like Cuba, Egypt, and Indonesia only a few years after their revolutions. What I was trying to show was that American democracy is not as good as some of its apologists, both right and left, seem to think; nor is the lack of a two party system in the developing nations the only criterion for totalitarianism, as charged by such people as Irving Howe.

Hal Draper brought my name into the article on the New Left, and prestidigitated the comparison between the U.S. and Cuba et al., out of thin air.

MICHAEL MUNK:

I AM IN GENERAL AGREEMENT with the greater part of Draper's article that relates to its title; namely the "Defense of the 'New Radicals'" (whom I call the New Left) against its "permeationist" (or coalitionist) critics of the Socialist Party's Right wing. I also admire the clarity and sharpness of his characterization of the New Left as non-ideological rejectors of coalition who have not developed, to this point, effective revolutionary tactics. But I dissent from his attack on the New Left for its failure to adopt Draper's particular anti-communism stance, and it is to this point that I will address my comments.

Of all the ideological baggage that the Old Left has brought with it to the 60s, the communist/anti-communist wardrobe is its greatest burden. It is to the credit of the New Left that in rejecting the surviving political sects that continue in this ideological rut (a rejection Draper also applauds but only when applied to the ritualistic apologists on both sides) it also rejects the perspective derived exclusively from their existence—the "third camp's" moralistic equation of real-life capitalism and socialism. In his charge that the New Left, on this issue, "is extraordinarily immoral and intellectually non-responsive"; that it "asserts its indifference to the fate of oppressed peoples in one third of the world"; and in his warning that "it would be the end of the road" if the New Left's rejection of coalition led to the "musty neo-stalinism of the various theoreticians of 'totalitarian socialism'," I sense the "odor of decayed radicalism" of the late Independent Socialist League.

While Draper does have the honesty to disassociate himself from those in the SP who masquerade as members of the "Third Camp" but clearly prefer the capitalist one, honesty is not the issue here. For far from "copping out" on the issue of anti-communism, I believe the New Left has faced it more squarely than Draper does. To me, the essential question is whether one accepts the limitations of the real world and attempts to act responsibly within them, or "cops out" in moral struggle within oneself to some high plateau from which the world's evils can be denounced without danger of contamination.

Almost all of the New Left rejects communism "in its own way": they do not join the Communist party and condemn the crimes committed in the name of socialism. But what Draper is insisting on is the elevation of such "anti-communism" to a central position in whatever ideology may develop from today's ferment and groping. To merit Draper's endorsement, the New Left would have to decree that all its theoretical and tactical work flow from anti-communism as from a conditioned reflex; and it is the new generation's refusal to lie on his procrustean bed that brings forth all his accusations and warnings.

I predict Draper will eventually lose what hopes he has for the New Left on precisely this issue. For it is futile to expect that the present generation can be as emotionally conditioned by *its experience* with American communism as was Draper's; his deeply internalized worries of the 30s and 40s are of the past, despite his insistence that, for example, the Soviet Union has not changed during that period. Draper is himself a prisoner of the *idée fixe* that the socialism so far produced by man can never, without revolution, change

its fundamentally evil character. The trouble is that it is constantly changing, and the New Left is reaching maturity in a historical period in which only rigid ideological blinders can prevent recognition of this fact.

The third camp's Great Equation must produce such slogans as "Neither the NLF nor Saigon!," "Neither Castro nor Batista!" in make-believe procession. The raising of questions about who the Vietnamese or Cuban people want brings the reflex: "Indifference to their fate" and similar moralistic pronouncements. The alternatives suggested are invariably insignificant sects so we are finally left with a primarily self-satisfying negativism toward all important social and political movements. In our controversy on Vietnam in the previous issue of *New Politics* [vol. IV, No. 2], Sam Bottone put it nicely when, after acknowledging that the NLF enjoys "considerable" support from the South Vietnamese people, he wrote: "But the extent of Vietcong support cannot be a decisive criterion for endorsement by [U.S.] radicals." Of course not! But it might be damn important for those radicals who live there. We, with our superior knowledge of what an NLF victory would mean to the misguided Vietnamese can project the equation of a Vietnamese guerrilla and the U.S. Marine as two indistinguishable evils locked in combat. This allows us to maintain an unassailable moral position without being faced with any sticky choices (I speak here of attitudes and not memberships in either "friends of the NLF" or "support our boys" organizations).

As for Draper's charge that the New Left's rejection of anti-communism results from its awareness of only the establishment's version, I feel that the New Left (I am referring here, as elsewhere, to its politically sophisticated sections) also recognizes Draper's version as an Old Left variant. I have found a wide sharing of the view that the slogan "Let the people decide" ought to apply to those who choose Communism as well as to those who don't. And I have found explicit rejections of the equal denunciation of the revolutionaries (communist or not) of the world and their oppressors. I submit that such perspectives offer more promise for the building of a new radical movement in the U.S. than does the anti-communist touchstone proposed by Draper. Study and understand radical history by all means, but do so to help assure you do not relive it!

MARTIN GLABERMAN:

SURELY THERE WAS A TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR in the title of Hal Draper's article in the last *New Politics*; In Defense of the "New Radicals." It very clearly should have read: "In Defense" of the New Radicals. But perhaps, since the misplaced quotation marks appear in three different places, the mistake was not typographical but in Draper's head. To coin a cliché—with such defenders who needs . . .

Draper does not think that the New Left is very new. And he does not think that it is very left. But the problem is Draper's, not theirs, because he cannot break out of the sectarian categories and limitations that he has held on to since the 1940's. He attempts to define the New Left more carefully but he succeeds only in defining it narrowly in terms of his own politics. Nowhere

is there an attempt to define the New Left in relation to society and its objective development; always it is seen as an internal development of the radical movement. He says that each generation is new and that the old generation failed. By this he means what all old radicals mean: not that they were wrong, only that they were never able to make the revolution. And this is at the core of the difficulty of communication between the generations. Lip service to the young replacing the old is simply a form of patting a few precocious heads. The tests that are applied are still those of an older generation. This is made a little easier to do by dealing only with SDS, which has certain ties with the past, and ignoring such organizations as SNCC.

The New Left is new and to the extent that it differs from older youth movements it is more perceptive about our society, bolder and more revolutionary, and more sophisticated politically.

The organizations of the New Left are much freer of adult domination than the youth organizations that Draper and I were a part of. They are either completely independent (such as SNCC) of any "parent" organization (although they have ties to SCLC and other groups in particular activities) or they have a degree of autonomy that the youth organizations of the thirties and forties never dreamed of. This is both new *and* left. It has made possible the imaginative actions, the boldness, the revolutionary initiative which was so lacking in the youth movements of older generations in the United States. Even the organizations which are least independent are a reflection of the New Left because the roots of their recent growth are not in the particular policies of these organizations but in the movement of a major segment of a generation toward revolutionary politics and activity.

The organizational looseness and fluidity of the New Left has no parallel in earlier youth movements. The ad hoc committee or action (FSM is the major example) is a widespread phenomenon. The willingness to experiment with organizational forms, the hostility to elitism which this reflects, the sensitivity to society and the forces in it and the ability to respond rapidly and easily to events, mark the New Left as both new and revolutionary. It is reflected in the use of the phrase, "participatory democracy." "My difficulty," says Draper, "is that I do not have the least idea what it means." Exactly. And he compounds this difficulty by confusing the concept with formal views of particular regimes abroad. This is simply because Draper can only see movements in terms of political lines. These are either true and revolutionary or false and reactionary. Participatory democracy, or direct democracy, is both a picture of the new society (soviets approached it; workers councils achieved it) and a way of life for those participating in revolutionary struggles. It is integral to understanding SNCC and much of SDS. It has nothing to do with what these organizations, or parts of them, think of China or Cuba or Yugoslavia. It has to do with the fact that these organizations are not putting themselves forward as the new elite, the Vanguard Party, the saviours of the world. They are trying simply to help the masses, or those sections of the masses that they are in touch with, to organize themselves, to develop their own talents and abilities. This is alien to what Draper understands by politics which is, simply, a Vanguard Party (as large as possible, of course, but still a vanguard) and a Correct Political Line.

The New Left is more sophisticated and more advanced in political ideology than the youth organizations (or adult organizations, for that matter) of old. Draper considers them naive and primitive and anti-ideological because they do not have an all-embracing, correct ideology. As a Marxist, I have a tremendous respect for a fundamental ideology which makes it possible to view the world as a totality and to function in it in a revolutionary manner. It is one of the functions of a Marxist organization to continue and develop such an ideology. It does not follow from that, however, that everyone must be a member of a Marxist organization, or even be a conscious Marxist, to function as a revolutionary in particular struggles. Draper has only the test of the Revolutionary Party: if these organizations show no signs of functioning as a mass political party with all the ideological trappings that implies, they are therefore non-ideological.

No one would insist that a false ideology is in any way superior to no ideology. What needs to be considered is not ideology vs. non-ideology in general but the particular ideology of the New Left and the ideology it is replacing. The old organizations that called themselves revolutionary believed in an elite party. The New Left, on the whole, opposes that belief. The old belief was wrong and a major reason that the old left failed.

The old left in the thirties believed that under the leadership of the advanced sections of the population it could prevent war. In practice, the overwhelming majority of the youth anti-war movement marched merrily off to the battlefield. The precise moment of their adherence to the war machine varied with their particular political line, but only a small minority (of which Draper was one) maintained their opposition to capitalist war. The New Left has no illusions that it can end war, but it has maintained its stand, as a necessity to itself, during the course of a war. I would submit that the anti-war politics of the New Left is superior to that of the old.

Draper ridicules the fact that the New Left tends to go to the lowest, the most exploited sections of the population, the slum dwellers. The criticism, in fact, would apply to the rural South as well, were it valid. But there is no need for involved criticism. Draper's statement: "The community in which the slum-dwellers live—the slum—does not provide a framework for socializing resentments and aspirations such as is provided by the integrating life of the factory; it atomizes," was blown sky-high by Watts. Of course, the factory is most important and a lot of the young people today do not realize this. But they are not repeating the mistake of their elders of going into factories, pretending they are workers, to lead the proletariat to revolution. That is a very practical—and revolutionary—wisdom.

What is very deceptive in this matter of ideology is that much that was accepted only by Marxists in the thirties is now accepted matter-of-factly by major sections of the population. After the Depression and the New Deal, World War II, the Bomb, the colonial revolution, that is, the domination of the world by both totalitarian and welfare state capitalism and the challenge to that domination, no one has to prove the need for national planning of the economy, for the international integration of society, for the need to end all war, for the integrity of the individual. These are integral to the ideology of the New Left. And while that is not yet Marxism or a "total" view, it is a

long way toward such a view and far superior to the rigid stupidities that most of us held on to in the thirties and forties.

In one sense, the difficulty in assessing the New Left is indicated in Draper's treatment of the choice of "*permeation* or *left opposition*." (This used to be known as *reform* or *revolution* but I suppose a New Left requires a new terminology.) Much of what Draper has to say in this connection is quite valid, particularly his attack on Howe and the Establishment. What he does not see, however, is something that goes beyond the choice of reform or revolution—the conception that is evident in wide sections of the New Left that revolution should not be synonymous with isolation, that there is a revolutionary potential in the American population, that among Negroes, among workers, among the slum poor, among sections of the middle class, there is hostility to the existing society and that it should be possible for conscious radicals to make contact with broad layers of the society on a revolutionary basis. This is very different from the romantic vanguardism that characterized the movement in the thirties. And it is a more accurate and perceptive view of the American reality than the cynical nihilism of the old left.

HAL DRAPER REPLIES:

THIS EXCHANGE OF OPINIONS gives only a partial idea of the scattering of views and criticisms in and about the new-radical movement and student left. There's a lot more. It's part of the expected ferment of ideas in this non-ideological movement. What has been unexpected is the degree of agreement with my article in new-radical circles, according to reports; it was not quite as provoking as I thought: so much the better. But the one type of criticism that one does *not* often get inside the movement is the criticism that one is too critical; that sort of thing is best shrugged off.

I

I AM GLAD that Mario allowed himself to get provoked on the subject of morality and ideology, for (as I pointed out) what is involved here is a very pervasive new-radical tendency which is rarely formulated in print. This is the tendency which insists on seeing the important social and political issues of our time as moral issues *only*. The *only* was italicized in my article, to make sure, and Mario quotes it properly. Yet he goes on to discuss as if the *only* were not there. For me, it is breaking down an open door to insist that social issues are also moral issues; but the "moral-only" approach ("This is wrong") is inadequate. Inadequate for what? I specified: "as soon as you try to examine why it is wrong, or how you know this is wrong and not that, and above all how you choose among the various things to do about making it right you get into 'ideology,' that is, more general ideas about social action and program."

No mass socialist movement anywhere was ever recruited in the first place on the basis of ideological convictions gained by studying Marx or anyone else. The initial motive-power of all radical movements has always been the

elemental revulsion of people against the felt evils of the status quo, whether a revulsion powered by interest (the legitimate interest of people who feel those evils on their own backs) or a moral revulsion by individuals who are not themselves oppressed but who identify with the oppressed. This has been so often chewed-over in analyses of past social movements that it is not only uncontroversial but rather platitudinous. The *intensity* of the dynamism behind any social movement has also been based on how deeply felt the evils are. There is nothing new about the new-radicals in this respect, and it goes double for what I described as a "new beginning."

This is how a social movement starts, and this is what remains the source of its motive-power. But every social movement worth its steam has next had to do something more—or else peter out. If the "elemental revulsion" of one kind or another is the locomotive, then the people on the train have got to acquire a few more notions before the locomotive can get anywhere. There are the problems of routing, and braking at the proper times; there are track forks; sometimes even new track may have to be laid, in a chosen direction; it becomes necessary to have a sketch map of the territory; relations with other locomotives (known as time tables) have to be taken account of:—this metaphor can go on, including some thoughts about the hand on the throttle, but it is only a metaphor and should not be pushed too far. The point is that a locomotive is a necessary but not sufficient equipment for railroading; and moral fervor is a necessary but not sufficient basis for revolutionary politics.

Now if Mario will look back at his letter, while considering this relationship between moral feelings and political ideas, he may possibly still not agree but he will plainly have to find some other basis for argumentation. For example, he actually quotes my statement that "You don't need much of an ideology to feel deeply about it [civil rights]," and then says he is "scandalized by this view. It suggests that to *feel deeply* about significant public questions one generally needs a 'system of ideas about the transformation of society.' " Look again: my flat statement said *diametrically the opposite*—that you *don't* need much of an ideology, etc.

This is so breath-taking that there must be a hang-up here that even plain words can't unsnarl. But for what it's worth, let's repeat: It does not take much ideology to feel deeply about civil rights*, but it is for effective *next* steps that ideas about society and politics are increasingly indispensable.

Going further, Mario's arguments seem to imply that "a capacity to feel deeply" is *all* you need at any stage. Or am I being misled by my interpretation of one statement—"if Americans could feel deeply enough to take their own good ideas at all seriously, we should soon have the sort of society we greatly desire"—and by the whole passage in which this statement has its context?

I don't believe that "What Americans lack is seriousness, a capacity to feel deeply." I don't think "Americans" are, as a people, less serious or deep-feeling than Italians, Britishers, Chileans, Scandinavians, Chinese or any others. Anyone can write a fierce indictment of "Americans" on this ground, with

* My article made this point not only in the sentence quoted, but in all of page 8; see also page 163-64 of my *Berkeley: The New Student Revolt*.

abundant evidence, but it will apply *mutatis mutandis* to a far broader category: human beings. Like other people Americans can be very serious and deep-feeling about things which Mario and I may not like at all. The same Goldwaterites who (Mario tells us) feel deeply about bureaucratism in government are often also just as serious about the horrors of the income tax, or the Great Democratic Principle of States Rights as expounded by Governor Wallace; and it would be vulgar-radicalism to suppose that many on the Right are not perfectly serious and deep-feeling (and sincere) about the Menace of Communism in the State Department and the Protestant clergy, etc. That's not the trouble with them.

Nor does Mario's indictment apply by and large to the much-abused American liberals. I have known too many liberals who are at least as serious as my radical friends in their hatred of social evils and who, far from being stunted in the deep-feeling department, are most easily the prey of racking despair (which can be defined politically as deep feeling plus impotence). This kind of anti-American stereotype won't do. Here the expedient of merely "pointing" is not only inadequate but erroneous.

Of course, most Americans are little interested in political issues at all. Does Mario think this is so *today* (obviously it isn't in the blood) for moral reasons—perhaps because they are moral monsters? In fact, if we take the majority of Southern white middle-class people, who condone segregation or resist measures of racial justice—and who are commonly *very* serious and deep-feeling about it—is this true basically because these people are morally evil individuals?

All this leads to Mario's last sentence, which follows his self-analysis (revulsion against Roman Catholic training in ideology, and so on). He says flatly that "If something is *really* wrong, it *should* be enough just to point to it." This is a more religious notion than Mario may believe, for the concept of the self-disclosure of manifest evil to the human soul is more fundamental to theism than any ideological rationalizations invented by Jesuits. But is it tenable? (I certainly don't find it to be true of my automobile and find it even more difficult to believe that it is true of that far more complicated engine, human society.)

But test it: try "just pointing," say, to the Roman Catholic Church, since Mario obviously thinks there is something wrong with it. Opponents have been pointing to the Church long enough, without dazzling results. More to the point: try "just pointing" at capitalism! (You will first have to decide on the much-mooted question of whether there is such a social system.) Or do you point at the *evils* of the system? That is easier, but then you have to decide whether these evils are regrettable temporary blemishes which should be reformed, or whether they are inherent in a social system which has to be abolished and replaced with a better one. That is only one of a hundred important questions which "pointing" will not resolve.

Again: after you have gotten through "pointing" to everything wrong (morally and otherwise) with the Democratic Party and the Johnson Consensus, you still have to decide whether to try to combat the felt evils by working inside this political structure, like the coalitionists, or as an opponent outside. (I do not think the coalitionists are morally depraved; I think they

are politically wrong.) The social maxim which Mario bravely set down in so many words points to a blind alley for any would-be movement that tries to operate by it.

One other matter: I am loth to comment on Mario's passage on collective bargaining, since at this point I refuse to believe that he means what he seems to say. Collective bargaining, he says (I think), is "undemocratic in principle," because "two parties come together to bargain over the income of *one* of the parties." (Which is not true, by the way, since the boss's income is involved too.) Well, there he has done his pointing, and since it doesn't explain what is undemocratic about this, I feel once again that pointing is not enough.

In this system, where a man known as an owner of capital has had the unilateral power to decide the income of a mass of other human beings known as his employees, collective bargaining was developed to modify and counterbalance this one man's power. What is undemocratic about that? Furthermore, claims Mario, it "must work to the systematic disadvantage of wage-earners." Does he mean that wages and conditions would improve if trade-unions were all smashed? I can't believe he believes this, or that he would expound this theory to the farm workers, who have not yet been corrupted by decent wages and who are presently being so immoral as to fight in the Delano grape strike for collective bargaining. "Collective bargaining is perhaps the fundamental institution of our society," says Mario (of a country in which only about *one-third* of employees are covered by collective bargaining)—and does this mean that trade unions are perhaps the fundamental enemy, to be fought perhaps in alliance with idealistic Goldwaterites?

Most incredibly, Mario concludes this passage on "these wrongs" with the assertion that "it is quite false to suppose we require a theory to *see* them." This after having just stated a whole theory about collective bargaining, though his statement of the theory lacked either evidence or argumentation in its brevity. It all makes a curious gloss on the Non-Ideological Hang-up.

2

JIM WILLIAMS' FURIOUS LETTER, on the subject of whether he was or was not associated with the SDS wing which stood for "coalitionism" (in current new-radical jargon) or "permeationism" (in my jargon), is one of those things which may give the reader an idea of some of the SDS's past internal frictions—an unpleasant subject I did not raise. My article referred to him only in one connection, as one of the leading people in that wing, around the period of the 1964 election. I made no reference to him whatsoever in connection with the MFDP question, where I discussed the position of Michael Harrington, who is a different person.

Now: was Williams one of the leaders of this SDS wing or wasn't he? In fact, does he even dispute this? My reference to him and his two colleagues came straight from the discussion articles and letters in the *SDS Bulletin* during this period. A more or less lively discussion was going on in SDS on coalitionism. Could the gentle reader of Williams' violent letter possibly deduce from it what his position *was* in that discussion? What *was*

this political view which the SDS discussed as embodied in pieces signed by Max, Ireland and Williams, separately and also jointly as a group?

A careful perusal of Williams' letter will show what he is so heatedly denying is a "label" (he uses this word several times). "I will not accept Draper's label of 'permeationist' as accurate in describing my politics," he writes. That's his democratic right, and also a matter of indifference to me. Whether this term accurately describes *coalitionist* politics could be a very useful political discussion, in which I am resigned to possibly failing to convince Williams.

But my unforgivable crime, amounting to "intellectual renegacy and dishonesty," was in giving the quotation from Dick Flacks. Flacks, writing as one who deplored the factional intensity of *both* sides and who sought to calm the waters (and we perhaps now have an inkling of the problem), wrote down a political summary of both SDS wings. This is what I quoted *in extenso*. It now appears that I am a Dishonest Intellectual Renegade, not to speak of being tragically immoral in "intent" as well as intimidated by the "mindless ferocity" of the new-left, because I did not report that Williams' group objected to Flacks' "label" and further objected by "asserting that we as radicals were concerned with 'power,' not 'respect' or 'voice.'" *This is the complete crime.*

It is perhaps adding insult to injury to say that, then as now, I was not impressed with the news that the coalitionists were concerned with power; nor convinced that it was terribly offensive to be thought concerned with "respect" or "voice." However, I am willing to believe that Williams regards these irrelevancies as more important to History than I do.

One detail: Honest Jim presents "Brother Draper's neat syllogism: Max-Ireland-Williams are 'permeationists,' 'permeationists' fail to support the independent action of the MFDP, e.g. Max-Ireland-Williams did not support MFDP, q.e.d." This silly syllogism is a pure invention by our honest man, out of the whole cloth, and exists nowhere in my article. This imaginative approach and temperance in language clearly make Williams an authority on "mindless ferocity" . . . of the people who disagree with him.

3

SPINRAD'S MUSINGS ON TERMINOLGY are the sort of thing I would gladly discuss with him at great length on the Terrace at Berkeley over a cup of coffee on a lazy afternoon. For example, I think we could have an exhilarating, if not downright hilarious, time discussing whether the word *Establishment* is "at variance with the genuine Marxist tradition." I gather he thinks the new-fledged radicals should shuck "their cliché terminology and say *ruling class* outright—no kidding around—something fresh. As a foursquare genuine Marxist myself, I often like to unleash hazy, pop-journalistic substitutes like "the Powers-That-Be" (which has a long history in Marxist pop-journalism) or "ruling circles" (which is, or are, naturally roundabout), and other such terms which may make Spinrad "queasy" but which rest on my own stomach like unto a good steak.

But now: the non-ideological radicals don't use terms like "ruling class"

because they do *not* accept "the genuine Marxist tradition." That's a pity, of course. Off with their heads.

Meanwhile—that is, while I wait for every last one of them to attend the classes of our Independent Socialist Club here, which tell them all about bureaucratic collectivism and many other invaluable things, or to listen to the class on Marxism which I run over station KPFA now and then—meanwhile I am very grateful for the term *Establishment*, which points their thinking in the right *direction* without demanding that they first become genuine blown-in-the-bottle Marxists.

This drumfire against the term *Establishment* is really a most interesting phenomenon! Cast a cold eye on the word "uncomfortable" which pops up in Spinrad's letter. It appears that terms like *Establishment*, *coalition*, *permeation* and *West* have "an uncomfortable resemblance to what emanates from Madison Avenue or the disciples of J. Stalin." It happens that not one of these terms, discussed by Spinrad with such acid contempt (hokey, etc.), was developed by the new-radicals. *Coalition* is the chosen term used freely by the coalitionists themselves. *Permeation*—which has its origin in Fabianism—appeared in my discussion as my own import; it is not new-radical "lingo." The *West*, in the sense of Western capitalist society, has been a fixture of socialist journalism (including the genuine Marxist type) for decades. And *Establishment*—was popularized by the British *socialists*. When words like these are smeared, instead, with "Madison Avenue" and "J. Stalin's disciples," there must be a term somewhere in the genuine Marxist tradition to describe this sort of amalgam. At any rate it is plain that the use of *Establishment* makes Spinrad uncomfortable.

My article gave my own freehand definition of *Establishment*: "essentially it is a term pointing in the direction of whatever one thinks is the center of socio-political power in this system," with the "hangers-on" etc. added as an extra. Not only does Spinrad ignore this, but he obviously doesn't know the SDS definition, of which I quoted only the first sentence and said it "continues with considerable specificity." But what difference do such details make when "clarity and relevance" are on the order of the day?

4

SID LENS' SUMMARY OF HIS OWN ARTICLE is enough for the purpose. He explains that what he wrote is that American democracy ranks high in terms of ballot-boxes, but "it ranks rather low" in terms of participative democracy.

Good: now all Sid has to explain is this: in participative democracy America ranks *low in comparison with whom or what?* Low or high have no meanings except comparative ones.

Now it is clear that he didn't mean to convey that America ranks low in comparison with Tibet, Tanzania, Terra del Fuego or Taiwan. So America ranks low in comparison with what other places?

The Lens article did not leave the reader in suspense but went right on to its plug for P.D. in the regimes which I mentioned, under Castro, Nasser and Sukarno. If Sid did not want to convey the impression that America ranked "low" in comparison with these regimes, then he ought to

watch that his pen doesn't run away with itself, in his present incarnation as an enthusiast for the developing authoritarian states.

Yes, authoritarian states—by any standards that the Sid Lens I knew used to explain. I published an enthusiastic review of his book *The Counterfeit Revolution* (1952), which gave a convincing analysis from a revolutionary socialist standpoint of the bureaucratic-collectivist counter-revolution in Russia and the Communist world; and if that analysis is obsolete now, I would like to challenge the Sid Lens of today to refute it for my education. (Say, in *New Politics*.) The author of that book would not have been in doubt about what to say on apologies for the new dictatorships (modernizing dictatorships) which crush all political opposition, *particularly* opponents who try to fight for participative democracy.

5

MICHAEL MUNK LIKES MY SECTION ON COALITIONISM and just hates my section on Communism and anti-Communism. That's par for a *National Guardian* staffman, and there would be little to comment on if Munk had merely gone through the usual litany reserved for revolutionary socialist opponents of Stalinism. Unfortunately he did not restrain himself to that.

The litany is there, of course: "ideological baggage of the Old Left"—"insignificant sects" [hiss]—"ideological rut"—"limitations of the real world"—"conditioned reflex"—"rigid ideological blinders"—"negativism"—in fact, a standard recording of all the "ideological baggage" of a very old "left" which has been playing this record since long before the *National Guardian* was invented. Munk's is a relatively polite version (as compared with "left social-facists," "running dogs of imperialism," and other witticisms), for which I thank him kindly; and I do not want him to think that I had any special complaint about his effort as long as the needle stayed in these grooves.

I have two other apples to peel with him, a small one and a big one. The small one is that he rebaptizes Tom Hayden and Staughton Lynd. Commenting at some length on a key quotation from Hayden and Lynd, in which they gave reasons for rejecting "anti-Communism," I remarked *inter alia* that their stand was "extraordinarily immoral" etc. What Munk's letter says is that I charged the *New Left* with being "extraordinarily immoral," etc.

Now in the real world Hayden and Lynd are not known collectively as the New Left—are they, Mr. Munk? In fact, these two courageous gentlemen nowadays represent a rather extreme point in the spectrum. It is not the "New Left" that went fellow-traveling with Aptheker, or even approved of it, and it is not the "New Left" that joined the DuBois Clubs like Lynd.

The new-left, glory be, is a far more variegated movement than it appears in Munk's books; and the day when it narrows down to merely an assortment of fellow-travelers of the DuBois Clubs or the *National Guardian* (not to speak of the Communist Party) is the day when Munk's prediction about me will be confirmed. But that is only another way of saying that the new-left would be dead. Meanwhile, any tendency to misrepresent it as being that *now* is itself an effort to shove it in that direction— which

means to gut it, to sterilize it, to pervert it. All litanies aside, what on earth could be a more suicidally *sectarian* approach to the new-radicals than this?

"Almost all of the New Left," says Munk, "rejects communism 'in its own way,'" and then, after a curious colon, he adds: "they do not join the Communist party and condemn the crimes committed in the name of socialism." (This, I take it, means the crimes committed by the Communist regimes.)

This is very interesting. Does Munk mean that *he* rejects Communism, and what is his way? Or does the *National Guardian* reject Communism? I am all agog. As for Hayden and Lynd, they have just explained why they reject not Communism but *opposition* to Communism; and if they have explained somewhere their own particular way of rejecting Communism, I should like to know, so that I can do them justice. Does Munk's revelation apply also to the DuBois Clubs (which he includes in the new-left, if I am not mistaken), and will he please refer me to where the DuBois Clubs reject Communism in their own way?

This brings us to the big apple. Since Munk too has rejected Communism in some unexplained way, obviously the trouble with Draper *can't* simply be that he also rejects Communism, although an innocent might have thought so from some other grooves on the record. What then?

But what Draper is insisting on is the elevation of such 'anticommunism' to a *central position* in whatever ideology may develop from today's ferment and groping. To merit Draper's endorsement, the New Left would have to decree that *all its theoretical and tactical work* flow from anti-communism as from a conditioned reflex; and it is the new generation's refusal to lie on his procrustean bed that brings forth all his accusations and warnings. [Italics added.]

Now where in my article did Munk get this from? He quotes nothing; he refers to nothing. Yet it is the crux of his letter, for we have already found out that there is nothing terrible in merely rejecting Communism in some way.

This statement by Munk is a simple falsification, which I trust he will regret on seeing it in cold print. My article systematically spent more space in attacking this sort of anti-Communism than it spent on the Munk types. Its relevant section (6) began with a criticism of Irving Howe on this subject. It went on to explain the new-radicals' disgust when they "found anti-Communism to be an *overshadowing preoccupation* also of a whole generation of decayed radicals, 'the old-leftists of a certain type.'" It cited with approval the SDS Port Huron Statement's attack on the paranoid American-type anti-Communism which permeates "even many liberals and socialists." And then, for the benefit of those who read very fast, it summarized as follows:

On one side of the coin is the paranoid view that Communism is a great danger in the U.S. today. Turn it over and on the other side is the Hayden-Lynd position: that *to state a principled democratic stand in criticism of Communism, in proper context and proper proportion*, is to condone rape. [Italics added]

Comes the winged summary by Munk: Draper insists—absolutely insists—that anti-Communism must have the “central position” (no less) in any radical ideology, and that all—yes, *all*—of the new Left’s work must flow from anti-Communism; or else he will not “endorse” the New Left . . .

I am anxious to save Munk’s soul, out of simple good-nature; and so I invite him to commune with his conscience on the first available spare weekend, and ask himself seriously whether he has not already unwittingly absorbed too much of the Stalinist school of slander from the circles he has been associating with.

Munk, some day or other, will have to decide whether there is any real content to his diaphanous hints that he too has some kind of anti-Communist “stance.” For he writes that what he dissents from is “Draper’s particular stance of anti-Communism.” In the real world, on which he is an authority, this implies that he has some *other* anti-Communist stance. Now if this is so, and if he ever works out what it is, it will mean that he rejects both Communism and capitalism. Horrors! This implies nothing else than a Third Camp stance of some kind, about which his letter repeats much nonsense. But it will do him good, for then he will have to think more seriously about the Third Camp viewpoint, and about the basic theoretical work done by the Independent Socialist League in developing it.

THE INSULAR VIETNAMESE . . .

The Vietnamese are an insular people. Their vision is very limited. They display little concern for the rest of the world and often, for that matter, seem to show only the slightest regard for the broader effects of their actions on the destiny of their own country.

Instead they are driven by regional and personal fears, jealousies and ambitions. Vietnam is, above all, a society of men and sects and not of laws and institutions. Thus the current political crisis, like the myriad of previous ones, evolved not from any deep clash of ideologies but rather from regional and personal conflicts.—(N.Y. *Times* News of the Week in Review, April 10.)

. . . AND THE ENTERPRISING AMERICANS

SAIGON, April 7 (UPI)—The enterprising Americans in the green berets—the elite jungle fighters of the Army’s Special Forces—were doing a booming business in the sale of bloodstained “Vietcong battle flags” to United States airmen in Saigon. But their business, a fraud, has been dissolved.

The Special Forces soldiers were selling their “Vietcong battle flags” to the United States pilots at \$25 apiece.

The airmen, who spend most of their duty time high above the Vietcong, had no way to know the flags were imitations.

According to the Saigon police, the Special Forces men hired an old woman in a Saigon back street to sew the flags. Then they stomped on the banners in the mud and sprinkled them with chicken blood.

Each morning, the police said, the seamstress delivered a bundle of the flags—blue and red with a gold star in the middle to the salesmen.

The police arrested her after finding 30 Vietcong flags in her possession during a routine check.—(N.Y. *Times*, April 8.)

Crime and Punishment in Poland

IN JULY 1965, a man named Ludwik Hass who had emerged eight years earlier from almost two decades in Russian slave labor camps, took the witness stand in Warsaw at a trial of a group of young intellectuals to answer charges that he was a Trotskyist. He answered the charges by confirming them and defending the ideas of revolutionary socialism. Hass was one of a group of five socialists sentenced to prison by the Polish government in two successive trials.

The case began in April 1965, when more than a dozen people, most of them young members of the Polish Communist Party, were arrested in Warsaw for "possessing and distributing pamphlets . . . detrimental to the interests of the Polish state and dealing with political and social relations in Poland." Their offense—the preparation and distribution of a 128-page pamphlet criticizing the regime.

Of those tried in July 1965, Karol Modzelewski, a lecturer at Warsaw University, 27 years old, whose father had been Minister of Foreign Affairs in Communist Poland, was sentenced to three and one-half years imprisonment, and Jacek Kuron, also at Warsaw University, was sentenced to three years. The fate of the other defendants is unclear from news reports. There was a demonstration in the courtroom when spectators joined with the defendants in singing the *Internationale* and giving the Communist clenched fist salute.

No doubt, that demonstration contributed to the fact that the second trial, held in January 1966, was secret. At this second trial, Ludwik Hass and Romuald Smiech, both history instruc-

tors at Warsaw University and Kazimierz Badowski, an economist at Cracow University, were all sentenced to three years imprisonment. The defendants were brought into the courtroom handcuffed—the first time since 1956 that political prisoners have been treated in this fashion.

All the defendants were convicted under Section 23 of the "small Penal Code" enacted on June 13, 1946. The law—actually a sedition statute—penalizes those who distribute or "prepare for the purpose of distribution" literature which "contains false information that may bring essential harm to the interests of the Polish state or bring prejudice to the authority of its chief offices." This law which provides a minimum penalty of three years aroused great discontent which erupted into open criticism during the upheaval of 1956. Such open criticism was silenced as the Gomulka regime responded with repressive measures a few years later.

The literature which caused the arrest of the group was a pamphlet which analyzed the structure of Communist society. The substance of its analysis was that the Communist state does not represent the workers but a new ruling class. It characterized the regime as a "bureaucratic dictatorship" which has usurped the workers' property and called for a struggle for workers' democracy based on workers' councils. The authors of the pamphlet differentiated themselves from the Titoists in their rejection of the workers' councils of Yugoslavia as genuinely democratic or representing the rule of the Yugoslavian workers. The influence of Leon Trotsky is re-