

# THE STUDENTS

## And The Establishment

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution in the Streets—a highly praised and definitive new volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands*. Mr. Allen is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes and is President of the Foundation for Economic and Social Progress. A film writer and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen lectures widely.

■ FROM *dissent to resistance!* That is the current battle cry of the New Left as it moves from demonstrations to active guerrilla warfare. In seven short years, the Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.), largest and most influential of the radical New Left groups, has evolved from propagating the philosophy of Norman Thomas to promoting that of Mao Tse-tung. This trek across the ideological spectrum was as predictable to students of Communism as was the mushrooming of the (never really) *non-violent* "Civil Rights" movement into a S.N.C.C.-Black Panther army of National Liberation.

### I

By combining the predominantly white New Left with the paramilitary Black Nationalists, the Communists are in the process of creating a potential for sabotage and guerrilla warfare with consequences beyond the imagination of most Americans.

In the October issue of AMERICAN

OPINION we detailed (primarily from their own writings) the plans of the Communist Black Panthers to institute guerrilla warfare in our major urban centers—a terror aimed first at the police and then at other blacks. What has received less attention is the fact that the Comrades running this show well realize that the militant black Communists, no matter how fanatically dedicated and well-trained, cannot effectively carry the war much beyond their own communities. Only by working together can the black and white pincers of the Marxist New Left create the domestic Vietcong of which they dream.

Alone, the urban Negro terrorist is geographically restricted to the central city. This is primarily so because of his high "visibility" in a largely white America. Thus, a large core of white terrorists is also needed. The principle is a simple one. What makes the Communist terrorist in Vietnam so elusive is that once he has completed his mission, and abandoned his weapon, he is generally indistinguishable from other Vietnamese and can literally evaporate into the crowds. This is not true of the black revolutionary in the United States. Stokely Carmichael, for example, cannot enjoy such camouflage in an America where most men are not black. But, all a white revolutionary need do to "evaporate" into the populace is to shave and bathe—in the ultimate sacrifice for the revolution. Thus groomed he becomes, presto-chango, a faceless Mr. Straight enjoying a mobility greater than that available to a colored terrorist operating outside a Negro community.

Some of the ways in which the white revolutionaries are intended to help their Black Brothers were outlined by Devereaux Kennedy at a 1967 "Students and Society" forum sponsored by the "non-political," tax-exempt Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, California. Kennedy, then President of the Student Body at Washington University in St. Louis, declared:

*... I'll tell you the steps that I think will be needed. First of all, starting up fifty Vietnams. . . . This is going to come about by black rebellions in our cities joined by some white people. People in universities can do a number of things to help it. They have access to money and they can give these people guns, which I think they should do. They can engage in acts of terrorism and sabotage outside the ghetto. Negro people have trouble getting out because they cordon those areas off, but white activists can go outside, and they can blow things up and I think they should.*

The "Liberal" commentators, looked upon by New Left as cringing puppets of the Establishment, are already telegraphing the punch. The line is that the confrontation in the streets of Chicago during the Democrat National Convention has driven the kindly revolutionaries of the New Left away from "a belief in American political democracy" and forced them "in their frustration" to seek more violent means of achieving "social change." The New Left, through its phony "underground newspapers," is also promoting this myth.\* For example, Lawrence Lipton, writing in the *Los Angeles Free Press*, refers to "Czechago, the turning point of the revolution. From now on everything will be Before Chicago and After Chicago, BC and AC." David Bodie,

of the *East Village Other*, puts it this way:

*The Enraged Generation has taken to arms. Their weapons used to be the sit-ins and all other ins. Their weapons now are silly stink bombs, bottles, rocks and the mimeo press. But the call is now for guns; it is our side against their side. The line was drawn in Chicago.*

And, Bodie continues:

*What is happening now is that we are deciding to become revolutionary. The first stage is our changing rhetoric [dissent to resistance], finding the words to express our madness. The Enrages [sic] are now looking for a common voice.*

*The next stage will be to merge the ideas (theories) with the actions (the tactics) and engage in real revolution. (We've already seen revolutionary tactics in Chicago, Columbia style, etc.) So one hears talk of buying guns, learning self-defense, practicing revolution, of becoming American Cong and starting planned guerrilla raids that will lead to victory: the Changed Order.*

The horror show staged by the Comrades at Chicago was thus the first step in a major move to escalate what has been primarily a campus movement into a full-fledged revolution—creation of a

\* While the concept of an "Underground Press" evokes the mystique of forbidden fruit to the younger generation, the concept is pure fraud. These papers are so "underground" that they can be purchased on nearly any corner in hippy districts or university campuses. The primary papers are published by men who were over thirty when J.F.K. was running for the Presidency, and some are approaching an age for receipt of Social Security benefits. The highly profitable papers are filled with ads from the hated Establishment, particularly those of major record companies. One wonders when young people are going to catch on. The so-called "Underground Press" is about as *Underground* as a McDonald's hamburger stand.



major white revolutionary force to support the black skirmishers already in the field.

Of course, the thought of student revolutionaries emerging victorious in any armed and open conflict with the army, or the police, is preposterous—and all but the most insane Maoists know it. Even S.D.S. admits in its newspaper, *New Left Notes*: "We are not ready yet to take state power. But what Columbia, Northwestern, and soon others, will have shown us is that some practical experience can be part of the process of getting ready."

Whatever the leaders of the New Left may be, they are not fools. They have no intention of beginning an immediate armed confrontation, face-to-face, with the ranks of law enforcement. They know that the only possible outcome would be a decimation of the revolutionary ranks. Instead, their plans call for hit-and-run tactics, for firebombings, industrial sabotage, and assassination from ambush.

Last spring John Hillson, S.D.S. leader at the University of Colorado, returned from an S.D.S. planning seminar in the East "to tell it like it is" and to brief the unenlightened as to what lies ahead. In his monograph entitled "Revolution: Pen and Sword," published in the *Colorado Daily* of April 16, 1968, young Hillson did just that. Here is a part of his S.D.S. policy declaration:

*The ideal of revolution in America used to be, even at best, sophomoric. Well, all those sophomores have gone through three toughening and intensified years of thought, appraisal, and scrutiny. They have learned — and now, in 1968, they have graduated. The time, whether we care to know it or not, has come, and it has come today.*

*The east coast, the west coast, and perhaps Chicago (and you may con-*

*sider this an insult if you care to), are the areas of conflict and action. Mainstream, very mainstream and very rapid. SDS is no idyllic and contemptuous cabal of ego-trippers in the east. They have been arming, arming heavily, and they have been caching their weapons for over a year.*

*... Like it or not, the revolution has begun. And don't think for a minute that the store bombings in Chicago, the violent action in New York, and the non-violence turned now power in Memphis [sic] isn't indicative of that. ... But the incidents in New York and Chicago had a unified and cohesive element behind them. And don't fall prey to the evilly intoxicating idea that a revolution must be mass and have many behind it. One man can bring a city to its knees, for like the highly polished and functioning machine it is, a city needs every cog in cinch, every single bolt and screw must work together for the city-machines to run properly. And one man, just one man, can simply throw a wrench in the works and cripple the entire scheme of things. And there is, to be sure, many a "one man" in the revolution.*

*First of all, who is in the revolution? Anywhere from five to fifty thousand hard core leftist radicals, black nationalists and separatists, gun-toting hippies, peace freaks and Spanish-Americans (remember Huelga? remember Delano?). There are the dreamer Communists and the fanatic Mao progressives. There are thousands of white, yeah white, middle class kids; disenfranchised, disenfranchised and actively committed to creation built on destruction.*

*... These groups and members, then, are bent on violent actions, and ultimately and hopefully, violent overthrow — and then, control. On*

*the east coast and on the west coast and in Chicago these people are building and biding for tomorrow. And that tomorrow has come today. . . . remember one man can bring a city to its knees, easily.*

*. . . There is a revolution. There are and will be blacks and whites fighting and bombing and dying and none of this is a joke. SDS's here, Che Guevara is not dead—he lives in the hearts and minds of more than a maniac handful of alienates.*

Hillson's statement is a fair and representative sample of the thinking of the S.D.S. leadership. That leadership is on record, again and again, with precisely this theme. As S.D.S. Organizer Rennie Davis puts it, Students for a Democratic Society "must work to build a National Liberation Front in the United States." Greg Calvert, National Secretary of S.D.S. during 1967, told the *New York Times* what such a National Liberation Front means: "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment. . . . We are actively organizing sedition. . . ." Communist Jerry Rubin,\* a past national officer of S.D.S. and founder-leader of the Youth International Party (Yippies), is quoted in the *New York Free Press* as follows: "The storm is just around the corner. I can feel the tornado. Best thing we can achieve is to throw the election to Nixon and prepare the people for ten—that's right, ten—continuous years of underground warfare."

On July 18, 1968, F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover released a report made, alas, to Attorney General Ramsey Clark concerning training of S.D.S. saboteurs. Undercover agents attending the S.D.S. National Summer Convention, at Michigan State University, had reported to

Hoover that workshops on "sabotage and explosives" were conducted openly at the June meeting. According to Director Hoover's report: "The participants discussed various devices which might be developed for use in planned attacks on Selective Service facilities and in connection with other forms of violent demonstrations." Mr. Hoover added these details:

*They explored the use of combustible materials and the various types of bombs which could be devised to destroy communications and plumbing systems of strategic buildings. They even discussed the finer points of firing Molotov cocktails from shotguns, as well as similar forms of so-called defense measures which could be used in defiance of police action.*

In a recent issue of *Open City*, radical reporter Robert Igriega offered more information in an article called "New Peace Tactics—Sabotage." In that article, illustrated with designs for making bombs, Igriega noted:

*Within the last two months this reporter got to look, briefly, at a very detailed backyard sabotage manual. It went into an infinite variety of ways to make napalm (mixing gasoline and egg-whites for instance), and describing how to devise your own detonator (without breaking the filament, fill a lightbulb with black powder; when the light's turned on—boom!).*

*This was supposed to be a CIA manual that was distributed and reproduced outside official channels. Except for its black outside covers, it did look like an official government pamphlet. The person who had it said it had already gotten wide distribution among black internationalists. He himself was white. . . .*

\* Rubin and S.D.S. founder Tom Hayden led the revolutionaries in their Battle of Chicago at the Democrat National Convention.



If the sabotage manual was indeed a C.I.A. guerrilla manual, one wonders why it was printed in English. What English-speaking Government is the Central Intelligence Agency trying to overthrow? Indeed, one does wonder. One also remembers. One remembers that the C.I.A., which is supposed to be concerned with *foreign* espionage, has been caught financing Leftist student activities in the United States by funneling cash to the radical National Student Association through assorted foundations. One remembers also that the Michigan State University at which S.D.S. met this summer has long been a hotbed for C.I.A. activity.

Robert Igriega continues:

*In recent weeks anti-war people have been getting a mimeographed broadside from Toronto, Canada, that describes a couple of simple firebombs and explains at length why sabotage is the necessary and proper next step in the movement. . . .*

*The anonymous writer in Canada, obviously an American, suggests that straight [non-hippy] and otherwise unsuspected people get familiar with some simple bombs, and perhaps once every three or four months carry out an act of sabotage against a draft board, an induction center, or some other government installation.*

All of this is not merely empty boasting. As Igriega notes:

*According to University anti-war people at Berkeley, at least three fires have been set at the Berkeley draft board in recent months. On Feb. 15 the Berkeley campus building used by the Navy ROTC was hit with four Molotov cocktails in a pre-dawn raid that caused a reported \$2,000 damage. Four days later in another early morning attack a gasoline fire was set at the Navy ROTC*

*building at Stanford University, this time causing damage estimated between \$5,000 and \$6,000.*

Since Berkeley has been the eye of the campus hurricane, it is not surprising that the area should also be "progressive" when it comes to escalation of the revolution. The highly respected *Berkeley Gazette* revealed on October 10, 1968, that a revolutionary "mini-arsenal" had been fortuitously discovered and seized by the Berkeley police. They discovered "rifles, shotguns, carbines and ammunition . . . [and] stacks of Communist literature, life-size portraits of Mao Tse-tung plastered on the walls, the complete works of Lenin and other Communist authors, and a box with a list of names of donors to a 'defense fund.'"

Daniel Guirkins, a twenty-three-year-old Army deserter and stockade escapee, was thereafter formally charged with the bombing of the R.O.T.C. building at Berkeley, as well as the bombing of the Alameda County Courthouse. Law enforcement officials soon linked Guirkins with S.D.S.

"What started out as a routine deserter arrest," says the *San Francisco Examiner*, "took on greater significance when F.B.I. agents discovered a virtual 'bomb factory' in [Guirkins'] apartment. Included in the vast array of explosives, blasting caps, timing devices and booster charges was a particular type of uncommon explosive" used in the acts of sabotage. Authorities traced a motorcycle used by Guirkins to the home of Anthony Tankersley, a graduate student in the University of California at Berkeley. As the *Examiner* reports:

*In the Tankersley home were found pertinent correspondence of a radical nature, bombs prepared for immediate use, a list of targets including telephone micro-wave sta-*

*tions, power stations, power line towers, transformers and industrial plants, together with dynamite, blasting caps, timing devices, literature pertaining to revolution and maps.*

Tankersley and his wife (who until recently was employed by the University of California in its Survey Research Center) disappeared after attending S.D.S.'s Fall Convention at the University of Colorado. Mr. and Mrs. Tankersley, according to the *Examiner*, have been "linked to 30 East Bay sabotage bombings which have occurred since February." More than 150 pounds of explosives were found in the Tankersley's home.

It is believed that among the jobs master-minded by these S.D.S. activists was the dynamiting of nearly a dozen of the huge Pacific Gas & Electric microwave towers in the hills behind Oakland. The F.B.I. is now conducting a nationwide search for the Tankersleys and for a Berkeley Commune leader named Raj Razavi, head of a Red anarchist group at Berkeley called the Persian Mother \*\*\*\*\*. They are described as "armed and dangerous."

With the S.D.S. terrorists still on the loose, F.B.I. Agent-In-Charge Charles Bates has noted that "Investigation is being made into the 'rumor' that there is a bomb-gun exchange between the Black Panthers and these Berkeley street anarchists."

In the face of such a linkup, it is hardly coincidental that Students for a Democratic Society has recently published a screed called *Revolutionary Warfare*, a handbook on terrorism by Eqbal Ahmad. Mr. Ahmad is a radical Pakistani national now teaching at Cornell University. The handbook begins by stating: "Interest in guerrilla warfare has rapidly developed in the U.S. The subject is studied with a sense of urgency in the universities. . . ." That point having been made, Ahmad avoids

further reference to internal revolt in the United States and concentrates on the principles of revolution as they have been applied by the Communists around the world. For example, Mr. Ahmad instructs the S.D.S. guerrillas:

*A revolutionary guerrilla movement . . . seeks not simply to inflict military losses on the enemy, but to destroy the legitimacy of its government and to establish a rival regime through the creation of "parallel hierarchies."*

Later, he contends:

*A revolutionary guerrilla movement concentrates on "outadministering," not on "outfighting" the enemy. This is a constructive and not simply a destructive undertaking.*

*Terror is also used to ensure survival of the militants of the movement. . . . Second-degree terror, which normally does not result in killing, is used to sabotage the government's belated effort to gain mass support and thus to perpetuate its isolation from the people. . . .*

So that no one will miss the point, the pamphlet closes with a full-page pitch for the student of guerrilla warfare to join Students for a Democratic Society. There can be little doubt about the intended use of this handbook.

## II

WHAT MANNER of madness is this Students for a Democratic Society?

The organization was revamped into its current form in June of 1962 by a gathering of fifty-nine college students at Port Huron, Michigan. Its renaissance manifesto was the "Port Huron Statement," a thirty-thousand-word Marxist critique of American society, the central theme of which revolved around something called "participatory democracy"



— another Marxist euphemism for “what’s yours is mine.” These junior savants of S.D.S. tell us they do not, for example, believe that business should be conducted through the mutual agreement of buyer and seller. Instead, they argue, the tenant should tell the landlord how much rent he can charge, and the customer alone should dictate to the grocer the price he may charge for a loaf of bread. It is pure balderdash—the usual Red bait for the callow.

Writing in *New Left Notes*, Clark Kissinger, a founder and past President of S.D.S., reveals the more serious purpose of this organization by boasting of its Marxist antecedents:

*In 1959, the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID) changed its name to Students for a Democratic Society. As the youth arm of the League for Industrial Democracy (LID), SLID could trace its origins back to the founding of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society in 1905. But except for a brief period (1936 to 1939) when it was merged with the Communist-controlled National Student League to form the American Student Union, SLID comprised a largely moribund amalgam of liberals and social democrats who conducted pro-labor and anti-Communist discussion groups on campuses. Throughout much of its history it maintained a close relationship with the Young People's Socialist League (YPSL), the youth arm of the Socialist Party. And LID's tax status restricted SLID to solely educational programs.*

In 1966, the political activism of this Marxist progeny had become too hot a potato for the salad of the L.I.D., and official ties with the League for Industrial Democracy were severed—apparently, as Kissinger says, to protect the parent organization's tax status.\* Since

then, according to F.B.I. spokesman Eugene Methvin, S.D.S. has moved decidedly to the Left. As Agent Methvin notes: “By mid-1968, S.D.S. claimed to have 6,300 dues-paying members with another 35,000 unregistered participants in 250 chapters, all under the direction of S.D.S. headquarters in a shabby two-room flat on Chicago's West Madison Street.” Geared to the concept of receiving something for nothing, the vast majority of the members of this or-

\*This business of tax-exemption is very important. It prohibits overt political activism. Clearly, S.D.S. couldn't have that. After all, what is for all intents and purposes an S.D.S. front has now been formed within the federal government.

The Associated Press carried a story on October 4, 1968 describing the “Thursday Group,” a New Left cell which meets weekly in Washington in the basement of a building housing the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This group, the wire service reports, “is part of an expanding movement of young people who are trying to shake up the federal bureaucracy from within.” And, says A.P., “they do more than just talk. The movement has caused considerable interest—and some concern—at top levels of the Administration.”

Out of this noble group evolved a new and permanent organization called Federal Employees for a Democratic Society—F.E.D.S. While for the record denying any official ties with S.D.S., the F.E.D.S. leaders declare again and again that “their ideas closely parallel those of S.D.S. and the New Left.” And, F.E.D.S. makes no bones about its intentions. Madeleine Golde, Vice Chairman of F.E.D.S. and a researcher at H.E.W., says the movement is designed for “internal subversion of the system.” She proclaims: “We are impatient—we don't want to wait any longer. We think there are changes that are needed if we are going to save the cities, if we are going to save the country.”

Associated Press reports that “leaders of the movement say it is really catching on. They point to groups that have been formed in recent months in the Agriculture Department, Department of Manpower Administration, anti-poverty agencies, Bureau of Standards, and the Executive Offices of the President. . . . Through its luncheon meetings the Thursday Group plans to bypass the normal channels to high ranking Department Officials including H.E.W. Secretary Wilbur J. Cohen.”

Cohen, having himself participated in a number of Communist Fronts, comments: “There are a lot of people in this group and they are very much interested in the social problems of today.” But, he adds, “the movement could lead to open rebellion. . . . That's why we want to use them. . . .” Wilbur apparently wants to keep his eye on F.E.D.S. to make sure it lives up to its potential.



ganization don't even pay their dues.

The evolution of S.D.S. as a revolutionary organization is traceable in the escalation of its radical activities. In 1964, three hundred S.D.S. members moved into mostly white "ghettos" in seventeen American cities to agitate for more Welfare and promote rent strikes. During the same period, S.D.S. developed close working arrangements with C.O.R.E. and S.N.C.C., and members of S.D.S. worked with these groups on voter registration drives in the South. In 1965, S.D.S. found the issue with which it has been most successful in attracting campus support — the Vietnam War. Since that time, the Marxist Students for a Democratic Society has consistently been at the heart of the organized pro-Vietcong activity on American campuses, regularly sending representatives to Hanoi for conferences with Ho Chi Minh.

In 1966, the organization expanded its efforts on behalf of kindly "Uncle Ho" to include overt draft resistance, and the following year it began harassing industrial and military recruiters. This past year, 1968, was the year of the campus takeover at Columbia and other organized revolts at literally hundreds of American colleges. During the summer of 1968, S.D.S. also took an active part in planning and carrying out the wild and brutal demonstrations at the Democrat Convention in Chicago.

Curiously enough, S.D.S. is currently shifting its line from "anti-imperialism" to revolutionary "anti-capitalism." Many S.D.S. officers and members now openly refer to themselves as "revolutionary communists" (they spell it with a *lower-case "c"*). The first major step in this direction was taken at the June 1965 convention at Camp Maplehurst in Kewadin, Michigan, when it was decided to admit *open* Communists into S.D.S. In his three-part history of Students for a Democratic Society, "SLID to Resistance," Clark Kissinger notes that this

1965 convention "destroyed the last vestige of S.D.S.'s LID origin by removing the *long ignored* communist-exclusion clause from S.D.S.'s constitution."

This raises a rather important question: Just how Communist *is* S.D.S.? *Time* magazine, a voice of the Establishment which S.D.S. claims to despise, has sought to minimize Communist influence in the organization by reporting: "Probably no more than 2% of all SDSers belong to the Communist Party." While this may be true, it is highly misleading. The implication is that to be a Communist one must be a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Today, nothing could be further from the truth.

The Communist Party is but one of the crags of the iceberg which is the Communist Movement. Whether a revolutionary considers himself to be an *upper-case "C"* Communist or a *lower-case "c"* communist means little to the Comrades or anyone else. Within S.D.S. may be found the complete revolutionary spectrum, including "democratic Marxists," Moscow-lining members of the Communist Party, Bakunin-style anarchists and nihilists, followers of Mao Tse-tung, and devotees of Che Guevara, Fidel Castro, Ahmed Ben Bella, and the Mau Mau Leader Jomo Kenyatta. While they often quarrel with each other, there is one matter on which they are in absolute agreement: Capitalist America must be destroyed.

The fact that only about two percent of the S.D.S. "communists" are members of the Party does not, however, derogate the influence of Communist Party leadership and influence within Students for a Democratic Society. As F.B.I. spokesman Eugene Methvin has declared, "The student who walks into an SDS meeting today hears Marxist rhetoric often virtually indistinguishable from Radio Moscow's worst Stalinist paranoia."

The Communist Party's attitude to-



wards S.D.S. and the New Left has been described by J. Edgar Hoover in these words:

*Here is the danger — that a disciplined, experienced revolutionary organization, like the Communist Party, will be able to reach into the variegated at times almost chaotic New Left movement, recruit young people, and then train them into revolutionary cadres. Remembering the words of Lenin, the Party realizes that revolutionary zeal, vociferous and outspoken, is not of great value unless it is channeled into revolutionary cadres — the dedicated men and women who are trained for revolution. The tumultuous unpredictability of some of the New Left leaders makes the Party distrustful of them; but the New Left as a movement has given the Party an ideological bonanza undreamed of just a few years ago.*

It should be remembered that, like S.D.S., the nihilist movement of pre-revolutionary Russia was not formally connected with the Communist Party, but it was the Communist Party which reaped the rewards from the killing and destruction wreaked by the young nihilists. The "groovy" crowd at S.D.S. might be interested to know that the editions of *Encyclopedia Britannica* contemporary with that time tell us that the Russian nihilists dressed and lived much like our modern-day New Leftists and hippies, and that they too did everything possible to offend conventional taste and morality. There is nothing new under the sun.

Of course, the idea that S.D.S. was ever non-Communist is pure sham. The F.B.I.'s Eugene Methvin states: "Communists have sat in on SDS meetings and coached organizers from the start. In turn, S.D.S. leaders have been welcomed at secret communist conventions." Then, too, key S.D.S. leaders

have regularly made both secret and publicized trips for briefing sessions to Communist countries. S.D.S. founder Tom Hayden, for example, openly visited Hanoi in 1965 with Communist Party theoretician Herbert Aptheker and Marxist Professor Staughton Lynd. Hayden has also sojourned in Moscow, Peking, and Havana. In September 1967, according to F.B.I. sources, ten S.D.S. leaders journeyed to Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, for a week-long, ultra-secret pow-pow with Vietcong and North Vietnamese propaganda specialists. Leaders of S.D.S. continue to make regular trips behind the Iron Curtain.

That June 1968 convention at Michigan State should have served notice on even myopic "Liberals" that S.D.S. is not just another group of student humanitarians. The scene at the convention hall was described this way by the *San Francisco Express Times*:

*The SDS convention hall resembled at times a circus, a national political convention à la Democrats or Republicans, a livestock show, or the First International. On the stage were the red flag, traditional socialist and labor flags, and the black flag of the Anarchists. Anarchist members were identified by black headbands; socialists by red arm bands. . . .*

Of the three national officers elected, only one failed to proclaim himself a "communist." For example, before her unanimous election as Inter-organizational Secretary, non-student Bernadine Dohrn, age twenty-six, was asked if she is a "socialist." Her reply was as rapid as it was direct: "I consider myself a revolutionary communist." At that, the audience of five hundred arose in cheers. According to the F.B.I.: "Without a ripple of dissent, speaker after speaker espoused the dogma that American society must be destroyed by constant disruption now and revolutionary



'armed struggle' when the time is ripe."

Much of the convention time was devoted to a heated struggle between members of Comrade Mao's Communist Progressive Labor Party and others for control of S.D.S. An intelligence contact, who has carefully researched the secret reports of this meeting, comments:

*The non-P.L. members of S.D.S. are for the most part just as much Maoists as the P.L. people, but they resented having this group try to steal the whole organization. It was pretty funny seeing the P.L. people denouncing the other S.D.S. Comrades as Red-baiters and McCarthyites.*

Of course, Students for a Democratic Society serves as an umbrella organization covering members from nearly all New Left organizations. The Maoist Progressive Labor Party, however, forms the largest contingent.

### III

THERE CAN be little doubt that S.D.S.'s greatest revolutionary triumph thus far came last spring when it successfully closed Columbia University with a series of riotous demonstrations using the techniques of Adolf Hitler, Che Guevara, Mao Tse-tung, and Ho Chi Minh.\*

\*With the exception of Adolf Hitler (the only Socialist S.D.S. does not memorialize), the aforementioned butchers are all heroes of the New Left. The *Los Angeles Times* of January 15, 1968, carried a story headlined "Survey Finds Guevara Hero Of Student Left." That report, which originally appeared in the *Times*' affiliate, the ultra-liberal *Washington Post*, noted: "'Che' took his place beside Malcolm X at the altar of The Movement. . . ." The *Post* declared that "Che" is perhaps "the most popular hero of the student left in the United States and Europe." According to the article, "the anti-war movement is more closely aligned with Guevara than it ever has been and his name, more than any other, comes up at the activist rallies." It certainly provides an insight to the true nature of the "peace" movement to learn that its sainted guru is a blood-thirsty Communist butcher.

As the F.B.I.'s Eugene Methvin writes: "Late last year [1967], 300 delegates to the SDS National Council at Bloomington, Ind., decided to launch a national campaign they dubbed 'Ten days to shake the empire.' Secret caucuses picked Columbia for a 'beacon' demonstration whose flare would spark a nationwide conflagration."

Having selected the target, it was necessary to manufacture grievances at Columbia to serve as a focal point for the S.D.S. disruptions. Naturally enough, Students for a Democratic Society had no problem in accomplishing this. It began by demanding that Columbia University abandon its plans for building a gymnasium in what had hitherto been a park serving nearby Harlem. A second major demand was that Columbia sever its ties with the Institute for Defense Analysis, a non-governmental combine of professors advising the government on defense problems. While there were other demands, these two served as the primary themes of the protesters' chants. They were the issues on which the Columbia administrators suggested compromise.

The head compromiser, you will recall, was the University's President, Dr. Grayson Kirk — also, at the time, President of the Leftist Establishment's Council on Foreign Relations. Kirk must have had an awfully hard time keeping a straight face as he was being denounced by his "enemies from below." What happened at Columbia was, after all, merely another example of the Communists' technique of using pressure from below to justify a Leftward move by their agents and dupes at the top, as described by Communist Jan

There is, however, some disagreement within the older "Liberal" community as to just who is the Number One idol of the student activists. Joseph Alsop, an A.D.A. socialist, writes that he believes "Mao Tse-tung is now the greatest hero of the American New Left, and even the less exotic academic-intellectuals commonly discuss Mao's China in the manner of *The New Republic* writing about Stalin in the 1930's."



Kozak in the Communist masterwork, *And Not a Shot Was Fired*.

When the surrendering was finished at Columbia, campus S.D.S. leader Mark Rudd (pronounced *rude*) admitted that the demands were a hoax and a pretext. The *Chicago Tribune* of November 9, 1968, quotes the arrogantly confident Mr. Rudd as declaring:

*Let me tell you—we manufacture the issues. The Institute for Defense Analysis is nothing at Columbia; just three professors. And the gym issue is bull; it doesn't mean anything to anybody. I had never been to the gym site before the demonstrations began. I didn't even know how to get there.*

Although the student strike at Columbia was pure Communist show business, it has produced far-reaching consequences for the New Left. Eric Mann, a New England Organizer for S.D.S. who has promised "more Columbias by the score," explained all of this in the November 1968 issue of the S.N.C.C. newspaper, *The Movement*:

*For many, resistance to radical argument stems, not from disagreeing with the particular issue being discussed, but from a belief that radicals can't win. At Columbia, thousands of students came to believe that the left was, or perhaps could be, a real force in this country. And because of that feeling, they became more open to our politics. . . . The Columbia strike, more than any other event in our history, has given the radical student movement the belief that we can really change this country.*

Mark Rudd has most succinctly summed-up the goals of that "change" to which Eric Mann refers. Rudd puts it this way: "We, the young people, whom you so rightly fear, say that the society is sick and you and your capital-

ism are the sickness. You call for order and respect for authority; we call for . . . socialism."

#### IV

AMONG THE few amusing features of this whole business is the fact that the New Left refers to its enemy as "the Establishment." To the Left, the Establishment is anyone with a "vested interest" in preventing a revolution—i.e. parents, police, the military, business people, and (for all practical purposes) anyone who holds a job or loves our country enough to stop revolution.

Conservative anti-Communists, of course, are also opposed to the Establishment. In the view of such anti-Communists, the Establishment is composed of power hungry *Insiders*, powerful collectivists conspiring within our society to gain total control over the people through total government. To promote total government, conservatives believe, this Establishment promotes the Left. The revolutionaries at the top thus finance and glamorize the revolutionaries at the bottom.

Hard to believe? Okay. Why haven't the leaders of the New Left who have made regular illegal trips to Communist China, Red Cuba, and North Vietnam been indicted by our government, which we agree is in the hands of the Establishment? Why haven't the student revolutionaries been expelled from their Establishment-run schools? Why do the Establishment media regularly glamorize the New Left?

Since Columbia, the mass magazines of the Establishment have consistently featured articles glorifying S.D.S. and its army of New Leftists. Almost without exception these stories romanticize the student Communists as intellectual giants leading the way into the future. Although the reportage has not been wholly uncritical, the New Left is regularly praised in Establishment journals with faint damns. While the revolu-



tionaries may at times be a little pushy, over enthusiastic, or occasionally (horrors) obnoxious, they are, according to the Establishment media, pure of heart, noble of purpose, and courageous in deed.

The Establishment's treatment of the New Left is a twist on the old cliché concerning Senator Joseph McCarthy. That cliché went: "I like his goals, but I don't approve of his methods." With McCarthy, the Establishment Press focused public attention exclusively on the faults it manufactured in his methods, and completely ignored his anti-Communist objectives. With the New Left, the objectives are praised and the methods ignored. The fact that "revolutionary communism" is treated by the Establishment as a desirable ideology provides considerable insight into that Establishment's real purposes.

The treatment of the revolutionary youth movement by the mass magazines has not only served to neutralize parental opposition, but has provided a recruiting bonanza for S.D.S. The radical newspaper, *The Guardian*, officially cited by the federal government as a Communist mouthpiece, carried in its issue for October 25, 1968 an article headlined "SDS Membership Climbs Steeply." That article, syndicated by the wildly Leftist Liberation News Service, revealed:

*An unprecedented number of college students have flocked to the opening meetings and other activities of the Students for a Democratic Society on many college campuses. Throughout the nation local college chapters are feeling the result of the crescendo of activities from Columbia to Chicago, the rash of articles about the SDS in mass circulation magazines, and the growth of the underground press.*

Here are some samples of the press

agency for the New Left in those "mass circulation magazines" which the Communist *Guardian* says are swelling the ranks of S.D.S.

*Life* magazine of October 18, 1968, for example, presented a long article on S.D.S. with extremely flattering and sympathetic personality sketches on four of its leaders. The S.D.S. communists are presented there as highly rational, intelligent, and sensitive souls whose goals in life are to banish poverty and racism. While the fact that these marvelous tykes declare themselves to be "communists" is mentioned, it is done in such a way as to assure the reader that the leaders of S.D.S. are really just idealistic humanitarians given to minor hyperbole.

The whole technique is reminiscent of the propaganda fed Americans only twenty years ago about that loveable agrarian reformer, Mao Tse-tung; or the snow job given the public about Castro, "the George Washington of Cuba," a decade later. The idea that student revolutionaries could be manipulated by upper-case "C" Communists is thoroughly ridiculed as early as the second paragraph of that *Life* article. The allegation that S.D.S. has been infiltrated is considered by members of S.D.S., *Life* assures us, to be "ridiculous and unworthy of an answer. . . . Even if the Communist Party wanted to take over SDS . . . [a member stated] he doubted very much that it could: 'They wouldn't be able to find us.'"

Old reliable *Look* magazine, always in the forefront in promoting the Left, concluded an article on these campus activists in its issue for April 2, 1968, with this statement:

*To an adult outsider, the present mood on some campuses may seem like an aimless nihilism, a pointless lashing out at every target within slogan reach. Especially, since some of those targets are the most deeply held*



*notions of the over-thirty folk. But the thrashing about is often the outward symptom of a highly idealistic view. . . . Predictably, confusion vies with outrage, indecision contends with despair. But under it all runs a strong desire to make a positive achievement.*

The "revolutionary communists" of the S.D.S. were no doubt thrilled by such appreciation of their altruism.

*Look*, which has always led the parade in smearing anti-Communists, presented another paean of praise for S.D.S. in its issue for October 1, 1968. This time, "doing its thing," *Look* came up with the rationalization of the year in explaining why Communists are welcomed into Students for a Democratic Society:

*Remembering a college generation of the fifties that had been frightened into silence by Communist witch-hunts, SDS's organizers deliberately decided to open its ranks to anyone of whatever political creed, and so to remove the Red-baiting weapon from its enemies.*

Clever, what? You take away the Red-baiting by inviting the Reds to run the show!

*Look* assures us that we have a lot to learn from those whom that magazine describes as "idealists" and "visionaries." Then it says:

*Sometimes inspired, often chaotic, the Students for a Democratic Society represents an effort by a key minority of the Nuclear Generation to break out of a political and moral maze built by their elders. It is an upheaval being duplicated around the world, in Communist and non-Communist countries alike. What began on the campus may well prove educational for our entire society.*

Comrade Mao couldn't have put it better.

Of course, all of the major magazines (with the exception of *U.S. News & World Report*) have scoffed at the idea that there is any prior planning or co-ordination to the campus riots, just as they have been scoffing for years at the idea there is any organization behind the black insurrections which Communists have been leading in our urban centers. *Newsweek* of May 20, 1968, for instance — in lunatic contradiction of both the S.D.S. leadership and the F.B.I. — declared matter-of-factly: "Some reports charged, *erroneously*, that SDS had planned the Columbia revolt since last summer." The same article assures us that "SDS thinking has a strong current of idealism."

*Time* magazine, which described the S.D.S. Maoists as "disenchanted young liberals," also denied that the Columbia riots were anything but happenstance. Was Columbia part of a conscious conspiracy? asks *Time* of May 24, 1968. "That is unlikely," *Time* answers itself: "SDS was just playing a natural role in most of the campus uprisings . . . conspiracy is not really its game." How's that for mongolistic doubletalk?

*Esquire* for December 1968 even carried a piece — entitled "Will Tom Hayden Overcome?" — in which the Maoist S.D.S. founder is pictured as a magnificent if somewhat quixotic champion of the downtrodden. *Esquire's* Steven Roberts described Hayden at the bloody Chicago riots against the Democrat Convention as if Tom were the original kindly reformer preparing to rid the world of wicked machine politics:

*I saw him standing on a platform under a tree in Grant Park, exhorting a crowd on the last day of the Democratic convention. The mere presence of him and a few thousand others in Chicago caused Mayor Richard J. Daley to call out 10,000 troops,*



armed as if they were going on a search-and-destroy mission.

As you read this next excerpt from *Esquire*, compare Roberts' glowing description of Hayden to the diatribe regularly afforded conservative anti-Communists in the Establishment's mass magazines:

*His strength, I think, comes from a rare mixture of perspective and commitment, humor and seriousness. Sometimes shy and suspicious at first meeting, Hayden can become a genial companion with quick enthusiasms and affections. He will interrupt a momentous discussion to throw a football around (which he does very well [of course]) or crack a joke. . . . \* Someone has called him a "young Norman Thomas," and that's not a bad description. Given*

\*Hayden is a very important radical. Not only has he traveled illegally to the major Communist countries with impunity, but he has close ties with such Establishment leaders as Averell Harriman and other *Insiders*. Even *Esquire* notes: "He is continually attacked for talking to Averell Harriman, . . . for consorting with the New York literary crowd, for meeting Bobby Kennedy." Hayden, *Esquire* reports, was asked to join the honor guard at Robert Kennedy's funeral.

All this for a Comrade who in September of last year declared in Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, at a Communist strategy meeting with representatives of the Vietcong: "I am the Vietcong. We are everywhere! We are all the Vietcong." Tom Hayden then promised Vietcong-style terrorism throughout the United States.

Of course, being a street revolutionary like Tom Hayden apparently has many curious advantages. Our intelligence sources tell us, for example, that when Tom was in Hanoi a while back his traveling companion was attractive Anne Scheer, wife of the wildly Leftist Editor of *Ramparts*. While the billygoat-bearded Bob couldn't get away from his editorial duties to make that trip, Anne and Tom were intimate friends. Our sources tell us that Robert Scheer's wife has now left him for Tom Hayden, on the ground that there is more to Tom—as he is *both* a Marxist intellectual and a street revolutionary, while the aesthete Bob is only a Marxist intellectual who advises *others* to take the revolution to the streets. Poor Bob Scheer. He is currently trying to decide whether to sell his little \$35,000 cottage in the suburbs or to turn it into a hostelry for the New Left. Meanwhile, Tom and Anne are busy in the streets.

*the acceleration of history, he has already seen some of his earliest dreams come true. . . . Like Thomas, he is half-visionary, half-pragmatist. He understands the world but somehow hopes it can get better. Like Thomas, too, he is always ready for a new cause. . . .*

*Esquire* also has lavish applause for Hayden's Comrades:

*The New Left might be a lot of things, not all of them pleasant or tolerant. But it is neither the tool of a conspiracy nor a group of ungrateful wretches who haven't grown up. It is the best of a generation—and it has been bred by nothing more than the world it was given.*

That last part is quite right. But, "the world it was given" was full of conspiracy led by such men as Tom Hayden's hero, Mao Tse-tung—butcher of 25 million Chinese — and Communists operating from Moscow and Peking to Paris and Washington.

The Establishment's press agency in promoting the members of the New Left as brilliant young idealists and humanitarians has buffaloed many Americans, mature in years, into accepting the absurdity that the New Left is composed of bright intellectuals committed to idealistic purposes. While most will criticize "the now generation" for being "over-exuberant," many actually buy the phony proposition that these schoolboy Lenins are "the hope of the world."

What is happening is that we are being led toward class warfare in the classic Marxist mold. During the Thirties the thrust was labor *vs.* management, in the late Fifties and early Sixties, it became black *vs.* white—now the Establishment and its political tool, the "Liberal" Left, has opened a new front: youth *vs.* age.

Since youth is always the cannon fod-



der of revolution, and America's current crop of young people is enormous in size, it is not surprising that the big guns of the Establishment media are all being trained on exploitation of the acne set. What is most incredible is that it is all being done in the name of "destroying the Establishment." Of course, setting up and manipulating your own opposition is classic Marxist strategy based upon the Hegelian concept of dialectics.

## V

A top government intelligence operative assigned to the New Left tells me that he expects the Reds' student Movement will soon split into two basic groups — those who will continue to organize on the campus, and those working underground in hit-and-run guerrilla warfare. "A highly complex and sophisticated urban-industrial society such as ours," this informant says, "is especially vulnerable to such sabotage. The primary targets of both the Black Nationalists and the New Left guerrillas will be the public utilities—gas, water, and electricity. There are two reasons for this: first, they are a symbol of capitalism; and, second, their destruction will produce the maximum amount of dislocation with the minimum amount of sabotage."

In order to create maximum effectiveness, he says, the attacks will be coordinated in a nationwide effort. To accomplish this it will not be absolutely necessary to have a day and hour set in advance and agreed upon throughout the network. Such a plan would be vulnerable to exposure by government agents who have infiltrated the New Left. Rather, he thinks the sabotage will be controlled by "manipulating the emotional climate."

While the Chicago Riots are being used as an excuse for turning to guerrilla warfare, the plans for that show were of course in an advanced stage long before last summer. An "emotional cli-

mate" was created with inevitable results.

As for sabotage, we know that large amounts of LSD were poured into the Chicago water supply during the Democrat Convention — a fact reluctantly admitted by authorities who were afraid that the news would create massive public panic. The New Left group which for several nights poured thousands of dollars worth of "acid" into Chicago's water tanks was undoubtedly puzzled by the fact that the whole city was not "tripping out." Fortunately, the LSD was neutralized by chlorine-adjustment equipment at the point of its origin in the system. But, the mere fact that revolutionaries attempted to spike the Chicago water supply — and spent thousands of dollars in doing it — is ample proof that they are not just *talking* revolution. One of our most reliable intelligence contacts says of the Chicago incident:

*These people were not completely aware of what they were doing. Fortunately, chlorine has a neutralizing effect on LSD. Nonetheless, I believe that we have more to fear from the New Left resorting to chemical and bacteriological warfare than we do from the New Left bombings. A few of these kids are simply brilliant, and a number of them have access to people in government research projects who have the same beliefs which induced J. Robert Oppenheimer to associate with Communists while he was working on the A-bomb. Some of these young people have set up rather elaborate laboratories to produce LSD and other drugs, and there is no reason to believe that they could not do the same thing to support chemical and germ warfare.*

Public utility corporations in key areas are already patrolling their prop-



erties by helicopter, and man-hole covers near police stations have been welded shut in a number of our cities, to guard against sabotage by bombing.

In all probability, the New Left will seek to coordinate its attack of general sabotage with a nationwide crisis of some sort. When the government's printing-press monetary policies finally lead to runaway inflation and economic catastrophe, militant Black Nationalists and New Leftists will attract large followings from the heretofore apathetic. The revolutionaries believe that jobless Negroes and those whose Welfare checks no longer seem adequate will be easily convinced that the economic difficulties are the Establishment's attempt at black genocide or economic war on "the poor." Students who are driven out of college because of the economic reverses will see revolution as a feasible alternative. The Black Panthers among the Negroes, and the S.D.S. guerrillas among whites, will serve as the cadres for a mass revolutionary movement.

At least, that is The Plan.

One top law enforcement officer I interviewed told me that he is afraid it will take a national disaster of monumental proportions before public opinion will demand and receive a crackdown against the few, but well organized and determined, hard-core revolutionaries now operating with impunity. "We seem to be possessed by a 'Pearl Harbor syndrome,'" he said, "which keeps us from acting while there is still time to save hundred of thousands of lives and billions of dollars in property."

How can such an incredible disaster be prevented? "First," says this intelligence officer, "Chief Justice Warren's resignation must be accepted and a *legitimate* judge appointed to succeed him. Then our entire internal security system must be overhauled so that the revolutionaries can be prosecuted before they can actually carry out their plans.

Both federal and local law enforcement bodies have abundant evidence upon which to try these revolutionaries for sedition—and they must be allowed to do so. Many of the key Black Nationalist leaders, openly espousing Communism, have renounced their citizenship by proclaiming that they are Africans not subject to American jurisprudence—they should be deported to someplace like Cuba or Tanzania." This contact maintains: "Law enforcement people are the most frustrated group in the United States. If their hands were untied, the country could be saved."

Unfortunately, rather than a crackdown on subversives, what is more likely to happen is that the Red terrorists will be *allowed* to wreak their destruction. Their efforts will thus be used by the Establishment as an excuse to invoke already existing Executive Orders formalizing dictatorship. The mass media will then tell us that the only solution to the massive sabotage, race war, and economic catastrophe is to establish a world authority to govern all countries and end the "disparities" which cause such chaos.

Under normal circumstances, the American public would not knowingly permit the surrender of our sovereignty to a world government; but, in the throes of a desperate crisis, many will pray for a dictator and others will be willing to grasp at any straw which promises to stop the destruction and restore some modicum of normalcy. The Establishment's media will then hold out the straw, and the New Left and the Black Nationalists will have performed their final service for their real masters—the *Insiders* of the Establishment they ostensibly opposed and whose tools they were.

There is a way to stop it, of course. A crackdown on subversives and terrorists would *certainly* put a stop to it. It is the job of each of us to demand that crackdown *now!* ■ ■