

# THE FREE SPEECH MOVEMENT and the NEGRO REVOLUTION

by

Mario Savio

Eugene Walker

Raya Dunayevskaya

--

Includes also:

**Robert Moses on Education in the South**

and

**Inside Sproul Hall: An Eyewitness Account  
of the Arrest of 800 Students, by Joel L. Pimsleur**

# Berkeley Fall

## The Berkeley Student Rebellion of 1964

by Mario Savio

There are quite a few students who have attended school at Berkeley who went South to work with the Student Non-violent Co-ordinating Committee, and who have been active in the civil rights movement in the Bay Area. At the end of last summer, some of these students returned from Mississippi, having taken part in the COFO Summer Project. I was one of these returning students. We were greeted by an order from the Dean of Students' Office that the kind of on-campus political activity which had resulted in our taking part in the Summer Project was to be permitted no longer.

It is a lot easier to become angry at injustices done to other people than at injustices done to oneself. The former requires a lower degree of political consciousness, is compatible with a higher political boiling point. You become slowly, painfully aware of those things which disturb you in the ways society oppresses you by taking part in activities aimed at freeing and helping others. There is less guilt to suffer in opposing the arbitrary power exercised over someone else than in opposing the equally unjust authority exercised over yourself. Thus, the order banning student politics on campus was an ideal locus of fierce protest. It combined an act of bureaucratic violence against the students themselves with open attack on student participation in the Bay Area civil rights movement. The seemingly inexhaustible energy which the Berkeley students had so long devoted to the struggle for Negro rights was now turned squarely on the vast, faceless University administration. This is what gave the Free Speech Movement its initial impetus.

But the new restrictions were not aimed so much at curtailing activity which would result in civil rights work in the South as at halting the very active participation of students in the civil rights movement in the Bay Area. The University was apparently under considerable pressure to "crackdown" on the student activists from the right-wing in California business and politics. William Knowland, who has become symbolic of this pressure, managed Goldwater's statewide campaign; the reactionary Oakland Tribune, which Knowland publishes, has played a major role in creating the myth of Berkeley, the "little

red school house." Last March when about 160 demonstrators, including many University students, were arrested at the Sheraton-Palace Hotel while protesting a discriminatory hiring policy, Don Mulford, conservative Republican State Assemblyman from the University district, was severely critical of the Berkeley administration for not expelling the then arrested students. Student pressure on Bay Area business resulted in business pressure on the University; the University responded by trying to restrict student political activity.

The liberal University of California administration would have relished the opportunity to show off in the national academic community a public university enjoying complete political and academic freedom and academic excellence. And if student politics had been restricted either to precinct work for the Democrats and Republicans, or to advocacy (by public meetings and distribution of literature) of various forms of wholesale societal change, then I don't believe there would have been the crisis there was. In any case an accommodation between the bureaucrats and the students could more easily have been achieved. The corporations represented on the Board of Regents welcome Young Democrats and Young Republicans as eager apprentices, and sectarian "revolutionary" talk can be tolerated because it is harmless. The radical student activists, however, are a mean threat to privilege. Because the students were advocating consequential actions (because their advocacy was consequential): the changing of hiring practices of particular establishments, the ending of certain forms of discrimination by certain concrete acts — because of these radical acts, the administration's restrictive ruling was necessary.

Which is easy to understand. The First Amendment exists to protect consequential speech; First Amendment rights to advocacy come into question only when actions advocated are sufficiently limited in scope, and sufficiently threatening to the established powers. The action must be radical and possible: picket lines, boycotts, sit-ins, rent strikes. The Free Speech Movement demanded no more — nor less — than full First Amendment rights of advocacy on campus as well as off: that, therefore, only the courts have power to determine and punish abuses of freedom of speech. The Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate endorsed this position on December 8, 1964 by declaring against all University regulation of the content of speech or advocacy — by a vote of 824 to 115.

Probably the most meaningful opportunity for political involvement for students with any political awareness is in the civil rights movement. Indeed, there appears to be little else in American life today which can claim the allegiance of men. Therefore, the action of the administration, which seemed to the students to be directed at the civil rights movement, was felt as a form of emasculation, or attempted emasculation. The only part of the world which people could taste, that wasn't as flat and stale as the middleclass wasteland from which most of the University people have come, that part of the world was being cleanly eliminated by one relatively hygienic administrative act. The student response to this "routine directive" was outraged protest.

Student civil rights action in the Bay Area has been significant and will become increasingly so. I am sure we haven't seen the last of the administration's attempts either to limit, or, if possible, to eliminate activity of this kind. On the other side, I think last semester has shown that such attempts, if drastic enough to be effective, are bound to end in disaster. So, what we have to fear is not some extreme act, such as was attempted last September, but rather petty harassments of various sorts, and the not-so-petty exclusion of "non-students" from the campus, toward which legislation recently passed by the State Legislature is directed. I believe it unlikely for the students to rally in opposition to such harassment; probably we shall have to be content with opposing decisively only gross provocation, which probably now the Administration has learned not to attempt.

But the civil rights movement is only one aspect of the dual motivation of FSM support. And this is so because people do find it easier to protest injustices done to others: even adverting to injustice done oneself is often too painful to be sustained for very long. When you oppose injustice done others, very often — symbolically sometimes, sometimes not so symbolically — you are really protesting injustice done to yourself. In the course of the events of the fall, students became aware, ever more clearly, of the monstrous injustices that were being done to them as students.

We found we were being denied the very possibility of "being a student" — unquestionably a right. We found we were severed from our proper roles: students denied the meaningful work one must do in order to be a student. Instead we were faced with a situation in which the pseudo-student role we were playing was tailor-made to further the interests of those who own the University, those vast corporations in whose interest the University is managed. Time past when the skills required of laborers were nowhere near so great as the ones required now, bosses built schools for their own children. Now the bosses build schools for the children of their workers. They build schools to further their own interests.

Accordingly, the schools have become training camps — and proving grounds — rather than places where people acquire education. They become factories to produce technicians rather than places to live student lives. And this perversion develops great resentment on the part of the students. Resentment against being subjected to standard production techniques of speedup and regimentation; against a tendency to quantify education — virtually a contradiction in terms. Education is measured in units, in numbers of lectures attended, in numbers of pages devoted to papers, number of pages read. This mirrors the gross and vulgar quantification in the society at large — the real world — where everything must be reduced to a lowest common denominator, the dollar bill. In our campus play-world we use play money, course units.

It is understandable that resentment should develop among the students. However, it was not always so easy for the students to understand the causes of their own resentment. It is not as easy to see what is oppressing the subject as to see what is oppressing the others. Nevertheless, we students did become more and more aware of the factory education which we were being provided.

It is significant that the President of the University of California should be the foremost ideologist of this "Brave New World" conception of education. President Clark Kerr dreamed up the frightening metaphors: "the knowledge industry," "the multiversity," which has as many faces as it has publics, be they industries of various kinds, or the Federal Government, especially the Pentagon and the AEC. He also invented the title "the captain of bureaucracy," which he is, by analogy with earlier captains of industry. He is the person directly charged with steering the mighty ship along the often perilous course of service to its many publics in government and industry. Not to the public, but to its many publics, the Kerrian whore is unlawfully joined.

Those disciplines with a ready market in industry and government are favored and fostered: the natural sciences, engineering, mathematics, and the social sciences when these serve the braintrusting propaganda purposes of "liberal" government. The humanities naturally suffer, so that what should be the substance of undergraduate education suffers. The emphasis is given to research instead of to teaching undergraduates. Teaching graduate students is less effected by this prostitution since such teaching is intimately bound to research. But the undergraduate has become the new dispossessed; the heart has been taken from his education — no less so for science students — for the humanities are no longer accorded the central role they deserve in the university.

And of course there are whole areas which never see the light in undergraduate instruction. Who takes undergraduate courses in the history of the labor movement, for example? Certainly no one at the University of California. Likewise, American Negro history is a rarity and is still more rarely taken seriously. To be taken at all seriously it would have to be seen as central to all American history.

In a healthy university an undergraduate would have time to do 'nothing.' To read what he wants to read, maybe to sit on a hill behind the campus all alone or with a friend, to 'waste time' alone, dreaming in the Eucalyptus Grove. But the university, after the manner of a pesky social director, sees to it the student's time is kept filled with anti-intellectual harassment: those three credits in each three unit course, those meaningless units themselves. The notion that one can somehow reduce Introductory Quantum Mechanics and Philosophy of Kant to some kind of lowest common denominator (three units a piece) is totally irrational, and reflects the irrationality of a society which tries to girdle the natural rhythms of growth and learning by reduction to quantitative terms, much as it attempts to market the natural impulses of sex.

From my experience, I should say the result is at best a kind of intellectual cacaphony. There are little attractions in various places, philosophy in one corner, physics in another, maybe a bit of mathematics every now and again, some political science — nothing bearing any relationship to anything else. Everything requires too many papers, too much attendance at lectures, two-thirds of which should never have been given, and very few of which resulted from any serious thought later than several years or earlier than several minutes before the lecture period. It is easy to see that there should be real resentment on the part of the students. But it is resentment whose causes are, as we have seen, very difficult for the student to perceive readily. That is why what occurred last semester gained its initial impetus from the very different involvements of what are mostly middle-class students in the struggles of the Negro people. Thus, it was both the irrationality of society, that denies to Negroes the life of men, and the irrationality of the University, that denies to youth the life of students, which caused last semester's rebellion.

June, 1965  
Oakland, California

MARIO SAVIO

\* \* \* \* \*

### "MOVEMENTS TO CHANGE AMERICA"<sup>3</sup>

"Last summer I went to Mississippi to join the struggle there for civil rights. This fall I am engaged in another phase of the same struggle, this time in Berkeley. The two battlefields may seem quite different to some observers, but this is not the case . . . In our free speech fight at the UC, we have come up against what may emerge as the greatest problem of our nation — depersonalized, unresponsive bureaucracy. We have encountered the organized status quo in Mississippi, but it is the same in Berkeley. . . . The same is true of all bureaucracies. They begin as tools, means to certain legitimate goals, and they end up feeding their own existence. The conception that bureaucrats have is that history has in fact come to an end. . . .

"On campus students are not about to accept it as fact that the University has ceased evolving and is in its final state of perfection, that students and faculty are respectively raw material and employees, or that the University is to be automatically run by unresponsive bureaucrats. . . .

(3) The tape recording made during the sit-in was edited and published in *Humanity*, No. 2, Dec. 1964, Berkeley, California.

"The university is the place where people begin seriously to question the conditions of their existence and raise the issue of whether they can be committed to the society they have been born into. After a long period of apathy during the 50's, students have begun not only to question but having arrived at answers, to act on those answers. This is part of a growing understanding among many people in America that history has not ended, that a better society is possible, and that it is worth dying for.

"This free speech fight points up a fascinating aspect of contemporary campus life. Students are permitted to talk all they want so long as their speech has no consequences. . . .

"Many students here at the university, many people in society are wandering aimlessly about. Strangers in their own lives, there is no place for them. They are people who have not learned to compromise, who for example have come to the university to learn, to question, to grow — to learn all the standard things that sound like cliches because no one takes them seriously. And they find at one point or other that for them to become part of society, to become lawyers, ministers, business men, people in government, that very often they must compromise those principles which were most dear to them. They must suppress the most creative impulses that they have; this is a prior condition for being part of the system. The university is well structured, well tooled, to turn out people with all the sharp edges worn off, the well-rounded person. The university is well equipped to produce that sort of person, and this means that the best among the people who enter must for four years wander aimlessly much of the time questioning why they are on campus at all, doubting whether there is any point in what they are doing, and looking toward a very bleak existence afterward in a game in which all of the rules have been made up, which one can not really amend.

"It is a bleak scene, but it is all a lot of us have to look forward to. Society provides no challenge. American society in the standard conception it has of itself is simply no longer exciting. The most exciting things going on in America today are movements to change America."

\* \* \* \* \*

### "I HAVEN'T FELT MUCH LIKE A COMPONENT PART"<sup>4</sup>

"He (Clark Kerr) looks at a university this way . . . these are his metaphors, not mine. It's a factory and it has a manager . . . that's Kerr . . . and a Board of Directors . . . that's the Board of Regents . . . and employees, the faculty and teaching assistants, and raw materials . . . that's us. We've proven ourselves rather intractable raw material.

"His view as stated in that quotation is that we serve the national purpose by being 'a component part of the military-industrial complex.' Well, I haven't felt much of a component part and I think that has been part of the problem. Nor, have all these students. There is an incredible alienation on the campus, especially among the undergraduates. . . . I think it is a scandal that such a person should be president of a university . . . any university. But, maybe the thing worst about the university is not that Kerr is president of it but that it's the kind of university that needs Kerr to run it. Because it is a factory to a large extent. . . .

"That is the issue. Arbitrary power, alienation, the managers and the managed . . . after a while the people get tired of being treated, you know, by managers, as managed. They want to be treated as human beings should be treated. . . . Human beings are not things to be used. . . ."

(4) This is from an interview on KPFF News, Dec. 25, 1964, Los Angeles, California. It was also printed in the *Los Angeles Free Press*, January 1, 1965.

# FSM and the Negro Revolution

by Raya Dunayevskaya

The Negro revolution emerged so quietly on the American scene with the Montgomery Bus Boycott (1955-56) that the North hardly gave it note, much less rose up in its support. It wasn't until 1960, when Negro youth in Greensboro, North Carolina, staged a sit-in at a lunch counter that the first responsive chord was struck in the North. That same year witnessed a mass anti-HUAC demonstration in San Francisco. Thus did the white student youth in the North find its own voice at the same time that it helped the Negro revolution gain momentum not only in the South, but in the North. In the California Bay Area in particular there was, thereafter, no activity — from the Freedom Rides in 1961 to the Mississippi Freedom Summer Project in 1964 — in which the student youth didn't participate with a spirit characteristic of youth-conscious of reshaping a world they had not made.

Thus, suddenly, a generation of new radicals was born to replace "the silent generation" of the 1950s. By winter that year a new form of revolt, with a new underlying philosophy, called itself the Free Speech Movement. To retrieve the moment of new truth, it becomes necessary to view the FSM at that moment — December 2-3 — when the student revolt culminated in a mass sit-in.

## 1. Students Take Matters Into Their Own Hands<sup>5</sup>

On December 2, 800 students in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley sat in at Sproul Hall to protest against the University's curtailment of free speech and freedom of action in behalf of civil rights and political principles.

On December 3, Governor Pat Brown dispatched 643 police to eject the 800 sit-inners who, in self defense, as well as for their belief in non-violence, went limp. None too gently, the non-violent demonstrators were dragged down the stairs and thrown into police patrol wagons headed for jail. During the 12 hours of this operation the building was closed to the faculty. But TV

---

(5) The most objective and comprehensive report, "Berkeley Free Speech Controversy," is the Preliminary Report issued on December 13, 1964 by a Fact-Finding Committee of Graduate Political Scientists (Bardach, Citrin, Eisenbach, Elkins, Ferguson, Jervis, Levine and Sniderman). Most of the factual material in our analysis is taken from this report and from the official FSM Newsletter.

Other reports of participants consulted appeared in *The Campus Core-Later*, "What the Students Want" by Stephan Weissman appeared in *The New Leader*, Jan. 4, 1965, which also carried an article by a faculty member, Paul Jacobs, "Dr. Feuer's Distortions." See also: "Civil Rights and FSM" by Michael Rossman (*Occident*, Fall 1964-65); *FSM*, a Du Bois Clubs of America pamphlet by Bettina Aptheker, Robert Kaufman and Michael Folson; *Students in Revolt*, Solidarity Pamphlet, No. 18, London, England; and Eric Levine's *The Free Speech Controversy*, published by Students for a Democratic Society.

coverage of the police force's invasion of the university grounds and the subsequent fingerprinting and mugging of the students as if they were common criminals, did more to galvanize the majority of the student body to action than all the speeches and actions of the FSM had been able to achieve in the three months since the start of its struggle.

The "moderates" became "leftists," the apolitical political, and the political students called for a strike. On December 4, 15,000 students stayed away from classes.

This put an end to the myth, perpetrated by the University Administration, the Governor and the press, that "a small hard core of Leftists" (if not outright "Communists"), who were "non-students" to boot — estimated by President Clark Kerr to be no more than "30 to 40," and by the spokesman for the truly hard-core minority of the faculty, Prof. Lewis S. Feuer, to be "170"—constituted the Free Speech Movement. In truth, not only did a majority of the vast student body now support the FSM, but the overwhelming majority of the faculty likewise now sprang to action. Two departments cancelled classes and many professors honored the picket lines. The chairmen of all departments constituted themselves as a Council of Chairmen, met with President Kerr and tried to work out a compromise. At the same time 200 professors met to plan strategy to present to the Academic Senate to endorse complete political freedom and amnesty. The Academic Freedom Committee and the Chairmen's Council endorsed the proposals. On December 8, the Academic Senate voted, 824 to 115, to endorse the Resolution of the Academic Freedom Committee.

To find out how it was possible for the allegedly most apolitical student body in the world—the American—to open a new chapter of mass action for freedom, applying tactics never before used, we need to trace the dialectic of revolt from its beginning.

#### UNDER THE WHIP OF COUNTER-REVOLUTION

On September 17, a united front of organizations as far apart on the political and civil rights spectrum as SNCC, CORE, SLATE, YSA, SDS, and the Du Bois Clubs, on the one hand, and the Young Democrats, Young Republicans, and even some Students for Goldwater, on the other hand, united to oppose the arbitrary September 14 ruling issued by Dean Kathryn Towle which curtailed the content of, and areas for, free speech as well as fund solicitations and recruitment by civil rights and political organizations.

The University of California's sudden "discovery" that the area heretofore used by these organizations, and for which city permits had been obtained, was university property, came about through the prodding of forces outside the academic community, forces whose only concern with education lay in the attempt to extend McCarthyite tactics against both academic freedom and civil rights. These reactionary forces had, in summer, gathered in convention to capture the presidential nomination of the Republican Party for Goldwater. They stood aghast at the students and other civil rights workers who were demonstrating before the hall.

The old leaders of this new fashioned neo-fascistic fringe of American politics had memories that were as long as they were abysmally deep in the backward look. They recalled that this was the city, and these youth the fighters against the "open" hearings that the House UnAmerican Activities Committee chose to conduct in San Francisco in 1960, the very year in which Negro youth began their revolution down South.

And here they were again, despite the fact that the film made of the 1960 demonstration and police measures against it, plus the fascistic rhetoric

extolling the forces of "law and order and anti-Communism," had succeeded in forging a new brand of college conservatives — Goldwaterites, Birchites, and even Wallace-ite racists. At the height of their power, about to capture a major political party, they were being challenged by still a newer and greater national force, since the Negro revolution had extended itself from South to North and aligned itself with new white youth.

There is no way, of course, of knowing whether plans against the Berkeley students were hatched there and then, or whether these forces felt too cocky with big power politics to do more than store the sight of the youth in the back of their heads for future use.

What we do know beyond the peradventure of any doubt is that one man of the extreme Right had a personal vendetta to settle, since the paper he published had been picketed by these same university youth who protested his unfair hiring practices. This man—erstwhile U. S. Senator, California Chairman of Goldwater for President, and publisher of the Oakland Tribune, William Knowland — was a local resident and could take his time about deciding when to launch his campaign against the students.

No doubt Mr. Knowland felt doubly armed since this time, as against 1960, there were "court convictions" of the students for the spring actions at the Sheraton-Palace and Auto Row, and he knew the right section of Big Business to put pressure on the fund raisers in the UC Administration. Moreover the University would float a bond issue in November and he had a paper at his command. It was he who made sure that the administration "discovered" the property belonged to them. The fall semester had no sooner opened than the students were confronted by the new ruling. It hit the newly returned Mississippi Freedom Summer participants, like Mario Savio, especially hard since they knew just how the southern Freedom Fighters depended on the North for both human allies and financial assistance. That is why the first of the 19 organizations in the united front to man the tables in a challenge of the ruling were SNCC, CORE, SDS, Du Bois Clubs and SLATE, and these were the first organizations warned by the Administration about their violations of the arbitrary ruling. The warnings were followed by the indefinite suspension of eight students.

The first head-on collision which imparted an altogether new quality to the battle between students and university administrators occurred when, once again, an outside force entered the fray.

Fifteen minutes before a scheduled rally of students to protest the suspensions, at 11:45 a.m. on October 1, Dean Van Houten approached the CORE table that was being manned by a "non-student," Jack Weinberg (who was a recent graduate), and attempted to have him arrested. Spontaneously, the students moved to surround the police car and block it from removing Weinberg. Mario Savio, head of the Friends of SNCC, emerged as leader as he addressed the crowd. Later he said, as he recollected this moment: "I don't know what made me get up and give that first speech. I only know I had to. What was it Kierkegaard said about free acts? They're the ones that, looking back, you realize you couldn't help doing."

Very obviously several hundred other students "couldn't help doing" what they did as they sat down and surrounded the car. Some were making speeches. The university administration was not yet ready to do in October, what they were all too willing to do in December — use police force. A group of faculty members intervened and convinced Pres. Kerr to negotiate. By the time an agreement was signed with students — which included submitting rules to a tripartite study committee of administration, faculty and students—the police

car had been pinned down for 32 hours. The united front of student organizations felt as one now, and constituted themselves as the Free Speech Movement.

Without waiting for the recommendations from either the faculty or the students, however, Chancellor Strong went about appointing 10 of the 12 men who were to serve on the Campus Committee on Political Activity (CCPA). He announced that his appointed Faculty Committee on Student Conduct, and not a Committee of the Academic Senate, would hear the cases of the eight suspended students. The FSM stated that if the Administration continued its refusal "to sit down and discuss issues" on the different interpretations of the October 2 agreement, which Chancellor Strong had violated, the FSM planned to end the moratorium on demonstrations.

At this point 600 unaffiliated students, called "independents," expressed their support of the FSM. They chose five to serve on the executive committee. President Kerr reversed Chancellor Strong's interpretation insofar as the committee to whom the cases of the suspended students were to be submitted, and expanded the CCPA to include four from FSM. However, he remained adamant on his interpretation of what constituted "unlawful acts," while the students contended that the question of legality and illegality was for the courts to decide. A move "to exercise our constitutional rights" was made by the students who resumed manning tables.

Chancellor Strong disbanded the CCPA and the Dean's Office sent a letter to 70 students, citing violations. A new force then joined the FSM: a newly organized teaching assistants' association. The Dean's Office moved against the graduate students. The FSM was busy collecting signatures on petitions which urged the Board of Regents to leave the question of "advocacy" to the courts to decide. On November 20, the Regents seemed to side with President Kerr on the question of "illegal" advocacy. When this was followed, during the Thanksgiving holidays, by suddenly resuming disciplinary action against Savio and others, the gathering storm broke loose. It was December 2.

## THE SPROUL HALL SIT-IN

To a mass rally of thousands Mario Savio said:

"There comes a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you cannot take part; you cannot even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the wheels, and the gears and all the apparatus, and you have to make it stop. And you have to make it clear to the people who own it, and to the people who run it, that until you are free their machine will be prevented from running at all."

Eight hundred walked into Sproul Hall for an all-night sit-in. Again the students heard Savio:

"Here is the real contradiction: the bureaucrats hold history as ended. As a result significant parts of the population both on campus and off are dispossessed, and these dispossessed are not about to accept this a-historic point of view . . .

"The most crucial problems facing the United States today are the problems of automation and the problem of racial injustice. Most people who will be put out of jobs by machines will not accept an end to events, this historical plateau, as the point beyond which no change occurs. Negroes will not accept an end to history here. All of us must refuse to accept as history's final judgment that in America there is no place in society for people whose skins are dark.

"The futures and careers for which American students now prepare are for the most part intellectual and moral wastelands. This chrome-plated consumers' paradise would have us grow up to be well-behaved children. But an important minority of men and women coming to the front today have shown that they will die rather than be standardized, replaceable and irrelevant."

Others spoke in a similar vein.<sup>6</sup> Telegrams of support came from James Farmer, Chairman of CORE, and John Lewis, Chairman of SNCC.

The University administration and the Governor, on the other hand, panicked. Gov. Edmund Brown ordered the state troopers to invade Sproul Hall to make the arrests. The move of the University administration to use police force "to resolve" its dispute with the students, the shameful acts of the state troopers in making the arrests of the student demonstrators brought about, as we saw, the student strike and such massive support from the faculty that it became the turning point for all parties to the dispute. Labor in the Bay Area also gave the students support both in not crossing picket lines and in telegrams of protest to the University Administration and the Governor.<sup>7</sup>

Just as the faculty was propelled into the student dispute with the Administration, so the civil rights movement found that it was by no accident bound up with the issue of academic freedom. The FSM itself had reached a new stage of development, for the dialectic of revolt is inseparable from the dialectic of ideas. All the participants suddenly found that the whole struggle, victory included, was but prologue to the unfolding drama which would first reveal differing attitudes not merely to the role of youth in a university, but to ideas and to reality. The right to free speech became a discussion on alienation in society as a whole. The right to discipline became a question of human relationships. The dialogue on concrete questions became a search for a total philosophy.

## II. The Bankruptcy of Bourgeois Thought: Profiles of Clark Kerr and Lewis S. Feuer

Long before the Berkeley battle broke out, UC President Kerr wrote of the university as a "multiversity" with government research, business, the military, and scientific institutes all being part of the "new" academic complex. Both in his Godkin lectures at Harvard in 1963, *The Uses of the University*, and in his other book, *Industrialism and Industrial Man*,<sup>8</sup> he wrote of the need

(6) Jack Weinberg's views were published in the January 1965 issue of *The Campus Core-Later*; Marvin and Barbara Garson's comments appeared in *Students in Revolt*. Marvin Garson is also the author of the pamphlet, *The Regents*. (Also see Footnote 5, above.)

(7) In addition to the support from the regional UAW (see footnote 1, above) labor support came from George Hardy, Secretary of the State Council of Building Service Employees, the Central Labor Council of Alameda, San Francisco and Contra Costa Counties, and the Longshoremen's Union. The Teamsters' Union refused to cross the picket lines during the strike.

(8) It is, of course, necessary to consult these books by Clark Kerr to get a full view of his ideas. But his actions during the crisis speak loudly enough. Also, his interview with William Trombley of the *Los Angeles Times* (Jan. 6, 1965) is quite revealing. Where the citations, above, are not from Kerr's books, they are from this interview, while the exchange with Feuer are from *The New Leader*, Jan. 18, 1965. A timely analysis of Kerr's books by Hal Draper was published October, 1964 by the Independent Socialist Club titled *The Mind of Clark Kerr*.

to do away with ivory towers in order to become part of "society," i.e., the statified, militarized economy: "When the borders of the campus are the boundaries of our state, the lines dividing what is internal from what is external become quite blurred: taking the campus to the state brings the state to the campus . . . the multiversity has many publics. . . . The University as producer, wholesaler, and retailer of knowledge cannot escape service. . . . Instead of the Captain of Erudition or even David Riesman's 'staff sergeant,' there is the Captain of Bureaucracy. . . . The production, distribution, and consumption of 'knowledge' in all its forms is said to account for 29 percent of gross national product . . . and 'knowledge production' is growing at about twice the rate of the rest of the economy. . . . The multiversity is more a mechanism—a series of processes producing a series of results—a mechanism held together by administrative rules and powered by money."

Instead of resisting this development, the president of the largest university in the USA proposed, instead, to do away with — the intellectuals who are "by nature irresponsible. The intellectuals (including the university students) are a particularly volatile element . . . capable of extreme reactions to objective situations—more extreme than any group in society. They are by nature irresponsible, in the sense that they have no continuing commitment to any single institution or philosophical outlook and they are not fully answerable for consequences. They are, as a result, never fully trusted by anybody, including themselves."

Now, whether, as Kerr now claims, he was merely describing what is, not advocating what should be, the point is that, once the actual student revolt began in "his" university, President Kerr showed which part of "society" he was for, and who was the "enemy" and thereby not part of his concept of society. It turned out to be the students and the faculty.

The students, on the other hand, considered "society" to be the civil rights movement and those struggling for freedom of thought, especially since the only struggle possible in the nuclear world is the struggle for the minds of men. They hungered to participate in that conflict. They rejected Kerr's concept of the "multiversity" along with its IBM cataloguing of students as if they were mere numbers.

Professor Lewis S. Feuer rushed into print with a pompous and vituperative article<sup>9</sup> on the events at Berkeley. He thinks that by coining a new word, "nulliversity" in place of "multiversity," and speaking of a so-called community of scholars, he has thereby put himself to the left of President Kerr. As it turns out, he is to the right of him. In the notorious style of "patriots" who used to ask: "If you don't like this country, why don't you go back where you came from?" Professor Feuer asks: If the students don't like the large campuses, why don't they go to smaller colleges? Why do they flock to Berkeley?

Dr. Feuer thought it a big joke for Savio to have introduced the question of alienation in his speeches. He also thought that he had really dug up the root of evil in the "multiversity." "Extremes do meet," he wrote. "The astonishing thing is that both Clark Kerr and Mario Savio agree about the nature of the modern university."

Between Feuer who has elected himself a sort of spokesman for the minority of the faculty, and Kerr who speaks for the majority of the university

administrators, it is hard to decide who is more adept in degrading the world of learning. Both have emasculated language of its meaning. "Non-student" has become for both, a sort of substitute for "subversive." The once hallowed word, alumni, has been dropped altogether, now that some turned out to be part of the FSM. Instead we hear about "a hidden community" who live "off campus" and who, Kerr says, resemble "the Paris left bank." (He says it like a man announcing that he had found "foreigners" and "guerillas" hidden behind every campus bush.)

Feuer, who is a master of the Stalinist-type of amalgam, here goes the whole hog: "undergraduate Goldwaterites and graduate Maoists," "forlorn crackpot and rejected revolutionist," "lumpen beatniks and lumpen agitators." And while he is within sound of the syllable, "nik," he creates a new term with which to deride practitioners of non-violence who go limp rather than actively resist the armed police: "Limpnik."

President Kerr will not, however, let himself be put completely in the shade in innuendos against the aims and tactics of the student revolt. His tone in referring to the tactics of non-violence as "civil disobedience" has the sound of a military man who has just informed a defense plant about which grounds must be restricted areas. Evidently President Kerr thinks we are at war and "civil disobedience" is synonymous with treason. Like a magician pulling rabbits out of a top hat, he suddenly pulls out of nowhere the word, "conspiracy." "The campus cannot be a sanctuary, but the question is whether their punishment should be by the courts or by campus authorities. There is a philosophical problem here: do we want district attorneys and sheriff's deputies on the campus? And there is a legal problem: when does 'advocacy' become conspiracy?"

"Frankly," adds Kerr — who wasn't ready for as simple a matter as letting students do what they had been doing all along, in manning tables for causes — "I wouldn't expect one case of conspiracy in 10 years on the Berkeley campus, but I realize we must still answer the question."

One thing must be said for Kerr. He at least spares us the display of amateur pseudo-psychology in which Feuer indulges as he pretends to write history. Thus Feuer tells us that student movements from 19th century Russia to Berkeley, USA, 1964, have always acted as a magnet for "non-students" who find "their life's calling in a prolonged adolescence and repetitive reenactment of rebellion against their father." As for the FSM specifically, Feuer writes: "The so-called students' movement . . . suddenly sounded more like children asking for permission to be bad . . ."

Feuer cannot resist speaking in a "for adults only" type of whisper to call attention to the big university's acting "as a magnet for the morally corrupt; (who) advocate a melange of narcotics, sexual perversion, collegiate Castrolism, and campus Maoism." In contrast to this Feuer prepares to present himself as the perfect father image practicing godlike cleanliness and patriotism: "The acrid smell of the crowded, sweating, unbathed students sharply reminded me of smells I had long since forgotten among soldiers in the Pacific more than 20 years ago."

After this stab at melodrama, the professor pontificates about the "anti-democratic potential" of the FSM, designates the united front of the student organizations as a "Soviet-style coalition," and concludes that it all reminds him "unpleasantly of young German students talking in a similar vein in the early 1930's." This should make any Communist of Stalin's infamous "Third Period," when all opponents were designated as "social fascists," feel that he has met his match!

(9) "Rebellion at Berkeley: The New Multiversity: Ideology and Reality." *The New Leader*, Dec. 21, 1964. Most of the quotations, above, are from this scurrilous account. The reader, however, should also consult Prof. Feuer's continuing diatribes in the issues of Jan. 4, 12 and 18, 1965.



The fact that the author of such spurious analysis could be the Chairman of the "Social Science Integrated Course" of the largest university in the country and thus can place himself modestly as part of "the greatest concentration of intellectual power and genius in the sciences and scholarship the world has ever known," speaks volumes for the bankruptcy of bourgeois thought in America, and speaks just as eloquently of the need for the students to go "off campus" to find a market place of ideas. The very fact that they have succeeded in opening this intellectual abscess is no small achievement.

The differences between Kerr and Feuer soon evaporated and, by no accident whatever, mutual admiration became the order of the day. Far from Feuer's slanderous contention that there was something akin in President Kerr's and Student Savio's concept of the university, the organic kinship is between Kerr and Feuer. "I congratulate Professor Feuer," writes Kerr, "on his perceptive analysis of the psychodynamics and social context which apparently motivated much of the student action at Berkeley." Feuer, who was at pains to erase his own past<sup>10</sup>, and went so far as to call Kerr "almost a 'neo-Marxist'" before he received Kerr's congratulations, now replied in as laudatory terms:

"Clark Kerr's book is, to my mind, the most powerful analysis of the modern university which has been written in the United States. It is more searching (sic!) than Veblen's classical *The Higher Learning in America* . . . Kerr has been an outstanding president because in practice he has usually acted not as a mediator as his book would have him, but as a leader . . . Kerr is making a valiant effort to create new environments . . . (he) foresaw the coming of the student revolt against the Multiversity. We have seen the advent of what we might well call 'the politics of the absurd.' Will the university community have the wisdom and foresight to prevent their recurrence?"<sup>11</sup>

Now that the alleged proponent of a "community of scholars," and the "technomanagerial realist," find cohabitation so pleasant, we must pray not only for the student body, but also for the state of scholarship in the U.S.<sup>12</sup>

(10) About the only truthful statement to appear in Feuer's mouthings is this indirect one: "The students here tell that their senior professors were in their youth not infrequently Marxists, Trotskyists, Yipsels, Left-wingers. Now in middle age they seem to be resting on reputations gained by their advocacy of conservatism with a Marxist vocabulary. . . ."

(11) These pleasantries are exchanged in *The New Leader*, Jan. 18, 1965.

(12) Reference must be made to his scholarship as analyzed by learned sources long before he wrote of issues in which he was a participant. Thus, Professor David Joravsky, the one historian who has written the best documented and truly scholarly work on *Soviet Marxism and Natural Science, 1917-1932*, had to show that Communist authors did not go unaided, "in accordance with their shibboleths," to create confusion:

"Non-Communist authors have contributed to the confusion by an excess of boldness, by the proclivity that many have shown towards magisterial judgments on the basis of insufficient evidence. One author, for example, writing in a scholarly journal, based a history of the theory of relativity in Soviet physics and philosophy on three 'sources' two of which were merely ambiguous passing references to Einstein's theory in Soviet articles on other subjects." The author referred to is none other than Lewis S. Feuer.

Since that was written, Feuer was nevertheless sent as part of the cultural exchange with Russia and since his few months' stay there he has written endlessly (and so have they against him: See *Voprosy Filosofii*, Nov. 1963) and just as ignorantly so that, once again, he has aroused the ire of specialists in the Russian field. Thus, Professor Joseph Roucek has had to write to the *Slavic Review* (Dec. 1964), complaining that Feuer "is either unacquainted with such studies, or unwilling to acknowledge that they exist" and, after citing about a dozen that deal with the same subject as Feuer, Roucek concludes: "Shall I go on? I can produce other studies. There is nothing particularly wrong if his article is to be only his personal impressions. But since his footnote refers to a few 'other' works in that field, I am wondering whether this is exactly fair to the whole idea of scholarship."

And this is the representative of "the West" who is supposed to win the struggle for the minds of men from Communism!

Thus, Professor Hook of New York University, who, during the McCarthy period, found reasons why academic freedom should be restricted within the context of the Cold War, now tells us that academic freedom in any case,<sup>13</sup> was never meant to apply to students who are there only to learn. He failed to explain how the police invasion of the campus contributed to the University of California being a citadel of learning.

It is no accident, of course, that such as he and his colleague, Feuer (who called the strongman Chancellor at UC nothing short of "saintly") would be as one with Gov. Brown in considering the police invasion of a university a symbol of "law and order." Before the University administration elaborates this myth into a legend, we must reestablish the facts of the case. As we know from TV coverage and from the one reporter, Mr. Pimsleur, who was in the hall for 12 full hours, the truth has a different ring to it:<sup>14</sup>

"The only way to purge the nightmare of that black Thursday is by getting the ugly images out of my brain and down on paper . . . The question might well be asked, why do you need 600 cops to cope with 700 passively resisting kids? This was no prison riot; yet from the police response, you would have thought they were handling convicts, not students . . . Make no mistake, the cops weren't just doing their duty . . ."

"(The students) were deliberately hauled down the stairs on their backs and tailbones, arms and wrists were twisted, hair and ears were pulled—all to the immense amusement of the Oakland police. And lest anyone think I exaggerate, listen to the cops themselves: . . . 'Hey, don't drag 'em down so fast—they ride on their heels. Take 'em down a little slower—they bounce more that way. . . .'

. . . 'Law and order must be preserved' contend the authorities (Mulford, Brown, Knowland, McAteer, the newspapers, the administration, etc., etc.) But are law and order really civilization's ultimate virtues—or are freedom and justice? Indeed, law and order are maintained with brilliant efficiency in totalitarian states . . ."

Mario Savio was absolutely right when he characterized such display of "law and order" as "the organized violence and organized sadism of the power structure." When American academicians (sic!), exactly as their counterparts, the state philosophers in totalitarian lands, come to the point where they accept the manifestation of the state's brute force as the proper way of "resolving" disputes in academia, we are made witness to the reality which Marx described when he spoke of "the knell of scientific bourgeois economy . . . in place of disinterested engineers, there were hired prize-fighters. . . ."

Just as the continuous struggle for equality has exposed the hollowness of American democracy,<sup>15</sup> so the student revolts have exposed the hollowness of academic freedom in the United States. The seal of bankruptcy of contemporary civilization is the seal of bankruptcy of its thought.

(13) "Freedom to Learn But Not to Riot" by Sidney Hook, *The New York Times Magazine*, January 3, 1965. Evidently the outcry against such prejudiced writing impelled *The New York Times* to send out its staff member, A. H. Raskin, who produced a more factual and sympathetic report, "The Berkeley Affair: Mr. Savio & Co." *The New York Times Magazine*, February 14, 1965. Mr. Raskin writes: "Among the young everywhere is a sense of alienation that turns every affluence and security into worthless prizes. This may prove to be the nation's critical challenge."

(14) See Appendix I.

(15) See *American Civilization on Trial*: "Because slavery stained American civilization as it wrenched freedom from Great Britain, the Negro gave the lie to its democracy. . . . The Negro became the touchstone of this class-ridden, color-conscious civilization which had an ever-expanding frontier, but no unifying philosophy. . . . Today, as in the days of the Abolitionists, we see a new beginning . . . the Freedom movements have given ample proof of the Humanist surge of masses in action seeking to reconstruct society."

### III. The Other America

As is evident from the 824 to 115 vote of the Academic Senate in support of the students' demands for free speech, there is an "Other Academia" than the university administration. And in a few cases, this is not only a defensive stance. Thus, Professors Sheldon S. Wolin and John H. Schaar, in their serious analysis of the Berkeley revolt,<sup>16</sup> pointed out that the Administration's "rhetoric of affluence and order revealed fatal ignorance of the yearning and comments of the present generation of students." They fully appreciated the fact that it was no small feat for a university "numbering 27,000 students, 12,000 faculty and non-academic employees, numerous research laboratories, institutes, old-fashioned classrooms, and boasting an annual budget of \$60 million" to have been brought to a halt by a "few thousand students who had no other power than the moral courage to say 'no' before the colossus and the tactical skill to say it at the right time and in unison."

In singling out "the new breed of students" for praise, they have grasped reality: "For some time now, the students, especially the undergraduates, have felt themselves to be an alien presence within the multiversity, an 'Other Academia' analogous to the 'Other America,' ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clothed not in the material sense, but in the intellectual and spiritual senses." All the same, they have placed themselves, in the main, not so much with the "Other America" as with the "Other Academia." By relegating the questions, including the philosophic one of alienation, to the university sphere, they allow themselves to conclude that once "a climate of respect and concern" for the student body is created, "the future of this University can be a noble one." The Byrne report<sup>17</sup> tries to do as much. Were this, instead of the scandalous "Meyer Report" (no matter how much amended),<sup>18</sup> to prevail at Berkeley, it would still be necessary to ask: Who will educate the educators? As against those who wish to limit their action to the given power structure, the "Other Academia" that the FSM represented sided with the Other America that is living in real, unadulterated material poverty and untold misery. The middle-class students felt kinship with, and not just sympathy for, this Other America. Nor was their participation in the Negro revolution just a summer experience. Far from it. Listen to the head of the Mississippi Summer Project, Robert Moses, grasp the totally new quality in the concept of education which he calls "a whole new dimension," and then contrast this to what the Berkeley students, turned teachers in Mississippi, felt upon their return to UC:

#### 1) Robert Moses on Education in the South<sup>19</sup>

"... We got freedom schools. You form your own schools. Because when you come right down to it, why integrate their schools? What is it

(16) "Berkeley and the Fate of the Multiversity" by Sheldon S. Wolin and John H. Schaar, *The New York Review of Books*, A Special Supplement, March 11, 1965.

(17) The full text of the Byrne Report appeared in *The Los Angeles Times*, May 12, 1965. This independent study, commissioned by the Forbes Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of California, holds that the FSM was a natural outburst, not controlled by Communists, and is critical of the UC administration as well as the Board of Regents itself.

(18) The Meyer Report of the Regents' "Special Committee to Review University Policies," tries to move the whole situation at Berkeley back to the period of McCarthyism by vesting all authority, including punishment for off-campus activities by students, in the hands of the Chancellor, thus annulling all the free speech rights won by the FSM.

(19) From SNCC's Western Conference, Fall 1964, which has been printed in *Pacific Scene*, Feb. 1965, Fresno, California.

that you will learn in their schools? Many Negroes can learn it, but what can they do with it? What they really need to learn is how to be organized to work on the society to change it. They can't learn that in schools . . .

"Now nobody sat down and theorized all this. It's just that you went down there and started to try to do something . . . College kids come down, some of the Negroes who have come down, and are now trying to get back in school, can't relate to it. That raises for them the whole question of education. What is the degree? What do I need it for? What do I do with it after I get it? . . .

"We asked this one guy why he came; what he was doing. And he said, for his own personal self, he found out what work meant. He found out what it meant to live. What it meant to relate to people. What society meant. That's what he was getting in SNCC. Because who determines what work is? How many people come up to the SNCC people and say, 'Well, when are you going back to work?' And they mean, 'When are you going to fit into society?'

"Now what the SNCC people have found in a slow process is that they don't have to accept that definition of work. That they can define their own. And that they understand a little better what it means to work. That is to really put energy into something and to make something that's meaningful to yourself.

"In the process of that they begin to understand what it means to relate to people, to being at least able to break down all these things that happen in our society.

"This is part of what is happening in SNCC and this is why in a sense it is unique. . . .

"... The progress we experience is mostly progress in terms of what happens to the people we are working with. It's that they, in many communities, have found a new kind of strength.

"In their individual acts just going to the courthouse (to register) is a revolutionary act. Given their lives.

"A community has developed in places because of those acts. Local people have really begun to find a way they can use a meeting as a tool for running their own lives. For having something to say about it. That's very slow, but it's happening.

"In a sense, these people have found freedom. They don't have any participation in society but they're free now. They can do things that they've wanted to do for a long time.

"They've been able to confront people who are on their backs. They take whatever is dished out — bombings, shootings, beatings, whatever it is. After people live through that they have a scope that they didn't have before. There's a whole new dimension in their lives that wasn't there before."

How can such concepts be institutionalized? No, the two worlds of Mississippi Freedom Summer and Berkeley officialdom are fundamentally incompatible. The participants in Mississippi Freedom Summer had found a new type of education, and not just education, but a new way of life. A new way of life and a new way of thought.

## The Other America: Hazard, Kentucky



Unemployed miners and their families in Appalachia  
—how they live, meet and organize, 1964.

## 2) Freedom vs. State Capitalism and Its Wars

It is no accident that the one thing that both foe and friend of FSM agree on is this: "the students' own favorite word for their condition is 'alienation.'" The feeling of alienation felt by the student body was the point of affinity to the ideas of the FSM which brought the students into it en masse, including not only those who had not previously expressed any interest in civil rights, but also those who had not even been interested in free speech per se. Their feeling of alienation can be sensed from one of the placards which read: "I'm a UC student. Please don't bend, fold, spindle or mutilate me."

Or, as a college student in Philadelphia put it:

"I think it was those who were most alienated from themselves by the totalitarianism of the multiversity who gave their main support to the Free Speech Movement. At the big universities today, the administration thinks of students as commodities, as units of production. The universities turn out graduates to be fit as cogs and round pegs into the corporate apparatus and the scientific machine of the warfare state.

"So the student has been depersonalized, dehumanized, alienated from himself. That's what the student revolts are about. When students 'senselessly' ripped apart a New Hampshire resort town, it was their target that was senseless, not their revolt."

The insurgency among the students was not only limited to the fight for free speech on the campus, nor even to its participation in the Negro Movement which inspired it, but extended to the crucial subject of war, even as before these events, midwestern students were involved in Appalachia, especially with helping miners in Hazard, Kentucky.<sup>20</sup>

Some CORE chapters involved themselves not only in inter-racial work but in breaking down the division between labor and students. Thus, at Columbia University, in 1952, students were used to break a strike of cafeteria workers. Today, on the other hand, the CORE chapter there is helping the Negro and Puerto Rican cafeteria workers wrest union recognition from the "non-profit" and scab Columbia University administration. They have also, on their own, staged a four-day hunger strike. Michael Flug, who organized the action, wrote *News & Letters*:

"The strategy of the university has been to divide the workers from their natural allies, the students. Students have been told that the food prices will rise if a union is recognized and that the student jobs will be imperiled. The university knows that if the students turn on the workers as scabs, as they did in 1952, no strike can succeed.

"We are trying here, by the use of the hunger strike, to show that the students are determined not to ride through school on the backs of men who make starvation wages. Only through this sort of an alliance can we end the poverty conditions that university workers all over America suffer in the name of what is 'good for the students.'"

There is hardly a campus in the country, small or large, where a student revolt of one sort or another has not erupted, and where it has not won to its side some of the faculty, or, vice versa, as in the case of Yale University, where

(20) Typical is the case of Stephen Ashton, an Oberlin student who went to Hazard, Ky., to help the jobless miners. He was arrested before he could distribute his 8-page report, "Notes on a Mountain Strike" (see *News & Letters*, Jan. 1965).

the students' sit-in was to come to the defense of a popular philosophy professor, Richard Bernstein, who was refused tenure because he hadn't buckled to the conservatism of the Administration and "his own" philosophy department. This type of conservatism is felt even more in a small liberal arts college like Oberlin which had its origins during the Abolitionist period, and whose "first business manager was one John Brown, and Oberlin College owned the farm from which he launched his raid on Harper's Ferry. . . . It also attracted a varied and exciting group of faculty and students, who soon came to exercise nearly complete control over the College's policies.

"Yet within recent years the once decentralized power structure at Oberlin has fallen into the hands of a few administrators, the faculty having willfully given up its power to use its time in the pursuit of the varied and complex pleasures and problems of academia. The general desire for institutional efficiency has led, at Oberlin as at many other schools, to a large, self-justifying bureaucracy, jealous of its power and convinced of its importance. Oberlin is not yet a 'multiversity,' but it has its own Clark Kerrs."<sup>21</sup>

By the time a great many students there felt it necessary to parade with torches to protest the trustees' refusal to give students a more active role in the running of their college, they felt certain that the description by the great Abolitionist, Wendell Phillips, was more applicable today than when it was first said: "There is a class among us so conservative, that they are afraid the roof will come down if you sweep the cobwebs."

And, like the Abolitionists, today's rebels are not about to capitulate to the administrative mentality. The conflict between the student body and the administrators of "higher learning" has everywhere erupted into the open.<sup>22</sup> As one foreign student wrote us from Kansas University:

"There is a lot of ferment on U.S. campuses today. At K.U. here the students have been in all kinds of protests, from civil rights to the firing of the track coach, from the proposed new Fraser Hall to Vietnam and the military draft. They even formed committees to fight the increase in the price of coffee in local restaurants. By jove, I tell you there is a whole history to write here."

One week, a University of Michigan student had written *News & Letters*: "California students must be something special. I heard the delegation from Berkeley when they came to the University of Michigan. You would have thought a lot more would be interested. Longshoremen stick together, but students figure it's just for a short time in their lives that they'll be in school." But the very next week—on March 24 to be exact—Ann Arbor was precisely the place where yet another form of revolt emerged—the teach-in—and no less than 2,500 students and faculty initiated what was to become a national phenomenon—the all-night teach-in. Within a month no less than 50 such teach-ins took place in protest against the war in Viet Nam. As a result, the Students for a Democratic Society that originally called a rally in Washington, D.C., in opposition to the U. S. bombing of North Viet Nam, and hoped 5,000 would show up, found that no less than 20,000 had come to D.C. Simultaneously with this there were local marches, including a sit-down on the road leading to President Johnson's Texas ranch.

(21) See "Bureaucracy and Protest at Oberlin" by Dennis Hale and Peter Miller (*News & Letters*, May 1965).

(22) For a report of sit-in at Kansas University, see *The Kansas Free Press*, March 22, 1965, Lawrence, Kans. For a report of the Free Speech Front's Struggle at Ohio State University, see *Students In Revolt*, Strike Pamphlet No. 13, Cleveland, Ohio.

Naturally, it isn't the FSM which "produced" these. The U.S. bombing of North Viet Nam did. The cancerous condition of this exploitative society, poised for war—"little wars" and big ones—is responsible for the bombings in Viet Nam. It is responsible for the situation in South USA where, 100 years after Appomattox, Negro citizens are still deprived of their elementary rights; it is responsible for the fact that in affluent USA there are Appalachias where 35 million Americans live in abject poverty.

The fact that "the East," like "the West," is engaged in a fatal flirtation with nuclear war does not diminish but increases the possibility of nuclear war. It is this which is the underlying cause of all the revolts — and not only in the USA, but throughout the world.

### 3) Tendencies in the Negro Revolution

The spirit of alienation characterizes the whole fabric of world capitalism in this stage of automation and racism, bureaucratization and wars and H-bombs and ICBMs. The Negro, in fighting for elementary rights, felt that between South USA and South Viet Nam stood President Johnson who had evolved a new manner of politicking. No sooner is a new atrocity perpetrated against Negroes in South USA than he appears on TV in the unsullied vestments of a veritable Biblical prophet. After the March 7th gassing and clubbing of Negroes in Selma he even used the battle-cry of the civil rights movement, "We Shall Overcome." When the march of no less than 30,000, white and Negro, ended in Montgomery, he at once withdrew the troops. The KKK was once again free to gun down Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo as she was transporting a few marchers back to Selma. Only then did President Johnson, as the daily press so melodramatically put it, "declare war on the KKK."

In each case he dragged in (no doubt out of his conference with the warhawks) something that didn't at all flow from the Negro struggle for freedom here. Thus, after shouting, "We will not be intimidated by the terrorists of the Ku Klux Klan," the President continued in most self-righteous tones: "any more than we will be intimidated by the terrorists in North Vietnam." Were we to allow ourselves, for the moment, to forget the truth, that it is U.S. imperialism that is raining terror on North Vietnam, not vice versa, we can see the real source of his worries and new manner of politicking. It is that his posture of being "with" the American Negro, "the real hero of the struggle," is only for the purpose of mobilizing America for the most unwanted war in its history. Herein is the most serious danger for the civil rights movement. It calls for a new evaluation of its forces, and its aims; the momentum it has gained as well as its underlying philosophy of freedom.

When the barbarism that passes for civilization in South USA reached the stage of savagery known as bloody Sunday, thousands of new forces joined the civil rights movement. There was no way to stop the massing of the new arrivals from the North, and the march of hundreds, which was stopped by Sheriff Clark's storm troopers, became a march of 3,000, stopped by nothing but the compromise Rev. King arrived at with President Johnson's representative, Roy Collins.

This only led to unled forms of struggle, such as the spontaneous sit-in in the White House itself, vigils in Federal Buildings, such as in Los Angeles, and in general a restlessness with the civil rights leadership among the ranks. Moreover, the counter-revolution did not abide by any compromise, and the foul-mouthed Gov. Wallace inspired the clubbing to death of the Rev. Reeb on

a street in Selma. Hence, a new set of legalisms came from the White House — a proposed new voting rights bill. But this too couldn't stop the momentum, and the Federal Government proceeded to protect the massive march — this time going the whole length from Selma to Montgomery. This did not stop the wanton murder of Mrs. Liuzzo. By now even the notorious House Un-American Activities Committee felt compelled to vote "to investigate" the KKK. The Negro fears this will turn into a witchhunt for "Communists" in the civil rights movement.

There have been too many martyrs, too many memorials; there has been too much achieved in daring self-activity for the momentum to be halted by such "investigations." Past history (the FBI's prosecution of one corrupt "Grand Wizard" in the 1920's) shows that even if such an investigation would lead to action against the KKK (which is doubtful), nothing basic would be changed in the exploitative class structure of the North, much less the racism of the South which survived a Civil War, two World Wars, and is getting a new injection of "patriotism" from the U.S. unholy war in Vietnam.

The truth of the matter is that it is on just such imperialist adventures that racism has always thrived ever since its reappearance in history when Populism was defeated and the U.S. embarked on the Spanish-American War at the turn of the century.

President Johnson, in his present neo-colonialist invasion of the Dominican Republic,<sup>23</sup> is re-enacting the imperialist "manifest destiny" doctrine first enunciated by Theodore Roosevelt as, with "big stick" and "speaking softly" he forced the building of the Panama Canal.

Or, to take an entirely different example of how the Negro revolution has been diverted in the past: during World War II the American Communists, once Russia was invaded, told the Negro not to fight for his freedom. Now, President Johnson is readying an excuse why the Negro must give up his struggle as the war in Viet Nam is going from bad to worse, and as the invasion of the Dominican Republic is compelling the Negroes here to take a second look at their own country.

The revulsion against the latest outrages has forced even the moderate Roy Wilkins to state that there is a limit to patience and non-violence, that if the Administration can't establish order, the Negro will have to, for it is "American to protect oneself when attacked." But — now that the President has spoken out "strongly" and presented us with still one more bill on voting (nearly a century after the 14th and 15th amendments, following a civil war, had already established that elementary right) — the question is: Will the established leadership attempt to divert the movement? Hence new forms of revolt appear. One such case is the vigil before the Federal Building in Los Angeles. One

---

(23) For background to the present actions in Santo Domingo, see the sections, "Plunge into Imperialism" and "Racism" in *American Civilization on Trial*: "The 'psychology of Jim Crowism' is itself the result, not the cause, of monopoly capital extending its tentacles into the Caribbean and the Pacific as it became transformed into imperialism, with the Spanish-American War. . . . The capitalistic mentality and the slavemaster mentality are not very far apart when the domination of the exploiters is challenged by the working people. Indeed, monopoly capital needed Southern racism for its plunge into empire. North and South, the thirst for empire was brilliantly white." (p. 16)

"Theodore Roosevelt's 'manifest destiny' does not fundamentally differ from Britain's jingoistic 'white man's burden' or from the French 'mission civilisatrice' or the German 'kultur.' All white civilization showed its barbarism in the conquest of the whole Afro-Asian, Latin American and Middle Eastern worlds. . . . Even when with the New Deal, the Good Neighbor policy was established and direct rule given up, we at no time, even to this day, did anything to free the countries from being one-crop or one-mineral economies subordinated to America," *American Civilization on Trial*, p. 17.

young sit-inners I spoke to pointed happily to the fact that the new form of revolt brought new people: "I found all Mexican-Americans present at one of the vigils. This is the first time that happened. We were all quiet, and we brought sleeping bags and stayed all night.

"Once we had a discussion on the 98 arrests of those who first began the sit-in. Someone said they had actually stepped out of the way when the mail truck arrived, but the Federal Marshals were yelling at them all the same that they were "obstructing the mail." This made them so mad. They felt that they would be charged with this offense anyway, so they might as well continue to sit down right in front of the truck. It was a defiance.

"On Sunday, CORE and SNCC were having a meeting about the vigil. One of the sit-inners was there for a while and he came back to us and said he was disgusted because they had all been shouting at each other about leadership of the vigil.

"We didn't want any leadership. We said each of us was a leader and we felt no need for a 'spokesman.' As far as I know nothing was accomplished. CORE and SNCC did decide to support us, but we felt that as soon as they did, they would say it was their leadership that did it, and that got us mad. We did it on our own and continued the vigil because we just felt we didn't want to be pushed around by the Federal Government either. Each of us was picketing in his own way. Each was acting on his own. None wanted to be a leader.

"Two weeks after, the vigil stopped. It stopped because CORE sent a bus to Selma for the big march and many of those on the vigil went to Selma on this bus."

#### 4) The Humanism of Marxism and Today's Rebels

The anti-leader attitude characterizes not only the rank-and-file, but also some of the young leaders, as witness Bob Moses changing his name and leaving Mississippi where he headed the Freedom Summer Project for work in another Southern state. One liberal writer, Andrew Kopkind, caught some of the spirit of the new radicalism when he wrote: "SNCC is part of the 'new radicalism,' or the 'student left,' and is closer to Mario Savio than to Marx. It is anarchic rather than monolithic, social more than economic, downward-pointing rather than pyramidal in organization. . . . There are, no doubt, those in SNCC who have read Marx, and some socialist theory may inform their political ideas, as it does almost everybody these days. It is a far cry from interpreting that vague longing for social and economic equality and the rather pervasive anti-establishment behavior, as evidence of a Communist plot, or imminent Soviet or Maoist takeover."<sup>24</sup>

Other bourgeois writers,<sup>25</sup> however, have suddenly discovered that the new generation of radicals consists mainly of the sons and daughters of the old generation of Communists and reflects the split in the Sino-Soviet orbit. Without being as crass as the columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak who shout McCarthyite slanders against SNCC being "substantially infiltrated," these writers have nevertheless laid the foundation for creating such amalgams.

(24) "New Radicals in Dixie" by Andrew Kopkind (*The New Republic*, April 10, 1965).

(25) See especially "To the East of the Communist Party" by Thomas R. Brooks, *The New York Times Magazine*, April 25, 1965, and "The Explosive Revival of the Far Left" by Richard Armstrong, *The Saturday Evening Post*, May 8, 1965.

Long before the latest off-campus "exposes of Communism," one of the FSM leaders, Stephen Weissman, rightly warned: "Dialogue will not be stifled by the anticipated red-baiting, nor by the probable resurgence of the manipulated consensus with which President Kerr for so long directed the university."<sup>26</sup> The students know they are only at the beginning of the long road to total freedom. To develop a serious dialogue, on the campus and off it, it is necessary, first of all, to clear one's head of the brainwashing that passes for thought.<sup>27</sup> They have had their experience of tangling with Prof. Feuer who has villified them for being "graduate Maoists" and laughed at their concern with the notion of alienation. Mr. Feuer's slanders against the FSM is on a par with his ignorance of the philosophy of Maoism. So fearful is Mao of the deeply-rooted individualism, the Humanism of Marxism, resting on the theory of alienation, that he outdoes the Russian Communists in his attacks on Marx's Humanism. As one Chinese theoretician — Chou Yang, in "Fighting Task of Workers in Philosophy and Social Science" — phrases it: "In advocating the return of Man to himself they are actually advocating absolute individual freedom and asking the people who live under Socialism to return to the human nature of bourgeois individualism and to restore the capitalism by which it is fostered."<sup>28</sup> The "they" is supposed to refer to "revisionists," but there is no doubt whatsoever that, on the part of both the Russians and the Chinese, what is under attack is the young Marx's Early Humanist Essays.

Interestingly enough, Feuer is not the only one who thinks the question of alienation is misplaced. The Du Bois Clubs' "man of ideas" (it is their description; not mine), Robert Kaufman, likewise considers such an approach "less than helpful": "The nature of this deepest motivation (for joining FSM — rd) is superficially summed up in the word alienation. . . ." And again: "Because alienation is manifested as a state of mind, there is a tendency to deal with it psychologically, in terms of the individual, to retreat from politics. . . ."<sup>29</sup>

No, far from the theory of alienation being either a joke on Mario's lips, or on a par with Maoism, "graduate" or otherwise, Savio was nearer the mark: "I think it would distort the facts not to make it quite clear that the tone from the very beginning and the possibility of success was founded in a new non-ideological radicalism which is expressed most clearly in SNCC. Those people who have been most effective have been those who have made their decisions from a very pragmatic point of view. An activist pragmatic radical view to be sure, but not an ideological point of view. . . ." And again, "Large numbers of students from Berkeley have gone South, so there's constant intellectual ferment. On the other hand, the political issue is a pretext for this rebellion. The real cause is the alienation that students feel from what is a knowledge factory. Kerr is quite right. You're processed. You become a num-

(26) See Stephen Weissman's answer to Feuer, "What The Students Want" (*The New Leader*, Jan. 4, 1965).

(27) A beginning in this direction was made by Joseph Paff, Bill Cavala and Jerry Berman in their piece, "The Berkeley Riots: Dissent in the Multiversity" which appeared in *The Activist*, January, 1965. Consult that issue also for "SNCC: The Beginning of Ideology" by Staughton Lynd.

(28) *Peking Review*, Jan. 3, 1964. The Russian Communists were, however, first to attack the Humanist Essays of Marx. See *Voprosy Filosofii* (Questions of Philosophy) No. 3/1955; also my analysis in 1964 edition of *Marxism and Freedom*, pp. 62-66. For Mao's philosophy, pp. 304-310, also p. 329: "Mao's failure to grasp dialectic logic has nothing whatever to do with 'understanding philosophy.' Dialectic logic is the logic of freedom and can be grasped only by those engaged in the actual struggle for freedom. Therein lies the key to the fulfillment of human potentialities and therein lies that new relationship between theory and practice which could lessen the birthpangs of industrialization. Anything else is the type of subjectivism which hides Mao's compelling need to transform the struggle for the minds of men into a drive to brainwash them."

(29) The Du Bois Clubs of America as publisher of FSM describes its authors as follows: Bettina Aptheker "A Woman of Deeds"; Robert Kaufman "A Man of Ideas," and Michael Folsom "A Man of Words."



ber on a set of file cards that go through an IBM machine. The terrible dehumanization. The things which are worst about America are most cruelly exemplified here."<sup>30</sup>

Raising the theory of alienation was one of the unique achievements of the FSM. And since content of thought goes hand in hand with freedom of speech, it thereby posed questions that go far beyond either the multiversity or old politics. It questioned American society as a whole. Here is how Savio phrased it in his interview with Life:

"America may be the most poverty-stricken country in the world. Not materially. But intellectually it is bankrupt. And morally it's poverty-stricken. But in such a way that it's not clear to you that you're poor. It's very hard to know you're poor if you're eating well. . . .

"Students are excited about political ideas. They're not yet inured to the apolitical society they're going to enter. But being interested in ideas means you have no use in American society . . . unless they are ideas which are useful to the military-industrial complex. . . .

"Factories are run in authoritarian fashion — non-union factories anyway — and that's the nearest parallel to the university. . . ." <sup>31</sup> In contrast to this, the point Savio kept driving home about the feelings of his fellow-students was that "they are people who have not learned to compromise."

The trouble with the elders, even when they are for the student revolt, is that they do not listen to the new voices. It was ever so. The Humanism of Karl Marx was the only vision that held as one, thought and action, mental and manual labor. It was the only one that saw the negative feeling of estrangement as the path to freedom; the only one that saw the positive in the negative not only as a philosophic abstraction but as a human force for the reconstruction of society.

Deriving the concept of alienation from Hegel, Marx did more than place it upright on materialistic foundations. He opposed the communists who vulgarized materialism and rejected "bourgeois idealism." Marx's main opposition to Hegel was not his idealism; it was his dehumanization of the idea as if it were not part of man's body, as if ideas could, indeed, float outside of the human being. Or, as Marx himself put it, and put in strictly Hegelian terms, Hegel "separated thinking from the subject," even as capitalism has put, "in place of all the physical and spiritual senses . . . the sense of possession, which is the simple alienation of all these senses. To such absolute poverty has human essence had to be reduced in order to give birth to its inner wealth!"<sup>32</sup>

In a word, Marx saw alienation as an essential dimension of history, characteristic of all class societies — based as they are on the division between mental and manual labor — and gaining its most monstrous form under capitalism: it is under "machinofacture" where the laborer becomes but a cog in the machine, so that not only his product is alienated from him, but his very activity. Once this is achieved, it is not only labor that suffers; all of society is demeaned and degraded, including its thought. The only way out is to reconstruct society on totally new beginnings: "To be radical is to grasp something at its roots. But for man the root is man himself."

(30) Interview in *Free Student*, No. 1, 1965, New York.

(31) *Life*, February 26, 1965.

(32) I'm using my own translation of the Humanist Essays which first appeared as Appendices to the 1958 edition of *Marxism and Freedom*, but these essays can now be gotten in paperback edition of Erich Fromm's *Marx's Concept of Man*.

It still is. And it is this precisely which the students have got hold of and are fighting for, and this is also the underlying, though not always acknowledged, philosophy of the Negro revolution.

If we follow the development of Rev. King whose terms, far from being Marxist-Humanist, are religious, even as the doctrine of non-violence is related by him to Gandhism rather than to the deeper native roots of Abolitionism, we see the turning-point, philosophically, he reached after Bull Connors' hounds, hoses and murders in Birmingham led him to reject the attempt of white "fellow clergymen" to have him confine the movement to legalisms. "We can never forget," he wrote in the famous letter from a Birmingham jail, "that everything Hitler did in Germany was 'legal' and everything the Hungarian Freedom Fighters did in Hungary was 'illegal' . . . this calls for a confrontation with the power structure. . . . To use the words of Martin Buber, the great Jewish philosopher, segregation substitutes an 'I-it' relationship for the 'I-thou' relationship and ends up by relegating persons to the status of things." But King himself made an impersonal ethic rather than the living mass movement the point of creative origin, and therefore left the door ajar for Johnson's "Great Society."

Feuer, in his latest diatribe,<sup>33</sup> tries to impute to Savio an "apparent new-found attachment to violence." Had Feuer been truthful he should have said that Savio refuses to compromise with the status quo. This is precisely the point stressed by another FSM leader, Jack Weinberg:

"One of the greatest social ills of this nation is the absolute refusal by almost all of its members to examine seriously the presuppositions of the establishment. . . . It is their marginal social status which has allowed students to become active in the civil rights movement and which has allowed them to create the Free Speech Movement. . . . They become activists and a new generation, a generation of radicals, emerges."<sup>34</sup>

What needs to be stressed now is that a new generation of radicals is born not only through such activities as the sit-in, the picket line, the strike, but also through the activity of thinking. It should be unnecessary to add that the mental alertness and social aspiration, more than the marginal social status, impelled the students into the FSM and such new bold forms of revolt as "civil disobedience." Of course, they "took it" from the civil rights movement, but placing it on a university campus, means that the whole so-called academic community, and not only at Berkeley, will never be the same. It is precisely the philosophic aspect which gave a new dimension to the very movement which gave the FSM its impetus: the civil rights movement. It is this which must not be reconfined, not even in activism.

Our age of state-capitalism with the administrative mentality so inherent in it, shows us, over and over again, that, despite the appearance of opposites, reconfinement and activism can and do meet to form the evasion so characteristic of modern intellectuals, including those who do see the ills of the world and do oppose the status quo.

Even an intellectual of the stature of Jean-Paul Sartre found it much easier to declare the Communist Party to be "the only revolutionary party"<sup>35</sup> — and that, though he was witness to, and opposed, the outright counter-revolutionary

(33) "Pornopolitics and the University," *New Leader*, April 12, 1965.

(34) "The Free Speech Movement and Civil Rights," by Jack Weinberg, *The Campus Core-Lator*, Jan. 1965.

(35) For a detailed development of Sartre's philosophic works, see my *Sartre's Search for Method to Undermine Marxism*, News & Letters, Detroit, Mich.

suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956! —, than to undertake the challenge to thought once it was designated as "political." This, moreover, is not only due to the fact that it is easier to shift responsibility for leadership "to the party." It is, above all, due to the fact that it doesn't soil the intellectual's hands who would otherwise have to go below, to the source of ideas, to the masses.

As I pointed out in the special introduction to the Japanese edition of **Marxism and Freedom**, the revolutionary petty bourgeois intellectual shows that he bears the mark of our state-capitalist age. In and out of power, he would rather lean on some State power and State Plan than subject himself to the creativity of the proletariat and the compulsion to a unity of thought and practice.

The task that confronts our age is this: how can the movement from theory meet the challenge of the movement from practice which strives to reconstruct society on totally new, truly human beginnings. The challenge is not to machines, but to men. The compulsion for a unity of theory and practice arises both from the impulses toward a new society and a total philosophy.

This search for a total philosophy has disclosed a new, a third world in the post-war revolutions in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. It is this new, third Afro-Asian-Latin American world, which is at the root both of the struggle for world domination between Russia and the United States as well as within the Sino-Soviet orbit and within Western colonialism and neo-colonialism. And it is this world which opens the greatest challenge to the intellectuals as well as the proletariat of the most industrialized land of this third world — Japan. In a word, the problem is global.

Revolutions do not arise in the fullness of time for the purpose of establishing a party machine; **partinost** (party-monolithism) is there to throttle the revolution, not to release the creativity as well as the energies of the millions. Marxism is either a theory of liberation or it is nothing. In thought and in life, it lays the basis for achieving a new human dimension, without which no new society has viability.

Now that the students have experienced the urgency of freedom's call, and have given the struggles their own stamp, a new path to Marx's Humanism has been opened up; today's young Abolitionists are acting out the truth of Wendell Phillips' admonition: "Never again be ours the fastidious scholarship that shrinks from rude contact with the masses."

It is, of course, true that it was contact with the Negro people that inspired the Berkeley revolt. It is, however, also true that the Berkeley revolt, followed by the teach-ins, in turn, changed the climate for free speech on the pivotal question of war and peace for the whole country.

Other forms of revolt are sure to break out in opposition to any rerun of the turn-of-the-century film of "manifest destiny" by the very power structure that has now brought civilization to the edge of the abyss. It is no accident that the civil rights movement, especially its youth section, felt impelled to participate in the anti-war demonstrations. Our state-capitalist age is full of "little wars" that — despite operation brainwash to make people accept this as a veritable way of life, "the price of avoiding" nuclear war — might very well trigger off a nuclear holocaust that would put an end to civilization as we have known it.

The only war that can be won in a nuclear age is the battle for the minds of men. Hence, the need for a new relationship of theory to practice. Hence the new role of the intellectuals, or, more precisely put, the role of the new

intellectuals, those who have recognized that "the 'futures' and 'careers' for which American students now prepare are, for the most part, intellectual and moral wastelands," and who have refused to compromise. Hence, the search for new ways to break down the division between philosophy and reality. Apparent is the necessity for a philosophy of freedom that can meet the challenge from below, from the actual struggles for freedom, be they for civil rights in the South, or free speech in the North; be they the fight of labor with automation or the struggles of the submerged fifth of the nation that is engulfed in unemployment and in poverty in a country bulging with unprecedented profits and brazen profiteers, situated in a world of Big Powers, each fighting for domination over the whole.

Neither the Sino-Soviet orbit — together or separately — nor NATO — together or separately — can offer a way out. And those who are so much against one power bloc that they are willing to associate with the "other one" only endanger the freedom movement and risk begetting a modern Napoleon, a new "Captain of the Bureaucracy," a new exploitative class. As the revolutions that have soured have proved, it is impossible to create a new society where the mode of labor rests on the same division between mental and manual labor that underpins all class societies.

When the very fate of mankind, not just rhetorically, but actually, is within orbit of an ICBM, the job cannot be left in the hands of the intellectual elite, not even the Other Academia. The whole of Other America is involved and must move to the front center of the historic stage. The Negro revolution and the FSM<sup>36</sup> have opened new roads to freedom. But the task to make freedom a reality remains. It is the task of the whole. All energies, theoretical as well as practical, emotional as well as spiritual, are needed for the arduous labor of reconstructing society on new foundations. It is the human project. It cannot brook any new division between the activity of thinking and the activity of revolution. The urgency of our lives and times demands that all "philosophic absolutes" come down to earth.

The today-ness of the theory of liberation that is the Humanism of Marxism is this: it has never isolated itself in any ivory towers, nor flown to other planets to avoid facing reality. This freedom philosophy is in the events of the day. When concretized for our day, Marxist-Humanism puts into words what every activist knows is true as he battles the power structure which stands in the way of freedom. It becomes imperative therefore to work out a new unity of thought and action which can release the vast untapped energies of mankind, their innate talents so that the new human dimension, inherent in the old society, can finally emerge and make freedom a reality.

June, 1965  
Detroit, Michigan

(36) I have limited myself to the Free Speech Movement. The new Free Student Union has yet to write its own chapter.



# Appendices

## I. Inside Sproul Hall

by Joel L. Pimsleur

Ralph —

This is as much personal catharsis for me — purging Thursday's nightmare by putting it on paper — as it may be an assist to you. But there are certain things that should not go unspoken.

At the risk of moralizing, if any good comes from all this (and I'm still naive enough to think it will), at least one lesson has emerged that must not be missed:

You can crush the idealists, but you cannot crush their idea. . . .

You cannot hit it; you cannot step on it; you cannot kick it; you cannot beat it with a billyclub; you cannot twist its arms; you cannot drag it down the stairs; you cannot hide it behind a screen; you cannot bury it in the basement; you cannot put it in jail; and you cannot silence it.

Ultimately if the idea is good, it will survive its enemies — for it is more powerful than its advocates. It endows existence with purpose. It will endure, and — in the end — prevail.

I won't soon forget the scene of that army of police, massing silently in the night, and a photographer peering out the press room window and remarking with a thin smile: "It seems to me I read all about this somewhere before. In a book called *Mein Kampf*."

The question might well be asked, why do you need 600 cops to cope with 700 passively resisting kids? This was no prison riot; yet from the police response, you would have thought they were handling convicts, not students.

More important than their number, however, was their attitude. Make no mistake, Ralph, the police weren't simply doing their duty. If they'd merely been the machines, the automatons, the privates in the army of the politicians, they'd have been much better.

But many of them were enjoying their work. They were getting their revenge for the embarrassment of the 33-hour siege of Oct. 1-2 (the incident of the trapped police car). And the air of vindictiveness was unmistakable.

Without indulging in parlor psychology, it was obvious that for many policemen (and this is something that must somehow be precluded in the future) this was a safe way to work out their own frustrated resentment of students and intellectuals.

There was much hilarity in the ranks, as the students were dragged the gauntlet down the long corridors to the stairwell. Very few of them struggled or resisted in any way save going limp, but they were deliberately hauled

down the stairs on their backs and tailbones, their arms and wrists twisted — all to the immense amusement of the Oakland police. And lest anyone think I exaggerate, listen to the cops themselves:

One three-way conversation overheard among the Oakland crew went like this:

"They shouldn't let those beatniks and kooks in here (the University) in the first place."

"Yea, they're just a bunch of jerks — we oughtta show 'em."

"Don't worry, wait till we get 'em on the stairs."

Or, while a pair of cops dragged a student down two flights of stairs, a third, surveying the scene from a landing, remarked:

"Hey, don't drag 'em down so fast — they ride on their heels. Take 'em down a little slower — they bounce more that way."

Or, outside Sproul, near a parked Santa Rita-bound bus, one of the Alameda Sheriffs Dept. men to another:

"We should do like they do in them foreign countries; beat 'em senseless first, then throw 'em in the bus."

Whatever may emerge from all this, those are indignities that no settlement can erase.

Then there were the contrasting images, and one wondered who were the more violent — the law breakers or the law enforcers?

The students shielding their public address system with their bodies against a phalanx of helmeted police who'd been told to "kick their way through" to clear a path.

The cops charging up the curving stairs to the second floor, shoving the kids down the steps, some tumbling head first others feet first, stepping on a few with their boots, billyclubbing a couple out of the way, and getting the big speaker — but missing a smaller one. And as the police retreated, the kids began singing!

"Oh Freedom, Oh Freedom  
And before I'll be a slave,  
I'll be buried in my grave  
And I'll fight for my right  
To be free..."

The indomitable spirit of the students was repeatedly revealed by the small incident:

The students using one of the basement's "survival drums" (remnants of the campus' abandoned civil defense program) — still stocked with year-old water and graham crackers — as a podium from which to conduct a lecture on Civil Disobedience.

At 4:00 a.m., one of the FSM steering committee leaders waving his hand around the packed, stuffy second floor and observing: "Here lies the body politic."

#### Some random reactions:

Since when does the press meekly submit to its own suppression? Where were the outraged editorials? Where were the complaints about press censorship, amid all the howls for law and order?

Why were newspapermen barred from watching the bookings? Since when do the cops get the right to plaster papers over windows so reporters can't see what's going on? There's a nice little irony — newspapers' used as a device to keep newspapermen from getting the truth.

Why was an N.B.C. television cameraman blocked at the stairwells and prevented from taking pictures freely — although he stood there for 15 minutes pleading with the police: "But we're on your side; we want to tell your story; we want to prove to the public that the police aren't brutal..."

Why was a C.B.S. campus stringer prevented by the police from getting to the phone — although the line was being held open for him? And why was the press barred from the basement? So far as I know, I'm the only reporter who managed to get down there, and I have a hunch why —

Because it was the first time that the basement of a building on a college campus in America was turned into an interrogation cell, where students became political prisoners herded into a detention pen — awaiting deportation to a prison farm.

(While cops milled around outside the cage — I use that word deliberately — teasing the students.)

That's what went on during my sojourn in the Sproul Hall basement — before the Alameda D.A.'s office invited me upstairs, where the officially approved versions of the news can be reported without ever having to leave whatever "public information office" happens to be handy.

And where was the "administration" all this time? So far as I know, Kerr and Strong never saw a damn thing that went on inside that building — although they sanctioned it. Since when does an Administration turn over total control of the nerve center of a university to the police — who not only did not permit free access to the press, but barred the faculty (including members of the Faculty Committee on Student Conduct) from free movement on their own campus!

The total abdication of responsibility, by an administration which has insisted on its prerogatives, cannot be overlooked.

By noon, Thursday, pandemonium prevailed on the campus. An angry crowd jammed the plaza, filled the steps of Sproul Hall and was pressing towards the barricaded doors, and I'm certain that we were 30 seconds short of a riot. The sight of the armed cops was infuriating the students, many of whom were nearly hysterical. The tension was indescribable, and all that was needed was a single provocation...

When a dozen highway patrolmen emerged from Sproul — bent on moving the public address system forward to clear the top step — a roar of protest went up from the crowd.

Instead of moving back, it surged forward, and only the supreme efforts of two professors (Minsky of the Economics Dept. and Wildavsky of the Political

Science Dept.), who struggled through the crowd and on their own managed to convince the officer in charge to pull his men back out of sight — because their appearance was inflaming the crowd — managed to restore a modicum of calm.

Not a single representative of the administration was present to perform, much less assist in, this negotiation.

Some basic questions left unanswered.

Why do we revile our own rebels (unless they've been dead for at least 150 years) while revering everybody else's? How is it that the Free French, the Greek partisans, the Irish insurgents, the Hungarian and the Cuban freedom fighters are guaranteed our sympathies — though they too were certainly "anarchists"?

Was not theirs also a fundamental challenge to the forces of law and order? (Though their grievances were obviously greater, were their goals fundamentally any different?) Is the demand for absolute free speech ever illegitimate?

Even if you granted that free speech was not the issue on this campus, is the demand for the right to partake in full and unfettered political and social action — which is an issue — too much to ask in a Democracy?

The FSM requested "too much," "demanded the moon," "wouldn't compromise," "wanted everything," the authorities have said repeatedly — and the public overwhelmingly agrees. But can there be too much free speech in a free society? Or should the question be quite the opposite: Do you dare compromise with it?

"You cannot shout 'fire!' in a crowd," they argue, or talk unchecked in a classroom. But so far as I know, such "rights" have never been demanded; the most radical of the students have never considered these to be "rights," so they are not now and never have been at issue.

"Law and order must be preserved," contend the authorities (Mulford, Brown, Knowland, McAteer, the newspapers, the Administration, etc., etc.). But are law and order really civilization's ultimate virtues — or are freedom and justice?

Indeed, law and order are maintained with brilliant efficiency in totalitarian states. Order is only a virtue if it preserves just laws; and laws are only just if they are made by the governed, not the governors.

(This is not to suggest carte blanche for the students to establish their own dictatorship; but it does demand at least a continuing dialogue among students, faculty and administration — and it totally rejects the concept of government by arbitrary fiat, the regulations changing every other week to fit the moment's expediency. And it does suggest a very basic question: Who represents the heart and core of any university — the faculty and students, or the administration?)

There is a final point. The old "Red-inspired," "left wing dupes" explanation has already been offered by a number of state legislators, and it is likely that the charge will continue to be aired with increasing frequency. It might therefore be worth asking ourselves why we are willing to keep giving the Communists so much credit. Since when is free speech a Communist idea, or the right to mount political and social action a Communist concept? I thought precisely the opposite.

Joel L. Pimsleur

## II. The Theory of Alienation: Marx's Debt to Hegel

by Raya Dunayevskaya

[Editor's Note: This is the lecture most frequently requested by students and civil rights workers.]

The topic "Marx's Debt to Hegel," is neither merely academic, nor does it pertain only to the historical period of Marx's lifetime: From the Hungarian revolt to the African revolutions, from the student demonstrators in Japan to the Negro revolution in the U.S., the struggle for freedom has transformed reality and pulled Hegelian dialectics out of the academic halls and philosophy books on to the living stage of history.

It is true that this transformation of Hegel into a contemporary has been via Marx. It is no accident, however, that Russian Communism's attack on Marx has been via Hegel. Because they recognize in the so-called mystical Absolute "the negation of the negation," the revolution against themselves, Hegel remains so alive and worrisome to the Russian rulers today. Ever since Zhdanov, in 1947 demanded that the Russian philosophers find nothing short of "a new dialectical law," or rather, declared "criticism and self-criticism" to be that alleged new dialectical law to replace the Hegelian and objective law of development through contradiction, up to the 21st Congress of the Russian Communist Party where the special philosophic sessions declared Khrushchev to be "the true humanist," the attack on both the young Marx and the mystic Hegel has been continuous. It reached a climax in the 1955 attacks on Marx's Early Essays in theory. In actuality it came to life as the Sino-Soviet Pact<sup>37</sup> to put down the Hungarian Revolution.

One thing these intellectual bureaucrats sense correctly: Hegel's Concept of the Absolute and the international struggle for freedom are not as far apart as would appear on the surface.

### I. THE IDEAL AND THE REAL ARE NEVER FAR APART

It is this which Marx gained from Hegel. It is this which enabled the young Marx, once he broke from bourgeois society, to break also with the vulgar communists of his day who thought that one negation — the abolition of private property — would end all the ills of the old society and be the new communal society.

Marx insisted on what is central to Hegelian philosophy, the theory of alienation, from which he concluded that the alienation of man does not end with the abolition of private property — UNLESS what is most alien of all in bourgeois society, the alienation of man's labor from the activity of self-development into an appendage to a machine, is abrogated. In the place of the alienation of labor, Marx placed, not a new property form, but "the full and free development of the individual."

(37) Once the Sino-Soviet conflict came into the open, Chinese Communism actually dared boast of the fact that it urged Khrushchev to undertake the counter-revolutionary intervention. For the latest Chinese attacks on Marxist-Humanism which it calls the "revisionist" concept of Man, see text of this pamphlet, p. 39.

The pluri-dimensional in Hegel, his presupposition of the infinite capacities of man to grasp through to the "Absolute," not as something isolated in heaven, but as a dimension of the human being, reveals what a great distance humanity had traveled from Aristotle's Absolutes.

Because Aristotle lived in a society based on slavery, his Absolutes ended in "Pure Form" — mind of man would meet mind of God and contemplate how wondrous things are.

Because Hegel's Absolutes emerged out of the French Revolution which put an end to serfdom, Hegel's Absolutes breathed the air, the earthly air of freedom. Even when one reads Absolute Mind as God, one cannot escape the earthly quality of the unity of theory and practice and grasp through to the Absolute Reality as man's attainment of total freedom, inner and outer and temporal. The bondsman, having, through his labor gained, as Hegel put it, "a mind of his own," becomes part of the struggle between "consciousness-in-itself" and "consciousness-for-itself." Or, more popularly stated, the struggle against alienation becomes the attainment of freedom.

In Hegel's Absolutes there is imbedded, though in abstract form, the full development of what Marx would have called the social individual, and what Hegel called individuality "purified of all that interfered with its universalism," i.e., freedom itself.

Freedom, to Hegel, was not only his point of departure. It was his point of return. This is what makes him so contemporary. This was the bridge not only to Marx but to our day, and it was built by Hegel himself.

As Lenin was to discover when he returned to the Marxian philosophic foundations in Hegel during World War I, the revolutionary spirit of the dialectic was not super-imposed upon Hegel by Marx; it is in Hegel.

## II. MARX'S CRITIQUE OF, AND INDEBTEDNESS TO, THE HEGELIAN DIALECTIC

The Communists are not the only ones who try to spirit away the integrality of Marxian and Hegelian philosophy. Academicians also think that Marx is so strange a progeny that he has transformed Hegelian dialectics to the point of non-recognition, if not outright perversion. Whether what Herbert Melville called "the shock of recognition" will come upon us at the end of this discussion remains to be seen, but it is clearly discernible in Marx.

Marx's intellectual development reveals two basic stages of internalizing and transcending Hegel. The first took place during the period of his break with the Young Hegelians, and thrusts at them the accusation that they were dehumanising the Idea. It was the period when he wrote both his *Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right*, and the *Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic*.

There was nothing mechanical about Marx's new materialist outlook. Social existence determines consciousness, but it is not a confining wall that prevents one's sensing and even seeing the elements of the new society.

In Hegel, too, not only continuity as relation between past and present, but as attraction exerted by the future on the present, and by the whole, even when it does not yet exist, on its parts, is the mainspring of the dialectic.

It helped the young Marx to found a new stage of world consciousness of the proletariat, in seeing that the material base was not what Marx called "vulgar," but, on the contrary, released the subject striving to remake the world.

Marx was not one to forget his intellectual indebtedness either to classical political economy or philosophy. Although he had transformed both into a new world outlook, rooted solidly in the actual struggles of the day, the sources remained the law of value of Smith and Ricardo, and Hegelian dialectics. Of course Marx criticized Hegel sharply for treating objective history as if that were the development of some world-spirit, and analyzing self-development of mind as if ideas floated somewhere between heaven and earth, as if the brain was not in the head of the body of man living in a certain environment and at a specific historic period. Indeed Hegel himself would be incomprehensible if we did not keep in front of our minds the historic period in which he lived — that of the French Revolution and Napoleon. And, no matter how abstract the language, Hegel indeed had his finger on the pulse of human history.

Marx's *Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic* is at the same time a critique of the materialist critics of Hegel, including Feuerbach who had treated "the negation of the negation only as the contradiction of philosophy with itself."

Marx reveals, contrariwise, that principle to be the expression of the movement of history itself, albeit in abstract form.

Marx had finished, or rather, broken off his *Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic*, just as he reached Absolute Mind. Marx's rediscovery of the Absolute came out of the concrete development of the class struggles under capitalism, which split the Absolute into two:

(1) The unemployed army which Marx called "the general absolute law" of capitalist development, the reserve army of unemployed. That was the negative element that would cause its collapse.

(2) "The new forces and passions," the positive element in that negative, which made the workers the "gravediggers" of the old society, and the creators of the new.

It is here — in the second stage of Marx's relation to the Hegelian dialectic — that Marx fully transcended Hegel. The split in the philosophic category of the Absolute into two, like the split of the economic category of labor into labor as activity and labor-power as commodity, forged new weapons of comprehension. It enabled Marx to make a leap in thought to correspond to the new, the creative activity of the workers in establishing a society on totally new foundations which would, once and for all, abolish the division between mental and manual labor and unfold the full potentialities of man — a truly new human dimension.

## III. THE HUMAN DIMENSION

Of course it is true that Hegel worked out all the contradictions in thought, alone while in life all contradictions remained, multiplied, intensified. Of course where the class struggle did not abolish contradictions, those contradictions plagued not only the economy, but its thinkers. Of course, Marx wrote, that beginning with the first capitalist crisis, the ideologists turned into "prize-fighters for capitalism."

But, first and foremost, Marx did not separate ideology and economics as if the latter were the only fundamental, and the former nothing but "show." Marx maintains that they are both as real as life. Throughout his greatest theoretic work, *Capital*, Marx castigates "the fetishism of commodities" not only because relations of men at production appear as "things," but especially because relations under capitalism are so perverse that that is not appearance; that is indeed what they really are: Machine is master of man; not man of machine.

Marx's main point was that the driving force of the dialectic was man himself, not just his thought, but the **whole of man**, beginning with the alienated man at the point of production; and that, whereas bourgeois ideologists, because of their place in production have a false consciousness because they must defend the **status quo** and are "prisoners of the fetishism of commodities," the proletarian, because of his place in production is the "negative principle" driving to a resolution of contradictions.

In the **Histroy of Philosophy** Hegel had written "It is not so much from as **through** slavery that man acquired freedom." Again we see that "Praxis" was not Marx's discovery, but Hegel's. What Marx did was to designate practice as the class struggle activity of the proletariat. In Hegel's theory, too, praxis stands higher than the "Ideal of Cognition" because it has "not only the dignity of the universal but is the simply actual."

It is true that Hegel himself threw a mystical veil over his philosophy by treating it as a closed ontological system. But it would be a complete misreading of Hegel's philosophy were we to think that his Absolute is either a mere reflection of the separation between philosopher and the world of material production, or that his Absolute is the empty absolute of pure or intellectual intuition of the subjective idealists from Fichte through Jacobi to Schelling, whose type of bare unity of subject and object — as Prof. Bailie has so brilliantly phrased it — "possessed objectivity at the price of being inarticulate."

Whether, as with Hegel, Christianity is taken as the point of departure, or whether — as with Marx — the point of departure is the **material** condition for freedom created by the Industrial Revolution, the essential element is self-evident: man has to **fight** to gain freedom; thereby is revealed "the negative character" of modern society.

Now the principle of negativity was not Marx's discovery; he simply named it "the living worker"; the discovery of the principle was Hegel's. In the end, Spirit itself finds that it no longer is antagonistic to the world, but is indeed the **indwelling spirit of the community**. As Hegel put it in his early writings, "The absolute moral totality is nothing else than a people . . . (and) the people who receive such an element as a natural principle have the mission of applying it."

The humanism of Hegel may not be the most obvious characteristic of that most complex philosophy, and, in part, it was hidden even from Marx, although Lenin in his day caught it even in the simple description of the Doctrine of the Notion "as the realm of Subjectivity OR freedom." Or man achieving freedom not as a "possession," but a dimension of his being.

It is this dimension of the human personality which Marx saw in the historical struggles of the proletariat that would once and for all put an end to all class divisions and open up the vast potentialities of the human being so alienated in class societies, so degraded by the division of mental and manual labor that not only is the worker made into an appendage of a machine, but the **scientist** builds on a principle which would lead society to the edge of an abyss.

One hundred years before Hiroshima, Marx wrote, "To have one basis for science and other for life is a **priori**, a lie." We have lived this lie for so long that the fate of civilization, not merely rhetorically, but **literally**, is within orbit of a nuclear ICBM. Since the very survival of mankind hangs in the balance between the East's and the West's nuclear terror, we must, this time, under the penalty of death, unite theory and practice in the struggle for freedom, thereby abolishing the division between philosophy and reality and giving ear to the urgency of "**realizing**" philosophy, i.e., of making freedom a reality.