

THE
CONFLICT
OF
GENERATION

*THE CHARACTER
AND SIGNIFICANCE OF
STUDENT MOVEMENT*

LEWIS S. FEUER

BASIC BOOKS, INC., PUBLISHERS

NEW YORK / LONDON

168. Jonathan Root, *The Betrayers: The Rosenberg Case—A Reappraisal of an American Crisis* (New York, 1963), pp. 31-33, 54, 59, 79.
169. *The Campus*, LVIII, No. 21 (April 24, 1936).
170. *The Campus*, LVIII, No. 29 (May 26, 1936); No. 28 (May 22, 1936); No. 27 (May 20, 1936); No. 26 (May 19, 1936).
171. Joseph P. Lash, "Action Notes," *Student Advocate*, I, No. 5 (October-November 1936), 28.
172. *The Campus*, LIX, No. 13 (October 30, 1936). I have not tried to correct discrepancies in the published figures.
173. Lapin, *op. cit.*, pp. 9, 21.
174. *The New York Times*, February 11, 1940. See also Joseph P. Lash, *Eleanor Roosevelt: A Friend's Memoir* (New York, 1964), pp. 55-58.
175. Iversen, *op. cit.*, p. 213.
176. "Are Students Afraid of Politics?" *New Republic* (October 29, 1951), pp. 16-17; Paula Goldberg, "League for Industrial Democracy," *New Republic* (December 10, 1951), pp. 2, 4.
177. James Webster, "A New Road for Student Socialism," *Monthly Review*, III, No. 6 (October 1951), 175.
178. The third of the twenty-one conditions which the Communist International required, in July 1920, of its affiliated parties was as follows: "In nearly all countries in Europe and America the class struggle is entering the stage of civil war. Under these circumstances the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois legality. They must everywhere create a duplicate illegal apparatus, which, at the decisive moment, could help the Party to perform its duty to the revolution." See V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, X: *The Communist International* (New York, 1938), 202.
179. Alistair Cooke, *A Generation on Trial: U.S.A. v. Alger Hiss* (New York, 1950).
180. Lawrence Barrett, "What the Campus Thinks: Polling College Editors," *The Nation*, CLXXXII (May 12, 1956), 402-403; "College Press for Ike," *The Nation*, CLXXXIII (October 27, 1956), 336.
181. "College Revival Becomes Confession Marathon," *Life*, XXVIII (February 20, 1950), 40-41.
182. Jones B. Shannon, "Religious Revolution on the Campus," *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXXX, No. 39 (March 29, 1958), 20.
183. "A Survey of the Political and Religious Attitudes of American College Students," *National Review*, XV, No. 14 (October 8, 1963), 291.
184. "Conservatives on the Campus," *Newsweek*, LVII, No. 15 (April 10, 1961), 35.
185. "A Survey of the Political and Religious Attitudes of American College Students," *National Review*, XV, No. 14 (October 8, 1963), 279-302.
186. The Editors, "Who You Are," *Monthly Review*, IX, No. 12 (April 1958), 426-431.
187. Roy Finch, "The Liberation Poll," *Liberation*, IV, No. 8 (November 1959), 14.
188. Robert Martinson, "State of the Campus: 1962," *The Nation*, CXCIV, No. 20 (May 19, 1962), 434. The inventory of students' political journals was as follows:

NAME OF JOURNAL	PLACE
<i>Cambridge 38 Alternatives</i>	Harvard University of Illinois
<i>Albatross Awareness</i>	Swarthmore University of Chicago
<i>Nightshade</i>	University of Connecticut
<i>A Liberal Light</i>	Miami
<i>The Activist</i>	Oberlin
<i>New University Thought</i>	Chicago
<i>New University News</i>	Chicago
<i>Reed</i>	Tulane
<i>The Phoenix</i>	Chicago
<i>Our Generation against War</i>	Montreal
<i>Comment</i>	Harvard
<i>Studies on the Left</i>	Wisconsin
<i>The Fat Abbott</i>	Boston
<i>Advance</i>	Harvard
<i>New Freedom</i>	Cornell
<i>Warbaby Review</i>	Harvard
<i>Mosaic</i>	Harvard
<i>The Lion Rampant</i>	Harvard
<i>Adams House Journal of the Social Sciences</i>	Harvard
<i>Yale Political</i>	Yale
<i>The Root and Branch</i>	Berkeley
<i>The Second Coming</i>	Columbia
<i>Tocsin News Forum</i>	Harvard
<i>Venture</i>	New York
<i>Audit</i>	Buffalo

EIGHT

The New Student Left of the Sixties

1960:

The Issue-Searching Stage

The student movement in America as it revived in 1960 was very much in its issue-searching stage. The numbers involved were small. At the University of California, according to two activists in 1960, "out of a student body of nearly 20,000, the student movement has a fluctuating core of about twenty-five to fifty students and several faculty members. Another few hundred students regularly offer their support on specific causes. When a real controversy arises, probably no more than five thousand people, or a quarter of the student population, are even aware of any unusual activity. But this is a real increase over previous times."¹ The student movement had not yet perceived the strategic significance of the merger of its own generational struggle with the civil rights movement. The first book to emanate from the student movement in a generation, *Student*, published in 1962 and written by David Horowitz, a leading Berkeley activist, in its headings of seventeen chapters dealing with various student causes never mentioned the civil rights movement. It gave primacy rather to criticizing the university as "an assembly line for high-grade technicians"; "the most powerful force defeating us in our lives as students," it said, "is the irrelevance of knowledge in America today." The book treated such matters as the hunger strike of a student against compulsory R.O.T.C. in October 1959, the university directives of 1959 which forbade the student government to speak for the student body on off-campus political issues, the student campaign against capital punishment, their vigil the night a prisoner was executed in San Quentin, the controversy over an English examination question which cast slurs upon the F.B.I., the students' demonstration in the San Francisco City Hall on May 12, 1960, against the House Un-Ameri-

can Activities Committee, the arrests and trials that followed, the campaign against the film *Operation Abolition*, the report by J. Edgar Hoover on Communist activities among the youth, the resignation of the *Daily Californian* editors when they were forbidden by the student government to support one particular student political party, the shooting of an activist professor and the killing of an assistant by a demented former graduate student, an extravagant charge that "the administration in Berkeley played the same role in the [latter] Parkinson case that officials have played for years in the South," the protest inspired when one student was failed in military science for wearing his uniform on a picket line against the R.O.T.C., the Easter Peace Walk, the address on campus of a speaker who had recently been convicted of contempt of Congress, the trial of a student accused of hitting a policeman with a club at the San Francisco City Hall riot, the university rules and the student protests against the Cuban invasion in April 1961, and the prospect for a new politics. In its search for a strategic issue, *Student* was characterized by all the themes of generational mission, generational conflict, and student elitism: "The campus is the last refuge of true democracy in America. Only on the campuses was there widespread support of the right of self-determination for the Cuban people; only on the campuses has there been large-scale community action in the defense of free speech."² These students, "as yet out of power, still at work in the universities, represent a new and dynamic group who will one day take the reins of this great nation." Strangely the civil rights struggle was only in passing mentioned in this book. A few sentences told how a student chapter of CORE had picketed the local Woolworth and Kress stores that year, and how the student government had enacted a resolution in support of the Southern sit-ins. But the campaign against capital punishment was given far more space, and still many more pages were devoted to the House Un-American Activities Committee. The final political statement by a graduate student in economics, Robert Scheer, was primarily a document on cultural alienation; it assailed "the humanly debasing mediocrity of T.V.," criticized society's manipulation of man for profit, defended the takers of pot or Plato, and warned that "inside every socialist lurks a puritan."³ But throughout this program-manifesto, there was no mention of the struggle for the Negro's civil rights.

Traits of the New Student Movement: Rejection of Labor

The new student movement, unlike the old, made no pretense of being rooted in economic issues. Early in its issue-searching stage, an article in one of its organs observed:

Little, if any, concern has been evidenced over economic issues—certainly only a very few students have shed tears over the strike defeats of unions, massive

unemployment, right-to-work laws, urban re-development, etc. The dramatic, clear-cut, and relatively easy-to-comprehend yet appalling conditions of the farm laborers have aroused some sympathy—but mostly in the highly politicized California area. Affluent society or not, these issues are strange to primarily middle-class students, and are far too complex to arouse a moral or emotional reaction, except for a few from pro-labor backgrounds.⁴

No longer could the American student activist satisfy his back-to-the-people impulse by identifying with the labor movement. Labor had ceased to be a movement; it had its everyday material interests but no apocalyptic goals; it was smug, self-satisfied, suspicious of idealistic intellectuals. A former president of the newly organized Students for a Democratic Society a year later described the students' disenchantment with labor: Labor, he said, had once been an "opposition group," championing the causes of the people against the starkest oppression, and putting forward a set of values and a social image of industrial democracy:

No longer does labor have this image. It appears not as an opposition group but as a reform club within the "establishment." It does not call for militant rank and file action, it does not basically challenge the structure of the Democratic Party, it doesn't challenge the economic privilege of corporate elites. Even more disheartening to students, its failure to banish discrimination from within its own house makes it a party to the racism that pervades almost every institution of American life.⁵

Labor had "acceded to Johnson as Kennedy's second man. . . ."

The New Left was one which rose predominantly out of an "affluent society" and moreover out of a relatively stable system; it therefore tended, when it thought critically, to do so in moralistic rather than economic terms. The New Left also was an indicator of the pattern which generational revolt takes in a prosperous society. The young activist, filled with aggressive emotion, found no objective, economic institution against which to direct his feeling. "Free-floating" aggression is much more likely to take a moralistic form; the very values of the System as a whole are rejected, precisely because the System is so economically stable that it provides jobs and opportunities for the willing and capable. The values of Vocation, Work, and Success are made the targets of generational revolt; hence the New Left has a propensity toward the beatnik and the hippie. A Communist writer noted this contrast between the present generation's radicalism and his own:

The revolt is generally expressed in the idiom of modern sociology and psychology rather than in the terms of political economy that were in vogue a generation ago. There is much talk about values, but a radical Rip Van Winkle who might mutter, "Ah, yes, exchange value and surplus value . . ." would soon be puzzled—the common current usage refers to moral and not economic categories.

Frequently this difference between the generations is enveloped in mystery, or it is made to appear that the moral concerns of this one are somehow

superior to the materialistic emphasis of its predecessor. It is really not so mysterious and spiritual—the generation that came of age in the 1930's experienced a shattering economic crisis, while the college radicals of today are children of the "affluent society." . . .

Among some student leaders there is a powerful sense of mission. One said, "If this student generation does not bring about meaningful social change I am afraid it will never come."⁶

What the new student radicalism resented most, however, was probably not the Affluent Society or the Organized System but the Stable System. It would have welcomed a chance to make a society affluent or to organize a system if it could do the organizing. But a Stable System defeats the possibilities of change which only an unstable society provides. The metaphysical value of the young is change; and the restless desire to direct and dominate change, and to see one's energies actualized, made the Stable System an alienating, impersonal object.

Rejection of the Old Liberals

If the New Student Left, disenchanted with labor, was at odds with the Old Marxists, the Old Left, it also utterly rejected the Old Liberals. The latter had committed the unpardonable sin—they had joined the Establishment. The new student movement refused utterly to identify with any part of the System or Establishment. It scorned the Old Liberals as Establishment Intellectuals. A vice-president of the National Student Association said in June 1963, "Involvement has meant to the post-war intellectual service in the Establishment . . . So that, in the late fifties, there was a good deal of celebration of the fact that intellectuals were to be found in all power structures of the society. . . ." Now, however, new alternatives existed for the intellectual—it was no longer a choice of either the Establishment or Isolation. "For the first time there is a base of power outside the university to which the intellectual can turn." The Young Left sought a new road to power. "The intellectual can obtain power by involving himself in the emerging centers of power in society: the civil rights movement, the peace movement, the discussion of economic issues."⁷ The will to political power of an intellectual elite was never more clearly stated.

The New Left in the sixties was as contemptuous of the Old Liberals as the young activists of the thirties had been of the liberals of the twenties. As one New Leftist wrote:

The symbol of the "old order," of the intellectuals of the fifties, is Arthur Schlesinger, and the reaction to Arthur Schlesinger underlines the healthy reaction of the intellectual to the trap that they were (and Schlesinger is) in. And the more articles that Arthur Schlesinger writes, lecturing intellectuals, telling them that they are out of their minds not to be serving the Establishment, the better off we'll be.⁸

Such a middle-aged radical as James Wechsler was dismissed as essentially well-meaning but ineffectual because he was too involved with the System. His *Reflections of an Angry Middle-Aged Editor* was treated in much the same terms in which Wechsler himself had described the Columbia liberals thirty years before: "For all Wechsler's amiable arguments, this is a depressing book. He says so many of the right things, more or less as they have been said for so many years, and it is not enough. In his way he is as devoted to *realpolitik* as are Nixon and Johnson."⁹ The trend of the New Left was to work "outside the framework of party politics." It was attracted to the tactic of direct action, to emulating the examples of the Montgomery bus strike, the sit-downs in the South, the pacifist demonstrations against atomic installations and bomb testing. One could pass directly from moral principle to direct action without the distortion of an intervening refractory political machine. One could pit one's will against the System, and it would yield. One could make history instead of being made by it.

Emergence of an Elitist Ideology: Intellectuals, Especially Students, as the Primary Agents of Social Change

An elitist trend in the American student movement emerged early in the sixties, finding its most explicit spokesman in C. Wright Mills. Disillusioned with labor, and at odds with the middle class and what he called the "power elite," Mills, by a process of elimination, had only the intellectuals to turn to as agents of social change. He was recapitulating the same processes of disillusionment with the people and apotheosizing of the intellectuals which the Russian populists had undergone. As the Russian students became disillusioned with the Bakuninist metaphysic which exalted the revolutionary potential of the masses, so now Mills threw aside the outmoded "labor metaphysic":

What I do not quite understand about some new left writers is why they cling so mightily to "the working class" of the advanced capitalist societies as *the* historic agency, or even as the most important agency, in the face of the really impressive historical evidence that now stands against this expectation.

Such a labor metaphysic, I think, is a legacy from Victorian Marxism that is now quite unrealistic.¹⁰

Mills made the intellectual class into the historical elite, the makers of history. "Who is it that is thinking and acting in radical ways? All over the world—in the bloc, outside the bloc and in between—the answer is the same: it is the young intelligentsia":

In the Soviet bloc, who is it that has been breaking out of apathy? It has been students and young professors and writers. . . . That is why we have got to study these new generations of intellectuals around the world as real live agencies of

historic change. . . . "But it is just some kind of moral upsurge, isn't it?" Correct. But under it: no apathy. Much of it is direct non-violent action, and it seems to be working, here and there. Now we must learn from the practice of these young intellectuals and with them work out new forms of action.

Some student activists had misgivings about Mills' espousal of intellectual elitism, though he had clearly caught an undercurrent of the student movement. "The books of C. Wright Mills are well-thumbed by us, and it is his sort of radicalism with which many of us identify. Yet Mills is not our intellectual leader, nor are we blind to his faults. We criticize him for his elitism and a certain callousness toward fact," wrote a Stanford student leader, the head of the Palo Alto Fair Play for Cuba Committee.¹¹ Some student idealists were reluctant to look at themselves as candidates for power in their own right rather than as trustees for the masses. They argued that Mills' elitism could lead to the support of undemocratic regimes such as Castro's.¹² They held on to the hope of a "pacifist-liberal-labor-Negro coalition." Others argued that where the students and young intellectuals had been able to make their contribution, it was by merging themselves with the revolutionary masses: "The social value of the Cuban intellectual has stood in direct proportion to his willingness to fuse his own identity with that of the Cuban worker and peasant."¹³

The neo-elitist ideology often expressed itself in an adulation of identification with such figures as Fidel Castro. Castro, an intellectual, a student leader, had galvanized the masses. Castro was anti-American, and the new student movement was emotionally attracted to whoever was anti-American. Anti-Americanism was the ideology of rejecting all that the fathers stood for. History was going to be made by the anti-Americans of the world, the "uncommitted" peoples of the world, the colored races of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the Negro in the United States. The fathers were defined by the unconscious of the students in the student movement as without virtues, the oppressors "of all that was living in the world."

Search for a Foreign Identification: The Appeal of Castro

To the new student activists casting about for some personality with whom they might identify, Fidel Castro was what we might call a "generational hero"; he had destroyed the order of the fathers. The young bearded Cuban doctor of law, leading his band of student revolutionaries to victory over the System, and to the founding of a New Humanistic Society, was quickly exalted in the new revolutionary mythology. Fidel Castro synthesized the ingredients of the New Ideology, anti-Americanism, intellectual elitism, revolutionary activism, and a sense of generational mission. One student leader in 1961 explained this identification in astonishingly naïve terms: "To a remarkable degree there are ideological similarities

between the Cuban and Campus revolutions. Both Cuban and Campus rebels are *strong* dissenters, firm in their convictions and willing to speak out and act militantly in spite of the mighty coercive powers of the American state." Castro had not yet declared himself a Marxist-Leninist or his regime Communist. Therefore young student activists could the more easily project their own free-wheeling rebellion on him:

Both Cuban and Campus revolutions are inexperienced, groping movements, sometimes stumbling. . . . Most important, their motivating ideologies are neither socialism—Marxian or otherwise—nor liberalism, although they combine elements of both. Rather, the ideology of both the *Barbudos* of Cuba and the Campus revolutionaries is a refreshing combination of humanism and rationalism. . . . In at least one sense the Fidelista is very fortunate. He is confronted with the opportunity to steer Cuba's, and perhaps Latin America's destiny upon the path which he chooses. . . . Many students at U. of C., Stanford, San Francisco and San Jose State College, at Wisconsin, and Chicago and N.Y.U. grasp and appreciate this attempt to direct human history.¹⁴

The emotional appeal of Castro to American students was founded on precisely its amalgam of elitism and populism. American activists longed to share such an experience as the Cuban students' back-to-the-people movement:

They had all volunteered to leave their homes and promising careers for three years to go to the mountains to teach the children there the simple elements of a basic education. . . . Fidel Castro was speaking. He warned them of the difficulties they would face there, their isolation from all to which they had become accustomed in their lives, and the natural resistance they would find among the peasants to the new venture. He urged patience upon them and then thanked them for their sacrifice.¹⁵

To lead the people, to be its pure, youthful guides, to sacrifice oneself for them, to live by an ideal higher than the ordinary goods of careers, and by a faith nobler than the objectivities of science, such was the creed of which Castro seemed the prophet. When the missile crisis of 1962 took place, and the United States insisted on the withdrawal of the Soviet missile installations, the student activists were ready to believe it was all an invention of the Central Intelligence Agency. As the Cuban crisis receded, as Castro became embroiled with Communist China over her attempts to dominate his policy, and as Cuba itself became less stridently anti-American, the student activists became perceptibly less enthusiastic over Castro. Then the Vietcong's guerrilla warfare and the grandiose anti-American onslaughts of Mao Tse-tung became more suitable objects for generational admiration.

But a foreign identification was never a sufficient channel for the back-to-the-people longings of the emerging American student movement. If there was no proletariat, no peasantry, no downtrodden people with whom

to merge oneself, there was a challenge of identification with the lowliest of Americans, who stood outside the ordinary boundaries of the class system—the Negro. In 1960 the sudden rise of the Negro student movement gave a fresh stimulus to the American student movement.

The Negro Student Movement for Civil Rights

The Negro student movement came spontaneously into existence on February 1, 1960.¹⁶ Its immediate objective was to desegregate lunch counters; its ultimate aim was to destroy the entire "Jim Crow" system of discrimination in transportation, rest rooms, restaurants, and recreational facilities. On February 1, 1960, four Negro students sat down at a dime store counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, and asked for cups of coffee; they set off a chain of reactions on the campuses of Negro colleges throughout the country, and had the deepest subsequent effect on the American student movement generally. The students were bullied and beaten, but they could not be browbeaten. Their sit-ins were truly spontaneous, for no organization such as NAACP, CORE, or the Southern Christian Leadership Conference planned or organized them.¹⁷ The initiative during this period was that of Negro students, though they had the example before them of the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955. A Negro seamstress, Mrs. Rosa Parks, had boarded a bus in Montgomery after her day's work on December 1; when the bus driver ordered her to yield her seat to a white passenger, she refused. Her arrest aroused the Negro community, which organized a nonviolent boycott of the bus line. Hardships, arrests, imprisonment, and terrorism followed; almost a full year later, on November 13, 1956, the United States Supreme Court declared unconstitutional Alabama's laws on segregation in buses, and a few weeks later integration on the buses was realized. The name of the young leader of the boycott, a twenty-seven-year-old Baptist minister, Martin Luther King, Jr., was written down among those of the outstanding Americans of his time. It was the Negro middle class which had conceived and inspired the Montgomery boycott;¹⁸ it was their sons who less than three years later proceeded to the even more direct "confrontation" of sit-ins. The fathers had abstained from using a public utility; the sons demanded the use of one.

The wave of sit-ins which took place was unprecedented in the history of the American student movement. "The Greensboro sit-ins struck a special chord of repressed emotion," writes Howard Zinn, "and excitement raced across the Negro college campuses of the South."¹⁹ This was the direct action of a Negro student movement. The chronological list for the month of February 1960 alone indicates the readiness to spontaneous action among the Negro studentry:²⁰

DATE	CITY AND STATE	SCHOOL	ACTION	NO. ARRESTED AND CHARGES
Feb. 1	Greensboro, N.C.	N.C. Agricultural and Technical College Dudley H.S. Bennett College	Sit-ins Picket and Boycott	4: Trespass
Feb. 8	Durham, N.C. Winston-Salem, N.C. Fayetteville, N.C.	N.C. College Winston-Salem Teachers' College Fayetteville Teachers' College	Sit-in Sit-in Sit-in	25: Trespass
Feb. 9	Charlotte, N.C. High Point, N.C. Concord, N.C.	Johnson C-Smith Univ. William Penn H.S. Barber-Scotia College	Sit-in Picket and Boycott Sit-in Sit-in and religious service on court- house lawn	3: Assault and violating fire law 1: Blocking sidewalk
Feb. 10	Raleigh, N.C.	Elizabeth, N.C. Henderson, N.C. Shaw Univ., St. Augustine College	Elizabeth City Teachers' College Kittrell College Sit-in Sit-in Sit-in	43: Trespass
Feb. 11	Hampton, Va. Portsmouth, Va.	Hampton Institute Norcom H.S.	Sit-ins and Picket Sit-ins	28: Disorderly conduct
Feb. 12	Rock Hill, S.C.	Friendship Jr. College Clinton Jr. College		

DATE	CITY AND STATE	SCHOOL	ACTION	NO. ARRESTED AND CHARGES
Feb. 13	Nashville, Tenn.	Fisk Univ. Tenn. State College	Sit-ins Boycott	76: Conspiracy to violate commerce laws; dis- orderly conduct
Feb. 19	Chattanooga, Tenn.	High School	Sit-ins	59: Loitering
Feb. 20	Richmond, Va.	Va. State Univ.	Sit-in Picket Boycott	63: Trespass
Feb. 22	Petersburg, Va.	Va. State College	Library Sit-in	14: Trespass
Feb. 25	Montgomery, Ala.	Alabama State College	Sit-in March to state capital	34: Disorderly conduct
	Tuskegee, Ala.	Tuskegee Institute	Boycott of classes March	
Feb. 29	Tallahassee, Fla.	Florida A. & M. Univ.	Sit-in Boycott	6
	Nashville, Tenn.	Fisk Univ., Tenn. Agri.	March to court	

Thus, within the first month of sit-ins, February 1960, the students of at least twenty-six Negro institutions were involved in direct action to secure the abrogation of racial restrictions. The following month of March, twenty-seven more Negro institutions of learning were drawn into spontaneous sit-in movements. Then, as Tom Kahn writes, "as the novelty of the demonstrations wore off, newspaper reporting became increasingly meagre."

Generational Revolt in the Negro Student Movement

Underlying the Negro student movement, the spontaneous uprising of the sit-ins, was a profound de-authorization of Negro students' own fathers, their older generation. The Negro student movement was thus directed, not only against white oppression, but also against the students' fathers; it was a generational conflict at the same time. "The sit-ins," writes Louis Lomax, "were a revolt against both segregation and the entrenched Negro leadership." To the students' minds, their own fathers seemed too often

cowed and emasculated by centuries of white oppression and humiliation. The fathers failed as moral guides in the struggle for emancipation.²¹ Often professors were cast in the role of de-authorized fathers by their students. As one Negro student leader, Glenford Mitchell, editor of the student newspaper at Shaw University and member of the Intelligence Committee which led the sit-in demonstrations in Raleigh, North Carolina, described this generational division:

The Intelligence Committee at Shaw University and St. Augustine's College asked the students not to elicit advice or opinions from their instructors. "This," we asserted, "is a student movement, manned by students, planned by students, and controlled by students. We do not need faculty advisors on this venture. . . ." We are always very cautious not to allow Uncle Toms to share our plans and decisions. Heaven knows how far such plans would get before we were ready to execute them. We have reason to regard some of our faculty members as such, and there are even some among our ranks. . . . Our indifference to administration and faculty on this issue is well understood by both sides . . .²²

At the largest Negro university of the United States, Southern University in Baton Rouge, the administration and parents made common cause against the students. The president of the university, Dr. Felton G. Clark, felt himself obliged to invoke disciplinary action against participants in sit-ins. When the students protested, seventeen of them were expelled. "Their schoolmates decided to boycott all classes until they were reinstated. In retaliation the administration called the parents of students and told them the student leaders were inciting to riot. Upset parents summoned their children home." When many students proposed to withdraw in protest, the university required that they secure the approval of their parents for such a step. For a brief period after student demonstrations the university was closed, and at the request of the authorities, police cars patrolled the campus to maintain order and rebuff demonstrations on behalf of the expelled students. Subsequently, the student leaders advised their almost five thousand fellow-students to return to classes.²³ Southern University thus became the unique battle ground of two generational standpoints. Dr. Felton Grandison Clark, president of Southern University, was a noted educator who had done much to advance Negro rights and opportunities. His father before him had been president of the institution too, and both believed in the efficacy of quiet, persistent pressure and education. Dr. Clark had proved effective, for example, in persuading a Southern chemical plant to hire its first Negro chemists; but when his students were arrested for off-campus sit-in demonstrations, he found himself bound to comply with the mandates of the State Board of Education. The students charged him with "knuckling under." The president replied that a state regulation provided for the suspension of arrested students until their cases were decided by the courts.²⁴ To the embattled students this constituted an evasive, cowardly, hypocritical administrative legalism.

The Negro student movement, whose participants yearned for inclusion in the rights and privileges of middle-class America, was relatively free of the beatnik, nihilist elements which characterized the white student movement. Students in the Negro colleges were content with the everyday culture of American life. One observer reported, "They are more likely to quote you Harry Golden than Gandhi or Thoreau. In a meeting with a group of leaders from Virginia State, one proclaimed: 'We have no intellectuals, we read no books. I'll be blunt with you, man: We're conservatives.'"²⁵ A Berkeley activist felt himself out of place at the leading Negro institution, Howard University.²⁶ The sit-ins contrasted strangely with the "tameness" of Negro campus life.

Absolutely no forms of rebellion exist: no bohemianism, no orgies, no riots, no radical discussion groups—not even walking on the grass! Everyone dresses like the pictures in Sunday magazines—pressed pants, shined shoes, ivy shirts and flouncy dresses. Girls, as a rule, must be safe in their dormitories by 10:30 PM—even on weekends—and to be caught drinking is cause for expulsion. Fraughts are rife and claim fanatic loyalty.

The virtues of the "Protestant Ethic," of hard work, conscientiousness, and thrift, for the Negro student often constituted goals sought in his generational protest. Often he knew only too well that at one generation's remove his own forebears had lived the life of the lowliest, with their disorganized families, absent fathers, and sexual promiscuity. This was a heritage which the young Negro student wanted to overcome by his self-discipline.

Moreover, the students were no longer content "to thrive on handouts from the white community." "Since the professors and administrators have lived in just this way, they come in for a good deal of contempt." This was the de-authoritization of the old out of which every student movement is born. "For, when asked why they rebel actively where their parents did not, the students reply, 'You can't keep an educated man down.' Half a loaf is ashes in the mouths of the new generation."²⁷

The Impact of the Negro Student Uprising on the White Student Movement

The wave of sit-ins in 1960 by Negro students had a tremendous effect on Northern white students. It prepared the emotional basis for a new back-to-the-people identification on the part of white students, for the old identification with the labor movement had vanished and left a vacuum. Organized labor was now regarded as one of the comfortable, narrowly oriented, and relatively culture-less interest groups of American society; furthermore, the workers had made it plain that they could do without the intellectuals.²⁸ But if the Marxist notion of the proletarian mission to reconstruct

society seemed to the students an antiquated myth, it had expressed their emotional longing to merge themselves with the lowly and the exploited. Now the Negro students' heroism set an example for white students; an interracial unity in a common struggle for the voiceless Negro masses—here was an ideal perhaps even nobler than that of the workingmen's internationals. Southern Negro student emissaries toured the Northern campuses. On April 1, 1960, for instance, Berkeley students crowded into their largest auditorium to hear Thomas Gaither from Claffin College in South Carolina.²⁹ His grammar was poor, his words eloquent, when he told how his four hundred fellow-students had been soaked with fire hoses and tried for breach of the peace. The Negro students' example was evidently a powerful one, for the following month more than sixty Californian students behaved similarly in protest against the House Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco, and were also hosed with water and arrested.³⁰

Civil rights now rapidly became the dominant issue in the new student unrest. It allowed the coalescence of all the emotional sources of student movements. It provided a back-to-the-people identification in a way in which no campaign for the abolition of capital punishment could; it offered a chance for utter self-sacrifice far more than any pacifist campaign against bomb testing or military installations could, for it brought one face to face with the most violent and vindictive elements of society. This, moreover, was the one issue in which moral right and wrong stood out most clearly. The ethic of racial justice had a simplicity which was absent from the complex considerations and counter-considerations of such issues as capital punishment or war. And finally, the civil rights issue was the one which embarrassed the elder generation most. How seriously had the liberal elder generation meant its liberalism to be taken with respect to racial relations? How sincere were the elders?

The Negro and white student movements now started to merge in one back-to-the-people movement. Negro students, veterans of the sit-ins, and several white students, resolved to form a protest organization of their own distinct from the three existing adult organizations, NAACP, CORE, and the SCLC. Thus the generational division and generational revolt manifested itself in the organizational structure of the civil rights movement itself, and in the spring of 1960, SNCC came into existence, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Sixteen staff people worked at its headquarters in Atlanta at only subsistence wages.³¹ The adult organizations took its existence as a rebuke, but it was indeed the students' own. Its organizers were college youngsters, who "decided to drop everything—school and family and approved ambition—and move into the Deep South to become the first guerrilla fighters of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee," wrote Howard Zinn.³² By the middle of 1964, there were about 150 of them working full time, of whom approximately 80 per cent were Negro. Moreover, this Negro student movement was unusual

in the history of student movements inasmuch as its members came predominantly from poor and working-class families. A census late in 1963 of the forty-one field workers in Mississippi showed that of the thirty-five Negroes, the twenty-five who were from the Deep South "came from homes where the mothers were maids or domestics, the fathers factory workers, truck drivers, farmers, bricklayers, carpenters."³³ The sons were usually college graduates. They went about in Mississippi conducting Freedom Schools, teaching the theory and practice of democracy, cajoling the passive, the timid, and the indifferent to register to vote. In the summer of 1964, there were 650 of them, "the volunteers," mostly Northern white students, drawn by the spirit of idealism and self-sacrifice to the calling of missionaries of democracy. These several hundreds of idealistic college students were statistically a minute fraction of their two million fellow-students in the United States. Yet their moral influence was immense.

Fortunately, however, the civil rights movement never became altogether a student movement. A measure of generational equilibrium remained, with the influence of Martin Luther King, the NAACP, and the Kennedy administration itself strong. Left to itself, the student movement, in the form of the SNCC, would have mounted a series of actions which might well have led to massive outbursts of directionless violence; personal disillusionment and the alienation of the white liberal community would have resulted. At this critical juncture, the influence of the Kennedy administration kept the student movement along constructive channels. As Tom Hayden wrote:

The Kennedy Administration made clear that it believed and was willing to support the idea that the vote, not the lunch counter, must be the ultimate focus of the integration movement. . . . Prominent individuals and foundations met with student representatives from SNCC and promised financial help for massive voter registration efforts. Coupled with the virtual promise of full Justice Department support, the promise of financial help considerably enhanced the possibility of a fruitful voter campaign.³⁴

This, then, was a back-to-the-people movement conducted in part with the blessing and advice of the government. Many in SNCC were restive about the role of the government, accusing it of passivity and betrayal, and many caviled at the continuing advice and participation of the adult liberals of NAACP and SCLC. Nevertheless, the fact that this student movement could pursue a path which led to constructive legislation and extension of the democratic process, that it did not terminate as so many of its forebears in disillusionment with the people and individual terrorism, was probably due to the cross-generational cooperation which was maintained. Perhaps the administration's helpfulness arose in part, as some students charged, from its desire for Southern Negro votes in 1962 and 1964, but as Tom Hayden conceded, this was "not to gainsay the validity of the administration's viewpoint."

The Will to Martyrdom Ingredient in the New Student Movement

The students who converged on Mississippi were not altogether representative of the growing American student movement. They were subject to adult controls. "The screening process for volunteers had been rigorous. From Stanford University, only 45 of an original 300 applicants eventually got to Mississippi, and at Wesleyan University half of the students who wished to participate were not admitted." Professor John Maguire of Wesleyan indicated that they aimed to exclude "two types: those who are looking for a new kind of 'kick,' sexual or otherwise; and those evangelical souls" who, with no understanding of the concrete situation, will "turn their eyes skyward and say, 'Lord, here I am.'"³⁵

Elitism, populism, and the tragic ingredient of suicidalism, however, were all present in this new back-to-the-people movement. One student noted, "Some of these people think that they are going to reform our entire civilization and that the Negro will be the spearhead of this new age."³⁶ There was suicidalism. The columnist, Joseph Alsop, wrote, "It is a dreadful thing to say, but it needs saying. The organizers who sent these young people into Mississippi must have wanted, even hoped for, martyrs."³⁷ It was an "undeclared guerrilla war," wrote William McCord. In seminars they learned how, if caught in a violent mob, to crouch with knees up to protect the belly, and to wrap one's arms around one's head.

The letters, for instance, of the young martyred Episcopal seminarian, Jonathan Myrick Daniels, murdered by a white racist sadist in August 1965, expressed this high note of self-sacrifice and the self-destructive desire to become immersed in the life of the lowliest. An essay of his, printed in the *Episcopal Theological School Journal*, a mimeographed student publication at his seminary in Cambridge, told how in Selma a "redneck turned and stared at my seminarian's collar, at my ESCRU (Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity) button, at my face":

He turned to a friend: "Know what he is?" The friend shouted: "No." Resuming, the speaker whinnied, "Why, he's a white niggah." I was not happy thus to become the object of every gaze. And yet deep within me rose an affirmation and a tenderness and a joy that wanted to shout, yes! . . . I should be unspeakably proud of my title. For it is the highest honor, the most precious distinction I have ever received. It is one that I do not deserve—and cannot ever earn. As I type now, my hands are hopelessly white. "But my heart is black. . . ."

When a Negro child of four said she did not love him, Jonathan was smitten with guilt. "A part of me seemed to die inside, and I fought back tears." There was the student's alienation from the world: "We are beginning to see as we never saw before that we are truly in the world and yet ultimately not of it."³⁸

To merge himself with the Negroes, to be "black in heart," here we have the typical mechanism of identification with the lowliest which characterizes student movements. It fused itself with an extinction of both one's selfhood and selfishness through a death-seeking for the movement's sake. The students became death-seekers.

The strange suicidal trait manifested itself with unprecedented strength in the new American student movement. As the volunteers gathered to prepare for their civil rights campaign in Mississippi during the summer of 1964, the awareness that they were embarking on an encounter with death cast its enthrallment upon them. "I may be killed and you may be killed," said James Forman, executive secretary of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, to two hundred of the college students. "If you recognize that, the question of whether we're put in jail will become very, very minute."³⁹ The students, noted the reporter, had "an unmistakable middle-class stamp," and many were from the best schools in the East and West, Harvard, Smith, Stanford. Their common interest, apart from civil rights, seemed to be folk singing. Yet in their search for community, meaningfulness, for overcoming alienation, the death-motif was dominant. Some could offer the reporter "only the vaguest of explanations for deciding to join the project," but in their letters the Mississippi volunteers documented once again the death-wish which has hovered over all student movements:

"I've thought about death a lot and what death means about life, and I know that right now I don't want to live any way but the way I am. . . ."

"To us it was something new, something unbelievable, that we were putting our lives on the line, that some of our team-mates had been killed. . . ."

"He said what I knew all along, but it has made this place seem like a funeral parlor. People just walk around and sing, or are silent."

"If we realize that safety is a myth, aren't we in a sense 'saved' by that knowledge and acceptance of death?"

The students recognized that their ideological dedication had its unconscious sources:

"There's a lot of truth about all of us—y'all too—in Eric Hoffer's *The True Believer*."

"Look magazine is searching for the ideal naive northern middle-class white girl. For national press, that's the big story. And when one of us gets killed, the story will be even bigger."

Though "most of the staff and volunteers were agnostic nonviolent technicians," masochistic imagery of crucifixion and Jesus came into evidence:

"We must also learn to take the worst. Some of the Staff members walk around carrying sections of hose. This strangely terrible training in brutality may well save lives. (I must confess, I have not been able to take part in even the screaming of a mob scene. . . . Wherever possible, I am among the victims.)"

"[Bob Moses] is more or less the Jesus of the whole project."

"Furthermore, did Jesus Christ say, 'Let the experts preach the gospel'? No! He commanded everyone who loves Him to 'take up thy cross and follow me.'"⁴⁰

The Mississippi volunteers were usually acting against their parents' wishes, asserting their generational independence. As the editor of their letters writes, "Some parents were sympathetic. But many were uncomprehending, others were simply afraid for their children. Thus a number of volunteers had gone to Oxford secretly. Or against the wishes of their families. They tried to explain." For instance:

"By now you know what I told you about my plans for the summer was in part a deliberate lie."

"I want to fulfill myself. . . . I do not want to spend my life in the pursuit and enjoyment of comfort and security. . . . I 'save' myself by committing myself to the concerns of other men. . . . I sense somehow that I am at a crucial moment in my life and that to return home where everything is secure and made for me would be to choose a kind of death."

The Mississippi student leaders were aware of the suicidalism which characterized many of the participants in the project, but they resented the suggestion made by some Northern writers that the summer volunteers were being "used as unwitting martyrs to provoke federal intervention." This suggestion especially infuriated young Robert Moses, graduate of Hamilton and Harvard, who for three years had been working in Mississippi as a SNCC field secretary, often virtually alone and ignored. "He was," said an interviewer, "understandably irritated at the implication that he is a Machiavellian who sits in an office somewhere coldly sending innocents to the slaughter." The movement's leaders emphasized that "the Summer Project volunteers were repeatedly warned ahead of time of the dangers they would be facing." Yet it was conceded that the presence of death-minded students was helpful to the movement: "They acknowledge that protection for Negroes in Mississippi is likely to be provided only when whites are involved." A local girl in the Holly Springs Freedom School wrote in its mimeographed newspaper that she and her friends were hurt but not shocked by the disappearance of the three freedom workers: "Many of our people have come up missing and nothing was said or done about it. . . . But never have I heard it said on the news or over T.V. or radio."⁴¹ The death-seekers, it was surmised, perhaps were the needed martyrs of social advancement. Suicidalism, in the language of sociology, was said to have an essential functional role in a social movement.

The self-destructive theme in the student movement was at its height in Mississippi. In a lesser guise, it reappeared from time to time in the Berkeley student movement two years later. The prosaic, organization-minded Communist student leader in Berkeley was so much disturbed by this tendency in the "peace movement" to choose the most self-destructive

tactics that she characterized this trend in un-Marxian terms as "self-immolation": "We are witnessing the self-immolation of a very important section of the movement. We must stop it."⁴²

Rejection of the Peace Corps

The new student activists, especially the revolutionary ones, had little interest, however, in the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps was recognized as an imaginative effort by the administration of President John F. Kennedy to channelize constructively the populist, back-to-the-people impulses of young idealists. It was first proposed to students on October 14, 1960, on the steps of the Student Union Building of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. Greeted by a large, enthusiastic crowd of ten thousand students, candidate John F. Kennedy, speaking extemporaneously, challenged the students' idealism: "How many of you are willing to spend 10 years in Africa or Latin America or Asia working for the U.S. and working for freedom? How many of you [who] are going to be doctors are willing to spend your days in Ghana? . . . On your willingness to do that . . . I think, will depend the answer whether we as a free society can compete." But this challenge to idealism lacked one ingredient vital to the student activist; it lacked the anti-elder generation, anti-System element. It offered the possibility for an identification but not for aggression. And a revolutionary student movement above all seeks a channel for aggression. A movement sponsored by the government, by the oldsters, is simply too tame for the activists.

From its inception the student activists criticized the Peace Corps as pro-Establishment and nonrevolutionary, and when the war in Vietnam broke out they cited more specific rationalizations for their animus against the Peace Corps. Thus, students of a Committee on the Peace Corps and the Vietnam War circulated a statement in November 1965 which said in part, "I cannot serve in good conscience while the same government which would employ me to help people in one part of the world is killing, maiming, and leaving homeless men, women, and children in Vietnam," and they applauded a young associate professor who denounced the Peace Corps as a plot of the older generation. "The administration is using the Peace Corps as a playpen to keep unruly students out of the kitchen where adults are cooking up a war." The Peace Corps, he said, "is in fact the sugar coating to our war pill."⁴³

Thus, the Peace Corps was perceived as a "playpen" for children to make it all the easier for the evil-minded adults to go about their nefarious work. The slogan-metaphors of an emotive generational revolt permeated the rationalization for spurning the Peace Corps. When the newly appointed director of the Peace Corps appealed for volunteers on the campus of the University of California, the questions from a hostile audience of

activists aimed at the involvements of the United States in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. The older generation was presumably unmasked and exposed.⁴⁴

Thus, the student movement generally stood opposed to the 10,200 volunteers who in 1966 were at work in forty-six countries on a variety of projects. The Peace Corps represented an isolation in pure form of the back-to-the-people component of traditional students' movements; it was the idealism, the altruism, in its pure state. In six African countries, more than one half of all high school teachers with college degrees were Peace Corps volunteers; in Nigeria, one-third of its students, more than fifty thousand of them, were being taught by Peace Corpsmen.⁴⁵ But the student activist regarded them with something of the bemusement which activists fifty years ago reserved for settlement house workers. The Peace Corps volunteer was still part of the System; the activist wished to secede from it, and destroy it. The volunteers were not generational revolutionists.

Failure of a Quest: Rejection by the Poor

Activists and student leaders, rejecting the Peace Corps and governmental projects, sought to contrive new forms of populism dissociated from the Establishment and expressive of their generational revolt. They tried to go back to the people directly in the slums, without benefit of mediation by the government or the labor movement.

Tom Hayden, a founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, and later a participant in the three-man mission of self-appointed diplomats who went to North Vietnam in December 1965, was one such ideal-typical activist filled with a missionary, back-to-the-people spirit. An admiring article in the *Village Voice*, organ of the young intellectuals of Greenwich Village, held him up as a model.

For the last year-and-a-half Tom Hayden, 26, has been invisible to the mass media as he worked to build a community union in Newark's Negro ghetto. He led an exhausting, spartan life there. He ate and slept irregularly, worked hard, lived with frustration and failure.

But NCUP (Newark Community Union Project) persevered. . . . Eventually, there were small triumphs: better garbage collection, repairs of rundown tenements, the de-activation of the city's urban renewal scheme that would have uprooted thousands of low-income families.

Hayden, a former graduate student at the University of Michigan . . . was there—in Newark—because he chose to live his theory that social change comes from the disinherited of society. He disagreed with the wisest—and often the best—of the older radicals. . . . Hayden could have had his choice of juicy jobs. . . . Instead, he chose to live on \$10 a week and remain invisible in Newark where he sometimes seemed a religious prophet fasting outside the gates of Sodom.⁴⁶

Here, in Newark, said the writer, the root ideas of the New Left were being tested. "Could a lasting alliance be forged between university intellectuals bred on Mills and Camus and the excluded of the ghetto with their lack of education and enormous despair?"

Very quickly, however, American student activists began undergoing an experience very much like that of their Russian forebears. They found themselves rejected, in a sense, by the poor whom they came to save. In 1963, for instance, the Students for a Democratic Society had resolved to make the organization of the white poor its main objective. "The young people who joined SDS after Kennedy and the mass media discovered the poor saw the organization as one which would organize the poor." Michael Harrington, author of *The Other America*, prophet of poverty, was received on many campuses by enthusiastic audiences. Two years later, however, this back-to-the-people spirit had ebbed and was being replaced by a more unadorned elitism of the intellectual class. *Viewpoints*, a journal by members of New York Students for a Democratic Society, tried to explain the reasons for this intellectual and emotional change. The projects, it said, "have disappointed many others who had higher hopes. . . . The fact that the poor as a 'class' do not have the power to change society by themselves is coming to be understood by more and more members." Meanwhile, the intellectuals were on the march; "The anti-war movement and the Berkeley events have brought into visible protest middle-class intellectuals, faculty members, political figures, and a few trade unionists." The emphasis was increasingly strong on middle-class intellectuals as the chosen disinherited. "Middle-class groups such as teachers, welfare workers, and other white collar elements are coming to be seen along with the working poor and unionized workers as groups which have problems, suffer alienation, are organizable and, in fact are organizing already." Lastly, the students were getting tired of giving their emotions so fully to the poor. As the author put it more circumspectly, "perhaps most important, is simply that this generation of students is far too flexible and fluid to stay with any perspective once it begins to be dogmatic and limiting."⁴⁷

The failure of the masses to respond, and the plain fact that the "initiative" was that of the "students and professors" began to affect student ideologists. They began to recognize and accept their apparent role as the primary makers of history. They began to conceive the role of intellectuals exactly as Lavrov had when he told the Russian students, disillusioned with the people's passivity, that the historical mission belonged to the "critically thinking individuals." The chief ideologist of the Free Speech Movement in Berkeley in the fall of 1965 was metamorphosing into such an ideologist of intellectual elitism. "Extreme action on their [the students'] part," wrote Steve Weissman, "might move whole other sectors of the population. If not, we should perhaps find out now so that we can plan our futures differently."⁴⁸

The ebullient chief writer of the Berkeley Student Movement, laureate-

expellee from both Brandeis University and the Trotskyists, and promoter with petit-bourgeois zest of the sales and production of *MacBird*, became utterly disillusioned with the American working class when it failed to heed the New Leftist summons to oppose the war in Vietnam. He wrote bitterly of the pro-war workers' demonstration in New York:

It was the day of the great workers' march, a marvelous day. . . . A hundred thousand workers marched down Fifth Avenue. . . . Seamen, Teamsters, Longshoremens, Auto Workers, Carpenters, Bricklayers, and many others. . . .

It was last Saturday, May 13, the day of the March to Support Our Boys in Vietnam, and the most popular chant was: "What do you want?" "Victory!" "When do you want it?" "Now!"

You will forgive me for seeing everything in class terms, but you see I Was a Teenage Trotskyist (at 19 I joined the Young Socialist Alliance) and that experience taught me to believe that my place was with the workers, however backward and lacking in true consciousness they might be. . . .

Anyway, the next time some \$3.90 an hour AFL type workers go on strike for a 50¢ raise, I'll remember the day they chanted "Burn Hanoi, Not Our Flag," and so help me I'll cross their ——— picket line. . . . They are grownups responsible for their own acts . . . evil, ugly people in their own right, every bit as bad as the Madison Avenue hipster. . . .

So what if the peace march on April 15 had a "middle-class" tone and the war march on May 13 had a "working-class" tone? Does that mean the middle-class types should be embarrassed and apologetic that they're not the "real" people? Of course not. . . .

As for the occupations themselves, schoolteaching and computer programming are ways of making a living every bit as honorable as carpentry or plumbing, and much more honorable than loading ships bound for Vietnam.⁴⁹

The New Left thus differed in one basic respect from the Old; more elitist, disenchanted with the working class, looking elsewhere to satisfy its needs for a populist identification, it was prepared, if need be, to look finally to the intellectuals themselves.

The so-called New Left which came into existence between 1960 and 1965 was under an emotional resolve to differentiate itself from the Old Left. The dividing line, however, remained primarily generational rather than ideological; the new emotions of revolt sought their own distinctive "style," vocabulary, and tactics. But when it came to the formulation of an explicit ideology, the New Left found itself, to its embarrassment, repeating the lines of the Old Left. The Old Left demanded to know precisely how the New Left differed in what they were saying from what socialists had always said. The New Left found it hard to define its ideological break with the Old Left.⁵⁰ Their generational rejection was clear; the Old Left in their eyes was de-authorized, defeated. In Berkeley, they ignored the plea of the fifty-year-old socialist and Trotskyist, Harold Draper, that they recognize their socialist identity with the Old Left; the New Left, feeling that they were making mass history, talked disparagingly and mockingly of the aged "grouplets." The new student activists, wishing

to maintain a generational autonomy, searched for a corresponding ideological demarcation. Clark Kissinger, the former national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society, for instance, tried to portray the New Left as less dogmatic: "The old Marxist Left was intensely ideological. They could rattle off the cause of any war as capitalism, imperialism, fight for markets: one, two, three. We are characterized primarily by skepticism." Actually, however, the New Left was equally hostile to the skeptics who proclaimed the concept of the "end of ideology." They "denounce that whole concept as part of the previous generation's sellout. (Says Kissinger, 'When they proclaim the end of ideology, it's like an old man proclaiming the end of sex. Because he doesn't feel it any more, he thinks it has disappeared.')⁵¹ The real cleavage still remains generational. The New Left rejects whatever smacks of the older generation, whether it is ideology or the end of ideology. "Virtually the entire established Left, from Norman Thomas to the Communist party, is viewed as having 'copped out' to 'the power structure' or 'the Establishment.'"⁵² The LID, its parent organization, was described by a New Leftist as "a kind of camp for itinerant old Leftist intellectuals—or those who think old."⁵³

The New Left is the most Traditional Left in its repetition of the classical themes of student movements. We have witnessed these recurrent themes—the desire to identify with the lowliest combined with elitism and an anti-democratic impulse. Both rejected by and rejecting labor as too "prosperous" to be a reliable ally, and finding their home middle class, their own, as clearly no force for radical social change, the New Left looks temporarily to the poor for its allies, the voiceless, unorganized poor, who have no union bureaucracy, no defensive organizations. At its extreme, the New Left, we might say, is the first movement to seek for an identification with the lumpenproletariat (in Marx's idiom) or the lower-lower class (in Lloyd Warner's usage). The chief spokesman for this neo-populism within the New Left was at the outset Paul Goodman, in whose writings it found a mélange of advocacy of criminal vandalism, homosexuality, and (what we might call) the "anti-virtues" of an un-Protestant ethic.⁵⁴ The Enemy, from this standpoint, is not the bourgeois system, not the socialist system, but the "Organized System" which necessarily maims and crushes man. The New Left, the *New Generation*, thus merges in part with the ethic of the Beat Generation, and with their successors three years removed, the hippies. It rejects *in toto* vocations and career jobs, refusing to capitulate to the System, refusing to become organization men. At its Goodmanian extreme, it claims to seek, in protest, the most menial jobs, thereby boycotting the "Rat Race." "Among some of the Beats, such a principle of integrity is clearly operating in the choice of job. . . . Farm labor, hauling boxes, janitoring, serving and dish-washing, messenger—these jobs resist the imputation of uselessness (or exploitation). . . . These *are* preferred Beat jobs."⁵⁵ The Beat Generation was

said to have contrived a "pattern of culture that, turning against the standard culture, costs very little and gives livelier satisfaction."

Yet in one respect the New Left has absorbed and gone beyond the Beat Generation. For the beats remained bound to their fathers, defying their values, but living on their allowances as remittance-men.⁵⁶ The beats wrote Abomunist Manifestoes but were essentially apolitical. They sought to found a subculture of their own within the interstices of the System, but they were not interested in proselytizing or building a mass movement.⁵⁷ The New Left endorses the moral critique of the Beat Generation, but adds to it the all-powerful strain of activism. The beatnik immersed himself in Zen, the ideology of secession and masochism; the New Leftist goes on to aggression, participatory democracy, and the young Marx. The political cycle, however, then continues. When he is rejected by his hoped-for lowly class allies, the New Leftist turns either to individual violence or individual withdrawal; the terrorist and the hippie are the commingling alternatives within the next stage of the New Left.

The New Leftist meanwhile tries to organize the poor to wage their own war against poverty and urban renewal. The poor themselves are urged to call their own strikes against slumlords—"No Rent for Rats"—and to exert pressure for improved garbage collections. The poor, the lower-lower, the permanently alienated, are seen as recruits in training for the guerrilla warfare against the Establishment.

"Participatory Democracy": Lenin Updated

"Participatory democracy" is the contribution of the New Student Left to political theory. It was born of their meetings, small and large, minute and mass, where the speaker, heckler or chairman, would feel that he had articulated in words what was trying to emerge from a long, often inchoate discussion. Suddenly the mass seemed inspired; words passed to action; the spontaneity of the mass broke through the formal paraphernalia of formal democracy with its parliamentary rules. "Participatory democracy" was "democratic anarchy" fulfilled. The phrase appeared in the Port Huron statement of the founding convention of Students for a Democratic Society in 1962: "In a participatory democracy, the political life would be based . . . (on the principle that) decision-making of basic social consequence be carried on by public groupings." An issue of the pacifist *Bulletin of the Committee for Nonviolent Action* undertook to explain how it had operated in the Assembly of Unrepresented People (AOUP), a group of two thousand, mostly composed of students, drawn from all segments of the "New Left," which convened for four days in Washington in August 1965 to press for peace in Vietnam, and which led to the arrest of more than 350 demonstrators:

AOUP had no organizational structure nor established discipline because its decision-making process was by "participatory democracy." This meant that not a single policy was predetermined and imposed; all policies could be established or modified by the participants in the Assembly. Because participatory democracy is likely to be around the radical movements for some time and may eventually be accepted almost universally, it is important that this mode of organization be studied and understood.

Participatory democracy has no initial organization or policies for a demonstration. . . . Decision is by neither voting nor consensus. In fact, decisions in the usual sense don't occur. Policies are set and action determined by those who in the maelstrom of discussion and debate, exert the most influence through courage, articulateness, reasonableness and sensitivity to the feelings of the group. Influence is enhanced by image characteristics such as reputation, looks and style of living that appeal to young people. . . .

Participatory democracy is unsuited for steady activities in which careful reason dominates, clear policy statements are important, and dissonant minorities would become conspicuous. The method is best suited to an action movement, mobilizing and focusing the moral energies of young people in brief, one-event actions. In such a milieu a leader's declaration of intent is a policy, his actions a decision; all currents move toward a crescendo, overwhelming discordant notes.⁵⁸

The advocates of the new "participatory democracy" explained that what they were advocating was a democracy of direct action in which the concerned activists could intervene directly in political processes, and affect their outcome without the intervention of an electorate and the machinery of representative democracy. The direct actions of a "participatory democracy" would be set up parallel to the institutions of representative democracy which they would then supersede. Staughton Lynd, an active civil rights worker and an assistant professor at Yale, saw "participatory democracy" as an American version of the Russian Soviet, with admixtures of Gandhi's pro-village ideology and of the back-to-the-people spirit of the Russian student movement of the nineteenth century. Staughton Lynd wrote:

In form, parallelism suggests a kinship between participatory democracy and Trotsky's conception of the Soviets as a "dual power," or Gandhi's concern to preserve the Indian village analogy. . . . Let the teacher leave the university and teach in Freedom Schools; let the reporter quit his job on a metropolitan daily and start a community newspaper; generally, let the intellectual make insurgency a full-time rather than a part-time occupation. As the Russian radical movement grew from Tolstoyism and the Narodniks' concern to dress simply, speak truth, and "go to the people," so participatory democracy at this point speaks most clearly to the middle-class man, daring him to forsake powerlessness and act.⁵⁹

The participatory democrat saw the people bestirring themselves spontaneously from the fetters of the System, throwing off its rigidities, its

formalistic elections and bureaucracies, and acting directly, humanly. A spontaneous protest might suddenly grow into a direct action against the government itself. Lynd wrote, with apocalyptic emotion, of a demonstration in Washington against the war in Vietnam:

Still more poignant was the perception—and I checked my reaction with many others who felt as I did—that as the crowd moved down the Mall toward the seat of government . . . so that there was nowhere to go but forward toward the waiting policemen, it seemed that the great mass of people would simply flow on through and over the marble building, that our forward movement was irresistibly strong, that had some been shot or arrested nothing could have stopped that crowd from taking possession of its Government. Perhaps next time we should keep going. . . .⁶⁰

The kinship between "participatory democracy" and "Soviet democracy," which Lynd acknowledges, takes us to the heart of the political theory of the New Left. In essence, it is Lenin's theory of revolutionary action by a small, dictatorial elite translated into the language of the "nonviolent" movement. Where Lenin wrote that the people would dispense with parliamentary procedure and substitute for it the direct action of "the simple organisation of the armed masses (such as the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies . . .),"⁶¹ Staughton Lynd has the nonviolent student mass surging forward to take possession of the government. The Senate and House of Representatives would be closed permanently, as the Constituent Assembly was in St. Petersburg in 1918. The "complex machinery" (as Lenin called it) of people's formal elections in representative democracy would be replaced by "participatory democracy." Just as Lenin promised that in the soviets within twenty-four hours of the revolution, there would be a "universal participation of the people" to replace all the machinery of the bourgeois state and economic administration, so the New Leftist envisages the direct action-participation of the moving mass as supplanting the Establishment, the organs of the System. As Lynd writes:

One can now begin to envision a series of nonviolent protests which would from the beginning question the legitimacy of the Administration's authority where it has gone beyond constitutional and moral limits, and might, if its insane foreign policy continues, culminate in the decision of hundreds of thousands of people to recognize the authority of alternative institutions of their own making.⁶²

The crux of a revolution, says Lynd, learning from Trotsky, occurs when the troops desert to the side of the rioters. This he envisages as a "scenario" for America. "A constitutional crisis" exists in America, he declares, "we have moved into a twilight zone between democratically elected authority and something accurately called 'fascism.'" He envisages the denouement of the next major demonstration: "Perhaps next time we should keep going, occupying for a time the rooms from which orders issue . . . until

those who make policy for us . . . consent to enter into dialogue with us and with mankind."

Behind all the phraseology of dialogue there is the simple fact that the ideology of the New Left is one of imposing the will of a small elite, a band of activists, on national policy. The students are summoned to be the shock troops of the elite: "If students chained themselves to the Capitol this summer in wave after wave of massive civil disobedience, even the Johnson Administration would be constrained in its choice of means." What begins as talk of a higher form of democracy, of people directly participating in decisions, turns out to be the defensive formula for action by a student elite which would contravene the will of the majority as expressed in the institutions of representative democracy. "The Movement," like "the Party," seizes power; the one invokes the myth of "participatory democracy," the other invoked the myth of the soviets.

As the civil rights leader, Bayard Rustin, trenchantly declared, "Under whose mandate are the 20,000 Washington marchers entitled to occupy 'their government' for even ten minutes? Does Lynd believe that they represent the views of anything approaching the majority of the people on the question of Vietnam? . . . What gives the disaffected sons and daughters of the middle class the right even symbolically to become the government?"⁶³

The tactical means of "participatory democracy" was identical (though translated into ostensibly "nonviolent" terms), with the principle of political tactics which Lenin enunciated in justifying the seizure of power, and in defending his dissolution of the democratically elected Constituent Assembly: "Have an overwhelming superiority of forces at the decisive moment at the decisive point—this 'law' of military success is also the law of political success, especially in that fierce, seething class war which is called revolution."⁶⁴ It was simply not possible, said Lenin, for the working class to acquire a sufficient firmness of character, perception, and wide political outlook to enable them to vote intelligently;⁶⁵ therefore, he argued, a minority must seize the state power; then, holding power, it would in "a long and fierce struggle" "'convince'" the majority of the workers to accept its policies. The "participatory democrat" likewise has no use for elections, votes, parliamentary procedures; his basic argument is that since the masses are nonparticipant, the elite activists must act on their behalf. The votes of the electorate and of Congress are simply dismissed; somehow the "power structure" has purloined or befuddled the masses and their political expression. The "participatory democrats" will surge forward, take hold of the state, and establish new organs of rule, of their own hegemony. Thus, the line of reasoning which began with the intellectual elitism of C. Wright Mills, with his ridicule of the "labor metaphysics," culminated in Staughton Lynd's conception of the dictatorship of a student elite in the guise of "participatory democracy."

The notion of "participatory democracy" involved a basic alteration in

the concept of civil disobedience. Originally, as conceived by such persons as Martin Luther King, it was basically an appeal to the conscience of the community; the civilly disobedient undertook to violate some unjust or unconstitutional ordinance in order to draw the attention of the electorate and the government to ignored wrongs. The civil disobedient still retained a faith in the workings of representative democracy. The student movement, on the other hand, rapidly losing faith in representative democracy, began to conceive of civil disobedience as a first step in a "confrontation" with the "power structure" which would lead in some vague, undefined way to a seizure of power by the student movement. The two conceptions of civil disobedience clashed basically in Selma, Alabama, in the spring of 1965. As Staughton Lynd writes:

The old politics and the new confronted each other once again in Selma. SNCC was the first civil rights group on the ground there. . . . Then, by agreement with SNCC but nonetheless traumatically for the SNCC workers in Selma, Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference moved in. SCLC's focus was the passage of national legislation, not the political maturing of persons in the Alabama Black Belt. . . . SNCC could only experience Selma with mixed feelings and considerable frustration. The "march" of March 9, when Dr. King led people to a confrontation he knew would not occur and then accused the police of bad faith for exposing his hypocrisy, must have seemed to those in SNCC a symbolic summation of much that had gone before.⁶⁶

"SNCC," wrote James W. Silver, "is seldom amenable to compromise. . . . These activists were unimpressed with legalism and constitutionalism; they were the 'new abolitionists.'"⁶⁷

What SNCC had wanted was the kind of movement Staughton Lynd had dreamed of, the confrontation, the unpredictable occurrence, the elite and their allies surging forward, the seizure of power, the creation of the New Society, the release of the creative energies of all activists in the student movement and their allies, and finally, though it was only slowly avowed, violence.⁶⁸

The fate of the notion of "participatory democracy" is instructive. It began as the apparent expression of a strong populist identification, with the "unstated assumption," in Lynd's words, "that the poor, when they find voice, will produce a truer, sounder radicalism than any which alienated intellectuals might prescribe."⁶⁹ As the doctrine evolved, however, it became the ideological bearer of elitism. It began ostensibly by seeking a political participation by the American citizen which would be more than "the annual act of pulling a lever in a little curtained room."⁷⁰ But as the citizenry proved quiescent, or failed to follow the students' lead, the doctrine, with its "insistence that decisions should come about through a process of personal confrontation and encounter," metamorphosed into an apologetic for the "putschist" action of a small student elite, abetted by the violence of the alienated "guerrillas," to impose its will on the recalcitrant majority of the people. Thus, "participatory democracy" was

recapitulating in large measure the career of "proletarian democracy." Between the intellectual elitism of C. Wright Mills and the "participatory democracy" of Tom Hayden and Staughton Lynd there was a clear line of continuity; the last fulfilled the first. All were intellectual authoritarians, the only difference being that Hayden and Lynd used an existentialist vocabulary whereas Mills spoke in neo-Marxist terms.

**The Teach-In:
The Authoritarianism of
the Student Intellectuals**

The spring of 1965 saw the elitism of the student movement being expressed in the form of a new political institution, the "teach-in." It began at the University of Michigan, where a group of thirteen professors had originally announced that they planned to cancel their classes on March 24 as a protest against the policy of the United States in Vietnam. When their plan was condemned by both the governor and the legislature of Michigan, they were induced to alter their plan to an all-night protest on March 24; this was attended by about two thousand students and supported by about two hundred professors.⁷¹ The idea soon spread to other universities, including Columbia and California.⁷² Student movements took it up, and a new political claim was advanced: that the national administration was under an obligation to be confronted by the academic community, that it was especially incumbent upon the administration to defend its policies before the academic community, and that this was an obligation especially mandatory for those administration officials who had an academic background. A national teach-in in Washington which was broadcast on television took place on May 15, 1965. When the administration spokesman, McGeorge Bundy, failed to arrive (because, as it later transpired, he had had to go to the Dominican Republic for important negotiations), the organizers of the teach-in rebuked him strongly for having failed to fulfill his duty to the academic community. As the *Times* correspondent reported, "Few were willing to await the explanation for Mr. Bundy's withdrawal before imputing dishonorable motives to him."⁷³

On the face of it, the "confrontation" of the teach-in seemed to be altogether consistent with the workings of the democratic process. Actually, however, it constituted a demand for special status and privilege. The radical activists of the academic community were in effect organizing themselves into a renovated Second Estate, a clerisy to replace the church, and demanding that the government especially justify its policies with them in debate. However, we have in the United States a representative democracy, a Congress and a Senate, to which we elect representatives whose debate presumably becomes a sifted mirroring of our views. Now the radical intellectual elite demanded a special priority in the debate. It demanded a privileged recognition as the most qualified constituency to which the

government must submit its decisions and policies. If this had been a debate among professors of differing views, it would have been a straightforward "teach-in." Certainly there was no lack of able professors and students who shared the government's position and were prepared to argue for it with fellow academicians. But what the radical elite wanted was to compel a "confrontation" with the government, to place it under a special obligation to defend itself before an activist minority, itself already rejected by the people in accordance with the workings of representative democracy. In short, the rejected elite was looking for some elitist, nondemocratic basis for influence. The subtle anti-democratic bias, the perverse elitism hidden behind the phrase "participatory democracy" thus emerged again. Once more it was the formula according to which a radical intellectual elitist minority, backed primarily by a student movement, tried to impose its will on the government directly in a face-to-face challenge. Those overtones were apparent to the observer. Abetted by audiences which it usually controlled, the elitists, unconsciously following Lenin's tactical principle, brought to bear a maximum of force on the government in the strategic setting of their choice. The *Times* correspondent wrote:

To observers here, most of the organizers and audiences appeared to be motivated by much more than the subtleties of Vietnam policy. In many remarks and questions there lurked distrust and hostility toward the Government itself. Mr. Bundy was the preferred official spokesman because others from the campus seemed really to want to ask, "Et tu, Brute?" . . . There was evidence of a still wider gulf between the capital and the campus. . . . And there may have appeared a gulf between generations.⁷⁴

The new student generation could not recall the experience with American appeasement and inaction before the Second World War; they had not known the cost of rethinking which had been involved in stopping Stalin and Soviet imperialism after the war. They were a generation which knew not Joseph because it knew not Pharaoh. For the terrible fact about sociological experience is that, difficult as it is to impart from generation to generation in normal times, it is abruptly dismissed when generational struggle grows intense. "[M]any of the younger critics could not or would not remember or accept the analogies of the nineteen-thirties and nineteen-fifties for the nineteen-sixties." A generational equilibrium allows for a cumulative principle of sociological experience and wisdom. The conflict of generations negates it.

Thus, the teach-in enabled students and teachers to thrust themselves upon a national audience "with the blessing of the Administration they condemn for secrecy" . . . and all for an investment of less than thirty thousand dollars. Never before in American history had a "group of intellectuals been hurtled so swiftly into the political arena."⁷⁵ In this manner, an intellectual elite, with its student infantry, reached for an authoritarian hegemony in the national councils; "participatory democracy" meant the authoritarianism of the young intellectuals and their allies of the moment.

The overwhelming majority of the American studentry, however, unlike their classmates in the "student movement," continued to support American involvement in the Vietnam War. The Survey Research Laboratory of the University of Wisconsin in 1966, for instance, found that 72 per cent of the students favored American participation in the war, while only 16 per cent were opposed. Only 12 per cent, moreover, felt that this state university was "highly depersonalized." It was evident that the "student movement" did not democratically represent the American studentry, but only its "alienated" segment.⁷⁶

The Generational Selection of Political Issues:

Emergence of Anti-Americanism as a Student Ideology

In the first months of 1965, the student movement began to turn rapidly from the civil rights issue to that of Vietnam. It was not that the problems of civil rights had suddenly ceased to exist; rather the issue no longer offered as good an emotional opportunity for conducting a generational struggle. The Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, for instance, when it was at its height in 1964, proclaimed its primary concern with civil rights and the welfare of the Negro community. For a brief while subsequent to its success, there was a flurry of concern over establishing volunteer tutorial classes for Negro children which would enable them to compensate for deprivations in their backgrounds. Within a few weeks most such efforts and concerns had strangely vanished. The passage of the Voter Registration Act made it harder to draw a strict generational line on the question of civil rights; with every act and intervention of the government, the student movement's enthusiasm for organizing classes for Negro children dwindled. An issue was most attractive to the degree that it could readily channelize generational resentment; involvement in an issue subsided when the issue failed to provide the occasion for a clear generational struggle. It is this motivation which primarily explains the curious movement from issue to issue on the part of the student movement. Thus, there arose the Vietnam Day Committee in Berkeley to supersede the dominant concern with civil rights. Its chief spokesman wrote:

The VDC began as an idea in the heads of four people over supper one day last April, an idea to organize a large community teach-in at a time when the civil rights and free speech movements were waning. . . .

The same individuals involved in free speech and democracy on the campus, and civil rights, became involved in the struggle against USA policy in Vietnam.⁷⁷

Thus, the emotion of generational struggle defined the direction of transition from issue to issue. The young student, who just a few weeks

earlier had thrilled to the thought of teaching Negro children, lost interest in the project. To parade, protest, to "confront" the local police were more of an adventure, and more satisfying to one's aggressive impulses. "Confrontation" always had the generational overtone of the son standing up to the father; and if an issue, or a cause, lacked this element of "confrontation," it was not emotionally satisfying. Pure "do-gooding" would never satisfy the student activist, because it lacked this element of confrontation, of conflict, of the occasion for aggression. The VDC spokesman, by contrast, was able to redefine themes for generational conflict. When the older generation in its anti-poverty program tried to reduce the number of school drop-outs, the *VDC News* proclaimed the meaninglessness of schools, and called for a revolt against them: "We should ask people to quit school and forget middle-class futures and join a movement to change America."

The theme of identification with the lowliest, that theme recurrent in all student movements, reached a new stage. Identification with the people, peasantry, proletariat, the Negro and poor of one's own country was now supplanted altogether by an identification with the backward peoples and races of other continents.

On the back of the VDC membership card is written the words: "We must build a New America and join with those peoples in Asia, Africa, and Latin America building a New World. . . ."

The USA is for the status quo. But I as an American want to be with those making history, not with those freezing it.⁷⁸

Anti-Americanism thus became a recognized article of faith in the ideology of generational revolt. Naturally, it was cast in the current idiom of "alienation": "We are the country's alienated—alienated by America's values, alienated by America's mass culture, alienated by America's image of the Good Society. We are repelled by the idea of exporting Americanism overseas."⁷⁹

In the thirties, the student activists had been able in the time of the economic depression to forecast the breakdown of American capitalism and the future hegemony of the working class. In the mid-sixties, the American capitalist system was impressively stable and prosperous, and its workers largely contented. The rebellious activists, feeling a diffused resentment, called it "alienation," but their rejection of America sometimes tended to be total, as they felt themselves bereft of class allies in America and frustrated by the society's stability. Therefore, they began to turn abroad for their identifications. They were rather anti-American than anti-capitalist. When they criticized the capitalist order, it was because it partook of American, Western civilization.

As the new student movement found itself "alienated" in American society, its most activist element began to move toward an exaltation of violence. The May Second Movement, a group attracted to Mao and Castro, were among the first to voice this trend. They welcomed the Watts

riots as a "people's uprising" against "imperialist" America, as part of the same "guerrilla warfare" which was being carried on from Vietnam to Los Angeles against the United States:

Vietnam, of course, is the most organized and coherent of the self-determination movements, but the seemingly structureless riots in Watts heralded the beginnings of the organized build-up of Negro militance and even violence in this country. . . . Watts was a "people's uprising," as the *Liberator* said. There were no illusions about who the enemy was—the Los Angeles police and "imperialist" merchants of the Watts shopping areas . . . the sniping and guerrilla action had become tightly organized. . . . The Chinese Communist Party maintains that at this time the Negro struggle, like the Vietnamese, is a national struggle, and Mao Tse-tung has said, "In the final analysis, a national struggle is a question of class struggle. . . ." Revolutionary action by the black citizens of the U.S. is neither foolhardy nor an adventurist fantasy—in truth there is no other choice.⁸⁰

The student as a "guerrilla fighter" came to be the image which most appealed to young student activists. The beatnik metamorphosed into a "guerrilla" fighting in the fastnesses of the city. In 1962, for example, the San Francisco Mime Troupe had called themselves disciples of the "theater of the absurd." They went to the people in parks with their pornopolitical plays. Five years later they said they were a "guerrilla theater," attacking the System, making money, withdrawing, attacking. The absurd had evolved into a guerrilla; the unconscious generational violence became conscious.⁸¹

Ethic of the Student Movement: From Absolutism to Amoralism

The activists of the student movement feel a need to define their virtues as unique to their generation, as distinct from those of the middle-aged and middle-class generation. Student leaders enumerate the virtues of their generation—authenticity, courage, truthfulness. One might say that every virtue they could name had been expounded and argued for by some philosopher of the older or past generations. One might even say that all virtues are "bourgeois" virtues, in the sense that they have been defined and advocated by "bourgeois" philosophers. "Authenticity," apart from the word, received its magisterial advocacy from John Stuart Mill in *On Liberty*, in which he argued for individuality and character. Immanuel Kant carried truth-telling to its last consequence. Spinoza, Russell, Tillich have written philosophies of courage.

Nevertheless, the students' underlying emotion is undeniable—their will to define themselves as different, as uncorrupted (unlike the elders), as determined to change the world the elders transmit to them. Each suc-

cessive generation has a tendency to want to blame its elders for the kind of world it inherits, forgetting the element of truth in Marx's statement that men, at any given social stage, "enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will."

To overcome alienation, to achieve a new mystical community, the striving of the new student movement is for an all-embracing generational consciousness. At the National Coordinating Committee Convention to End the War in Vietnam, in Washington in November 1965, for instance, Delmar Scudder, described as "the new traveling salesman of 'soul,'" said, "First people have to touch one another. That's where program comes from." His words were said to have been the "most penetrating" spoken at the meeting. The theme of "touching one another" was dearest to the new activists, so that soon they felt discomfited by hardened organizational operators who were less interested in tactual mysticism. The theoretician of the Free Speech Movement lamented, "Unfortunately once the convention had started it was perhaps too late to have a convention in which people could touch one another."⁸² The old-fashioned Trotskyist Young Socialist Alliance was described as having "fueled the fires of mistrust by its failure to practice the candor which we have the right to ask of those who believe in democratic centralism." Staughton Lynd has said that the New Left must regard itself as a "blessed community, a new society." "The left must not lose all the beautiful elements of spontaneity and comradeship."⁸³

Civil disobedience itself was a tactic which emphasized the community of the young as well as the defiance of the old. It carried with it an unusual emotional satisfaction. The leading ideologist of the Free Speech Movement told of the joy which the practice of civil disobedience brought, the momentary euphoria of the Blessed Community:

Dear Co-conspirators,

. . . Civil disobedience is good when it feels good—not only at the point of disruption, but also as one looks back after the euphoria and the crowd have dispersed. . . . But, dearies, we can't let that moment of apparent pleasure arising out of frustration ruin a life of happiness and community service. For my own part, I find a correlation between the political effectiveness of C.D. and its long-lasting pleasurability.

How then to sustain this Generational Community, this Conquest of Alienation? The father, we might say, could only be destroyed once, and "depoliticalization" rather than "politicalization" easily followed in its wake—"the disillusionment and depoliticalization that often follow those grueling days in court."⁸⁴

But even before a stage of disillusionment was reached, too often the Ethic of Community was transmuted into an Ethic of Destruction.

Such observers as Michael Harrington have written eloquently of the

high ethical vocation of the student movement. The young radicals of today, he says, are without cynicism; they believe in freedom, equality, justice, world peace; "they became activists in order to affirm these traditional values with regard to some ethical cause."⁸⁵ They have a painful consciousness, he writes, of American hypocrisy. Yet this interpretation, with its segment of truth, leaves unexplained the amoral cynicism of student activists; Berkeley, for instance, became the famed center of thievery by student activists. Documents were stolen from administrators, goods were stolen from both merchants and the student cooperative. Moral standards in various ways declined within the student movement. Harrington recognizes the generational animus in the New Left: "It is, I suspect, this unique Fifties-Sixties experience which gives the New Left its distinctive flavor: a sense of outrage, of having been betrayed by all the father-figures, which derives from an original innocence." By the same token, however, it was true that the most unethical means and conduct of life too were adopted whenever they led to the discomfiture of the elder generation. The theft of documents, for instance, was not the behavior of irresponsible exceptions; it was approved by the chiefs of the Berkeley student movement. Photostatic copies of confidential letters were purloined from the office of the president of the university.⁸⁶ A year later, confidential documents were stolen from the file of the chancellor's assistant: "Two weeks ago, certain delegates to the Constitutional Convention secretly removed letters and memoranda from a file that belonged to me. Last Thursday, those delegates mimeographed one of the confidential papers and distributed it to hundreds of people on the campus." Far from being embarrassed by the accusation of theft, the leaders of the student left-wing political party (Slate) defended their right to thievery: "In fact, the file and papers were public, although secret. They concerned matters which students have a right to know about."⁸⁷ The student leaders argued that they had rendered a service to their electorate by stealing and publishing the documents. This had been the classical ethic of student movements from Karl Follen to Gavriilo Princip: the end justifies any means. If there is a hypocrisy of the old, there is a hypocrisy of the young as well.

The decline of moral standards, the confusion of good and evil which Vera Figner long ago observed in the Russian student movement emerged very early in the new American student movement. This decline was dramatized vividly in Berkeley in 1963. In January of that year, the left-wing student leader on the campus was arrested for stealing a book from a local bookstore. Subsequently, he pleaded guilty to a charge of malicious mischief. Under pressure from conservative students, he resigned from his seat in the student senate. What was noteworthy, however, was that he refused to take full responsibility for his individual act of dishonesty, but instead tried to give his deed a social justification. "I would like to say a few words about 'morality' and 'public virtue,'" he declared in his statement of resignation:

Probably as many as 90 per cent of the people in the U.S. could be put behind bars this moment for criminal conduct. . . . Our laws are outdated, our penal system prejudicial to the wealthy and white, and our police forces brutal and grossly unfair. Ordinarily students who take books are not even arrested, but are simply referred to the District Attorney or the Dean of Students. My major mistake was being a controversial figure. This is not to say that theft is not wrong. . . .⁸⁸

Never did the student leader simply say his theft was wrong; the most he conceded was an ambiguous double negative.

By 1965, the "Campus Left" was notorious on the Berkeley campus for its petty larcenies; the most militant, the students of the Progressive Labor Movement, the so-called Maoists, boasted especially of their accomplishments in thievery.⁸⁹

The New Student Movement began early to voice its sympathies with the abnormal, the extreme, the unreal. The beatniks early affiliated themselves as associate members with life standing of the New Student Movement. The editor of the *Berkeley Barb* (described as "the most successful of the left-wing papers which have sprung up in Berkeley since the free speech movement") documented this evolution. The New Left, he claimed, was much more an outgrowth of the "beatnikism" of the 1950s than of such phenomena as the civil rights movement. "A look at the personnel will show," he says, "that the same people who outraged the establishment culturally with their seemingly selfish 'art for my sake' crusade have turned altruistic and taken to outraging the establishment on the political level."⁹⁰ The beatnik influence made itself felt especially in the elevation of drugs, marijuana, and hallucinogens as an adjunct of the New Student Movement. In 1965, for instance, a student leader at Berkeley wrote for the movement a vigorous pamphlet exposing the economic holdings of the regents of the university; the next year that same student leader was writing sympathetically of the growing number who "are experimenting with such extraordinary hallucinogens as LSD, DMT, and mescaline; it has taken on the proportions of a social movement." One didn't wish to be left aside: "Something is happening, something new, something big, something with great dangers but also possible benefits."⁹¹

These "consciousness-expanding" drugs had their appeal for student activists. Rebellious against the affluent society, the life of prosperity, the bourgeois existence, their fathers' condition, the students hearkened to the call of the hallucinogens, their new world of fantasy and new perceptions. Here was a generational consciousness which was radically new. One could be swept into a half hour's euphoria by Joan Baez singing of freedom; the movement itself was a hallucinogen. Why not seek its effects directly? Such was the decision at Berkeley of the 40 per cent of the student body who (according to a university criminologist) used drugs intermittently, and the 20 per cent (according to the chief psychiatrist) who were smoking marijuana. "They are vaguely leftist, disenchanting with

American policies in Vietnam, agitated because there are Negro ghettos and bored with conventional politics. They do not join the Peace Corps, which, a student at Penn State said, 'is for Boy Scouts.' And most of them were in the humanities or social sciences, with fewer in the sciences.⁹² Their profile indeed was that of the typical rank-and-filer of the New Student Movement.

The hallucinogenic phase of the New Student Movement was rooted in the self-destructive ingredient characteristic of such movements. Here was an assault upon one's personality, one's reason, upon the categories of everyday existence. The rebellion against the father, the generational revolt, in this extreme manifestation took the form of a rebellion against the qualities of ordinary consciousness itself; one was destroying one's psychological bond of continuity, severing the psychological umbilical cord itself that united one to one's father, the elder generation. This was the most eloquent symbolic rejection of the virtues of the Protestant or Jewish ethic.

Every student movement, furthermore, has tended to produce new forms of sexual behavior; the ascetic unions of free love in the Russian student movement, the homosexual loyalties of the Burschenschaft, the choices of romantic love by Chinese students rebelling against the family system, were all instances of student generational revolt in sexuality. The New Student Left in the United States has shown certain embryonic developments in this regard whose significance and extent at the present time it is hard to evaluate.

Among a segment of activists of the Berkeley student movement, three forms of sexual behavior appeared which had the significance of a revolt against the elder liberals. Sexual behavior began to take on an ideological function: one had "ideological sex." The elder liberals had long ago evidently won the right for love's choice in premarital intercourse. The new activists felt impelled to go far beyond that to, first, a positive advocacy of interracial sexuality, second, a positive advocacy of promiscuity, taking form in, third, a positive advocacy of "sheer, undiluted orgy-ism."

The pattern of interracial sexuality especially characterized the chapter of Berkeley CORE in 1962-1964 during the period of its highest activity in pickets and sit-ins. Two of its officers at that time remarked that a sociogram of the group would show that almost all of its members were involved at that time in interracial sexual liaisons. Sexuality tended to become an avenue for the expression of guilt feelings. At discussions in cafeterias and in their apartments, white middle-class undergraduate girls heard of their participatory guilt in fostering American racial inequality. Interracial sexual relations became a form of atonement for this participatory guilt. The trend toward orgyism on the fringes of the New Left was exuberantly narrated in its press. Certainly it went far beyond Bertrand Russell's *Marriage and Morals* of a previous generation. The chief Leftist, student-directed newspaper in Berkeley described it enthusiastically:

It seems, in fact, that Berkeley is fast becoming the great experimental "freedom lab" for the whole country and the world! In Berkeley, amidst all the other forms of rebellion afoot, there is very much a sexual rebellion in the making also. The rebellion here spoken of is not mere "shacking." . . . What is here referred to as betokening a greater rebellion in Berkeley is the incidental rise of sheer, undiluted orgy-ism. Consistent with our point here, this would seem good and desirable, the first positive step in unrepressing our repressions. Indeed, Freud's description of "repressed" sexual desires is certainly a description of orgiastic impulses. The mood that is arising in Berkeley seems to state implicitly that there is nothing wrong with orgies if entered into uncoerced and for mutual pleasure. . . . Evidences that such an orgiastic rebellion is taking place in Berkeley can be glimpsed in such things as anonymous ads appearing with increasing frequency on Student-Union bulletin boards, in the *Barb*, and elsewhere. The content of all these ads all but unabashedly advertised for other couples interested in "sexual-communal" living, "coterie" living, "get-togethers" and other less sensational, but unmistakable, wordings.⁹³

The teaching of the new sexual ethic provided the content of one of the courses in the so-called Free University of Berkeley, which came into existence in February 1966 as part of the rejection, in its words, of "an Educational Establishment which produces proud cynicism but sustains neither enthusiasm nor integrity." Its twenty-eight courses, ranging in subject matter from Vietnam to Beethoven to Soviet thought to Afro-American music to black nationalism, were mainly taught by graduate students. But one special course was added, to be given by the president of the Sexual Freedom League, "The History of Western Anti-Sensualism." The overcoming of alienation, of isolation, of separation, was sought in the most direct way by communitarian sexuality. A newspaperman who ventured into one of these orgies, principally composed of "students in their twenties," reported:

By 1 o'clock, with the music still playing and the wine still flowing, the floor, couches and two bedrooms of the apartment had become the frenetic scene of what Richard Thorne, the 29-year-old head of the Sexual Freedom League, likes to call a "sheer, undiluted orgy." "Actually, we think there's nothing wrong with orgies," explains Thorne casually. "The Greeks had them, and to be able to fully participate in an orgy without feeling ashamed or guilty is a sign of a truly healthy attitude toward sex."⁹⁴

A segment of the New Student Left thus experimented in sexuality without alienation, the Sexual Community. As one spokesman (whom we have previously cited) wrote, "The radical political fraternity . . . believes strongly that movement that screws together glues together. Or, to be specific, that Socialists who sleep together creep together."⁹⁵

The rational student, with liberal political and economic ideas, found himself under great pressure to conform to the "generational line." Generationalism thus made for irrationalism. Student movements have always

had their own insistence on generational conformity, on following the "generational line." They have been radical in their demands, but never authentically liberal in their philosophy. They have never accepted fully the notion of a free competition of ideas. Although they have defended radical professors from ouster, they have usually been just as ready to force the ouster of reactionary or conservative professors. At other places and times, the pattern has been the reverse. Student movements are not exponents of freedom of thought. Student demonstrations against individual professors have thus been part of the movement from its Russian beginnings to the Latin American present; the City College in the thirties and Berkeley in the sixties saw similar attempts to defame and "ostracize" certain professors. The student movement at the City College in 1940 was reluctant to defend the right of Bertrand Russell to teach (when a judicial decision denied him an appointment), because they were at that time partisans of the Stalin-Hitler Pact and disapproved of his advocacy of the Allied cause.

Thus, there was the pressure on the student to accept too, even against his better judgment, the "generational line" on questions of sexual morality. This generational pressure was pointedly described by Jed Rakoff, '64, of Swarthmore College, president of its student council, editor of the *Phoenix*, the student newspaper, and "a radical rules reformer." While he was president of the student council in 1963, Rakoff had supported the use of "civil disobedience" to express student opposition to the rule requiring that a young man's door be open when he was receiving women guests. Little more than a year later, meditating at Oxford University on his Swarthmorean activities, wondering what their rationale had been, whether the students had fought for a "freedom" in which they didn't believe, Rakoff wrote about how generational conformity is produced:

I can still remember, sophomore year, when some *Phoenix* pollsters asked a random sample of fifty Swarthmore men "Would you care if the girl you married wasn't a virgin?" To our shock all but two of the respondees answered "yes." We decided not to publish the results.

. . . I think that when you frankly examine Swarthmore men's sexual attitudes (mine included) you find that they are too often selfish and materialistic—and ought to be discouraged.

. . . Of course, some people will say that the Swarthmore sex rules represent an infringement on individual freedom of choice, that by the superb age of seventeen and over each individual ought to be left free to make his or her own moral decisions.

*Such humdrum ignores the obvious fact that a Swarthmore student's opinions are framed in the context of a considerable social pressure in favor of premarital intercourse, and thus the sex rules serve merely to restore a partial balance. Quite irrespective of the rules of the Administration, Swarthmore students enjoy very little freedom of thought on sexual matters. I doubt, for instance, that I could have written this article while at Swarthmore.*⁹⁶

Jewish Students as the Bearers of Generational Conflict in the United States

Jewish students have been the mainstay of such an American student movement as has existed. "This is indisputable," wrote James Wechsler in 1935, "a large number of those who inaugurated the left-wing student movement, for example, were Jews. That, remember, was late in 1931."⁹⁷ When the Berkeley Free Speech Movement burgeoned thirty-three years later, in 1964, a majority of its steering committee of eleven were Jewish.⁹⁸ A survey of the student body at the University of California by Kathleen E. Gales, of the London School of Economics, showed that the "strongest level of approval" of the Free Speech Movement was found among Jewish students.⁹⁹ Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner were the names of the two white boys among the three martyred in Meridian, Mississippi, in June 1964. Two-thirds of the first Freedom Riders who went to Jackson, Mississippi, were Jewish.¹⁰⁰ The phenomenon aroused the deepest interest and concern of Jewish organizations. When it was discussed, in June 1965, by the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the delegates agreed that "Jewish youth were disproportionately numerous in the student movement."¹⁰¹ When the leftist students occupied five buildings in Columbia University and caused the suspension of classes in May 1968 it was noted that "the activists are typically very bright and predominantly Jewish. . . ."¹⁰²

Various explanations have been proposed at different times for the pre-eminence of successive generations of Jews in the student movement. In 1965, the explanation proposed by Jewish officials was that Jewish students especially were in revolt against middle-class values and liberalism. Jewish parents, it was said, were overwhelmingly among the middle-class, self-described liberals "against which the whole [student] movement was essentially in revolt." "The middle-class establishment is the enemy" in the students' eyes, it was said, and "the Jewish community is an integral part of this establishment in the minds of these students." The Director of Social Action of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Albert Vorspan, declared that the Jewish students rejected "the middle-class values of self-indulgence and country-club materialism which they see as a corruption of the American way of life—values to which, in their view, Jews have acquiesced."¹⁰³ Jewish students themselves, on the other hand, said they did not feel that the spirit of revolt on the campus was a rebellion against the older generation. In September 1965, 215 Jewish students, leaders of Hillel Foundations on 123 college campuses, convened and discussed this question. Their dominant view was that the Jewish students involved in political activist movements were not acting in any way as Jews but as Americans; Jewish values did not seem consciously involved.

And they felt indeed that the 325,000 Jewish students in American universities were akin to them in this latter respect.¹⁰⁴

Why then have Jewish students been for the last sixty years foremost in the recurrent, small American student movements? The answer in my view lies in the recurrent de-authoritization of the older Jewish generation in each recent historical era. The Jewish student shared experiences of de-authoritization of their elders similar to those which called forth student movements in Russia, Bosnia, and Japan, but with a peculiar poignancy derived from their situation as an ethnic minority.

This was already evident in the earliest Jewish student movement in the United States at the turn of the century, when a group of City College students led by the young Morris R. Cohen, and jointly inspired by Karl Marx and a wandering "chaplain," Thomas Davidson, dreamed that by founding workingmen's colleges, "breadwinners' colleges," they could plant the roots of socialist emancipation among the workers. One of them, Joseph Gollomb (later a mystery story writer), recalled how Morris Cohen, a product of the literary clubs and the socialist platform at the Suffolk Streeters' hangout, "now a Doctor of Philosophy and tutor in the subject at City College, and a score of other East Siders had organized a group with the objective of emancipating the working class of the whole world, not directly through revolution but by the route of education. It would be different from the Educational Institute, which was primarily a helping hand from 'uptown'; Breadwinners' College was to be an enterprise in self-help. Workers, and sons and daughters of workers, would-be teachers, pupils, and often both." A score volunteered to teach. "Enthusiasm mounted, and Moey Cohen, for once the rhapsodist, wound up the meeting with the prophecy that workers throughout the world would emulate Breadwinners' College and effect a social revolution by the sheer power of enlightenment." When Gollomb left the fold, Cohen told him with all self-righteousness, "You'd rather see some dinky little piece of yours in a yellow sheet than stick by a social good in the throes of its birth. We'll survive your loss, but some day we'll remind you of what King Henry said, 'Go hang yourself, brave Crillon, we won at Arques, and you were not there!'"¹⁰⁵

It was Morris R. Cohen himself who perceived that generational conflict was the deepest psychological problem of the Jewish students. As a young student, at the age of twenty-one, he wrote:

The most important practical question on the East Side is undoubtedly the strained, I might say the tragic, relation between the older and the younger generations. The younger generation has, as a rule, been brought up under entirely different circumstances from those of its elders, and therefore naturally entertains radically different aims and ideals. The older generation does not sympathize with these new ideals, and in the ensuing discord much of the proverbial strength of the Jewish family is lost. This is fraught with heart-

rending consequences. When the home ceases to be the center of interest the unity of life is broken, and the dreariest pessimism and cynicism may follow. . . . You cannot and must not expect the younger people to become false to their own best insight at the very entrance of life!¹⁰⁶

The young students inhabited a cultural universe which their parents could not comprehend. Often their mothers and fathers were illiterate; and if they could read Yiddish, they were still alien to the American culture and language of Emerson, Bryant, Whitman. With their lack of dignity and their seeming acquiescence to persecution and poverty, with their lack of manliness and resistance, they were depreciated by the standards of the new literary-philosophical culture which the sons imbibed in school. They were at the lowest rung of society, defeated, always fleeing, and their lips could not form the words that schoolteachers spoke. The sons were ashamed of their parents and prone to accept a redemptive philosophy which would acknowledge the claim of intellect to leadership and which would usher in social justice.¹⁰⁷

But these early Jewish student groups revered the authority of the academy. Uprisings against the latter began to appear only with the First World War and the introduction of R.O.T.C. training into the college. And it became more acute with the depression. The Marxist student leaders explained the greater radicalism of the Jewish students in historical materialist terms:

Jewish students reacted to the economic crisis in greater numbers than did others because the burden of that decline, in its inception, fell most heavily upon them. Even in times of comparative prosperity, they did not enjoy many of the benefits which accrued to their Christian colleagues; they were barred from jobs because of their religion, professional schools systematically rejected their applications, advertisements concluded with the age-old warning: "Christians only need apply."¹⁰⁸

The Jewish students who became activists in the student movements, however, were notable for rejecting the moderate socialistic views of their workingmen fathers as passive, lacking in energy, quiescent, unaggressive, purely sentimental. The story of Herbert Zam, "the energetic and aggressive leader of the Young Communist League in the 20's," became typical in the early thirties:

I was born and raised on the Lower East Side of New York. My father was a garment worker, a passive Socialist and a reader of the *Forward*. . . . While in high school I joined the YPSL's, bringing a whole gang with me. The League did not seem to be sufficiently active politically. They appeared to us more like a marriage club. . . . I entered City College in June, 1920, at the age of 17. There, for the first time, I heard of Communism. There was a Social Problems Club on the campus. Sidney Hook was a member. All the club did was to have an occasional lecture. . . . The limited scope of the club looked ridiculous to

me. I secured a list of twenty Communist students. . . . At the next elections we ran Sidney Hook, a Left-Winger but not a party man, against Emil Schlesinger, a senior and a Socialist. The club grew, numbering several hundred. The Communists controlled the club for a long time. . . .¹⁰⁹

The passive socialistic fathers were being put aside. If the host culture had welcomed them, the sons would not have gone to a more radical stage of radicalism. Rejected themselves in part by the dominant American culture, and themselves rejecting their fathers' ways, the activist students inclined toward a Marxism which was a higher rejection in turn. The experience of John Gates, editor of the *Daily Worker*, veteran of the International Brigade, prisoner in the Atlanta penitentiary, was similarly, as Earl Browder wrote, "representative of what happened to a generation of young Americans who approached maturity during the shattering days of 1929 to 1934." Gates insists he had a "happy childhood" and led a "normal, typical life," and that his politics was not touched with neurosis. His actual autobiography depicts a transition of generational creeds and practices and a desperate search for a new religion, born of an acute psychological rejection of his father and what he stood for. Gates was born Sol Regenstein—the son of a Jewish immigrant candy storekeeper, "rigorously orthodox in his faith," stern, with a strong sense of right and wrong. The depression reduced the family further in poverty, as the father lost in his stock speculations. "We students in the first years of the Hoover depression were the Aimless Generation. But our very uncertainty drove many of us to search for answers and for a cause to live by."¹¹⁰ He joined the Social Problems Club at City College, and when a young Communist leader was suspended for an infraction of college rules, was moved to take a vigorous part in the campaign for his reinstatement; as a consequence of this incident, he joined the Young Communist League. His search for a religion to replace his father's was over. "Only the Communists were able to infuse youth with idealism, missionary zeal and a crusading spirit. And with these, they invoked a willingness to undergo any hardship, to sacrifice life itself if need be, for the cause of the socialist revolution." All the motifs of generational revolt were here—the idealism, elitism as missionaries, populist zeal, the death-longing. The professors at college became the surrogates for a rejected elder generation: "As I became filled with the superiority of my new-found faith, I was sure there was nothing that college could teach me. I wrangled with my teachers and developed a contempt for them."¹¹¹ Gates and a friend took three months off "unofficially" from college to study Marx's *Capital*; then, embarking on their own back-to-the-people crusade, they "formed a club to stop evictions, called the Young Hunger Fighters."¹¹²

The generational rejection of their fathers by the Jewish students had one curious consequence which cannot otherwise be explained. The Jewish activists never raised squarely the issue of anti-Semitism in the academic world. Rejecting their fathers' Jewish culture, they repressed any forthright

mention in their demands of anything which stemmed from their own situation. Jewish premedical students at the City College knew, for instance, that they were virtually excluded from the medical schools of Columbia and Cornell universities. One might have expected a student union to undertake picketing on their behalf or to raise the issue in some public way. Yet one searches through the magazines and reports of their activities in vain to find a single case in which a protest was made. One might have expected the student unions to have lobbied the legislature and political parties to found state medical schools. When such suggestions were made, however, the student leaders were singularly uninterested. The full-scale report delivered by the secretary to the biggest convention of the American Student Union on December 27, 1938, dealt extensively with educational reform, the reform of the curriculum, and the reform of the national Administration; it congratulated the Supreme Court for its favorable ruling on behalf of a Negro student in the Gaines case. But it would have gone against the grain of the student leaders, Jews though most of them were, to raise the issue of abolishing discrimination against Jews in universities and professional schools.¹¹³

If the unusual economic hardship and deprivation suffered by Jews had been the all-explaining factor that sent a disproportionate number of Jewish students into the student movement, one would have expected them to raise precisely those issues where as Jews they were made to bear additional burdens of economic and educational discrimination. But the Jewish activists of the student movement, largely moved by the psychology of generational revolt, repressed these issues. They went on instead to attack the R.O.T.C. and to support of the general line of Soviet foreign policy.

When the revival of the American student movement commenced in 1960, the head of the National Hillel Summer Institute, a man with considerable experience among university students, noted that the activism of Jewish students was founded in some obscure way on their rejection of their traditional religion. He wrote in 1961:

Despite the close link between the ethical and religious elements in Jewish tradition, and despite the reform emphasis on prophetic Judaism, few if any Jewish students considered their radical views an expression of a Jewish religious conviction or commitment. Jews were among the leaders of the social action projects and radical movements on campus. But their radicalism, whatever its source, was a form of rejection, and substitution for, Judaism.¹¹⁴

The Jewish students who participated in the Mississippi Summer Project of 1964 likewise found in this activity satisfaction of their generational rejection of their Jewish identity and of their de-authorized fathers and at the same time an expression of their own inner resentment against what Jews have had to experience in recent history. At a public dialogue under Leftist auspices, seven students who had been in Mississippi clearly exhibited this rejection of their Jewish identification.¹¹⁵ They disclaimed

any connection between their involvement and awareness of Jewish values. One, a Bank Street School student, spoke of her "own lack of Jewish consciousness," and justified the Negroes who told Jews they were "tired of hearing about the six million." Another, a Radcliffe student, complained that Jews, having experienced war and the Nazi holocaust "sit back and feel, well, we have suffered, therefore we don't need to help anyone else because we have enough of our own problems." She complained that her home Jewish community in Harrison, New York, was addicted to "a very shallow type of success," the "sickness" of the Jewish community. "I didn't see really anything to be proud of in this kind of Judaism." A third, a Columbia Law School student, spoke of the Jewish community in Jackson, Mississippi, and tried to explain Southern white anti-Semitism much as Russian student activists justified Russian pogroms seventy-five years before: "There are 100 Jewish families, close to a quarter of whom are millionaires. . . . You get the 'Shylock' kind of thing." Northern Negro anti-Semitism was given a similar sufficient explanation; the existence of Jewish slumlords and discriminators was cited by the young activist. This student, a Brandeis graduate, spoke plainly about the element of generational revolt. His participation, he said, "was a kind of revulsion to the reaction of most first generation American Jews, who were born here and feel this strong kinship for Israel. My strongest drive and motivation was to my nation, which I consider to be America." Although "large numbers of the participants in the struggle were Jewish . . . they don't go into the Jewish community and see how the Jewish community feels." This Jewish student believed he was the only one who had made an effort to seek out the Jewish community. According to another participant, the Gentile wife of a Jewish student, "one-third to one-half of the white participants in the struggle today were Jewish," but evidently this startling fact was glossed over by participants, rather than analyzed.

The Communist speaker at the symposium was more aware of the heart of the problem: "It's one thing to turn away from the rabbi. It's another thing even to turn away from your parents. But, to turn away from a people, that's another thing." As one student, also a Mississippi participant, plainly put it, "There is a tremendous desire on the part of many Mississippi Jewish freedom workers to deny their identity with Judaism." The Communist speaker dwelled on the psychological rejection of generational heritage which persisted among the Jewish students. It was no longer directed against orthodox immigrant parents in a proletarian East Side, for the new student was born into affluence, literacy, culture, and progressivism. He tried to explain the suppression of and hatred for their Jewish roots as the fault of the elders: "They probably all come from liberal-progressive parents," from "homes where progressive ideals were uppermost, but were presented in such a way as to disguise and therefore keep from these younger people the Jewish element in the struggle."

The young Jewish student activist is eager to become an expert on Negro

history. He hates to know about Jewish history. There is an ugly component of self-hatred in the Jewish student which has impressed the Negro observer:

A Negro student once came to me in a class with an odd kind of complaint. He said to me, "Mr. Schappes, you know I have a great number of Jewish friends who are very active in the civil rights struggle. I find that they know more about Negro history than I do. But when I ask them a simple question about Jewish history, or Jewish affairs, they don't know the answer." And he added: "I'm beginning to get suspicious of them. What are they up to? Are they missionaries? Are they in this for some kind of ulterior purpose?"¹¹⁶

Indeed, the Negro student had grasped the nub of the problem. There was an "ulterior purpose"—a repressed, often unconscious search for identification with another people's suffering, an identification which would go hand in hand with a refusal to dwell on the experience of one's own people. The contemporary Jewish student of liberal parents was in strange revolt against them and their heritage, even as the liberal fathers had revolted against their immigrant grandfathers. In the case of Jews in the student movement, there was no return of the third generation to the heritage of the first; Marcus Hansen's law of the immigrant generations did not hold. For the Jewish generations, it was always a negation of the negation. The basis of the revolt was always oddly much the same, and had little to do with economics. In previous generations Jewish students felt ashamed that their often cultureless parents were a persecuted people, always passive, always suffering, telling horrid stories of the indignities of pogroms. Their fathers seemed lacking in manliness. Their misfortunes lacked the heroic cast, and were therefore devoid of the nobility of tragedy. When a new generation after the Second World War heard of Jews, it was as victims, again almost always passive, of the Nazi holocaust, of those who had had torn from them the last shreds of human dignity as they were led in queues to abattoirs. The Jewish students of successive generations felt that their parents—orthodox, liberal, religious, agnostic—somehow shared in the psychology of passive acquiescence, that as the persecuted, they had been virtually deprived of their manhood, emasculated. Books, plays, films such as the *Diary of Anne Frank* or *The Deputy* probably made the Jewish would-be student activist wish all the more to repress his Jewish origins. The elder generation, for all its anti-Nazism, somehow shared in the collective guilt; it had not acted forthrightly, dramatically, to prevent such things from taking place. Thus the Jewish activist student tried to obliterate his Jewish derivation. Nevertheless, he felt he had been conceived in a world which enveloped him with injustice. The Jews were a chosen people, in that the world had chosen them for genocide and pogroms. And the Jewish student activist felt called upon to protest, without, however, drawing attention to the fact that he was a Jew—to protest against racial hatred, genocide, culturocide, while repressing at the same time the fact that he came from a people which had experienced all these demonic forces. Hence

the young Jewish student was especially prone to finding in the Negro people a surrogate for his own. He could thus reject his father, even as he projected his protest against the indignities his father had experienced, in the guise of protesting on behalf of another, even more despised race, whose members, unlike himself, could never escape visibility and identification with their people. Thus, the basic reason for the continued high involvement of Jewish students in the small American student movement has been the successive de-authoritization of the older generation by successive waves and forms of historical anti-Semitism. It was not in their case a revolt against middle-class values, any more than the earlier movement of City College men had been a revolt against their fathers' proletarian situation. What was involved was the peculiar de-authoritization of a generation associated with the passive recieption of persecution.

Conclusion

What, then, have been the achievements and failures of student movements in the history of the United States? The movements were always a source of intellectual ferment on the campuses; they had a sense of the drama of ideas. They made the average undergraduate and professor more aware of the emerging problems and realities of the world. They were a channel for the noblest idealistic aspirations of adolescence. At the same time, they were also a channel for emotions of generational revolt. They tended, therefore, to extremes of doctrine, the rejection of the elders' liberal values and a choice of self-destructive means in political action. The student movements from 1905 to 1940 could point to no single accomplishment of legislation, no statute, no New Deal measure, for which they could truly claim credit. The thirties saw the blind alley of the Oxford Oath and the corruption of Communist hegemony during the time of the Hitler-Stalin Pact. The most notable achievement of the sixties was the Mississippi Project of 1964; but the student civil rights movement came repeatedly into conflict with the leadership of the older generation, a conflict which reached its climax in 1965 at Selma, Alabama, in the clash with Martin Luther King. Legislative victories followed, but the success of the movement depended on the maintenance of a generational equilibrium within it. Persons of all ages and classes were summoned to the movement; it was not allowed to become a student movement. The distinctive student vector has emerged in its advocacy of violence, guerilla warfare, and its hostility to the liberal democratic process.

The student movements are presumed to have been a remarkable training ground for political action and initiative. Too often, however, they burned out their participants. The activist lived at a level of excitement which he could not long maintain. Activist at twenty-one, de-activated at twenty-two became a familiar pattern. Political action born of generational revolt tended to be self-terminating; it ended when some measure

of generational independence was achieved. Meanwhile, the leading political student leaders were often disabled by extreme commitments from assuming the role of leadership they might otherwise normally have filled.

Compare the histories of the labor and student movements. The labor movement went through the bitter school of poverty, fought to keep its organizations alive and to give its members a philosophy. It too had its lapses into illusion, violence, and self-destruction. But it has written its achievements into volumes of legislation while at the same time rejecting the elitist myth that it was the Elect of History. By contrast, student movements have always been laden with emotion and doctrine concerning themselves as the elitist makers of history. Unlike the labor movement, they have often tended to represent not the reason of the studentry but its unreason. If students in the United States have generally held aloof from student movements, it was not always because of smugness or selfishness but because they felt that social idealism too readily went hand in hand with social irrationality.¹⁷ Student movements as agencies of generational revolt have distorted and thwarted the generous emotions which were also their partial inspiration.

NOTES

1. Marshall Kaplan and Richard Wedington White, "Birth of a Student Movement," *Liberation*, V (June 1960), 13.
2. David Horowitz, *Student* (New York, 1962), p. 151.
3. *Ibid.*, pp. 154-157.
4. Otto Feinstein, "Is There a Student Movement?" *New University Thought*, I, No. 4 (Summer 1961), 24.
5. R. Alan Haber, *Students and Labor*, leaflet, Students for a Democratic Society (New York, September 1962), pp. 5-8.
6. Al Richmond, *Campus Rebels*, (pamphlet; San Francisco, 1960), pp. 20-21.
7. Paul Potter, *The Intellectual as an Agent of Social Change*, leaflet, Students for a Democratic Society (New York, June 1963), pp. 2-5.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
9. Charles Chadwick, "Angry Liberals," *Liberation*, V, Nos. 5-6 (July-August 1960), 29.
10. C. Wright Mills, "On the New Left," *Studies on the Left*, II, No. 1 (1961), 70-71. See also Saul Landau, "C. Wright Mills—The Last Six Months," *Root and Branch*, No. 2 (1962), p. 7;
- Hans H. Gerth, "C. Wright Mills, 1916-1962," *Studies on the Left*, II, No. 3 (1962), 11.
11. Dale L. Johnson, "On the Ideology of the Campus Revolution," *Studies on the Left*, II, No. 1 (1961), 75.
12. Wayne Price, "Letter to the Editor," *Viewpoint*, I, No. 10 (1965), 11.
13. Robert Wolfe, "Intellectuals and Social Change," *Studies on the Left*, II, No. 3 (1962), 65.
14. Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 74.
15. Horowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
16. Howard Zinn, *SNCC: the New Abolitionists* (Boston, 1964), p. 19.
17. Louis E. Lomax, *The Negro Revolt* (Signet edn.; New York, 1963), pp. 96, 134; Tom Kahn, *Unfinished Revolution* (New York, 1960), p. 12; *Sit-Ins: The Students' Report*, accounts by Patricia Stephens, Edward Rodman, Paul Laprad, Thomas Gaither, Major Johns, Martin Smolin (New York, May 1960); James Peck, *Freedom Ride* (New York, 1962), pp. 56 ff.
18. Martin Luther King, Jr., *Stride toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story* (New York, 1958), pp. 131, 36.

19. Zinn, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
20. See Kahn, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-33; also Glenford E. Mitchell and William H. Peace III (eds.), *The Angry Black South* (New York, 1962), p. 103.
21. Lomax, *op. cit.*, p. 133; Abram Kardiner and Lionel Ovesy, *The Mark of Oppression* (New York, 1951), pp. 46, 59-60, 366, 381.
22. Glenford E. Mitchell, "College Students Take Over," in Mitchell and Peace, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-93.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 94; see also Major Johns, "Baton Rouge: Higher Education—Southern Style," in Peck, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
24. "Educator in Quandary: Felton Grandison Clark," *The New York Times*, January 22, 1962. See also Adolph L. Reed, "Crisis on the Negro Campus," *The Nation*, CXCIV, No. 6 (February 10, 1962), 111-113.
25. Jeremy Lerner, "The Negro in the South: 'Half a Loaf Is Ashes,'" *New Leader*, XLIII, No. 35 (September 12, 1960), 11.
26. Art Goldberg, expelled from Berkeley for his obscurantist leadership in 1965, enrolled at Howard University the next year. He sent back a pathetic complaint about the middle-class values of the Negro students to the *Daily Californian*: "The first day I came to register at Howard I was wearing Bermudas. . . . So I went into the Law School. . . . Everyone else had on a suit. . . . I later found out that the students couldn't figure out what this nasty, funky white boy was doing sitting on the floor in the lobby. . . . I would constantly get into political fights about Vietnam. . . . The Greeks control the school and they are even worse than the white fraternities and sororities. They adopt the worst patterns of middle-class white people." See Art Goldberg, "On Negro Universities," *Daily Californian*, June 29, 1966, p. 12.
27. Lerner, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
28. Kermit Eby, "Expert in the Labor Movement," *American Journal of Sociology*, LVII (1951), 27-32; "Young Idealists in Labor Unions," *Christian Century*, LXVI (1949), 1009-1010; "Organization, Bureaucracy, Loyalty," *Antioch Review*, XV (1955), 195-203.
29. Peck, *op. cit.*, pp. 73 ff.
30. Lewis S. Feuer, "Youth in the '60's," *New Leader*, XLIV, No. 10 (March 6, 1961), 18-22; reprinted in Albert T. Anderson and Bernice P. Biggs (eds.), *Focus on Rebellion* (San Francisco, 1962), pp. 142-151.
31. Lomax, *op. cit.*, p. 139; Lamer, *op. cit.*, p. 11; Zinn, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
32. Zinn, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 3, 9-10.
34. Tom Hayden, *Revolution in Mississippi* (New York, 1962), p. 7.
35. William McCord, *Mississippi: The Long, Hot Summer* (New York, 1965), p. 53.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
38. "Excerpts from the Slain Seminarian's Essay," *The New York Times*, August 21, 1965.
39. Claude Sitton, "Students Briefed on Peril in South: Rights Campaigners Warned of Death in Mississippi," *The New York Times*, June 17, 1964.
40. Elizabeth Sutherland (ed.), *Letters from Mississippi* (New York, 1965), pp. 24, 27, 28, 17, 18, 136, 13, 15, 20.
41. Calvin Trillin, "Letter from Jackson," *New Yorker*, XL, No. 28 (August 29, 1964), 101-102.
42. "Bettina: The Movement's 'Self-Immolation,'" *Daily Californian*, March 24, 1966, p. 8.
43. "Boycott Peace Corps Rally," *Daily Californian*, November 5, 1965; "Hypocritical, Peace Corps Boycott Urged to Protest War in Vietnam," *Daily Californian*, November 2, 1965.
44. "Corps Director: Peace Corps—'Outside Politics,'" *Daily Californian*, March 9, 1966.
45. *Peace Corps World: 1966* (Washington, D.C.), p. 1.
46. Jack Newfield, "Tom Hayden: Prophet Comes to Sodom," *Village Voice*, January 20, 1966, p. 1. Newfield is a leading practitioner of the New Leftist style in political journalism. He wrote, for instance, of Senators Robert F. Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy: "They are both politicians, both whores working in the same Democratic Party whorehouse." Jack Newfield, "The Arrogance of Class: Humphrey is the Enemy," *Village Voice*, May 2, 1968, p. 6.
47. Steve Max, "The 1965 SDS Convention: From Port Huron to Maplehurst," *Viewpoint*, I, No. 10 (Summer 1965), 7-10.
48. Steve Weissman, "Civil Disobedience in Action," *Students for Democratic Society Bulletin*, IV, No. 1 (1965), 7. A similar evolution from activist confront-

- tationism to populism to disillusionment with the poor marked the Canadian student movement. When the Student Union for Peace Action voted to disband in September 1967, the student newspaper of the University of Toronto summarized its career: "SUPA decided to stimulate Berkeley-type confrontations on campuses across the country. It was tried in a few places, but although administrations were terrified, there was little to fear. . . . Other SUPA members went off into community organizing binges—to Saskatchewan among Indians and Metis; to Kingston with slum dwellers and so on. Most of the young radicals came back from those experiments disillusioned. They found they couldn't so easily leave their affluent backgrounds and live among poverty cultures." See editorial, "Supa: what is accomplished," *The Varsity*, October 2, 1967, p. 4.
49. Marvin Garson, "The Ombilical: When the Workers Start to Move," *Berkeley Barb*, May 19, 1967, p. 12.
50. One New Leftist, Andrew Kopkind, resigned from the *New Republic* on the ground that it was too closely tied to the "Establishment." At a "counter-convention" to the National Student Association which he helped organize, he was asked what the alternative institutions he stood for were. He was at quite a loss for an answer, and fell back on saying that what was needed was to make an "attitudinal leap, to drop out of the Establishment, to put the radical idea first"—in short, an "attitudinal leap" of generational revolt, with the program to come later. Kopkind added that it was hard to propose alternatives "in a world of large institutions." See Steven V. Roberts, "The Voices of the Campus," *The New York Times*, August 20, 1967.
51. Steven Kelman, "SDS: Troubled Voice of the New Left," *New Leader*, XLVIII, No. 19 (September 27, 1965), 12.
52. *Loc. cit.*
53. The "new radicalism," or the "student left," wrote Andrew Kopkind, "is closer to Mario Savio than to Marx." See Kopkind, "New Radicals in Dixie," *New Republic*, CLII, No. 15 (April 10, 1965), 13; also his "Of, By and For the Poor: The New Generation of Student Organizers," *New Republic*, CLII, No. 25 (June 19, 1965), 15.
54. Paul Goodman, *Growing up Absurd* (New York, 1960), p. 202.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 123. See also Lewis S. Feuer, "Cult of the Rebel," *New Leader*, XLIV, No. 25 (June 19, 1961), 21-23.
57. The "hipster," noted Eugene Burdick, "'disaffiliates.' This means that he withdraws from the senseless organizations of orthodox society, whether these be political parties or corporations. . . . No figure of speech is used as often as 'Christ-like' in the beat vocabulary." Yet he sounded too "like the younger Bakunin." Eugene Burdick, "The Politics of the Beat Generation," *Western Political Quarterly*, XII (1959), 553-555.
58. Bradford Lytle, "After Washington?—Three Views," *Committee for Non-violent Action Bulletin*, V, No. 5 (August 27, 1965), 1-2.
59. Staughton Lynd, "The New Radicals and 'Participatory Democracy,'" *Dissent*, XII (1965), 328-329.
60. Staughton Lynd, "Coalition Politics or Nonviolent Revolution?" *Liberation*, X, No. 4 (June-July 1965), 21.
61. V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution* (New York, 1932), p. 75.
62. Lynd, "Coalition Politics or Nonviolent Revolution?" pp. 19-21.
63. Bayard Rustin, "The New Radicalism: Round III," *Partisan Review*, XXXII, No. 4 (1965), p. 537.
64. V. I. Lenin, *The Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (Moscow, 1954), p. 14.
65. *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 31.
66. Lynd, "The New Radicals and 'Participatory Democracy,'" pp. 326-327.
67. James W. Silver, *Mississippi: The Closed Society* (New York, 1966), pp. 342-343.
68. In 1967, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee dropped its tactical fiction of "nonviolence" and advocated violence, especially "guerrilla warfare." Curiously, in its espousal of "guerrilla warfare," it was following in Lenin's footsteps. William English Walling, activist at the turn of the century, reported from Russia how Lenin favored "guerrilla warfare," and how the lesson of the Revolution of 1905 was "the possible success of guerrilla tactics in a modern city"; guns could be passed, house owners could be terrorized, and the chance of detection

was small. See William English Walling, *Russia's Message* (New York, 1909), pp. 358, 370.

69. Lynd, "The New Radicals and 'Participatory Democracy,'" p. 328.

70. Lynd, "Socialism, the Forbidden Word," *Studies on the Left*, III, No. 3 (1963), 19.

71. "Michigan Faculty Created Teach-In," *The New York Times*, May 9, 1965.

72. "Now the Teach-In: U.S. Policy in Vietnam Criticized All Night," *The New York Times*, March 27, 1965.

73. Max Frankel, "Future of the Teach-In," *The New York Times*, May 17, 1965.

74. *Idem*.

75. *Idem*.

76. "Poll Contradicts Students' Image," *The New York Times*, January 16, 1966.

77. Jerry Rubin, "October 15-16 and the VDC," *VDC News*, published by the Berkeley VDC, I, No. 4 (October 11, 1965), 1.

78. *Idem*.

79. *Idem*.

80. Dave Slavin, "The Watts Ghetto: A People's Uprising," *Free Student*, No. 5 (n.d.), p. 12.

81. Robert Hurwitz, "Mime Troupe Always Set to Shuffle," *Berkeley Barb*, July 28-August 3, 1967, 9.

82. Steve Weissman, "The National Coordinating Committee Convention," *Liberation*, X (January 1966), 48-49.

83. John Corry, "'We Must Say Yes to Our Souls'—Staughton Lynd: Spokesman for the New Left," *The New York Times Magazine*, January 23, 1966, p. 12.

84. Steve Weissman, "Civil Disobedience in Action," *Students for a Democratic Society Bulletin*, IV, No. 1, 6.

85. Michael Harrington, "The Mystical Militants," *New Republic*, CLIV, No. 8 (February 19, 1966), 20. See also Lucille Birnbaum, "The Unkempt Prophets of Berkeley," *Issue: Those Who Make the Waves*, III, No. 1 (Spring 1965), 23-27.

86. *Daily Californian*, November 5, 1964, p. 1.

87. *Daily Californian*, February 28, 1966, p. 1.

88. "Clove's Statement of Resignation," *Daily Californian*, March 6, 1963, p. 1.

89. Morris E. Hurley, "Minority of One," *Daily Californian*, July 23, 1965, p. 9.

90. Davis Allen, "The Barber of Berkeley: Interview with Max Scherr," *Daily Californian*, March 8, 1966, pp. 9-10.

91. Marvin Garson, "Cal Goes on a Bad Trip," *Daily Californian*, February 15, 1966, p. 12. See also Garson, *The Regents* (Berkeley, 1965).

92. John Corry, "The Use of Drugs on College Campuses Is a Growing Problem," *The New York Times*, March 21, 1966. There is some evidence too that suicidalism increased at this time among American students. The United States Public Health Service estimated that adolescents of college age constituted the nation's highest potential suicide risk group. See "College Suicides Put at 1,000 in '66," *The New York Times*, October 4, 1966; also see "Pressure—and Suicides—Rising on Campus," *The New York Times*, October 9, 1966.

93. Richard Thorne, "A Step toward Sexual Freedom in Berkeley," *Berkeley Barb*, February 4, 1965, 5.

94. Adam Hochschild, "The Way-Out Set: Reporter Visits a Nude Party," *San Francisco Chronicle*, March 1, 1966, pp. 1, 10.

95. David Kamen, "The New Left—the New Fraternity," *Daily Californian*, August 10, 1966, p. 10.

96. Jed Rakoff, "Social Rules Are 'Good Thing,'" *Swarthmore College Phoenix*, LXXXVI, No. 24 (December 12, 1965), p. 2.

97. Wechsler, *Revolt on the Campus*, p. 359.

98. Jack Weinberg, Art Goldberg, Suzanne Goldberg, Stephen Weissman, Michael Rossman, Bettina Aptheker served on the Steering Committee. Information of Marilyn Noble, secretarial manager, Free Speech Movement, September 1, 1965.

99. Summary of lecture by Kathleen Gales, *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, July 28, 1965.

100. See *Jewish Currents*, XIX, No. 7 (July-August 1965), 14.

101. Irving Spiegel, "Jewish Officials Vexed by Youths: Students Said to Regard Agencies as 'Banal,'" *The New York Times*, June 26, 1965.

102. *The New York Times*, June 10, 1968, p. 53.

103. *The New York Times*, June 26, 1965.

104. Irving Spiegel, "Students Ponder Role of Judaism: Moral and Social Issues are Weighed by Hillel Group," *The New York Times*, September 5, 1965.

105. Joseph Gollomb, *Unquiet* (New York, 1935), pp. 366, 400-401, 436.

106. William Knight (ed.), *Memorials of Thomas Davidson: The Wandering Scholar* (Boston, 1907), p. 87. See also Leonard Prager, "Of Parents and Children: Jacob Gordin's The Jewish King Lear," *American Quarterly*, XVIII (Fall 1966), 506-516. "Hundreds and thousands," wrote David Philipson in 1905, "are leaving the old paths; the religion of their fathers is repugnant to them. In many instances, it is hated because it is synonymous with the old life of the ghetto and oppression." See "Strangers in a New Land," *American Jewish Archives*, XVIII (November 1966), 130; see also Hutchins Hapgood, *The Spirit of the Ghetto: Studies of the Jewish Quarter in New York* (rev. edn.; New York, 1909), 32-38.

107. See Melech Epstein, *Jewish Labor in U.S.A.: An industrial, political and cultural history of the Jewish Labor Movement, 1882-1914* (New York, 1950), pp. 355-356. Even "many radical parents also saw their children becoming alienated from them and things Jewish."

108. Wechsler, *Revolt on the Campus*, p. 359.

109. Melech Epstein, *The Jew and Communism: The Story of Early Communist Victories and Ultimate Defeats in*

the Jewish Community, U.S.A., 1919-1941 (New York, 1959), pp. 201-202.

110. John Gates, *The Story of an American Communist* (New York, 1958), p. 16. See also Nathan Glazer, *The Social Basis of American Communism* (New York, 1961), p. 137.

111. Gates, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

112. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

113. Joseph P. Lash, *The Student Movement Comes of Age* (pamphlet; New York, 1938).

114. Alfred Jospé (ed.), *The Legacy of Maurice Pekarsky* (Chicago, 1965), p. 144.

115. Eight who were in Mississippi [and] James A. Jones, Morris U. Schappes, "Jewish Young Freedom Fighters and the Role of the Jewish Community: An Evaluation," *Jewish Currents*, XIX, No. 7 (July-August 1965), 4-33.

116. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

117. According to the Playboy College Opinion Survey, a large majority of the American studentry, 82 per cent, felt that the United States was obligated to provide active military aid to South Vietnam. Only 6 per cent opposed any American involvement. One thousand students on two hundred campuses provided the sample. An overwhelming majority of 90 per cent felt that an American was obligated to accept military service even if he disagreed with his government. "Playboy's Poll Says Students Favor 'Bomb Hanoi' Policy," *Daily Californian*, November 23, 1965, p. 11.

NINE

The Berkeley Student Uprising: 1964-1966

Berkeley in 1964: The Freest University Campus in the United States

No other student uprising in the United States has ever impressed the public imagination as much as that which took place at the University of California in Berkeley in the fall of 1964. Its story is one of the usual dualities which have characterized student movements: selfless idealism matched with ugly hatreds of generational revolt, high moral ends and low immoral means, a vision of Utopian community and a reality of destruction, a populist yearning joined with an elitist self-assertion. Within two years the student movement, which began with an avowal of nonviolence and a higher ethic, was becoming the apologist for violence and political amorality. The classical patterns of student movements, familiar enough in nineteenth-century Russia, began to appear, of all places, in the most advanced university and the most modern state of the United States. Theoreticians who for fifteen years had been telling themselves that such movements were incidents of "developing countries," "emerging new nations," and "underdeveloped areas" found themselves confuted by a movement which had grown, unperceived and uncomprehended, a few yards from their studies. Why did it happen at Berkeley?

The student body at Berkeley was not a radical one. Indeed, in the national election of 1956, it was more conservative than the population at large; a sample poll indicated that 71 per cent of the Berkeley students had supported President Eisenhower as the candidate for election to a second term.¹ During the years from 1960, however, to 1964, a tension spread among a section of the studentry. It linked itself successively with a series of issues, especially with the growing civil rights movement in the

United States; these youth experienced a sympathy, sometimes an identification, with the struggles and sufferings of the Negro people. For a year or two, in little circles organized by such groups as the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), they picketed retail stores, department stores, restaurants, and apartment houses to protest against practices of racial discrimination in these establishments.² They organized boycotts, which often were successful; and they experimented with sit-in tactics, which proved effective enough to put one large store out of business completely. In the spring of 1964, several hundreds of students were arrested in San Francisco when they staged massive sit-ins in Automobile Row and the Sheraton Palace Hotel. Nevertheless, agreements were secured which evidently raised the ratios of Negroes employed in these enterprises, and the student activists felt that at long last they had found a tactical weapon through which they could directly compel social change: civil disobedience in the form of the massive sit-in.³ A back-to-the-people spirit together with a messianic feeling surged among the student activists. "A weekend of songs, sit-ins, and sleep-ins," rejoiced the *Daily Californian*, as it announced the victory: "Demonstrators 1—Sheraton Palace O." They, the students, became confident in noble exaltation that by their sheer heroism and resourcefulness they would lead the Negro masses; the downtrodden would lift their heads. Several Berkeley students had been Freedom Riders in Alabama and Mississippi two years earlier; now in 1964 their successors went as volunteers to the Summer Freedom Project in Mississippi, volunteers to lead voter registration drives and Freedom Schools. That summer, the first "long, hot summer," three civil rights volunteers were murdered in Mississippi; the missing bodies of Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and James Chaney haunted the summer's weeks until they were discovered buried in a ditch on August 3. The first two boys were college students from New York, the third was a Negro co-worker from the neighborhood. They had been tortured and shot. Their murderers were citizens whose identity was known but who seemed to have an immunity before the law. Meridian, Mississippi, became the symbol of the martyrdom of the American student volunteer.⁴ The nation was aghast over the brutality, cruelty, and indifference which were meted out upon the young idealists.⁵ Older people began to experience a sense of guilt in the sacrifice of the young as well as of their de-authoritization as they saw the young prove their martyrdom; this new generation was ready to put its convictions to the test of individual direct action; the student activists by the fall of 1964 had assumed the role of conscience of their society.

Moreover, in 1964, a "generational complex" had become strong in Berkeley. Its chief symptom was a readiness on the part of student activists to demonstrate at the slightest real or imagined provocation. A demonstration became a compulsive gesture; the will to demonstrate was experienced apart from and prior to any specific issues. It was a readiness to serve notice on the elders, to "confront" them. As one young

assistant professor told his fellow "peace" advocates, they were minded for civil disobedience and then looked around for a cause to justify the means. The means were the real end; the apparent "end" was an occasion for their use. The will to demonstrate, to be disobedient, to "bring the system to a grinding halt," to "lay one's body on the line" became like an obsessive Kantian a priori category. As the poet Kenneth Rexroth noted, a group had arisen of "compulsively addicted demonstrators. One week they are Youth, next week they are Negroes, next week they are Free Speechers, or for Peace or against the Atom. The beards, duffle coats, bare feet, jeans, dirty hair, remain the same." And Rexroth, trying to define the compulsion, wrote, "They are voluntary outcasts who identify their own personal alienation with the actions of others protesting to achieve definite goals within society." He once asked a compulsive demonstrator in the sit-ins whether she knew how many Negroes had been employed since the sit-ins. "She gave me a look of withering contempt," wrote Rexroth, "and said, 'I couldn't care less.'"⁶

The University of California at Berkeley was probably the freest campus in the country. Its administration in April 1964 had been awarded the Alexander Meiklejohn Prize by the American Association of University Professors for its advances and steadfast adherence to academic freedom.⁷ Communist speakers and organizations had the freedom of its campus rooms; an outdoor free speech area was available to all.⁸ The university had refused to consider disciplinary action against students convicted of violating the law during civil rights disturbances. Student pickets on the campus grounds had agitated against compulsory Reserve Officers' Training Corps (R.O.T.C.) courses unmolested, and student petitioners set up their tables on the steps of the administration building; the university nonetheless pursued its liberal policy, and terminated compulsory military training. When, during the Cuban Bay of Pigs crisis, a graduate student spoke for eight hours at an unauthorized meeting at an out-of-bounds center of the campus, he received only a gentle reprimand. When Mme. Nhu of South Vietnam came to Berkeley, she was greeted by student pickets. The organizations of the New Left flourished at Berkeley meetings as they did on no other campus in the United States. Yet it was precisely here that the activists raised the cry that they were being persecuted and deprived of freedom.

Then, too, Berkeley had become a center for nonstudents, a relatively new phenomenon in American social history but one which was familiar in Europe wherever a student movement flourished. Every classical student movement, beginning with the German and Russian movements in the nineteenth century, has attracted to itself nonstudents, many of whom find their life's calling in a prolonged adolescence and repetitive re-enactment from year to year of the rebellion against their fathers. A few thousand such nonstudents lived in proximity to the University of California at Berkeley, attracted there by the salubrious climate, the gentle sunny

surroundings, the relaxed mode of life, the record shops, bookstores, restaurants, and students' apartments, the reputation of the Berkeley police force for its tolerance toward deviants, nonconformists, and militants, and the university's free offering of immense cultural riches in lectures, plays, concerts, books. When the beatnik community came to feel that San Francisco was becoming too bourgeois and tourist-ridden, it largely migrated to Berkeley. The "hidden community," as the students' newspaper called the nonstudents, was significant in the Berkeley student uprising among other reasons because it provided members who were available for full-time activity in any action against the Establishment or the System, and who in any situation were inclined to choose the most provocative speech and action.⁹ When the *Spartacist*, an organ of a Berkeley Trotskyist sect, published a long article explaining why the student uprising had erupted at Berkeley, it proudly claimed a primary causal role for the nonstudent corps:

Berkeley has accumulated over the years a sizable fringe of disaffected semi-bohemian elements who, while they have no formal connection with the University, cluster around it and form a supportive element for student radicals. . . . They find in Berkeley an atmosphere conducive to living on their political light-duty slips. In short, the student radical does not face a harshly hostile environment once he steps beyond Sather Gate.¹⁰

Moreover, Berkeley and its environs during the years had become the last sanctuary for the defeated activists of the thirties. In Berkeley they found a liberality of spirit which revived their flagging revolutionary ardor; they even found jobs in the university institutions, institutes, and adjacent operations, and such part-time employment gave them a base for commencing a new agitational career among the students. An able former editor of a New York Trotskyist magazine, *Labor Action*, after the demise of his magazine and movement, turned from labor action to student action; he secured part-time employment in the university library, and in 1964 conducted a notable University Socialist School with a course entitled "Ten Revolutions that Shook the World." There were five evenings, with two revolutions an evening and ten lecturers; for a total tuition fee of one dollar, the student was offered a chance to re-experience the high emotions of the Paris Commune, the Revolution of 1848, the Russian and Chinese Revolutions, the Spanish Civil War.¹¹ The hundred or so activists who attended the school heard lectures on the value of the revolutionary experience; revolution seemed the culmination of one's life, the moment of heroism, the moment of meaning. A few months later the same activists were seeking their own revolutionary experience on the Sproul steps and the plaza. As the French revolutionists had stormed the Bastille and occupied the Tuileries and Versailles Palace, as the Bolshevik-led masses had occupied the Winter Palace, the students would surge forward to occupy the open administration building, Sproul Hall.

Former Trotskyists, socialists, and Communists were drawn to Berkeley as a new political fountain of youth. A former Communist, presenting himself regularly to student groups as a Soviet expert, martyred during the so-called McCarthyist era, complained to the students that the university refused to appoint him to its faculty; the student activists, always quick to sympathize with a presumed underdog and to empathize with his criticism of authority, were left ignorant of the fact that the self-styled Soviet expert had testified before a congressional committee in 1952 that Stalin never killed his political opponents and that there were no slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union. A former Trotskyist organizer and later labor journalist now graced by an institute retainer gave his ardent blessing at rallies to student activists. And when the moment of action came, the activists marched under banners to occupy Sproul Hall to the singing of the beautiful and famed folk singer, Joan Baez. No spontaneous student action was ever staged with such a remarkable directorial flair, before so many television cameras, and with such an entranced audience.

What Is a Nonstudent?

What is a nonstudent? This new American sociological type, which emerged at Berkeley, often defines himself as a "guerrilla fighter" against society. He admires the "guerrilla fighter" who at any given time most challenges the System. Castro, Mao, Che Guevara, the Vietcong have all been guerrilla superegos for the nonstudents. Oldsters who associated themselves with the students pictured themselves too in this guise; when the actor Sterling Hayden was arrested in the San Francisco sit-ins in the spring of 1964, he described himself to reporters as being engaged in a sort of "guerrilla warfare" against the System. The nonstudent was in part a nihilist, though from 1963 on he was tending to move from pure nihilism to life as a full-time (if possible) guerrilla fighter against the System. As a nonstudent, he was the first in the history of American society to define himself negatively. He indeed lives in negation; he has no job, no calling, no vocation. If the System has had its yes-men, he will be a total no-man. He denounces the Impersonal Society, the Organized System, and the Bureaucracy. Yet he is strangely parasitic on the System. He lives in its interstices, needs its systematic conveniences, and above all requires the student environment. Himself permanently fixated or arrested in the stage of adolescent revolt against authority, and having failed to acquire the habits of work and discipline, the virtues of the "Protestant ethic," he requires the emotional reassurance of the youthful audience, their naïveté, ready sympathy, and shared rebelliousness. The nonstudent, in short, is under a compulsion to live in perpetual generational revolt. To every virtue which his father upheld he counterposes an anti-virtue. A job, responsibility to one's family, the value of work, the insistence on ethical means

in political action—all are rejected as Establishment tainted. Living on his father's donations, or the government's unemployment insurance, or student hospitality, the nonstudent is a luxurious excrescence of the affluent society. The leading nonstudent of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, Jack Weinberg, once described his political and private history in the characteristic idiom of the nonstudent; it was an autobiographical document representative of several hundreds, and later thousands, like him. He explained:

I became an activist before the FSM. I worked with CORE in the South in 1963 so the FSM didn't screw up my private life. It was already screwed up and I loved it.

The FSM, though, has been the most complete experience of my life, the most all-encompassing. Very complex, a tremendous amount of responsibility, working 16 hours a day.

It gave me a sense of comradeship we had not known existed.

It gave me insights into myself that I will need years to define.¹²

Once people used to define themselves by what they did, by their function. Living in permanent generational revolt, this new group defined itself negatively, by what it didn't do; its adherents even contrived an ideology for their existence as nonexistence. One nonstudent said:

It is invariably the radicals, not the conservatives, who drop out of school and become activist nonstudents. . . .

"We don't play a big role politically," says one. "But philosophically we're a hell of a threat to the establishment. Just the fact that we exist proves that dropping out of school isn't the end of the world. . . . We're respectable. A lot of students I know are thinking of becoming nonstudents."¹³

Berkeley, of all places in America, was the promised land for the nonstudents. "The climate is easy, the people are congenial, and the action never dies." For instance, Jim Prickett, nonstudent, became an editor of *Spider*, dedicated to "sex, politics, international communism, drugs, extremism and rock 'n roll." He had "quit the University of Oklahoma" and been dropped for poor grades from San Francisco State College. He came to Berkeley because "things are happening here." A fellow-editor of his lived with three other nonstudents and two students in a comfortable house. They clung to their post-student prolongation of the student existence. For the psychological essence of the nonstudent is that he cannot give up being a student. He is fixated in its psychology, and from this standpoint the term "nonstudent" is a misnomer. The nonstudent views with horror having to give up student existence, with its privilege of intellectual and emotional freebooting. He lacks the intellectual self-mastery or love for a subject or science which would lead him on to complete his studies, but he loves the externalities or pseudo-externalities of student life. Instead of having completed his adolescent rebellion by defining his own vocation, he actually remains emotionally dependent on his father, on the elder

generation; he has to remain in proximity to students because he has to re-enact the pattern of opposition, of revolt. He remains a rebel because he has never fulfilled his emotional revolution, and he is trapped in a compulsive repetitive pattern. Hence at Berkeley the nonstudent projected his illness on society: "What this country needs is a revolution; the society is so sick, so reactionary, that it just doesn't make sense to be part of it." Here in their communal apartment, there was not Permanent Revolution but Permanent Rebellion:

Papers litter the floor, the phone rings continually, and people stop by to borrow things: a pretty blonde wants a Soviet army chorus record, a Tony Perkins type from the Oakland Du Bois Club wants a film projector; Art Goldberg—the arch-activist who also lives here—comes storming in, shouting for help on the "Vietnam Day" teach-in arrangements. It is all very friendly and collegiate. People wear plaid shirts and khaki pants, white socks and moccasins. There are books on the shelves, cans of beer and Cokes in the refrigerator, and a manually operated light bulb in the bathroom. In the midst of all this it is weird to hear people talking about "bringing the ruling class to their knees. . . ."14

The nonstudents' choice of metaphor was revealing. Not the positive vision of betterment but the image of humiliating the enemy, making him cringe, the fantasy of a sick adolescent everlastingly plotting to reduce his father and reverse social relations. Another nonstudent, an editor of *Spider*, said he became a radical after the 1962 civil rights demonstrations in San Francisco: "That's when I saw the power structure and understood the hopelessness of trying to be a liberal. After I got arrested I dropped the pre-med course I'd started at San Francisco State. The worst of it, though, was being screwed time and again in the courts. I'm out on appeal now with four and a half months of jail hanging over me." Above all, the nonstudent was estranged from America and in quest of another loyalty. The chairman of the Vietnam Day Committee wrote, "In most of the world people are eager and optimistic, making a new history, trying out new forms, experimenting. . . . The U.S.A. is for the status quo. But I as an American want to be with those making history, not with those freezing it. This is my own personal view. It is why I quit a newspaper job after five years to become involved in politics. It is why I left graduate studies to become involved in politics. It is why I choose to spend my time with the VDC."15

The Berkeley nonstudent, fixated in the student condition and consciousness, came to think of himself by a curious twist of logic as the "true student" on the university campus. When the chancellor of the university in November 1965 expressed his concern with the fact that organizations "nominally registered" as student organizations were "in fact controlled and run by nonstudents," he was bitterly criticized by the leading nonstudent organizer of the Vietnam Day Committee. The nonstudent declared, "I am a nonstudent and I consider myself an integral part of the

University." He was "thoroughly disturbed" by the official "definition of a student." "The University should be a community of ideas open to all who wish to use it." Because of the "cash register, grocery store-style of education offered here," said Jerry Rubin, "many nonstudents are more serious about education than the students."16 Becoming a nonstudent was often the consequence of a conversion-like experience; one believed oneself to have seen the Evil of the System, and would have no part of it. "I consider myself a full-time political activist," said Jerry Rubin. "I've dedicated my life to changing the country. . . . I voluntarily became a nonstudent because I was totally disheartened by the reality I saw as a student. . . . I took seriously the idea that the university was a place for education and meaningful social action."17

The Berkeley student movement was not unique for the presence within it of "nonstudents." Every student movement has been conspicuous for the sheltering environment it gave to these extreme exemplars of its own motivations to generational revolt. The nonstudents hailed Berkeley for what it meant in their lives:

There is a thing characteristic of Berkeley, and that is a fantasy, a thing in the mind. In these United States, Berkeley is unusual, for it is a continuing, never-concluded experiment, with people as voluntary self-subjects. No city has quite such a transient group as Berkeley people, yet they cohere into a community like any other. These people have filtered out of The New Deal, The New Frontier, The Great Society, and landed here. One large vehicle of the filtration process is the great learning machine in our midst (or are we in its midst?). . . . Almost anyone with a moderate amount of aspiration to personal humanity has got to try it, even if it can't last for some and they must finally describe the Berkeley experience as simply an experience, something which they had to try. But it is that fantasy, that radical thing in the mind, which, though perhaps never to be totally realized in a larger context, is the Berkeley constant.18

Thus the fantasy world of the nonstudent—generational revolt permanent and continuously consummated, the tired revolutionists rejuvenated, the Berkeley experience, the Berkeley constant.

There can be little doubt, however, that without the individual leadership of the sophomore, Mario Savio, the Berkeley student uprising would never have reached the proportions that it did. Savio not only articulated latent sources of student unrest; he partially created them by the oratorical fervor of his moral indignation. He was himself in the throes of a personal generational rebellion. Born December 8, 1942, in New York on the Day of the Immaculate Conception, named Mario for St. Mark, he had spent his first collegiate year at Manhattan College, an institution run by the Christian Brothers; Mario had found it "too parochial."19 Then he went to Queens College, where he was president of the Fraternity of Christian Doctrine.20 He experienced an inner turmoil concerning Catholic theology. The next year at Berkeley, Mario once interrupted his philosophy class,

vehemently declaring, "But the most important thing we must first do is to decide whether Thomas Aquinas is right." His father, a sheet-metal worker, was evidently unaware of his son's emotional-intellectual travail. He said that when Mario was at home he attended church with his family, and he spoke with pride of Mario's presidency of the Fraternity of Christian Doctrine. As with so many student activists, the university constituted a surrogate father against whom all the emotions of generational revolt could be channelized. Apparent family equilibrium was often maintained because the university provided a substitute target, psychologically *in loco parentis*. Mario's father took pride in the awards his son had won, even from the Veterans of Foreign Wars. They were part of America, though the grandfather in Italy had been a Fascist.

Mario, as he departed from Catholic doctrine, sought a philosophy by which to live. He therefore "majored" in philosophy; within a few months, however, he found its "analytic" linguistic emphasis of little interest. He was briefly associated with the Young People's Socialist League, but more important, read Marx and Marxist literature. Marx's concept of alienation impressed him as a master key for dealing with human problems. He sought for causes to which to give himself, in the typical pattern of the unhappy youth who seeks to assuage his unhappiness by working among those living under greater, starker misery. The summer of 1963 he spent in the Taxco area in Mexico, helping to build a laundry for its people to prevent cholera infection. The next summer, in 1964, he was among the teachers in a Mississippi Freedom School. He recalled how two men armed with clubs had assaulted and pursued him and two others. He was filled not only with a back-to-the-people zeal but also with an elitist sense of historic mission. He wrote that spring to a friend of his, "I'm tired of reading history. I want to make it."²¹ Before an audience, his personal doubts and hesitations vanished. The larger the crowd, the more liberated did he seem from his own inner conflict. In private conversation "a marked stutterer,"²² he all but lost his impediment when he felt the support of a sympathetic mass. He talked of how on October 2 he had held the great crowd in the Plaza "in my hand," and how they would have obeyed him in anything he might have asked. He looked back on the December sit-in as his high moment of encounter with history:

Whenever I go into Sproul Hall and see all the footprints on the lower part of the wall where we sat through the night awaiting arrest, I feel a bit sad. You know, it has a kind of macabre quality. To remember what was going on there once. For a moment all the hypocrisy was cleared away and we all saw the world with a much greater clarity than before. It seems in some ways frightening now that the old shell of hypocrisy that we exposed is beginning to repair itself. It seems frightening that there is such a difference between the way things are and what people actually say—people like Clark Kerr—and then the things they actually do when they are put under pressure. I feel a wistfulness that the time is gone. But also I feel pride.²³

He felt that the students should not be punished but should receive "the kind of public apology that Socrates suggested . . ."

Like all the student leaders of history, with Karl Follen, Sergei Nechayev, and Gavrilo Princip, Mario Savio felt moved to indicate the "hypocrisy" of his society; like all of them, he was scarcely sensitive to the "hypocrisy" which might infect his own project for the making of history.

The Student Uprising of 1964: Chronicle of Events

An incident of small proportions in September 1964 became the center for the accretion of generational resentment during what became the Berkeley Student Uprising. By itself, the original dispute could have been easily resolved. But the student activists and their nonstudent auxiliaries felt themselves enveloped in the mantle of the civil rights movement, and were heady with the urge to civil disobedience. Every violation of a university rule was represented as allied with the dramatic legal violations of the civil rights movement; every generational rebel had found a banner to unfurl over whatever action his spirit drove him to. A puzzled university administration bungled and fumbled, fearful of being accused of hurting the civil rights movement if it disciplined disobedient students engaged in crude insults and floutings of rules. And when it did try to act, the administration was defined in the activists' eyes as the Cruel, Heartless, Impersonal Father who aimed to destroy his sons. At the height of the student uprising in November and December 1964, the issue of civil rights disappeared almost completely from the students' speeches and leaflets.

Every student movement, as we have seen, has tried to attach itself to a more enduring pervasive and massive carrier movement, whether it be a labor, peasants', nationalistic, or even fascist movement. The generational struggle during the summer of 1964 had merged itself with the civil rights struggle; the older generation was relatively de-authorized on this issue. This gave to the Berkeley activists their moral hegemony over their elders in the fall of 1964; the administration was consequently timid about reacting to the most flagrant disregard for college order. But as the weeks passed, and conflicts with the elders multiplied, the issue became almost blatantly one of sheer generational solidarity and revolt, with the multi-university cast in the role of an I.B.M. machine which was mutilating (castrating) its children.

During the summer of 1964, when the Republican National Convention took place in San Francisco, there were evidently some complaints from supporters of Senator Goldwater, a presidential nominee, that the university grounds were being used to organize disorderly forays on behalf of another Republican nominee, Governor Scranton. At any rate, in September, the university administration undertook to enforce the existing regulations concerning the university's political neutrality. For several

months it had allowed such groups as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) to place their tables across the street side of Sproul Plaza and to solicit funds and volunteers for sit-ins. The university's regulations actually forbade both the soliciting of funds on university grounds as well as their use for organizing outside political drives. In all likelihood, it would shortly have relaxed back into connivance in the violation of these regulations by civil rights groups; furthermore, given the trend in the liberalization of its rules during the previous years, and the extent of faculty involvement in the civil rights movement, a more formal amendment of the rules probably would have followed a period of discussion. The chancellor of the Berkeley campus, Edward W. Strong, was, according to the "official" history published by the Free Speech Movement itself, "a genial if austere liberal who seemed to mirror the principles of freedom and enlightenment the President [Clark Kerr] frequently espoused."²⁴ But the student activists, veterans of civil disobedience actions from San Francisco to Mississippi, resolved precipitously, after some provocative challenging ("Will you dare use civil disobedience?"), to employ their well-practiced tactic on the university itself. First, they invaded the university's convocation with protest signs, parading and exhibiting them in the aisles. Then, a few days later, a group of students, after exhortation by several nonstudents ("What will they think of you if you submit?"), invaded the administration building for their first, rather short sit-in.

The mood for direct action, for civil disobedience, was growing among the small group of activists who sensed that they had fallen upon a weapon which unnerved the administration; in the fall of 1964, administrators and officials in the United States lived in fear of civil disobedience, for any arrests by them of participants in it were promptly used to link them with all the repressive racists of Mississippi and Alabama. The Berkeley activists were small in numbers. The combined membership of SNCC, CORE, Slate (a student political party embracing all varieties of protest—Stalinism, Maoism, beatnikism, anarchism, and sheer orneriness), and the YSA (Trotskyist Young Socialist Alliance), was no more than 170 students out of a total student population of more than twenty-seven thousand. It was these four organizations which on Tuesday, September 29, set up their tables in front of Sather Gate in contravention of the rules. The dean's representatives persuaded a few of the students to identify themselves but allowed the tables to remain. The fervor of civil disobedience now began to spread, all the more so as it became clear that the authorities were embarrassed and reluctant to act. The next day, about four hundred students signed petitions to the dean declaring that they too were guilty of having manned the political tables in conscious violation of the university's rules. A sit-in then began which lasted into the early morning of October 1. That day the university finally suspended eight

students. Meanwhile, a continuing demonstration was maintained on the steps of the administration building.

Then came the first clash with the police. The dramatic universal patterns in the history of student movements repeated themselves in a familiar succession of scenes. Always in the past, in nineteenth-century Russia, in China, in Burma, the appearance of the police to enforce a university rule had produced an immediate "escalation" of minor incidents into major events; the appearance of policemen seemed to recall childhood traumas of harsh authority. The amiable campus guards at Berkeley were viewed as "fascist cops," as "Mississippi sheriffs and deputies." All the unconscious sources of generational solidarity began to feed energies of revolt.

The specific occurrence which then sparked the actual clash was unpredictable, but that something like it would take place was highly predictable from the whole history of student movements. The *Newsletter* of the Free Speech Movement, which shortly came into existence as a Soviet-style coalition of fourteen student groups ranging from Khrushchevites to Goldwaterites (for a brief period), tells the story vividly.²⁵

Then came the unpredictable. At noon the following day a rally was held to protest the suspensions and the freedom limitations. Tables were set up in opposition to the ban. Among this[?], campus police arrested Jack Weinberg, who was manning a table for CORE. He went limp and was carried into a police car. When the police tried to drive the car off campus, someone sat down in front of it and a moment later the car was completely surrounded. Speakers addressed the crowds from the top of the car, and so the vehicle, now Jack Weinberg's cell, became the focal point of the rapidly accelerating movement.²⁶

We have already met the police car "limpnik" (the word is mine), the nonstudent Jack Weinberg. Twenty-four years old, a former graduate student in mathematics, an activist in CORE, Weinberg said, "I decided I'd rather work for civil rights than study math." But another remark of his became celebrated because it revealed plainly the generational animus underlying the Berkeley Student Uprising: "We have a saying in the movement that you can't trust anybody over 30."²⁷ The "someone" who placed himself obstructively in front of the police car was likewise a nonstudent—chiefly famed for his tireless advocacy of the use of drugs, and at the time of these occurrences on parole from a jail sentence.²⁸

From noon Thursday until 7:30 P.M. Friday, the student activists held the police car with its prisoner hostage. The policemen behaved good-naturedly and worked out arrangements to provide for the physical needs of their prisoner. It was their first encounter with moralistic civil disobedience, and they feared to incur the wrath of the community on any issue even remotely related to "civil rights"; they restrained their impulse to arrest those who were hindering the enforcement of the law.

The vigil around the car was maintained through the night by about

seventy students on blankets; some trying to read by lamplight and searchlight, others with guitars singing ballads of themselves and creating the legend which they will embroider in later years; all of them weary, fighting vaguely for a cause they could hardly explain, but moved to this declaration of generational independence. When daylight came, it brought a mercilessly hot sun. The acrid smell of the crowded, sweating, unbathed students reminded one observer of long since forgotten smells among soldiers in the Pacific twenty years before. The overheated oratory vied with the sun, never ending, always strident, a ceaseless flow of "manifestese." One student declaimed, "Clark Kerr has written that the university is a factory. He deals with us as numbers. Well, that's the language he understands, so we are here as numbers—hundreds and thousands. . . ." ²⁹

The numbers fluctuated from several hundred to close to six thousand Friday evening. Always there was the oratory, the invective against the bureaucrats, the demand for freedom. There were signs and slogans, a medley of the heroic and scurrilous; a former CORE officer bore aloft a quotation from a book signed by "Clark Cur." Shamefacedly she admitted that she had not even read the sign she was carrying, but she was demonstrating, protesting, rebelling. Generational solidarity carried the day as undergraduate neophytes and graduate political sectarians somehow defined a common enemy in Paternalism (a word endlessly repeated) and the System. There were no stepsons; all the activists were sons against the father.

The United States had never seen the like. The official report of the Berkeley police transcribed the scene and its ending:

On Friday, October 2, the university announced the intention to take police action and again requested mutual aid assistance. Six hundred and forty-three officers from the Berkeley and Oakland Police Departments, the Alameda County Sheriff's Office and the California Highway Patrol were assembled on the campus, briefed and prepared for action within a period of three hours. At 6.00 P.M., the time selected for police action, the police command group was notified that representatives of the university and the demonstrators were negotiating and that the operation should be delayed. At 7.10 P.M., the dispute was compromised and the police force dismissed.

The riot potential was extreme on Thursday and Friday. ³⁰

The several hundred sitting demonstrators dispersed when Mario Savio, the chief student leader, told them from the police car of the agreement with the administration. The several thousand spectators, sympathizers, and opponents of all degrees quit the Plaza. But that evening hysterical and emotionally wrought students were still standing on the abandoned battlefield which groundsmen were trying to clean. They could not leave the scene where they had embattled the administration; the battered police car was the enemies' pillbox which they had taken. Angry, sleepless voices charged that their leaders had sold them out. The editor of the *FSM Newsletter* met one of her former teachers. She was carrying a beautifully

wrapped gift box. She explained that in it was an air valve of the tire from the police car. It would be cherished in later years as a sacred relic, a pathetic reminder of how a new generation of student activists sought its Guadalcanal and Iwo Jima and believed itself to perceive the enemies' visage in the chiefs of the "multiversity."

After the October days there were weeks of negotiation, followed by the university's proposal of broad provisions for freedom of speech, organization, solicitation of funds and members, and actions in the community—everything short of explicit permission to use the university's facilities to organize illegal actions in the community at large. ³¹ But the student activists, conforming to the strange workings of the psychology of generational rebellion, demanded that the university promulgate their right to engage in illegal action; it was as if the children wanted their fathers to formally acknowledge the moral sovereignty of their offspring; the old superego was to formally abdicate in favor of the moral authority of the young, to acknowledge its own de-authoritization in the right of the sons to be illegal—that is, to destroy the old. Therefore, the student activists persisted in their demonstrations. On November 20, they attracted thousands to the Plaza to hear Joan Baez sing of freedom and love. As she sang "We Shall Overcome," they marched in solemn procession to University Hall, where the regents were convening. For several hours there was more singing, then anger and tears when the regents would not concede the students the strange new "right"—the right to be illegal.

Nonetheless, during the last week of November, it seemed as if the university might at last know some respite from the troubles which had plagued it. Generational struggle is the preoccupation of student activists, but not of the majority of students who find in their everyday studies and advance to independence a more normal path to emotional autonomy. The daily demonstrations and noon orations were dwindling in numbers to some two hundred or so of the faithful; another sit-in came to an end after three hours when the graduate students withdrew their support.

Then, a week later, all the unconscious forces of generational struggle and generational solidarity were once more ignited. Four student leaders were summoned, in accordance with the regents' decision, to appear before the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs to discuss charges that they had committed acts of violence in early October against the campus police. Mario Savio in particular was accused of having bitten a policeman in the left thigh while the officer was trying to close the door to Sproul Hall. The administration's action was like a challenge of the older generation to the young. The student activists were no longer compelled to invent scholastic arguments for an alleged right to organize illegal actions on the campus. Now they could rely on the elemental reaction of their fellow-generationists against the Cruel Heartless Administration which wanted to punish Mario Savio for biting a policeman's thigh, an incredible charge. The administration, said the organ of the Free Speech Movement, "never

dreamed that the threat to expel four FSM leaders would provoke such a massive reaction of solidarity."³² What is more, the student orators intimidated, the charges were frame-ups; why, they said, one of the accused had been nowhere near Sproul Hall. In any case, almost everyone had put the October events aside, and had taken it for granted that the cases would not be pressed by the administration. Instead, said the student activists, their trusted leaders were going to be picked off one by one and penalized; the elders were described as engaged in a crafty conspiracy to undo the young.

Thereupon, on December 1, the activist leaders submitted an ultimatum saying that unless the charges were dropped within twenty-four hours, the students would resort to massive tactics of civil disobedience. The Graduate Co-ordinating Committee, the "soviet" of delegates from the graduate students of the various departments, authorized its Strike Committee to call a general strike of teaching assistants if necessary.

The next day there took place with solemn ceremony the students' occupation of Sproul Hall. At noon Mario Savio addressed a crowd of several thousand. He attacked Clark Kerr as a manager, responsible to a board of directors, one who treated the students as "raw material": "It becomes odious so we must put our bodies against the gears, against the wheels and machines, and make the machine stop until we're free." Once more Joan Baez sang the Lord's Prayer and "We Shall Overcome" and about one thousand students marched in holy procession to occupy the administration fortress. In Sproul Hall they quickly set up a "Free University of California" and announced a course on music by Joan Baez as well as courses on the nature of God and the logarithmic spiral, wild Spanish, and arts and crafts, with a special section for making strikes and signs. The halls were like an indoor bivouac of boys and girls enjoying a rare all-night party; since the doors were closed, food was hoisted through the windows. At 3:00 A.M. the chancellor, Edward Strong, pleaded with the students unavailingly to leave. His words were rational and sincere, but the students were now in the full mood of generational uprising and Socrates himself would have got no hearing from them. Thereupon the police, acting under the orders of the governor of the state, began to arrest and remove 814 sit-down occupants, of whom 590 were students.

The police action took twelve hours and was generally without violence. In several cases, the students' tactic of going limp resulted in some forcing and pushing. The inevitable cry of "police brutality" was later acknowledged by many of those arrested to have been a reflex exaggeration. But exaggeration or not, the spectacle of 635 police on the campus acting against students had the effect hoped for by the student leaders. They had intended their move (as they said) to provoke the calling of the police, counting on generational solidarity to succeed where their argument had failed.

The next day, Thursday, December 3, saw the students' strike of Berke-

ley. Picket lines paraded in front of the classroom buildings. At the gates, strike leaflets were issued. They put their appeal in the primitive terms of generational solidarity:

Our fellow students are being dragged off to jail. You must not stand by and do nothing. It does not matter whether you support a particular tactic. The matter is that the police are on our campus sending students to prison farms in an attempt to crush the free speech movement. . . . There are only two sides—you must choose yours. . . . Defend your fellow students. Join them in a massive university-wide strike. Do not attend classes today. Strike.

That day and the next there were feverish meetings on the campus: a huge one of several thousands, an improvised one of a thousand faculty members, students, and onlookers, and in every department small ones of anxious professors and graduate assistants. In the social sciences, the departments generally allowed or advised the assistants not to meet their classes temporarily. In the departments of engineering and chemistry, the strike was unsuccessful. Probably half the classes in the university did not meet in those days.

Finally on Monday, December 7, President Clark Kerr addressed the students directly for the first time since the eruption of the three-month-old crisis. Eighteen thousand students and professors in the Greek Theater heard him accept a proposal that the university should press no prosecutions; furthermore, he guaranteed that no regulations would be imposed which involved either prior censorship or double jeopardy in connection with student political activities; he expressed his willingness to test in court difficult issues which might arise. These proposals, which were indeed radical ones, the most advanced which any American state university administrator had ever proposed, did not still the turbulent fever of rebellion among the Berkeley students.

As the meeting was being adjourned by the chairman, Professor Robert Scalapino, the student leader, Mario Savio, stalked across the platform and tried to seize the microphone. The police removed him bodily, but he was later allowed to go back to announce his own daily meeting. His followers were at first shocked by what he had done, yet by the afternoon they were busy inventing rationalizations for the tactics of the coup. The "Free Speech" Movement was showing quite clearly that, like so many student movements, it had within it an anti-democratic potential, with a conception of "free speech" compatible with taking over other people's meetings. According to its rationale, at every inaugural of a President of the United States the defeated Communist candidate would, at the ceremony's conclusion, be entitled to seize the microphone to demand a "confrontation." The orations of the student leaders about "alienation," their diatribes against "pluralistic democracy," even Mario Savio's citing of Plato for a new concept of "organic democracy" reminded one unpleasantly of young German students talking in a similar vein in the early thirties.³³ Insofar as

this would become the shape of an American student movement, it was clearly no safeguard for democracy.

The following day the faculty of the University of California capitulated emotionally and intellectually to the student activists. One was reminded of scenes during the nineteenth century when in many American colleges professors together with their students were swept from time to time by an emotional revivalism. Two years later *The New York Times* observed in an editorial that the Berkeley faculty had "wavered badly in its dedication to principles of responsibility in the initial uprising of two years ago."³⁴ During the intervening two years the Berkeley Student Movement provided a kind of laboratory test tube in which the American people could observe the psychology of generational political revolt. A noted political sociologist recalled the circumstances under which on December 8, 1964, a de-authorized elder generation abdicated in fear and confusion: "The Academic Senate meeting of that day occurred under conditions never before witnessed on an American campus. The campus had been tied up by a student strike, backed by a faculty minority. The debate at the meeting was piped outside to loudspeakers, and over 5,000 students stood outside cheering or booing the speeches made by their professors inside."³⁵ Moved by fear of the students, but very largely too by anger against the administration for the intrusion of the police, desirous of the good opinion of the activists, bewildered in its reasoning by eager doctrinaires, exalted by its new role as the university's emancipators, and with a vacuum of leadership caused by the absence of an administration spokesman, the Berkeley faculty resolved by an overwhelming vote "that the content of speech or advocacy should not be restricted by the university." It renounced any limitation whatsoever on the content of speech; it pointedly rejected an amendment which would have affirmed to the student body the American constitutional principle that freedom of speech does not extend to the advocating and organizing of immediate acts of force and violence. One Noble Laureate explicitly defended the students' use of "force"; a professor of philosophy warned his colleagues this was no time to think, that a mob of students was at the doors; the chairman of the department of sociology declared eloquently that the Berkeley Community should dispense with the reminder of American constitutional restraints on violence. The faculty promulgated a charter which could be used to safeguard the advocacy and planning of direct acts of violence, illegal demonstrations, interferences with troop trains, terrorist operations, and obscene speech and action. By the very generality of its resolution, added to its rejection of the constitutional limitation, it indicated that as far as it was concerned, university facilities were available for the extremes of speech, including the unconstitutional. Let the civic authorities exercise their powers in this realm, it said; the university washed its hands.

Thus the Berkeley faculty in effect created a moral and political vacuum in the heart of the university. It founded an enclave which canceled the

limits of any previously defined freedom of speech. This university enclave was unique in the United States, for it was the only one in which for all practical purposes political authority was excluded, since both university and civic powers renounced their responsibilities. On the one hand, the administration was bound by its faculty to refrain from all restraint of speech; on the other, the civic powers by long custom and usage were reluctant to enter the student terrain: they did not understand it, they feared it, and they felt it to be the university's business. The Generational Revolt had won a marked victory in Berkeley. There were other fruits, like the ouster of the chancellor, which perhaps was its most symbolic achievement in generational triumph. But the faculty resolution of December 8 was what it later boasted of most. An unusual experiment in unrestrained advocacy by the student generation thus began. Its consequence during the next two years was an accelerated deterioration of student ethics and of freedom of speech in Berkeley.³⁶

TRAITS OF THE BERKELEY STUDENT MOVEMENT: DECLINE
OF THE STUDENT ETHIC, MISPERCEPTION OF SOCIAL REALITY

The patterns of action, emotion, and experience of the Berkeley Student Movement were indeed those of the classical student movements of the nineteenth century.

In the first place, like its predecessors, the Berkeley movement exhibited very rapidly the phenomenon of moral decline; it quickly came to believe that its high vocation entitled it to practice deceit and thievery whenever they advanced its situation in generational struggle. The student leaders, for instance, misled the student body concerning the truth of the charge that Mario Savio had bitten a policeman in the left thigh. To secure immunity for their leader's act of individual violence, they were prepared to cloak themselves in the protective mantle of the nonviolence movement. Joan Baez was enlisted to sing of love and freedom, and several hundred students marched in heroic illusion to occupy Sproul Hall. Only several months later did Mario Savio acknowledge publicly in a debate before the Berkeley High School students that he had bitten the policeman; the high school students were stunned by this admission.³⁷ Yet on December 2 the student leaders had been prepared to involve several hundred students in arrests rather than have their chief take the responsibility for his own individual act of violence.³⁸ Then the seizure of the microphone at a meeting organized and conducted by a faculty group was a reversion to the tactics of Nazi and fascist students in Europe thirty years before; it showed an instinctive preference for a procedure of mass generational intimidation to one of liberal democracy.

During the weeks that followed the students' victory, incidents of dishonesty on the part of student leaders multiplied. The student Leftist political party, Slate, published a review of professors and courses in the

university, their Counter-Catalogue. On its bright pink cover it bore a quotation which it falsely attributed to Professor Robert Scalapino: "No one wants this university to become an arena for controversy and debate." Professor Scalapino wrote publicly on February 4, "Far more serious, however, is the fact that the error was known to the Editor and to a large group of Slate workers prior to publication." The editors promised to remove the cover, but instead scratched his name out though it remained "clearly visible beneath the erroneous statement." More important than this personal matter, observed Professor Scalapino, "is a question that goes to the very heart of all crises in our times. I cannot explain how individuals who want (and deserve) freedom and respect for their own views choose not to grant that to others."³⁹ A few days later the director of the Student Health Service accused a Slate representative publicly of having sent out a deceitful letter to fifty colleges and universities misrepresenting his stand with respect to contraceptive advice for students; the action of the student leader, he said, was "unethical, irresponsible, and immature," "deceitful behavior," which added "an unwelcome element of distrust and suspicion to constructive efforts and discussions."⁴⁰ The Slate representative then apologized.

The moral level of the University of California became the lowest in the history of American education among both the students and the faculty. Professor Seymour Martin Lipset the next year recalled, "A number of letters were stolen, telephones were tapped—the whole thing was a mess!"⁴¹

The so-called students' Counter-Catalogue published by Slate became a weapon both for the political intimidation of professors and for the lowering of academic standards. The chairman of the department of classics, a socialist who had earnestly supported the student activists, reported sadly, "When in September I asked to see the questionnaires on one of my courses, I found that they had conveniently been lost. If not dishonest, the course reports are incompetent; but worst of all is the anti-intellectual attitude and the slant toward the non-serious student."⁴² In its next September issue the Counter-Catalogue renewed its efforts to intimidate recalcitrant professors. It characterized the chief campus mediator, a professor of industrial relations whom it disliked, as "a terribly dull, insincere professor who should be avoided at all costs"; it described a liberal economist, who became vice-chancellor, as one who "presents a liberal apology for capitalism"; it conceded that the chairman of the political science department was "an excellent teacher of constitutional law," but said that because he had failed students who had missed their examinations to go picketing, their "rating of him as a human being would be much lower."⁴³

The decline of student ethics was elevated into a principle of generational revolt during March 1965 in the curious episode of the student movement's obscenitarian phase. It began on March 3, when a nonstudent

began to walk up and down the University Plaza carrying an obscene placard. When he was arrested, several of the original "Free Speech leaders" raised a sign urging students to contribute to the "_____ Defense Fund." The principal theoretician of the Free Speech Movement, Stephen Weissman, delivered a speech whose argument was the following: obscene speech is the language of the masses; correct speech is the language of the middle-class pluralistic liberals; therefore, to make contact with the masses, the students must use obscene speech and fight for their freedom to do so. The student body generally, however, failed to respond to the obscenitarian issue. A student movement is moved as a whole only when a highly moralistic-political issue is invoked in terms in which the elder generation can be judged as de-authorized. In this sense, the obscenitarian issue misfired. The students sensed that the flaunting of obscene words had more to do with shocking the elders the way children do than with establishing contact with the masses; the obscenitarians seemed more intent on outraging the university's officers than achieving social goals. In short, when the obscenitarian rationale was seen to be a pretext for generational revolt, and nothing more, it collapsed at once as a political cause. In the meanwhile, the president and chancellor of the university submitted their resignations in protest; faculty radicals gave bold speeches which had obscene innuendoes; a corps of administrators and committees were baffled; and the authority of the elder generation was suitably flouted. Mario Savio came back from Selma, Alabama, to discourse on obscenity and violence. If he hadn't been in jail at the time, he said, he probably would have taken part in the obscene speech movement. For "sound tactical reasons," however, he now advised against it: "We have a professor here, Lewis Feuer. Lewis Feuer was falling over himself to prove in *The New Leader* that the FSM was based on a corporate Oedipal complex, yes, a corporate Oedipal complex. Therefore, there should have been no free sexual intercourse movement."⁴⁴ Thus, the student leader warned his activist followers to suppress their obscenitarian impulse lest they provide the observer with overt evidence for what they covertly felt. The generational revolt had to present itself in terms of an issue which was more moralistic, less blatantly one to shock the elders.

This address of Mario Savio's to an estimated 1,500 persons was remarkable as a new landmark in the decline of the ethics of the student movement; for the first time, nonviolence was ridiculed and violence extolled. It was the first and familiar step, oft-repeated in the history of student movements, a veering toward the doctrine of elitist violence. First, the student leader launched into a bitter denunciation of Martin Luther King, ridiculing him for his religious affirmation at Selma: "We'll put our bodies on the altar, and God is with us." Selma, said the student leader, had been a "demoralizing experience," a "Children's Crusade" led by Dr. King; but, he added, "the movement isn't Dr. King." Then Savio went on to mock nonviolence and to indicate a new attachment to violence. He

now doubted, he said, whether he had done the right thing on October 2 when he had told the thousands of students to go home to avoid an encounter with the police. Thus violence began to emerge as an attractive means for student action, as the political method of those who felt that they would not survive the more rational judgment of the community acting through institutions of representative democracy.

The decline of student ethics was evident not only in their political actions; it affected their personal lives.

To be a guerrilla fighter against the system began to mean for the students a warrant for theft and dishonesty. The more guerrilla-like one's ideology and model, the more thievery was authorized. Bookstores, supermarkets, small grocers, entrepreneurs, and cooperatives could all be directly expropriated. The student Maoists were evidently pre-eminent on the Berkeley campus for their exploits in thievery. "The PLM (Progressive Labor Movement)," wrote the *Daily Californian*, "is a hard-core coterie of Peking-oriented agitators. Notorious even among the campus Left for their petty larceny (no honor among thieves?), these ideologues despise the Communist Party for its moderation."⁴⁵

The Berkeley Student Movement thus scarcely proved to be the harbingers, as so many persons had hoped, of a higher student ethic. The aftermath of the student uprising of 1964 brought to the city of Berkeley a period of unprecedented crime. According to the annual police report, almost half of the persons arrested in Berkeley during 1965 (the year which followed after the student uprising of 1964) were "students" of various kinds. Close to three thousand students of all sorts and schools were arrested during that year. In a five-year period, which coincided with the rise of the student movement, burglaries had increased from 147 to 1,164 and thefts from 305 to 664. While the city as a whole during 1965 sustained an 11 per cent increase in crime, the increase in the campus area was 39 per cent. The chief of police reported that the most striking upsurge in crime took place at the end of 1964—that is, at the height of the student uprising.⁴⁶

The aftermath of the student movement brought to Berkeley also an astonishing increase in rape. Twenty-one instances of rape were reported in 1965; by 1966, the figure had increased by more than 100 per cent to fifty-five reported cases. Most of the assaults, moreover, took place in the south-side area adjoining the campus.⁴⁷

The Berkeley Student Movement tended also to search for its distinctive form of protest in sexual behavior. Every student movement in history has tried to define the counterpart of its political revolt in sexual terms. The German student movement always had a touch of homosexuality in the *Burschenherrlichkeit* which was its romantic stand against the paternalistic bourgeois society. The Russian students sought to carry the sincerities of free love to their last consequence, living in passionate austerity like the hero and heroine of Chernyshevsky's *What's to be Done?* The American

student activists of the thirties found their manuals for sexual activity in Bertrand Russell's *Marriage and Morals* and Leon Blum's *Marriage*. The Berkeley Student Movement had on its fringes bold new practitioners of ideological sexuality, an "undiluted orgyism" in which alienation presumably was totally overcome. Again it was the nonstudents who tried to create this new trend.

There were various evidences of "orgiastic rebellion" in Berkeley—advertisements, for instance, on student union bulletin boards for "sexual-communal" practice.⁴⁸ Within two years, the chief student nonstudent organ was publishing news reports of public sexual intercourse to the "applause for the stars" from the spectators. The United Sexual Rights Committee was quoted: "Watching someone else screw can be very enlightening."⁴⁹ It was argued that the pleasure principle was thus made fully operative in people's lives, and that public sexual communism would diminish anxieties. Thus, an almost ultimate stage in generational revolt in the realm of sexuality was being pioneered in Berkeley. All the child's repressed sexual questions would be answered publicly; the whole code of sexual behavior transmitted by the fathers would be flouted. It seemed indeed as if only the advocacy of incest were left.

As the movement continued during 1965–1966 and 1966–1967 with largely the same cast of leading characters, it exhibited repetitively the compulsive traits which have characterized generational revolt in politics. Faculty enthusiasts for the student movement (who had enjoyed vicariously a delayed foray into the Making of History, especially when others took the risks) were sometimes perturbed by these traits; they tried to comfort themselves with the notion that the movement was entering a decadent stage. One such professor complained that "there has been a serious degeneration within the Berkeley student movement recently, that the standards of last year's movement are not being upheld, and that some students have vastly exaggerated certain deficiencies which exist in our campus rules governing activity." He objected to the students' comparing their situation on campus with that "of oppressed Negroes in Mississippi"; their doing so, he wrote, was "an insult to the intelligence of our student body . . . and a cheap attempt to exploit anti-racist sentiment by turning it into a situation where it is totally irrelevant."⁵⁰ Actually the tactics and amorality of the student leaders were remarkably the same from one year to the next. In the first year, they secured stolen files from the president's office and published them; the next year, they rifled the files of the chancellor's assistant and photographed them. No student leader or faculty activist condemned the thievery in the first year, and the chancellor's assistant, a former activist, was in no position to complain in the second.⁵¹ If student leaders insisted in the first year that the Berkeley streets were like those of Montgomery, Alabama, and the University Hall like the Mississippi capitol, then during the second year they maintained that the streets of Berkeley were like those of Saigon, and the Berkeley police were

to be fought with "guerrilla" tactics. If the activists said in the first year that the university was plotting to destroy the civil rights movement, then in the next year they said it was plotting to destroy the Vietnam protest movement. If the chancellor's assistant was called a "liar" in the second year, his erstwhile student confederates had so denominated the president during the first year. If there were legal avenues of protest and reform available in the second year, they had also been available during the first year but were disregarded in the haste for civil disobedience. The speeches which called the second student strike in December 1966 were almost verbally identical with those of December 1964.⁵²

Such were the continuous traits of the Berkeley Student Movement: a misperception of social reality guided by the wish to discredit that reality as the product of a corrupt elder generation, a belief that their own elite status and Messianic calling exempted them from the laws of morality, a readiness to identify in quick succession with whatever lowly group they could accuse the elder generation of suppressing, a tendency to regard the university as "plotting" to destroy their movement, an utter disregard of the fact that existing institutions allowed for discussion and reform, because their own desire to use tactics of generational insurrection and direct action led them to regard every issue as an occasion for "confrontation." "Confrontation" was the latent goal of the student movement; the changing issues became so many occasions, so many pegs on which to post confrontations.

"Confrontation" could be simply defined: it was an occasion for a pitched battle of generational struggle.⁵³ It suggested generational violence against individuals. The language of warfare came naturally to the confrontationist engaged in successive re-enactments of generational uprising. When Mario Savio addressed the Independent Socialists Club after the end of the second student strike of December 1966, it was natural that the leaflet announcing the meeting was emblazoned "The Second Battle of Berkeley."⁵⁴ Its slogan, "No More Cops," echoed the familiar childhood trauma of the frightening policeman. And curiously, with the second strike, the inner destructive tendency in the student movement emerged more clearly through the various ideological guises. The Strike Committee threatened to destroy the university if its wishes were not heeded. The regents, it said, "recognize that if they took direct action against us the University would be destroyed . . . in the future they are ready to force this destruction rather than accede to our just demands."⁵⁵ Destruction, self-destruction, the haunting nemesis of student movements, was clearly in evidence among the Berkeley student leaders. They were brethren to the Russian student leaders who thought they triumphed over the older generation when they brought the universities to close their doors.

Berkeley activists were always ready to make common cause with any foreign antagonist of the System or Establishment. The System of their fathers defined a Common Enemy. In a series of international crises, the

Berkeley Student Movement was always predictably aligned with the anti-American power. When Khrushchev precipitated the Berlin crisis, and said the situation was intolerable, the Berkeley student activists echoed his words and charged the United States with endangering world peace. They provided a variety of arguments to prove America simply had to abandon Berlin. Then Khrushchev altered his stand, and the "intolerable situation" was forgotten. When Khrushchev placed missiles in Cuba, Berkeley student leaders first charged the story was a C.I.A. fabrication; later they defended the emplacement of missiles and stormed against President Kennedy for insisting that they be removed. When Khrushchev broke the moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons, Berkeley student activists staged an all-night vigil on Sproul steps, not in criticism of the Soviet decision, but to protest any American retaliatory testing. The emotional a priori of student revolt defined their fathers' enemies as the sons' friends. It was part of the misperception of social reality inherent in generational revolt.

**The Anti-Democratic Bias
of the Berkeley Student Movement:
Attraction to Violence
and Suppression
of Free Discussion**

Above all, the Berkeley Student Movement tended, like its forebears in the nineteenth century, finally to destroy the confidence of its followers in the processes of representative democracy. It became an elitist, direct action group; it saw no democratic decision in the votes of the two American political parties. If in one breath it assailed the Republican candidate for governor, Ronald Reagan as a right-winger, it asserted with the next that Governor Pat Brown, the Democratic liberal, was just as bad; and anyhow, it reasoned, if the Democratic liberals were destroyed, the New Left might take over the Democratic party. Like the Communists of the early thirties, the New Left reserved its greatest hatred for the liberals. When the New Left movement held its conference in California on October 1, 1966, participants listened to discourses by such senior gentlemen as Bishop James A. Pike; but its activist rank and file was the student movement, and the "new politics" was described in terms which the Berkeley Student Movement had made familiar. The manifesto of the New Left spoke of the "new politics" as "pressure-point politics," "guerrilla politics," "like jazz." The generational revolt was stressed: "Anybody who can take leadership is free to do so without waiting in line to acquire seniority in the old politics."⁵⁶ When Bishop Pike tried to speak on behalf of those who opposed the "boycott Brown" resolution, he was hooted down. Two hundred delegates, mostly relative oldsters, walked out after the "anti-Brown resolution" was passed. The

New Left activists were untroubled by the split. One of their leaders, a young college teacher, put it all in generational terms: "This meeting helped separate out the old liberals from the New Left radicals."⁵⁷ The Conference of the New Left aptly enough was held on a college campus in Los Angeles, and its leading figure was Robert Scheer, a product of the Berkeley Student Movement.

Robert Scheer only a few months before, in June 1966, had tried to capture the Democratic nomination for Congress in the Berkeley district. He ran against the incumbent, a liberal trade unionist who supported President Johnson. Scheer was above all the candidate of the Alienated New Left. His candidacy was, according to *The Activist*, "first suggested by Vietnam Day Committee activists last year after the death of the Free Speech Movement, when a new radical project was being sought."⁵⁸ "Scheer's organization developed autonomously, but with exaggerated dependence on the campus community."⁵⁹ Almost all student-faculty activism converged on behalf of his candidacy; Scheer carried Berkeley by a decisive majority, 14,625 votes to 12,165, though he lagged elsewhere in the county and lost by 25,270 votes to the victor's 28,751. As a product of the Berkeley Student Movement, he had all its taste for violent language and direct action. While a graduate student in economics in 1961, he was an editor and founder of a magazine of the New Left, *Root and Branch*. "The college left," he wrote at that time in an ugly vocabulary, "consists of a few thousand cultural freaks. Its membership is weighted heavily to New York Jews, children of older generation radicals, and Bohemians. For reasons of culture, personality, or choice, they are generally impervious to the normal rewards and concerns of American society."⁶⁰ He articulated the underlying emotion of the nonstudent: because the intellectuals were alienated from society, he wrote, they clung to the university—"the University is 'home'; this is the world we understand, and the other one frightens the hell out of us." He was aware of the roots of the New Left in student generational revolt: "Anybody who protests today is a reasonably sharp, overeducated egghead who has extracted himself from the clutches of neighbors, parents, and T.V." Scheer defended Fidel Castro, jibed at John F. Kennedy, and was mildly pornopolitical. Five years later the New Left tried to associate itself with the youthful glamor of President Kennedy's name, but in 1962 Scheer wrote denigratingly of the liberal, "We cannot expect a Jack Kennedy to feel the necessity of political freedom—he has never been threatened by the state, never questioned by the secret police (F.B.I.), never seen his parents arrested as political prisoners, never been carried limp into a southern jail or in a police instigated riot."⁶¹ Drawn by the calling of nonstudent, Scheer grew a shaggy, Castro-like beard, and went to work as a salesman for the famed literary center in San Francisco's beatnik quarter, the City Lights Bookshop. Subsequently, the System, through the beneficent Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, pub-

lished a paper by him on Vietnam. He spoke at "teach-ins" and, according to Vietnam Day Committee spokesmen, was one of those who favored militant action in their parade of October 15, 1965, against the Oakland police formation. For some time he had been using the rhetoric of a seizure of power by the Oakland poor, and during one speech left some listeners gasping with his extremism: "If the Viet Cong are the only alternative in Vietnam, then I'm for the Viet Cong."⁶² Then the student leader became a candidate for Congress. He trimmed his beard so that he looked like a New England whaling captain and began to wear a bourgeois jacket such as befitted a well-groomed candidate.⁶³ He even began to dissociate himself from the hyper-extremist tactics of the over-alienated section of the New Left. Student and faculty activists gave time and money to the Scheer campaign, which cost seventy thousand dollars, "the largest ever for a House congressional election in the State of California," they claimed. They availed themselves of old and new political technique, from hard precinct work to demagoguery and sexagogy. One day the New Left brought a leading San Francisco go-go dancer to the Lower Plaza of Berkeley's university to lure the students into politics. She danced for the multitude but embarrassed her sponsors by telling a reporter that she didn't know who Robert Scheer was. Here and there a puritanical Old Leftist would look disapprovingly on this swinging campaign, but the New Leftist could gleefully cite a text from the Marxian Dead Sea Scrolls: the young Karl Marx himself had written eloquently on the potency of can-can dancing as a way of overcoming alienation, "the boldness, the frankness, the graceful petulance and the music of that most sensual movement."⁶⁴ Several months after his campaign was over, Scheer took the next step and called for a coalition with the "LSDers and the swingers."⁶⁵ This marked the emergence of psychedelic politics under the auspices of the Berkeley Student Movement.

Meanwhile, under the hegemony of the New Left, freedom of discussion seriously declined on the Berkeley campus. The New Leftist student activists, though a minority, felt themselves privileged to disrupt and threaten other people's meetings, to insist on "confrontations" on their terms. It was a pattern which Berkeley student leaders hoped to diffuse through the nation. Indeed, when the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, visited Harvard University, he was met by a disorderly demonstration of members of the Students for a Democratic Society "designed to force a direct confrontation" (in their words) with their spokesman, the Berkeley activist, Robert Scheer. It was of small moment to the Harvard imitators of Berkeley that their spokesman had recently been confronted by the voters in a democratic election; theirs was the new concept of "participatory democracy," invented by the student movement, in which a minority used the threat of disruption to impose its will on the majority.⁶⁶ The majority of the Harvard undergraduates apologized to the Secretary of Defense; as one of them said, "The crux of the matter

was that the crowd physically took away the rights of a human being, and . . . this sort of thing could stifle free exchange . . ."⁶⁷

Free discussion indeed vanished on the Berkeley Plaza under the dictatorship of the New Left. As a professor of history described it:

Sproul Steps have long since degenerated into a demagogic and anti-intellectual institution, inimical to rational discourse and geared essentially to the shock-effects of vituperation and vilification—of the administration, of the faculty, of the larger society, of almost everything in sight. This degeneration of free speech has affected not only the Plaza but the whole of the campus as well. The tone of the Steps has undermined the community's respect for the ethics of controversy and the canons of evidence appropriate to political debate in a university. . . . Worse still, the power of the Steps constitutes a kind of censorship over who can speak on campus . . . Cases in point are Senator Clark, who refused to come at all even though he had ample free time while in the Bay Area, and the expert on foreign affairs, Prof. Henry Kissinger of Harvard, who spoke almost surreptitiously in a classroom, without publicity, since he did not wish it to be known that he had been here.⁶⁸

The faculty and administration were indeed intimidated by the Berkeley New Left. The most militant young faculty supporter of the Free Speech Movement, who as a result of the turmoil was made chancellor's assistant as a way of conciliating the student movement, more than a year later made a revealing confession of the deterioration of a university's ethic. The university, he said, had for eighteen months submitted to a "peculiar brand of blackmail"; there had been numerous "sordid incidents" in which the Berkeley administration had looked the other way to "avoid trouble." "That's the pattern of blackmail we've been under," said Professor John Searle, and the newspaper reporter noted that "Searle finds himself in a position 180 degrees from two years ago when he was one of the F.S.M.'s most ardent and articulate backers."⁶⁹ Thus, under the impact of the Berkeley Student Movement, the values of liberal democracy declined at the University of California. The patterns of generational struggle, the emotional drive toward "confrontation" with the elders, toward the demonstration of "student power," imposed themselves on the discussion of underlying issues. In short, the student movement imposed its patterns of irrationality on the social processes of the university.

The Berkeley Faculty Capitulates: An Elder Generation De-Authoritized

Every student movement owes much of its influence to the fact that the surrounding society regards it as its pure, idealistic children. Thus the Russian students were regarded, thus the Japanese activists of Zengakuren. The Berkeley Student Movement was remarkable for the psychological changes it wrought in the university's professors. Something of the confessional spirit and the campus revivalism of a century and a half before

returned in modern ideological guise as professors rose in self-criticism before their students. During the first Berkeley strike, for instance, in December 1964, at a large faculty-student meeting, the director of the Chinese Center, a researcher on communist self-criticism, confessed that he had been guilty in the past for neglecting his students; one could almost imagine the scene transplanted from Communist China. The next month the chairman of the department of sociology told a large student meeting how he and the faculty were grateful to the students for having reminded them of the significance of freedom. For a while the elders of the faculty subscribed to a New Cult of Youth, according to which the student activist was the Community's Prophetic Conscience. A professor of English poetry departing on a leave of absence delivered a farewell address in which he spoke of the "beautiful and strong Mario Savio." A chairman of a department of science, who happened to be a member of a religious sect, became convinced that Mario Savio was a reincarnation of Jesus; even his militant colleagues were discomfited by this unusual theology. The philosophers were not far behind the scientists; their chairman told an excited student assemblage after the Greek Theater microphone seizure that they had all the power. Professors of biochemistry included such questions as the definition of "civil disobedience" on their examinations.⁷⁰

What were the sources of the psychological capitulation of a large section of the Berkeley faculty? Many were simply shocked by the sight of police contingents on the campus, and by way of protest, voted for leftist resolutions. But other factors were at work too. A professor of history, observing his colleagues during the second Berkeley strike, wrote that his fellow-historians "in some small way want a taste of making history as well as writing it."⁷¹ This remark actually went to the heart of a great deal of the psychology of the Berkeley Intellectual Class, as indeed of that section of the American Intellectual Class which is spiritually affiliated to the so-called New Left. From the time of the Pythagorean sect, intellectuals have felt a vocation to rule. The Utopias which they have envisaged, from Plato to Edward Bellamy and H. G. Wells, have usually involved a rule of society by the intellectuals. If the intellectual today feels "alienated," his alienation is that which Plato knew and described: the frustration of lack of power, the sense that his participation in events is always vicarious, through books, commentaries, and footnotes. Suddenly in Berkeley the dream world of books seemed to intersect with the real world of action. The men of books, who had rarely known the responsibilities of action, were lifted by the student activists into a new realm. The author of a Ph.D. thesis on German socialism, who had always admired Rosa Luxemburg's faith in the spontaneous action of the masses, found himself talking dithyrambically of the creative spontaneity of the students; the historian-admirer of the abolitionists saw himself in the resurrected company of William Lloyd

Garrison and the Underground Railway. There were physicists who reacted as if they were fighting anew for J. Robert Oppenheimer and the *esprit de corps* of the scientific elite. A sizable group of vaguely pro-Soviet sympathizers, who felt inwardly ashamed for their timid silence during the previous decade, relished a personally nondangerous ideological foray. Scholars who had repressed their resentment against the bureaucratic machinery of universities enjoyed seeing the latter discomfited by student guerrillas. Then there was the guilt which the successful academic felt; he had knowledge but it had often been rendered impotent by his fears and ambitions. He enjoyed substantial salaries and comforts, but felt the guilt of being part of a new leisure class. Noted faculty leaders, moreover, were having difficulties with their own adolescent children; adopting a radical stance at the university helped secure generational peace at home. A new post-Marxist historicism arose in which the student youth replaced the proletariat as the historical elite. A young author of several sociological treatises on social change was quoted for his remark that the student movement would inevitably achieve its objectives. Many professors were reluctant to condemn the students' actions which had been consciously calculated to provoke the intervention of the police. They succumbed either to the fashion set by the Nobel Laureate in Physics who extolled the students' "force and violence" or to the professor of philosophy, who invoked the several thousands of threatening students at the door.⁷² A noted sociologist two years later pleaded that there were extenuating circumstances for the Berkeley faculty—"a thousand academics of all varieties and disciplines, most of whom had little contact with the dispute until the Sproul Hall sit-in."⁷³ Actually, however, the Berkeley faculty was widely regarded as among the most politically sophisticated in America. Many of its members had lived through the years of the Loyalty Oath controversy and the Oppenheimer-Teller debate; for more than two months they had been arguing about the Free Speech Movement. Above all, one must remember that two years later the majority of the Berkeley faculty, experiencing a second student strike, did not respond too differently from the way it had earlier. And those differences which did emerge were regarded by the students as the outcome primarily of the election of Republican Governor Ronald Reagan and the outspoken, widespread criticism of the university among the people at large.

But why was it precisely the Berkeley faculty which was prone to such militance and sympathy for the New Left? It was a faculty which had expanded very rapidly within a few years. The university's liberal president sought to build both a large and an outstanding staff. To Berkeley's faculty came, for instance, former Trotskyist and socialist student leaders as well as the former national chief of the Communist youth. But they were not a significant factor in the growth of the Berkeley New Left. Of high importance was the character of the Berkeley faculty, most ideal-typical of

the science and scholarship of the modern American university. A corps of ambitious middle-aged and younger scholars had been recruited throughout the entire country for this burgeoning corporate center. Their vocation as teachers was sometimes vestigial; they regarded Berkeley as an institution to be exploited for its grants and allowances. The Scholar-Bureaucrat, beset by guilt, felt a curious attraction to the Student Activist, the symbol of what he in his careerism had rejected. A strange symbiosis arose between the bureaucratic faculty and beatnik activists; indeed, the New Left is a coalition of the two psychological types. The activists could externalize every grievance and guilt which the bureaucratic professors nourished; they could badger the administration, and occasionally opened new avenues for "upward mobility" as new assistant chancellorships and boards were created. Those departments of the more traditional kind which had not shared in the affluence of the departments of physical and social science nourished their own grievances of diminished status. Classicists, historians, philosophers, professors of English and American literature, felt a kinship with the student activists who assailed the modern impersonal university, that is, the one in which their status was declining. To some, moreover, the student movement seemed to have overcome alienation and to have founded a new university political constituency. It was a remarkable sociological phenomenon to watch a Vietnam Day Committee Parade and see a Nobel Laureate in Physics marching in new-found community with the nonstudent "drop-out" activist.

Faculty activism at Berkeley often extorted a spiritual toll. Take, for instance, the case of the most militant faculty activist who, for a few feverish months, was indeed the paradigm of the faculty rebel; he had brought back from Oxford the mien of the Angry Young Man. In November 1964, he stood before the students on the Plaza, and said, "The University is out to destroy the civil rights movement." And though he neither sat-down with the students nor shared their jail sentences, he encouraged them with spirited words and admiration. Appointed the new chancellor's special assistant on student affairs in 1965, he expected the student activists to learn conformity, emulating his own collaboration with the new chancellor, Roger Heyns, author of *The Anatomy of Conformity* and *The Psychology of Personal Adjustment*. Evidently fancying himself like his fellow-Oxonian, T. E. Lawrence, an uncrowned king of student guerrillas, he assured skeptics that he would be able to control the student activists. He imagined that he had helped to lead a successful revolution, which the student activists would now obediently bring to a close: "What really happened in Berkeley last year? In the 1964-65 year something very like a revolution took place on this campus." The leaders of "successful revolutions," he wrote, must then take measures to control extremists who do not accept the historic decision. He wrote and spoke sometimes like a Girondin proposing to control the Jacobins, at other times like a disciple of Stalin invoking discipline against

Trotskyists and Maoists. He assured the American intellectual community that now that he was running things, "every attempt to attack the university in 1965-66 was completely unsuccessful."⁷⁴ Several of his leading fellow-faculty activists joined in depicting a university which through the Student Revolution had emerged as a Great Community of Scholars; they seemed ready to excommunicate anyone who dared question their achievement.⁷⁵

Within two months of the time the faculty activists published their pronouncements, the outbreak of the "Second Battle of Berkeley," the second student strike in December 1966, harshly refuted their words. At that time (as we have seen) the chancellor's assistant resentfully revealed that the university had been "blackmailed" by student activists during the past eighteen months in a series of "sordid incidents." He acknowledged that the so-called university community was a fiction: "The mistrust is going to last for a long time; in fact, it's spreading. The students now mistrust the faculty."⁷⁶ Thus, the practitioners of generational revolt broke ranks, devouring each other, in accordance with the law of revolutions, whereby parricide initiates a series of fratricides—after the father is killed, the brothers rend each other. In reality, however, the Berkeley Student Uprising was not a "successful revolution." This was the language of the misperception common to generational rebels. There were several hundred students awaiting jail sentences two years after the occupation of Sproul Hall. Those who stormed the Winter Palace or the Tuileries never had to go to court and jail for their "successful revolution."

The Berkeley Student Movement as a Generational Uprising

How can one test the hypothesis of generational struggle as the prime underlying factor in the Berkeley Student Movement? The most crucial test is the character of the emotions which prevailed at the moments of decision, the moments of action. The essential question is: to what emotions did the basic speeches and leaflets which moved large masses of students appeal? Under the impetus of the movement, emotions which otherwise were recessive, and scarcely played a part in the students' consciousness or behavior, emerged into the forefront. The movement became the matrix in which "collective representations" (as Durkheim would have called them) were created.⁷⁷ The movement shaped the dominant emotions of the activists and participants to a degree which they never would have known or exhibited in the isolated environment of an interview or questionnaire. The activists were certainly predisposed to such action to a greater degree than the nonactivists, and had more elements of "alienation" and "community longing." Yet even that degree would

often have been a small one, and perhaps even undetectable in many cases by the customary methods of interrogation. It is all the more important, therefore, to ask what were the dominant slogans, symbol-words, which caught the emotional allegiance of students, and which expressed, shaped, and constituted the moving quality in the movement.

The most striking fact is that after the first September weeks of 1964, during which the references to the civil rights struggle were frequent, the speeches and leaflets increasingly defined the Enemy as the Impersonal University, the Machine, the Administration. There were continuous attacks on Paternalism, the System, Bureaucracy, IBM Machines. The pamphlet, *The Mind of Clark Kerr*, which many student activists took as their official manifesto, was an attack on bureaucracy that never mentioned the racial problem. The most invoked metaphor was that of the IBM card: "I am a UC student. Please don't bend, fold, spindle or mutilate me," and "Are you a student or an IBM card?" Others were similar: "Nobody knows my name."⁷⁸ In upwards of one hundred student speeches, not more than five made any reference to civil rights goals. And when Mario Savio called on his followers to occupy Sproul Hall, it was (as we have seen) in terms of an attack on a university administration which treated the students the way an impersonal corporation would treat "raw material." The civil rights movement was only vaguely in the background; the First Battle of Berkeley, as the students later called it, was a battle of generations.

Like every student movement, this one suffered from the misperception of social reality characteristic of the "alienated." The "alienated" never looked closely into themselves to find the subjective cause of their "alienation." Instead, they projected upon the Impersonal Knowledge Factory and the Administration all the traits which would justify their revolt; their fruitless rebellion never reached to the unconscious cause within themselves, the inner, inaccessible Being who tyrannized over and emasculated them. Many of the student leaders had come to Berkeley precisely because they wanted to have the experience of generational revolt. The will to revolt, the "alienation," was present long before a *causa belli* had been defined. Such students came to the university in quest of a bill of particulars to justify their "alienation." Such was the author, for instance, of the principal activist pamphlets, including one on the regents. Expelled from Brandeis University for an episode of blasphemy, he became alternately a student and nonstudent at Berkeley. Such too was the student who became in 1966 leader of the Strike Committee; his career at Harvard had been terminated.⁷⁹ One day he told me that I was quite right, that as far as he and his friends were concerned, they had been "alienated" long before they ever got to Berkeley, and that they had come there because it was the vantage point in the United States for expressing such alienation. They chose to come to the "multiversity"

rather than go to any one of the many excellent smaller campuses in California or other states because they were looking for a generational battlefield.

The generational misperception of social reality expressed itself in numerous ways. Placards were held aloft, "Two Chancellors, Hitler—1934, Strong—1964," equating the Nazi Führer, the exterminator of the Jews, with the Berkeley chancellor who had once testified on behalf of Communist professors and was too gentle to enforce campus rules against civil rights activists. The campus policemen, who were always worrying lest they infringe upon any student's rights, became "fascist cops," and the University Hall was a replica of the Mississippi Capitol. One non-student irreconcilable, a Maoist, presenting himself to a protest rally as an epileptic maltreated by the police, kept intoning in a strange whine, "Cops are cops; they are the same everywhere. Let's escalate now."

"Bureaucracy" became the slogan-word for all the harsh impersonal paternalism against which the Berkeley students believed themselves in revolt, the Projected Father Image in the Era of the Computer Machines. Yet it was the selective nonstudent environment and selective migration of "alienated" students to Berkeley which brought to the fore the usually contained ingredients of generational revolt. There was scarcely any unrest in other major state universities in the United States, scarcely any at such campuses as Los Angeles, Minnesota, Washington, or the many other Californian universities. At many campuses there were discussions as to why they had not experienced a Berkeley-type movement. The discussion at Pennsylvania State University, which had upward of twenty thousand students, was typical. "Why is there no general revolt at Pennsylvania State?" queried the students. One official answered, "We have no city. The non-college population is not full of semi-professional agitators. . . . Our dropouts give up and leave town. They don't become a parasitic 'hidden population' agitating for revolt. That's the curse at Berkeley." Another administrator said that fortunately Pennsylvania State was "not a subway campus." Still another pointed out that Pennsylvania State had a smaller graduate population. "The graduate students are where the impetus is coming from. They appear to be among the propagators of revolt and it filters down." There was a student movement, an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Freedom, led by a Jewish graduate student of philosophy, but he acknowledged that "the tactics of Berkeley are not appropriate here." The student activists, it was noted, "are, for the most part, clean-shaven, well-dressed and exceptionally articulate."⁸⁰

Bigness, impersonality, bureaucracy, by themselves failed to arouse revolt on the greater number of American campuses. Los Angeles saw no revolt although it was big, urban, and had a nonresident studentry. The City College of New York, a big, impersonal "subway campus" experienced virtually no agitation in 1964-1965. Certainly Berkeley had become the nation's primary gathering place for the "alienated" nonstudents and

students of America. Just as Marxists once emphasized that the workers by themselves would not rise to a socialist consciousness, and often not even to a clear class consciousness, without the help of "intellectuals," so likewise, the kindling of generational consciousness to an insurrectionary degree required a group fixated in the emotions and mentality of permanent generational rebellion. This was not a sufficient condition for the Berkeley Student Uprising, but it was a necessary one.

As with every student movement, there was the singing, the brotherhood, the comradeship. As the St. Petersburg students had known their happiest days of unity and love in the comradeship of prison, so the Berkeley students violating the law found a new comradeship. For if, on the one hand, a student movement is a generational struggle, it is also the last cry of the children, in despair at leaving the child's world, beholding with horror the competitive world of the adult, in which each man is every man's enemy, in which hierarchy will emerge, in which one's friends will be transmuted into strangers. It was noteworthy that so many of the student leaders—Mario Savio, Suzanne Goldberg, Michael Lerner, Robert Atkins—were philosophy students, unable to adapt to a prosaic vocation, seeking the meaning of things in a life which seemed to be rising up harshly against them. When the second Berkeley strike ended, the Strike Committee, in its terminal leaflet, even as it spoke of the "destruction" of the university, talked in children's language of the hoped-for community of love:

A community which had seemed submerged has revealed itself again, discoverable and developing. . . . The Yellow Submarine was first proposed by the Beatles, who taught us a new style of song. It was launched by hip pacifists in a New York harbor, and then led a peace parade of 10,000 down a New York street. Last night we celebrated the growing fusion of head, heart and hands; of hippies and activists; and our joy and confidence in our ability to care for and take care of ourselves and what is ours. And so we made a resolution which broke into song; and we adopt for today this unexpected symbol of our trust in our future, and of our longing for a place fit for us all to live in. Please post, especially where prohibited. We love you.⁸¹

The most unusual leaflet of a strike committee probably in all the history of strikes, it echoed the trauma of adolescents. This was a movement which sought for a "counter-community" in which something of the children's world, snug and secure, could be preserved. When the second Berkeley strike was suddenly called in 1966, a student leader wrote that "the latest revolt was a lightning bolt which shot furiously through our routines. It left activist students disoriented within themselves but with a sense of community lacking since the 1964 uprising." A girl added, "When the strike started, for the first time since I came here, I had a tremendous feeling of accomplishment, of getting somewhere."⁸² This concept of the counter-community had been circulating for some time among student activists; it was in the nature of a generational secession,

a withdrawal from the adult world; only in the counter-community, it was said, would "the values of honesty, concern, and commitment permit the clarity and moral indignation necessary to meet the dangers of atomization by H-bombs, bureaucracy, and race hate. And it is only in this counter-community that these virtues can survive, for the other community is designed to further conformity, apathy, and 'shaping up' as virtues." The activists rejected any prolongation among themselves of the disputes of the Old Leftists, the "distrust and prejudice based on the experiences of their 'fathers.' . . ." ⁸³ They sought to preserve their generational unity, and believed firmly that the bond of youthful idealism would surmount ideological differences.

Thus, this new generational politics seemed indeed to overcome all alienation, all estrangement, for its participants. It was, as one of its advocates wrote, a substitute for psychotherapy:

What enlivened the Free Speech Movement was the exhilaration of feeling that you were, for once, really acting, that you were dealing directly with the things that affect your life, and with each other. You were for once free of the whole sticky cobweb that kept you apart from each other and from the roots of your existence, and you knew you were alive and what your life was all about. ("For a moment all the hypocrisy was swept away and we saw the world with a greater clarity than we had before." Savio). . . . The F.S.M. was a swinging movement. The F.S.M., with its open mass meetings, its guitars and songs, its beards, and its long-haired chicks, made the aloofness and reserve of the administrators, the turgid style of the pronouncements emanating from the University Information Office, the formality of the coat and tie world, seem lifeless and dull in comparison. ⁸⁴

It was a singing, swinging movement, yet they could march self-destructively to beautiful song; but there was always the memory of their beautiful Pied Piper, Joan Baez, her long black hair waving in the wind, her olive face lit by the sun, as she sang with proud head thrown back and her guitar more summoning than any bugle call—singing of love, as the children marched into Sproul Hall in defense of the right of Mario Savio to bite a policeman in the left thigh.

Resistances to the Theory of Generational Struggle: The Aftermath of Berkeley's Symbolic Parricide

When the first analysis of the Berkeley Student Uprising in terms of the theory of generational struggle was published, there was a tremendous cry of outrage. To study the impact of the emotions of generational revolt on the tactics and goals of the student movement was regarded as the height of calumny. Student leaders, nonstudents, and their professorial allies had reveled in analyzing the alleged moral corruption of their elders;

but when their own motivations and behavior were exposed to scientific scrutiny, they gave way to anger and fury. Their indignation had all the earmarks of the "resistance" phenomenon. In truth, the student activists had long been conducting their agitations under the cover of a privileged exemption from analysis; they claimed the right to analyze others, to dissect the System, to expose the Establishment, but they claimed unconsciously the privilege of immunity to such a study of themselves. And in this respect they were typical of student movements; they regarded themselves as an elite, as the conscience of the community, as its valued children, and they expected the privileges at once of irresponsibility as children as well as the obeisance due to society's conscience. Activists of all varieties, pacifists, anarchists, Communists, Trotskyists, socialists, existentialists, hangers-on, all joined in a universal chorus of denunciation of the effort to examine their underlying motivation of generational struggle. The motives of all those actually and symbolically under thirty were claimed to be sacrosanct, and he who studied them was sacrilegious; the student movement presumed so much precisely because indeed it was the bearer of all the resistance mechanisms of the generational unconscious. ⁸⁵

Gradually, however, the outcry and resistance to the theory of generational struggle subsided. Instead theoreticians of the student movement, as they adapted themselves to its truth, advanced a new standpoint; they acknowledged that generational struggle was at the heart of the Berkeley Student Movement, but tried to use this very concept to justify and validate the movement. As one such writer said:

Although none of the other liberal critics of the F.S.M. have articulated the cry of "generational revolt" as Feuer has, I think that an examination of this concept provides a key to understanding not only what the Free Speech Movement was all about, but also why it has been attacked with such enmity by many academy liberals. . . .

I agree with Feuer that "generational revolt" was a critical underlying force moving the Free Speech Movement, without which the events of Berkeley could never have taken place in the way that they did. I do not believe that this discredits the F.S.M., however; I believe that this is precisely what validates it and makes the Free Speech Movement of major political and social significance. . . .

"The revolt of the generation coming into being against the generation in power, the revolt of the sons against the fathers, is a sign of, and a measure of, the failure of the older generation," continued this writer. "Specific events have specific causes," and the specific cause in the present instance was society's failure "to provide for its children a society compatible with the fulfillment of their needs. . . ." ⁸⁶

Now it is certainly true that the impulse to generational revolt always attaches itself to some underlying carrier wave of discontent; a student movement always seeks to find a wider justifying cause in a labor move-

ment, peasants' movement, civil rights movement, anti-colonialist movement. What the writer failed to grasp, however, is that the superimposition of the generational struggle on the carrier movement of class, national, or racial struggle involves a superimposition as well of means, which tend to be irrational and self-destructive. The unconscious drives of generational struggle project themselves on the materials provided by the other underlying social struggles, deflecting them into irrational channels. Even the writer of the above article, a participant in the San Francisco sit-ins, thus confessed in an aside that the avowed, overt, manifest goal of jobs for Negroes was only a "pretext" for something else he was seeking, the community of the young, and that the political means by which they chose to achieve the latter were finally "demoralizing" and self-defeating for the civil rights movement as a whole:

So when the press pointed out the following day that eighty per cent of the demonstrators at the Palace were white students, and questioned what they were really there for, whether they were agitating for jobs for Negroes or only using that as a pretext for something else, they were essentially right. We were concerned about those jobs, but there was much more at stake that night.

What this experience gave us, and what their experience in the civil-rights movement gave the students who committed themselves to it, was the knowledge that a community is possible. . . . The group which sponsored that demonstration, a coalition of youth and student groups . . . was never able to muster that kind of strength again; partly because of the demoralizing effect of the arrests and trials that ensued . . . but even more importantly for another reason.

The demands of the civil-rights movement were demands made on behalf of the Negro, and most of us were not Negroes. As we in the North attempted to get more Negro working people involved in the struggle . . . a growing sense of frustration set in; for we were outsiders . . . and there was a gap between us that all our good intentions could not breach. . . . Finally, we were haunted by the knowledge that we had returned, in our own lives, after the Sheraton-Palace, to the same jobs and the same neighborhoods. . . .⁸⁷

It was the familiar story of the frustration of the back-to-the-people mood of the students; as they had felt rejected by the Russian peasants in the nineteenth century, so they felt rejected by the American Negro in the twentieth. And with that sense of frustration, the search for an occasion for desperate acts of their own direct intervention against the System grew. There was, too, the poignant search for a counter-community of the young against the old, the invariant emotion which ran through a succession of causes and "pretexts," the pervasive emotion of revolt. This invariant emotion imposed its "passionate style," its compulsion for irrational means and self-destruction, on a succession of causes. This was most clearly perceived by a student leader, a member of the Executive Committee of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley, who accepted the thesis of generational revolt but was troubled by the self-insight which

it brought. It is wrong, he wrote, "to deny the interrelation between political radicalism and generational revolt, and to assert that our politics rests solely on rational judgment." While acknowledging an "intense personal projection" in the student activist, he argued nonetheless that "precisely the underlying revolt against the sins of the fathers vindicates that radicalism." At the same time, the student leader agreed that a "political short-sightedness," a "passionate black-and-white morality" went hand in hand with the rejection of the fathers' political order. When students rebelled against the university, it was a "revolt against the values and mores with which our parents had constructed their own self-images and life styles." The administration symbolized that judicious, moderate life style. By contrast, FSM signified "the passionate style in Berkeley politics." Inherent in generational revolt, that "passionate style," he wrote, "becomes a barrier to effective political action when it clouds our perceptions. Revolutions devour their children, for many reasons, among them the fact that revolutionaries, bound as they are to the passionate style, have a disturbing tendency to devour each other." Thus, the student leader conceded, as he observed the "passionate style" among his fellow-members of the Executive Committee, that they had a compulsion to devour each other; the sons, guilt-smitten with having killed their father, killed each other; some were devoured because they seemed to take on their fathers' ways, others for the opposite reason. Once the FSM Executive Committee debated the question whether or not to request that its demonstrators wear neat dress at one of their rallies. At once one faction was ready to destroy the other for a generational betrayal: "The intensity of those who held that to ask our supporters to dress neatly was to 'sell out' was disturbing . . . many fought for the no-dress position not so much like men arguing for a particular tactic as like cornered wild animals fighting for their existences. The no-dress request position won. . . ."⁸⁸

Such were the consequences of the superimposition of generational struggle on political struggle as they manifested themselves in the Berkeley Student Movement. After its activists had forced the ouster of the chancellor, many were numbed by feelings of guilt. Two years later a prominent Berkeley student leader accounted for a certain passivity on the part of veteran activists by reference to "tremendous guilt feelings on the part of those still around from 1964 who have never gotten over their previous parricide."⁸⁹

Meanwhile, there had been all the distinctive traits—the readiness for self-sacrificial tactics (in the arrest and trials of several hundreds for the occupation of Sproul Hall in generational solidarity), the longing to see the overthrow of some father figure (in this case the chancellor, Edward Strong), the fitful movement from issue to issue (the civil rights movement on the campus virtually collapsed a few weeks after the uprising, for its strategic potential as a generational issue was exhausted, and the

promises which had been made to tutor Negro children were promptly forgotten except by a few dedicated "do-gooding" but nonactivist students; for a while, the activists tried to exploit the potentialities of obscene speech, but this failed; shortly thereafter they transferred all their energies to the issue of the war in Vietnam), and last, the idealization of a student leader who was a model of readiness to challenge the collective father.⁹⁰

The debilitating effect of generational politics and its destructive impact in the long run not only on the students' personalities but on their presumed goals of civil rights work was nowhere stated as eloquently as by a student leader, a former member of the Free Speech Movement's Executive Committee, as he appraised the fruits of the first "Year of Our Victory."

From the high point of our Solidarity, 800 indignant students who so violently and decisively threw themselves into the machinery of our insensitive educational "factory" have been transmogrified into: 5,000 days of suspended sentences, \$400,000 in appeal bail tied up for about two years, approximately 1,000 man-years of appeal to higher courts, 1,200 years of court probation, \$75,000 in fines, and individual jail terms ranging up to 125 [days] for each of the defendants. The "eight hundred" students, the "two hundred" faculty, the community of a year ago were all lost somewhere in the shadow "between the motion and the act."

We fought for political freedom. We skipped classes. We flouted rules. Petitioned. Sat. Bit. Spent sleepless days and nights. Finally, after the faculty resolutions of December 8, and the revised University-wide rules, we thought we had won. . . .

And now that we have our rights basically secured to wage the Revolution in peace, we have been seized by a peculiar immobility. The two civil rights organizations that formed the backbone of the FSM leadership have run into trouble finding things to do, and have considered holding joint meetings. . . .

Instead of undergoing an evolution of thought, we have been sucked into a helpless goal-less evolution turning constantly in on itself.

Political stagnation is followed by political incest, and that soon by widespread political cretinism. . . .

Back in the old bad days, before the administration provided us with loudspeakers and assured us that almost anything we did was A-OK, Berkeley students fought for and got: the abolition of compulsory ROTC, the elimination of the controversial speakers ban, a highly satisfactory settlement on minority living from the San Francisco hotels. . . .

And if we try to discover the sources of our political sickness, even now we can find no answers. . . . Has enervation permanently captured our minds? It seems that we have reached the end of politics. . . . We ask only to be allowed to "forget about today until tomorrow."⁹¹

The chief ideologist of the Free Speech Movement, Stephen Weissman, was writing only a year later of the "myths" which had moved them, and the self-destruction of idealism which it had brought in its wake:

Radicals increasingly feel themselves operating in a vacuum. There is no apparent perspective, agency, or hope for radical structural change in America. The Delano grape strike, for example, or the prospect of unionizing the working poor, no longer create the myths or hold forth the promises that many of us saw in Civil Rights on campus movements a year or two back.

From the "history of radical politics," the student ideologist reflected, one learns "about the destruction of ideals—and idealism—that occurs when people are used. . . ." He now found it unreal to equate the Berkeley police with the Saigon police, though such equations had been the rule the year before.⁹² As the generational revolt ebbed, it left a hollowness in the "idealism" which it had inspired.

And the Berkeley faculty? Slowly recovering from their euphoristic revivalist mood of 1964-1965, they were well characterized in 1967 by Mario Savio and his friends as "wishing us all back into the pre-1964, anti-bellum period."⁹³

A *bellum* it had been, and it left the generations two years later more estranged than ever. The second strike played all over again, though longer, for several days in December 1966 the themes of generational betrayal and the impersonal corporation. In June 1967, Mario Savio entered prison to serve his four-month sentence for the events of two and a half years before, together with many of his fellow-students.⁹⁴ Faculty activists who had spurred him on with admiring words now held various administrative posts. They wished he would leave Berkeley.

With the election of the Republican candidate, Ronald Reagan, as governor of California, the university administration was impelled to take a firmer stand on the enforcement of existing rules and laws with respect to nonstudents making the campus their agitational base; many rank-and-file student activists began to see how the basic animosity of the movement to the democratic process provoked a counter-intellectualism.⁹⁵ In the summer of 1967, the war between Israel and the Arab countries estranged many liberal students, especially Jewish ones, from the New Left; the latter suddenly externalized so much masochism, self-hatred, and anti-Semitism that the effect was therapeutic. Above all, the inner mainspring of the student movement during 1965 to 1967 in generational revolt became painfully clear. The movement tended toward a bifurcation—on the one hand, to the secession of the hippies, in nihilistic rejection of all received values, to utter irrationalism and the fantasy of drugs; and, on the other, to the violence of "guerrilla warfare" against American society. The moderate students and activists began to feel they had been misled and misused. When Clark Kerr was dismissed from the presidency of the university in January 1967 by Governor Reagan, Mario Savio and other student leaders rejoiced, "Good riddance to bad rubbish." Many former activists emerged from psychological enthrallment to "charisma" and generational solidarity. The "collective consciousness" of the student move-

ment could, like an unstable compound, disintegrate under the power of light. A next generation of students might, however, re-enact the same drama.

The dream of an idyllic university community as a generational counter-community was lost as the dialectic of generational revolt fulfilled its course. The self-congratulation of student activists, their faculty allies, and their nonstudent auxiliaries, proved to be hollow. The upshot of two years of generational revolt by the Berkeley Student Movement was summed up by the students' president when he addressed the faculty of a strike-torn campus in December 1966: "We protest the general state of non-community on campus; we protest the hostility, distrust and rampant disrespect which pollutes the university atmosphere; we protest the sickness pervading the university."⁹⁶

Three years ago almost to the day we sat in to defend our right of free speech. Today, the gains of that sit-in have all but been eradicated. . . .

Last month . . . the Regents re-adopted their prohibition against on-campus organization of off-campus illegal activity. . . .

And instead of educational reform we got the quarter system; instead of channels of communication we got the ineffectual, dormant rules committee; and Tuesday night the Chancellor, in effect, castrated the ASUC.

All the while espousing liberal attitudes the administration has successfully maneuvered the students back into their position of impotency before the FSM sit-in and strike.⁹⁷

When Vice-Chancellor William Boyd arose to address the graduating class of 1968, he could not indulge in self-congratulation. This class in its four years had seen the beginnings of the student uprising and its consequences. The vice-chancellor said: "Now our very name is shorthand for trouble, our budgets are inadequate, our lagging salary schedules make faculty recruitment ever more difficult, and the public holds us in varying degrees of disgust. To the extent that the objectives of student activism for the past four years were to produce a better university, they have failed miserably."⁹⁸

Such was the story of the Berkeley Student Movement in its first chapters. It repeated the themes of generational conflict; it was driven, despite all its idealism and democratic aspiration, to trying to project the irrational patterns of generational struggle on American life. "Berkeley" became a byword throughout North America for a generational running-amok.

The Consequences of the Berkeley Student Movement for the American People

What were the consequences of the Berkeley Student Movement for the United States as a whole?

It is undeniable that "Berkeley" became a symbol for student genera-

tional militancy. Every campus newspaper in the United States pondered the meaning of "Berkeley," and university administrators took mutual counsel as to how to avoid a "Berkeley" on their campuses.⁹⁹ "Berkeley" entered the idiom; whether it was student unrest in Berlin or London, the question as it tended to formulate itself for Americans was whether another "Berkeley" was going to occur.¹⁰⁰ What, however, were Berkeley's deeper consequences for good or evil?

In the first place, there can be little doubt that the Berkeley Movement contributed to the atmosphere of violence and lawlessness which began to develop in the United States in 1965. The worst of these episodes took place in the summer of 1965 in the Watts region of Los Angeles, California. One might question whether any connection between Berkeley and Watts might be more than tenuous. The average Californian, however, perceived a relationship in spirit between the two outbreaks. He sensed the effect of the televised broadcasts over several months of the Berkeley studentry "mobilizing" and violating laws and rules, the scenes of angry speakers, the students defying policemen and claiming the warrant of a higher ethic, the massive meetings, the arousing singers. No ordinary lawbreakers these, but students at California's highest university. Disobedience, violation, the flouting of the democratic process, resistance to law, were given the sanction of the community's intellectual elite. If the educated, the learned, the intelligent, approved of violating the law in a democratic society, then this path was so much the more indicated for those less fortunate and less endowed. Berkeley was the intellectual precursor for Watts. The student leader Mario Savio denounced Martin Luther King for failing to lead his people to violence at Selma, Alabama. And when violence came to Watts, Berkeley student leaders predictably welcomed it. The cult of violence in Berkeley even allowed the founding of a "guerrilla training school." "A group of Berkeley students," reported the university newspaper, "convinced that the political situation in the United States has degenerated to a point beyond remedy by peaceful means, has taken, so to speak, to the hills. This committee, meeting at 5:30 A.M. every weekday morning in Strawberry Canyon, above the football stadium, is the Berkeley Guerrilla Training School."¹⁰¹ This represented a handful, no doubt, but it imparted to the atmosphere of violence in the community at large.

At its inception, leading activists of the Berkeley Student Movement said they were disciples of Camus. Two years later, a survey reported that Camus was "losing ground on campuses to Che Guevara and to Frantz Fanon," exponents of guerrilla warfare. Within those two years the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee had evolved to the full advocacy of violence and guerrilla warfare. The Berkeley Student Movement had indoctrinated students with the notion of bringing the System to a grinding halt by direct physical action; it had been vague, ambiguous, open-ended as to the employment of violence. When the System failed to yield

to nonviolent direct action, by a gradation of rapid steps the transition was made to the apotheosis of direct violence.¹⁰² Berkeley activists, employed in "poverty programs," regarded their federal employment as an opportunity for agitation to arouse the Negroes to direct action; they said they were emulating Lenin, who had used German imperial funds to make the Bolshevik Revolution. But the name that above all "cropped up in talks in college cafeterias whenever the New Left's current infatuation with direct action was mentioned," according to *The New York Times*, was Che Guevara's. His "bearded likeness was encountered on the walls of the littered offices of radical newspapers and left-wing groups." One young woman student activist, twenty-one years of age, "at that citadel of the New Left, the University of California campus at Berkeley" (in the correspondent's words), said, "I recognize that violence may be necessary. . . . I'm a white middle-class girl, but I understand why Negroes, Puerto Ricans, or Okies riot. I feel the same frustrations in myself, the same urge to violence."¹⁰³

This urge to violence, reported so honestly by Lena Zeiger, was becoming characteristic of the American student movement, as it had been of its European predecessors. Berkeley led the way. The national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society declared himself in 1967 a disciple of Che Guevara:

"Che's message is applicable to urban America as far as the psychology of guerrilla action goes. . . . Che sure lives in our hearts." "Black power," he added, "is absolutely necessary." White student activists warmly noted that "black nationalists are stacking Molotov cocktails and studying how they can hold a few city blocks in an uprising, how to keep off the fire brigade and the police so that the National Guard must be called out. . . ."

The New Left has an apocalyptic sense that it defines the dividing point in history, the "historical moment which will divide that which went before from that which follows." California, it says, first defined the pattern of the future—"the rocking and the rolling that many now feel may be the beginning of the new social earthquake. The war triggered it, but there were obviously deeper causes. It is not inappropriate that in California, which gave the world Watts and the hippies and Ronald Reagan, the major cracks are appearing."¹⁰⁴ Berkeley led the way in applauding the advocates of racial war. In the fall of 1964, the Berkeley activists welcomed the playwright LeRoi Jones with masochistic fervor as he told them how he advocated a civil war of the Negroes against the whites. Two years later they were similarly applauding Stokely Carmichael, the advocate of "guerrilla warfare" for "black power." In the Berkeley area in 1968, violence became a political norm. The lives of the officers of the student body at Oakland's Merritt College were threatened; they were a group of moderate Negroes which had defeated a more militant faction. The entire group of moderate officers resigned. That spring too the whole University of Cali-

fornia campus was plunged into darkness when its transmission tower was dynamited and its guard struck unconscious.¹⁰⁵ Of all American universities, Berkeley and its student movement did the most to prepare the capitulation of young American intellectuals to "guerrilla warfare."

The pamphleteer of the "Free Speech" Movement, Marvin Garson, enumerated with pride (in *The Village Voice*, July 11, 1968) the bombings which had become a standard procedure in the political life of Berkeley and its environs:

The series of successful and highly popular bombings which have occurred here recently: the steady bombing of the electric power system from mid-March when the lines leading to the Lawrence Radiation Lab were knocked down, to June 4, when on the morning of the California primary 300,000 homes in Oakland were cut off; the dynamiting of a bulldozer engaged in urban renewal destruction of Berkeley's funkier block; three separate bombings of the Berkeley draft board; and finally, last Tuesday night, the dynamiting of the checkpoint kiosk at the western entrance to the University campus, a symbol of the Board of Regents's property rights in the community of scholars.

On September 3, 1968, *The New York Times* reported that the city of Berkeley was declared to be in a state of civil disaster; the city authorities invoked emergency police powers, and the campus of the university was placed under curfew rules.

Curiously, one aspect of the student movement's abdication from reason was the frequency with which the word "charismatic" appeared in their writings and conversations. America hitherto has had little use for this word; it pertains to the hero-worshiping and hero-strutting characteristic of societies with totalitarian tendencies. Invariably, however, the new generation of student leaders in America have been seen as "charismatic." Mario Savio was pre-eminently the "charismatic." And although "Snick" (Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) embarked on a campaign against "charisma," as it turned toward violence, it elected Stokely Carmichael, "its most charismatic remaining member" (*The New York Times* called him) as chairman.¹⁰⁶ The "charismatic" sickness came to the American student movement with Berkeley, a sickness both of the "hero" and the group which emotionally needs one—as from Karl Follen to Nechayev to Savio.

With the student movement's attraction to violence, direct action, and generational elitism, it was natural that devotion to academic freedom and liberal discussion should decline at Berkeley. The chief ideologist of the Berkeley activists boasted that the departure from Berkeley of Professor Seymour Martin Lipset was "one of the 'Movement's' major contributions to intellectual integrity." There is no record that a single Berkeley professor had the courage to protest this statement. No student movement in the world has ever shown itself in the long run to be attached to the values of academic freedom. Berkeley was the first in the United States

ever to break openly with the hard-earned tradition of academic freedom.¹⁰⁷

The Berkeley Student Movement contributed to the psychological disorientation in the United States; there had been a confrontation of generations, and the elder generation had capitulated abjectly. This mood of the elders bowing before an allegedly "higher morality" of the young spread rapidly through the country. An eminent critic, for instance, found himself swept into the current of moral abdication; he wrote of "my own ambivalence, my own fear, my own hopes and misgivings before a generation more generous and desperate and religious than my own," and found himself trying to make sense of himself before them.¹⁰⁸ From this moral surrender of the elder generation, and the moral vacuum that came with the "dethronement of the super-ego," there sprang the movement known as the "hippies."

The "hippies" appeared in San Francisco and Berkeley in the wake of the Berkeley Student Movement.¹⁰⁹ Hunter S. Thompson reported:

In 1965, Berkeley was the axis of what was just beginning to be called the "New Left" . . . and many professors approved. Now, in 1967 . . . the end result is not exactly what the original leaders had in mind. Many one-time activists have forsaken politics entirely and turned to drugs. Others have even forsaken Berkeley. . . . The "Hashbury" is the new capital of what is rapidly becoming a drug culture . . . perhaps as many as half are refugees from Berkeley and the old North Beach scene. . . .¹¹⁰

A psychological parricide had taken place on a massive social scale; the fathers were in debacle, defeat, de-authorized, floundering; the fathers confessed that their values were wrong, but only under the physical compulsion of the sons. Freud once described the guilt which followed a primal parricide. Here the parricide was psychological, and compounded by the elders' own abdication. What were the consequences? Not guilt (at least for a while), but a loss of all standards, a collapse of all conceptions of right and wrong. Was there anything valuable which the elder generation could transmit? Every student movement evokes moral nihilism; the hippies, in a prosperous society, carried to a last conclusion the nihilization of all the values which bourgeois society had labored to achieve—honesty, self-reliance, self-respect, work, cleanliness. Moreover, in accordance with the example of the Berkeley Student Movement, it was proposed to attain the New Non-Society by direct action, simply by living it, without the bother and distortion of an intervening political movement. Drugs became the mark of the expanding consciousness of the ex-student activist, along with promiscuous sexuality, with a special leaning toward homosexuality and interraciality. Bourgeois sexuality, the sexuality of the fathers, was accused of being slave to bourgeois privacy; the hippie wrote in praise of public sexuality. A visiting sociologist from Oxford University wrote:

Hippies merge with the new radicals, who, in Berkeley student co-operatives, have old roots. But this is a radicalism that has replaced self-denying puritanism with self-indulgence. For hippies, if not for their activist New Left allies, the millennium of socialist society is too remote for their enthusiasm: in the psychedelic age, pleasure may be got now, where drugs and sex, and the scene are all available. One local, far-Left Democratic candidate, urging hippies to political action, concedes that drugs and nude parties are great before talking about nationalizing public utilities.¹¹¹

The Berkeley Student Movement lowered the whole level of the country's political ethics. In its own activities it had quickly adopted the maxim that the end justifies the means. It imparted this doctrine to the discussions of political issues in avant-garde circles. From Berkeley came the play *MacBird*, written by a student who had served as press officer for the Movement. Originally published by Berkeley's Independent Socialist Club, it was soon winning accolades from youth-adoring New York critics, some of whom rejoiced that the Berkeley studentry had given the country not only its new political leader but its playwright as well.¹¹² The political content of the play was clear: it insinuated that President John F. Kennedy had been assassinated at the behest of Lyndon B. Johnson. The author's husband, another student and nonstudent activist, whom we have already encountered, also served as a "secret agent" of one of the groups trying to discredit the Warren Commission's report on the assassination of President Kennedy.¹¹³ *MacBird* enjoyed a considerable success in New York as the dramatic achievement of the New Left. Its message spread to other continents. In Caracas, Venezuela, the play was advertised as "an extremely informative" account of the "assassination of J. F. Kennedy." London could not go quite that far, but its New Leftist justified the fantasy by saying that American society was so grotesque and fantastic that such a fantasy had poetic truth.¹¹⁴ Thus, the political amorality of the New Left was guided by Berkeley activists to a new theory of twofold truth: the objectively false was politically "true"; the illusion was the reality.

Third, the Berkeley Student Movement evoked a strong reaction among the people of California especially, and America generally, of anti-intellectualism. The fissure between the people and the intellectuals became deeper than it probably has ever been in American life. The Berkeley student activists generally professed contempt for the American political process; there was no basic difference, they said, between a right-wing Republican and a liberal Democrat—both were part of the "System." The lawless actions of the Berkeley Student Movement were a principal issue in California's election of 1966. The elected Republican, Governor Ronald Reagan, took a moderate course with respect to the university, his principal proposal being to call for small increases in fees by the students. The student activists demonstrated against him at the state's capital, Sacramento, a Berkeley campus Communist leader boasting how several

thousand students had driven in their cars to the demonstration.¹¹⁵ Many Californian workingmen no doubt thought that students who could afford cars could afford to pay small increases in fees. The governor's popularity rose steadily with his every act of resistance to the intellectuals' economic demands—the students' for lower fees, their professors' for higher salaries. By June 1967, after a half-year in office, his popularity was at its highest, with 74 per cent of the people, according to a public opinion poll, indicating their approval of his administration.¹¹⁶ It was the community now which felt "alienated" from its intellectuals, and which regarded the universities as a special-interest group, with professors ready to exploit the rest of the community economically and students regarding themselves as a privileged elite immune to the law.

The Students' Seizure of Columbia University: The Battle of Morningside Heights

"Berkeley started it, Columbia will finish it!" shouted a student orator on Morningside Heights. The events of April and May 1968 at Columbia University were in some ways even more significant for America than those at Berkeley. Violence became much more the norm; the themes of generational rebellion were reiterated—the destroying of the system, the apotheosis of guerrilla warfare, amorality, the misperception of reality, the search for the strategic, vulnerable issue in terms of which the older generation could be de-authorized, generational solidarity aroused by police intervention. Let us without trying to write a chronicle of the events at Columbia observe the recurrent themes and patterns of generational conflict.

STUDENTS FOR DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY'S SEARCH FOR A STRATEGIC ISSUE

In October 1967 the chairman of the Columbia S.D.S. drew up a "Position Paper for Rest of Year—University Complicity." It envisaged the achievement of two goals, the "radicalization" of the students, "showing them how our lives really are unfree in this society (and at Columbia)," and "striking a blow at the Federal Government's war effort ('resistance')." The student leader planned to secure a referendum on university complicity in the war by March 10, a final ultimatum on March 15, and then by April 5, "a sit-in at Low Library which, after one day, turns into a general student strike. University capitulates."¹¹⁷ This was the master-plan for student activist tactics. Its intent governed subsequent events, but in one important respect it was modified through improvisation. It transpired that America's involvement in the war in Vietnam simply did not de-authorize the older generation to the extent that a large-scale student uprising required. A new issue came to the fore in April with which the students could move with

greater confidence against the university, knowing that when this issue was raised, the university would be hesitant; naturally, as in Berkeley, it was the racial issue.

Columbia University had begun to build a gymnasium on a rocky slope of Morningside Park, the upper stories to be used by its students, the lower stories by the community of Negro Harlem. Several years of discussion with the city's authorities, the state legislature, and the community's organizations had preceded the approval of the project. As Arnold Beichman wrote:

The Harlem community, when the idea was first broached . . . wanted the gymnasium because part of its facilities would have been given to Harlem youngsters. It was a way of rehabilitating a park rendered unusable because of the dangers of criminal attack against passersby, black or white. Most of the land taken by the university for the gym was a sheer cliff, an escarpment functionally useful to flies.¹¹⁸

Young Negro extremists organized in the Students' Afro-American Society first voiced the complaint that Columbia was encroaching on the Negro community, and that the rear of the gymnasium would look down symbolically on Harlem. The leftist white student organization now seized on this issue as its strategic one. As two participants wrote:

The gym was made an issue because it would coalesce the black radicals behind the protest. . . . But the three issues [the gymnasium, the university's affiliation with the Institute for Defense Analysis, and the demand for an amnesty for those who seized and barricaded the university's buildings] were pretexts. The point of the game was power. . . . It was revolution. . . . Everywhere the purpose was to destroy institutions of the American Establishment. . . .¹¹⁹

The student leader, Mark Rudd, had little emotional interest in the racial question. He stated: "I was never really attracted to civil rights. There was too much idealization of Negroes, and they didn't seem too effective. I've always felt a tremendous barrier between me and blacks."¹²⁰ The issue at any rate was one around which a generational battle could be most readily pitched. For several years the young Mark Rudd had been seeking an occasion to express his "will to revolution." He said:

I had always had a humanist bent, but when I got to Columbia I started reading people like Marcuse and Lenin. Marcuse was very important to me. He made it clear that revolutions come from the will to revolution. . . . Then I met these guys who were in S.D.S. They were people I could respect. . . . You trust people first and then accept their opinions.

In short, Rudd's experience was a typically conversionary one, searching for a comradeship linked by the "will to revolution," that is, generational revolt translated into an emotive a priori through which all social events would be perceived. He made his pilgrimage in March 1968 to Cuba, the

Mecca of the New Leftist creed, and "came back more enthusiastic than ever about the Castro regime and Ernesto Che Guevara," the slain guerrilla fighter who has become the ego-ideal of the student activists. If Mark Rudd thought himself the prophet of a higher society, the vice-president of the university, David B. Truman, characterized him as "totally unscrupulous and morally very dangerous," as an "extremely capable, ruthless, cold-blooded guy, . . . a combination of a revolutionary and an adolescent having a temper tantrum. No one has ever made him or his friends look over the abyss. It makes me uncomfortable to sit in the same room with him." Born of Jewish parents, the son of a middle-class realtor, young Rudd used to urge his father to pay his Negro employees higher wages. The father observed that the son never had to worry about making a living: "We're glad he has time to spend on activities like politics."¹²¹ With no challenge of the material environment to call upon his efforts, the aggressive energies in this rebellious Jewish youngster sought their channel. Fortunately, the university was at hand, the surrogate father, on whom the will to revolution could be vented.

On April 23, 1968, three hundred students occupied Hamilton Hall, the building for undergraduate instruction, barricaded its doors, and held the dean of students as hostage. Mark Rudd announced they were prepared to stay there until the university agreed to discontinue the construction of the gymnasium as well as its involvement with the Institute of Defense Analysis. "We're going to take a hostage to make them let go of I.D.A. and let go of the gym," he said.¹²² David Truman offered to meet immediately with the students, but they refused. They demanded later a prior written guarantee of amnesty for all their actions. Again this curious trait of student revolutionists appeared—the demand to be regarded as adult citizens and the demand for special privileges as students, for exemption from the civil and criminal law. It was the recurrent elitism of revolutionary student movements.

The occupation of Hamilton Hall was itself the culmination of several preceding episodes in the course of which the student activists found that an association with the racial problem provided them with the most strategic base for operations against the university. A campus memorial service for the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., two weeks earlier had been interrupted by these same student activists who had always ridiculed his non-violent philosophy. Now, however, the full momentum of student uprising was released. As at Berkeley and almost every center of student movements for a hundred years past, the instinctive strategy of the student movement was to act in such a way as to provoke the intervention of police force; then it could hope to see the emotions of generational solidarity transform its minority uprising into a majority revolt.

Meanwhile, however, the Negro Black Power students broke with the white leftists. The Negro students were uninterested in the white students' talk of university reform; they said frankly that they simply wanted a

victory over the white university. A Negro student leader said: "Black university students have barricaded themselves here to protest a white racist university that encroaches on the Negro community."¹²³ The white leftists decided to appease the Black Power faction. They left Hamilton Hall to the Negro students on the night of April 24; the whites seized the office of President Grayson Kirk and its environs in the Low Memorial Library. At this juncture, only 150 students of a total student body of 27,500 were involved in the occupations. Signs and posters in the new language of generational revolt went up on the walls of the buildings, inside and outside. The activist unconscious with its fantasies of guerrilla uprisings and guerrilla heroes enveloped the reality of Columbia University.

SYMBOLS AND EMOTIONS OF GENERATIONAL REVOLT

Student activists proclaimed the "liberation" of the Low Memorial Library. Posters announced: "Liberated Areas, Be Free to Join Us." On Hamilton Hall the posters were icons of the students' faith—posters of Che Guevara and Malcolm X. One sign announced: "Malcolm X University, established 1968 A.D." Slogans were scratched on the walls: "Lenin won. Fidel won. We'll win." The white student activists in Low Library vandalized President Kirk's office. A warm sympathizer of theirs in the *Village Voice*, telling how the student activists felt, gave the best picture of their underlying seething irrational motivation, of the emotional unconscious beneath their surface political consciousness:

Don't underestimate the relationship between litter and liberty at Columbia. Until last Tuesday, April 23, the university was a clean dorm, where students paid rent, kept the house rules, and took exams. Then the rebels arrived, in an uneasy coalition of hip, black, and leftist militants. They wanted to make Columbia more like home. So they ransacked files, shoved furniture around, plastered walls with paint and placards. They scrawled on blackboards and doodled on desks. They raided the administration's offices (the psychological equivalent of robbing your mother's purse) and they claim to have found cigars, sherry, and a dirty book (the psychological equivalent of finding condoms in your father's wallet).¹²⁴

Moved by the compulsions of generational struggle, the student activists tried to destroy the university fathers by whatever means they could. As at Berkeley, they stole letters from the files of their university president, made photocopies, and published them.¹²⁵ The student leader, Rudd, said they were being distributed to "educate" his fellow-students. They dealt with administrative relations between Columbia University and such agencies as the Asia Foundation and the Institute for Defense Analysis. It was only too apparent how the rights of individual freedom and personal inviolability were scrapped by student activists. One sensed that their emotions would condone their own dictatorship and their own police terrorism far beyond anything which the much denounced "system" and its investigative

agencies would allow. "Participatory democracy" rapidly metamorphosed into exclusive dictatorship. As one participant described it, at Hamilton Hall where the nonstudent activist Tom Hayden was in charge, "participatory democracy" signified that "a highly organized minority . . . is able to cow the unorganized, apolitical majority into acting against its better judgment." "Self-appointed censors" supervised all efforts at writing: "Later, when the intimidation went beyond verbal admonishments, I saw them as part of a kind of Stalinist approach to the truth that many of the radicals observed. Nothing was to be written that did not conform with the immediate demands of the 'revolution.' Every word had to follow the SDS line. . . . I was told by members of the Steering Committee that I had to clear anything written about the commune with them."¹²⁶

Then too the seizure of the university buildings had the aspect of a mass generational celebration, a triumphal festival of the young. The *Village Voice* reporter wrote enthusiastically:

You entered Fayerweather Hall through a ground floor window. Inside, you saw blackboards filled with "strike bulletins," a kitchen stocked with sandwiches and cauldrons of spaghetti, and a lounge filled with squatters. There was some pot and a little petting in the corridors. But on Friday, the rebellion had the air of a college bar at 2 a.m. . . . On the other side of the campus, the mathematics building was seized. . . . The rebels set about festooning walls and making sandwiches. Jimi Hendrix blared from a phonograph. Mao mixed with Montesquieu, "The Wretched of the Earth" mingled with *Valley of the Dolls*.¹²⁷

Still, however, only about a fifth of the daytime studentry were not attending classes; the great majority were still meeting. The student activists held fast to their determination to provoke the intervention of the police. They seized three more buildings. They ignored the trustees' approval of the decision to suspend construction of the gymnasium. They rejected all offers to mediation by a faculty group on the ground that they were not assured of amnesty for every violation of rule and law they had committed. Among moderate students, sentiment was strong against the activists; two hundred of them, organized as a "Majority Coalition," and dressed in conventional jackets and ties, "held the line" successfully against an activist contingent bringing food to the Low Library occupiers. But university authorities and faculty prevailed on student moderates not to act to regain the buildings from which they were violently barred. The initiative was allowed to remain in the hands of a violent minority.

GENERATIONAL SOLIDARITY AND POLICE INTERVENTION

Then on the night of April 30 one thousand policemen, in accordance with a request from the university authorities, intervened to remove the occupying students. The Negro students evacuated Hamilton Hall peace-

fully; but at Fayerweather, a line of faculty activists tried to interpose itself between the students and police. A kind of hysteria of generational ferocity overcame student activists. One shouted at three middle-aged men near Hamilton Hall: "I hope you old . . . die! I hope all you old . . . die. Go ahead and watch us and die!" Another shouted as he was arrested: "I'm going to rape your daughter." A girl student screamed: "First they arrest the workers and now they arrest the intellectuals!" The neo-Marxist symbolism substituted for reality: What workers were being arrested? Had a single New York workers' organization or trade union indicated any solidarity with the Columbia activists? The student activists taunted the police with obscenities and epithets, seeking to provoke the longed-for "police brutality." Violence and counter-violence, at times indiscriminate in the hysterical atmosphere, became general. Seven hundred and twenty persons were arrested, one hundred and nine were injured, including seventeen policemen. *The New York Times* correspondent described this night of higher education: "Somehow the whole night seemed unbelievable, a mixture of moods that seemed to have no relationship to each other: violence and compassion, talk of hatred and death and talk of gentle philosophers, ugliness of action and of speech, and moments of tenderness, a place of learning become a place of destruction."¹²⁸ It was the familiar combination of emotions that generational revolts have, as we have seen, always engendered.

The next day saw the oft-repeated pattern of the coalescence of generational solidarity. Indignation was high with the intervention and "brutality" of the police. The student activists called a university-wide strike while the university itself closed the campus; the faculty called for a day of reflection and discussion upon the aims of the university. On May 5, the faculty of Columbia College ended all formal classes, provided for grades of pass or fail on the basis of work already done, and asked for university reforms. The university on its side announced the appointment of an eminent commission of inquiry headed by a Harvard Professor of Law and former Solicitor General, Archibald Cox. As was to be expected, the student activists declared they would boycott the commission's inquiry as a device of the System for diverting the militancy of the students. It was the familiar pattern of student activism—that of avoiding the use of available legal channels for the expression of discontent in favor of "participatory democracy" and "confrontation," that is, the force of a small elitist minority. A Columbia Strike Coordinating Committee came into existence to organize picket lines and courses in a fantasy "Free University"; the schools of Engineering, Law, and Business Administration were scarcely affected. The evening students of General Studies, usually working for their living, and the graduate students in the natural sciences, with their concrete goals and curricula, evinced little interest in the strike; but Hamilton Hall, the undergraduate humanities building, was void of both pupils and professors. The student activists in their fantasy felt they were

making their own "cultural revolution"; they spoke the Maoist language of communes, their own "great leap forward" into liberated classes. Signs announced: "The Math Commune meets at 3"; "The Law Commune meets at 5."¹²⁹

Thus the academic year wound to its end. The president of the university, confronted with threats of student disruption, announced he would not address Columbia's commencement assembly. Another occupation of Hamilton Hall took place on May 21 to protest the suspension of four student leaders who refused to appear in the associate dean's office. Again there was violence; fifty-one students and seventeen policemen were injured. The students' amorality reached new proportions when they broke into the office of an assistant professor of modern European history, who had dared to criticize them, and burnt his private research papers.¹³⁰ One had a preview of what liberty would mean under the rule of the New Left. The "creative vandalism" which their publications and prophets extolled could now be seen in practice.

A vandalism of the spirit, moreover, one more corroding than the physical kind, had made its appearance among professors as well as students. There was, for instance, the professorial expert on African politics who predicted and threatened "that if the police came—the university would be burned down."¹³¹ As at Berkeley, academic demagogues made their appearance, seeking and needing the emotional responses of crowds. A well-known professor of drama stood before a "teach-in" at Teachers' College in early May at last finding a drama of which he was not the mere critic but in which he could cast himself as a hero among the characters. These are "days," he said, "in which everything is possible." He described how he had gone forth to confront President Kirk, looking for him in the men's rooms of the Low Library. He defended the activists' thievery of the president's files. "Violence was not committed; the files were only violated," he said in a shrill voice, and finding a curious satisfaction in his sexual imagery and pun. But when much of the audience, composed of adult teachers, failed to respond to the professorial daring, he apologized for his levity, and became more argumentative: "If you approve of our aims," he said, "you must approve of our means. . . . This country exists on the basis of armed revolt. . . . We have gotten glimpses of a new type of education. . . . You must strike."¹³² It was the typical middle-aged seeker of student rebellions, seeking to appease his inner irrationality by helping to realize an external one among the pliable, susceptible adolescents.

Why was Columbia University so vulnerable to the tactics of a small activist student minority? Why did similar tactics that same month of May 1968 fail to provoke for instance a rebellion and stoppage at Brooklyn College? Both institutions were large, both were urban, and in both cases, large percentages of the student bodies, especially of the activists, were Jewish, though, of course, the total Jewish percentage at Brooklyn

College was estimated to be as high as 85 per cent. The tradition of activism has been much greater at such free, "proletarian" colleges as Brooklyn and the City College reaching back through years when middle-class Columbia had been relatively quiescent. Over the years, however, the class differential between Columbia and the municipal colleges had declined; at Brooklyn College, for instance, a survey in 1962 showed that a majority of the freshmen had fathers who were either in small businesses, sales, or the professions.¹³³ Yet two differences remained which were important. Brooklyn College was a "subway college," composed entirely of commuters; therefore generational struggle was apt to express itself directly in the family environment rather than on the campus where the student spent a few brief, instrumental hours. Second, Brooklyn College was composed of urbanites, predominantly lower middle class, as compared to suburbanite, upper middle class Columbia. As persons struggling themselves for a foothold in society, with parents of whom at least one was in many cases an immigrant, the Brooklyn undergraduate was far less susceptible to feelings of guilt concerning the racial problem. Usually he had gone to public elementary and high schools with Negro students; often he estimated their abilities and characters as realistically as he did his own. If his parents had worked their way up from East Side and Brownsville slums, he felt others could too with hard work; he had no consciousness whatsoever that he had ever imposed a burden on the Negro. This relative absence of guilt over the racial issue was probably the chief factor in the failure of would-be student uprisings at Brooklyn and at City College, though the latter was situated even closer to the heart of Harlem and had expanded relatively far more than Columbia. Of course, as a private institution, Columbia could be depicted as an "encroacher" far more than the public City University; Columbia's guilt-consciousness could be the more easily aroused. Yet after all these factors are weighed, one must still recognize that a majority of the students at Columbia probably would have opposed the "occupiers" and dislodged them, if they had not been restrained by professors and administrators.¹³⁴ The Columbia studentry was moderate; only the preceding year, in a referendum of undergraduates as to whether the college should permit all governmental and business agencies, regardless of their involvement in the Vietnam War, to recruit staff on the campus, a decisive majority of 67 per cent had voted in favor of so doing, and had rejected the standpoint of the student activists. If the violent occupiers had been expelled the first day, the majority of the students no doubt would have approved. Clearly, the effects of a psychology of deauthorization had deprived the Columbia authorities of their powers of response.

The immediate consequences of the Columbia student uprising were clear. For one, it brought an atmosphere of anti-intellectualism into New York which that city had never known before. A poll conducted by Public Opinion Surveys of Princeton indicated how feeling against the students

had grown. To a random sample of residents of the New York metropolitan area, the question was put concerning the "extensive student protest" in the past week: "Who do you think is more to blame for this situation—the people running Columbia University or the students involved?" Fifty-five per cent, a decisive majority, blamed the students more, while only 11 per cent blamed the "people running Columbia."¹³⁵ As many as 83 per cent felt the university was right in calling the police to remove the protesting students from university buildings; and 58 per cent approved of the degree of force that had been used against the student activists. Among the working classes the resentment against the Columbia students was especially great. Of those respondents without college education (of whom the working class constitutes the largest group), the overwhelming number, 86 per cent, approved of the calling of the police, while 63 per cent endorsed the degree of force they had used. Far from promoting a bond between the people and intellect, the student activists had promoted a rift which could have serious consequences. The average citizen of New York tended to identify more with the policemen, as men without educational advantages, coming to blows with academic upper-class, indeed, leisure-class youth.

Second, the faculty itself, the senior intellectuals, tended to discredit themselves in the eyes of the American people. The Columbia professors generally responded with more critical acumen than their Berkeley colleagues had three and a half years before. Perhaps no other university in the United States includes among its scholars so many well-known critics of and commentators on American society as does Columbia. Nevertheless, when the student uprising came, not a few such distinguished writers found themselves indecisive and inclined to yield in varying degree to the "confrontation" of the activist minority.¹³⁶ According to the Cox Commission, the group of faculty which interposed itself between the students and the police "increased the likelihood of violence and magnified the reaction by lending an air of legitimacy to use of the tactics of disruption. . . ." There was a pressure on professors to sacrifice convictions for the sake of classroom popularity; professors knew that the moderates, liberals, and conservatives would never disrupt their classrooms; only the activists would. Therefore, professors tended to respond to the crisis with a touch of the classroom demagogue, yielding to a kind of pressure or threat from the extreme left.¹³⁷

Third, the Columbia episode was a pilot project in New York for the use of violence for political aims. Here, the intellectual elite itself, the educated class, the favored sons of the well-to-do, were acting lawlessly, violently, moving in mobs, shrieking obscenities. They gave the sanction of similar action to the uneducated and the poor. The university was superseded as a moral force in the community—to be replaced by the New Left and its amoral force. The university ceased to be the conscience of

the community; it became an enclave for the rule of the id. The Columbia episode added to the difficulties of the community of New York City trying to solve its racial problems in a rational way. The student movement had once more acted self-destructively because such destruction was part of its unconscious aim.

Lastly, the revolt of Negro student extremist activists against their own more moderate elders made the probable path of relations between white and black even more difficult for the future. The head of their organization at Columbia told the white students: "Remember that in a few years when you get off at the 116th Street subway station and head for your classrooms, you'll be the minority and we'll be the majority."¹³⁸ The Negro students asserted that Columbia was encroaching on the black community when it bought properties in the neighborhood. By the same token, white persons could argue that Negroes should be kept from encroaching on white communities. The kind of polarization which divides societies, and makes it hard to achieve rational reforms, was abetted by the Columbia student uprising.

When the whole story, however, of the American student movement is reviewed, it becomes clear that it remained peripheral to the philosophies and lives of the vast number of American students. Unlike the Russian activists of the nineteenth century, the American activists were still estranged from the mass of American students. Although at least 221 demonstrations occurred at 101 colleges and universities (apart from Columbia) during the interval from January 1 to June 15, 1968, only 38,911 students were involved, that is, 2.6 per cent of the American studentry. As compared with the more than 80 per cent involvement of Russian students at critical times, the American figure was minute; by the barometer of student activism, one might say that the generational equilibrium of American society was not basically impaired. It was rather the secondary consequences of student activism which brought dangers to the United States—their example of violence and contempt for American democratic procedure, their disruption of traditionally peaceful electoral debates and speeches, their intimidation of the majority, their disregard of political ethics, and the ensuing polarization of American society and the reactive growth of anti-intellectualism. Of the 221 demonstrations, 97 were evoked by aims of black power, 50 were directed toward student power, while only 45 were related to the Vietnam War or military factors. A small number of students were suspended, 60 throughout the nation, and 124 expelled, without reinstatement.¹³⁹ The percentage of American students incurring such penalties was infinitesimal compared to what the Russian students sustained. Evidently, the elder generation in the United States was not morally de-authorized in the eyes of the younger in anything like the proportions which had obtained in pre-revolutionary Russia.

NOTES

1. Hanan C. Selvin and Warren O. Hagstrom, "Determinants of Support for Civil Liberties," *British Journal of Sociology*, XI (1960), 56; "Student Attitude Survey Revealed," *Daily Californian*, May 12, 1959.
2. "CORE in the Negro Uprising," *American Liberal*, III, No. 10 (November 1962), 8.
3. Sara Shumer, "The Demonstrations: A Moral Defense," *Liberal Democrat*, IV (1964), 10-12; Jim Willwerth, "A Weekend of Songs, Sit-ins and Sleep-ins," *Daily Californian*, March 9, 1964; Nancy Tolbert, "Demonstrators 1—Sheraton Palace O," *Daily Californian*, March 9, 1964.
4. Three years later the father of Michael Schwerner, Nathan Schwerner, was booted at a meeting of the Student "Non-violent" Coordinating Committee. His son's martyrdom was scorned by the student activists, who were now shouting, "Keep it violent!" See "That New Black Magic: 'Keep it Violent,'" *Village Voice*, September 7, 1967.
5. "Nation Mourns Slain Workers," *Student Voice*, V, No. 21 (August 19, 1964), issued by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.
6. Kenneth Rexroth, "Compulsive Demonstrators," *San Francisco Examiner*, October 14, 1964.
7. "Educator and Libertarian," *Daily Californian*, April 29, 1964. See also E. W. Strong, "Shared Responsibility," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, XLIX (June 1963), 109-113.
8. The Communists found the Berkeley campus so free that "its organizational profusion might seem excessive. . . ." See Al Richmond, *Campus Rebels* (San Francisco, 1960), p. 11.
9. Steve Phipps, "The Invisible University Community: A Report on the Underground Student," *Daily Californian*, March 13, 1964. At that time, a few months before the Berkeley Uprising, the writer estimated the "hidden community" as several thousands in number.
10. Geoffrey White, "The Student Revolt at Berkeley," *Spartacist*, No. 4 (May-June 1965), p. 14. Stephen Weissman, the chief ideologist of the Free Speech Movement, in an interchange in the *New Leader*, denied that nonstudents played an important part in the Berkeley student movement. A year later, however, he acknowledged: "But let's face it . . . we cannot do without nonstudents." Not to have them, he said, would impose an intolerable handicap on the Berkeley student movement. *Daily Californian*, March 24, 1966, p. 11.
11. See *2nd University Socialist School, An Unofficial Supplement to the Curriculum, Ten Revolutions that Shook the World: Sponsored by the University Democratic Socialist Club*, a brochure, February 18, 1964.
12. "Leader of FSM Sums up Battle," *Open City Press*, I, No. 8 (January 27, 1965), p. 2.
13. Hunter S. Thompson, "The Non-student Left," *The Nation*, CCI, No. 9, (September 27, 1965), 156.
14. Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 157.
15. Jerry Rubin, "Oct. 15-16 and the VDC," *VDC News*, No. 4 (October 11, 1965), 1.
16. Jerry Rubin, *Daily Californian*, November 12, 1965, p. 1.
17. "Jerry Rubin: the Regents are Non-students too," *Berkeley Citizen*, I, No. 37 (December 9, 1966), 4.
18. Shea Weré, "The Berkeley Constant," *Berkeley Barb*, February 11, 1966, p. 4.
19. Paul Weissman, "Close-up of Mario Savio," *San Francisco Examiner*, December 9, 1964, p. 1.
20. "Mario's Father Approves," *San Francisco Examiner*, December 9, 1964, p. 75.
21. "A Rebel on Campus: Mario Savio," *The New York Times*, December 9, 1967.
22. Weissman, *loc. cit.*
23. "Mario Savio: The World Was Clear But a Moment," *Open City Press* (San Francisco), February 10-16, 1965,

- pp. 1-2. Also see Mario Savio, "An End to History," *Humanity: An arena of critique and commitment* (Berkeley), No. 2 (December 1964), pp. 1, 4.
 24. *A Brief History of the Free Speech Controversy: University of California, September-January, 1964-5*, a publication circulated by the Free Speech Movement.
 25. Several critics took umbrage at the description of the Free Speech Movement as a "Soviet-style coalition" of student groups. With some disingenuousness they suggested this was a charge that the Free Speech Movement was a Communist organization. To any student of political science it was clear that I was referring to the mode of organization which sprang up spontaneously during the Revolutions of 1905 and 1917 in Russia in which workingmen's, peasants', students', and soldiers' groups sent their representatives to councils and contrived a form of organization outside the usual legal channels, the so-called "dual power." The Free Speech Movement was such a "dual power" of representatives alongside the official Associated Students Union, which it ridiculed as an agency for "sandbox politics." See Hal Draper, "FSM: Freedom Fighters or Misguided Rebels?" *New Politics*, IV, No. 1 (Winter 1965), 25; J. B. Neilands, "The Rise of Freedom at Berkeley," *Frontier*, XVII (October 1966), 5. For my original statement, see Lewis S. Feuer, "Rebellion at Berkeley," *New Leader*, XLVII, No. 26 (December 21, 1964), 5.
 26. *FSM: Free Speech Newsletter*, undated, circulated October 12, 1964, p. 4.
 27. James Benet, "Growing Pains at UC," *San Francisco Chronicle*, November 15, 1964, p. 6.
 28. A graduate student in sociology, Ursula Cadalbert, chanced to take a film of the episode and kindly allowed me to study it in several showings.
 29. *FSM: Free Speech Newsletter*, October 12, 1964, p. 4.
 30. *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, October 30, 1964.
 31. "It seems very likely now," wrote Barbara Garson plaintively, "that the University will liberalize its regulations on free speech and political activity. . . . But must we always make this massive effort in order to effect a minor change? The answer is yes." See Barbara Garson, "Freedom Is a Big Deal," *FSM Newsletter*, No. 4 (November 17, 1964), p. 3.
 32. *FSM Newsletter*, No. 5 (December 10, 1964), p. 2.
 33. See Lewis S. Feuer, "Rebellion at Berkeley," *New Leader*, XLVII (December 21, 1964), 8.
 34. *The New York Times*, December 8, 1966.
 35. Seymour Martin Lipset, in "Berkeley and Freedom. Comments and Criticisms," *Atlantic Monthly*, CCXVIII, No. 4 (October 1966), 105.
- The atmosphere of the collective irrationalism in this meeting of the Berkeley faculty is well described in a letter circulated by David Shwayder, later chairman of the department of philosophy: "I attended the meeting in company of four of my departmental colleagues, all of whom, during the previous weeks, had expressed against the students indignation of a kind I could never muster. Only one of them (besides myself) voted for the Feuer Amendment, and all of them voted twice for the unamended resolution. . . . It was all very sheeplike, a kind of cowardice of conformity, very depressing to observe, especially since no one had anything palpable to lose by standing their ground. I must laugh at the repeated compliment members of the Senate have paid themselves for the orderly manner in which the meeting was conducted: most of us were simply cowed into silence. But academics are just that way, I guess, as was shown over and over again in Germany from 1815, and as was even confirmed by the behavior of the '200' at Berkeley. They knew what they wanted and they knew what was happening. I asked one of the most conspicuous of them—also a departmental colleague—why none of them had sat-in, and received the bland reply that they had decided that it would be foolish for they might go to jail! . . . They depended upon the students and non-students to make the case and to carry it along, and also to pay the price, while they conspired with their sense of responsibility, exuded words, and had the time of their lives. . . ." (Letter of March 6, 1966.) Professor Denzel Carr, formerly chairman of the department of Oriental languages, wrote of the "mass hysteria" of the meeting of the Academic Senate and its "incredible feature." See the *Atlantic Monthly*, CCXVIII (October 1966), 43. The former chairman of the department

of Near Eastern languages wrote that "in the crucial weeks of November and December of 1964 I felt that the campus in fact had fallen victim to totalitarian tactics and totalitarian mentality. As chairman of my department at the time I can testify that some of my colleagues had their classes disrupted or dismissed not by their own actions or by the decision of the students . . . but by well-planned tactics organized by students (or even 'non-students') who had nothing to do with the classes in question. Similar occurrences were reported at the time by members of other departments on the campus and by chairmen. I could not then, and cannot now, conceive of a grosser invasion of the academic freedom of the faculty than those events." See Jacob J. Finkelstein, in "Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom," *Meeting of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate*, October 17, 1966, p. 5. Professor Seymour M. Lipset, in a generous defense of the Berkeley faculty, advanced the novel idea that cowardice and confusion are virtues of the tragic hero. See Lipset, "Berkeley and Freedom," p. 106.

36. The overwhelming majority of the Berkeley studentry, nonetheless, in 1964, disapproved of the tactics of the Free Speech Movement; a gulf existed between the student body as a whole and the activists, the "student movement." The students generally were working at their studies in libraries and laboratories; they were not on the Plaza except when Joan Baez was singing, and they found the whole affair unpleasant and turned aside. A poll of student opinion taken in the Social Science Integrated Course toward the close of the semester of uprising revealed the separation in spirit between the student body and the student movement. The course was composed of freshmen and sophomores, with about 54 per cent in the liberal arts and 46 per cent studying engineering. The poll was conducted by assistants predominantly supporting the FSM; their leniency in assigning grades was later shown to be proportionate to their political involvement in the FSM; the professor in charge, Nathan Glazer, was known to have been a warm partisan of the FSM during its formative phases. Yet the students decisively expressed their disapproval of the Free Speech Movement. Of the 390 respondents, the percentage of opinions were distributed as follows:

OPINION	PERCENTAGE
(a) Agreed with FSM on issues and methods	19%
(b) Agreed with FSM on issues, but questioned methods	39%
(c) Agreed with FSM on issues, but disliked methods	24%
(d) Disagreed with FSM on issues, and disliked methods	17%
(e) Other	1%

Eighty per cent of the students thus either questioned or disliked the methods of the Free Speech Movement; only 19 per cent endorsed them. And since the "student movement" was one which insisted above all on the tactics of civil disobedience and sit-ins against the university, it is clear that it possessed the support of a minority of students. However, that minority could muster and mobilize far more activists than could the majority of the student body. The engineering students "were somewhat more likely to dislike the FSM," though "results did not vary greatly by major." It was the "student movement," the "alienated," who imparted, however, the dominant tone to the Berkeley campus, and the decline in ethical sense which followed. See posted document, *Some Results of the Social Science Integrated Poll on Class-members' Involvement in the FSM Controversy and Reactions to it*, January 1965.

37. The debate between Mario Savio and myself at the Berkeley High School on February 5, 1965, was reported the next day in the local newspapers.

38. A Trotskyist organ held, "The students were most grateful for the support of folk-singer Joan Baez, for example, but when she called on them to enter Sproul Hall with love in their hearts this plea was received with considerable cynicism." See Geoffrey White, "The Student Revolt at Berkeley," *Spartacist*, No. 4 (May-June 1965), p. 14.

39. *Daily Californian*, February 4, 1965.

40. *Daily Californian*, February 16, 1965.

41. *Berkeley Barb*, June 3, 1966, p. 3.

42. *Daily Californian*, February 12, 1965.

43. Lewis S. Feuer, "Should College Students Grade Their Teachers?: The

Risk is 'Juvenocracy,'" *The New York Times Magazine*, September 18, 1966.

44. Lewis S. Feuer, "Pornopolitics and the University," *New Leader*, XLVIII (April 12, 1965), 14-19.

45. Morris E. Hurley, "Minority of One," *Daily Californian*, July 23, 1965, p. 9.

46. The facts of the case did not prevent Paul Goodman, fifty-four years old, from declaring that crime and delinquency were lessened by the Berkeley Student Uprising. He called instead for more "creative disorder" and "anarchic incidents"; "the community spirit of Berkeley this year is better than ordinary," he wrote. See Paul Goodman, "Civil Disobedience Decreases Lawlessness," *Daily Californian*, April 13, 1966, p. 13.

47. Judy Zimring, "Mostly on Southside: Sudden Increase in Berkeley Rape Cases," *Daily Californian*, February 1, 1967, p. 1.

48. "A Step Toward Sexual Freedom in Berkeley," *Berkeley Barb*, February 4, 1965, p. 5.

49. *Berkeley Barb*, III, No. 22 (December 2, 1966), 9. See also a series of news stories devoted to Berkeley sexual group communism, *Berkeley Barb*, May 6, 1966, pp. 1-2; February 18, 1966, pp. 1-7; February 25, 1966, pp. 2, 7; April 15, 1966, pp. 1, 10.

50. Professor Reginald Zelnik, in the *Daily Californian*, March 7, 1966; March 15, 1966.

51. The Berkeley student ethic was a revival of Nechayevism. Their thievery was like Nechayev's. As Bakunin wrote in 1870, "When you are out, he will open your drawers and boxes and read your letters; if he finds anything that could embarrass you and your friends, he will steal it and hide it in order to use it later against you and your friends." See Michael Prawdwin, *The Unmentionable Nechayev: A Key to Bolshevism* (London, 1961), p. 53.

52. Thus, in 1966, Mario Savio "decried a situation in which the only way the students could get the administration to listen was to use their power of coercion. . . . Hal Draper, a nonstudent and writer on students and the radical left, called vehemently for a strike, although he insisted he was 'just speaking historically' [a weather-beaten device of Marxist agitators], *Daily Californian*, December 1, 1966, p. 2. The correspondent for the

"underground" Michigan State newspaper reported, "Also there re-appeared a cast of Mario Savio, Bettina Aptheker, Jerry Weisberg, Jerry Rubin and other legendary characters." See Mike Price, "Son of FSM: Berkeley Report," *The Paper* (December 8, 1966), p. 9.

53. "Confrontationist students," observed three student writers, "seize every opportunity to block meaningful dialogue on the subject." See the *Daily Californian*, November 21, 1966, p. 12.

54. Circular of Independent Socialist Club Forum, December 8, 1966.

55. Circular, The Strike Committee, *Masskoercion: Resolution of the Strikers' Meeting in 2000 LSB, December 6, 1966*.

56. "Election Divides Coast Liberals," *The New York Times*, October 2, 1966.

57. "New Left Parley on Coast Denounces Brown and Backs Black Power," *The New York Times*, October 3, 1966.

58. Robert Kuttner, "Robert Scheer Trims His Beard: The Birth of Wishy-Washy Radicalism," *The Activist*, VI, No. 3 (May 1966), 8.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

60. Robert Scheer, "Notes on the New Left," *Root and Branch*, No. 2 (1962), pp. 17, 19, 22.

61. Scheer, "Notes on the New Left," p. 26; "Poet is Priest," *Root and Branch* (Winter 1962), p. 71.

62. "Some people gasped" when Scheer advocated the poor should seize Oakland. "Watts rather than Ghetto—Scheer Says," *Berkeley Barb*, February 4, 1965, pp. 2, 7. Scheer subsequently became the spokesman for the "Egyptian position," anti-Israel and pro-Nasser, at the grotesque National Conference for New Politics in Chicago in September 1967 at which time, according to one writer, he also evinced "considerable talents as a trimmer." Martin Peretz, "The American Left and Israel," *Commentary*, XLIV, No. 5 (1967), 34. The Jewish Communist organ wrote that Scheer "did not help matters" by his calling for support of the Arab guerillas, the "Palestine Liberation Front," against Israel. Jack W. Weinman, "New Politics is Born," *Jewish Currents*, XXI, No. 11 (December 1967), 8.

63. Kuttner, "Robert Scheer Trims His Beard," pp. 7-10.

64. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Critique*, tr. R. Dixon (Moscow, 1956), pp. 91-92.

65. *Berkeley Barb*, January 13, 1967, p. 5; "The Community for Old Politics," *Berkeley Barb*, January 13, 1967, p. 7.

66. Robert E. Wood, Roger A. Rosenblatt, Joseph J. Persky, "Harvard War Protest," *The New York Times*, November 20, 1966.

67. *The New York Times*, November 11, 1966.

68. Martin E. Malia, in the *Daily Californian*, May 19, 1966, p. 12.

69. Alan Cline, "Faculty View: 'Eighteen Months of Blackmail,'" *San Francisco Examiner*, December 2, 1966. There had been "18 months of activist blackmail," said Don Wegars, "UC Rebuffs Strikers," *San Francisco Chronicle*, December 3, 1966. The student leaders denounced their quondam faculty ally as a "fink." See Hal Draper, "The Confessions of John Searle," *Berkeley Barb*, December 5, 1966, Strike Committee Special Issue, p. 3. "Another head that will have to roll is John Searle's. In the recent disturbances, he was reduced to the level of a name-taker. Nobody really takes John seriously anymore." See Stewart Albert, "Guru, or Gorilla?" *Berkeley Barb*, January 13, 1967, p. 7; Michael Lerner, "On Mourning Clark Kerr," *Daily Californian*, January 24, 1967, p. 12; Michael Lerner, "The Times They Are A-Changing," *Daily Californian*, January 9, 1967, p. 12. The Communist party (East Bay Section Committee) said, "Searle now speaks with the voice of the administration. . . . That he is roundly despised by militant students for the traitorous act is right and proper. And the demagogic way he often tries to justify the repression of student activity by invoking the very principles of FSM is beneath contempt." See "C. P. Answers Dewgood," *Berkeley Barb*, July 28-August 3, 1967, p. 10.

70. See the *Daily Californian*, March 8, 1965; *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, February 5, 1965. The chairman of the sociology department reverted curiously to his standpoint as a student activist twenty years earlier. "We should work as political missionaries, from within, sharing inevitably what is culpable . . ." Philip Selznick, "Revolution Sacred and Profane," *Enquiry*, II, No. 2 (1944), 18.

71. Letter to the author, December 6, 1966.

72. Daniel Amon, professor of cell physiology, replied: "We are told a mob is waiting outside and unless we vote

'right,' we'll never solve the problem." See *San Francisco Examiner*, December 9, 1964, p. 75.

73. Lipset, "Berkeley and Freedom," p. 105.

74. John Searle, in "Berkeley and Freedom," *Atlantic Monthly*, CCXVIII, No. 4 (October 1966), 111.

75. See Mark Schorer, "Final Thoughts on Berkeley," *Atlantic Monthly*, CCXVIII, No. 5 (November 1966), 38; Herbert McClosky, "Berkeley and Freedom," *Atlantic Monthly*, CCXVIII, No. 4 (October 1966), 108. See also the *Daily Californian*, August 24, 1966, in which several faculty activists joined with the editor, John F. Oppedahl, in writing a series of articles which provide unusual documents for the study of the psychological consequences of generational animus in an academic community.

76. Roger B. Henkle, "The Pattern of Confrontation," *Bay Guardian*, I, No. 4 (December 20, 1966), 1.

77. The chief ideologist of the movement almost personified it in totemic fashion: "The 'Movement' is a strange beast. It is neither a formal organization nor a fixed doctrine, but rather a loose community of people, activities, and ideas held together by loyalty and mutual self-identification." Stephen Weissman, original copy of letter in "Berkeley and Freedom," *Atlantic Monthly*, CCXVIII (October 1966), 109.

78. Even the account in the Communist W. E. B. Du Bois Club journal conceded that the object of hostility and cause of alienation is summed up in the symbol of the IBM card which was prevalent on the posters, placards, and lips of the FSM. See Robert Kaufman and Michael Folsom, "FSM: An Interpretive Essay," in *FSM: The Free Speech Movement in Berkeley* (San Francisco, 1965), p. 29. See also S. E. Stern, "A Deeper Disenchantment: The Anti-Bureaucratic Revolt at Berkeley," *Liberation*, XI, No. 11 (February 1965), 19; "Do Not Fold, Bend, Mutilate, or Spindle," *FSM Newsletter*, No. 5 (December 10, 1964), p. 2.

79. *The New York Times*, December 8, 1966; James Wilson, "The Rebel Behind 'MacBird,'" *World Journal Tribune Magazine*, January 22, 1967, p. 11.

80. Donna S. Clemson, "There's Activism but No Revolt," and Bill Welch, "Students Seek 'Bill of Rights,'" *Centre Daily Times* (State College and Belle-

fonte, Pennsylvania), June 30, 1965, pp. 17-18.

81. Leaflet, The Strike Committee, *Masskoercion: Resolution of the Strikers' Meeting in 2000 LSB on December 6, 1966*. Shortly after the strike the student activist leaders announced a new coalition with the "hippies." It was an all-embracing coalition of generational revolutionists. The word was spread: "It's happening. Berkeley's political activists are going to join San Francisco's hippies in a love feast that will, hopefully, wipe out the last remnants of mutual skepticism and suspicion. The Thing is called A Gathering of the Tribe, a Pow Wow and Peace Dance, a Human Be-in. . . . The two radical scenes are for the first time beginning to look at each other more closely. What both see is that both are under a big impersonal stick called the Establishment. So they're going to stand up together. . . ." See "The Beginning is the Human Be-In," *Berkeley Barb*, January 6, 1967, p. 1. This was the prelude, they said, to revolution. "The Human Be-in is the message, it will say, 'We're here, together, free, alive, creative, and this is the way the whole world will be when it's ours.'"

82. Peter Benjaminson, "Jottings on a revolution . . ." *Bay Guardian*, I, No. 4 (December 20, 1966), 2.

83. Otto Feinstein, "Is there a student movement?" *New University Thought*, I, No. 4 (Summer 1961), 27.

84. Gerald Rosenfield, "Generational Revolt and the Free Speech Movement (Part 2)," *Liberation*, X, No. 10 (January 1966), 18-19.

85. "The punditry race is on to fathom the significance of the Free Speech Movement. At this moment the front-runner is Lewis S. Feuer. . . ." See Jack Weinberg, "The Free Speech Movement and Civil Rights," *The Campus Core-Lator*, January 1965, p. 6. The student Communist organ wrote of my "vituperative article in that old Cold War follower, the New Leader" (December 21, 1964) as abolishing "political meaning from the FSM by explaining its motivations as mere 'generational conflict.' . . ." "No bumptious 'adolescents,'" it replied, "would waste so much energy, sacrifice, and dedication simply to exercise hostility towards another generation." See Robert Kaufman and Michael Folsom, "FSM: An Interpretive Essay," *FSM*, W. E. B. Du Bois Clubs of America, San Francisco, 1965. See also Geoff White,

"The Student Revolt at Berkeley," *Spartacist* (organ of "the Revolutionary Tendency expelled from the Socialist Workers Party"), No. 4 (May-June 1965), pp. 12-14. "Thus they (the New Conservatives) find it necessary to attribute the cause of anti-authoritarian protest to pathology (Feuer) . . ." See James Petras and Michael Shute, "Berkeley 1965," *Partisan Review*, XXXII (Spring 1965), 315-317, 322. Also, Jane Burnett, "Multiversity Bends to Protests," *New America*, IV, No. 20 (February 8, 1965), 8. James Petras, "Berkeley and the New Conservative Backlash," *New Left Review*, No. 31 (May-June 1965), p. 62. "A professor at the university, Lewis Feuer, in an article which otherwise showed understanding of the terrible effects of the 'multiversity,' also had to explain much of the student revolt as being instigated by a collection of Maoist-beatnik-sexual libertine pseudo-students who were all looking for some synthetic revolution to make up for the emptiness which they felt in their lives." Sol Stern, "The Anti-Bureaucratic Revolt at Berkeley: A Deeper Disenchantment," *Liberation*, IX, No. 11 (February 1965), 20. An article by two academics in the throes of vicarious revolt said it was "almost delusional" to regard such a movement as a "generational uprising." "There is, for example, Professor Lewis Feuer's denial that there were any genuine issues at stake and his claim that very few genuine students were involved in the controversy. He attributes the uprising to the powers of a handful of crackpots, political extremists, drug addicts, and sexual libertines, most of them, thank God, not students at all, but spoiled personalities, tormented members of that underground Berkeley community of lumpen-intellectuals who managed to dupe thousands of innocent and true students into believing that there were real issues, thereby capturing the ever present hostility of the young against their elders and mobilizing it into a 'generational uprising.'" See Sheldon S. Wolin and John H. Schaar, "The Abuses of the University," *The New York Review of Books*, IV, No. 3 (March 11, 1965), p. 17. Similarly, the novelist Ayn Rand complained of my "Marxist-Freudian appraisal, ascribing the rebellion primarily to 'alienation' . . . and to 'generational revolt.'" See Ayn Rand, *The Cashing-in: The Student "Rebellion"* (New York, 1965), p. 10, reprinted from *The Objec-*

tivist Newsletter, July, August, September, 1965. "And (so to speak) along came Feuerysides and explained. . . . 'This is just a Generational Conflict.'" "Professor Feuer, in his article, which is perhaps the most violent, vitriolic and virulent attack on the FSM, called the FSM a 'Soviet-style coalition.'" See Draper, "FSM: Freedom Fighters or Misguided Rebels?" pp. 25, 33. A professor of sociology complained that my articles in the *New Leader* were "the most public and malicious maligning of the acts and motives of the students, which was part of the vital context of events and a part of the events themselves. . . ." See John R. Seeley, review of *The Berkeley Student Revolt*, in the *American Sociological Review*, XXXI (February 1966), 108.

86. Rosenfield, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

87. Rosenfield, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

88. Michael Golden, "The Passionate Style in the New Student Politics," *The Activist*, VI, No. 3 (May 1966), 33-36. The article began by observing that my articles had begun a new phase in the analysis of the psychology of the new politics, but then argued that I had used the notion of "generational revolt" to discredit the student movement. "Rosenfield," it said, "arrives at a different conclusion after having agreed with Feuer that 'generational revolt' is the underlying avenue of the New Radicalism."

89. Michael Lerner, *Daily Californian*, October 17, 1966.

90. When asked at one student meeting what he had required most psychologically to fight the administration, Mario Savio replied, "Balls." This simple psychology also characterized faculty supporters who were urging the student activists on. One of them, a professor of biochemistry, agitating a large student assemblage to militancy, said, for instance, "Then you (the students) will have the faculty by the testicles and I hope you squeeze." See Professor John B. Neilands, *Daily Californian*, December 6, 1966, p. 8.

91. Brian Turner, "Nine Thermidor: Thoughts of a Dry Brain in a Dry Season," *Daily Californian*, February 18, 1966.

92. Steve Weissman, "The Movement," *Daily Californian*, April 19, 1966, p. 12.

93. *Daily Californian*, January 26, 1967, p. 3.

94. "Savio Goes to Jail for '64 Sit-in-

Role," *The New York Times*, July 1, 1967.

95. The chief faculty agitator of 1964-1965, John D. Searle, said in May 1967, "The student movement isn't dead—it's just asleep and not very healthy." See the *Daily Californian*, May 15, 1967. Robert H. Cole, who helped draft the faculty resolution in 1964, said three years later: "I was a revolutionary in 1964—a faculty Young Turk. Now I'm an administrator, and I'm tired, very, very tired. We all are." Nan Robertson, "The Student Scene: Militant Anger," *The New York Times*, November 20, 1967, p. 30.

96. Benjaminson, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

97. *Daily Californian*, November 30, 1967, p. 8.

98. *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, June 15, 1968.

99. Two and a half years after the Berkeley events, the chairman of a meeting of the Canadian Association of University Student Personnel, Erik Hansen of Acadia University, said that student agitation in Canada probably had its origin "in the Berkeley confusion." See the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, June 14, 1967, p. 3. The student newspaper at the University of Toronto, for instance, referred to "Berkeley" symbolically in issue after issue. See, during a two-week period when Berkeley itself was not making news, *The Varsity*, October 26, 1966, pp. 5, 8; October 28, 1966, pp. 1, 5, 21; November 7, 1966, pp. 3, 5. "Berkeley, where it all began," noted Katherine O'Keefe, in "Accident, etc." *The Varsity*, October 6, 1967, p. 11. During a series of visits to American campuses in 1966-1967, the writer found "Berkeley" always used as a symbol of generational disorder. At the City College of New York: "At 11:30 President Gallagher appeared before the students at the sit-in, where he was . . . asked to identify who he thought 'interned at Berkeley.'" See "Sitting-In Made Simple," *Main Events*, November 14, 1966. At Michigan State University: "All the while I was at MSU, people worried about its becoming another Berkeley," said R. A. Ogar in "Nothing Serious—Just a Case of Déjà-Vu," *The Paper*, November 3, 1966. Also see Glenn Becker, "Berkeley Now," *Collegiate Press Service*, November 11, 1966. When a wave of antiwar protests took place in October 1967 *Time* magazine wrote, "The antiwar sentiment ignited the San Francisco Bay Area, tinder-

box of every antimovement of recent years. Boiling out from the University of California campus at Berkeley, aggressively nonviolent protesters—many of them non-students—descended 10,000 strong upon Oakland. . . ." See *Time* (Canadian ed.; October 27, 1967), p. 20.

100. See, for instance, *Time*, June 30, 1967, p. 32. When leftist students in Berlin threatened to "assassinate" the visiting Vice President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey, then a few weeks later cursed their country's President to his face, and when students in June exploded smoke bombs in the path of the Shah of Iran, *Time* magazine wrote, "The scenario sounded like a rerun from Berkeley, but the setting was a long-way from California. . . ." When the London School of Economics was beset by unprecedented student strikes, sit-ins, and demonstrations in March 1967, its leader was Marshall Bloom, a Berkeley alumnus of '22; "parallels with the student disturbances that periodically shake the Berkeley campus students of the University of California have been widely drawn," reported the press, as London students "turned to direct action, Berkeley style." See "U.S.-style student protests rock London School of Economics," *Toronto Globe and Mail*, March 16, 1967.

101. Paul Glusman, "The Guerrilla Training School," *Daily Californian*, April 17, 1967, p. 12.

102. "The fresh-faced new leftists on the Berkeley campus who a few years ago were so devoted to non-violence have grown increasingly grim . . . left-wing political activists—some college drop-outs and some Ph.D. candidates—inquire of their friends with forced casualness about rifle clubs and karate courses . . . it is not the easy joke it would have been a year or two ago when sensible radicals all scorned the 'guerrilla complex.'" See Marvin Garson, "Vietnam Summer No. 4: By the San Francisco Bay," *Village Voice*, August 24, 1967, p. 5.

103. Paul Hofmann, "Today's New Left, Amid Frustration and Factionalism, Turns Toward Radicalism and Direct Action," *The New York Times*, May 7, 1967.

104. Andrew Kopkind, "America's 'Blue Fascism,'" *New Statesman*, July 7, 1967, p. 4.

105. "Berkeley Stirred by 'Black Power,'" *The New York Times*, October

30, 1966. Pamela McCorduck, "Protest Rolls Off the Assembly Line," *Village Voice*, May 16, 1968, p. 7. *Berkeley Daily Gazette*, March 21, 1968.

106. Gene Roberts, "The Story of Snick: From 'Freedom High' to 'Black Power,'" *The New York Times Magazine*, September 25, 1966, p. 124.

107. Stephen Weissman, "Berkeley and Freedom," *Atlantic Monthly*, XXVIII (October 1966), p. 108; Arthur O. Lovejoy, "Academic Freedom," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York, 1930), I, 387.

108. Leslie A. Fiedler, "On Being Busted at Fifty," *New York Review of Books*, IX, No. 1 (July 13, 1967) 10.

109. "Organized Hippies Emerge on Coast," *The New York Times*, May 5, 1967; *Time* (July 7, 1967), p. 27. Telegraph Avenue, adjacent to the Berkeley campus, was the birthplace of the "hippie sub-culture." While recognizing its idealistic potential, a Berkeley professor of sociology acknowledged that it also had the seeds of "a potential youth fascism (such as in Hitler's Germany)." See Carol Matzkin, "The Hippies: A Permanent Subculture?" *Daily Californian*, May 25, 1967, pp. 1, 10.

110. Hunter S. Thompson, "The 'Hashbury' is the Capital of the Hippies," *The New York Times Magazine*, May 14, 1967, p. 29.

111. Bryan Wilson, "The Here and Now of Hippy Escapism," reprinted in *The Toronto Globe and Mail*, March 31, 1967.

112. See the discussion which followed the publication by Dwight MacDonald, "MacBird," *New York Review of Books*, VII (December 1, 1966), 12 ff. Herbert Gold notes, "The Free Speech Movement in Berkeley . . . inspired this play." See Herbert Gold, "Where the Action Is," *The New York Times Magazine*, February 19, 1967, p. 51.

113. Richard Warren Lewis, "The Scavengers," *World Journal Tribune Magazine*, January 22, 1967, p. 4.

114. "The beauty of that play is not its text but its innuendo. It had all the fascination of a wicked rumor in the midst of partial knowledge and confused information. No one in his right mind could take its premise seriously. But, as in the case of rumors, sometimes one entertains an idea simply because it is grotesque and incredible. In regard to the Kennedy-

Oswald-Warren trinity, 'MacBird' is consistent with the extravagance of contemporary history. That is why I think it is popular in America. Not as a 'new play' by a 'new author' but as another notorious development in the mind-boggling saga which the Kennedy assassination unleashed. . . . Questions of 'responsibility' are utterly irrelevant." See Charles Marowitz, "Theatre Abroad: 'MacBird' Gets the Bird," *Village Voice*, April 27, 1967, p. 24. The ethics and logic of this defense of *MacBird* were precisely those used by apologists for the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

115. "We had six bus loads and an inestimable number of private cars going," he said. "There were probably about 2,500 to 3,000 from Berkeley," said Brian O'Brien, a member of the Teaching Assistants' Union, and a charter organizer of the Campus Chapter of the American Communist party. See the *Daily Californian*, February 3, 1967, p. 2; February 14, 1967, p. 1.

116. *The New York Times*, July 23, 1967.

117. *The New York Times*, May 13, 1968.

118. Arnold Beichman, "Where Does Columbia Go From Here?" *New York Magazine* (May 27, 1968), p. 20.

119. Dotson Rader and Craig Anderson, "Rebellion at Columbia," *The New Republic*, CLVIII, No. 19 (May 11, 1968), 10.

120. *The New York Times*, May 19, 1968.

121. *The New York Times*, May 19, 1968.

122. *The New York Times*, April 24, 1968; Graduate Sociology Students Union, Columbia University, *Conflict at Columbia* (mimeographed; August 14, 1968), p. 2; "The Siege of Columbia," *Ramparts*, VI, No. 11 (June 15, 1968), 35.

123. *The New York Times*, April 25, 1968.

124. Richard Goldstein, "Insurrection at Columbia: The Groovy Revolution: Fold, Spindle, Mutilate," *Village Voice*, May 2, 1968, p. 1.

125. "Liberated Documents," *Rat Sub-*

terranean News, May 3, 1968, pp. 8 ff. *The New York Times*, May 5, 1968. Graduate Sociology Students Union, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

126. Dotson Rader, "More about Columbia," *The New Republic*, CLVIII, No. 23 (June 8, 1968), 23.

127. Goldstein, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

128. *The New York Times*, May 1, 1968.

129. Bernard Bard, "Rebels on the Campus," *The New York Post*, May 4, 1968. Graduate Sociology Students Union, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

130. *The New York Times*, May 23, 1968.

131. Max Lerner, "Agony at Columbia," *The New York Post*, May 3, 1968, p. 54.

132. Personal observation, Teachers' College, Columbia University, May 2, 1968.

133. M. A. Farber, "Brooklyn vs. Columbia," *The New York Times*, May 24, 1968, p. 33.

134. Beichman, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

135. *The New York Times*, May 9, 1968. A survey of the opinions of the student body at Columbia University showed that an overwhelming majority disapproved of the tactics of the seizure of buildings. Sixty-eight per cent of a responding sample of 1,726 students said they were against such tactics, while only 19 per cent favored them; 13 per cent were undecided. *The New York Times*, June 6, 1968. Also see Graduate Sociology Students Union, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

136. It transpired, as Arnold Beichman wrote, that the faculty and administrators "are not as well informed or politically intelligent as they thought they were." Beichman, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

137. *The New York Times*, May 12, 1968.

138. Beichman, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

139. The statistics were collected by the National Student Association. See "Student Survey Shows 38,911 Staged 221 Protests," *The New York Times*, August 27, 1968. Also see "Campus Protests Find Many Issues," *The New York Times*, January 21, 1968.

TEN

Alienation: The Marxism of Student Movements

The Revival of Ideology

When Marx and Engels were young men in 1844 and 1845, they dreamed of communities which would overcome all human alienation—alienation from other human beings, alienation from one's work. They dreamed of the moral redemption and realization of man's essence. They even began to take steps toward founding an ideal community on the pattern of the American communitarian settlements.¹ Community was the answer to alienation. Marx and Engels at this time, as young disciples of Ludwig Feuerbach's philosophy, sharing his conception of "alienation," sought to realize its vision in Utopian communist enclaves. Three years later they had already shed their youthful idealism in favor of class struggle; revolutionary violence superseded communal love as the mechanism for social change. "Alienation" vanished from their vocabulary, and, in the *Communist Manifesto*, they ridiculed its use. They wanted now to abolish exploitation, not to overcome alienation, and they postponed their total hopes of the immediate regeneration of man's nature. But concepts have their own laws of recurrence and revival. Today the concept of alienation has the same appeal for circles of student activists as it once had for the young Feuerbachians. Those who feel a comradeship in direct action for personal rights, peace, and civil rights find its language congenial, and often share the same encompassing hopes for overcoming all alienation.

"Alienation" is the answer the student activists make to the "end of ideology" standpoint which they reject as the tenet of middle-aged and middle-class post-Marxists. The latter phrase itself comes from Engels, who