

CBM

C

13978

8

THE NEW LEFT

in

The United States of America

Britain

The Federal Republic of Germany

**International Documentation and Information Centre
(INTERDOC)**

This booklet is the second study in a series on the New Left

1. THE NEW LEFT

The Hague: INTERDOC

1969

52 pp.

THE NEW LEFT

in

The United States of America

Britain

The Federal Republic of Germany

INTERDOC CONFERENCE

Universitätsbibliothek Bonn	
Handnummer	967334
Signatur	C 13978

International Documentation and Information Centre

(INTERDOC)

Van Stolkweg 10, The Hague

Holland

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION CENTRE
UNIVERSITÄT BONN

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
by C. C. van den Heuvel	
RADICALIZATION AND FRAGMENTATION OF THE NEW LEFT IN THE UNITED STATES	3
by Dr. Milorad M. Drachkovitch	
THE ORIGIN, DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT OF THE NEW LEFT IN BRITAIN	35
by C. H. Ellis	
CAUSES, AIMS AND METHODS OF THE NON-PARLIAMENTARY OPPOSITION IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY	51
by Dr. Hans Joachim Woehl	

INTRODUCTION

by
C. C. van den Heuvel

The first study in the series on the New Left, which preceded this one, dealt with the following general aspects: the ideological foundations, the motives and aims of student movements, the new inspirers of violence, international relations, and relations with communism.

In this booklet the relevant situation in three countries will be treated: in the United States of America, in Britain and in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The New Left in the United States of America is in many respects an inspiring example for New Left movements in Europe. Various ideas and issues have come over from America and these encourage extremist groups in Western European countries. Herbert Marcuse's theories dominate in European New Left movements; common issues, such as the Vietnam war, racial discrimination and university reform, are constantly fed by the example of American action in this field. New Leftists from the United States have widespread foreign contacts, and are playing an important role in demonstrations which take place in France, West Germany and Britain.

A comparison of the New Left in the United States with the New Left in Western Europe shows that the former one is more radical, more violent and more totalitarian. It cannot be denied that there are groups in European countries which are as extremist as the American New Left, but on the whole the European New Left seems to be more moderate. There are European New Leftists who reject the extreme violence used by their transatlantic counterparts.

It seems that the American New Left is already paying for its excessive emphasis on violence. More and more representatives of important groups in the United States are beginning to condemn the student revolts, believing that the radical student groups are going much too far, in spite of the validity of certain claims in regard to university reform. As a result, more moderate student groups which support certain claims by the New Left start to turn their backs on such extremism.

Similar reactions are now noticeable in West Germany and Britain. Radical students in West Berlin have overstepped the mark in several violent outbursts.

and they are paying for this by a more isolated position in the student movement as a whole.

This development, however, implies a few dangers which may emerge as a reaction to increasing violence on the part of the extremist vanguard of the New Left.

Communism, which shares many common issues with the New Left may become more attractive to those who grow disappointed with the New Left's extreme radicalism. They may start to believe that communism is after all an organised world movement with considerable power, through which their aims have a better chance of materializing than through a violent, anarchistic movement, lacking international power and organisation.

A second danger is that extreme left wing actions evoke strong right wing reactions. Moderate right wing groups are becoming increasingly irritated and alarmed by action on the part of extreme New Left groups. They are more and more inclined to take to the streets in order to counteract New Left terror and violence. If this did actually happen, right wing extremists, who are waiting for this opportunity, would get their chance and a very serious situation would be imminent.

Violence plays a growing role in student action, and students are increasingly inclined to regard violence as an appropriate means, justified as counter-violence against the establishment. Taking this into account, it seems to be a positive sign that students start to react against too violent forms of action. It is to be hoped that it will be increasingly realized by the new generation that the New Left, while pretending to strive for democratization, in fact does the opposite when it chooses violence and terror to attain its goals. In an age-long struggle to achieve democracy it has been learnt that undemocratic methods and means badly serve democratic purposes.

Only the situation in three Western countries will be treated in this booklet. As far as the New Left is concerned, however, they are very important countries with many common problems, but also many different problems. Therefore, in spite of similarities in their New Left movements, there are differences as well, which make the picture of the New Left more varied than it looks at first sight.

The next booklet in this series will examine the situation in some other countries.

RADICALIZATION AND FRAGMENTATION OF THE NEW LEFT

IN THE UNITED STATES

by
Dr. Milorad M. Drachkovitch ††

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the present situation of the New Left, with emphasis on its transformation from a radical-democratic movement to promote civil rights in the South, into a global revolutionary movement rejecting the struggle for reforms within the existing framework of society. The paper will also try to identify groups, trends, and issues within the conglomerate of the New Left whose two main present characteristics are named in the title of this essay.

The Protest Movement and its Morphology

Representing quantitatively small portions of the society, the protest movement in the United States is concentrated on college campuses and in the black ghettos. Moreover, within the student and black communities, the protesters (to use intentionally this broad, generic term) are also a minority, whose impact, disproportionately greater than their numerical strength will be assessed later¹). There do exist, to be sure, groups and individuals outside the academy and the ghetto who harbor feelings of alienation and dissent, but at least up to the present time it has been only on the campuses and in the slums that dissatisfaction has exploded into violence. The active loci of protest are thus to be found at two cultural poles of society, involving on the one hand the best educated, and on the other hand the least schooled citizens. The existing social order is thus attacked mainly by those who, excluded by choice or circumstance from the huge machinery of making a living by their own hands, have the most time to devote to protest. To paraphrase a famous Marxian concept, it is the (guilty)

† The author wants to thank Mrs. Carole Norton and Mrs. Anne Fitzpatrick for their assistance in preparing the final version of this paper.

†† Updated and revised version of a paper presented at the Conference on the Nature of Liberty Under Law and Its Contrasts With Anarchy and Totalitarianism. Pittsburgh, February 8 and 9, 1969.
The copyright of the paper belongs to the "Standing Committee on Education About Communism and Its Contrasts With Liberty Under Law" of the American Bar Association.

conscience of the first that determines their (militant) existence; it is the wretched economic condition of the others that makes them receptive to the radical appeals. This is what Herbert Marcuse had in mind when he acclaimed the revolutionary meeting of "the most advanced consciousness of humanity, and its most exploited forces."²⁾

Campus protest, however, is not only minoritarian but heterogeneous. Bearing in mind that such a classification should be taken in an indicative and not restrictive sense, one may distinguish three categories of protesters: 1. pragmatic protesters, i. e. people, who dissatisfied with the present nature of the political, socio-economic, and academic life, ask for practical, institutional reforms without challenging the very foundations of the established order. 2. Then there are those whom one may call the existential protesters, encompassing those new leftists who no longer believe in institutionalized reform but who rebel culturally rather than politically against the establishment³⁾. 3. Finally come the revolutionary protesters, i. e. the militant minority which believes that the American society is so corrupted by its military-industrial governing class and its imperialist foreign policy that only a revolutionary upheaval could bring meaningful change.

These three categories (to which one could also apply the familiar campus terms: dissent - resistance - confrontation) do not represent rigid and static groupings. A frustrated reformist can easily swell the ranks of the "alienated", and from the very volatile situation of being alienated one may easily join the revolutionaries. The movement in reverse is no less possible and observable: there is indeed heavy two-way traffic on protest roads.

As for the ghetto protesters, one may also distinguish between the three stages of dissatisfaction, going from a reformist-minded aspiration to achieve full equality within the existing society, to a strong cultural emphasis of blackness, to violent revolutionary postures with either nationalist or class content.

Neo-Communist and Neo-Anarchist Versions of Revolutionary Protesters

Concentrating on those who proclaim the need for revolutionary upheaval, one must distinguish between the white and black extreme radicals; then, with regard to the whites, one has to define the complex relationship existing between the most radical of the cultural rebels, the hippies, and the strictly political revolutionaries.

Among the white radicals the most significant development is the broadening of concerns and the intensification of emotions among those involved since 1960 in the civil rights movement. From the regionally and topically limited battles for

Negro rights in the South, the Movement (especially its most militant branch - Students for a Democratic Society, SDS) became concerned with broader problems of American domestic and foreign policies. For a while this segment concentrated on the single issue of opposition to the war in Vietnam, but it has transcended with ease that or any other specific cause to confront and reject the entire institutional structure of contemporary American society.

This process has been graphically described by Carl Oglesby, former president of the SDS. According to him the young radicals first tried "the politics of the appeal to higher power", which they believed to be "responsive and decent". Then the momentous recognition that "the enemy is not a few men but a whole system", made them "immoderate and unconciliatory". In a sentence that reflects a terminal stage of radicalization, Oglesby states:

"The rebel is an incorrigible absolutist who has replaced all 'problems' with the one grand claim that the entire system is an error, all 'solutions' with the single irreducible demand that change shall be total, all diagnoses of disease with one final certificate of death. To him, total change means only that those who now have all power shall no longer have any, and that those who now have none - the people, the victimized - shall have all."⁴⁾

This evolution is particularly striking in the relatively short history of the SDS. Its first official document, the Port Huron Statement, prepared by Tom Hayden and adopted in June 1962, was a manifesto of democratic and humanitarian radicalism, seeking as a new social system "the establishment of a democracy of individual participation", and declaring that "as democrats we are in basic opposition to the communist system."⁵⁾ Five years later, as its sixth national convention in June 1967, SDS exhibited political tendencies that were "on the one side the left-wing Socialists and neo-Marxists; on the other side the anarchists of various persuasions, including hippies."⁶⁾ The leftward process accelerated during the next year, causing a competent observer on the occasion of the SDS convention in June 1968 to comment: "SDS, which in the last 12 months has evolved from an anti-imperialist to an anti-capitalist perspective, is on the precipice of embracing socialism or, in the terminology of a considerable number of SDS members, revolutionary communism."⁷⁾ This "precipice" was overstepped, according to another SDS leader, at the organization's national council meeting at Ann Arbor in December 1968. "The resolutions (of the meeting) dealt with converting the student group into a revolutionary youth movement, (and with) racism and women's liberation. They clearly conveyed SDS's move toward a well-defined Marxist analysis of American society..."⁸⁾ It will be seen later that SDS's "revolutionary communism" does not represent

either an ideological or organizational merger with the "old" communist parties and groups; it represents instead a neo-communist adjunct to the fragmented world of the American extreme left.

The rapprochement and ensuing cooperation between the previously apolitical hippies and the militant radicals was a milestone in the process of radicalization of the New Left. A San Francisco underground paper made the following announcement in January 1967: "A union of love and activism previously separated by categorical dogma and label mongering will finally occur ecstatically when (the) Berkeley political activists and hip community and San Francisco's spiritual generation and contingents from the emerging revolutionary generation all over California meet for a Gathering of the Tribes for a Human Be-In at the Polo field in Golden Gate Park on Saturday, January 14, 1967, from 1 to 5 p.m."⁹ Although the hippies appear a dubious partner in any revolutionary venture because of their lack of ideological background and training, and because of the apparent contradiction between indulgence in drugs and revolutionary discipline, they represent "objectively" a radically dissenting and disrupting factor in American society:

"Hippies have a clear vision of the ideal community - a psychedelic community, to be sure - where everyone is turned on and beautiful and loving and happy and floating free. But it is a vision that, despite the Alice in Wonderland phraseology hippies usually breathlessly employ to describe it, necessarily embodies a radical political philosophy: communal life, drastic restriction of private property, rejection of violence, creativity before consumption, freedom before authority, de-emphasis of government and traditional forms of leadership."¹⁰

The relationship between the revolutionary hippies, or more precisely the Yippies (alias Youth International Party, formally born on October 21, 1967, and formally declared extinct on August 21, 1968) and the SDS is extremely difficult to describe. The SDS, despite its complexities and lack of any conventional political structure, is a movement that can be defined in terms of rational political analysis. Such is not the case with the Yippies. By reading the writings and pronouncements of the two most important Yippie leaders, Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffmann, one obtains a curious impression that he is dealing with people who are at the same time exhibitionist clowns and potentially dangerous anarchists, with people whose brains are already blown by countless "trips" but who are still lucid and cunning political maneuverers, with persons who by combining a cult of pornography with dreams of revolutionary guerrilla action seem to herald a peculiar new irrationality in politics. Here are jet-age Bakunins who, permanently "stoned", use every electronic and mass-media vehicle to promote their "message", making a clinically paranoid behavior the norm of their new

society. And to illustrate that this cursory description of hippie neo-anarchism is not an exaggeration, only one quote from Jerry Rubin's prose may suffice:

"What's needed is a new generation of nuisances. A new generation of people who are freaky, crazy, irrational, sexy, angry, irreligious and mad. People who burn draft cards. People who burn dollar bills. People who burn M. A. and doctoral degrees. People who say to hell with your goals. People who lure the youth with music, pot and LSD. People who proudly carry Vietcong flags. People who redefine reality. People who redefine the norm..."¹¹

One could of course be tempted to dismiss such a discourse as the ravings of sheer lunacy. But then one must remember that the extraordinary events last August in Chicago, during the Democratic national convention, were planned and executed largely by the Yippies, and that the entire American political system was shaken by these few "lunatics" who found inspiration in "Guevara, Debray, Mao, Giap, Mc Luhan."¹²

From the Battles of Civil Rights to the Glamors of Black Revolution

Turning to the phenomenon of radicalization among the black student militants, one may observe a certain similarity between the evolution of the SDS and that of the predominantly Negro Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC, or Snick). From its inception in 1960 until approximately mid-1965, Snick was essentially a militant, democratic organization distinguishing itself by its struggle for Negro emancipation in the South. In 1965, however, internal conflicts began to plague the organization, and a violent and racially exclusivist faction got the upper hand and finally took over in May 1966, when Stokely Carmichael assumed leadership.

Under Carmichael, who later candidly admitted that he and his friends had joined Snick to prepare cadres for armed struggle¹³, the concept of "black power" (when Carmichael acceded to leadership the whites were thrown out of the organization) acquired a precise meaning. Internally, the organization's raison d'être became the pursuit of "anticolonial struggle for black self-determination", which was conceived to be a part of the general revolution within the United States. Internationally, systematic links with the "revolutionary Third World" organizations and "national liberation movements" were established, with the aim of solidifying the front against a common enemy: "U.S. imperialism." Castro's Cuba, particularly after the January 1966 Tricontinental conference in Havana, played a pivotal role in forging this "anti-imperialist" unity¹⁴.

The establishment of the new Black Panther Party was a step forward in building a more appropriate political-military tool. One point in the Party's ten-point platform and program, elaborated in October 1966, stipulated that the major political objective of the party was "... a United Nations-supervised plebiscite to be held throughout the black colony (U.S.A.) in which only black colonial subjects will be allowed to participate, for the purpose of determining the will of black people as to their national destiny". One of the rules of the party, stipulated that "No party member can join any other army force other than the Black Liberation Army".

While the Black Panther Party cannot claim a monopoly on black militancy, it incarnates best the tendency toward radicalization of the Negro left. A brief look at three of the Party leaders will illustrate more sharply the profile of this movement as it blends together elements of separatist black nationalism, quasi-anarchist violence, and Castro-Maoist devotion to revolutionary change. For Carmichael (presently prime minister of the Black Panther Party) "the problem of (racial) color transcends the class divisions", and the best tactics to destroy the capitalist structures of the United States is the launching of "urban guerrilla warfare".¹⁵⁾ Eldridge Cleaver (minister of information, presently fugitive from justice) resembles by the rumbling violence of his harangues Jerry Rubin¹⁶⁾. Finally, George Murray (minister of education) had the following to say during a press conference in Havana last August:

"We have vowed not to put down our guns or stop making Molotov cocktails until colonized Africans, Asians and Latin Americans in the United States and throughout the world have become free ... the defeat of the murderers of mankind will come as soon as we create a few more Vietnams, Cubas and Detroits... our thinking is inspired by Che Guevara, Malcolm X, Lumumba, Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung."¹⁷⁾

Intellectual Mentors of Revolutionary Protesters

A question that arises at this stage is how to explain the unprecedented rebelliousness of the most affluent and best educated generation in American history. To give at least a partial answer to that question one must turn to specific aspects of the intellectual and cultural *Zeitgeist* that prevades the atmosphere of the campuses.

One could hardly find more articulate writers than Herbert Marcuse and Susan Sontag to capture and formulate the spirit and underlying causes of the revolt of our time. Marcuse, the aged philosopher who teaches in Southern California and is universally considered the oracle of the New Left (groups of

students marched in Rome under posters bearing the names of a curious trinity: Marx-Mao-Marcuse), interpreted in this way the essence of the students' rebellion:

"I think here there is a common ground between the American movement and the French movement. It is a total protest, not only against specific evils and against specific shortcomings, but at the same time, a protest against the entire system of values, against the entire system of objectives, against the entire system of performances required and practiced in the established society. In other words, it is a refusal to continue to accept and abide by the culture of the established society. They reject not only the economic conditions, not only the political institutions, but the entire system of values which they feel is rotten at the core."¹⁸⁾

Described by her publisher as "one of the most exciting figures in contemporary letters," the young New York writer, Susan Sontag, completed Marcuse's definitions by some observations of her own:

"... from a world-historical perspective, the local (American) history which some young people are repudiating (with their fondness for dirty words, their peyote, their macrobiotic rice, their Dadaist art, etc.) looks a good deal less pleasing and less self-evidently worth of perpetuation. The truth is that Mozart, Pascal, Boolean algebra, Shakespeare, parliamentary government, baroque churches, Newton, the emancipation of women, Kant, Marx, Balanchine ballets, et al., don't redeem what this particular civilization has brought upon the world. The white race is the cancer of human history; it is the white race and it alone — its ideologies and inventions — which eradicates autonomous civilizations wherever it spreads, which has upset the ecological balance of the planet, which now threatens the very existence of life itself... This is a doomed country, it seems to me; I only pray that, when America founders, it doesn't drag the rest of the planet down, too. But one should notice that, during its long elephantine agony, America is also producing its subtlest minority generation of the decent and sensitive, young people who are alienated as Americans. They are not drawn to the stale truths of their sad elders (though these are truths). More of their elders should be listening to them."¹⁹⁾

These two quotes go to the roots of the collective psychological and political disposition of a large number of American intellectuals and their youthful followers in the universities, who damn not only the culture and institutions of their own country, but reject the basic values of Western civilization. They also epitomize a complex of personal and political attitudes bestowed upon the New Left by its literary heroes. One of these attitudes expresses itself in what may be called

the hate-America psychosis. On the other side of the Atlantic the French writer, Jean Genet, had this to say about the country he had recently visited: "America is a heavy island, too heavy: it would be good, for America, and for the world, for it to be demolished, for it to be reduced to powder."²⁰ In a spirit of congeniality with Susan Sontag's maxim about the white race as the cancer of human history, Jean-Paul Sartre went a step farther and, after having cursed the United States as "that super-European monstrosity", he proclaimed that "we (the whites) are the enemies of mankind", and then proceeded to justify in advance the colored man's redemptive act of slaughtering the white man:

"The rebel's weapon is the proof of his humanity. For in the first days of the revolt you must kill: to shoot down a European is to kill two birds with one stone, to destroy an oppressor and the man he oppresses at the same time: there remain a dead man, and a free man; the survivor, for the first time, feels a national soil under his foot."²¹

As a logical consequence of this total negation of the ethos and norms of the West, there emerge claims about the necessity to "rehaul ... the whole character-structure of modern American man, and his imitators"²²) The key element of this rehauling consists in an all-out attack on Western liberal and empirical tradition and its tenet that rationality is the source of human freedom. Marshall McLuhan and Norman O. Brown, have already left a deep imprint, either by denying the relevance of rationality at a time of qualitative technological innovation or by advocating the abandon of rationality and reduction of society to the unconscious level. McLuhan's central thesis that "the medium is the message", (i. e. that the new electric technology, by causing instant sensory awareness of the whole, renders obsolete the Newtonian laws of mechanics, latent in the Gutenberg typography, and based on fragmentation of individual tasks and actions as well as on the primacy of opinions, concepts, and contents of media of communications), invalidates all the prevalent norms and ideas of education, government, industry and social life. Thus, for instance, contrary to the overwhelming trend of belief during the last two centuries, "the intellectual is no longer to direct individual perception and judgement but to explore and to communicate the massive unconsciousness of collective man"²³) While McLuhan denies the relevance of established institutional structures and belief systems in the name of technological imperatives, the neo-Freudian Brown assails the modern industrial world for its rationality and condemns other aspects of Western civilization (including the concepts of private property and individualism). In the words of one of his critics, "He bids us attain unification (of mankind) by reducing ourselves to our lowest common denominator, the pre-rational, pre-realistic and pre-individual layer in everyone's unconscious"²⁴) Similarly, Herbert Marcuse attacks Freud's pro-

position that civilization is based on the permanent subjugation of human instincts, that is on the discipline of work as full time occupation, on the discipline of monogamic reproduction, and on the established system of law and order. Instead, Marcuse sees as preconditions for his ideal of a "non-repressive" society, "the subversion of the traditional culture, intellectual as well as material, including the liberation of instinctual needs and satisfactions which have hitherto remained tabooed or repressed"²⁵)

From these positions it is easy to go a step further and, on the assumption that existing society is insane, proclaim a paranoid rejection of that society as the precondition for return to sanity. For instance, an influential social critic recently wrote:

"So long as so many of our institutions remain part of America's expanding war machine, the mass paranoia that is infecting our society may not only be 'normal', but our only hope for survival... Should not every student develop a cultural paranoia in which every professor is viewed as a potential agent or tacit supporter of the murder factory and every academic system is seen as set against the student's mental and social health until he finds out differently?"²⁶)

The cultural paranoia which Hentoff advocates has already for years been a prominent motif in a series of novels and theatrical pieces, a syndrome which another social critic, Lionel Abel, writing about Peter Weiss' drama "Marat/Sade", called "leftism plus madness"²⁷) Expounding on this theme, Abel cited Norman Mailer's essay *The White Negro* which singled out psychopaths as the bearers of future values. Likewise Sartre's "canonization" of Jean Genet ("Saint Genet"), glorified a foundling, thief and homosexual who on his own has glorified crime, sexual and social depravation, above all murder.

It remains, finally, to deal with the "elitism" of the mentors who impart to their young revolutionary followers what Eric Hoffer has called "the intellectual's most fundamental incompatibility with the masses"²⁸) This point has been elucidated with a remarkable degree of outspokenness by the late C. Wright Mills, another "founding father" of the New Left:

"Marx was basically wrong. Look, it is obvious that the proletariat doesn't make history, no matter how much you want to stretch historical facts. At certain points in history it has been more active than at others, but clearly an elite has made and still makes world history. How anyone can deny this in the face of the modern power state is almost unbelievable... Now in all the overdeveloped societies, with the intricate control of the mass media, it's up

to the intellectuals who have a conscience to do what must be done."²⁹⁾

And what must be done? Here again Herbert Marcuse has furnished a substantive answer. In his essay entitled "Repressive Tolerance" he argued that "the realization of the objective of tolerance would call for intolerance toward prevailing policies, attitudes, opinions, and the extension of tolerance to policies, attitudes, and opinions which are outlawed or suppressed"³⁰⁾ After making it explicit that "liberating tolerance would mean intolerance against movements from the Right, and toleration of movements from the Left", and that intolerance toward the existing society should include propagation of "thought, opinion, and word", Marcuse describes who should preside over the task of rearranging society. According to him it would require "a small number indeed, and not necessarily that of the elected representatives of the people"³¹⁾ The rejection of the principle of representative democracy is justified on the ground that "the continued existence of small and powerless minorities is more important than the preservation of abused rights and liberties which grant constitutional powers to those who oppress these minorities"³²⁾

By a curious whim of history, many of the alienated Western intellectuals who consider themselves revolutionary Marxists are espousing some of the basic ideas of Marx's anarchist enemy -- Bakunin. Marcuse's denunciation of the industrial working class for having become a pillar of social cohesion, and his extolling of the revolutionary virtues of the "substratum of the outcasts and outsiders, the exploited and persecuted of other races and other colors, the unemployed and the unemployable"³³⁾ has nothing in common with Marx's vision and description of the revolutionary process. Likewise, as Lewis Feuer has brilliantly demonstrated, Bakunin's *Catechism of the Revolutionist* was a forerunner of Che Guevara's and Regis Debray's manuals on the vocation of the guerrilla warrior³⁴⁾.

It is a small wonder that a young, inexperienced, idealistic American college student, sheltered from the hardships of economic deprivation, and often burdened with personal or family problems, discovers in the writings of Marcuse, Sartre, Brown, Mailer, Sontag, Mills and Debray fascinating new grounds for criticism and a blueprint for action. Every shortcoming of Western liberal civilization is catalogued and denounced, often brilliantly, by the intellectual mentors of the New Left. And one would need strong doses of good sense, wider reading, and life experience to avoid succumbing to the pervasive feeling of guilt that, once intellectually and emotionally totalized, leads to nihilism toward one's own cultural heritage and to at least a temptation to take part in the struggle to destroy the American "empire". Without this causal link between the words of armchair intellectuals and the acts of campus radicals the New Left would not have become what it is.

A final factor must be stressed when analyzing the elements contributing to the radicalization of the New Left: Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba. All of the authors quoted above, particularly Mills, Sartre, Sontag, and Marcuse, have written enthusiastically about Castro, giving him so to speak the certificate of intellectual excellence. Enjoying such a stamp of approval Castro, with his unique political style, his total yet original system of social engineering and his living charisma coupled with that of the dead hero Che Guevara (the James Bond of the radical left-wing), represents a perpetual source of inspiration and encouragement to American revolutionary protesters. Cuba's presence only a few miles from the United States and Castro's open flouting of everything American, render the aging and lusterless bureaucrats in Moscow or the distant and inscrutable Red mandarin changing the face of China somehow less appealing to the young, flamboyant American radical.

No less important are the organizational ties between Havana and the American revolutionaries. While it is impossible to define the exact nature of these relations, several characteristics are unmistakable. Using Fidel Castro's words, Tom Hayden described the Columbia university insurgents as "guerrillas in the field of culture"³⁵⁾ George Murray, instructor at San Francisco State College, whose dismissal triggered the student strike, proudly proclaimed in Cuba last August his black nationalism of a Castroist leaning. In the same spirit, the *Tricontinental Bulletin*, published in several languages by the Executive Secretariat of the Organization of the Solidarity of the Peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, presented in its November 1968 issue an interview with Huey Newton. The imprisoned chief of the Black Panther Party expressed his full agreement with Guevara-Debray concepts of guerrilla warfare. Finally, the Third World Liberation Front, the main striking partner of the Black Students' Union at San Francisco State College, reflects by its very name, its fighting methods, and even the physical appearance of some of its leaders, the impact of the Cuban regime and the tricontinental revolutionary organization functioning from Havana.

Alienation and Violence

It is remarkable and certainly ironic that while the initial impulses of the New Left sprang up in reaction against what was perceived as the built-in violence of American society, the means devised to eradicate this "institutionalized violence" have turned out to be an enhanced (though still mainly abstract) revolutionary violence. Professor Kenneth Keniston from Yale Medical School's Department of Psychiatry, observed this phenomenon, seemingly without recognizing its incongruity:

"The avoidance and control of violence, whether in international warfare, political organizations, small groups, or face-to-face personal relations, is a central goal and a key psychological orientation in the New Left."³⁶

However, only two pages later the same author made a statement which radically modifies what he had just proclaimed, and that modification is indeed of paramount significance:

"For all his efforts to control violence, cataclysm, and sadism, the young radical continually runs the danger of identifying himself with what he seeks to control, and through a militant struggle against violence, creating more violence than he overcomes."³⁷

This violence as a cure for the alienation syndrome (one is reminded here of an earlier belief in the "war to end all wars") is especially striking when mirrored in the concept of "identification with the enemy" pertaining to the war in Vietnam³⁸). In contrast to the genuine pacifists who abhor war as such, the revolutionary protesters have put themselves uncritically on the side, as Albert Camus used to say, of the "privileged executioners" — in this case the Viet Cong. Compounding extreme simplification with total moral revulsion toward the American "Inferno" (Carl Oglesby's formulation, which is similar to that of Stokely Carmichael³⁹)), the student left regards the Viet Cong not as a ruthless political and military reality, but as a moral abstract exuding virtues worth emulating. Resembling the Western enraptures with Stalinism in the 1930's, this vicarious patriotism is particularly galling in view of the extreme sensitivity which is shown vis-à-vis every real or assumed shortcoming of the American society. To crown the paradox, this new crop of American revolutionaries, who proclaim the dictates of individual conscience as the supreme law of personal behavior, would be the first to suffer under the implacable collective molds of the present North Vietnamese regime.

There exists today an escalation of "direct-action" violence in the United States, with manifestations on three levels: rhetorical, preparative for action, and performatory. Rhetorically, the revolution being an established norm, one goes to describe all the aspects of its forthcoming fury. Thus, the 27-year old Robin Morgan, former child actress and a present leader of the Woman's Liberation Movement, conveys the following image in one of her poems:

I am pregnant with murder.
The pains are coming faster now.
And all your anesthetics
Nor even my own screams can stop them.
My time has come⁴⁰.

In every issue of the Black Panther newspaper, its articles, drawings, photographs, and caricatures concentrate on the theme of "killing the pig" (the policeman), and the Panthers' Minister of Education, George Mason Murray, extolled in these words the virtues of black "revolutionary culture":

"Our painters must show piles of dead businessmen, bankers, lawyers, senators, congressmen, burning up inside their stores, being blown up in cafes, restaurants, night clubs. Our music, rhythm and blues, jazz, spiritual music, must burst the eardrums of the whites who dare to listen to it... Those are the battle cries of mad, crazy black men, and the screams are coming from the honkey's throat as he and his wife are strangled to death, and robbed, looted, then set afire, for change."⁴¹

The next step in glorifying verbally violence is to instruct and prepare its eventual perpetrators. An anonymous mimeographed manual, entitled "What Must We Do Now?" (with the subtitle "An argument for sabotage as the next logical step toward obstruction and disruption of the U.S. war machine") discusses at length how to shut down through arson and bombings military induction centers, and contains drawings and instructions explaining how to make incendiary time bombs and Molotov cocktails, as well as how to set simple fires, sabotage automobile tires and gas lines. The manual insists on total secrecy and total decentralization in the execution of acts of sabotage in order to minimize risks and capture by the police. Thus, "all actions undertaken by individuals or by two's or three's should be entirely independent of and separate from local radical groups (such as resistance groups or SDS). That is to say, John X participates in SDS on campus, but never mentions his other activities against Selective Service to the membership of the SDS. That he is protecting himself against arrest as well as keeping SDS 'above-board' and aiming at an ever-stronger campus base, goes without saying."⁴²

In a similar vein, though this time in a publication sold in bookstores, a certain Georg Prosser offers to his readers detailed technical instructions on how to wage urban guerrilla warfare. He warns them on the necessity to make thorough preparations before armed actions can seriously be considered:

"Weapons, ammunition, explosives and much related equipment must be obtained and stockpiled; the terrain must be thoroughly and minutely scrutinized; suitable recruits having the desired revolutionary orientation must be selected and trained; leadership cadres must be formed and given intensive indoctrination and training in revolutionary objectives and methods of struggle; the exceedingly delicate task of building an underground fighting

organization must be undertaken at the same time that practical political work is carried out in the ghetto to prepare the masses for resistance."⁴³)

The most significant is, however, the third stage, that of violent performances. An underground newspaper from Illinois reported the following in an article entitled "Sabotage: This is Number One and the Fun Has Just Begun":

"The war began last winter on the Western front, in the rainy season. The guns of February were four Molotov cocktails, thrown at the Naval ROTC building on the Berkeley campus of the University of California ... This campaign has dynamite, fire-bombs, and plastique. It is fought on hill-tops in California, in the hollows of Appalachia, on scores of college campuses, in black ghettos and downtown shopping districts. The targets are police cars, draft boards, military facilities, power stations and mining equipment... There is no need for national coordination, and there is no evidence at all that any exists. Related action springs naturally and spontaneously from similar causes: revolutionary youth in Delaware do not have to get orders from Berkeley to attack their local draft board. News of one accident spreads quickly enough from coast to coast in the radical underground, and the very knowledge that a war is underway gives support and encouragement all around."⁴⁴)

Another bizarre symbiosis conspicuous among many of the revolutionary protesters is the connection between radicalism and libertinism, Che and sex. A recent inscription on a wall at Stanford University proclaimed "No universal revolution without universal copulation". The speeches of Eldridge Cleaver and Jerry Rubin relay the impression that the revolutionary process accelerates with the frequency of shouted obscenities. And it is easy to imagine the sovereign contempt with which the ascetic revolutionary of the Third World would view the porno-radicalism of Ralph Ginzburg's *Avant Garde* or Barney Rosset's *Evergreen Review*.

Strategic Reorientation of the Radicalized New Left

In many respects the year 1968 has played a crucial role in the radicalization of the New Left. Domestic confrontations and international tensions have been sharper than in the past several years, contributing to the emergence of a much clearer profile of the entire Movement, and particularly of its revolutionary wing. Two international events and three domestic confrontations should in this context be singled out. The Viet Cong's Tet offensive in South Vietnam in January and its impact on both American public opinion and on the policies of the Johnson administration furnished the militant war protesters with further evidence that their confidence in the Viet Cong's final success was well founded. The revolt of French radical students in May made an even more profound

impression on the American New Left. The vanguard role of small French radical groups (Anarchists, Mao-Castroists, Trotskyists) - groups usually overlooked as effective political bodies - inflamed kindred spirits on this side of the Atlantic. The near-success of rebellion in a developed Western capitalist country, and the French students' exploit to put into motion a massive working-class quasi-insurgence, remained as a powerful inspiration for future militant planning and actions.

On the domestic front the seizure and occupation of several buildings at Columbia University, in April-May, by an initially small group of students not only succeeded in paralyzing that prestigious university, but served as a worthwhile example of what to try elsewhere. The disturbances at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, in August, also receiving great publicity, transformed what could have been a political fiasco for the organizers, into a great propagandistic victory for their cause⁴⁵). Finally, the longest student strike in the history of American education, that which began in December 1968 at San Francisco State College, has had great impact upon the movement and the academic community in general. Owing to its duration, militancy, and the originality of the protest and disruption, the San Francisco State strike served as a prototype for the increasingly effective large-scale effort to embarrass both the academic and political "establishments".

All these events and experiences contributed to the ideological and strategic reorientation of the New Left, particularly of its most militant wing. The clearest outward sign of this reorientation was the aforementioned meeting of the SDS National Council at the end of December 1968. The main resolution of the meeting, entitled "Towards a revolutionary youth movement", was ideologically undistinguishable from the pronouncements of other communist groups. The main divisions and disputes at the meeting were those between the so-called "national collective", which includes most of the SDS national and regional staff, and the "student-worker alliance" composed of adherents of the Maoist Progressive Labor Party. Despite their disagreements, "both sides advocate a Marxist-Leninist class analysis of American society. Both agree that the industrial working class will be the central force for making a revolution. And both agree on the necessity of transforming the radical student movement into a broader anti-racist, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist class-conscious movement that will form an alliance with the working class."⁴⁶)

Ideology apart, the resolution signals a very important new step in future SDS strategy, tactics, and organization. The crucial decision, in the language of the resolution, was the official SDS abandonment of the earlier concept of student-power (described as "economism" of the radical movement, alluding to

Lenin's struggle at the beginning of the century against moderate social-democrats) and its transformation into a "youth movement that is revolutionary". Thus, the earlier emphasis on "anti-imperialist" struggle, was extended to cover "anti-capitalist" struggle, as well as "an anti-colonialist struggle against racism and the racist imperialist power struggle", consequently "for black liberation"

A special part of the resolution dealt with specific tasks which the broadened struggle will entail. Mere enumeration of some points will suffice:

"SDS organizers should direct the focus of their energies to organizing on campuses of working-class colleges, community schools, trade schools and technical schools as well as high schools and junior colleges. Attacks should also focus on the university as an arm of the corporations that exploit and oppress workers... SDS should move towards the building of alliances with non-academic employees on the campus based on struggle against the common enemy - the university...

... Some of us should move into factories... We should move into the liberation struggle now being fought inside the armed forces ... Dropout and forced-out youth both should be encouraged to join our movement".⁴⁷⁾

The spirit in which the meeting ended may be seen from a graphic description: "... the two opposing camps delivered volleys of chants back and forth. 'Ho Ho Ho Chi Minh' came from the national collective supporters, answered by 'Mao Mao Mao Tse-tung' from the other side."⁴⁸⁾

Although the decision to transform the existing student movement into a revolutionary youth movement has yet to be realized, the student radicals are well advanced in a nation-wide process of campus disruptions and confrontations with the academic authorities. This phenomenon has its "white" and "black" components, acting separately or in cooperation according to local campus conditions. Simultaneously, in the previously described secret and decentralized way, unknown militants are performing, both on and off campus, a higher level of destruction - sabotage.

Leaving aside this terroristic aspect of radical militancy, it is worthwhile to analyze briefly a basic document describing the techniques of organizing disturbances. It was written in 1967 by one of the most politically alert leaders of the SDS, Carl Davidson, and entitled "The Multiversity: Crucible of the New Working Class", with the subtitle "Long-range strategies for student power movements". Although, as seen above, the concept of student power had to be modified, Davidson's 18-page pamphlet is an extremely lucid and useful manual for

effective disruption of any college or university. While the intended Marxist analysis of students and lower-echelon faculty as the "new working class" remains doubtful from the standpoint of ideological orthodoxy, the chapter entitled "The Praxis of Student Power: Strategy and Tactics", is a remarkable Leninist document, using even, without mentioning the name of the author, the precepts of Lenin's well known neo-Machiavellian pamphlet *Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder* (Davidson goes so far as to subtitle one section "Socialism on One Campus, an Infantile Disorder"). The thrust of Davidson's argument is to instruct SDS militants to work inside the existing academic system, but to disregard the establishment rules: "Fighting for reforms and making a revolution". Psychologically and politically they should "wage an effective 'desanctification' program against the authoritarian institutions controlling us. The purpose of desanctification is to strip institutions of their legitimate authority." At the same time the militants should use all the available student institutions: they should staff the school newspapers and radio stations, and establish and maintain friendly contacts with local off-campus news media; they should participate in student government for the sake of political publicity and use its money to found desirable events - speakers, films, conferences, etc. They should insist in particular on civil liberties (free speech, right to organize) and on the abolition of on-campus repressive mechanisms (student courts, disciplinary tribunals, deans of men and women, campus police, and the use of civil police on campus). The strategic aim of these and similar piecemeal reforms is to achieve what Davidson calls "encroaching control": "There are aspects of the university's administrative, academic, financial-physical, and social apparatus that are potentially, if not actually, useful and productive. While we should try to abolish the repressive mechanisms of the university, our strategy should be to gain control, piece by piece, of its positive aspects" (underlined by Davidson). In addition to the above, the militants should call into life a series of organizations: Student Defense League, Teaching Assistants' Unions, Non-Academic Employees' Unions, SDS chapters. The final stage, "the most crucial and delicate", is the formation of a Student Strike Coordinating Committee. The strike should enhance radical consciousness among large numbers of the students and win partial victories for the movement. "Finally, the organizational form that should grow out of strike or series of strikes is an independent, radical, and political Free Student Union that would replace the existing student government". To what extent Davidson's ideas and instructions were useful and are used can be seen from countless SDS endeavors, coast-to-coast⁴⁹⁾.

The most experienced and imaginative leaders of the New Left feel certain that the process of revolutionary radicalization will in the future encompass larger and larger sections of the population. According to Julius Lester, probably the best columnist of the hard New Left, "the next step in the evolution of the

revolutionary process will be the move from self-defense to aggressive action". Foreseeing that the incidence of arson and other forms of damage to college buildings will increase, Lester singled out the "low-key warfare" existing already in black communities, particularly in East St. Louis. Since August 1968, more than fifty reported sniping incidents, as well as numerous fires, have affected profoundly the economic life of the city. In particular, "to the black community 'The Sniper' has become a hero. He is known to shoot only at whites or at blacks who are known enemies of the community. He is also known to be bold, able to strike at high noon or after midnight with equal impunity". Another bit of Lester advice is that radical activities be concentrated in medium-sized cities, where the police are less sophisticated and effective than in the large cities of the East and West (he cites in this connection the experiences of revolutionaries in China and Cuba, as well as the present tactics of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam). And then he concludes:

"If East St. Louis is any indication, the revolutionary process has entered another stage. At present, it is harassing action. Undoubtedly, it will be followed by terrorist action in the white community, and eventually all-out guerrilla warfare. It is to be hoped that the white radical movement will be able to relate effectively to what is developing in the black community."⁵⁰)

The Scope of New Left's Successes

In view of its limited size, the impact, both domestic and international, of the militant New Left is remarkable. According to Mark Rudd, the fiery leader of the Columbia rebellion, "the 'organized' left on campus had been small - perhaps 150 were active in SDS, if that - but the number who identified with the left, with opposition to the war and to racism and now, the whole structure of capitalism, grew to immense proportions"⁵¹) Before entering into discussion of why and how small numbers of organizers are so effective, it is informative to quote a statement by the Harvard sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset about "the powerful 2 per cent":

"According to national surveys of student opinion taken by the Harris Poll in 1965 and the Gallup Poll in 1968, approximately one-fifth of the students have participated in civil rights or political activities (17 per cent in 1964-1965, the year of the Berkeley revolt, and 20 per cent in 1967-1968, the year of the McCarthy and Kennedy campaigns). The radical activist groups generally have tiny memberships. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) claims a total membership of about 30,000 out of a national student body of 7 million of which about 6,000 pay national dues. A Harris Poll of American students taken in the spring of 1968 estimates that there are about 100,000 radical activists,

or somewhere between 1 and 2 per cent of the college population. A Gallup survey also conducted in the spring of 1968 reports that 7 per cent of male students indicate that they will refuse to go, if drafted"⁵²)

It is obvious that such a small fraction of the student population could not perform its spectacular role, if other elements did not exist to facilitate its endeavors. Without entering into details one may enumerate the following factors: 1. the existence of large segments of "existential protesters", who in view of their own "alienation" may under given circumstances be mobilized and used as invaluable allies; 2. the persistence of either offcampus (war in Vietnam, racial relations) or campus issues (outdated administrative structures, student participation in university decision-making process, relevance or irrelevance of curricula) which most legitimately concern wide categories of students, and which if properly handled (in the sense of the aforementioned Carl Davidson blueprint) can serve as pretexts for "confrontation" with the authorities. With his remarkable frankness Mark Rudd admitted that "the essence of the matter (at Columbia was) that we are out for social and political revolution, nothing less"⁵³) however, the SDSers skillfully used larger issues - the Columbia Community gymnasium in the Morningside Park and the university relations with the Institute of Defense Analysis - to arouse wider interest. Once on the collision course with the authorities they knew that a student solidarity, in part generational, would work in their favor. 3. The vacillation of university administrators, lacking the imagination and firmness to forestall confrontations and forced, in desperation, to call for police intervention, enhances student solidarity and remains one of the weakest links in the entire chain of academic disruptions. This weakness is compounded by the usual division among faculty members, with the minority supporting rebellious students and giving them precious help, and the majority passively and helplessly watching what happens.

An understanding of the radicalization of the New Left requires a precision concerning the impact which various openly communist youth groups have exercised on that movement. One New Left writer has elucidated that complex relationship in a concise and convincing way:

"Writers such as Jack Newfield, in *A Prophetic Minority*, and Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, in *The New Radicals*, have been quick to dismiss the DuBois Clubs (W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, founded in California and under the strong influence of the Moscow-oriented Communist party of the United States), YSA (the Trotskyist-oriented Young Socialist Alliance), and May 2nd (the presently extinct youth organization largely controlled by the Maoist Progressive Labor Party) as being simply hereditary remnants of the Old Left. I am reluctant to do this. Granted that

the rhetoric and style of these groups may in varying degrees be foreign to New Leftists, it is still true that the DuBois Clubs provided an organizational vehicle for many New Left activists, and that the YSA and May 2nd have influenced the thinking of thousands of young radicals outside their own ranks. YSA's work in building up anti-war committees has been important. May 2nd played a vanguard role for the New Left in some ways, by raising issues such as imperialism, the draft, and university involvement with the military in advance of their being pushed by SDS.⁵⁴⁾

Most significant is here the New Left's desire (as exemplified in the case of the SDS) to maintain its separate existence and political style, while actively cooperating with and sympathetically reacting to the openly communist groups. More specifically, the revolutionary protesters have contributed the following to the common arsenal of political weapons of the radical movement:

1. The establishment and functioning of "free universities", whose avowed aim is to contribute to the radicalization of their students.

2. The annual Socialist Scholars Conference, supplying the ideological ammunition for a radical critique of capitalist society, and building a network of like-minded faculty across the nation⁵⁵⁾.

3. The spreading of unrest among high school students, both white and Negro. The mood of rebellion is nurtured by a network of nearly 500 "underground" high school papers, while according to a reliable source, the "national SDS headquarters has been overwhelmed by the flood of requests for literature from high school groups, and estimates an increase of about 800 per cent over last (1968) year"⁵⁶⁾.

4. The assertiveness of a new radical left group, called Women's Liberation, coinciding with a major SDS drive toward the radicalization of women⁵⁷⁾.

5. A new and ingenious device to influence and change the so-called underground press "from a reflection of an isolated phenomenon into a self-conscious agent of revolution":

"A major agent effecting the change of the local papers into radical weapons is Liberation News Service. Headquartered in New York, twice weekly it mails out packets to more than 150 local underground papers, whose combined circulation is estimated at over 1,000,000. Each week it brings roughly 60 pages of national and international news to Bloomington, Seattle, and Jackson, to Madison, to Albuquerque, to Dallas."⁵⁸⁾

6. The functioning of so-called "Guerrilla Theaters", performing in parks or street corners, with the aim, as explained by Ronnie Davis, director of the San Francisco Mime Troupe, to bring to the public "thoughts, images, observations and discoveries that are not printed in newspapers nor made into movies: truth that may be shocking and honesty that is vulgar to the aesthete... Like a life that is valuable, you must begin by dropping out, getting away, leaving behind, dumping, junking the waste of dishonorable middle class institutions, groups, ideas and debris. That is the prescription for a theater company that is meaningful."⁵⁹⁾ To a similar category belongs "the radical newsreel project", designed "to make and distribute short films for use in radical organizing"⁶⁰⁾

7. The creation of an "international intelligence network" as explained in an SDS pamphlet at the occasion of launching in 1967 The Radical Education Program (REP):

"REP is assisting the development of a network of people, in the U.S. and abroad, closely tuned to international events, who will serve the movement as quick, incisive sources of intelligence on issues as they develop — and before. Such a network, including scholars, journalists, leftist youth leaders, government officials, guerrilla leaders, etc., can provide us with first-hand reports and analysis of the action of insurgent movements, the working of the foreign policy apparatus, hints of impending developments. Already we have contacts in Latin America, Japan, most European countries and Canada, with Vietnamese rebels and neutrals, African nationalists, and others. These contacts will be extended, particularly as American scholars with special knowledge and contacts affiliate. One former staff member visited Guatemala last summer where he made extensive contacts with Guatemalan guerrillas. On the basis of such contacts we can greatly improve the ability of the movement to produce documented political analysis, to make independent judgments, to challenge 'official truth' and to base political opposition."⁶¹⁾

It is difficult to evaluate on a global scale the effectiveness of these extensive and intensive efforts to radicalize different sectors of the American population. Many of the claims of success consist in self-serving statements and purposeful exaggerations intended to create a "myth" of the New Left. But whatever its real impact, one should remain aware of the versatility and dynamism of the movement which influences millions of young Americans.

Difficulties, Problems, and Prospects of the New Left

Despite its success and progress in 1968, the New Left is still far from a situation which would inspire its more lucid leaders with optimism. "From the Bay Area to New York, we are suffering the greatest depression in our history. People are taking bitterness in their coffee instead of sugar."⁶² These words of Jerry Rubin reflect not only his present personal predicament (on October 29, 1968, the Cook County Grand Jury returned an Illinois State indictment against Rubin on two counts of "solicitation to commit mob action", in view of his role in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention, a felony punishable on each count with 1-5 years in the state penitentiary) but the mood of the movement as such. Similarly, a San Francisco Bay Area radical leader of unimpeachable credentials, bluntly dismissed the possibility of a revolution in the United States in the near and even foreseeable future as a "myth", denounced the movement's organizations, particularly on campus, as "arenas for frustrated, competing egos", and concluded that "we need a program with realizable objectives which, if met, will increase the likelihood of further change."⁶³ Let us try then to identify some of the reasons causing the present "depression".

With former President Johnson's decision not to seek reelection and the ensuing deescalation of the war in Vietnam, the issue of U.S. involvement in the war has become progressively less effective as a means of arousing mass militancy. The huge mass parades and demonstrations which in the previous years had assembled hundreds of thousands of participants, had dwindled to much smaller proportions. Instead of the 150,000 to 500,000 demonstrators whom the organizers claimed to expect in Chicago last August, there were no more than 12-15,000. The announced massive disruption of the November presidential elections did not materialize. Similarly, the counterinaugural parade during the weekend of January 18-20, organized by the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (which was instrumental in assembling in previous years hundreds of thousands of peace marchers and protesting groups from moderate-liberal to the reddest left) attracted no more than 10,000 predominantly youthful demonstrators, belonging essentially to the far-out radical groups. A correspondent of the *Guardian*, the best and, politically, the most astute radical paper in the country, wrote gloomily about a "ritual dance losing its significance", and concluded: "What happened in Washington was an indication of the growing decline of the anti-war movement."⁶⁴

Even on the campus, where the New Left claims its greatest victories, the situation is not uniformly optimistic. To illustrate this the best example may be drawn from an article written by a radical student under the title: "Colum-

bia: a movement in collapse."⁶⁵ The article attributes the "collapse" to a series of interconnecting factors: the attitudes and manipulations of a new, more sophisticated university administration; concession allowing the Harlem community to decide the fate of the controversial gymnasium; lack of community support for SDS this fall; the rise of the liberal students' interest in "restructuring" the university; the SDS chapter's overemphasis of spontaneity and confrontation; and "the failure of the movement to consciously build an organization to withstand repression and cooptation by the university, as well as reach out to the average Columbia student with a relevant program". The SDS offensive at Stanford in January 1969 against the university structure and policies, was described by a sympathetic observer - as "faltering", adding that "it appears that SDS is operating within a defeatist frame of reference."⁶⁶ The end of student strikes at San Francisco State College and at the University of California at Berkeley in March, although far from settling the problems besetting these campuses, was not a radical victory either. On the other hand, the seizure of University Hall at Harvard and the forcible ejection of deans and their assistants by radical students, and the emergence of an armed group of black and white students after a 36-hour occupation of the students' union at Cornell University in April, along with the countless major and minor incidents on campuses throughout the country - all this confirms the point that the radical protest movement experiences ups and downs and does not follow a uniformly ascending or descending line⁶⁷.

Of even greater concern to the militants is the reaction of the public authorities. "Because we are striking so deep", complains Rubin, "arrests and trials and court appearances and jail have bottled up resources, sapped energy, and demoralized the spirit... If 1968 was 'The Year of the Heroic Guerrilla', then 1969 will be 'The Year of the Courts' ". Rubin's conclusion therefore was that "we must attack the myths surrounding the courts as ferociously as we have attacked the American myths of war, apple pie, your friendly neighborhood cop, and 'free election' ".⁶⁸

While the preceding remarks concerned the outer limits of the movement's activity, namely its "confrontationist" tactics, inner difficulties remain of potentially greater magnitude. Despite the apparent unanimity of their revolutionary phraseology, the revolutionary protesters are far from agreeing about the general direction and organizational forms the movement should take. Two schools of thought confront each other. According to some, such as Herbert Marcuse, the New Left would make a cardinal mistake if it were to adopt any of the traditional forms of organization. "No party whatsoever I can envisage today which would not within a very short time fall victim to the general and totalitarian political corruption which characterizes the political

universe. No political party, but also no revolutionary centralism and no underground." What then should be the solution:

"... what we have to envisage is some kind of diffuse and dispersed disintegration of the system, in which interest, emphasis and activity is shifted to local and regional area... What we can envisage is not, as I said, this large centralized and coordinated movement, but local and regional political action against specific grievances — riots, ghetto rebellions and so on, that is to say, certainly mass movements which in large part are lacking political consciousness and which will depend more than before on political guidance and direction by militant leading minorities."⁶⁹)

Marcuse's rejection of a "unification strategy", his reconciliation with the leftist splits ("The left has always been split! Only the right, which has no ideas to fight for, is united!"), and his insistence on the revolutionary role of small and dispersed groups, is rejected by another school of thought, most vividly represented by Julius Lester. According to him,

" 'The movement' has reached a critical stage. It must move from an action-oriented movement which was, in the main, concerned with single issues (the war and/or the universities) to a broad-based, multi-level movement which will change the political and economic structure of the country... That means developing a movement which has leaders, not personalities; theory, not rhetoric; strategy beyond demonstrations. We must realize that no one blow will topple the empire. It will take hundreds of thousands of little ones. That can only happen when we consciously make each of our acts relate to furthering the revolution. This means everything from the way you say good morning to how you plan to rob a bank to finance your organization. In the revolutionary, the personal life and the political life merge and become one."⁷⁰)

More important than these rather abstract considerations, is the fact that the fragmentation of the radical left prevents the building of a genuine unity of thought and action. In the opinion of a competent observer, "SDS is threatened, not only by serious ideological divisions, especially with the Maoists, but, what is worse, by sociopaths like those who form the 'Motherfucker' faction. This group has eliminated whatever political content might originally have existed in the New Left by denying the possibility of individual sanity in a corrupt society, and resorting to mental terrorism. 'The future of our struggle is the future of crime in the streets', their leader has proclaimed ... They disrupt the SDS's own meetings, surely a case of the chickens coming

home to roost. Those in the SDS leadership who are politically serious and committed, despair at the problem of such enraged. But, at least for the present, there is little they can do about it."⁷¹)

In the present agglomeration of the New Left, especially in its two most prominent symbols — the Red and the Black flags — reappears the famous 19th century revolutionary dualism:

"... what's important about the two flags is, of course, that they represent two different currents in our movement. It seems likely that these two currents will diverge, splitting the 'New Left' down the middle along the lines of anarchist versus traditional socialist. This would be a disaster for all parts of the movement — except the FBI caucus."⁷²)

The "Bohemian New Left", or the neo-anarchist hippies and Yippies discussed earlier, present a similar type of problem to the New Left. While Julius Lester enthusiastically hails the Yippies as "a liberated zone,... a hard slap, a kick in the crotch, a bunch of snipers pinning the enemy down and making him afraid to move"⁷³) others on the hard Left look at the bohemians in radical politics with utter contempt: "A boy on pot or heroin does not plot the overthrow of the existing order. Decadence never made a revolution... I used to think bohemia was a suicidal mistake, but now I see it as a murderous disorder."⁷⁴) To complicate even further the reality of fragmentation among the white radicals, the militant unity of action they dream to achieve with the Black revolutionaries remains most often a dead letter. The Blacks are deeply suspicious about the whites' revolutionary seriousness⁷⁵), and their nationalism pushes them to adopt within the radical movement, the attitude of "separate but equal". They also fight among themselves, often fiercely⁷⁶). They are, in turn, criticized by the American Maoists for lacking ideological consistence⁷⁷). For trained and disciplined communists the New Left, colored or not, even when it adopts Marxist-Leninist phraseology, represents no more than a recruiting ground.

A final observation should be made with respect to the perspectives of the revolutionary protesters. Even their greatest successes, disrupting momentarily campus life, were and still are easy successes for the simple reason that the universities are not conceived or built to sustain violent confrontations⁷⁸). At any moment, anywhere, determined minorities can easily break asunder "the house of intellect". But then, if the wreckers are successful and determined to pursue their revolutionary road the real confrontation begins: the confrontation with all entrenched institutions, authorities, and interests of a complex industrial

society. The accession to power (a perspective that fascinates the would-be-revolutionaries) can be achieved either peacefully, through the electoral process, or violently, through a well-planned coup d'etat or a genuine popular uprising. The radicals reject the former means and the instrumentalities of the latter are beyond their reach. Realistically enough, it is with the public at large that the college-centered revolutionaries are least popular. If they continue to effectively disrupt the fabric of society, and if the constitutional authorities fail to maintain law and order (understood in the democratic sense of these words) the outcome may be a violent one. The beneficiary, however, will not be the radical left but some variety of a rightist backlash mildly represented in 1968 by George Wallace. The United States, fortunately, is not Weimar Germany or pre-fascist Italy, but if here, as there, the democratic center should fail to prevent anarchy, the emerging victor will be the hard right and not the hard left.

Leaving this gloomy consideration aside, one may say that at the present moment, taking into account all the achievements, shortcomings, and problems of the movement, the following observations of Julius Lester summarize quite adequately the nature and the impact of the radical movement:

"To a limited degree, it is clear that we are involved in revolution. A revolution, however, is not the revolution, and too many of us mistake the former for the latter. The revolution we are presently involved in is a cultural one, an uprising of the young against the values which the society is based upon and perpetuates. It is a revolution that has involved an explosive and painful groping for new life styles, new mores, new music, new uses of the mass means of communication... It has been a cultural revolution, but not a political revolution. It has been a cultural revolution with political consequences, political ramifications, political meaning, because culture and politics cannot be separated. It has been a middle-class cultural revolution, bearing no similarity to the cultural revolution in China, which was named with scientific precision the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. The proletariat have been the spectators of our revolution, eagerly reading the newspapers and magazine articles about us, but still regarding us as different from them... Although our revolution has threatened the nation's sense of psychological security, the economic structure remains intact... The revolution is not yet. The seeds have been planted..."(79)

FOOTNOTES

- 1) Cf. Samuel Lubell's article "That 'generation gap'" in *The Public Interest*, Fall 1968, pp. 52-60.
- 2) *One-Dimensional Man*, Boston, 1964, p. 257.
- 3) What this writer has categorized here as existential protesters is described from a different point of view by Professor Arthur P. Mendel in his article "Robots and Rebels", *The New Republic*, January 11, 1969. Mendel describes what he calls "the Great Refusal" of the present student generation, and enumerates the following characteristics of their "quiet revolution": "revival among the social sciences of personalist, subjectivist approaches...; the spread of the humanistic psychology movement; ... upsurge of anthropological studies of primitive societies, religious studies in mythology, and historians' interest in aristocracies; the richly emotional qualities of contemporary art; the leisure and sexual-sensual liberation; the growing influence of the underground church..." He stresses the absence of programs and leadership within this diffuse movement.
- 4) *Containment and Change*, New York, 1967, p. 146.
- 5) *The Port Huron Statement*, New York 1964, pp. 7 and 31.
- 6) *National Guardian*, July 15, 1967.
- 7) *Guardian*, June 22, 1968.
- 8) *Ibid.*, January 11, 1969.
- 9) *Oracle*, January 1967.
- 10) Warren Hinckle, "A Social History of the Hippies", *Ramparts*, March 1967, p. 9.
- 11) *The Militant*, January 8, 1968. In a conversation published in the monthly newspaper, *Movement*, November 1968, Rubin expounded some of his basic ideas: "... most of the important things I do I do under drugs. ... It breaks down that kind of logic you learn in school, that ABCD chronological shit. ... (The role of the radicals in the universities is) to destroy it or drop out. ... The people on the campus movements who are Marxists never really know about what is happening in the country and they are really swimming in their own rhetoric. ... We're a new breed - we take dope, exotic religion, strange customs, you know we look like the man from Mars, and that is like a total message to middle-class America. ... Don't pay attention to what your parents, your teachers, your ministers, your doctors, your neighbors say, they don't know nothing".
- 12) *Free* (Abbie Hoffman), *Revolution for the Hell of It*, New York, 1968, p. 70. One of the fascinating aspects of this book is the author's explanation of how the Yippies planned the disruption of the Chi-

- cago convention by systematically creating a vast myth of their strength and intentions, with the inspiration found in Marshall McLuhan's ideas. See particularly pages 102-103.
- 13) Cf. his interview given to the weekly *Révolution africaine*, No. 239, September 11-17, 1967.
 - 14) It is interesting to note that in two of his columns Ralph McGill wrote about "Havana money" as the source of a sudden affluence of the previously financially broken Snick. "In early 1966 talk of 'Havana money' became current. SNCC, unable to meet payrolls, was suddenly able to form a front and purchase a \$ 65,000 building." *Palo Alto Times*, September 14, 1966. See also McGill's column in the same paper two days earlier. The present writer is not aware that Snick sued McGill for libel, or even issued a denial concerning these allegations.
 - 15) *Revolución africaine*, same issue as in footnote 13.
 - 16) Cf. for instance his "Pronunciamento", address given at Berkeley Community Center and printed in the December 21, 1968, issue of the weekly *The Black Panther*. The disjointed vehemence of this talk, with obscene words used in practically every sentence, can be partly explained by Cleaver's own admission that following Rubin's advice he got "stoned" that night.
 - 17) *Granma*, Havana, English edition, August 25, 1968.
 - 18) As quoted in *On the Barricades*, *Journal for the Protection of All Beings*, No. 2, 1968 (this publication took Marcuse's sentence from *Los Angeles Free Press*).
 - 19) *Partisan Review*, Winter 1967, pp. 57-58.
 - 20) From Genet's description of the Chicago National Convention of the Democratic Party, *Esquire*, November 1968, p. 88.
 - 21) From Sartre's preface to Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York, 1968, p. 22.
 - 22) Susan Sontag, *loc. cit.*, p. 57. Miss Sontag adds that "Old folks like Paul Goodman and Edgar Z. Friedenberg have, of course, been suggesting this for a long time".
 - 23) *The Gutenberg Galaxy*, Toronto, 1962, p. 269. See also chapter "The Medium Is the Message", in Marshall McLuhan's *Understanding Media: the Extensions of Man*, New York, 1966.
 - 24) Brigid Brophy reviewing Norman O. Brown's book *Love's Body* in *The New York Times Book Review*, July 24, 1966, p. 3.
 - 25) *Eros and Civilization*, New York, 1961, p. VIII.
 - 26) Nat Hentoff, "A Sanity Test for Self and Society", *Evergreen Review*, No. 60, November 1968, pp. 51 and 53.
 - 27) From his article "So Who's Not Mad?" in *Dissent*, March-April 1966, p. 167.
 - 28) *The Temper of Our Time*, New York, 1967, p. 69.

- 29) Quoted in Saul Landau's article "C. Wright Mills. The Last Six Months", *Ramparts*, August 1965, p. 48.
- 30) Robert Paul Wolff, Barrington Moore, Jr., Herbert Marcuse, *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Boston, 1965, p. 81.
- 31) *Ibid.*, p. 106.
- 32) *Ibid.*, p. 110.
- 33) *One-Dimensional Man*, p. 256.
- 34) "The New Marxism of the Intellectuals", *The New Leader*, November 4, 1968.
- 35) "Two, Three, Many Columbias", *Ramparts*, June 15, 1968, p. 40.
- 36) *Young Radicals, Notes on Committed Youth*, New York, 1968, p. 254.
- 37) *Ibid.*, p. 256.
- 38) Paul Jacobs, author and unsuccessful candidate for U.S. senator in California, developed at length this concept at a TV debate in San Francisco in the fall of 1967.
- 39) Oglesby's complete sentence reads: "The fundamental revolutionary motive is not to construct a Paradise but to destroy an Inferno." *Op. cit.*, p. 147. In his previously quoted interview with *Révolution africaine*, Carmichael called the United States "la garce du monde", and stated: "... le vrai impérialiste aujourd'hui est l'Occident Blanc, le principal bourreau, c'est les Etats-Unis".
- 40) Quoted in *The New York Times Magazine*, February 9, 1969.
- 41) From a 3-page mimeographed tract, entitled "For a Revolutionary Culture", distributed by the Black Panther Party in Roxbury, Massachusetts.
- 42) At the bottom of page 9 of the manual it is stated: "This pamphlet was prepared in Toronto, Canada. It has been distributed to 327 anti-Vietnam war groups across the United States."
- 43) George Prosser, "An Introduction to Elementary Tactics", *Black Politics*, January-February, pp. 18-26.
- 44) *Left Speaks Out*, Peoria, Illinois, n. d. (probably February 1969). - Quite congruently, an article entitled "Saint Dynamite", printed in the underground paper *San Francisco Express Times*, November 20, 1968, contained the following sentence: "... I got a letter this afternoon from the cats who did the ROTC bombing in Berkeley, they're in Canada now. They said the farthest out thing was the pig who was asleep in his car across the street from the Hall when it blew up. And they just drove past him and outdistanced him in a stolen Volkswagen. That's another important point. Always steal a car to do a job if possible."
- 45) The grave mistake of the Chicago authorities was that they have fallen into the trap prepared by the Yippies. They have accepted literally the

- Yippies' calculated boast about hundreds of thousands of wild demonstrators converging on Chicago. Police "overkill" not only saved the face of protesters but allowed them to reap unexpected political dividends.
- 46) Carl Davidson, "SDS makes big strides in analysis", *Guardian*, January 11, 1969.
- 47) *Ibid.*, January 18, 1969.
- 48) *Ibid.*, January 11. It is interesting to note that Mike Klonsky, SDS national secretary presented the draft of the resolution which was adopted by the meeting. His main opponent was Fred Gordon, SDS educational secretary and a member of the Student-Worker Alliance within SDS.
- 49) Davidson, in fact, may be considered as a chief strategist of the campus radical movement. In a more recent article (*Guardian*, December 21, 1968) he offered his readers practical advice on how to initiate "political struggles against the capitalist content of classroom courses". He foresees three phases. The first consists in having a single class participant "challenge bourgeois intellectual hegemony with an anti-capitalist critique of the day-to-day content of lectures, texts and course materials". The second phase is then the recruiting of sympathetic students from the class into a caucus; finally, "the group can move to confront the capitalist forms imposed on the class grades and competitive exams and term papers".
- 50) *Guardian*, January 25, 1969.
- 51) From his article entitled "Symbols of the Revolution", printed as an appendix in Jerry L. Avorn, *Up Against the Ivy Wall. A History of the Columbia Crisis*, New York, 1968, p. 292.
- 52) *The Public Interest*, No. 13, Fall 1968, p. 45. The SDS, however, gives different figures about its membership. According to Carl Davidson, during 1968 the SDS virtually doubled its size to about 100,000 national and local members in about 350 chapters. *Guardian*, January 11, 1969.
- 53) *Loc. cit.*, p. 291
- 54) James P. O'Brien, "The New Left, 1965-67", *Radical America*, vol. II, no. 5, September-October 1968, p. 6.
- 55) For details about these conferences, their agendas, speakers and papers, see Alice Widener, *Student Subversion*, New York, 1968.
- 56) Diane Divoky, "The Way It's Going To Be", *Saturday Review*, February 15, 1969, p. 102. The same article quotes the following views of a fifteen-year-old music critic of a high school underground paper: "Everything the adult Establishment does is not just undesirable, but repugnant to us. The real hero today is the person who can mess up the society and pervert the youth."
- 57) Cf. Peter Babcox, "Meet the Women of the Revolution, 1969", *The New York Times Magazine*, February 9, 1969.

- 58) Margie Stamberg, "Putting Out a Movement News File", *Guardian*, January 25, 1969.
- 59) "Guerrilla Theater", *Guardian*, April 27, 1968. For more details about the "guerrilla drama", see *Time* magazine, October 18, 1968, p. 72.
- 60) Gerald Long, "Radical Media: the Newsreel", *Guardian*, April 20, 1968.
- 61) "The Radical Education Project: An Introduction and an Invitation", *Ann Arbor*, 1967, p. 5.
- 62) "Emergency Letter", *Peninsula Observer*, February 3-9, 1969.
- 63) Peter Ware, "To Win the War We Must Win the Battles", *Ibid.*, March 11-17, 1969.
- 64) Jack A. Smith, "D. C. Action Marks End of an Era", *Guardian*, January 25, 1969.
- 65) *Guardian*, October 12, 1968. See the rebuttal by Eric Mann, an SDS organizer in the New England region, under the title, "Collapse at Columbia? A Denial", *Guardian*, December 21, 1968.
- 66) Carrie Iverson and Marc Sapir, "SDS Offensive Falters", *Peninsula Observer*, February 3-9, 1969.
- 67) Here is just one example of how cautious one should be in evaluating the campus events. In an otherwise highly informative and intelligent article ("Beyond New Leftism", *Commentary*, vol. 47, no. 2, February 1969, p. 71) Steven Kelman optimistically stated that the SDS at Harvard has been "in a state of drastic decline", attracting in 1968 "about a half the number of people to its meetings as compared with the previous year". A few months later, however, Harvard was facing the most serious student disturbance in its history, staged largely by the SDS.
- 68) *Peninsula Observer*, February 3-9, 1969.
- 69) *San Francisco Express Times*, December 18, 1968.
- 70) *Guardian*, January 4, 1969.
- 71) Same source as quoted in footnote 67.
- 72) "The Red and Black", *The Old Mole*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, vol. 1, no. 1, September 13, 1968. Cf. on the same subject the article by Paul Goodman, "The Black Flag of Anarchism", *The New York Times Magazine*, July 14, 1968.
- 73) *Guardian*, March 30, 1968.
- 74) Leslie Woolf Hedley, "Reflections on 'The Bohemian Left'", *The Minority of One*, March 1966, pp. 22-23.
- 75) "This (SDS) is probably the largest undisciplined so-called revolutionary organization that exists. They are the group which says to their members, 'Everyone do your own thing', and so nothing gets done... There won't be any black-white unity until there is first some white unity or white folks starting to change the decadence in a revolutionary manner." William Leach

- (member of the Detroit Black Panther Party): "Perspective Whiteleft: Serious or Not", *The Chicago Seed*, vol. 3, no. 6, 1969.
- 76) Cf. Julius Lester's article, "SNCC-Panther Split", *Peninsula Observer*, September 9-22, 1968. At the campus of the University of California at Los Angeles, two student militants of the Black Panther Party were killed, on January 17, 1969, by the members of the rival Black organization called US.
- 77) A Statement by the Black Liberation Commission of the Progressive Labor Party, criticized "the Panther tendencies towards Yippieism", and said that "the vital need of the Panthers is to develop an understanding of Marxism-Leninism". *PL*, February 1969, pp. 31 and 32. The same organ of the PLP, in its October 1968 issue, strongly criticized, in a lengthy article, Stokely Carmichael's "anti-communism", and particularly his statements that "Communism is not an ideology suited for Black people", while "racism ... is far more important than exploitation".
- 78) Cf. some brilliant observations on this theme in Professor Daniel Bell's article, "Columbia and the New Left", *The Public Interest*, Fall 1968, p. 90.
- 79) "But Is It The Revolution?" *Peninsula Observer*, January 27 - February 3, 1969.

THE ORIGIN, DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT
OF THE NEW LEFT IN BRITAIN

by
C. H. Ellis

The emergence during the past few years of a new movement in the Western world, often referred to as the 'New Left', has given rise to much speculation and inquiry as to what this movement represents, its origin and motivation, its objectives, and the extent to which it is associated with other political and social movements of protest throughout the world.

The designation 'New Left' is usually applied to a diversity of groups, which vary from country to country, but which have one common factor: protest and even revolt against traditional and established parties and institutions, whether these belong politically to what is generally recognised as 'Right' or 'Left', or are part of the social, economic, educational and administrative structure of society. It is thus revolutionary in essence, but the diversity of those groups which are usually classified under the title 'New Left', comprising elements which extend from orthodox Communism, Trotskyism, neo-Marxism and more or less conventional Socialism to Peace movements, supporters of Christian-Marxist unity, Pacifists, Syndicalists, and even Nihilists and Anarchists, rather suggests that the designation 'New Left' may be a misnomer, and that all that is new in the 'movement' is the effort to bring together a number of groups and organisations, many of which are basically in conflict with each other, to form a unified revolutionary front against the established order.

Before considering the circumstances as to how this has come about, it may be helpful to deal briefly with the post-war development in Britain of the 'Old Left', i.e., the more or less traditional Left that extended from the rump of the old Liberal Party, the Parliamentary Labour Party with its Trades Union background, to the relatively weak but active Communist Party and the splinter groups that developed in the late '50s and early '60s.

The part played by the Labour Party and the small remnant of the once powerful Liberal Party, both in and out of office, can only be briefly surveyed within the compass of a paper of this kind. Suffice to say that Labour Party and socialist doctrine, in conflict with the exigencies of political and economic circumstances of the post-war world, has been obliged to conform to the realities

of the domestic and world situation, and is now closer to the traditional pragmatic radicalism of the first decade of this century and the traditional English Fabian type of socialism rather than to Marxist theory. This coming to terms with the realities of the situation is not unnaturally regarded by the more doctrinaire or idealistic elements of the Left, as a betrayal of socialist principles, and finds expression in the Left wing of the Labour Party, in certain sections of Trades Unionism, among the intellectual element which now plays a part in Labour politics, and more recently with idealistic groups which are concerned with World Peace, the threat of another war, racism and international actions, such as Vietnam, which are considered to be the outcome of imperialism or colonialism, or both.

That dissatisfaction with the part played by Labour in power, or its failure to play any effective part at all, finding its main support among the younger generation is not surprising, especially in view of the change in the role of Youth in the world of today, the widening of its possibilities for self-expression, its role as an economic factor, the growth of higher education, and the publicity given to its aims, tastes, likes and dislikes, by the mass media. The main support for dissatisfaction with the Government and with public and private institutions coming from the younger generations is generally considered to be an expression of its 'frustrations', disillusionment and anxieties, largely arising from its lack of participation in the forces, political, social and economic, which encompass their lives and influence their outlook. There are, however, other factors to which reference will be made later.

It is significant that this turning away from traditional, political, social and moral concepts has not found expression to any marked degree in the growth of the Communist Party, which claims to represent the purity of Socialist doctrine and to be the spearhead of the struggle against bourgeois and 'outworn capitalist' ideas.

Before considering the reason for this circumstance, let us turn for a moment to the part played by the British Communist Party in the developments which have led to the emergence of this 'New Left' movement in this country.

British Communist Party and the Old Left:

During the past 40 years or so, Communism and the Communist Parties throughout the West attracted the support and sympathy not only of important sectors of the European workers, but also numerous intellectuals, writers,

philosophers, historians, scientists, artists and members of the liberal professions, many of them distinguished in their own sphere.

In recent years many adherents of the Party as well as members of the Social Democrat parties and groups have been disillusioned, and have rejected or questioned their original political views, to form the vanguard of New Left 'protesters' against the alleged futility of existing parties and groups of the Left. Communist parties in an ever-growing number of countries seek a revision of Communist policies: Social Democrats want a new order of social democracy; students want to discard old traditional structures of society and participate in the running of universities and other educational institutions. Educated youth in general, press for increased participation in the mechanics of education, industry and government to enable them to overhaul the social and political structures they have inherited from their fathers, and which they now question.

In Britain, these developments have taken place at a slower pace than in most other Western European countries, and it is only in recent months that there has been an intensification of the call for reforms from a wider section of society, and in particular from students. To some people of all classes Communism hitherto seemed to be the best answer to social and economic disorder and the external threat of Fascism. Marxism became fashionable among many young intellectuals and the 'progressives' of Oxford and Cambridge and other universities. The great mass of students, however, were hardly influenced by the fashionable trend.

Many were converted to Communism without having encountered any of the propagandists of the British Communist Party. They found their new faith abroad or from reading some left-wing writer who might not even be a member of the C.P. at all. In the thirties the impact of the Spanish Civil War played its part in winning many young people of all classes over to the Marxist camp, more in protest against Fascism as exemplified by its part in the Spanish conflict than through study of Marxist theory. (Later disclosures of Soviet intrigue and the dubious role played by the Communists, brought about some reaction against Leftish attitudes. A few of those who took an active part in the Spanish struggle and survived the conflict and the 2nd World War helped to form the intellectual nucleus of the post-war Left).

The full employment of the post-war years prevented any considerable revival of urgent problems in home affairs. With Labour in power, and new social legislation making universal provision of pensions and National health benefits, the edge was taken off social protest. However, Communist Party membership grew slowly until 1944 when a decline set in, culminating in the wholesale withdrawal from

the Party during the crisis of 1956-7 which was closely linked with the events of the last years of Stalin's dictatorship, the Hungarian revolt and the revulsion of feeling against the Soviet aggression and hypocrisy. The remaining intellectuals in the British Communist Party, who took a keen interest in the international scene, were increasingly restive in this period, and chafed especially at the constant disposition of its leadership to take its cue from the Soviet Government. Actually this was far less marked than was the case before the war; nevertheless, during the immediate post-war years the BCP hardly ever deviated from the Russian 'line'.

In Britain the record of the Communist Party since its foundation has been one of immense effort but of tantalising disappointment. Compared with other European countries the BCP has never secured the allegiance of a mass following, nor has it won the trust and co-operation of the major organisations of the Labour movement. Its leaders have assumed a tutorial role of some importance in the development of Communism in parts of the former Empire, particularly in India, but this partial success only emphasises by contrast the failure at home. The main reason is readily apparent: throughout the whole period the British people have never been in a revolutionary mood. All the absurdities of the history of the party spring from this one fact, that the CP has been a revolutionary party in a non-revolutionary situation.

Beginning of Change

The ferment that occurred in the Communist world following the events in 1956, and in particular the revelations of Stalin's bureaucratic and terroristic reign, had its impact on the BCP to a marked degree.

The reaction from the disclosures at the 20th Party Congress in Moscow was intensified by the stand by Gomulka in Poland and the uprising of the Hungarian people and its suppression by the Soviet army. This brought about an open revolt in the BCP, especially when the party leadership continued to mouth the rationalisations of the Kremlin. This sudden change in the situation, which was later given the label of 'revisionism' by the pro-Chinese element, was marked by a number of milestones which are significant in the formation of the trend to which the name 'New Left' is now given. Among these are the following: the publication of an unofficial party 'opposition' journal, *The Reasoner*, the strong reaction within the party circles over a letter published by Communist Party intellectuals in the non-Communist press, and the emergence of a new wave of anti-intellectualism in the Party.

While 'Hungary' is commonly regarded as the crucial event in the emergence of what is currently entitled the 'New Left' in Britain, some of the insurgent

tendencies which came to a head in October-November 1956 had already been at work for some time past. The crises of that autumn, preceded by the shock of Khrushchev's disclosures about Stalin, gave form to a movement which until that date possessed for its only identifiable political signature a generalised dislike of nuclear weapons and a demand for disarmament.

'Hungary' came to matter to most of those who, under the impulse of this event, left the Communist Party; the Suez crisis achieved similar status for left-wing elements in and around the Labour Party who had simultaneously become concerned over the racial struggle in South Africa and East Africa, and over the emerging colour problem in Britain consequent upon a post-war arrival of West Indian immigrants. The 'Peace' agitation against nuclear weapons and war in general was an element in the situation with a wider and non-party involvement, particularly among the younger generation, bringing together sections of the community with no particular party orientation with members of the CP and left-wing members of the Labour movement as well as many who had withdrawn from party discipline.

Those varied topics and changes in outlook coalesced to generate something like a unified attitude on the part of a left-wing intelligentsia for whom emancipation from Stalinism had somehow acquired an importance similar to concern over colonialism in Africa or dislike of the 'Establishment'.

The fact that these issues all tend to inhabit the same emotional plane, and to be debated with an equal degree of seriousness, testified to the truth — otherwise perceptible from the literary manifestations of the school — that the entire 'movement' is still in the main confined to students and intellectuals, although a serious effort is being made to enlist worker participation.

The 'new thinking' within the Labour Party provoked by the electoral defeat of 1955, was rendered more agonizing by that of 1959. It was in response to the earlier of these setbacks that the late Mr. Gaitskell obtained the leadership of the Labour Party with a programme of modernization; it was to satisfy the demand for a more streamlined type of socialist thinking that Mr. Crossland in 1956 published the *Future of Socialism*, the massive volume which has come to be regarded as the basis document of the Labour leadership's Keynesian faith. It may seem strange to couple this bulky manifesto of Labour's 'New Right' with the very different professions of the 'New Left'; but the intellectual tension between neo-Fabianism and neo-Marxism is very much part of the background against which socialist thinking in Britain currently seeks to define itself, as in the 'New Left May Day Manifesto'.

This pamphlet, first published in May 1967 by a group of socialist workers, university lecturers and writers, and recently published as a book, is socialist in content, but attacks the Labour Party and the present government, parliament and what it terms the 'new capitalism' which, it is claimed, now dominates Labour policies and determines its official attitude and action in both the domestic and international spheres.

Under the headings:

1. Labour and the New Capitalism
2. The Social Realities
3. The New Imperialism
4. War and Peace
5. The Policies of Socialism

the Manifesto presents an analysis of the domestic situation in Britain, her capitalist industrial and financial structure, international relations, economic position, education system, etc. which is similar in most respects to the viewpoint of Marxist writers on the subject. However, it makes no attempt to present solutions in Communist terms; Soviet type authoritarianism is condemned, but a programme of intense socialist propaganda, coupled with penetration of other political organisation, and association with 'New Left' organisations in Western Europe, Scandinavia and the United States is urged as the first stage in formulating policy for action.

Since the publication of the 'May Day Manifesto', there has been much activity in establishing provincial working committees which are engaged in working out a programme of action. This includes an effort to bring the ideas of the May Day Manifesto into the industrial field, to establish unity between workers, professional workers and students with a left wing background, and to plan a campaign for 'solidarity and joint action'. This involves agitation over questions of student participation, racial questions, industrial disputes, 'union democracy', demonstrations and 'teach-ins'. Communist influence in these developments is noteworthy, many of the leaders and promoters of action being party members, or belonging to such organisations as the International Marxist group, the International Socialist group and other 'splinter' or non-party Marxist groups.

The aim of the 'May Day Manifesto' group is to form a broad front with other extreme left parties and groups, and with this end in view it has staged a number of meetings and has formed a number of 'commissions' to study

particular questions, such as trades unions, education, imperialism, race etc. This effort culminated in the calling of a 'National Convention of the Left' at St. Pancras Town Hall in London on the 26th and 27th of April 1969 which was attended by representatives of most of the left wing and protest groups such as CND, Anti-Apartheid, the Young Communists, Young Liberals, International Marxists and the Christian Socialist movement. The promoters of the 'Convention' hoped to overcome deep and bitter divisions between the various groups and organisations, and to establish a common cause for action particularly in such questions as workers' control, extra-parliamentary action and rejection of institutional politics. The extent to which these aims seem likely to be achieved is not yet apparent, but there is evidence that the trend towards a more radical and extremist outlook among members of the various groups, including a large section of the student community, shows no signs of diminishing, and if anything, is being intensified as the prestige of the Labour Party in power suffers from circumstances which are largely beyond its control. The programme drawn up for the 'National Convention of the Left' is however clearly indicative of increased Marxist influence and indeed participation of those with 'official' connexions with the Communist Party and its affiliated organisations.

In his book *Contemporary Capitalism*, the late Mr. Strachey attempted to outline what he called a Social-Democratic position, midway between the Keynesian neo-Liberalism of the 'New Right' and the vestigial Leninism of the 'New Left'. This balanced approach does not come easily to the more strident ideologists of the 'New Left', but neither does his quiet acceptance of the end of British - if not Western - supremacy in world affairs appeal to the deeply ingrained outlook of his countrymen, whatever their party affiliation. It is well known to candid observers of the British scene that the 'imperial' nostalgia is shared by all classes and is by no means the special preserve of either the ruling stratum or the Tory defenders of tradition. Yet the painful discovery of this fact at the time of the Suez crisis in 1956 produced something like a traumatic shock on the Left; nowhere more so than among the London literary intelligentsia which had naively attributed its own pacific outlook to the majority of its countrymen, and was appalled to find that such sentiments evoked only the barest echo from the average Labour supporter.

From this brief enumeration it will be seen that the 'New Left' is far from being a uniform phenomenon; indeed, where it broadens out into an attack on the status quo in the Universities or in popular entertainment, its existentialist tendencies are more in evidence than neo-Marxist philosophy or its socialist adherents. Nonetheless, it is socialism that gives coherence to the movement, while cultural 'modernism' may be said to be among the features that it has in common with the more orthodox Liberalism of the 'Old Left'.

Socially this division between the 'old' and the 'new' Left - apart from the inevitable hiatus produced by the war, and the obvious difference between the political line-up of the 1930s and the 1960s - appears to reflect the cleavage between dissident 'Establishment' intellectuals and the new post-war intelligentsia which has come up by way of scholarships from the expanding secondary schools and lacks some of the social graces (as well as the characteristic snobberies) of its predecessors.

New Left Literary Expression

Since 1957 the principal literary exponents of the ideas of the new trend, prior to their amalgamation in 1959, had been two periodicals *New Reasoner* (NR) and the *Universities and Left Review* (ULR) with an estimated circulation of eight to ten thousand, when they combined to form the bi-monthly *New Left Review* (NLR). It is published by the *New Left Review Ltd.* with a board of nineteen director shareholders suggesting a careful balance of former Communists and traditional Left-Wing Socialists, with a slight numerical preponderance of the latter.

The fusion was, however, incomplete between these two groups, whose antecedents differed, not only with respect to politics and general outlook, but in regard to age groups. The *Universities and Left Review* (ULR) founders belong to the post war generation and are mostly in their early thirties, whereas the *New Reasoner* group are on an average several years older and include people with political experience going back to the 1930s. Having been closely linked with the Communist Party until the 1956 upheaval, NR tended to view political matters through Leninist spectacles even after the formal break with the CP, whereas the original ULR caucus at Oxford, which crystallized in the student excitement over Suez and Budapest, had no such ideological tendencies.

There was an important difference in that the NR group was centred on Yorkshire, and included some Trades Unionists, and in general showed a different social composition, some of its intellectual spokesmen having a working class background and links with the defunct 'Yorks Peace Group' (proscribed by the Labour Party). It was thus doubly outside the 'Establishment', a circumstance which lent a specific ring to its radicalism and likewise made it more dangerous to the CP than the rather more traditional (in British terms) London-Oxford middle class and student rebelliousness of the ULR.

The latter group, while larger, more ebullient, and with better facilities for spreading its views among students in London and at the two ancient seats of learning, was potentially naive, and to former Communists with some political

experience must have looked like a collection of youthful amateurs rather than a serious competitor. That in fact it turned out to be more successful in terms of public resonance (ULR's circulation steadily topped 8,000 almost from the first, while NR never got much above 2,500, including - it is claimed - some 250 in Europe (Eastern), and able to hold its own ideologically as well, must be attributed to the fact that some of its contributors had from the start struck a distinctive note which appealed to the ever-growing element of 'progressives' among the new intelligentsia, students and other restive sections of the community.

The growing convergence of NR and ULR thinking, as reflected in the editorial policy of both journals, gradually established the preconditions of a fusion which was consummated at the end of 1959. The offspring of the union, the *New Left Review* (NLR) soon displayed a very marked falling off in intellectual standards compared with its parent journals, although its appeal quite evidently reached a wider circle and met with more general response.

Although there is so far no embodied New Left Party with a coherent programme, a number of people who are to a greater or lesser degree out of sympathy with the policies and tactics of existing parties of the Left are actively engaged in seeking to establish a new programme of action which is evidenced by the programme of the Convention of the Left referred to above, and the intensification of agitation by the activist element among students. The mixture of political traditions which were at one time in conflict with each other - anarchism, Marxism, nihilism, liberal humanism, revived populism, existentialism, and black nationalism is an amalgam of dissent from existing ideological and political thinking, a reassessment of Marxism, a restatement of attitudes towards capitalism, colonialism, racial questions and disarmament, and on the more extreme fringe of its adherents, which embraces a section of students and some nihilistic elements, an iconoclastic tendency towards violence. The influence of certain writers, notably Marcuse, Debray, Wright Mills, and 'activists' such as Guevara, is noticeable in left-wing intellectual circles and among the more intense and dedicated student leaders, but to a markedly less degree than seems to be the case in France, Germany and even in the United States. British dislike of abstractions and suspicion of 'general ideas' no doubt plays a part in this tendency to concentrate on the concrete, and even the penchant of translating personal and purely local grievances into world issues, characteristic of student and youth protesters, seems to lack conviction, and to be a case of the emotional acceptance of slogans imposed by self-appointed leaders with a longing for power.

Students and the 'New Left'

Events in the United States, Germany and above all, France, have doubtlessly influenced the course of events here, and some of the more vocal exponents of protest in Britain pattern their attitudes and tactics on those of the self-appointed 'leaders' of revolt elsewhere, whose activities and expressed views have received wider press and television publicity than their abilities and achievements can be said to justify.

It is among students that the new trend towards dissent and violence has found its most active expression. The rapid expansion of universities and polytechnics since 1950 has produced a new type of student, less bound by traditional middle-class attitudes, and more subject to the influence of the mass media than students of the older universities had been. This is partly due to overcrowding, lack of suitable accommodation for students, and a tendency for the gap between staff and students to be accentuated by a number of causes arising mainly from too rapid growth of these institutions and the influx of a new kind of student.

Local discontent has been channelled into wider issues by the leaders of comparatively small groups of politically active students, many of whom are foreign nationals.

Tactics are apt to follow a pattern which draws its impetus from the Civil Right Movement in Berkeley University, and student disturbances in Berlin, Bonn and Paris; the grievances may be local but their form of expression and elaboration into wider issues is similar everywhere.

The view has been expressed by a section of the press that there is a centrally organised conspiracy behind student protests throughout the world, particularly in Europe, but no concrete evidence points to this. That students in different places often protest about similar things in exactly the same way cannot be coincidence; many students are affected by the same issues: the widespread criticism of the curricula of universities, lack of contact between staff and students, consensus politics, disenchantment with established political regimes, both of the Left and the Right, racial questions and major issues such as the Vietnam War. There is a great deal of international contact by individuals in staff and student exchanges and through the inter-availability of books and pamphlets, and the powerful effect of mass communications on immature minds. Even in the Soviet Union these influences are at work although subjected to official counter-action. The power of example is strong; young people are susceptible to the example of others in protests against real or imaginary abuses and transform their natural urge to assert themselves into less subjective issues.

Members of the Radical Students Alliance, which is a loose coalition of Communists, Trotskyists, and undefinable revolutionary types with a syndicalist background, have been actively engaged in an attempt to split the National Union of Students, and have embarked on a programme of mass demonstrations and 'direct action'. They have contacts with the syndicalist movement in France and elsewhere, and have produced a manifesto stating that the 'Association as an organised body must be able to take collective action on matters of general social concern'. 'We want to get rid of Capitalism'. The young Liberals were for a time closely associated with the RSA but have withdrawn; this leaves the extremists in control. In the large scale demonstration which took place in London towards the end of October, with the main emphasis on Vietnam, there was every indication of co-operation between the RSA and the International Marxist group (IMG) the recently formed Revolutionary Socialist Student Federation (RSSF) and other militant groups. A struggle took place between the leaders of militant and more moderate groups as to the manner in which this demonstration should be conducted, in which it was evident that the militant element was in favour of provocative action. Since then a number of demonstrations have taken place in London and provincial Universities, notably at the London School of Economics where 'sit-ins', obstruction of lectures, demonstrations and other manifestations of student protest led to the closure of the institution for a time. Led by a small group of dedicated revolutionary characters, a number of whom are American, many students who are by no means revolutionary in their outlook, have been led to participate in protest action against what they regard as repressive measures by the Chancellor and the university authorities in general to quell disturbances.

Student dissatisfaction with overcrowding, inadequate housing and teaching accommodation, the alleged irrelevance of much of the curricula to existing conditions, and insufficient student participation in university affairs is fairly general among students in most of the universities which suffer from the rapid increase in the number of students and perhaps failure to adjust some disciplines to the requirements of a changing world. These causes of unrest are seized upon by the extremist revolutionary element to secure leadership and promote interest in 'wider issues'. To a great extent, many of the demands of students in the domestic field have been, or are being fulfilled. Their idealistic demand for changes in the structure of society and a less materialistic outlook is widely shared, even if the object of many of those who advocate extremist and violent means to achieve these ends is suspect. The public statements, as reported by the press and by the mass media, notably in T.V. programmes, made by these largely self-appointed leaders of the 'Student Left' leave no doubt that they are not concerned with the particular problems and needs of students, except to exploit them in the interests of the revolutionary objectives to which they direct their activities.

Wider Issues

World affairs since 1945 are seen by writers adhering to the New Left movement mainly in 'neutralist' or pacifist terms, as a competition between two rival blocs whose latent enmity threatens to bring about a global conflict fought with nuclear weapons. But it also expresses with at least some of the sentiments voiced in Bertrand Russell's writings since 1957, and it is this brand of thinking which connects the New Left most closely with the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and the factional warfare of the Paris-based 4th International. In turn these are being succoured by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation which has inspired the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, spurned by the Communist Party, but drawing much of its strength from the New Left intelligentsia and students, who are stirred into action by contact between their opposite numbers in the U.S., Germany and France.

The borderline between pacifist and neutralist thinking e. g. the CND's demand that Britain leave NATO, which would appear to be a political rather than a moral issue - tends to be somewhat blurred. For the rest, racial problems, now that colonialism is as good as dead (except in the Soviet Union) are mainly envisaged in terms common to Socialist and Liberal democrats all over the Western world.

There is a marked reluctance to admit that working-class attitudes in this respect are not particularly 'progressive' and that middle-class Liberals - or even big business organisations - have been noticeably ahead of the 'common man' in working for racial equality. The attitudes of the London dockers and large sections of the working-class in Northern and Midland cities is a cause of great embarrassment, not only to the spokesmen of the New Left, but also to 'official' Labour and the Left in general.

The analysis of capitalism in general, and of British society in particular, has broken away from Fabianism and from rigid Leninist theorizing, but has not yet attained a theoretical level commensurate with the declared aim of providing the Labour movement with an up-to-date Socialist doctrine.

Disenchantment with government and criticism of aspects of the 'Affluent Society', the rat race, and the image of consumer capitalism are common to all classes, but in the case of a large section of student and 'advanced' youth groups, reformist concepts are out of date, and a form of nihilism fills the vacuum caused by the lack of positive ideas. It is noteworthy, however, that the great mass of workers are more concerned with securing a share of the products of 'consumer capitalism' than in changing the shape and content of its structure.

A sense of frustration is to be found in the growing feeling of helplessness of the ordinary man in relation to what is happening in the world, to the threat of war, as he sees it, and the impression that governments function mainly to perpetuate the existing apparatus of society. In Britain, the withdrawal from traditional centres of power and of national interest, the fluctuating value of money, the growing cost of living, shortage of housing, taxation and many other irritants - all these add to the restlessness and discontent of large sections of the public. Many feel that a change of government is merely a change of persons; the structure remains the same. Yet there is little sign of constructive thought on the part of those spokesmen of the New Left whose activity is mainly confined to exhibitionism and the promotion of violence.

To these mainly economic factors may be added the conflict of personal values and interests with values of the community as personified by the State, a weakening of belief in political and social movements, possibly deriving from the partial breakdown of the established social structure, and the present fluid state of society. Youth movements which in the past were dominated by more conventional, social, religious, national or even 'totemized' ideals, are now apt to reject 'society', traditional manners, morals and outlook, expressing these discontents with vague demands for change, often in nihilist or anarchistic terms. The old concepts, rituals and forms are no longer being accepted by a large section of the younger generation, who, however, have no clear idea as to what they want to take their place. This emphasis on the demands of youth, which the press, T.V. and the entertainment industry have fostered, is perhaps exaggerated as a social phenomenon. It gets a good deal of publicity and its cruder manifestations are topical subjects for the mass media and the commercial interests involved.

Other Influences

The 'ad-men' on both sides of the Atlantic have long since discovered how to exploit the comparatively affluent post-war youth society by stressing the importance of the new and modern, and the latest novelty, whether this be represented by articles of adornment or consumption or the manifestations of 'Pop' entertainment and display. In extolling, by assiduous propaganda and advertising (in which they have been assisted by the mass media), the tastes and immature outlook of Youth, with a capital Y, these are contrasted with the 'effete' manners concepts, tastes and viewpoints of past generations which are represented as stuffy, out-of-date and unworthy of attention. History, as the late Mr. Ford remarked, is 'bunk'.

This simplification and intensification of the age-old conflict of the generations widens out into other issues, and is channelled by the exponents of revo-

lutionary social and political change into wholesale condemnation of the past and contempt for tradition and the values on which western society has developed.

The extent to which this commercialized glorification of youth influences student and avant-garde youthful attitudes towards political issues may be open to question, but there can be little doubt that it is a factor in the readiness with which a large section of the younger generation reject authority, discipline, and older values, and become willing victims of the new mythologies. This decline in the acceptance of old established values and patterns of life is due to many causes, but it is unquestionably a factor in the widespread sense of frustration and emptiness of life felt by many people, and when coupled with the overcrowding in cities, schools and universities finds expression among a section of the young in revolt and violence.

The proportion of militants among students and young people in general is probably far less in this country than in several other western countries, notably the U.S.A. Among the youth of the large cities, particularly in industrial areas, it manifests itself in a kind of free and easy exhibitionism, and a disinclination to accept authority and direction, rather than in organised political and social protest. (The 'Hippie' and 'Drop Out' elements may be disregarded as political factors, although they are to be seen on the fringe of popular demonstrations, mainly engaged in drawing attention to themselves and their 'rejection of society').

The idea, which a section of the press sets out to present, to the effect that the student and workers disorders in Paris in May and June last year were an entirely new phenomenon, and represented a 'new awareness' on the part of youth, hardly fits in with the facts of history. The students and workers disorders in the 1840s in Paris and other European cities took forms that in many respects are similar to what recently happened in the same cities. The description by Flaubert in his well-known novel *L'Education Sentimentale* of the disorders in Paris at that time depicts demands and tactics of demonstration and disturbance that differ only in points of detail with the events around the Sorbonne in May. Turgenev's Bazarov, the youthful nihilist character of his novel *Fathers and Sons* has his many counterparts on the fringe of student disorder and rejection of society in our time.

As mentioned above, what began as an intellectual analysis of society and politics, already shows signs of being transformed into a Programme of Action. In the process the character of the movement undergoes a change as new elements are drawn into participation, committees are formed and new leaders take over, introducing their own pattern of action, based on a Marxist, or more often, on a somewhat confused version of the ideas prescribed by such writers

as Marcuse, Debray, Wright-Mills, Fanon and William Appleton Williams (to name a few), as well as by the emotional impact of the publicity given to the ideas of Mao and Che Guevara. On the intellectual level, however, these writers and revolutionary activists are probably less influential than they appear to be among militant youth organisations and groups here than in America and Germany. There are still many signs of dissension and confusion of aims among these latter, despite the very considerable effort that is being made by ambitious leaders to achieve a united front against 'capitalist society' and the political, educational and social 'establishments' as seen by them.

Despite setback, the Trotskyists are making progress, not only among students but also in the trades unions. Next in growing influence are the pro-Peking, or Maoists, many of whom are expelled Communists.

However, the BCP, with its widespread international connexions remains the strongest influence among the extremist element in New Left circles, despite the effects of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the confusing effects of the Moscow-Peking schism. Although recent events in Czechoslovakia have introduced a further element of confusion into their deliberations, Soviet ruthlessness, while condemned by some youth leaders, is given less prominence in public utterances and demonstrations than the U.S. role in Vietnam.

There is, however, a growing criticism among students and the younger generations in general against Soviet Russia and communism in action as exemplified by the USSR, and the efforts of the promoters of a New Left grouping are at pains to dissociate themselves from the blind support of Moscow and 'authoritarianism' that is characteristic of the died-in-the-wool Marxists. The propagandists of Hanoi are not without influence among the young, mainly because of the normal feelings of compassion with the victims of the Vietnam war, but also because of the less laudable tendency to make the United States the target of criticism for all the ills that beset us. Likewise the propagandists for Biafra, in evoking widespread sympathy with the lot of those suffering from the horrible war in Nigeria, have succeeded in distorting the image of that conflict, investing it with a character that corresponds with the official communist line on colonialism, imperialism and the new slogan 'neocolonialism'.

Conclusion

The 'New Left' in Britain is still far from being an organised body; a number of groups, however, have been formed, mainly in University centres, and doubtless others will follow, which are engaged in hammering out plans for winning over those, who for one reason or other, are in disagreement with the established

order, or with traditional ways of thinking. The influence of these groups, except in particular circles, is so far limited, but in view of the widespread atmosphere of frustration and unrest that exists, particularly among the younger generation, it would be a mistake to underestimate the extent that the New Left's thinking and plans for action will have on political and social developments during the next decade.

The deep-seated sense of dissatisfaction with society which many intellectuals and members of the younger generation express, reflects not only weaknesses in that society, but also the strains and stresses brought about by the new scientific and industrial revolution, which progresses faster than political and social forms can be adjusted to the new conditions which this revolution demands. Coupled with this is the diminished significance and effectiveness of the individual man and woman in a world of great power blocs, and a constant growth on a national and international scale of the forces of industry, finance, armaments and communications. The problems that have arisen as an outcome of these developments may take decades to be resolved, and while it is certain that this will not come about through student and left-group demonstrations, the discussion and dialogue taking place, and which will continue to be held, may in the long run contribute to a solution of at least some of the problems that have emerged during the second half of this distressful century.

CAUSES, AIMS AND METHODS OF THE NON-PARLIAMENTARY
OPPOSITION IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

by
Dr. Hans Joachim Woehl

I. The Psycho-political Causes

1. Point of Departure

For the Federal Republic of Germany (BRD)¹⁾ and perhaps for the whole Western world, the year 1968 will go down in history as the "year of protest". A dynamic and, to some extent, intolerant generation born after the Second World War, frequently expressing itself only in a "small radical minority", launched an assault on a paralyzed establishment and, amazingly enough, stirred it into action - apparently a virtually world-wide phenomenon.

The methods by which this found expression in the Federal Republic of Germany, as opposed to other Western countries, varied immensely. The intensity of the activities grew from month to month, themes changed according to political and regional factors and target personalities were changed according to expediency or replaced by new ones.

The extent to which this activity on the part of West German youth impressed itself on the consciousness of the entire population is borne out by figures supplied by the "Institute for Applied Sociology" ("Institut für angewandte Sozialwissenschaft (Infas)"), Bad Godesberg, based on a representative survey at the end of 1968. The student disturbances were for many citizens of the Federal Republic the overriding event of 1968. According to the Institute's most recent surveys on the most important occurrences of last year the student activities, especially in the first half of the year, overshadowed all other events. Thus in April 1968 alone 71 % of the population considered the Easter disturbances, and 19 % the attempt on the life of the prominent SDS official Rudi Dutschke, to be the most important event of recent times²⁾.

a) The Concept of "Non-parliamentary Opposition" in the Federal Republic of Germany

What over two years ago could be called "non-parliamentary" in the Federal Republic of Germany was - and this is typical - linked largely to

the intellectuals, the so-called "outcast Left". Today this form of the "New Left"⁽³⁾, in so far as the concept applies to the Federal Republic of Germany, takes on a completely new meaning. It dominated and still dominates in whole or in part magazines and illustrated papers, newspapers and journals, the theatre, cabaret, films and even the Churches. Even today it still has strongholds in the mass media, especially on radio and television and in the press. It is infiltrating the schools, colleges and youth organisations. It is in contact with those forces inside the trade unions and around the Social Democratic Party which are not prepared to follow either the Godesberg party line⁽⁴⁾ or a Grand Coalition.

According to the Basic Constitutional Law of the Federal Republic of Germany the function of the parties is to assist in the "cultivation of the political will of the people" (Article 21, Paragraph 1, GG⁽⁵⁾). This does not exclude the possibility, however, that in addition to the "conventional parties" represented in Parliament other forces outside Parliament may also assist in this process. In other words the right of political opposition is open not only to parliamentary parties, but also to non-parliamentary groups and individuals. A non-parliamentary opposition, therefore, is not illegal a priori; on the contrary, it might, at the present time in a great coalition with a "mini-opposition"⁽⁶⁾, even serve as a positive complement to the work of Parliament and the cultivation of the political will.

We should not, therefore, regard everything that stands outside the German Bundestag in opposition to the policies of the Federal government, as APO⁽⁷⁾. There is no doubt that the APO owes its success to the student protest movement which, having its origins in the colleges, soon came to be regarded as an "opposition pervading all sectors of society". One of its avowed, i. e. ostensible aims is "to demonstrate that an alternative to the existing situation in the Federal Republic is a conceivable reality"⁽⁸⁾.

Thus inevitably we come to the concept of "non-parliamentary opposition", i. e. in the case of the Federal Republic of Germany a typical collective designation for a number of political groups, opposed to the ruling parties in the Federal Republic and, for the most part, to the entire social system, and not represented in Parliament (Deutscher Bundestag). It is not correct when the APO claim that the "non-parliamentary opposition in the modern sense of the phrase first came into being after the formation of the Grand Coalition (December 1966), as a result of which the parliamentary opposition (FDP) was condemned to political insignificance owing to the small number of seats held by the party"⁽⁹⁾. Nor is there any more truth in the claim by leftists that the APO is a "reaction against the failure of the parties"⁽¹⁰⁾.

What evidence there is today of a "non-parliamentary opposition" in the Federal Republic of Germany does not date back a mere two years, i. e. to the formation of the Grand Coalition. It began in fact in the form of a neutrality movement from 1951 to 1953. It continued from 1954 to 1958 in the later "Paulskirche Movement"⁺⁺. In 1958 it found a new outlet in the "Easter March Movement", from 1960 in the "Anti Emergency Legislation Movement" and from 1963 to 1968 in the international movement against the Vietnam War, to name only a few examples⁽¹¹⁾.

In point of fact the APO of today pulls to pieces everything from which the state derives its authority and security. It directs its struggle against Parliament, against the integrity of the head of state, against the judiciary, the parties, the Federal Armed Forces, the police, the emergency legislation, the colleges and the Vietnam War. It does not confine its struggle within the narrow bounds of the permissible. It wages it fanatically against a "system", against the hated "Establishment" which, in its opinion, must be smashed. Its work is a methodical, exhaustive exercise, more or less, in negation; thematically it exploits every possibility, the end always justifies the means, in the selection of its confederates it is not selective. It now even oversteps the boundary between legal opposition and illegal obstructionism.

b) The Establishment as a Concept

The APO's attack, characteristic of the Federal Republic of Germany, is directed today against an alleged "authoritarian ruling system", which as far as the APO is concerned means the Establishment in general. Today the concept "Establishment" stands for the "ruling class, the pillars of society and all those persons and groups of persons, who are influential, carry weight or merely have a name in the various sectors of the ruling system - economics, politics and culture"⁽¹²⁾. The concept relates in particular to the "social order of late capitalism", by which is meant above all else the "late capitalist class society"⁽¹³⁾. In other words: the police as a "force for order" in the Federal Republic, the Federal Armed Forces as their "military power instrument", the colleges where particularly, it is alleged, "authority" is strongly in evidence, and recently the secondary schools as "breeding-grounds of universal military service". Also included are the judiciary as the "cudgel"⁽¹⁴⁾ of this state, the parties "competing for a share in power" and their "interchangeability"⁽¹⁵⁾ and the Churches practising "divine service for the purposes of the oppressors"⁽¹⁶⁾.

c) "Anti-authoritarians" and "Traditionalists" as Elements in the APO

What then is the cause of the APO's negative attitude towards the Federal Republic as a state? A distinction must be drawn here between the "anti-

++ Paulskirche: a church in Frankfurt

authoritarians" (they are to be regarded as the German contribution to the international "New Left"), whose stronghold is the APO, and between the "traditionalists". Figuring among the traditionalists is the widest variety of groups: neo-Marxists, disciples of Herbert Marcuse, Trotskyists, Guevarists and Maoists, to name only a few examples. One of the leading exponents of the anti-authoritarians in the student opposition is/was Rudi Dutschke. "The struggle of the anti-authoritarians is not concentrated on the production sphere, it extends to all the established institutions of society". For the traditionalists, on the other hand, "the Revolution will always be focused decisively"¹⁷ on the working class. Included among traditionalists in the Federal Republic are: old Trotskyists, Communists and pro-reform Communists.

d) Who Belongs to the APO?

According to the Federal Ministry of the Interior¹⁸ there is at the present time a total of 7 parties, 29 youth groups and 106 other groups with approximately 40,000 members in all, belonging to the APO. Great influence is wielded by the Press connected with or belonging to these groups, e. g. the monthly periodical *konkret*, Hamburg¹⁹, new review (*neue Kritik*), Hamburg (organ of the SDS), *Non-parliamentary Opposition*, Offenbach (organ of the Campaign for Democracy and Disarmament), the non-parliamentary news service *Berlin Extra*, West Berlin, and *The Other Newspaper*, Hamburg²⁰.

Of the organisations classed alongside the APO, the following are the most prominent: the "Socialist German Student Federation" (SDS) as its driving force, the "Campaign for Democracy and Disarmament" (KDA) and Communist camouflage organisations such as the "German Peace Union" (DFU), the "League of Germans" (BdD) and the Communist "Democratic Left" (DL). In addition: the widest variety of "Republican Clubs", parts of the "Socialist College Federation" (SHB) and the "Liberal Students' Federation of Germany" (LSD), the "Humanist Students' Union" (HSU), the "Socialist League" (SV), the conscientious objectors' organisations "Association of Conscientious Objectors, registered society" (VK) and the "German Peace Society/Conscientious Objectors' International" (DFG/IdK). Also included are the various neutralist, Socialist school unions, e. g. the "Central Action Group of Independent and Socialist Pupils" (AUSS).

2. The Emergence of the "New Left" in the Federal Republic of Germany

Five sharply defined time divisions can be identified in the emergence of the "New Left" in the Federal Republic of Germany:

a) Total Demilitarization after 1945

The ill-fated division of Germany with its wall, its barbed wire and its death zone, the absence of a peace treaty nearly 24 years after the end of the war (and the resulting feeling of being more the object than subject in foreign policy), the existence even now of positive resentment, not to say mistrust, at least among some of the Western allies despite all spiritual and material efforts at reparation on the part of the Federal Republic, massive propaganda from the East, above all the "German Democratic Republic": all this together is a burden, under which every single person in the Federal Republic of Germany - consciously or unconsciously - must labour with great difficulty.

Disillusionment among the wartime generation, political apathy or a lack of political commitment, an unconquered past, the total crushing of the military spirit and all traditional thinking by the four Occupying Powers after 1945 were bound to have political consequences. A direct impetus was given to neutralist-pacifist circles, partly under the mask of Christian charity. Communist groups also exploited these intellectual trends, giving them a political stamp and forming Communist camouflage organisations, so as to provide, more or less, a screen for their activities and to promote the realisation of their own world-revolutionary aims. Such were the circumstances in which a younger generation grew up in prosperity, no sacrifices being demanded of them either in the home or by the state: they were incapable of enthusiasm and without political commitment. They were fully aware of their rights, but to a lesser extent of their duties - often unpleasant for the individual -, e. g. universal compulsory military service. All in all a breeding-ground for radical forces, particularly those of the left.

b) Prohibition of the KPD (August 1956)

In August 1956, following the decision by the Federal Constitutional Court, the "Communist Party of Germany" (KPD) was prohibited in the Federal Republic in accordance with Article 21, Paragraph 2 GG. Because we have, or rather had, had²¹ no authorized Communist party in the Federal Republic for over 12 years, Communist activity up to now could only develop "underground", i. e. on a more or less conspiratorial and less broad basis. Camouflage organisations set up by the Communists immediately after prohibition, in particular the "League of Germans" (BdD)²², the "German Peace Union" (BFU)²³ or much later the "Democratic Left" (DL)²⁴ failed in any Federal or Land Parliament to gain the 5 % minimum prescribed by electoral law and thus remained "outside Parliament". Nor was the aim to introduce "popular front politics" on the lines of other Western countries realised by the Communists in the Federal Republic.

Condemned as they are in the Federal Republic to illegality, the Communists have been trying for years to achieve:

- readmission and thus "presentability at court"
- the expansion of their influence at least under given, i. e. for the time being restricted conditions.

Nowadays this means in practice: the "Private Committee for the Readmission of the KPD"²⁵⁾ has been demanding for two years the readmission of the hitherto prohibited KPD. Meanwhile it had a partial success when the proceedings, under the former Federal Minister of Justice Dr. Heinemann, on the readmission of a Communist party by establishing the new "German Communist Party" (DKP) ended in success, viz. on 22nd September 1968 in Frankfurt/M. While the DKP represents the minimum programme of the KPD, still prohibited in the Federal Republic, the above-mentioned "private committee", in openly advocating the readmission of the KPD, is advocating purely Communist aims.

In the last 12 years Communists in the Federal Republic have managed to bring their influence and control to bear in a disguised form, principally in the leftist mass organisations or Communist camouflage organisations such as the "Easter March Movement", the DFU, the BdD, the DL and the conscientious objectors' organisation DFG/IdK.

Since the admission of the DKP they have already pressed their demands for the Bundestag elections in autumn 1969 in the form of an "election alliance"²⁶⁾. Apparently they have worked out their chances of exploiting the "latent discontent" in the Communist - neutralist - anarchist wing of the Federal electorate in such a way as to obtain at least 5 % of the votes and thus regain representation in the German Bundestag, at least in the form of an election alliance.

Standing in the way of this development, however, is the fact that splits in the Communist wing in the Federal Republic are growing from week to week - much to the sorrow of the SED²⁷⁾ in East Berlin. For there are in the Federal Republic, apart from the DKP, - and this inevitably will prove a source of confusion to the Communist voter:

- an (illegal) KPD with the conservative Max Reimann as First Secretary
- a newly founded Trotskyist KPD (M/L)²⁸⁾
- an SED, exclusive to West Berlin since 1945 by virtue of the Four Power regulations
- and in addition the DKP youth organisation founded in Essen on 4th/5th May 1968, the so-called "Socialist German Workers Youth" (SDAJ).

These are several Communist parties or organisations competing among themselves and described in part by the SED in East Berlin as "revisionists" and "deviationists".

c) The Creation of the Armed Forces and the Introduction of Universal Compulsory Military Service (1956) ²⁹⁾

When the SPD in its Godesberg Programme (1959) after long and at times hard discussions, finally came out in favour of rearmament for the Federal Republic and later the introduction of universal compulsory military service, forces in the left-wing camp of the SPD unwilling to take this line either changed their party or were expelled from the SPD. Thus were formed at an early stage diverse "anti-militarist", "anti-atom bomb" and "anti-Emergency Legislation" committees, which cannot and should not be specified here; in addition there was the collective movement" of all Socialist forces in the Federal Republic"³⁰⁾, founded in Dortmund in 1960 by a group of expelled and deserting Social Democrats ("League of Independent Socialists"). For years these committees, which grew out of a definite, basic political disagreement with government policy, but also with the policies of the SPD leadership, have kept the SPD (and also the trade unions) on the move, besides giving the SPD leadership, on behalf of Communist propaganda, the tag "right wing of the SP"³¹⁾.

d) The Formation of the Grand Coalition in December 1966

When the Grand Coalition was formed at the end of 1966, the Federal Republic stood on the verge of a national crisis. The SPD, previously dismissed by Chancellor Adenauer as "unfit to govern", became "fit to govern" overnight. According to Helmut Schauer, however, secretary of the "State of Emergency in Democracy" board, the Grand Coalition has "increased the difficulties of the opposition in the Federal Republic"³²⁾: and this in particular through the obscuring of genuine differences between the two parties at present in government as well as the absence of a genuine strong opposition in the German Bundestag. "Only in a firm alliance with the trade unions", Schauer continues, "with the independent political opposition movements such as the Easter March Movement and the opposition to the Emergency Legislation have the opponents of government policy inside the SPD the chance of making themselves felt".

The SPD certainly saved the Federal Republic in December 1966 from an imminent national crisis by entering the government. However, it has failed so far to reap the fruits of this action - on the contrary, the SPD has had to face resentment from its members on three levels:

- At the Party Conference in Nuremberg the "rank and file", the lower party groups, inflicted a defeat on the "right-wing SPD leadership", in so far as the delegates only approved entry into the Grand Coalition by a narrow majority.

— In addition malcontents from their own ranks, either openly or in subsequent Land Parliament elections, have taken revenge on the SPD for entering the government and some have gone over to the APO, others to the NPD³³!

— A number of intellectuals, particularly professors and arts men, have been turning increasingly towards the APO after the formation of the Grand Coalition.

e) The Passing of the Emergency Legislation (1968)³⁴

The most recent freeboard in the development and activities of the APO is the passing of the Emergency Legislation by the German Bundestag in spring 1968, discussion of which has been going on now for over ten years. Although a series of articles of the Basic Constitutional Law has been altered or newly inserted, Article 87 a in particular is of special significance for the APO ("Deployment of the Armed Forces for Internal Purposes"³⁵). The APO sees in the passing of the Emergency Legislation, and in particular Article 87 a, a further strengthening of "authoritarian domination"³⁶ in the Federal Republic. Not only does it already fear the deployment of police and Federal border guards in time of peace, but its principle fear is the deployment of Federal Armed Forces against itself.

It now no longer acknowledges, and this is decisive, that Parliament stands "at the centre of the political decision — making process", but instead claims that "the decisions originate from another quarter, from the centres of economic power in the Federal Republic"³⁷.

Although sufficient precautionary measures are incorporated to guard against possible abuse of Article 87 a GG, the APO's purpose here is more in the nature of pure propaganda, e. g. the slogan that the Federal Armed Forces are to be transformed even in peacetime into "an instrument of civil war"³⁸, that they are to be "the hammer that crushes internal unrest and that "in future their machine guns will be pointing at their own citizens"³⁹.

For this reason the Federal Minister of the Interior, Ernst Benda, defended the Emergency Legislation in a home affairs survey of the year 1968. He took the view that, contrary to the fears of the opponents of the State of Emergency, the Legislation had not led to restrictions on the personal freedom of opponents. It was already patently clear that the Emergency Legislation was intended purely and simply as a precaution against possible emergency situations and was only significant in the light of such an eventuality. The Minister then also went on to describe the APO's discussion of Article 87 a GG as an "escalation of insanity"⁴⁰.

The Federal Armed Forces, felt most strongly by the APO to be the "authoritarian domination and power instrument" of the Establishment, have become the focal point for action by the APO, particularly as a result of Article 87 a GG. A signature collection campaign for the handing in of service men's papers⁴¹, carried out in connection with the Emergency Legislation and a further sharp rise in the figures for conscientious objectors in 1968⁴²) are only outward signs of this. When one considers that in 1968 the authorities only succeeded in calling up about 40 % of the age group concerned, the problem of the "injustice of military service", which for years has played a not unimportant role among German youth, becomes patently clear.

The two previously mentioned conscientious objectors' organisations, the VK and the DFG/IdK, have exploited these opportunities and demanded the rejection of military service for political reasons. It should be noted at this point that the Federal Republic of Germany is the only country in the world; in whose constitution there exists the built-in, "inalienable right" to refuse to carry out military service⁴³). The sharp rise in figures for conscientious objectors and in "army group representations"⁴⁴) constitutes a very serious danger to the military preparedness of the Federal Armed Forces. Considerations are therefore underway, without so far having taken on any real shape, as to whether the article concerned should at least be modified.

II. The Aims of the APO

What now are the aims which the APO has set itself for 1969 and what chances have the non-parliamentary forces in the Federal Republic for the immediate future?

From the political point of view quite a catalogue:

1. The Foreign Front

The consequences of the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia on 21st August 1968, the failure to make progress on an Eastern Europe policy, the certain reorientation in US policy after the inauguration of the Republican Nixon on 20th January this year and the possibility that individual states may, under certain circumstances, withdraw from NATO in 1969: all these things, in terms of foreign policy, necessarily place the Federal Government, dependent as it is on its Western Allies, and above all the USA, in a precarious situation and a position calling for extreme caution, at least for the first half of 1969.

2. The Home Front

In the light of all the facts previously dealt with and the above-mentioned thinking on public welfare the Federal Republic is, at the present time, going through a definite period of political weakness, of paralysis, which will certainly give impetus to the non-parliamentary forces, left as well as right:

Activity at the beginning of the New Year has already shown that the APO is prepared to turn these opportunities to advantage. It should indeed be pointed out that while the Right has "formed up" in the NPD and is causing not inconsiderable harm in its effect on foreign opinion, whose experience dates back to the National Socialist era, the danger for the Federal Republic, however, lies in the attack from the Left, in the activities of the APO which is determined not only to "change (public) consciousness" but to destroy the state by direct action⁴⁵).

In its character and objectives the APO in the Federal Republic must be regarded not only as anti-parliamentary but also as anti-authoritarian and anti-democratic. This is proved by the totality of its attack on the Establishment. Its aim, as shown in particular by the experiences of the last six months is to "change" and "fundamentally reorient" social "consciousness" by a lengthy process. And so, for example, by a slow "manipulation of conscience", conscientious objectors must "reveal" their conscience only after intensified anti-military service propaganda and then, above all, for political reasons.

For example, such is the extent today of the rift in the social consciousness that on 5th January this year Prof. Dahrendorf, Federal board member of the FDP criticised the alleged "growth of authoritarian traits in the Federal Republic" at the FDP/DVP Regional Party Conference in Baden-Württemberg. In the face of such slogans as "growing manifestations of authority", "manipulation of legislative rights in Bonn", "authoritarian tendencies and patterns", "state management", "authoritarian swing to the Right by the established parties" and other slogans⁴⁶) used at this Party Conference, are we not today in the Federal Republic well on the way towards a slow transformation of consciousness in keeping with the aims of the APO? A start has been made: we are already being borne along - at least in the case of that part of the population made up of non-radicals or indeed APO sympathisers - on a "light wave of socially susceptible APO consciousness". Thus we come extremely close to the kind of thinking expressed by Theodor Ebert⁴⁷) in a lecture at Bonn University on 23rd October 1968:

- The events of 2nd June 1967⁴⁸) had shown that the APO must engage in "long-term planning". Spontaneous action, as for example at the Frankfurt Book Fair, was categorically rejected by Ebert. One must be prepared, and here he is at one with Rudi Dutschke, for a "long march through the institutions" or, to quote Max Weber, for a "period of hard graft". To "change" the existing form of society, one must be prepared to wait up to five years (!).

- Ebert also conceded, however, that "non-violent action" could take "mixed forms" as he put it. In other words, "non-violent action", as has been tried by the APO in many places and on many institutions of the Establishment, e. g. the police and the Armed Forces, could abruptly turn into "psychical violent action" and should from that very moment most definitely be advocated as such.

The "New Left" in the Federal Republic, however, must not be regarded in isolation, but always as one part of the pace-setting and escalating extremism in the Federal Republic, which in the final analysis owes its existence to the external and internal political situation. There is an exact parallel here with the years of the Weimar Republic, the only difference being that today it is the Left which is becoming a threat to the continuing existence of democracy and to the Federal Republic, in contrast to the years before 1933 when it was the extreme Right.

3. Conclusions to be Drawn by the Federal Republic from the Avowed Aim of the APO: to Change the "State of Consciousness"

It is one of the fundamental aims of the APO to change social "consciousness" at the very "basis". Referring to the work of the "basic groups", Koplín expresses it as follows:

"By means of broadsheets and discussions the basic groups carry out instructional agitation (Method! author's note) which is enhanced in relation to the vital interests of the given audience and which exposes the interrelation between seemingly private tribulations and the general social situation" (Aim! authors's note)⁴⁹).

We have today, at least in the Federal Republic, reached a point in the "changing of the state of consciousness" where nothing is taboo any more, nothing unexposed to attack. A person who questions everything may himself no longer be questioned. At meetings, in discussions and platform colloquies the breakers of taboos are almost alone in counting for anything.

Unfortunately, at least in the Federal Republic, "consciousness" has already been "reoriented" to such an extent that many believe that to be critical,

intelligent and radical are all synonymous. To belong to the "critical intelligentsia" (read "radical minority") is nowadays considered "progressive"; to stand up for the existing order, on the other hand, is "old", "antiquated" and "stale" or to say the very least "in need of reform".

"Democratisation" is now the catchword. One fact emerges quite clearly: this ever so "modish" concept means nothing other than "politicisation". Two examples from the colleges and schools serve as illustrations:

"Show solidarity with the struggle of the students and pupils for a democratisation of school and college; support young people's demonstrations for their social relevance⁵⁰).

"The State wishes to reform the colleges, but the only aim of the alleged "reforms" is to make the colleges more efficient as an instrument of domination. The democratic movement of students stands opposed to this situation⁵¹).

Thus we come to a "politicisation", an "ideologisation", affirmed by Scheuch⁵²), of the sciences, the colleges and the schools: a long-range objective of the APO, unseen, unwanted, but unfortunately pursued by many citizens in the Federal Republic! "Democracy" turns into "direct action" and "reform" becomes a "struggle against the authoritarian ruling system".

III. The Methods of the APO

1. General

The following points should first be made: there is no such thing as the methods of the APO or a compactly organised APO or the SDS as its "driving force"; neither do the students, the Easter Marchers, the conscientious objectors (VK and DFG/IdK), the young people or the Communists represent the non-parliamentary opposition in the Federal Republic.

Strategy tactics, combat methods and forms of action vary according to ideological alignment - whether pacifist, socialist, Marxist, utopian, neutralist, Communist or anarchist in origin. This is the weakness of the APO - but at the same time its strength. The danger for the Establishment lies precisely in the incalculability and unpredictability of its actions.

Since the State of Emergency hysteria (Summer 1968) the die-hards in the ideologies and programmes of these "drawing-board revolutionaries" have been the democratic parties, the academic world, the police, Armed Forces, government and anyone else engaged in research, startled by the spectacular Easter Disturbances (1968).

Granted the APO has not, so far at least, confronted the guardians of order with any overall effective strategy. However: with its conflicting groups it is now undermining to the same degree what is good as well as what is obsolete in the system. It thrives on the discontent of the younger and older generations alike. Yet its disunity - in the organisation as well as methods of its actions - is no less dangerous for the freedom of the Federal Republic than its apparent single-mindedness at the beginning of 1968.

Up to now, quite clearly, the APO, full of ideas and flexibility, alternating between harshness and moderation and varying its tactics and methods according to the situation, has been and still is capable of dominating the public scene despite all setbacks - capable also of gaining publicity and of attracting the attention of the mass media: whether it be - for the second time now - at the Frankfurt Book Fair, in the mass march converging on Bonn or at ceremonies, election meetings or swearing-in ceremonies for the Armed Forces, or wherever. In addition to political and emotional engagement and idealism their methods are based - and this fact must be compared with the stagnation and conservative inertia of the Establishment - on work, work and more work. In other words: assiduous behavioural studies, training of activists, critical effectiveness analyses and adaptation to the given adversary - accompanied in part by that obduracy characteristic of the handling of the instruments of revolution throughout history.

The revolutionaries of tomorrow reject "expository discussion" as "having no function". The SDS and spiritually related groups in the APO engage in "purposeful monologue". The crowd in the hall, e. g. at "teach-ins", consists of the person addressed, the claue, the television. Participants in the discussion, whoever they may be, are of interest only as targets for agitation and the much quoted "unmasking". Either they are defamed from the outset as "old" and "stale" or, apparently, it is pointed out to them that they are "prisoners of their circumstances". And so the fundamental decision by these "neo-anarchists" to refuse to accept integration in parliamentary democracy inevitably finds expression in methods of aggression. These things form only the superstructure for a wild, pseudo-scientific theory, from which, to put it crudely, two different forms of action develop:

- "non-violent action" aimed at non-violent revolt

and

- "inflammatory terror" aimed at revolutionary guerrilla war (principal models, Mao and Che Guevara).

In the Federal Republic — at least up to now — the Ebert theory of "non-violent action"⁵³) has prevailed. Its intellectual stimulus is derived, in the main, from two areas:

- from the USA (The Black Power Movement exercises a very strong influence), and above all the tactics of this theory such as sit-ins, go-ins, teach-ins etc.
- from the so-called "Third World", above all India with its model, Gandhi (but also, in addition, Martin Luther King in the USA).

2. Attack on the Federal Armed Forces

Already since autumn 1967, i. e. since the SDS Congress in Frankfurt/M., but at the latest since spring 1968, (international SDS Vietnam Congress in Berlin), the three established targets of the SDS have taken the form of demands for:

- the departure of the "US Occupying Power"
- the dissolution of NATO in 1969 (election year)
- action against the Federal Armed Forces.

If one takes the most recent activities of the SDS as a basis, the following trend emerges fairly clearly: the main activities are now developed first by the Frankfurt group and then by the Hamburg group of the SDS. Standing in the forefront of crucial SDS operations against the Federal Armed Forces are four demands:

a) Call to Desert

Here opinions within the SDS differ. However the realisation appears to have prevailed that at the present time the SDS is not yet sufficiently strong internally nor — in the light of real considerations — in a position to "create solidarity" among the soldiers of the Armed Forces as is possible with elements in the student body, in order to put its demands into practice.

b) Sedition from Within

Recognising that, with the situation as it is at the moment in the Federal Republic, this is hardly feasible and would have to extend over a lengthy period,

such a form of action against the Armed Forces is envisaged only for those SDS members who display the necessary "moral strength".

c) Sedition from Without

Activity here should be centred round local SDS groups working in close cooperation. "Basic groups"⁵⁴) within the Federal Armed Forces should insinuate "project groups"⁵⁵) into the Armed Forces from outside. This was bound to entail thematic emphases and these coincide throughout with the main theses of Communist propaganda:

- to portray NATO as a "tool of US power policy" and to depict the "resistance to progressive militarisation in the Federal Republic";

- to denounce alleged abuses in the Armed Forces (e. g. "bull", shirking) and to present the "bourgeois in uniform" as a "stultification of man". The object here is to enable this information from the Armed Forces to be used for agitation aimed at outside.

d) Invitation to Refuse Military Service for Political Reasons

Refusal to serve for political reasons should be the tool of those SDS members who do not possess the "moral strength" to engage over a lengthy period in activities, "underground" where possibly, against the Armed Forces. They should enter the Armed Forces and a f t e r basic or special training submit their applications for exemption on political grounds in the form of "group representations".

To s u m u p the four above-mentioned points:

Lying at the centre of anticipated SDS activity against the Federal Armed Forces — and in this order — will be:

- infiltration into the Armed Forces from outside (short-term aim)
- the "creation of uncertainty" in and the "paralysis" of the Armed Forces by "group representations" (short term aim)⁵⁶).
- Only at a later stage (long-term aim) will the attempt be made to introduce open resistance (desertion, call for action against superiors) in the Armed Forces.

At the moment the SDS does not yet feel strong enough to undertake an all-out campaign against the Armed Forces. For the time being, therefore, it will be more concerned with sporadic actions than with activity ranging over a

longer period. However, there are already signs that an all-out campaign against the Armed Forces is now only a matter of time. Control over these (for the time being) sporadic actions will not be exercised from the centre (i. e. by the joint executive) but will "cut across" (meaning essentially that control will lie at regional level in the hands of individual local SDS groups). Thus particular attention will be directed in future on actions in smaller garrisons.

And it is in just the medium-sized and smaller towns that "informal cadres" will be created to give real effect to the work of the SDS in these regions.

The principal target groups envisaged by the SDS are:

- school children's organisations
- young students
- young workers (thus the attempt to establish contacts on "object groups in the factories") - so far with little success!

With such a combination the aim in these fields is:

- actively to explain the right to refuse military service for political reasons
- actively to gain supporters for the assault (internal and external) on the Armed Forces.

3. Attacks on the Police, the Judiciary and the "US Occupying Power"

If at Easter 1968 it was the police who stood in the forefront of attacks by the APO, then in autumn it was the colleges and shortly afterwards the judiciary. Activities are focused on individual target groups with methodical variation. An attack by the APO on one of these groups is always synonymous with an APO attack on the Establishment in its entirety. All the indications are that at the beginning of the coming year two important topics will bring the Federal Armed Forces into the forefront of non-parliamentary activity, viz:

- the Emergency Legislation, in particular Article 87 a GG (i. e. "Deployment of the Armed Forces for Internal Purpose")
- a further extensive spread in the rejection of military service for political reasons (as a preliminary to the right to oppose)⁵⁷).

The extension and intensification of action by the SDS must be reckoned against the degree to which the Establishment accepts such action without demur or fails to offer resistance by exhausting all the possibilities afforded by law. In other words, a wrong approach or a failure to intervene on the part of the police will inevitably have an effect on the Armed Forces as well, and vice versa. Police and Armed Forces are seen by the SDS as a single unit: as an authoritarian element of power or order.

There are interesting parallels here between the Armed Forces and judiciary as regards the APO's conduct of tactics, combat methods and forms of action⁵⁸). In the campaign against the judiciary, for example, the SDS among others is out to

- degrade the authority of judges and public prosecutors
- "create uncertainty" among or ridicule this group
- show that there is no such thing as impartiality among the judges, i. e. among the "Third Authority" in general. Here too the final aim - as with the Armed Forces - is, by means of continuous sporadic actions, continually to bring to the public's attention the "repressive function of the judiciary" or to cripple their capacity to function.

Meanwhile more important action, designed to encroach on the work of the judiciary, has occurred. The support of the two college groups SHB and LSD must be treated as a possibility. Petty sessions courts dealing with proceedings arising out of the Easter Disturbances are to be "occupied", where this has not already taken place. There are parallels here with action undertaken on behalf of soldiers detained for activities against the Emergency Legislation⁵⁹).

Even action against US troops stationed in the Federal Republic is only of a p p a r e n t secondary importance for the Federal Armed Forces. This was and is the drill ground of the non-parliamentary forces, above all the SDS and the VK, providing the practical training which will later decide how far these previously-tested methods can be used against the Federal Armed Forces.

So, for example, one may read in one of the most recent leftist publications how the "German Group of the Second Front" is seeking contributions for a US desertion campaign. To quote the exact words:

"The more cruel the war in Vietnam becomes, the more American soldiers are leaving the Army all over the world. For them it is a grave decision and one which teaches them to think politically and to organise themselves.

The deserters' groups in Sweden and France confront those still in the Army with a practical alternative. A few hundred deserters show the GI's that Army coercion and the war in Vietnam need not be dictated by fate. In May many of them fought behind the Paris barricades.

Support the desertion campaign. We need money for propaganda material and for transportation for the American deserters⁶⁰).

On 1st November 1968, a few hours after judgement had been passed in the case against the so-called "stores incendiaries", unknown persons threw three incendiary bombs into the Frankfort Law Administration building. On the right of January 1st 1969 there followed an attack with "Molotov cocktails" on the Recruiting and Replacement Office in Frankfort/M., resulting in damage to property estimated at about DM 1.000,-. Again on 9th January 1969 "Molotov Cocktails" were thrown at the "America House" in Frankfort/M. in the early hours of the morning, causing damage to property assessed at about DM 20,000,-.

According to Frankfort police it may be assumed with certainty that all three attacks were carried out from political motives.

These attacks show

- the escalation in the means employed, in other words that certain political forces are even prepared to resort to criminal methods to achieve their aims
- the link between the methods used in activities against the Armed Forces, the police and the judiciary - i. e. the Establishment in general.

4. Rejection of Military Service for Political Reasons and the Right to Oppose

Until the end of 1967 the two conscientious objectors' organisations (VK and DFG/IdK) confined their activities mainly to "explaining" and "making propaganda" for military service evasion. Since this time, however, regarding themselves as part of the non-parliamentary opposition, they have come out alongside other such groups (mainly the Union of Humanist Students, the LSD, SDS and others) and like these have gone over to action against the Armed Forces. They adopted at the same time, especially the Communist infiltrated DFG/IdK, in their themes as well as in their objectives, the demands drawn up by the anarchist wing of the SDS.

The aim of these non-parliamentary actions is open to no doubt: it is no longer a question of exercising a right under Article 4, Paragraph 3 GG. Rather it is a question of undermining the Federal Armed Forces from within, disposing of them as a military factor or, in the language of the APO, of paralysing them. Particularly illuminating in this connection is an extract from an essay by the Group 47 author, Hanns Magnus Enzensberger, where he sets forth as a model revolutionary practices already employed in the USA, which under certain circumstances could also become a political reality in the Federal Republic, but which the APO should at least strive after:

"The political rejection of military service in the USA has no chance at the present time of damaging the efficiency of the military machine. On the other hand the political effect is immeasurable. A nation which makes criminals of tens of thousands of its most intelligent young men is training tens of thousands of revolutionaries, who are used to illegality and whose political experience grows with every day that passes" (61).

The DFG/IdK is only one part of the non-parliamentary opposition. For about two years the APO has been conducting a grim and ever-intensifying struggle against the hated "authoritarian domination system": the police, Armed Forces, judiciary, colleges, schools, Parliament, parties etc. At the beginning of the year the SDS announced a stepping-up of action against this "Establishment". The new methods of the Communist infiltrated DFG/IdK are only a symptom indicating that the attack, in this case against the Federal Armed Forces, is becoming more acute, diffuse, discriminating and so more dangerous. In the struggle the individual APO organisations, according to their nature and aims, merely employ their own different and varying methods.

5. Attacks on the Colleges, Secondary Schools and the Churches

a) Colleges

At the end of the Summer Term 1968 many people thought that the radical wave in the student body was on the ebb. Yet a few weeks after the beginning of the Winter Term the picture had changed completely: almost everywhere university ceremonies were cancelled, meetings of the Senate were held underground as it were, invitations to foreign guest professors were withdrawn and everywhere the number of disturbances and disruptions to lectures increased rapidly: e. g. at the end of last year in Tübingen, where the protection of two hundred police was required to enable Raymond Aron to speak before a personally invited public, holding admission tickets.

More and more lectures were cancelled by the professors. More and more professors - described disparagingly by the leftist students as "specialist idiots" (62) - partly out of insufficient debating experience, partly from a lack of tactical skill and staying power, took the line: better to yield to force, to interrupt the lecture and offer outside discussions.

The centres of non-parliamentary activity today are, above all, the colleges of West Berlin, Frankfort/M., Freiburg and Heidelberg. Yet other colleges too are stirring. The disturbances are the work of at most 5 % of the student body and are caused mainly by the SDS, since it dominates the student organs. The mass

of students, in a similar position here to the professors, is "unpolitical": they want to study. But until this SDS superiority is broken by a politically conscious and democratic-minded centre, the colleges will career towards chaos with every month that passes. Today for the first time serious opposition from student circles is beginning to make itself heard. Whether it will prove to be a match for the activities of the SDS and the resignation on the part of the "centre" remains to be seen.

At the present time the universities are powerless. Apart from calling the police, which most rectors are reluctant to do, they scarcely possess appropriate means, at least for the moment, to prevent the piecemeal acquisition of their establishments as "free zones" for the leftists. Disciplinary measures to implement expulsions in given cases are paralysed by the radical students.

The legislature (Land Parliaments) and the executive (Land Ministries of Education) should, at the earliest possible opportunity, invoke a new law to cover order. Until that happens time is slipping by, too much time!

The state, i. e. the Federal Länder, should therefore act quickly and unbureaucratically. All that can be required of the professors at the moment is nerves and endurance. The mass of students, however, the "unpolitical centre" should recognise that inactivity on their part will mean the end of their studies. The restoration of order is not a reform. The future of the West German universities depends on the restoration of law and freedom. There can be no such thing as reform without order.

But one thing should be remembered in the Federal Republic. There is not another moment to be wasted. It is the object of the SDS, as the "driving force" of the APO, also in the case of college reform, to bring about ruin and not merely "reform":

" 'Socialist' means for the SDS that it regards the overthrow of all profit-oriented social institutions as the solution to the contradictions prevalent in late capitalism".⁶³⁾

Latest developments in the West German colleges point in this direction. Frankfort/M., Berlin and recently Heidelberg show that the SDS has made it its object that the conflict should culminate simultaneously in a student "general strike" in as many universities as possible. In this connection the following is generally valid:

- All student "strikes", almost without exception, are decided by a minority and carried out by force over the heads of the majority.
- Bare fists and lengths of wood, cf. on 10th January this year in Heidelberg, or bomb threats, as in Frankfort/M. on the same day, are not "compelling arguments" over the long term.
- The escalation in the means employed (planning of punishable offences) is on the increase. It extends from the colleges through to the police and on to the judiciary, gradually encompassing the entire "authoritarian state system".
- Disciplinary procedures and expulsions are no lasting solution to the use of force by radical students. Without the support of the legislature (Land Parliaments), i. e. additional legal measures, lasting solutions cannot be expected.

b) Schools

With regard to the secondary schools two main ideas predominate:

- In their organisation, schools rank among the most strongly "authoritarian" of state institutions. Resistance from this quarter, therefore, should be forthcoming at an early stage.

"The schools in our country are authoritarian in their organisation. Almost everywhere they are regulated to cultivate obedience to the state authorities and the self-styled ruling class. The democratic movement in the schools stands opposed to this situation"⁶⁴⁾.

- In the eyes of the APO the secondary schools are the "breeding-ground of militarism" in the Federal Republic. And so the subject of military service rejection cannot be introduced into the schools early enough:

"One can imagine the typical staff officer's dream: Every one of them could join. Theoretically every second pupil and student could refuse to carry out military service"⁶⁵⁾.

c) Churches

On Christmas Night 1968, probably the greatest feast in the Federal Republic, several young people interrupted Midnight Service during the sermon at the Kaiser Wilhelm Evangelical Church of Remembrance in Berlin. This, unfortunately, was not the first time that "go-ins" by radical students had occurred in churches. In

this, as in all the other cases, the young people's aim was and is to "reorient" an "event", here, - and this is the terrifying part of it - a divine service, and to compel the church-goers to take part in a political discussion. The attempt by a "radical minority"⁶⁶) to override the majority therefore knows no bounds, not even in church: A youthful "disturbance", moreover, that has found its way, not only into the Evangelical Church, but also recently into the Catholic Church.

It is not intended here to go into church questions or the support of so-called "leftist Protestants" for the neutralist-pacifist aims of the APO, but the peripheral example above should give a brief insight into the extent that has already been reached in the mental derangement and arrogance of our young people in the Federal Republic. One is reminded involuntarily of the speech of the Chairman of the SPD Parliamentary Party, Helmut Schmidt, delivered to the German Bundestag in another connection on 30th April 1968⁶⁷). In it he underlined this trend among the young as "elitist arrogance", enlarging on his description as follows:

"What causes me the greatest worry, when I look at a section of our young people, a section of young students, individuals and groups, is this elitist arrogance which might as well be God-given, this elitist awareness of knowing more about everything, yes everything, than the stupid workers, the stupid employees, the stupid politicians, the stupid professors..."

It is my fear that this presumption contains a seed which must be watched with the same care and dealt with in the same way and weeded out like that other seed, contained in the staggering formulation, the invention, Heaven knows, not only of the young: violence against persons is not quite the thing to be done but against property it is irreproachable. All violence carries the seeds of evil; they must take this as a warning!"

FOOTNOTES

- 1) Official abbreviation for "Federal Republic of Germany".
- 2) "Frankfurter Rundschau", Frankfurt/M., 27th December 1968.
- 3) The concept "New Left" has an international connotation and cannot be summarily regarded as being identical with the concept of the "APO". In the Federal Republic the concept "New Left" is not very common.
- 4) This refers to the so-called "Godesberg Basic Programme", agreed by the Party Congress of the SPD in Bad Godesberg (13-15th November 1959). Apart from the SPD's basic attitude to public order, this included endorsement of national defence, i. e. approval of the existence of armed forces for the Federal Republic.
- 5) Official abbreviation of "Grundgesetz" (Basic Law), i. e. the provisional constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany. In accordance with Article 146 the GG will lose its "validity on the day when a constitution, freely agreed upon and decided by the German people" comes into operation.
- 6) At the present time, out of more than 500 Bundestag members, there are 49 from the FDP who belong to the Parliamentary Opposition.
- 7) Since the Easter disturbances of 1968 the accepted abbreviation in the Federal Republic of "non-parliamentary opposition".
- 8) Raimund Koplín: "Sprachführer durch die Revolution" ("Phrase-book of the Revolution"), published by H. P. Hohn, Munich, 1968, p. 14.
- 9) Peter Weigt: "Revolutionslexikon" ("Lexicon of the Revolution"), Handbook of the Non-parliamentary Opposition, published by Bärmeier and Nickel, Frankfurt/M., 1968, p. 4.
- 10) Rolf Seeliger: "Die außerparlamentarische Opposition" ("The Non-parliamentary Opposition"), published by Eigenverlag, Munich, 1968, p. 39.
- 11) For a detailed description and documentation of the history of the APO in the Federal Republic see Nikolaus J. Ryschkowsky: "Die linke Linke" ("The left Left"), Vol. 129/130 taken from "Geschichte und Staat" ("History and State"), published by Günter Olzog, Munich-Vienna, 1968.
- 12) Koplín, loc. cit., p. 27/28.
- 13) Weigt, loc. cit., p. 17 and p. 57.
- 14) See essay "Justiz" ("Justice"), anon, in "Kursbuch" ("Time-table"), No. 12, published by Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt/M., 1968, p. 153.
- 15) Johannes Agnoli: "Transformation der Demokratie" ("Transformation of Democracy"), published by Voltaire Verlag, Berlin, 1967.
- 16) "Berliner Extra-Dienst" ("Berlin Extra"), West Berlin, 24th December 1968, p. 9, published by Carl L. Guggomos.

- 17) Koplín, loc. cit., p. 12 and p. 81.
- 18) "Erfahrungsbericht zum Linksradikalismus in der Bundesrepublik 1967" ("On-the-spot report on leftist radicalism in the Federal Republic 1967"), appeared 1968, Bonn.
- 19) Has in fact a wide circulation (end of 1968): 170,802. If one accepts as a basis that a periodical is usually read by at least 4-5 persons, this means that about 700,000 to 850,000 young people, especially students, read this APO periodical alone.
- 20) Circulation: 45,000 per week (end of 1968). Founded by Gerhard Gleissberg (until 1948 editor of the official SPD organ "Neuer Vorwärts") and Rudolf Gottschalk.
- 21) Further details will be given in another connection of the newly established "German Communist Party" (DKP).
- 22) The Communists reckoned with the prohibition of the KPD and " as a precaution" founded the BdD as early as May 1953.
- 23) Founded: December 1961.
- 24) Founded: 22nd November 1967 in Stuttgart.
- 25) Founded: 15th February 1967.
- 26) e. g. the "Action for Democratic Progress" (ADF). Founded: 7th December 1968 in Frankfurt/M.
- 27) Official abbreviation for the Communist "Socialist Unity Party of Germany" in East Germany. It was established by the compulsory amalgamation of the KPD and the SPD on 21st April 1946 in Berlin to form this new unity party.
- 28) KPD (Marxism/Leninism). Founded: 31st December 1968 in Hamburg.
- 29) Introduction of universal compulsory military service by the Military Service Law of 21st July 1956.
- 30) Organisational statute of the "League of Independent Socialists" (VUS).
- 31) By omitting the "D" the SED disputes the right of the SPD to continue using the "D" for "Deutschland" in its official title.
- 32) Helmut Schauer: "Radikale Opposition und sozialistische Politik" ("Radical Opposition and Socialist Policy"). Essay in the periodical "probleme sozialistischer politik" ("problems of socialist policy"), published by "neue kritik", Frankfurt/M., Vol. 4, 1967, p. 56/60.
- 33) It was a case here, e. g. in the Land Parliament elections in Baden/Württemberg on 28th April 1968, of a genuine "protest vote" and not as was represented at the time in certain foreign quarters of a growth in right-wing extremism in the Federal Republic! (SPD votes down by 8,3 %).
- 34) Third reading in the German Bundestag, passed by Parliament on 30th May 1968.
- 35) The crucial passage reads as follows:
"(4) Where the provisions of Article 91, Paragraph 2 are applicable and police and Federal border guards cannot adequately cope with the situa-

- tion, the Federal Government may, in the event of a threat to the stability or free democratic public order of the Federation or of a Land, call in troops to support the police and Federal border guards in the protection of civil objectives and the combatting of organised, armed insurgents. Troops are to be deployed at the request of the Bundestag or the Bundesrat (Upper House)".
- 36) Weigt, loc. cit., p. 42.
 - 37) Klaus Meschkat, Republican Club, Berlin.
 - 38) The former SDS Chairman Karl-Dietrich Wolff in his annual report at the opening of the 23rd Delegates' Conference of the SDS in Frankfurt/M. on 11th September 1968 ("Frankfurter Rundschau", Frankfurt/M., 13th September 1968).
 - 39) Broadsheet of the "Independent Action Group against the Emergency Legislation", entitled "Freiheit unter Gewehrläufen?" ("Freedom from the Barrel of a Gun?"). Distributed in connection with the passing of the Emergency Legislation in the German Bundestag, Summer 1968.
 - 40) CDU/CSU Press Service, 6th January 1969.
 - 41) E. g. in many university towns in the Federal Republic - overnight, as it were - hundreds of signatures were collected: in Berlin 350, in Munich 250, in Freiburg i. Br. 289, in Frankfurt/M. 200 and others in Mainz and Kiel in particular.
 - 42) In 1968 11,000 men liable for military service applied for recognition as conscientious objectors, i. e. twice as many as in 1967: approximately 3,000 of them only after commencing service in the Armed Forces. This exceeds the total figure for the last ten years.
 - 43) "No-one may be compelled to perform armed military service against the dictates of his conscience. Further details are governed by a Federal Law".
 - 44) By this is meant: for some time the conscientious objectors' organisations in the Federal Republic have been going over to providing not only "information" on the evasion of military service but also positive propaganda in that direction. Thus they give precise "step-by-step instructions" on how to refuse to carry out military service, and encourage the soldiers first to enter the Armed Forces and then only after basic or special training to submit their applications for recognition as conscientious objectors. The declared aim is to "create uncertainty" in and undermine the Armed Forces from within. We are dealing here with a pure, unadulterated "manipulation of conscience". (Cf. also Note 56).
 - 45) It was stated by the Inspector General of the Federal Armed Forces, de Maizière, on 26th November 1968 that the main concern with regard to the leftist forces was the possibility of a deliberate attack against the Armed Forces and also against parliamentary democracy. The influence of the

- NPD, on the other hand, was on the decline. ("Bonner Rundschau", Bonn, 27th November 1968).
- 46) "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung", Frankfurt/M., 6th January 1969.
 - 47) Academic assistant at the "Otto-Suhr Institute" at the "Free University" of West Berlin and at present the APO theorist on "non-violent action". Also vice-chairman of the "Association of Conscientious Objectors, registered society" (VK).
 - 48) Visit of the Shah to West Berlin and the subsequent shooting of the student Ohnesorge. Documentation in this connection is provided by Knut Nevermann: "2nd June 1967", "student disturbances, democracy and the Emergency. Documents on the events centred round the Shah's visit". Published by Pahl-Rugenstein Verlag, Cologne, 1967.
 - 49) Koplín, loc. cit., p. 16.
 - 50) Ryschkowsky, loc. cit., p. 153: "Aufruf des 'Sozialistischen Zentrums' ("Appeal by the 'Socialist Centre'").
 - 51) Ryschkowsky, loc. cit., p. 193: "Aktion von Gewerkschaftsfunktionären im Rhein-Main-Gebiet, Nordhessen und im Rhein-Ruhr-Gebiet" ("Action by trade union officials in the Rhine-Main, North Hesse and Rhine-Ruhr areas").
 - 52) Erwin K. Scheuch (publisher): "Die Wiedertäufer der Wohlstandsgesellschaft" ("The Anabaptists of the Prosperous Society"). A critical study of the "New Left" and its dogmas, published by Markus Verlag, Cologne, 1968, p. 7 et seq. and p. 104 et seq.
 - 53) Theodor Ebert: "Gewaltfreier Aufstand. Alternative zum Bürgerkrieg" ("Non-violent Revolt as an Alternative to Civil War"), published by Rombach Verlag, Freiburg i. Br., 1968.
 - 54) One of the alleged activities of the basic groups is to infiltrate provocateurs into the Federal Armed Forces through the normal channels.
 - 55) On 25th August and 1st September 1968 two broadsheets were distributed in front of the Bismarck Barracks 162, Hamburg. These consisted, it is alleged, of an "Armed Forces Information Sheet", for which an "Armed Forces project group", Hamburg 13, claims responsibility.
 - 56) In the August 1968 issue of the young people's periodical "konkret", Hamburg, for example, tips are provided under the heading: "Everybody's joining up - but we're not! ('konkret' gives tips for reluctant conscripts)".
 - 57) Cf. Chapt. III, Paragraph 4, p. 27 et seq.
 - 58) In connection with the events of 2nd June 1967 in West Berlin the "Time-table", No. 12/68, brought out a special booklet entitled "The Undeclared Emergency". In the booklet the APO makes its own analysis of the action and behaviour of the police and judiciary at the time of these events, with appropriate distortions for propaganda purposes.

- 59) E. g. in the case of the armoured infantryman, Walter Listl ("Deutsche Volkszeitung", Düsseldorf, 26th July 1968; also "elan", Frankfurt/M., No. 9, 1968), and in addition the soldiers Peter Bertz, Reinhard Junge and others.
- 60) "Kursbuch", No. 15/68, loc. cit., p. 199.
- 61) "Kursbuch", No. 13/68, loc. cit. p. 149.
- 62) Origin, role and definition of the concept, cf. Koplín, loc. cit., p. 28.
- 63) Thesis 2 of the "26 Theses on the Political Orientation of the SDS", concluded in Knedenich on 16/17th September 1967 by the Bonn group of the SDS.
- 64) Spring 1968 appeal to pupils and students by the "Action by trade union officials in the Rhine-Main, North Hesse and Rhine-Ruhr areas" - in "Die linke Linke" Ryschowsky, loc. cit., p. 193.
- 65) "konkret", loc. cit., 30th December 1968.
- 66) The following comparative statistic will serve as a basis: according to the "Statistical Year Book 1968" participation by young people aged 14 to 25, i. e. 12 age-classes, amounts to 14,3 % of the entire population of the Federal Republic of Germany.
- 67) Minutes of the 169th Session of the German Bundestag of 30th April 1968. Discussion arising out of the "Report of the Federal Government on the Internal Political Situation", p. 9011.