

1969

A Study in Marxist Revolutionary Violence: Students for a Democratic Society, 1962-1969

John Edgar Hoover

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

John Edgar Hoover, *A Study in Marxist Revolutionary Violence: Students for a Democratic Society, 1962-1969*, 38 Fordham L. Rev. 289 (1969).

Available at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol38/iss2/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in Fordham Law Review by an authorized editor of FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. For more information, please contact tmelnick@law.fordham.edu.

A Study in Marxist Revolutionary Violence: Students for a Democratic Society, 1962-1969

Cover Page Footnote

Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice.

A STUDY IN MARXIST REVOLUTIONARY
VIOLENCE: STUDENTS FOR A
DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY,
1962-1969

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER*

People ask, what is the nature of the revolution that we talk about? Who will it be made by, and for, and what are its goals and strategy?

The goal is the destruction of US imperialism and the achievement of a classless world: world communism.

The most important task for us toward making the revolution . . . is the creation of a mass revolutionary movement. . . . A revolutionary mass movement is different from the traditional revisionist mass base of "sympathizers." *Rather it is akin to the Red Guard in China, based on the full participation and involvement of masses of people in the practice of making revolution; a movement with a full willingness to participate in the violent and illegal struggle.*

The RYM [Revolutionary Youth Movement] must . . . lead to the effective organization needed to survive and to create another battlefield of the revolution.

*A revolution is a war. . . . This will require a cadre organization, effective secrecy, self-reliance among the cadres. . . . Therefore the centralized organization of revolutionaries must be a political organization as well as military, what is generally called a "Marxist-Leninist" party.*¹

We must take every opportunity to explain that the state cannot be challenged except through revolutionary violence. This is its nature.

We must study revolutionary principles of organization as Lenin, Mao, and others have written about them, develop collective methods of work and decision-making, and fight anti-communism

It is part of our function as a revolutionary youth movement²

We're not communist inspired. We're communists. Corrupt, evil and it [our system of government] should be destroyed, in fact smashed.³

A disease afflicts America today—the disease of extremism. We see extremism of several varieties: left wing extremism (Old Left and

* Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice.

1. You Don't Need a Weatherman to Know Which Way the Wind Blows, New Left Notes, June 18, 1969, at 3, col. 1 (emphasis added).

2. Revolutionary Youth Movement II, New Left Notes, July 8, 1969, at 5, col. 1. The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) met in national convention in June, 1969, in Chicago, Illinois. Intense factionalism erupted, and the organization split into two major groups each claiming to be the true SDS. One group is generally known as the National Office faction, the other the Progressive Labor Party. The National Office group, in turn is beset by factionalism and differing viewpoints. One such subgroup is known as the Weatherman group, the other the Revolutionary Youth Movement II, based on the two position papers issued.

3. Interview with Mark Rudd, SDS National Secretary, on Television Station WJW, Cleveland, Ohio, Aug. 30, 1969.

New Left); right wing extremism (Minutemen); black extremism (Black Panther Party); white extremism (Ku Klux Klan and anti-Negro hate groups).⁴ The mass media each day is filled with charges and countercharges, with accusations and counteraccusations, with one group bitterly assailing and denouncing another group. All too frequently these verbal assaults are reinforced with violent acts: murder, assault, arson, bombings.

Extremism poses a dangerous threat to the integrity of democratic institutions. Every American should be concerned. When individuals or organizations take the law into their own hands, they render a grave disservice to the concepts of civility and legality which hold our society together. The Greek historian Thucydides many years ago wrote about Athens:

Trust, the main element in high character, disappeared, laughed to scorn, and a convinced, suspicious hostility between man and man everywhere took its place.⁵

Our democratic society is held together by the law—that body of precedents, interpretations, statutes and pragmatic applications which theoretically provides balance, fair play and, to the best of human judgment, justice and dignity to the individual. The democratic process provides for change—but change within the framework of law. “The life of the law,” said Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, “has not been logic: it has been experience.”⁶ The law is a constantly evolving process which allows errors to be corrected, judgments to be reversed, and new knowledge to be incorporated.

Our society allows and encourages protest and dissent,⁷ the opinions

4. The Ku Klux Klan has frequently abused the rights of others through extremist and terrorist violence. The brutal murders of Lt. Col. Lemuel A. Penn in Georgia (July, 1964) and of three civil rights workers in Mississippi (June, 1964) are flagrant examples of Klan violence. Extremism denies the legal rights of others (such as the right of assembly, free speech, travel, vote, and the press). On May 2, 1967, a group of Black Panther Party members armed with rifles, shotguns, and handguns invaded the chamber of the California State Assembly while that body was in session to protest pending gun legislation. Obviously, here was an attempt to intimidate the legislative process. In October, 1969, groups of SDS members descended on Chicago, engaging in an orgy of vandalism. These types of hooliganism are a threat to the operation of democratic institutions.

5. J. Finley, *Thucydides* 210 (1963).

6. O. W. Holmes, *The Common Law* 1 (1881).

7. Legitimate protest encompasses a wide variety of choices and techniques, such as writing or visiting your congressman or other elected officials, letters to the editors of newspapers, petitions to legislative or executive bodies, and peaceful rallies and demonstrations. Legitimate protest means, basically, citizens expressing their opinions and views within the framework of the law. Our news media reflect constantly instances of how legitimate protest brings changes in society—ranging all the way from obtaining new traffic signs and playgrounds to changes in national policy. A great strength of our society is its ability to adjust to new problems, issues, and challenges through orderly and lawful change.

of the minority as well as the majority. Every citizen and group has the right (and duty) to point out the many imperfections in society and to take steps to have them corrected. But these steps must be within the democratic process—not in opposition to the law. Civil disobedience, violence and flouting of the law have no place in a democratic society. Free government is tragically weakened when individuals show disrespect for the law, engage in vigilante actions or endeavor to set one element of society against the other. When any group openly proclaims that our government should be overthrown by violence, the time has come to be concerned—and we as a nation have reached that point!

The quotations above⁸ reflect the existence in America today of a small group of individuals, primarily college students, who are working for the overthrow of our democratic institutions. A scant two years ago, few Americans had heard of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Today these initials are the trademarks of a movement whose members have developed into embittered, vociferous revolutionaries who have ignited many campus insurrections. They have nothing but contempt for this country's laws.

Here is a new type of extremism, an extremism all the more dangerous because it emanates from a group of young people (many of whom are highly trained academically) whose bitterness against their country is so intense that many of them want blindly to destroy without much (if any) thought as to what is to emerge from this destruction. Their ill will is guided more by whim than plan, more by cynical pessimism than hope for a better future, more by the spiteful revenge of the frustrated than by dedication to a noble cause. A type of youthful barbarism⁹ seems to have taken hold of this minority (SDS being an extremely small minority of our college generation). Danger arises from the fact that these people, in their hatred and anti-intellectualism, will cause great damage not only in the academic community but also in society as a whole.

Let us look briefly at the history and development of the SDS from a relatively obscure and mild campus group to an organization advocating Marxist revolutionary violence. Then let us discuss some of the controlling processes and techniques of the SDS mentality, *i.e.*, the processes which have severed allegiance to this country and to democratic principles.

8. See text accompanying notes 1 & 2 *supra*.

9. A vivid contrast to SDS extremism is shown by the many examples of student groups which have peacefully sought the correction of alleged wrongs in society and achieved results. Sometimes these groups are interested in strictly local problems (traffic control, local elections, housing). Other times, the campus group is part of a larger off-campus organization (political, economic, cultural).

The history of SDS is brief—spanning a scant seven years. Actually, SDS as we know it today was born at a convention of a mere handful of students meeting at Port Huron, Michigan, in June, 1962.¹⁰ These were the days of the civil rights struggles in the South. Many SDS members and sympathizers had been active in voter registration drives and freedom demonstrations and rallies. Their enthusiasm ran high and it seemed that SDS was to be a militant protest group bent on achieving reforms.

The original ideological framework of the SDS was proclaimed in the so-called Port Huron Statement adopted at the founding convention. Though the statement dealt with many issues of the day, it was characterized by two key words—"participatory democracy"—meaning, among other things, that the institutions of American society should be more open for individual participation and citizens should be encouraged to develop a sense of personal responsibility and concern.

As a *social system* we seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation.¹¹

The preamble of SDS's constitution¹² contains this sentence:

It [SDS] maintains a vision of a democratic society, where at all levels the people have control of the decisions which affect them and the resources on which they are dependent.

Following the Port Huron convention, SDS leaders returned to their respective campuses and embarked on an ambitious organizing campaign with the primary objective of "radicalizing" the students.¹³ In 1964, the Free Speech Movement erupted at the University of California at Berke-

10. SDS was originally the youth affiliate of the League for Industrial Democracy. The two organizations, however, parted in 1965.

11. Port Huron Statement, SDS Convention, Port Huron, Mich., Aug., 1962, at 7.

12. The full text of SDS's constitution can be found in *New Left Notes*, June 18, 1969, at 2.

13. SDS is the most militant of New Left groups. From its early days, SDS was basically an unstructured type of organization with little internal discipline (though this is now changing with some elements in SDS trying to develop a more disciplined cadre type of organization). SDS is held together primarily by national secretaries who travel extensively. There are an estimated 200 to 250 chapters, varying in size. These chapters are autonomous, doing "their own thing." Very little, if any, control can be exercised by the national headquarters (in Chicago) over these chapters. Membership is difficult to determine because of the loosely knit structure. SDS claims some 40,000 members. In addition, on key issues SDS is able to mobilize the sympathetic support of a large number of non-SDS members, especially on anti-Vietnam and anti-draft issues. The moderate students, however, almost invariably drop away when SDS engages in confrontation and violent tactics. Since the June, 1969, national convention, SDS has become factionalized, so it is difficult to speak of unitary and national policies.

ley. Also, there were the Gulf of Tonkin incident (August, 1964) and the escalation of the Vietnam War. New Left leaders began channeling the movement into anti-war activities. The SDS actively participated in the growing student unrest and the demonstrations against the Vietnam War. However, SDS was not yet regarded as a revolutionary, violence-prone group.

In fact, SDS involved itself in community action projects. In the autumn of 1964, SDS reportedly was active in seven such projects.¹⁴ The theory of these projects was to organize the residents of communities around the immediate issues which affected their lives, such as housing, jobs, education, voting rights, and opposition to the war in Vietnam.

The "participatory democracy" theme propounded by SDS brought many enthusiastic responses. "What is the strategy of social change implicit in the concept of participatory democracy?"¹⁵ asks one commentator. He went on to say:

The concept has become important this past winter [1964-1965]. . . . [A] number of SDS leaders have left college and are seeking to apply the idea in Northern ghettos.

The SNCC [Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee] or SDS worker does not build a parallel institution to impose an ideology on it. He views himself as a catalyst, helping to create an environment which will help the local people to decide what they want.¹⁶

Enthusiastically, this commentator could say: "A new style of work, fusing politics and direct action into radical community organization, is emerging in both SDS and SNCC."¹⁷

But the whole concept of "participatory democracy"—meaning a sincere effort to strengthen democratic processes by increased citizen responsibility—was a mere shibboleth. The seeds of anti-democratic thought contained in the original Port Huron Statement began to sprout, and the SDS (starting around 1966-1967) changed rapidly and perceptibly. It became more militant, more hostile, more anti-everything.

A close observer noted the process:

A year ago SDS was discussing the possibility of a move "from protest to politics." Today the discussion, and perhaps the decision, is "from protest to resistance." The distinction between politics and resistance is so great as to imply a qualitative change.¹⁸

14. Smith, Report on SDS: Students now stressing 'resistance', *National Guardian*, April 8, 1967, at 1, col. 3.

15. Lynd, *The New Radicals and "Participatory Democracy,"* 12 *Dissent* 324, 327 (1965).

16. *Id.* at 324, 328.

17. *Id.* at 324.

18. Smith, Report on SDS: Students now stressing 'resistance', *National Guardian*, April 8, 1967, at 1, col. 1 (became known as *Guardian (Independent Radical Newsweekly)* in the issue of Feb. 10, 1968).

This "qualitative change" was fundamental and foreboding: *The SDS had rejected the role of working as a left wing force within the traditional political structure of society.* "Most people in SDS," said one of its national leaders, "are not even vaguely sympathetic to the parliamentary game."¹⁹ Instead, it had cast its lot on a policy of resistance.

No matter what America demands, it does not possess us. Whenever that demand comes—we resist.²⁰

A resistance movement, based on the slogan, "Not with my life, you don't," is basic to helping people break out of their own prisons.

Many of us in SDS share a conviction that this is what has to happen. That we must resist, and that people must break free. None of us is sure we can win. All we can say is that there are other ways to lead our lives in the face of the obscenity of what American life is—and that we intend to live them that way.²¹

The dangerous Rubicon of violence had been crossed! Since 1967 the SDS has been involved in an ever escalating tempo of radical activity. In the spring of 1968, SDS was a spearhead in the violent student demonstration at Columbia University. The 1968-1969 academic year saw SDS violence on many campuses, including the conviction of an SDS member at a Midwestern university under the federal sabotage statute²² for attempting to bomb a Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) building on campus. In April, 1969, Cameron David Bishop, an SDS member, was placed on the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) "Ten Most Wanted" list of criminal fugitives. Bishop was charged with sabotage in the dynamiting of power transmission towers in Colorado.

The primary responsibility for handling violations of the law in connection with student disruptions rests with local law enforcement. The FBI, as a federal investigative agency, does not possess police powers including guarding buildings and grounds or providing personal protection. The FBI's responsibility is primarily twofold: (1) collection of intelligence data for immediate dissemination to authorized individuals in the executive branch of the government; and (2) securing evidence of any violation of federal laws within its jurisdiction.

Reported incidents attributed to the New Left suggest a few of the more serious federal crimes which some extremists may be disposed to commit. One group of offenses would be directed toward crippling military programs, including such acts as (1) sabotage to ROTC facilities on campus, recruiting stations, and other military installations, or war material (18 U.S.C. §§ 2151-56 (1964)); (2) destruction, theft, or al-

19. *Id.* at 8, col. 2 quoting G. Calvert.

20. *Id.* at 1, col. 2.

21. *Id.* at 8, col. 3.

22. 18 U.S.C. § 2155 (1964).

teration of any Selective Service document or record (50 U.S.C. App. § 462 (Supp. IV, 1969); 18 U.S.C. § 1361 (1964)); (3) counseling evasion of the Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. § 462 (Supp. IV, 1969)); (4) counseling insubordination or disloyalty of troops (18 U.S.C. § 2387(a)(1) (1964)); (5) harboring deserters from the Armed Forces (18 U.S.C. § 1381 (1964)); and (6) interference with government communications (18 U.S.C. § 1362 (1964)).

Another group of offenses would involve riot and civil disorder such as (1) traveling in interstate or foreign commerce to incite a riot or otherwise encourage, participate in, or commit any act of violence in a riot (18 U.S.C. § 2101(a)(1) (Supp. IV, 1969)); (2) interfering with any fireman or law enforcement officer on official duty during a civil disorder in any way that obstructs or adversely affects interstate commerce (18 U.S.C. § 231(a)(3) (1964)); or (3) interference with the exercise of federally protected rights (18 U.S.C. § 245(b) (Supp. IV, 1969)).

There are many other possibilities, of course. Among these are (1) advocating overthrow of government (18 U.S.C. § 2385 (1964)); (2) desecration of the flag of the United States (18 U.S.C. § 700 (1964)); (3) assaulting, resisting, or impeding certain officers of the federal government (18 U.S.C. § 111 (1964)); (4) assaulting certain foreign diplomatic and other official personnel (18 U.S.C. § 112 (1964)); and (5) threats against the President (18 U.S.C. § 871 (1964)).

At the SDS's 1968 national convention in Michigan, a workshop on sabotage and explosives was held. Here participants were told not only how to manufacture Molotov cocktails and incendiary devices but also how they could best be used against the "Establishment."

In December, 1968, the SDS's National Council approved a resolution entitled "Towards a Revolutionary Youth Movement." This resolution stated flatly:

The main task now is to begin moving beyond the limitations of struggle placed upon a student movement. We must realize our potential to reach out to new constituencies both on and off campus and build SDS into a youth movement that is revolutionary.²³

This is where SDS is today²⁴—a youth movement dedicated to a revolution of violence.

23. SDS National Council, *Towards a Revolutionary Youth Movement* (Dec. 1968), in *Guardian* (Independent Radical Newsweekly), Jan. 18, 1969, at 7, col. 1.

24. In October, 1969, the Weatherman faction of the SDS staged a series of violent street demonstrations in Chicago. "Radical members of Students for a Democratic Society," read a news account, "wearing helmets and carrying clubs, ran through this city's near North Side last night, breaking windows, damaging cars and intermittently battling with the police." *Chicago Police Battle Radicals*, *Washington Evening Star*, Oct. 9, 1969, at 1, col. 8. The young people who used clubs, chains, and pipes and as a tactic would suddenly break out of a peaceful march into small groups, yelling and throwing stones at anything

The SDS, however, is merely one group in the so-called New Left movement. This movement consists of many elements, for example, anarchists, communists (of various types), hippies, pacifists, and idealists. We must be extremely careful in differentiating and not lump all protesters into the extremist SDS category. Protest is a legitimate function of the university and society as a whole. This nation was built on protest. Many students and adults, for sincere reasons of their own, oppose the war in Vietnam, the draft, and university policies. They have a right to protest within the structure of free government. Great damage can be done by labeling these individuals as SDS members or guilty of advocating revolution. These non-SDSers are frequently manipulated by the extremist minorities, but they should not be summarily categorized as members or sympathizers of SDS.

Just what processes caused these tragic developments in the SDS? What factors molded the thinking and actions of this extremist minority of young people?

1) *A basic and fundamental rejection of democratic institutions and values as archaic, irrelevant and meaningless.*

SDS literature is filled with comments contemptuous of democratic institutions and processes. "I don't plan to vote," said an SDSer. "It's no choice—there are three pigs running for president. [W]e denounce the electoral process, it's senseless."²⁵ "Vote Where Power Is. Our Power Is in the Street,"²⁶ proclaimed an SDS publication. "While courts are still available to us as a means of defense, we should use them to the fullest extent, using the opportunity each time we appear in court to make clear the political nature of the police, courts, and attacks on

in sight (so-called "guerrilla tactics").

These demonstrations were the result of careful advance planning by Weatherman. Members were encouraged to come to Chicago for violent confrontations. For example, in the September 20, 1969, issue of *New Left Notes*, an article was carried entitled: *THE TIME IS RIGHT . . . FOR FIGHTING IN THE STREET*. This article stated: "It is a war in which we must fight. We must open up another front against US imperialism by waging a thousand struggles in the schools, the streets, the army, and on the job, and in CHICAGO: OCTOBER 8-11." *New Left Notes*, Sept. 20, 1969, at 6, col. 2. Another heading read, "THE TIME IS RIGHT . . . FOR VIOLENT REVOLUTION." *Id.* at 10-11. Still another article dealt with how to dress for the violent confrontation ("Wear a motorcycle helmet or surplus army helmet." "Wear protective clothing. Wear hard shoes, never wear sandals! Wear shirts and jackets with tight cuffs and high collars for protection against gas." *Id.* at 14) and how to behave medically ("Don't panic if you see someone with blood streaming from the head." "Never try to remove a bullet that is still in the body." "Get a tetanus shot." "If you do go to a hospital, treat the doctors and nurses there as if they were pigs." *id.*).

25. *Daily World*, Oct. 19, 1968, (Magazine), at M-4, col. 3 quoting Jerry Selinger.

26. *New Left Notes*, Oct. 25, 1968, at 12.

individuals,"²⁷ proclaims the Revolutionary Youth Movement II. The law enforcement officer is called a "pig." SDS members taunt, and hurl bitter obscenities against the police officer. In a recent interview SDS leaders were asked:

Question: "How would you describe the government and the structure of this country?"

Answer: "Capitalist, pig, power structure. That's what it is."

Question: "Would you call it a democracy at all?"

Answer: "No."²⁸

The whole history of Judaic-Christian culture is ridiculed, mocked and scorned. Out of this rejection of a belief in democratic values, grow dangerous processes.

2) *Violence as the type of leadership required to effect change in the United States.*

If an individual rejects democratic values, then violence becomes an acceptable means of action. The hatred of the "Establishment" (meaning the government, the military, private industry, and the educational system) is so intense that *any* means of attack is justified.

Until the student is willing to destroy TOTALLY and JOYFULLY those repressive structures—to attack and destroy the bourgeois social order—his student movement will always be just that—never truly revolutionary. There can be no liberated university in a dead society. All or nothing. The buildings are yours for the burning, for until they are destroyed, along with civilization and its DEATH, YOU will not live.

The revolutionary project should be clear to the student—destruction of the university . . . unless the student is capable of destruction as creation, there will be no revolutionary transformation.²⁹

To the SDS member, a key feature of this violence is guerrilla warfare. "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environ-

27. New Left Notes, July 8, 1969, at 9, col. 3.

28. Interview with Mark Rudd, SDS National Secretary, and two other SDS leaders, on Television Station WJW, Cleveland, Ohio, Aug. 30, 1969.

The transformation of SDS into a more violent posture has caused many moderates and genuine liberals to drop out of the movement. A New Leftist paper comments: "Middle-class liberals, who once predominated in the organized antiwar movement by sheer numbers and political influence, are now a minority, though the decline in influence has taken over-long. The 'hard-core' radicals of last August in Chicago and January in Washington are now ascendant, not simply relative to the liberal shambles but absolutely, in terms of numbers and influence." Viewpoint, Guardian (Independent Radical Newsweekly), April 12, 1969, at 12, col. 1.

29. Destructuring of SDS 7 (1968) (Leaflet distributed at SDS National Convention, June 9-15, 1968, East Lansing, Mich.).

ment."³⁰ He looks upon himself as an extremely small minority in a vast sea of hostile "imperialism," impotent, inconsequential and weak. Revolutionary power can be generated in his eyes, therefore, only through guerrilla tactics.³¹ No wonder the guerrilla, the individual who defied the Establishment and fought to overthrow existing society, is a New Left and SDS hero.³² Very revealingly, guerrilla warfare is a topic of study in the so-called free universities.³³ Here is a description of one course from a free university catalogue:

URBAN GUERRILLA WARFARE

We will study the aims and techniques of guerrilla warfare in an urban setting: organization, training, propaganda, intelligence and counterintelligence, sabotage, and civilian resistance. We will do this through the use of theory texts, practical manuals, and war games.³⁴

The whole concept of violence was tragically emphasized in a recent issue of SDS's *New Left Notes*. Under the caption, "Bring the War Home!," page one carried a full page photograph of a little boy with a big smile placing an object on a railroad track. The description read: "With a defiant smile, 5-year-old . . . shows how he placed a 25-pound concrete slab on the tracks and wrecked a passenger train."³⁵

3) *This violence is justified as moral, honorable, the thing to do. This gives SDS violence and potential violence a pseudo-religious fervor, a seeming moral imperative leading to the danger that the uncritical ob-*

30. Hofmann, *The New Left Turns to Mood of Violence in Place of Protest*, N.Y. Times, May 7, 1967, § 1, at 1, col. 3 quoting G. Calvert.

31. Here are the tactics of Weatherman as personified in the violent confrontations which took place in Chicago in October, 1969. Weatherman is gambling that guerrilla tactics, on the street violence (as in Chicago), will pay it high dividends in the radical left extremist movement: (1) by attracting recruits and validating militant street warfare as the best means of revolutionary action, and (2) by providing on the spot training for the building of a cadre revolutionary organization. Will it succeed? Hopefully, this militant Weatherman approach will be self-defeating, that more moderate student groups will arise, and that democratic methods of protest will prevail. Much will depend on the students on campus themselves.

32. Fidel Castro, Ché Guevara, Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse-tung are the tactical-ideological heroes of the New Left. SDS and other New Left literature carries extensive and favorable comments about them (including quotes from their writings and speeches). The Guardian, for example, devoted considerable space to what were reported to be unpublished documents from the Bolivian notebooks of Ché Guevara. These dealt with Ché's plan for guerrilla warfare. *Urban Guerrilla Warfare: Ché's Plan*, Guardian (Independent Radical News-weekly), July 20, 1968, at 13.

33. These are a haphazard assortment of classes on a variety of topics relating to the radical movement open to students (and others). Instructors may be faculty members, students or off campus personalities. Classes are largely freewheeling discussions and have no official connection with the university.

34. Midpeninsula Free University (Menlo Park, Cal.), Catalogue 37 (Fall 1968).

35. *New Left Notes*, Aug. 29, 1969, at 1.

server may consider the perpetrator as a martyr rather than a criminal.

In one attempted bombing by an SDSer, the culprit, who was apprehended and convicted, said he did not really want to injure any person. He wanted to destroy this ROTC building, he said, as a symbolic act, as his personal protest against the Establishment.

This SDS attitude is reminiscent of previous anarchist criminal activities in this country. Emma Goldman, the well known anarchist leader, has told how she and Alexander Berkman, another anarchist, plotted the murder of a key American industrial leader who, in their eyes, was symbolic of the hated Establishment. Berkman would personally attempt to kill him—not that Berkman had a personal grievance against this man, but that this individual was a “symbol of wealth and power.” Berkman would gain nothing personally—nor did he expect anything.³⁶ To these anarchists, the deed was justified because it would not only shock the Establishment but also would propagate their message to the whole nation. The “message” was as important as the deed. It was for the cause! Goldman adds:

Our end was the sacred cause of the oppressed and exploited people. It was for them that we were going to give our lives. What if a few should have to perish?—the many would be made free and could live in beauty and in comfort. Yes, the end in this case justified the means.³⁷

Some SDS leaders have talked about “the politics of guilt”—meaning that, in their opinion, Americans have troubled and guilty consciences about injustices and inequities in their society. To the hard core SDS members, a policy of violent confrontation (including campus insurrections, bombings and arson) hopefully will bring public sympathy and approval (even if silent).³⁸ Moreover, it may stir up interest in their cause and even prevent their prosecution later on criminal charges!

As a nation, we must recognize that this style of anarchist violence is a violation of our laws and should be treated accordingly.

4) *Disaffection from democratic values and a growing tendency toward violence have led to an increasing SDS emphasis on revolution, meaning*

36. 1 E. Goldman, *Living My Life* 87 (1931).

37. *Id.* at 88.

38. SDS has had both successes and failures. At some campuses during the 1968-1969 academic year, SDS was able to mobilize successfully a large number of students on certain issues. Sometimes SDS exploited sensitive issues on the campus (as dormitory regulations, the unpopularity of some administrative decisions on personnel, a failure of communications between the administration and students) of deep concern to many students. In such instances, SDS was able to gain the support temporarily of moderate students, students who were interested exclusively in campus reform, not disruption or revolution. Failures of SDS have been a growing extremism, an inability to maintain moderate support, and difficulty in attracting non-college (working) youth.

a qualitative and fundamental change in the economic, political, social and cultural system of this country.

Not long ago an observer of SDS activities commented that the SDS's attitude toward specific issues, such as opposition to the ROTC, the war in Vietnam and the university system, had become secondary to a bigger, broader, more important goal, namely, revolution.

Today, the SDS is calling into question the entire structure of American society and pronouncing it unfit for survival. The system as a whole, it says, is the enemy, not specific injustices and weaknesses. Accordingly, what is needed is a total purging of what is regarded as "evil," "corrupt," and "degenerate." Apparently, there is to be no compromise, no selection of what is good or bad. The entire apparatus is to be discarded.

Ideologically we began to grasp the idea that the system as a whole was the enemy; tactically we began to try to attack the system as a whole system. We gradually abandoned the notion that if we fought and fought for reforms we might succeed in reforming the system away or that consciousness would somehow arise out of enough local fights so eventually the local rent-strike group would spring into action as a guerrilla force.³⁹

Gone are the days of "sewer socialism,"⁴⁰ a term used by the SDS to mean reformist efforts on a local basis to improve society. The anti-war demonstrations changed this attitude.

Here in the United States those demonstrations set the terms for the struggle and gave the movement a push in gutsiness and in the targets it chose to attack. Remember the Pentagon and the nearly simultaneous West Coast Oakland Induction Center demonstrations. The slogans, targets, and militancy were almost totally new. We moved from individual acts of moral protest—remember the spring before the draft card burning had been considered the very limit of the movement—to massive attacks on the centers of military power in this country.⁴¹

The march on the Pentagon (October, 1967), according to the SDS, enabled the Movement to reach out "to millions where our organizing in the past could only reach thousands. . . . The demonstrations had a double effect: They spread the word that it was legitimate to fight and helped create a culture of resistance in which GIs revolted, white working-class gangs turned political"⁴²

The outcome is the current effort by the SDS to develop what is called

39. Look At It: America 1969, New Left Notes, Aug. 15, 1969, at 9, col. 3.

40. SDS's exact words in speaking about "sewer socialism" are: "We had, in fact, overcome localism, provincialism, and tendency for 'sewer socialism'—the term for those in the era of Socialist organizing before the First World War who wanted to concentrate on local issues, prove that socialists could deliver street lights faster than the bosses could, and to build socialism in one city." Id. at 12, col. 2.

41. Id.

42. Id.

a revolutionary youth movement (RYM). An SDS faction, Weatherman, issued a position paper which talks about a cadre-type, clandestine organization of revolutionaries under the discipline of centralized leadership. This organization would be buttressed by a revolutionary mass movement. "The most important task for us toward making the revolution . . . is the creation of a mass revolutionary movement, without which a clandestine revolutionary party will be impossible."⁴³

Can SDS, with its factionalism and hatred of discipline, create a revolutionary organization? Without it, the revolution cannot be brought about. The SDS militants know that discipline, organization and trained leadership are needed. The very fact that so many SDSers are talking seriously about revolution makes the future one to watch closely.

5) "*The new left as it has been known during this decade disappeared during the Chicago SDS convention. It is being replaced by Marxism-Leninism.*"⁴⁴

This diagnosis by the *Guardian*, the "independent radical newsweekly" which reports New Left activities, identifies a process inherent in SDS even from its early days. SDS (including its many factions) is today Marxist-Leninist oriented.

A loosely structured group, SDS has always been an ideological pot-pourri, including several varieties of Marxist positions: Trotskyites (Socialist Workers Party and its youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance), pro-Moscow communists of the Communist Party, USA, and its youth affiliate, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, and the pro-Red Chinese Progressive Labor Party. As time progressed, the Progressive Labor Party (PLP) became extremely strong in the SDS, resulting in a massive factional struggle at the June, 1969, national convention. The PLP faction was expelled and exists today as a rival group claiming that it is the true SDS.⁴⁵

43. You Don't Need a Weatherman to Know Which Way the Wind Blows, *New Left Notes*, June 18, 1969, at 8, col. 3.

44. Viewpoint, *Guardian* (Independent Radical Newsweekly), July 5, 1969, at 12, col. 2.

45. The "PLP problem" had been brewing for a considerable period inside SDS. In a pamphlet on why SDS expelled PLP, published by the National Office of SDS, these comments are found: "SDS's differences with PLP were not differences 'within the movement' or 'within SDS.' They are principled differences on what the movement is about, where and what the international struggle is about, and who the sides of it are. Since the PLP opposes revolutionary nationalism on the part of the colonized peoples; opposes the self-determination of black people within the United States . . . then they are in no sense a part of the people's movement, but in fact serve the enemy of the people." *New Left Notes*, Sept. 12, 1969, at 2, col. 3. In this connection, the *Guardian*, reporting on the 1969 national convention, talks about a "virtual ultimatum" from the Black Panther Party (and some other groups) demanding "that SDS purge itself of tendencies opposing their line on self-determination of oppressed peoples (including the right to secession). While insisting that it supports self-determination, PL[P] has stated that 'all nationalism is reac-

The two National Office factions (Weatherman and RYM II) and the Progressive Labor Party group have both similarities and differences. Because of conflicting claims the task of distinguishing their positions becomes difficult. The *Guardian* of June 28, 1969, however, reporting on SDS's National Convention, sets forth a brief summary of the various viewpoints.

RYM, as the concept is known, seeks to convert SDS into a mass revolutionary organization of youth grounded in Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-tung's thought. . . . [T]he RYM group split into two factions known as "weatherman" and RYM 2, based on names of papers submitted to the convention by the two groups.

Both factions agreed on many points, but came to a parting of ways due to different ideas on such questions as black liberation, women's liberation, nationalism, the white working class and action tactics.

Weatherman . . . tends to deny the leading role of the working class in revolutionary struggle. It has been charged with adventurism both for its seeming indifference to white workers and for a shock-brigade action strategy

Blacks in the U.S. are viewed [by] weatherman as a separate colonized nation within the oppressor country. National liberation for blacks in the oppressor country, it is maintained, cannot be accomplished until capitalism is overthrown. On women's liberation, the weatherman tendency holds that women should be organized around anti-imperialist, antiracist struggles.

RYM 2 . . . sees the proletariat as being the main force in the revolution, while at this stage, revolutionary blacks at home and liberation struggles abroad play the leading role. Blacks, women and students, RYM 2 holds, play a key role in raising the consciousness of the working class by struggling for their own liberation.

Blacks in the U.S. are seen by RYM 2 as a separate nation, but because of the dual position of black workers—oppressed as blacks, superexploited as workers—"their fight for the right of self-determination is a precondition for any kind of socialism in this country." This struggle for liberation, along with women's struggle for liberation from male supremacy and the struggles of youth, is seen as a means of developing proletarian unity and revolution.⁴⁶

As to the PLP (here called PL) the *Guardian* states:

PL, which considers itself the vanguard of the proletarian struggle, sees the working class as the key to revolution. While supporting self-determination, PL insists that national liberation struggles, including the black struggle in the U.S. must have a class character. Juxtaposed to the Black Panther Party slogan, "Power to the people," PL demands "Power to the workers." PL says student actions must be in the objective interest of the working class. . . . Women are seen as superexploited workers, victims of the ruling class—not as being oppressed by men as well.⁴⁷

These groups differ also on tactics (how to bring about the revolution)

tionary,' including the nationalism of oppressed minorities within the oppressor nation." SDS ousts PLP, *Guardian* (Independent Radical Newsweekly), June 28, 1969, at 3, col. 3.

In addition to these differences, there were problems of personal power (i.e., which leaders were to dominate). Actually, the voting strength of PLP was strong, and anti-PLP elements feared that PLP might even take over.

46. SDS ousts PLP, *Guardian* (Independent Radical Newsweekly), June 28, 1969, at 3, col. 3, 11, col. 1.

47. *Id.* at 11, col. 1.

as well as on overall strategy (the revolution itself). The Weatherman faction is the most militant, believing that direct, forcible, in-the-street guerrilla incidents must be pursued. RYM II, though not disavowing violence, is less militant. Guerrilla-violent tactics, RYM II leaders feel, are self-defeating and will probably alienate both potential recruits and public opinion. RYM II stresses study and education with an emphasis on the classical definition of the working class as the correct means to attain revolution. The PLP follows more RYM's tactics than those of Weatherman. The PLP, basing its position on the historic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, is not opposed in principle to the use of force. However, tactically speaking, it feels such extremist tactics at the present time would do the movement more harm than good.

Perhaps the SDS is the victim of history—that in attempting to bring about a revolution against “capitalist” society, it has partially succumbed to the Marxist-Leninist analysis of “imperialist” society.⁴⁸ Marxist terminology, concepts and thought processes permeate SDS revolutionary literature. In fact, the SDS, despite the purported intellectual prowess of its leadership, has not developed on its own an original, self-thought-out revolutionary analysis of capitalist society which would be independent of the historic Marxist viewpoint! Rather, the SDS and other New Leftists, who consider themselves “youthful” and “modern,” have become prisoners of a nineteenth century doctrine!

A key issue pertaining to Marxist doctrine is SDS's efforts to make contact with the “working class,” the “industrial proletariat” whom Marx considered as the class destined to carry out the revolution. Can

48. SDS's Marxism is not yet an exact replica of the historic doctrines of communism. Marxism-Leninism, for example, does vaguely paint a future society after the revolution which, it is claimed, will bring a more abundant, just and harmonious life. The SDS, however, reflects little interest or concern about any society which would come after the revolution it proposes to bring about. Its main purpose is to destroy what now exists. In this aspect, SDS is closer to anarchism than Marxism. SDS, as an activist group, appears to have adopted those concepts, principles, and slogans of Marxism-Leninism which can best be used as destructive weapons against the “Establishment”—as “class struggle,” “dictatorship of the proletariat,” “imperialism.” “[W]e live in a period when capitalism has developed into its highest stage—worldwide imperialism—and that because of this development the class struggle has become a worldwide struggle often manifesting itself in people's wars.” Education Secretary's Report, *The Boston Strangler: A Paper Tiger*, New Left Notes, July 8, 1969, at 3, col. 1.

SDS talks about the need to wage armed struggles for liberation and overthrowing the capitalist order. The RYM II statement says: “In order for the U.S. proletariat to play its historic role, it must be led by a party of revolutionaries, organized on the basis of democratic centralism, guided by the science of the proletariat, the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao. The party must be able to apply these teachings to the specific conditions of the U.S., in order to import class consciousness into the spontaneous struggles of the proletariat.” *Revolutionary Youth Movement II*, New Left Notes, July 8, 1969, at 5, col. 4.

students alone bring about a revolution? Most SDS thinking (especially the PLP faction) says "no." Students must combine with "workers." In the summer of 1969, the SDS instituted a highly publicized "Work In" program⁴⁹ whereby SDS members were encouraged to secure jobs in private industry for the purpose of making personal contact with workers. In these contacts they were to attempt to "radicalize" the workers, that is, to convince them of SDS's position on current issues.

There is an abhorrence in the SDS to the Communist Party, USA, which is considered "bureaucratic," "old-fashioned" and "irrelevant." Communist Party, USA, leaders and members have been active in SDS activities, but its leadership is skeptical and critical of many SDS policies.⁵⁰ For that reason, some top SDS leaders⁵¹ have publicly identified themselves as revolutionary communists with a small "c", that is, they claim they owe allegiance to the principles of Marxism-Leninism but not to either the Communist Party, USA, or its mentor, the Soviet Union.⁵²

Actually, however, all SDS factions are Marxist—with the Marxist

49. The SDS circulated a "Work-In Organizers Manual" designed to aid SDSers in obtaining jobs. The Manual sets forth data on how to find a job, how to dress, what to say and not to say, and how to behave. "Try to make a few friends among the workers that might last beyond the summer. Two or three—or even one. And try to get their addresses and phone numbers before you leave the job. . . . Join the bowling league or the baseball team. Avoid running home at the end of the day to the 'safe' company of your old friends and political buddies. . . . Go to the bar or whatever hang-out they go to after work. . . . If you can't hold your liquor, don't make a fool of yourself trying to be what you think is 'one of the boys.' Get to work early—sit around and talk. This is very much worth the extra effort." Students for a Democratic Society, *Work-In Organizers Manual* 4 (1969). Actually, this Manual was originally prepared (1967) by the Progressive Labor Party and distributed as "The Vietnam Work-In Organizer's Manual." PLP elements in SDS took the original manual, put on a new cover, and introduced it as an SDS Work-In guide.

50. See the articles by Bettina Aptheker, well-known leader of the Communist Party, USA, in the Party's theoretical journal, for an analysis of the Communist Party's view of the SDS and the New Left. Aptheker, *The Student Rebellion*, Part I, 48 *Pol. Aff.*, Mar. 1969, at 15; Aptheker, *The Student Rebellion*, Part II, 48 *Pol. Aff.*, April, 1969, at 12. Aptheker welcomes the "student rebellion," but deplors what she calls "petty-bourgeois radicalism" in the movement. She feels the New Left does not have a correct analysis of Marxism-Leninism and in reality is merely "playing" with revolution. In the Party's eyes, revolution is a "serious business" and must be prepared for through careful study and planning. Aptheker's conclusion is that there "is an urgent need for ideological and political leadership from the Communist Party and from a Marxist-Leninist youth organization." Aptheker, *The Student Rebellion*, Part II, 48 *Pol. Aff.*, April, 1969, at 12, 59.

51. Bernardine Dohrn and Mike Klonsky, SDS leaders, were quoted as calling themselves "revolutionary communists" in *Guardian* (*Independent Radical Newsweekly*), June 22, 1968, at 4, col. 1.

52. Bettina Aptheker in her articles in *Political Affairs* is worried about the anti-Communist Party and anti-Soviet sentiment in the New Left. See note 50 *supra*.

contempt for law, the dignity of the individual, and the rights of others. The tragedy of the SDS is that a group of young people, some with personal idealism and sincerity, have "jumped the tracks." They have left the mainstream of the democratic processes which have given life and meaning to the American experiment of government.

These students, many from economically affluent and well-educated families, have actually corrupted idealism and sullied the historic academic search for the truth. Many of their errors come from a shallow intellectualism, a lack of knowledge of history, and an arrogant self-righteousness which leads them to believe they alone know the truth. Dialogue, reason and understanding are scorned as contemptuous bourgeois values. "Non-negotiable demands," pompous generalizations, the simplification of complex issues into irrelevant and pious slogans—all these have propelled the SDS into the wasteland of nihilism, revolution and destruction.

Moreover, in the process they have lost their independence as either thinkers or custodians of the hopes of the future. Why? Because they have been captured by an antiquated totalitarian system known as Marxism-Leninism. In all their talk about being avant-garde, advanced thinkers, the bringers of a "new day," SDS leaders are voices from the past who talk in terms of violence, brute power and destruction. These are the age-old techniques of the conqueror and the criminal. In the name of dissent, SDS attempts to stifle dissent. In the name of an alleged pursuit of "justice," SDS is willing to jeopardize and undermine the accomplishments, values and welfare of a society which today is providing a higher standard of living and greater personal freedoms to its citizens than any society in history.

Our society has an obligation to face up to the realities of SDS extremism.

First, we must remember that SDS tactics represent a minority sentiment on our college campuses. The 1960's have been an age of protest, of questioning, of asking vital questions about our society. Our colleges have produced an inquiring generation, young people who are sincerely and deeply concerned about problems which arise from a complex, industrialized, urban society. We want this questioning process to continue. We should be thankful for the sophisticated, intelligent, poised generation of young people now coming of age.

Second, adults have a special obligation to establish and maintain a dialogue with the rising generation. All too frequently we in the FBI find a complete lack of communication between parents and young people about the really serious issues of life. Yes, there is talk about a new car or a vacation trip, but amazingly little about some of the basic problems which concern young people today (the war in Vietnam, the

draft, race relations, poverty). Often a parent and a child violently disagree—and each goes his own way, preventing the mutual interchange of opinions. The generation gap is, to a large extent, a communication gap.

Third, in discussing the SDS (or any other type of extremism) we must be careful of our facts and not indiscriminately label those whom we do not personally like or whose opinions are unpopular as extremists. We must remember that many non-SDS, moderate students are also protesting about key issues of the day. We should not label these legitimate protests as “SDS extremism” and therefore dismiss them from consideration. The genuine, hard core radical on campus must be distinguished from the legitimate protester.

Fourth, we must remember that the way to combat extremism is not by counterextremism. In other words, one of the dangers of SDS extremism on campuses is that it will engender antidemocratic vigilante and illegal actions against this minority. These extremists can and must be handled under due process of law. There is no room either on or off campus for an antidemocratic backlash.

Fifth, society must take seriously its own weaknesses and work to remedy them, promptly, effectively and fairly. Young people very rightfully hate hypocrisy and sham. The best way to counteract extremism of any kind is through a healthy society with self-creative energies working for constant improvement.

Sixth, the legal profession has a special obligation. It simply cannot remain quiescent about the SDS's stance toward our laws and democratic society. Students in law school, in particular, have an excellent opportunity, through campus media and discussions, to emphasize the sanctity of the law and to explain that violence ultimately is self-defeating. If lawyers do not protest extremist violations of the law, who else is there to defend the law?

Theodore Roosevelt said: “Much has been given us, and much will rightfully be expected from us. We have duties to others and duties to ourselves; and we can shirk neither.”⁵³

America must face up to the challenge of extremism—lest, step by step, the foundations of law are eroded to the detriment of all of us. No cement more durable to hold together a free society has ever been found than the law and all the majesty it represents.

53. Roosevelt, Inaugural Address, in *The Inaugural Addresses of the American Presidents* 185 (D. Lott ed. 1961).