

The Free University of New York:
The New Left's Self-Education and Transborder Activism

Toru Umezaki

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2013

© 2013

Toru Umezaki
All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

The Free University of New York:

The New Left's Self-Education and Transborder Activism

Toru Umezaki

This dissertation addresses the unique history of the Free University (School) of New York (FUNY), 1965-1968, in the context of the American radical movement that occurred amidst the international upheaval of national liberations. The Free University of New York was founded by young radical intellectuals who were inspired by the struggles for self-determination that were taking place in Third World countries. Radicals concerned with Third World liberation movements created the anti-Vietnam War group May 2nd Movement, from which the Free University was born. Although FUNY only existed for a short period of time, from 1965 to 1968 it functioned as a center for radical education and politics for intellectuals in leftist circles within New York and in the United States as a whole.

The uniqueness of the Free University lay in its experimental education and in its instructors' activities beyond the U.S. borders. The radical education at the Free University clearly reflected the interests of New Left intellectuals in the Sixties in America. The transborder activism of the Free University instructors included organizing an international pacifist movement against the U.S. involvement in the War in Vietnam, discussing the meaning of liberation with European intellectuals, and importing the idea of national liberation from the Third World revolutions. The FUNY

activists played a significant role in the International War Crimes (Russell-Sartre) Tribunal in Europe in 1967, which accused the U.S. of atrocities in Vietnam. They also participated in the Dialectics of Liberation Congress in London in 1967 and the Cultural Congress of Havana in 1968 to discuss the relevance of liberation and self-determination in the First and Third worlds. FUNY instructors brought these ideas back with them and built the philosophical foundation for the domestic protest activities in post-1968 America.

The activities of the Free University of New York were considered to be part of the larger New Left movement in the United States. However, the mainstream New Leftists in the United States not only rejected the “foreign” ideas of national liberation and the accusation of U.S. war crimes, but also marginalized the New York radical intellectual circle as an extremist fringe of the American left. This conflict reveals the peculiar nature of the American New Left movement in the momentum of the global sixties. Nevertheless, the Free University of New York contributed significantly to the development of the American Sixties by bridging the gap between the intellectual position of leftist activists during the Third World revolutions in the late fifties and beyond and the struggle of people of color for decolonization within the United States in the later sixties and seventies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter One “Breaking through the Cane-Curtain”: The Cuban Revolution and the Emergence of New York’s Radical Youth, 1961-1965	22
Chapter Two “It’s a Groovy Thing to Do”: The Founding of the Free University of New York	50
Chapter Three “Free U. People”: The Radical Self-Education of the American New Left	77
Chapter Four The Free University and the Vietnam War: Building a Domestic Base for the Movement	118
Chapter Five International Efforts to Stop U.S. Atrocities in Vietnam: The International War Crimes Tribunal, 1966-67	141
Chapter Six Ways for Revolution: The Discourse of Liberation and the Closing of the Free University of New York	179
Conclusion	219
Bibliography	230
Appendix	245

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Ever since I started my graduate study in U.S. history, numerous individuals, both in the United States and in Japan, have generously supported me and followed the development of my work. I owe a special debt to Eric Foner, my graduate advisor, whose careful advice and patience guided me as I completed this work. Alan Brinkeley's insightful comments directed my argument. Elizabeth Blackmar was willing to spend her time listening to me and kindly shared her wisdom. Volker Berghahn encouraged me with his comments from the perspective of international history. Ira Katznelson gave me very productive words of advice. Carol Gluck taught me how historians should think and argue about the world. Charles Tilly shared with me his deep sociological knowledge of social movements. So many scholars and friends inspired me in New York. The community of scholars at Columbia University surely nurtured my work. I would also like to acknowledge and thank the librarians of Columbia University, City College of New York, New York University, and Duke University. Also, I appreciate the staff and friends of the Fulbright Association who gave not only financial but also moral supports for my study in the United States.

I began my study of the American Sixties back in the late-1990s at Hitotsubashi University in Tokyo. I cannot overstate my gratitude to my undergraduate, graduate, and life-long mentor Daizaburo Yui whose intellectual and personal support has introduced me to the academic community in Japan. Makoto Tsujiuchi was another mentor in Tokyo who taught me how historians live sincerely in their times. Shuichiro

Yazawa is a sociologist who taught me what my “problem consciousness” should be. Satoshi Nakano’s keen sense in international history provided a significant clue for my study. Hiroshi Takayama also strongly encouraged me to go abroad when I was an undergraduate student. Professors at the Center for Pacific and American Studies at the University of Tokyo also gave me a lot of opportunities to join academic activities in Japan. I give a special thanks to Jun Furuya, Yasuo Endo, Masako Notoji, Fumiko Nishizaki, and Hiroshi Okayama. Without Yujin Yaguchi’s committed help, I would not have gotten a chance to go to New York City to study at Columbia. Kenryu Hashikawa was my senior at graduate school at Columbia and he set a great example for me. I have received the wisdom of people in such academic associations as the Japanese Society for American History, the Japanese Association for American Studies, and the Japanese Association for Contemporary Historical Studies. I have benefitted greatly from the Transborder Sixties study group organized by Daizaburo Yui. The friends who gave me welcome criticism, encouragement, and hospitality in Japan are too numerous to list. I am especially thankful to Kosuzu Abe, Katsuyuki Murata, Yumiko Nakano, Yasumasa Fujinaga, Yoshiyuki Kido, Kazuteru Omori, Koichi Kato, Masanori Nakagawa, Yoshiko Uehara, Hiroyuki Matsubara, Ichiro Miyata, Fuminori Minamikawa, Hironobu Nakamura, Walter Dawson, David Wright, Nancy Kwak, Brian Byun, Tim White, Ted Wilkinson, Moshik Temkin, Nicole Cohen, Aaron Skabulend, Dominique Reill, and Carmen Boon. Colleagues and students at Ferris University in Yokohama also provided me with friendship and the joy of teaching.

Thanks to my parents, Satoshi and Kazuko Umezaki who have patiently supported me throughout my life. Satoshi was my good intellectual companion and Kazuko was my reference for common sense. It was my deepest regret that Satoshi could not read my completed dissertation because of his sudden passing just a few months ago. Nevertheless, I have been encouraged by family members including my elder sister, Sayaka. Most of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my partner, Kazuyo Tsuchiya, a sincere and righteous historian who read my writing and always provided warm and stimulating comments, and to my son, Joe, whose humor and sound development have been the indispensable source of my inspiration.

INTRODUCTION

On a day early in the spring of 1966, approximately twenty-five students gathered in a tiny classroom arranged in a loft apartment above a café in the East Village to learn about “Marxism and American Decadence.” The instructor of the course was Allen Krebs, President of the newly established Free University of New York. A reporter from *Harper's Magazine* joined the class and reported that Krebs, in a turtleneck sweater, was “continuously reigniting his pipe, as a university president should,” as he leaned back “precariously” on a chair with his booted feet propped on a desk and lectured on the topic. After an active discussion, the class came to conclude that the United States was “a dismal place to live in unless you are awfully rich,” and that the country was “a force for evil in the world.”¹

The Free University [School] of New York (FUNY)² was founded as the nation’s first alternative educational institution of the New Left on East 14th Street, New York, in the summer of 1965. The instructors of the Free University came together from circles of radical intellectuals, bohemian artists, and political movement organizers from the neighborhoods of New York City. The organizers of FUNY

¹ Edward Grossman, “New York's Schoolhouse for the Left,” *Harper's Magazine* 232, no. 1391 (April 1966), 76.

² The Free University of New York changed its official name to the Free School of New York in order to comply with a New York State order in 1967. This was due to the fact that FUNY lacked the appropriate facility of a “university.” This dissertation uses the Free University of New York as the name because, even after this change, people still referred to the school as such.

claimed that they got the idea for the Free University from previous educational activities in the movement such as the Freedom Schools in the Southern Civil Rights Movement and the Free Speech Movement at the University of California, Berkeley. As they thought that the existing universities and colleges in the United States were dysfunctional in many ways, they established an independent space for radical politics and education. In the summer of 1965, the statement of the Free University declared:

The Free University of New York has been forged in response to the contemporary educational establishment. Its creators, a group of teachers and students in the New York metropolitan area, have been led to the conclusion that the universities and colleges of America have gone beyond the point of intellectual bankruptcy.³

The Free University considered the established schools to be oppressors of the intellectual imagination and of the revolutionary activities of American youths. Further, the education system was seen as a significant player in the larger system of American imperialism that oppressed the people of the world, especially the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The organizers established the Free University to challenge colonialism both domestically and globally. Thus, the radicalism that originated from the Free University of New York illustrates the historically significant connection between the American sixties movement and the concurrent developments abroad.

³ The Free University of New York, Catalog, Summer 1965, 1, Vertical File, Publication Relating to Free School of New York, The Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, New York University [hereafter, Tamiment Library].

The Free University of New York and the American Sixties

The historical significance of the Free University of New York can be found not only in the domestic context of the development of the American New Left movement in the 1960s, but also in the international context of the intellectual radicalism that bore the globally-constructed anti-war movement. Due to a lack of secondary materials, the Free University was not documented well in the existing accounts of the sixties. Nevertheless, this dissertation carefully examines the primary materials and explores the unique history of the Free University of New York at the crossroad of the highly interconnected national and international radicalism of the sixties in New York.

The Free University of New York was a part of the larger Free University movement of New Left in the American Sixties. In the fall of 1965, the *Students for a Democratic Society Bulletin* reported that there emerged “simultaneously” at least five free universities nationwide. The movement grew so rapidly in the subsequent years that *College Management*, a magazine for college administrators, estimated the number of such Free Universities to be 157 in early 1969.⁴ Yet, the nation-wide Free University movement was ephemeral. In 1971, the *New York Times* reported on the disappearance of Free Universities in an article entitled “Free Universities: No Grades,

⁴ *The College Management* 4, no.1 (1969), 45, quoted in Paul Lauter and Florence Howe, *The Conspiracy of the Young* (New York: Meridian Books, 1971), 80. Lauter and Howe also states that the National Student Association “claimed to know more than 300 of them” in the same period.

No Exams – And Now, No Schools.”⁵ Nevertheless, as the brevity of the Free University movement itself suggests the dramatic turn of the American sixties during the turn of the decade, the uniqueness of the New Left experiment at the Free University stands out in the history.

The Free University of New York was the leading institution of this short-lived movement due to its unique style of radicalism. At its foundation, national media, local authority, and federal politicians – liberal and conservative – paid special attention to FUNY to see what the New Left’s idea of counter-cultural experiments were like. From 1965 to 1968, hundreds of youths were attracted to the Free University’s intellectual, counter-cultural, and political atmosphere, from which various waves of the new movement emerged.

The Free University of New York was the central educational institution of the American New Left Movement, which proves that the New Left movement was undoubtedly the intellectual challenge accompanied by direct actions. The names of faculty members and their course titles at the Free University eloquently tell the rich history of radical intellectualism of the American New Left movement. The Free University of New York had more than 130 instructors who came from across the nation and the world. The founders of the school took advantage of the geographical and intellectual location of New York City, where the traditions of New and Old leftists were present. They invited renowned Marxist scholars from the older

⁵ Fred M. Hechinger, “Free Universities: No Grades, No Exams – And Now, No Schools,” *New York Times*, August 22, 1971.

generation, editors of New Left intellectual journals including the *Studies on the Left*, and celebrity Beat poets. The instructors conducted various countercultural experiments not only in poetry, but also in filmmaking, drawing, and psychiatry. Internationally famed figures also joined FUNY as faculty members, which brought the school into the web of the transatlantic leftist intellectual circle. Their critical attitude toward the conventional curriculums in established colleges and universities signifies the fact that the New Left dissent had a significant theoretical backbone, which somehow transformed the system of knowledge in the mid-twentieth century.

Another significant legacy of FUNY lies in the fact that its organizers tried to connect local activities to the larger context of the global wave of liberation movements in the post-World War II world. Not only did they protest locally and nationally; some of its members went beyond the national boundaries to see post-revolution Cuba and the battlefields of the national liberation in Vietnam. Still others crossed oceans and played significant roles in exchanging ideas with foreign radical intellectuals on such occasions as the International War Crimes Tribunals in Stockholm and Copenhagen in 1967, the Congress of Dialectics of Liberation in London in the summer of 1967, and the Cultural Congress of Havana in 1968. They brought back the internationally constructed notion of an American imperialism that oppressed the liberation of people throughout the world, and using this concept they continuously tried to build and rebuild their movement in the United States.

In the winter of 1968, the Free University of New York suddenly stopped its operations and closed its doors. Although the most direct reason for its decline

stemmed from internal conflict among the organizers, the demise of the Free University in the United States could also be seen as a signifier of the drastic transformation of activism toward the seventies, when the national or racial liberation of people of color overshadowed the personal liberations of white New Leftists. In many aspects, the Free University of New York was located in the epicenter of such watershed movements in the American as well as international sixties.

In spite of its leading roles in connecting protest activities to educational experiments, it is not easy to find an adequate place for the Free University of New York in the existing accounts of the Free University movement or those of the American sixties. This is mainly because the roots and ideology of radical activities in New York in the sixties were considered to be isolated examples among the circulating narratives of the American New Left movement. In their sympathetic analysis of the movements of the campus New Left, Lauter and Howe argued in 1971 that FUNY's distinctiveness among nation-wide Free Universities was illuminated by the following three points: first, it was not organized by students but by professors as a "separate," not "parallel," institution; second, it charged fees for courses, which meant that unlike other Free Universities, FUNY was not "free"; and finally, it was "explicitly political in nature" and Marxist in its orientation. Lauter and Howe also added that the courses offered at FUNY were "simply esoteric." In their account, the roots of the Free University movement could be traced back to the *Port Huron Statement* of the Students

for a Democratic Society (SDS) in 1962 in which “the ideal university” was “a community of controversy, within itself and in its effects on communities beyond.”⁶

Not surprisingly, this initial observation has still occupied the central position in scholarly arguments on the philosophical origin of the sixties’ free school movement in the United States. In 2002, Ron Miller has provided “the first historical” account of the Free School ideology for alternative education, in which what he calls the “holistic education” of free schools derives from the “unique context of the 1960s counterculture,” which was “essentially a rebellion against the triumph of technocracy over the ideals of democracy.”⁷ Following a general understanding of the New Left and counterculture, Miller argues that the momentum of this rebellion was formed by the age of such critics as John Holt, A. S. Neil, Paul Goodman, and C. Wright Mills. He concluded that “the humanistic psychology/human potential movement” figured prominently in the *Port Huron Statement* that preceded the Free School movement.⁸

The people gathered at the Free University of New York included liberal students and scholars, but the leading organizers considered themselves to be Marxist-oriented or Third World-inspired New Leftists. The story of those radicals has been put aside in the prevailing narrative of the American New Left Movement, which was constructed in reaction to the contemporary domestic politics in post-1968 American

⁶ Lauter and Howe, *The Conspiracy of the Young*, 79, 123. They also excluded San Francisco’s New School from their accounts of Free Universities as it was claimed that San Francisco’s New School was organized “to serve political activists” of SDS.

⁷ Ron Miller, *Free Schools, Free People: Education and Democracy after the 1960s* (Albany: State University of New York, 2002), 10.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 25.

society. By the nineties, ex-radical scholars, in many cases, veterans of the SDS, asserted that the movement had been built by American youths in the context of the authentic American tradition of civil disobedience.⁹ For instance, James Miller argued that the movement's central idea “owed little to Marxism, anarchism or the mainstream liberalism of John F. Kennedy,” but was derived from “the tradition of civic republicanism that links Aristotle to John Dewey.”¹⁰ In this scenario, the American New Left was born not from such bastions of traditional leftists as New York or San Francisco, but from Middle American soil. However, the existential humanism of the early New Left was replaced by violent, irrational turbulence in the latter half of the sixties. In Todd Gitlin's words, advocacy for Third World national liberation was a “romance with the other side” that caused the increased isolation of white liberals and an excess of militancy after 1968.¹¹ Thus, the influence of Third World struggles on American youths' political activities is directly linked to the unfortunate demise of the movement.

This view of “the good sixties” versus “the bad sixties” – before and after the year of 1968 – has been challenged by younger scholars, notably those who study African-American liberation movements. Robin D. G. Kelley accuses such a view of

⁹ See John McMillian, “‘You Didn’t Have to be There’: Revisiting the New Left Consensus,” in *The New Left Revisited*, ed. John Campbell McMillian and Paul Buhle (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 1-3.

¹⁰ James Miller, *“Democracy is in the Streets”: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), 16.

¹¹ Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1987), 210.

being a “neo-enlightenment” view blind to the radical humanist traditions and dismissive of what is typically labeled “identity politics.”¹² In “Black Like Mao,” Kelley, with Betsy Esch, opens a new horizon for understanding the impact of non-European political discourse on the movement and shifts scholarly attention to the latter half of the sixties and early seventies.¹³ In the same fashion, Cynthia Young depicts the formation of what she calls “the U.S. Third World Left” by tracing the development of African-American cultural politics and such organizations as the Black Panther Party, the Yong Lords Party, and the Third World Newsreel, which was originally born from a workshop at the Free University of New York.¹⁴ As Young argues, the term “Third World” became “a shorthand for leftists of color in the U.S. signifying their opposition to a particular economic and racial world order” at the end of the decade.¹⁵ Nevertheless, there is no legitimate reason for historians to limit their subjects to “leftists of color” when exploring the historical process in which the peculiar conditions of the American Third World movements developed.

¹² Robin D. G. Kelley, “Identity Politics and Class Struggle,” *New Politics* 6, no. 2 (1997), accessed September 3, 2012, <http://nova.wpunj.edu/newpolitics/issue22/kelley22.htm>.

¹³ Robin D. G. Kelley and Betsy Esch, “Black Like Mao: Red China and Black Revolution,” *Souls* 1, no. 4 (Fall 1999): 6-41.

¹⁴ Cynthia Ann Young, “Soul Power: Cultural Radicalism and the Formation of a US Third World Left,” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1999); Cynthia Ann Young, *Soul Power: Culture, Radicalism, and the Making of A U.S. Third World Left* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); Cynthia Ann Young, “Havana Up in Harlem: LeRoi Jones, Harold Cruse and the Making of Cultural Revolution,” *Science and Society* 65, no. 1 (Spring 2001), 12-38.

¹⁵ Young, “Soul Power,” v.

The term “Third World” was less racially confined in the United States during the early sixties. Historian Van Gosse pays special attention to revolutionary Cuba for inciting American radicalism in the sixties. In *Where the Boys Are*, Gosse “rediscovered” the “forgotten” history of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC), an organization of both white and non-white liberal journalists and intellectuals who showed their solidarity with the Cuban Revolution from 1961 to 1963. Although the FPCC included some influential figures to the newly emerging New Left movement, such as LeRoi Jones and C. Wright Mills, it was an adult organization that belonged to the late-fifties liberal intellectual circle. Gosse points out that the “quest for solidarity” was a “root impulse” of the New Left that was already seen in the activities of the FPCC.¹⁶ However, he does not provide a detailed analysis of student radicalism in relation to the Cuban Revolution, except to treat the legacy of the FPCC as the beginning of an open-ended movement that led to the activities of the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador, of which he had been a “comrade” since the late seventies. Therein lies the gap between historical accounts of the liberal activities of the FPCC and the upheaval of American radicalism in the latter half of the sixties, which clearly became pro-Third World in its rhetoric in terms of political revolution, racial liberation, and anti-imperialism.

American Radical Intellectuals and the Third World

¹⁶ Van Gosse, *Where the Boys Are: Cuba, Cold War America and the Making of a New Left* (New York: Verso, 1993), 9, 137.

This study reclaims Frederic Jameson's remark on the sixties in America: what came to be called "the Sixties" began in the Third World with "the great movement of decolonization" in the late fifties and ended when old-fashioned imperialism was replaced by the "neocolonialism" of the seventies.¹⁷ While the New Left and counterculture came much later and disappeared earlier, the American Sixties, like other First World Sixties, owed much of its imagination to the national liberation movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Before delving into the story of the Free University of New York, I would like to provide a framework for understanding how radical intellectuals in the United States had observed the emergence of the Third World since the mid-1950s. These individuals saw alternatives to their lives in America in the following three ways. First, the Third World represented, especially for African-American intellectuals, an alternative to Western colonialism. In April 1955, leaders from Asia and Africa gathered in Bandung, Indonesia, to declare the solidarity and discuss the development of newly independent nations in the Third World. Although Indonesian President Sukarno emphasized that the conference was not based on anti-Western sentiment, it was widely recognized as a dedication to the "elimination of colonialism and the 'color line.'"¹⁸ W.E.B. DuBois sent a welcoming letter to the delegates, and Richard Wright

¹⁷ Fredric Jameson, "Periodizing the 60s," *Social Text*, nos. 9-10 (1984): 180-84.

¹⁸ Penny Von Eschen, *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 169.

excitedly reported about the conference in his book, *The Color Curtain* (1956).¹⁹ These leaders and followers of the African-American liberation movements drew parallels between their racial experiences in the United States and the experiences of people in Third World countries. This view became the focal point of the liberation movements of the “people of color” in the latter half of the Sixties. By the end of sixties, radical white women, too, came to understand their relationship to men as parallel to the colonial relationship of African-Americans to whites in the United States, and that of the oppressed people in the Third World.

Second, the rise of the Third World signified an alternative to the Cold War stalemate and the political oppression derived from it. Observing the Cuban Revolution, liberal journalists and intellectuals organized the FPCC, an organization that supported the cause of the people’s revolution in Cuba, in 1960. When Kennedy invaded the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, C. Wright Mills remarked that “Kennedy and Co.” turned to “barbarism,” and declared that he would be fighting alongside Fidel Castro.²⁰ As his book *Listen Yankee* shows, Mills’ support for Cuba was derived not from a dogmatic analysis of the revolution, but from his sympathetic vision of revolutionary justice for the people.²¹

¹⁹ Richard Wright, *The Color Curtain: A Report on the Bandung Conference* (New York: World Publishing Company, 1956).

²⁰ Quoted in Arthur Schlesinger Jr., *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965), 286.

²¹ C. Wright Mills, *Listen Yankee: The Revolution in Cuba* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1960).

The comparatively small number of radicals who had connections to the CPUSA viewed the Third World as an ideological alternative to Soviet-led communism. The Progressive Labor Movement, which later backed the founding of the Free University in New York, was created by a CP organizer, Milt Rosen, who sought to go along the “Albanian line,” which broke with Soviet Russia but stood with the People’s Republic of China.²² The movement of the youths’ counter-culture in the Sixties emphasized the third aspect of the Third World liberations, which is that it presented an alternative to the American way of life. Although it is rarely referred to in existing accounts of the New Left movement, the early SDS organizers did not hesitate to show their respect for the people of the Third World for their individual aspirations and self-determination under revolutionary conditions. A section of the *Port Huron Statement* reads:

While weapons have accelerated man's opportunity for self-destruction, the counter-impulse to life and creation are superbly manifest in the revolutionary feelings of many Asian, African and Latin American peoples. Against the individual initiative and aspiration, and social sense of organicism characteristic of these upsurges, the American apathy and stalemate stand in embarrassing contrast.²³

Later in the sixties, revolutionary discourses, such as Che Guevara’s “guerrilla warfare” received popular attention as a possible substitute to the one-dimensional life in industrialized society.

²² Phillip Abbott Luce, *The New Left* (New York: D. McKay, 1966), 83-84.

²³ The Students for a Democratic Society, *The Port Huron Statement*, accessed November 20, 2010, <http://www.h-net.org/~hst306/documents/huron.html>.

These three aspects were closely intertwined to inspire activism in the sixties. Toward the end of the sixties and early seventies, too much emphasis on certain aspects led the movement to extreme positions. Yet, at the heyday of the Sixties movement, people freely discussed and argued about the Third World in order to create an alternative view of their lives in the most powerful empire of the First World.

Understanding the American Sixties in a Transnational Context

By focusing on both the domestic and international activities of the leading organizers of the Free University of New York, this dissertation reexamines the global significance of the history of the American Sixties. Recent scholarship has started situating the history of the United States in the larger context of regional or world history.²⁴ The topic of “the Sixties” is one example in which more and more historians around the world have found transnational synchronicity and interconnectedness between local movements in various countries and regions. Although sociologists such as Immanuel Wallerstein had emphasized the global aspects of the decade’s movements in the wider context of world history much earlier,²⁵ it was not until recently that historians started to expand the study of the domestic protests in the United States to encompass their foreign counterparts. This new international history

²⁴ See, for example, *Thomas Bender, Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Thomas Bender, *A Nation among Nations: America’s Place in World History* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006); Ian Tyrrell, *Transnational Nation: United States History in Global Perspective since 1789* (New York: Palgrave, 2007).

²⁵ See, Immanuel Wallerstein, Giovanni Arrighi and Terence K. Hopkins, *Antisystemic Movements* (New York: Verso, 1989).

of the Sixties was initiated by Jeremi Suri's *Power and Protest*, in which he used a comparative analysis of the United States, West Germany, France, the Soviet Union, and China to argue that policymaking with respect to détente was a conservative reaction of international leaders to domestic unrest in the sixties.²⁶ Jeremy Varon's comparative study on the Weather Underground in the United States and the Red Army Faction in West Germany is another good case study that explores the synchronicity and unique national contexts of these events.²⁷ Most recently, German historian Martin Klimke investigated the more intricate interconnectedness between German student movements and the American New Left movement. Klimke carefully looked into both the American SDS and the West German SDS (Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund) to illustrate how the "other" Cold War alliance—in the sense that it was not a governmental partnership between the United States and West Germany but was composed of rebellious students in these countries—shaped a similar countercultural political atmosphere in each country.²⁸

²⁶ Jeremi Suri, *Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

²⁷ Jeremy Varon, *Bringing the War Home: The Weather Underground, the Red Army Faction, and Revolutionary Violence in the Sixties and Seventies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

²⁸ Martin Klimke, *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010). Scholarly interests in the "global sixties" have produced new narratives of the sixties in many languages. For example, *Nobert Frei, 1968: Jugenderebolte und Globaler Protest* (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2008); Daizaburō Yui., ed. *Ekkyō suru 1960 nendai: Beikoku, Nihon, Seiō no Kokusai Hikaku* [*The Transborder Sixties: The USA, Japan, and Europe*] (Tokyo: Sairyusha, 2012) [in Japanese].

The aim of this dissertation is to contribute to the ongoing project of internationalizing the American sixties in a different way. Rather than selecting foreign organizations or activists for the purpose of comparison, it explores the activities and imaginations of American radical agents who transcended the U.S. border physically as well as philosophically. The Free University of New York was built in the international conditions of the age of three worlds, and its legacy was to connect the idea of colonial liberation in the world to the U.S. radicalism of the sixties. The people who gathered at FUNY were very sensitive to the conditions of Third World people and members of oppressed groups within the United States. They found an array of parallels between the colonial role of the U.S. in the world and the exploitative relationships within U.S. society, and when they felt revolutionary guilt as white middle class youths who enjoyed the affluence of the empire, they were forced to make a very tough decision concerning what the revolution ought to be. In this sense, the Third World repertoire used in the American Sixties was not a foreign or external force in the changes in indigenous radicalism. American radicals received the internationally constructed notion of the liberation movement and tried to apply it to the context of domestic radicalism.²⁹ Thus, the Third World was a significant

²⁹ The concept of diffusion of movement repertoire in historical sociology is extremely useful here. A movement's repertoire is a set of forms of claim making that people use in actual political situations. The reception of the Third World repertoire in the United States was both direct and indirect, and adopters translated strategies and ideas of foreign movements to make them compatible with American political culture. In this process of translation, many of the original aspects were, intentionally or uncritically, lost and the repertoire acquired new meanings. See, for example, Sean Chabot, *Transnational Roots of the Civil Rights Movement: African American Explorations of the Gandhian Repertoire* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2012).

ingredient in shaping the American sixties from the beginning, and the American sixties were surely embedded in the context of the international sixties.

Outline

Because this dissertation aims to illuminate both the domestic and international interconnectedness of American radicalism in the 1960s, it does not provide a conventional institutional history of the Free University of New York: rather, it explores the process through which a circle of Third World-inspired intellectuals in New York was formed in the early sixties and developed an international radicalism by utilizing the intellectual network formed around FUNY. In this process, the Free University of New York functioned as a loosely organized house for such radical intellectuals who devoted themselves to building a trans-border coalition against U.S. imperialism. Thus, the demise of FUNY in 1968 can also be seen as evidence of the transforming protest movement in post-1968 America and the post-1968 world.

The chapters begin with the origin of American Third Worldism among the newly emerging young leftists in the early sixties in New York. The Free University of New York had its roots in the activities of radical youths who organized a students' visit to revolutionary Cuba in 1963 and 1964 and started the anti-Vietnam War May 2nd Movement (M2M) in New York as early as 1964. Many of the leading members at FUNY, including President Allen Krebs, were veterans of the Cuba trips and protesters affiliated with M2M. This chapter investigates how the internationally-oriented group of the U.S. New Left was born in New York in the early part of the

sixties and prepared a philosophical foundation for the further activities of radical education and politics at FUNY after 1965.

The second chapter traces the process of the founding of the Free University of New York in 1965. Radical intellectuals and students in the circles of the M2M conceived of the Free University and created it through their protest activities on campus and through the radical discussions among young intellectuals in the streets. Thus, the Free University of New York was established as a significant and unique institution of radical education and politics that grew to attract the public's attention.

Next, the third chapter goes into the intellectual radicalism of the FUNY instructors by carefully reading its course catalogues from 1965 to 1968. The college instructors and students from the M2M successfully brought together a variety of radical leftist intellectuals in the Free University of New York. The chapter shows how more than one-hundred leftist intellectuals came together to challenge the conventional system of knowledge and what they sought through their experiments at FUNY. The stories of FUNY instructors reveal that the Free University occupied a prominent position in the New Left's intellectual enterprise in the United States.

The next two chapters deal with the Free University instructors' and students' protest activities against the War in Vietnam, at home and abroad. The third chapter discusses the way in which the confrontation with conservatives and liberals in the United States thrust Free University activists towards the ideological margin of the American New Left in the period from 1965 to 1967. The next chapter argues that, in spite of the organization's domestic status, some of the Free University organizers

played important roles in organizing the International War Crimes Tribunal, or Russell-Sartre Tribunal, in Europe in 1967, thus contributing to the single most significant international effort by the radical intellectuals of the world to stop the U.S. atrocities in Vietnam. The Tribunal reflected not only the internationally constructed idea of the self-determination of people, but also the international focus of the FUNY leaders. In examining this international effort against U.S. atrocities in Vietnam, this chapter also reveals the negative reactions of American citizens and mainstream American New Leftists toward the War Crimes Tribunal to demonstrate the peculiar nature of the American Sixties.

The FUNY leaders sought the expansion of their activities overseas, but their international focus drew their energy away from the Free University and finally contributed to its organizational demise. The closing chapter refers to two other international gatherings of leftists, the Dialectics of Liberation Congress in London in 1967 and the Cultural Congress in Havana, Cuba, to analyze how the international discourse of national liberation was discussed and adopted by participants from the United States and those from other countries. The chapter then discusses the causes of FUNY's organizational disintegration and follows the paths of some of the leading organizers of the Free University after the school's dissolution to show what the turn of the movement around 1968 meant in the context of the domestic as well as global sixties. Throughout this dissertation, I present the trajectory of New York radical youths who sought simultaneously the liberations of themselves and that of all oppressed people in the world, including those in the United States.

About the Sources

This dissertation depends, for the most part, on archival materials regarding the relevant figures and organizations for its evidence. The collections of the Free University of New York at New York University's Tamiment Library and the Papers of Will Inman, Vice President of FUNY, at the David M. Rubenstein Rare Books and Manuscript Library of Duke University are the two main sources of primary materials. In addition to these, flyers and pamphlets from the movement gathered by conservatives who watched "subversive activities" among young leftists in the United States also provide a variety of valuable materials. One such collection is the J. B. Matthews Papers at Duke University. Matthews was a former Director of Research for the House Committee on Un-American Activities who continued his research in the field of anti-communism, and had his eye on the Free University of New York since its foundation. Deceptively using the name of a student from St. John's College, Matthews gathered pamphlets, catalogs, and flyers produced by radical organizations, including the M2M and FUNY, as well as news coverage and FBI reports.³⁰ The collection of materials indicates that FUNY members' "subversive" activities were placed under observation because FUNY was seen as the first "counter university" that

³⁰ J. B. Matthews Papers, 1862-1986 and undated, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University [hereafter J.B. Matthews Papers]. Matthews joined leftist organizations in the thirties and turned his political orientation to the conservatism. For his bibliography, see Bibliographical Note of Inventory of the J. B. Matthews Papers, 1862-1986, Duke University, accessed September 11, 2009, <http://library.duke.edu/digitalcollections/rbmscl/matthews/inv/>.

served as a stronghold for the anti-war movement.³¹ Similarly, the reports of the House Un-American Activities hearings provided extremely useful accounts that describe subpoenaed activists and their activities. However, the purpose of collecting this information must be carefully considered. In terms of bias, these accounts cannot be disentangled from the political conditions in which the ex-radicals talked about their movement in interviews and in their memoirs. However, it is also true that more and more memoirs of the Sixties have been published in recent years, providing vivid pictures of the decade from a more current perspective. Thus, this dissertation makes arguments about the rise and fall of the Free University of New York with careful use of primary texts written in those days and afterwards.

³¹ See, for example, "Counter Universities," January 1966, Box 228, Folder 13, J.B. Matthews Papers. On the cover of this double spaced type written document, there was a handwritten memo, which reads, "FBI Report."

CHAPTER ONE

“Breaking through the Cane-Curtain”: The Cuban Revolution and the Emergence of New York’s Radical Youth, 1961-1965

The year was 1963. On Independence Day, only about nine months after the Cuban Missile Crisis, Premier Fidel Castro, outfitted in his signature green beret and combat jacket, defeated four American students at table tennis on Veradero Beach in Cuba. Reuters reported that it was a “surprise visit” by Castro to fifty-nine American students who were visiting the island despite the U.S. State Department’s travel regulations.¹ The trips, organized by the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba (SCTC) in 1963 and 1964, were groundbreaking events in the development of student radicalism during the sixties. The U.S. government and the media of the time paid special attention to those students by regarding their activities as the mark of an emerging New Left wing in the U.S.

The activities of the SCTC were organized as a publicity campaign of the Progressive Labor Movement (PLM) in New York City, which was a Maoist group that had split from the Communist Party USA (CPUSA) in the beginning of the sixties. This split not only reflected the international change of Communist leadership but also symbolized the generational shift of American radicalism from the Old Left to the New. The city of New York served as a hotbed for intellectual, cultural, and political interactions that spurred this transformation and enabled the SCTC to send students to revolutionary Cuba. Cuba was a window to the Third World from which radical

¹ “Castro Beasts U.S. Students at Pingpong,” *Chicago Tribune*, July 4, 1963.

youths absorbed the rhetoric of anti-imperialism and national liberation. When it was incorporated into the American tradition of civil disobedience, the course was set for political developments on the streets in the latter half of the sixties.

Nevertheless, the movements of Third World-inspired New Leftists, including the PLM and the SCTC, have largely been neglected in the SDS-centered New Left narratives. This chapter shows that it was not the early SDSers in the Midwest but members of the PLM and the SCTC in New York who inherited the yearning for the Third World of post-WWII intellectuals, as well as the ideas of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee (FPCC), which provided students with an anti-war political platform in addition to racial liberation movements in mid-Sixties America.

With the success of its Cuba trips and anti-War mobilization in 1964 the PLM transformed itself into a Party (PLP) with a tight organizational structure. Thereafter, as political commentator Paul Berman points out, the PLP became “the antithesis of every rebellious instinct of the SDS.”² This rivalry is a root cause of the lack of historical accounts covering the early PLP and its activities. Recently, historian Leigh David Benin investigated the PLP’s garment worker organizing effort in New York, which occurred in the late sixties. In many ways, his work provides an extremely valuable counter-narrative to the SDS-centered history of the American sixties, but the

² Paul Berman, *A Tale of Two Utopias: The Political Journey of the Generation of 1968* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996), 84.

activities of the SCTC were only mentioned as prehistory for the PLP's main activities of labor organization.³

The core members of the PLM believed they were following a Maoist style of revolution; however, the majority of students and intellectuals who joined the SCTC were far from militant. Yet they were still very sensitive to the self-determination of oppressed peoples, including blacks in the South and farmers in Vietnam. These were the student radicals who came to understand the structure of oppression and projected it in protest movements by using a Third World lexicon. This chapter reveals the process by which American youths imported and translated the idea of anti-imperialism and national liberation to forge a rhetoric of dissent that launched an era of mass mobilization.

“Breaking through the Cane-Curtain”: The Student Trip to Cuba in 1963

On June 26, 1963, American students, who had left New York's Idlewild International Airport for Europe en route to Cuba the day before, issued a statement to the American press. It declared that students and recent college graduates across the nation from institutions including Columbia University, New York University, the City College of New York, Harvard University, Wesleyan College, the University of Indiana, the University of Michigan, the University of North Carolina, the University

³ Leigh David Benin, “A Red Thread in Garment: Progressive Labor and New York City's Industrial Heartland in the 1960s and 1970s,” (PhD diss., New York University, 1997); Leigh David Benin, *The New Labor Radicalism and New York City's Garment Industry: Progressive Labor Insurgents in the 1960s* (New York: Garland Books, 2000).

of California, San Francisco State College, and Oakland City College, had accepted an invitation from the Cuban Federation of Universities for an all-expense paid trip to “see and evaluate Cuba for themselves.” It also noted that they expected to meet Castro and Robert Williams, an African-American exile in Havana, all the while emphasizing the “non-political” nature of the trip. Then it referred to the State Department’s travel regulation that prohibited unauthorized trips to Cuba and claimed that “freedom to travel was a basic American right.”⁴ The regulation forced the students to spend five days flying from New York through London, then on to Paris, Prague, Ireland, Newfoundland, and finally Cuba, an island that was only ninety-miles away from Florida. In another statement issued in Prague, members of the group declared, “We intend to break through the Cane-Curtain imposed by our State Department to limit travel to Cuba. A free, democratic society need have no fear from the truth.”⁵

This regulation, which was referred to as “the travel ban,” was issued in December 1960 in the form of a State Department notice to the press, based on Section 215 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Because it was issued and enacted along with the inauguration of a new president, the ban symbolized John F. Kennedy’s stark policy of non-tolerance toward the Cuban Revolution. Since its

⁴ *Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 3, September 12 and 13, 1963, Hearings Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representative, 88th Congress 1st sess. (1963)* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1965), 674.

⁵ Luce, *New Left*, 69.

enactment, only journalists and government officials were authorized to visit Cuba.⁶

The State Department occasionally warned that students who were “willfully and knowingly disobeying the law” would be punished with a five thousand dollar fine or a sentence of five years imprisonment.⁷ Yet, in the face of this open defiance of the ban, an officer generously commented that the State Department hoped the students would have an opportunity for “frank exchange with Cuban students.”⁸

The members of the group consisted of men and women mostly in their twenties, including African-Americans, Asian-Americans, and Puerto Ricans. As they claimed that they were not the “tools of any ideological bloc” nor were they “even in ideological agreement” among themselves, the majority of them did not belong to any particular political organizations.⁹ Phillip Abbott Luce, a spokesperson for the group, later recalled that most participants were “independent leftists” who were even

⁶ There were only a few individuals who defied the ban before the students’ trip. Rose S. Rosenberg, a 57-year-old lawyer in Los Angeles, traveled to Cuba by way of Mexico in April 1961 and was called before HUAC on July 1 and 2, 1963, while the students were visiting Cuba. Gene Blake, “Cuba Travel Probe in Stormy Session,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 2, 1963; *Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 2, July 1 and 2, 1963, Hearings Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representative*, 88th Congress, 1st sess. (1963) (Washington, DC: GPO, 1965).

⁷ “Passports to Be Withdrawn,” *New York Times*, July 2, 1963.

⁸ “Trips to Cuba Probed by House Group,” *Chicago Tribune*, July 5, 1965.

⁹ “59 U.S. Students Start a Visit to Cuba, Defying Washington,” *New York Times*, July 1, 1963.

ignorant of “the underlying reasons for the trip and the identity of the real organizers.”¹⁰

Some students were obviously disappointed by what they saw in Cuba. Among them, Clinton M. Jenkins, a twenty-year-old student from Louisiana, said to a reporter on his return in Madrid on August 27, “I don’t know how they lived before in Cuba, but I am sure the people of Cuba never lived worse than they do now,” after which he shaved the beard that he had grown in imitation of Castro.¹¹ Yet the majority of the students had a positive impression of the Cuban Revolution. Jose Maria Lima, a Puerto Rican student from UC Berkeley, said that nearly all the students realized that “everything which the North American newspapers say about the Cuban Revolution is false and distorted.”¹² Due to the difficulties of arranging a return flight home, their stay in Cuba lasted two months. Nevertheless, the Cuban government loyally hosted the travelers by planning visits to hospitals, factories, schools, and universities to talk with people and revolutionary leaders, including Castro and Che Guevara.

An unfortunate accident during the trip caused these students to become even more critical of the U.S. government. On July 15, Hector Warren Hill, a twenty-nine-year-old black artist studying at the Brooklyn Museum, accidentally drowned in the pool of the Versailles Motel in Santiago. In Luce’s words, Hill joined the trip:

¹⁰ Luce, *New Left*, 69.

¹¹ “Castro is Hailed by U.S. Students,” *New York Times*, August 28, 1963.

¹² “3 American Students Praise Castro Regime,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 2, 1963.

not because he was a Communist, but because he wanted to see what was happening to the children of Cuba... He wanted to carry their essence back to his children in the U.S.A. and show them that Cuban children were really not much different from us.¹³

While American newspapers reported that the Cuban government rejected a generous American plan to transport his body back to the U.S., the students learned that it was the American government that had turned down a Cuban offer and forced the Cuban Red Cross plane to land in a military base in Florida. They were further irritated by the fact that U.S. officials refused to release the casket and ship it to New York immediately. Black journalists raised the needed money and a Catholic priest named Flex McGowan persuaded the military to transport the remains to New York.¹⁴ The American officials' "callous" behavior toward a fellow American citizen in this affair only added to the travelers' anti-U.S. government sentiments.¹⁵

Due to the controversial nature of the State Department's travel regulation and the adventurous activities of the youth, American newspapers reported on the groups' trip to Cuba almost every day and some even supported the students' claim that American citizens have the right to free travel. For instance, the *New York Times* initially commented in an editorial that, although the students were "wrong" to break

¹³ Luce, *New Left*, 76-77.

¹⁴ McGowan's support derived from his missionary experience in Bolivia where he observed serious poverty and lack of medical attention. He consistently backed the students when they were under congressional investigation. "Catholic Priest Backs Students Who Visited Cuba," *New York Times*, September 14, 1963.

¹⁵ "Cuba Bars Red Cross Plane to Return Dead U.S. Youth," *New York Times*, July 17, 1963; "Drowned Man's Body Flown, Cuba to U.S.," *Washington Post*, July 18, 1963.

the State Department regulation, the ban itself would “make for even more dangerous anti-American propaganda and also put a romantic flavor on the idea of going to Cuba.” It also urged readers to “trust intelligent adults” to realize that the Cuban Revolution was “mostly bad” and ironically concluded with Kennedy’s remarks in Berlin on June 26: “freedom has many difficulties and democracy is not perfect, but we have never had to put a wall to keep our people in, to prevent them from leaving us.”¹⁶ Yet the *Los Angeles Times* was explicitly critical of the students, calling them “gullible” and saying they were “recruited as tools to [be] used by Red propaganda agents.”¹⁷ Thus the question of citizenship and basic rights of travel tended to be easily reduced to a Cold War dichotomy which unequivocally portrayed those who showed their sympathy to the other side as Communist enemies.

Confrontations with Conservatives

The U.S. Congress and the administration immediately assumed a simple but forceful conservative stance. As early as July 4, Edwin E. Willis, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and Rep. William C. Cramer named the Student Committee on Travel to Cuba as the organization responsible for the trip and identified it as an offshoot of a Communist front group. Cramer criticized the Kennedy administration’s “milk-toast position” on Cuba and attacked the “fuzzy headed

¹⁶ “The Students in Cuba,” *New York Times*, July 2, 1963. The *Washington Post* followed this line in an editorial entitled “The Cuban Wall” on the next day. *Washington Post*, July 3, 1963.

¹⁷ “They’re Not Martyrs, Just Gullible,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 3, 1963.

misconception” of the State Department.¹⁸ President Kennedy responded at a press conference held on August 1, claiming that some students who visited Cuba might be “just young men and women who were interested in broadening their horizons,” but they needed to be more concerned about “the security and foreign policy objectives” of the U.S. He noted that their passports would be revoked and that further steps would be considered regarding some members of the leadership who seemed, according to the President, to be “definitely Communist.”¹⁹ Now that the President had taken a tough stance on the travelers’ actions, HUAC displayed no hesitation in calling those “Communist” leaders to public hearings. Upon their arrival at Idlewild Airport, ten students, including Luce, were served subpoenas to appear before the committee in Washington on September 12 and 13, 1963.

The purpose of the hearings was to investigate whether the U.S. needed to consider further legislation in tightening the State Department’s regulation banning travel to Cuba. But the real aim was to prove that these leaders were Communists and that anti-American activities by the Cuban government had penetrated U.S. society. With the help of an informant in the travel group, the committee identified twelve members of the Progressive Labor Movement in New York as ringleaders. For many of the participants and supporters, the hearing was their first confrontation with conservatives at the national level, an experience which led them to identify themselves as a new radical leftist force. The hearings became a turbulent affair during

¹⁸ “Trips to Cuba Probed by House Group,” *Chicago Tribune*, July 5, 1965.

¹⁹ “Transcript of the President’s News Conference on Foreign and Domestic Matters,” *New York Times*, August 2, 1963.

which police forcefully ejected thirty-one supporters of the trip. Most of them were students who conducted sit-ins outside the hearing room demanding seats inside, while fifteen American Nazi party members were granted front row seats. Some screamed, “Fascists!” and “racists!” and were subsequently handcuffed and ironically relocated to the pressroom. In the caucus room, about three hundred people in the audience stood on chairs to observe the hearings.²⁰ This atmosphere was reminiscent of “Black Friday” in San Francisco on May 13, 1960, which constituted the first massive confrontation between citizens and HUAC.

The students who appeared before the committee refused to answer questions regarding other members by appealing to their rights under the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution, but they did proceed to eloquently tell their own stories, evoking traditional American values. Levi Lee Laub, a 24-year-old student at Columbia College, was a leader and recruiter of the SCTC. Laub joined the PLM right after the Cuban Missile Crisis and founded a study group named the Progressive Labor Club at Columbia. Then he started a nationwide recruitment for the trip. The *Golden Gater*, a student newspaper at San Francisco State College, reported on May 3, 1963 that he “spoke to a jammed classroom” about the one-month trip to Cuba.²¹ At the hearings, Laub claimed that he had been participating in a demonstration against the

²⁰ “Hecklers Battle Police at House Inquiry on Cuba Visit,” *New York Times*, September 13, 1963; “16 More Ejected at House Hearing on Travel to Cuba,” *New York Times*, September 14, 1963.

²¹ “Summer Cuba Trip Costs \$100: Not in Travel Folders,” *Golden Gater*, May 3, 1962, reprinted in *Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 3*, 718.

“ridiculous” state regulations “in a very old American tradition of civil disobedience.”²² On the next day, Phillip Luce insisted that his understanding was that the State Department travel ban was a “public notice, not a law” and asserted, “If there was a law, which there is not, I believe along with Thoreau, Emerson, and other people throughout American history that certain rules and regulations must be broken.”²³ The evocation of tradition was thus an effective tactic for these student actors in contextualizing their movement within a national narrative.

The students also connected their activities to the Civil Rights movement in the South. Catherine Jo Prenskey, a student at the City College of New York, explained why she joined the PLM: “Socialism is the way to end racism, and under socialism we could have Congressmen and Representatives that are truly representative of the people.”²⁴ Wendie Suzuko Nakashima, a 23-year-old CCNY student, was very conscious of her own ethnic background, which was a source of her political awareness. Asked her birthplace, Nakashima replied that she did not know the exact location in California because she was “thrown into these concentration camps” with her parents and “the rest of the yellow people and the Japanese people.” Then she criticized the U.S. policy in Vietnam by showing her strong identification with “my people in Asia.”²⁵

²² *Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 3*, 718-35.

²³ *Ibid.*, 755-66.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 779.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 761, 767.

The fire of confrontation between the travelers and conservative politicians soon ignited activism on the streets of New York. On September 15, 1963 the SCTC organized a rally at the Town Hall on West 43rd Street. Cuban exiles called for a demonstration against the rally, where more than one hundred policemen wearing steel helmets controlled a crowd of approximately 3,000 anti-Castro demonstrators and 1,400 supporters of the student trip to Cuba. When the SCTC members ejected some thirty anti-Castro sympathizers from the Hall, there were skirmishes in which a few members of the Anti-Castro Cuban Student Directorate were injured.²⁶ Facing the hostility of conservatives and the anti-Castro groups, the Cuba travelers and supporters came to understand that they were a group of new radical agents for social change. Yet even though the SCTC presented their trip as a traditional display of civil disobedience, these radicals came to be labeled as Communists because of the existence of their supporting organization, the PLM.

The Emergence of a New “Communist” American Left Wing

A series of incidents on Capitol Hill and in Manhattan stirred further curiosity about the identity of the “real organizers” of the trip. On September 14, 1963, the *New York Times* ran an interview article about the leadership of the PLM titled, “A New Left Wing Emerging in the U.S.” Although the Students for Democratic Society (SDS) had already been founded in June 1962 at Port Huron, Michigan, its image of liberal social reform with the idea of participatory democracy did not yet constitute the

²⁶ “Anti-Castro Crowds Disrupt Times Sq.,” *New York Times*, September 16, 1963.

definition of American New Left. The article reported that the Progressive Labor Movement, whose views “parallel many of those of the Chinese Communists,” had more than 1,000 members including a few hundred blacks and 6,500 readers for its monthly *Progressive Labor*, published since January of 1962.²⁷ What appeared to be a New Left to the public eye was a product of the changing currents in the American and international political arenas.

The international schism in the Communist world, which originated with the denunciation of Stalin by Khrushchev at the 20th Party Congress in 1956, intensified around 1960 and resulted in transfers of power between generations of Communists across the globe. American Communists were no exception in that a new political wing split off from the CPUSA. The party was already weary after the era of McCarthyism and had turned itself into a “defense organization.” Younger generations of Marxists-Leninists had come to complain that the CPUSA followed mainstream politics by embracing the idea of class collaboration for social reform and “peaceful coexistence” in the world. In 1959, after their defeat in a CPUSA committee member election, Milt Rosen, a forty-year-old labor leader of the CPUSA, and Mort Sheer, a forty-year-old CP organizer in Buffalo, New York, created a faction that sought to be identical to the “Albanian line.” At the time of the Sino-Soviet split in the late fifties, Albania, a small Communist country in Europe, broke with Soviet Russia and stood with the People’s Republic of China. When Rosen and others were expelled from the

²⁷ Peter Kihss, “A New Left Wing Emerging in the U.S.,” *New York Times*, September 14, 1963.

CPUSA in 1961, they suddenly found similar Communist defectors in the Western world, including Belgium, New Zealand, France, Italy, Australia, England, and Canada.²⁸

In June of 1962, the PLM held its first nationwide conference with “more than 50 delegates from Progressive Labor groups in 11 cities” at the Hotel Diplomat in New York. Milt Rosen declared that “The new world relationship of forces, favoring socialism, national and colonial liberation, and peace, has not fundamentally altered the basic characteristics of U.S. imperialism.” But they decided that they would “not be stamped into the party stage” until they achieved “three fundamental prerequisites,” including the development of a revolutionary program, the organizing of new forces with public acknowledgement, and the development of leaders “capable of guiding all aspects of political development.”²⁹ The delegates elected Rosen chairman and Scheer vice-chairman. In September they promoted the first action program that was to rebuild the national labor movement on the basis of “a Negro-Labor Alliance” with the unity of the unemployed “6,000,000” and indigent “77,000,000” workers.³⁰

The ideological position of the PLM was outlined in its pamphlet, *Road to Revolution*. The PLM leadership repeatedly criticized the CPUSA’s revisionism, which it denounced as “an evolutionary path to socialism” based upon “American exceptionalism,” a concept which qualified that the development of capitalism in the

²⁸ Luce, *New Left*, 83-84.

²⁹ “PL Conference,” *Progressive Labor* 1, no. 7 (July-August 1962), 5.

³⁰ “PL Trade Union Program: Part I,” *Progressive Labor* 1, no. 8 (September 1962), 3-10.

U.S. was unique enough to reject revolutionary change.³¹ The CPUSA was “a hopeless apologist for imperialism” because it abandoned “the central theory of Leninism,” stated as “the continuous revolutionary process” and was engaged in Khrushchev’s “peaceful co-existence” that had led to the cruel treatment of the people of Hungary, Albania, and Cuba since the late fifties.³²

The PLM leaders instead turned to the Chinese Communist Party as a leader of Marxist international revolutionary struggle. Philip Luce later ridiculed the PLM’s blunt advocacy of Maoism and cynically called the group “White Chinese.”³³ Praising the role that the Chinese government had played in Third World politics since the Bandung Conference in 1955, the PLM frequently quoted remarks and statements made by the Chinese government and echoed its argument on colonial struggles, declaring that:

the anti-imperialist struggle of the people of Asia and Latin America is definitely not merely a matter of regional significance, but one of overall importance for the whole cause of proletarian world revolution.³⁴

The PLM saw the black liberation movement at home as part of a global Third World struggle against U.S. imperialism. It pointed out that the movements initiated by the

³¹ The Progressive Labor Movement (PLM), *Road to Revolution: The Outlook of the Progressive Labor Movement* (New York, 1964), Tamiment Library, 10-11. The pamphlet is a collection of articles that appeared in PL’s *Marxist-Leninist Quarterly* from 1962 to 1964.

³² *Ibid.*, 31, 63-86.

³³ Luce, *New Left*, 85-86.

³⁴ The PLM, *Road to Revolution*, 101.

Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee in the South and the Freedom Now movement in the North called forth a new stage that began questioning the two-party system and reevaluated non-violent tactics in favor of “armed-self defense.” Yet the PLM’s position was very clear that those movements should be treated as class struggles. In this regard, they were puzzled about the emergence of the Black Muslims’ principle of separatism, even though it had “developed the idea of Negro identity and dignity” and could be favorably compared to the Chinese Revolution. The PLM claimed that the Cuban Revolution was successful because it was “led by Negro and white” and insisted that the Chinese people were advocates of “the unity of all oppressed peoples regardless of color as the means to destroy imperialism internationally.”³⁵

Nevertheless, the PLM was an organization less for theoretical analysis than for militant revolutionary actions. In early 1963, some members went to Kentucky to start organizing local coal miners, which was unsuccessful because their idea of armed struggle was too militant for those workers. On the other hand, an effective campaign was carried out in the urban setting of New York City beginning in the summer of 1963. The PLM launched a campaign for the candidacy of Bill Epton for city councilman as their “first step in the long march to political power.” Epton was a thirty-one-year-old electrical worker and former shop chairman of Local 431 of the

³⁵ Ibid., 35-45. The PLM was rather supportive to Black Muslims led by Malcolm X, minister of Mosque 7 in Harlem, as long as they opposed the “forms of gradualism and tokenism” of the existing Civil Rights organizations and attacked the federal government for racism and cold war policies. Mort Scheer, “Negro Freedom: A Comment,” *Progressive Labor* 2, no. 4 (April 1963), 10-12.

International Union of Electrical Workers.³⁶ He opened a new office on Lenox Avenue and 127th Street in Harlem and started organizing the residents. Although Epton could not get enough signatures to become a candidate, he established his leadership in the area by promoting rent strikes for poor residents, especially Puerto Ricans, most of whom were not registered voters.³⁷

The students' trip to Cuba was another effective way for the PLM to get considerable publicity for the organization. In the fall of 1962, Fred Jerome, who had spent months in Cuba in 1960 as a member of a CP youth front called Advance, approached the Cubans and started planning a trip for December 1962, with funding from the Cuban government. The PLM immediately set up a coordinating committee with Levi Laub as their public leader. The originally scheduled December trip was postponed because the Canadian government would not allow a Cuban plane to land at one of its airports. In the spring of 1963, Philip Luce, an editor of *Rights*, the magazine of the Emergency Civil Liberties Union, joined this Communist New Left circle. Laub approached Luce and told him that LeRoi Jones would explain the proposed trip to him. Luce was struck with the "brashness and boldness of the idea." Since the Revolution, he considered himself a "Fidelista," and was "chock-full of romantic

³⁶ "Epton Challenges All Big Business Parties to Debate on Freedom," *Progressive Labor* 2, nos. 7-8 (July-August 1963), 1-2.

³⁷ Epton collected 6,500 signatures, among which only 3,000 were those of registered voters. Bill Epton, "PL Election Campaign: An Analysis," *Progressive Labor* 2, no. 12 (December 1963), 15. The Columbia chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality played a significant role in the strike. Martin Cooper, "Columbia CORE Promotes Rent Strike in East Harlem," *Columbia Spectator*, March 4, 1964.

images about the country and the Revolution,” even though he did not share the ideological path of communist development.³⁸

The ideas of “Yankee Fidelista” and “fair play” were clearly elaborated in a telegram that C. Wright Mills wired to the 22 April 1961 Fair Play for Cuba Committee rally protesting the Bay of Pigs invasion by the U.S. military force. The telegram read:

Kennedy and Company have returned us to Barbarism. Schlesinger and Company have disgraced us intellectually and morally. I feel a desperate shame for my country. ... I would at this moment be fighting alongside Fidel Castro.³⁹

Mills’ support for Cuba was derived from a sympathetic perception of the justice the Revolution brought to the people. The FPCC was established in 1960 to represent such humanitarian liberals who challenged what William Appleman Williams later called “empire as a way of life.”⁴⁰ Before the State Department issued the travel ban, the FPCC sent hundreds of American citizens to the island. For LeRoi Jones, a Beat poet living in Greenwich Village, travel to the revolutionary site had a profound influence on his life. Cynthia Young argues that Jones came to identify himself with both a “real” and “imagined” Third World and with a “belief in the central importance of

³⁸ Luce, *New Left*, 65.

³⁹ Schlesinger himself reprinted it in *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House*, Arthur Schlesinger Jr. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965), 286. Schlesinger wrote that the Kennedy administration had determined not to make Cuba an Algeria of France.

⁴⁰ For the history of FPCC, see, Gosse, *Where the Boys Are*, especially Introduction and Chapter 5.

culture in precipitating revolution.”⁴¹ What he saw in Cuba was published as an essay titled “Cuba Libre,” which enticed youth with a romanticization of revolution. The FPCC’s connection to the SCTC was repeatedly reported in the congressional hearings.⁴² Then, in December of 1963, the FPCC was forced to close its office in New York because of the Warren Commission’s charge that Kennedy’s assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, was a card-carrying member of the FPCC.

The 1964 Trip and Radicalization of the Movement

Heartened by the success of the 1963 trip, during the following fall the SCTC launched another trip for the summer of 1964. The Oswald case positively affected the plan because the Warren Commission reports were controversial and seemed implausible to many Americans. Albert Maher, a committee official and Harvard student from a wealthy Texan industrialist family, proudly announced that they had received more than 1,000 applications and interviewed no less than 400 persons by May 1964.⁴³ On June 12, seventy-three American students arrived at Havana by way of Europe for a one-month stay, with nine more Americans joining the group in July. A total of eighty-four passports were revoked by the State Department upon their return on August 14, 1964.

⁴¹ Young, “Soul Power,” 18.

⁴² The HUAC charged that Vincent Lee, a founder and national director of the committee, attended PLM meetings in the fall of 1963. *Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 3*, 765.

⁴³ “100 U.S. Students plan to Defy Cuba-Visit Ban,” *New York Times*, May 24, 1964.

The leaders of the group were self-proclaimed Communists, but most participants were just liberals or leftists, and there were others who attended simply out of curiosity. Edward Lemansky, a group leader from the PLM and a 23-year-old graduate of Antioch College in Ohio, admitted to reporters that there were participants who did not want to be labeled as supporters of the Cuban Revolution and complained that “they just think it’s a pretty cool thing, but they just don’t know yet.” The group also included one individual who possessed a strong affinity for the Third World Revolution due to his background. Manuel Colón, a 33-year-old student from the New School in New York, was a member of the independence movement of Puerto Rico. He dubbed the Cuban Revolution to be “the most important development in Latin America since Simon Bolivar.”⁴⁴ Some other participants became famous for their later activities. Allen Krebs, a 30-year-old assistant professor of sociology at Adelphi College who was fired because of the trip, went on to found the Free University of New York in 1965. Jerry Rubin, a 26-year-old graduate student from Berkeley later co-founded the Youth International Party (Yippie) with Abbie Hoffman in 1967.⁴⁵

The group who went on the 1964 trip extended its militancy in two directions: one was towards the national liberation movements at home and abroad, and the other was towards the struggle against U.S. imperialism. At the HUAC hearings held on the

⁴⁴ Richard Eder, “75 Americans on Visit to Cuba Show Wide Variety of Motives,” *New York Times*, June 15, 1964.

⁴⁵ For the name list of the participants, see *Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 5, September 3, 4, and 28, 1964, Hearings Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representative, 88th Congress, 2nd sess. (1964)* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1965), 2194-2208.

3rd and 4th of September 1964, the committee reported that Radio Hanoi in North Vietnam broadcast a statement of solidarity which was issued by a group of African-American travelers on the second trip:

As we live in the heart of the U.S. imperialism and colonialism, and racism, we have clearly seen that U.S. democracy is the greatest deception in history. That is why we support the national liberation movements of our brothers in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We support all that U.S. imperialism opposes, and oppose all that it supports. It is necessary to thoroughly and completely annihilate U.S. imperialism.⁴⁶

The House committee also pointed out that the group was accompanied by the militant black activist Robert Williams when they issued the statement.

The argument made by Robert Williams for the armed self-defense of oppressed people had a significant impact on the formation of revolutionary radicalism. When he returned from the Marines after WWII to Monroe, NC, Williams found that the Ku Klux Klan had again gone on a rampage, persecuting blacks with renewed vigor. With his experience in the Marines and in revolutionary Cuba –which he visited as a member of the FPCC– he began to urge armed self-defense to combat the brutality of the police and the KKK. During a riot connected to the Freedom Riders in 1961, Williams was charged with kidnapping a white couple and had fled to Cuba. From its start, the PLM had nurtured Williams as a “darling” of the New Left. The April 22 issue of *Progressive Labor* published his last interview in the U.S.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ Ibid., 2101.

⁴⁷ Camilo de Chispa, “A Progressive Labor Exclusive, Robert Williams’ Last Interview in the U.S.,” *Progressive Labor* 1, no. 4 (April 1962), 4-7.

Williams continued inciting blacks in the U.S. to “meet violence with violence” in the same vein as Mao Zedong’s call for a worldwide anti-racist campaign in favor of people of color.⁴⁸ The militancy that the PLM supported inevitably led many activists toward an extremist position. In July 1964, Harlem PLM chairman Bill Epton faced criminal charges for inciting a riot in Harlem. Almost six months later, in February 1965, the New York Police Department arrested members of the Black Liberation Front, which was organized by some of the Cuba travelers in 1964, for planning bombings of the Statue of Liberty.⁴⁹

The other issue that became a touchstone for the radical values of the sixties was the war in Vietnam. A statement issued on June 27, 1964 with the signatures of sixty-one travelers expressed irritation regarding U.S. aggression in Indochina:

We the undersigned young Northamericans [sic] visiting Cuba, offer these statements of support for the people of South Vietnam in their just fight for liberation from the Imperialist oppression directed by our government. Today our government is unleashing one of the most brutal and criminal wars in history.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ “Answering a Request from Robert Williams: China’s Mao Writes on Negro Freedom,” *Progressive Labor* 2, no. 9 (September 1963), 17; Tad Szulc, “Expatriate, on Cuban Radio, Calls on U.S. Negroes to Meet Violence with Violence,” *New York Times*, July 28, 1964.

⁴⁹ Will Lissner, “Leftists Behind Harlem Protest Step Up Work Under Close Eye,” *New York Times*, July 26, 1964; “Sketches of Figures and Groups in Dynamiting Plot,” *New York Times*, February 17, 1965.

⁵⁰ *Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 5*, 2087-90; “With the 84 Americans in Cuba,” *Progressive Labor* 3, nos. 8-9 (July-August 1964), 16-17.

It went on to explain how the U.S. government supported “racist and reactionary regimes” in Spain, Portugal, South Africa, and Latin America. Then it referred to the May 2nd Movement (M2M) as their anti-Imperialist effort at home.

While the majority of self-identified New Left students were concentrating their efforts on the Freedom Summer or Johnson’s War on Poverty, radical intellectuals in the New York metropolitan areas had shifted their attention to the Vietnam War. Among these intellectuals were participants in the Cuba trips, such as Levi Laub and Allen Krebs, as well as people who gravitated towards a circle of New York radical youths, such as Jim Mellen, an instructor at Drew University, Sharon Krebs, wife of Allen Krebs and a graduate student of Russian Literature in Columbia University, and Russell Stettler, who initiated anti-war activity in New York.

The M2M has its origins in the Yale Socialist Union’s conference on “Socialism in America,” where representatives from 20 campuses across the east coast agreed to “support Viet Nam” and oppose “McNamara’s War.”⁵¹ Then, on May 2, 1964, hundreds of students, mostly from Columbia, NYU, and CUNY, took to the streets around 110th Street and Central Park West in New York City to demand the immediate withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam.⁵² *Progressive Labor* claimed that it was “the largest single demonstration against U.S. intervention in Viet Nam” ever, with simultaneous demonstrations in San Francisco, Seattle, Madison, Miami, and San Juan, Puerto Rico. At the rally, Conrad Lynn, a Civil Rights lawyer of

⁵¹ May 2nd Movement, “Stop McNamara’s War in Vietnam!,” Vertical File, Publications Relating to May 2nd Movement, 1964-1965, Tamiment Library.

⁵² *New York Times*, May 3, 1964.

the Freedom Now Party claimed that “the same U.S. policy-makers responsible for the War in Viet Nam are the ones responsible for the violence against civil rights fighters in Birmingham and New York.”⁵³ During the summer of 1964, the M2M held two massive rallies against Johnson’s actions in the Gulf of Tonkin at Times Square where the police had previously prohibited any political demonstrations, both of which turned into riots.⁵⁴

The M2M successfully raised the issue of Vietnam by presenting it as an issue that affected American citizens. A movement pamphlet with the banner of “Viet-Nam or Auschwitz,” with the letter “z” depicted as a swastika, argued:

The war in Vietnam will be won by the NLF. No matter how much “aid” we pour into the country and no matter how many American men give up their lives in a useless and futile war, we will never defeat the Vietnamese people who are struggling for their independence from all forms of colonialism and imperialism.⁵⁵

It pushed American students to recognize that they were as much a part of American imperial oppression against the great cause of national liberation in the Third World, as they were accountable for black oppression in the United States. The M2M effectively carried out an anti-draft campaign that initiated mass mobilization against the war, expanding across the nation in the latter half of the sixties.

⁵³ Fred Jerome, “May 2 Protests Hit U.S. War in Viet Nam,” *Progressive Labor* 3, no. 5 (May 1964), 2-3.

⁵⁴ See, Luce, *New Left*, 110-13; Benin, “A Red Thread in Garment,” 76-84, for the PLM’s structural transformation to the Party.

⁵⁵ May 2nd Movement, *Viet-Nam or Auschwitz*, n.d., Tamiment Library.

The leadership of the M2M overlapped with that of the SCTC. The SCTC argued that the two trips to Cuba by 142 youths provided American students with an “impetus” for a new peace organization because the travelers learned “the concept of American imperialism” as an “existent FACT” and as a “MAJOR stumbling block to world peace.” It was also because Cuba revealed, firstly, “an alternative to the present situation in Latin America, and the role that” the U.S. had played “in oppressing the people” and, secondly, why they had “racial discrimination, poverty, alienation” in the U.S.⁵⁶ Yet the most significant reason for the success of the SCTC and M2M might be that they avoided a dogmatic style of political rhetoric as much as possible in explaining the Cuban Revolution and Vietnam War, even though they were controlled by the pro-Peking PLM. Most participants were motivated by their sympathy for oppressed peoples and a passion for social change. A statement by the SCTC, published in the M2M pamphlet, denounced the HUAC investigation of members and declared that “we who are not communists are not afraid to stand with communists in proclaiming what we believe, and we intend to do so in a united fashion.”⁵⁷

In the fall of 1964, the central leadership of the PLM felt that it was time to transform their movement into a party for revolution. In April of 1965, national delegates gathered in New York to adopt a platform that confirmed its Maoist line, strict organizational structure, and support for revolutionary actions with armed

⁵⁶ Michael Brown, “SCTC Comments,” *Progressive Labor, Special Travel Issue* (December 1964), 8-11.

⁵⁷ The Student Committee for Travel to Cuba, *Statement by the Students Who Visited Cuba*, n.d., Tamiment Library.

insurrections in the name of social change. All the efforts of the SCTC, including the plan for another trip and a campaign for Cuba travelers who were indicted for breaking the State Department travel regulation, were suspended in order to give way to the anti-war issue. When the PLP suddenly disappeared from the public eye, Phillip Luce decided to leave the PLP and later became an informant of this radical circle. He wrote that he could not “be a part of a movement based on deceit and illegal activities,” and said, “My ‘bourgeois radicalism’ rebelled at continuing an association with people desirous of destroying individual initiative, character, and the future of the membership.”⁵⁸

Devised during a changing of the guard for the American Communist leadership and reflecting the international changes in the politics of the Cold War, the activities of the SCTC developed a sympathetic and imagined sense of solidarity with the Third World, and linked it with the mass anti-war movement and racial liberation movements in the United States. The success of this process seemed rather unintentional for the core PL members who wished for the participants to learn the Marxian discourse and to be revolutionary comrades. The majority of Cuba travelers simply possessed more sensitivity towards the human struggle under oppression than an affinity for dogma. The terms “liberation” and “anti-imperialism” were imported via the Third World but never acquired static meanings. They were translated in many ways ranging from the traditional conceptualization of civil disobedience to the

⁵⁸ Luce, *New Left*, 41-42.

militant strand of racial separatism. This equivocality was key to political mass mobilizations which were bastioned with a vague sense of solidarity with the peoples of the world.

In the mid-sixties, most Americans nebulously imagined the Third World as a homogeneous entity standing in opposition to the imperial aggressions of the First and Second worlds. Thus it was not a coincidence that the Sandpipers' *Guantanamera* and the film *The Battle of Algiers* captured American popular interest in the Third World during the same period. This perceived homogeneity was another key element that allowed radicals to identify themselves with the global liberating force in Cuba as the most successful example. Since the SCTC opened a way for radical pilgrimage to Cuba with the two trips, totaling 143 participants in 1963 and 1964, Cuba functioned as a window to the Third World for the American radicals. While the Chinese Revolution was a remote event both in time and space, and its conflict with the Soviet Union could be understood only abstractly, the Cuban Revolution had enough relevance to provoke reflection on the imperial aspects of American life. Thus, through Cuba, American students acquired a language through which they could recognize the meanings of the Vietnam War in terms of U.S. aggression.

This chapter illuminates a significant trajectory of Third World-inspired leftists in New York. In the beginning of the sixties, while the SDS was being formed by liberal students in the Midwest, militant Communists turned their eyes to China for an alternative to Soviet revisionism, as did young communists in many other countries. While SDS radicals found their *raison d'être* in the Civil Rights movement, the SCTC

participants started attacking America's foreign policy by connecting American racism with imperialism. Then, in 1964, while the majority of the New Left engaged with the Freedom Summer and the community organizing efforts of Johnson's War on Poverty, the Cuba travelers initiated an anti-war mobilization well before the SDS finally focused on the issue and attracted tens of thousands of students in the mid-sixties. This was possible because the revolutionary language had already existed from the beginning of the PLM and SCTC's activities, giving birth to a significant component of succeeding movements.

CHAPTER TWO

“It’s a Groovy Thing to Do”: The Founding of the Free University of New York

In February 1965, the Johnson administration increased U.S. intervention in the War in Vietnam by deploying Operation “Rolling Thunder,” a continuous air bombing that lasted for more than three years until December 1968. Nationwide, the student New Left immediately shifted its focus to the war and the SDS attracted about 25,000 anti-war demonstrators in Washington DC on April 17, 1965. For the majority of Americans, however, the U.S. effort in the war was not yet a burning question that might turn over the administration.¹ Rather, they were curious about who these anti-war protesters were and why they rebelled. It was only a matter of time before the media started reporting on the anti-war demonstrations and the New Left. Given the social conditions surrounding the expanding radical and counter-cultural movements, the creation of a Free University in New York was news not only to leftist intellectuals and liberals but also for ordinary citizens.

This chapter explores the process in which the Free University was conceptualized and materialized as a space for radical intellectuals in New York. The idea of the Free University was forged during the anti-Vietnam War May 2nd

¹ Gallup started asking American citizens if they thought “the U.S. made a mistake sending troops to fight in Vietnam” in August 1965. Sixty-one percent said, “No,” to this question at that point. The rate declined to around fifty percent in 1966, and it gradually went down to forty percent in April 1968. See, “Exploring Vietnam War,” Digital History, University of Houston, accessed, September 3, 2012, http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/learning_history/vietnam/vietnam_publicopinion.cfm.

Movement in late 1964 to early 1965. How did young radical intellectuals in the leftist circles of New York turn their eyes to a university when the general attention of the New Left shifted towards anti-war demonstrations? Founding the Free University was a hands-on effort by the initiators. Who joined the movements and what did they seek from this intellectual experiment? The media paid special attention to this freshly sprouted New Left institution, whose radical style triggered not only conservative reactions from institutional authorities and politicians but also adverse criticism from fellow leftists. What were the causes of antagonism that isolated FUNY from the New Left circle and society as a whole? A series of events during the early phases of the Free University accentuated the uniqueness of FUNY's education, politics, and culture in mid-sixties America and its peculiar position within the New Left movement.

Conceptualizing a Free University

Since its first massive demonstration in Morningside Heights on May 2, 1964, the May 2nd Movement had focused primarily on the following two issues: demonstrating against the U.S. intervention in the war in Vietnam, and appealing the criminal charges filed by the State Department against student travelers to Cuba in 1963 and 1964. When they rallied on campuses or on the streets, the M2M members often confronted regulations imposed by universities or local authorities. The students and young instructors who gathered from the New York metropolitan area began to wonder if the universities they belonged to were not what they ought to be. Such ideas were first expressed in a M2M organizational news magazine, the *Free Student*, whose

first issue appeared in the spring of 1965. The *Free Student* ran articles about the activities of the New Left and civil rights organizations, political opinions, cultural essays, and a variety of reports on world affairs, especially those related to liberation movements in the Third World, including Vietnam, Cuba, and Puerto Rico.

In a short column titled, “Ideologue: Who Owns University?” editors of the *Free Student* insisted that the issue was not “free speech” but the “free student.” They argued that, considering the administrative control of campus activities launched by groups such as the M2M, SDS, Dubois Clubs, and CORE, in addition to its decisions on campus “rules” such as curriculum, academic freedom, and “sex dress and housing codes,” the “rights” of the students and “free speech” were no longer the central issues. Rather, they insisted on creating “a community of scholars” consisting of “free teachers and free students.”² The column continues:

Free Student suggests that the issue at hand is the heart and soul of the University. We suggest that the issue is not “free speech” but the free student. But to ask who owns the University and why it is run the way it is, begins another sort of dialogue where the vocabulary and value system is so dangerous as to drive chancellors into early retirement and Secret Police into the sea of madness.³

The editors insisted that the university was an institution servicing the “Military-Corporate Complex” and an institution of repression that drove faculty and students to acquire the “desired cold war mentality.”⁴

² May 2nd Movement, *Free Student*, no. 1 (n.d.), 3.

³ *Ibid.*, 3

⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.

Their criticism and socio-academic ideals were not quite new, but they were a broadly shared sentiment among leftist intellectuals and students in the mid-sixties. The criticism surrounding the relationship between elite universities and the military and industrial powers originated in C. Wright Mills's *Power Elite* (1956). Furthermore, the concept of the university as a community of scholars and students could be found in SDS's *Port Huron Statement* (1962), as historian Ron Miller points out in his research on the Free School movement.⁵ After adopting the *Statement*, however, the SDS did not initiate an alternative university movement but urged students to go out into society and engage in community organization efforts such as the Newark Project led by Tom Hayden, a draft writer of the *Statement*. However, the uniqueness of the idea presented by the *Free Student* lies in its goal not to urge on-campus actions but to create an intellectual meeting place for students and scholars while maintaining a firm distance from established institutions.

In terms of organizational competition among the New Left, the M2M and the *Free Student* did not show any rivalry to the SDS at this point in time. In an editorial, the *Free Student* urged its readers to participate in the SDS's first march on Washington to end the Vietnam War.⁶ The SDS still had its national office in Manhattan and there were some overlaps and member exchanges with the M2M. Todd Gitlin, a national secretary of the SDS from 1963 to 1964, recalled that many in the SDS agreed to the "We Won't Go" petition that the M2M made in the fall of 1964, but

⁵ Ron Miller, *Free Schools, Free people*.

⁶ May 2nd Movement, *Free Student*, no. 2 (n.d.), 14.

did not adopt it because they themselves wanted to jump into the issue of the war. In the spring of 1965, Gitlin personally was more interested in organizing a protest against the role of American businesses in national foreign policy.⁷ Gitlin reported in the *Free Student* that “several hundred Americans, along with African students’ support,” demonstrated at Chase Manhattan Bank in New York on March 19, 1965 to stop its support of “South African tyranny.”⁸

Considering the ideological position of its parent organization, the Progressive Labor Party, the demand for an intellectual space for students and scholars made by the *Free Student* might have been an unexpected remark for some readers. Nevertheless, the idea of a “Free University” spread immediately and successfully among radical intellectuals because of the following three reasons. Firstly, events and projects in the 1964-65 academic year, including the Freedom Summer in the South and the Free Speech Movement in the West, created an atmosphere favorable for the development of new educational and intellectual activities in the Northeast region. Secondly, talk about a Free University in New York started several months earlier than the publication of the *Free Student*, and planners of the University wisely utilized the paper for the purpose of drawing in advocates. Names of the contributors to the *Free Student* suggest that the radical circle of the magazine, based in New York City, materialized itself as the Free University. Finally, the group of people who conceptualized the Free University was not as dogmatic as the PL leaders and

⁷ Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties*, 179-81.

⁸ May 2nd Movement, *Free Student*, no. 2 (n.d.), 15.

organized communists. Even though the M2M had affiliations with the PL, it was still a loosely organized anti-war group that focused on the Vietnam War issue. The organizational nature of the M2M allowed the Free University circle to include a variety of talents in its counter-cultural experiments. The core organizers of FUNY were not explicitly Maoist, though they claimed themselves to be Marxists on many occasions. A year later, the PL disbanded the M2M because it did not fit the PL's rigid political structure and because it no longer met the PL's political purpose of Marxist revolution.

The Initiators of the Free University Movement

The people who initiated or later joined the Free University were a squad of mavericks. One of its most important figures was a thirty-year-old instructor, Allen Krebs. After receiving a Ph.D. in social psychology from the University of Michigan, Krebs taught at the American University in Beirut. Afterwards, he returned to the U.S. and acquired a teaching position at Adelphi University in Long Island. In the summer of 1964, Krebs visited Cuba as a member of the Student Committee to Travel to Cuba. A few months after his trip, Adelphi University told him that they would not allow him to teach there anymore, giving him a "terminal leave" due to his "teaching deficiencies." The administration officially claimed that in his class on the "Development of Sociological Thought" Krebs diverged from the desired curriculum and taught Marxism instead of sociology. Krebs and his colleagues understood that the

real reason was his trip to Cuba which had violated the State Department's regulation.⁹ Krebs later told a reporter from *Life* magazine that the idea of a Free University popped up while he was holding seminars in a friend's house in Queens after he had lost his position at Adelphi University. He added in a "hip vernacular" that, "Folks thought it would be a groovy thing to do." The organizers first recruited seventeen faculty members who were asked to contribute \$30 for a "sinking fund." "Word simply went out into the intellectual community," Krebs explained.¹⁰

The "folks" included Jim Mellen, another key organizer of the Free University who served as Secretary of Treasury for the institution. Mellen dropped out from UCLA and finished his BA at San Francisco State University in 1960. He then enrolled in the University of Iowa for graduate study, where he studied the role of organized labor in U.S. foreign policy. After finishing his coursework, he was employed as an instructor of political science at Drew University in New Jersey.¹¹ Living close to New York City, he worked with PL members, but he never joined the organization. He later said in an interview:

⁹ For the dismissal of Krebs, see, Daniel Rosenberg, "Loyalty and Dissent: Free Speech at Adelphi University, 1964-68," *Long Island Historical Journal* 12, no. 1 (1999): 76-91.

¹⁰ Roger Vaughan, "New York City's Anti-University University Is for Radicals Only," *Life* 60, no. 20 (1966), 119.

¹¹ Howard Junker, "The Free University: Academy for Mavericks," *Nation*, August 16, 1965, 79.

I had difficulty with the Communists, much as I was opposed to ideological anti-Communism. I considered myself more Marxist than they, and longed for a movement with more revolutionary thinking.¹²

Mellen instead joined the M2M because he sensed that with its protesters, he could find a direction in which he could move forward. He thought that he could envision their job “as building a base among students for a Third World revolution” in the United States.¹³

Led by Krebs and Mellen, organizers of the Free University started a publicity campaign in the newly published *Free Student* and other leftist papers. In the *Free Student*, Sharon Krebs, Allen’s wife and a student of Russian literature at the graduate school of Columbia University, along with Ed Lemansky, an editor of the magazine, employed a familiar but persuasive logic pertaining to the university institution: that universities were controlled by the “power elite” in service of the Military-Corporate Complex; that students and faculty were also “oppressed” by the “power elite” and transformed into robots, “non-critical technicians capable of thoughtless but efficient physical and social manipulation.” Students and faculty, therefore, must organize themselves in the fight for a “free university.” They then declared, “We want a university. We want our schools.”¹⁴

¹² Milton Viorst, *Fire in the Streets: America in the Sixties* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 1979), 473.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 473-74.

¹⁴ Sharon Krebs and Ed Lemansky, “Columbia University: A Political Monograph” *Free Student*, no. 3 (1965), 11; “Imperialism and University,” *Free Student*, no. 3 (1965), 14.

They also used numerous handbills and newspaper advertisements in order to reach sympathetic readers. On June 12, 1965, FUNY's first advertisement appeared in the *National Guardian*, an independent radical leftist journal. It announced the opening of the Free University with an eight-week Summer Session beginning on July 6. The Free University of New York would open, the ad affirmed, "in response to the Cold War and the Garrison State," "in revolt against the bankrupt educational establishment," and "in quest of passionate involvement with the forbidden ideas of our generation."¹⁵

The FUNY organizers established their home base in a run-down loft above a café on East 14th Street in Manhattan. The fund for establishing the Free University and renting the loft was provided partly by students, non-paid faculty members, and two wealthy Harvard students, Albert and John Maher. John was a member of the Harvard SDS, while his older brother Albert was a doctoral student at Harvard who joined the Student Travel to Cuba in 1963 and had been working for the PLP and M2M. They were from a wealthy Texas family and both intellectually and financially supported the activities of these groups.¹⁶ Nevertheless, the fund for opening the University was far from abundant.

The founders built the school with their own hands. A reporter from the *National Insider* described that Krebs –in "work clothes, a hammer in his hand"–

¹⁵ "Announcing the Opening of the Free University of New York," *National Guardian*, June 12, 1965, 11.

¹⁶ Luce, *New Left*, 115; Gene Currivan, "Radicals Set Up Own 'University'," *New York Times*, July 11, 1965.

appeared in a big room in which “sawdust and tools were scattered around.” Krebs introduced himself by saying, “I’m director, manager, secretary, dean, telephone operator, librarian, and janitor!”¹⁷ In order to run the Free University, the registration fee for the summer term was set at 24 dollars, and for each additional course, students were expected to pay 8 dollars.

“A Clearing House for Radical Politics and Education”

On July 6, 1965, the Free University of New York officially announced its opening. It initially had thirty faculty members and two hundred and four students, with thirty-five of them taking two courses.¹⁸ Ten days before this date, more than three hundred people had gathered to celebrate its opening.¹⁹ Within a week of the opening, the *New York Times* published a short story about FUNY. According to a reporter from the *Times*, it was curious that “professors fired” from universities could attract so many students to such a new and tiny “university” which, in addition, was assumed to be lacking in many aspects as a university. The article explained the central principles of FUNY through an interview with Krebs and called the University “a clearing house for radical politics and education.”²⁰ In this way, the Free University

¹⁷ J. Newton, “The Free University of New York: I’ll Teach What Other Colleges Won’t,” *National Insider*, September 25, 1965, 4.

¹⁸ The Free University of New York, *The Free University News*, July 1965, 4, Box 228, Folder 13, J. B. Matthews Papers.

¹⁹ “Announcing the Opening of the Free University of NY,” *Free Student*, no. 4 (1965), 3.

²⁰ Currivan, “Radicals Set Up Own ‘University’.”

of New York was publicly recognized from the outset as an important hub for the activities of leftist intellectuals.

For the “Free U. people,” as they called themselves, the existence of FUNY was defined in relation to the established universities in contemporary American society. In the Statement of Principles, which appeared in the summer semester catalogue, the Free University declares:

The Free University of New York has been forged in response to the contemporary educational establishment. Its creators, a group of teachers and students in the New York metropolitan area, have been led to the conclusion that the universities and colleges of America have gone beyond the point of intellectual bankruptcy.²¹

It continues by saying that, because the “American university has been emasculated and because “its intellectual vigor, exuberance, and excitement have been destroyed,” the Free University was needed to facilitate the dynamic collision of ideas “which can find no expression within the academic establishment.” Within a community of scholars and students, they believed that, “through this clash of ideas, a sense of awareness will emerge concerning the individual’s relationship to mankind in this century.”²²

While the Statement emphasized the intellectual necessity of the Free University, Krebs more directly expresses its political necessity and antipathy to the established schools in the organizational newsletter, the *Free University News*.

²¹ The Free University of New York, *Catalog, Summer 1965*, 1, Vertical File, Publication Relating to Free School of New York, Tamiment Library.

²² *Ibid.*, 1.

No understanding of Viet Nam will emerge at N.Y.U., Cornell will not involve its students with the history and problems of black people in the United States. The revolutionary turmoil in Latin America will not receive cogent analysis at Columbia University.²³

Krebs defines the Free University as “a parallel institution,” “a community of scholars,” and “a confederation of intellectual cockroaches” in the essay. “Parallel” here signified that the University stood independently of established schools, not attached to any particular institution the way other free schools –subsequently launched on college campuses– tended to be. Interestingly enough, the term “cockroach,” which evokes filthy intellectual stubbornness, became the school symbol and was frequently printed in the semester catalogs.

Newspapers and magazines did not hide their curiosity about this new school, what it looked like, who was involved, and what they offered to society. The *Nation* focused on Free University’s anti-establishment orientation, and pointed out that FUNY could be compared with the New School for Social Research in New York, which was established in 1919, or Black Mountain College in North Carolina, which was in operation from 1933 to 1957, in terms of their founding process, autonomous character, organizers, and participants. The article emphasized that “academic mavericks” tried to do what they could not do “within the Establishment.” However, it concluded that FUNY was not “an academic smorgasbord” or “a sylvan atelier” as the New School and Black Mountain College once were, because “FUNY’s *raison d’être*

²³ *Free University News*, July 1965, 1.

is radical politics.” The Free University proved that “rebels need not be put down by the traditional administration taunt.” Since American students were developing “a sense of themselves as oppressed minority,” the founding ideas of Free University would spread nationwide, the article predicted.²⁴

The *Nation* observed that the students of Free University were mainly “middle-class Jewish college students, with a sprinkling of Middle Western note takers, a few middle agers, a handful of Negroes, a couple of graduate students, [and] a boy with an earring.”²⁵ At the beginning of the fall semester, in which more than 250 students were enrolled, the *National Guardian* reported that about ninety percent of the students were from the “white middle class.”²⁶ While these magazines, which were considered to be left-leaning, depicted the student members of FUNY as lively players, *Harper’s Magazine* described them somewhat differently. It noted that college students and graduate students were in the minority at FUNY:

Most are high-school or college dropouts, and if not on relief, working at postal clerical, or seasonal odd jobs. In each class there are boys and girls damaged by growing up in a world no more spacious than the Bronx. . . . Their faces have an alarming pallor. The girls are apt to have dry, frizzy hair; the boys affect dog-eared editions of Paul Goodman, [Federico García] Lorca, C. Wright Mills.²⁷

²⁴ Junker, “The Free University: Academy for Mavericks,” 78-80.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 80.

²⁶ “N.Y. Free University Opening,” *National Guardian*, September 25, 1965.

²⁷ Grossman, “New School for the Left,” 81.

This article over-emphasized the students' "outlaw" image, presumably to satisfy the curiosity of its readers. An internal report on its students appeared in *Life* magazine: Sharon Krebs described that most of them were "social rebels, beatniks, or whatever, who were just curious to see what was happening." Half of the students were concurrently enrolled in other colleges and universities, but they were "far more interested in ideas and learning than getting a degree."²⁸

One of the most significant characteristics of the student body was that these individuals did not just passively learn, but played significant roles in organizing and managing the Free University. With the success of the first Summer Session, the Free University of New York received nearly three thousand requests for fall term information. In response to its growing popularity, the school set up a coordinating committee to make administrative decisions by consensus. The committee epitomized the ideal of a community of scholars and students by adopting the concept of participatory democracy. It was composed of five elected students and five elected faculty members who discussed all issues thoroughly until reaching an agreement. Krebs explained to *Harper's Magazine* that their reason for agreeing to this structure was that their decisions were always "in good faith" and were "more especially the enthusiasm of the participants for their own beleaguered baby."²⁹ As such, the egalitarian organization and enthusiastic participants made it possible to create a

²⁸ Vaughan, "New York City's Anti-University University Is for Radicals Only," 119.

²⁹ Grossman, "New School for the Left," 82.

community of scholars and students as a “parallel” institution to the “factory-esque” established schools.

“An Academy of Mavericks”

Located in the nation’s long-time center of radical politics and *avant-garde* culture, the Free University of New York invited a wide variety of scholars, activists, and artists as faculty members who represented a “Popular Front of leftists,” as *Harper’s Magazine* depicted. The faculty consisted of a few Ph.D.s, recent Cuba visitors, a Hanoi visitor, a trade unionist, an editor of *Studies on the Left*, artists, college instructors, graduate students, poets and Beatniks, and African-American liberation activists. President Allen Krebs taught a course titled, “Marxism and American Decadence,” and his wife Sharon Krebs taught “Revolutionary Russian Literature.” Mellen’s course was “Instruments of American Imperialism,” in which he analyzed U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic.

According to a report in the *Free Student*, the most popular course, other than the ones taught by Allen Krebs and Jim Mellen, was “The American Radical Tradition to 1900,” conducted by Yale professor Staughton Lynd. Thirty to forty students regularly attended this class. Lynd was already famous among the New Left for his activity in the Freedom Schools, his speech at the SDS March on Washington, and his appearance at the Berkeley Teach Out Against the War in Vietnam. In addition, he visited North Vietnam with Tom Hayden and Herbert Aptheker of the CPUSA in the

winter of 1965.³⁰ The *Nation* described the first day of his course at FUNY on July 6, 1965, in the main room of the loft as follows:

His students, eager to do something revolutionary, suggest that the seating arrangement be changed from the usual rows to a classroom-in-the-round. Lynd agrees, then wonders if that's going to change anything. The students laugh, and Lynd, for openers, assails the phony tradition of the American Left.³¹

Although Lynd taught only in the summer session of 1965, his name was kept listed as a faculty member in FUNY's catalogs until its end.

Other instructors included Paul Krassner, an editor of the *Realist* magazine, Calvin Hicks, an African-American community organizer in Harlem, and Levi Laub, a leader of the Student Travel to Cuba Committee in 1963 and an organizer for the Progressive Labor Party. In his course, Krassner taught about the satiric possibilities of puns and the politics of abortion, and analyzed *New Yorker* magazine's cartoons to show "the many ways of being seriously funny." From his own experience, Hicks argued how difficult it was for good-intentioned white workers to give away their "deep-down racism." Laub taught about the Cuban Revolution in his course while he himself was on trial for violating the State Department ban on traveling to Cuba.³²

³⁰ Lynd and Hayden later published a report of their visit to North Vietnam, *The Other Side* (New York: New American Library, 1967).

³¹ Junker, "The Free University: Academy for Mavericks," 76.

³² *Ibid.*, 80; The Free University of New York, *Catalog, Summer, 1965* and *Catalog, Fall, 1965*, Tamiment Library.

The media tended to pick up “unusual offerings” at the Free University. For instance, the *New York Times* introduced “The Psychotic Experience as an Archetype of Paradise Lost,” in which Joseph Berke, M.D. provided a way to understand “the entire panorama of ‘Psychopathology’” through “madness.” The article also referred to “Hallucinogenic Drugs: Uses and Social Implications” taught by Peter Stafford, and “The Search for Authentic Sexual Experience” by William Erwin in its coverage to evoke readers’ curiosity.³³ Yet, all the courses offered at the Free University were indeed “unusual” because the faculty intentionally tried to teach what they were not allowed to teach and what students could not learn at the established schools.

Throughout the course of its development, the Free University of New York expanded the faculty list until more than 130 names appeared on its catalogs. The total number of faculty members who taught more than once at FUNY well exceeded seventy in the three years of its existence, among whom included famous and popular figures such as Allen Ginsberg, a Beat poet, John Gerassi, author of *The Great Fear of Latin America* and professor at New York University, and Corneil Cruse O’Brien, former representative of the United Nations Secretary General in Katanga and professor at New York University. With these unique instructors signed on, FUNY covered topics such as the politics of revolution, drug culture, Marxist theory, methods of community organizing, Mainland China, Cuba, Black Power, Bob Dylan, filming, and poetry.

³³ Currivan, “Radicals Set Up Own ‘University’”; *New York Times*, December 12, 1965.

Born out of the anti-Vietnam War movement, the Free University of New York was set to take the central role in radical education and politics within the circle of young radical intellectuals in New York. As an egalitarian “parallel institution,” it did not seek to replace any existing university. Rather, it existed independently of the established schools in order to cultivate spheres of thought that were ideologically avoided in the world of academism. The list of faculty members and their course titles reveals the uniqueness of FUNY’s education in the sixties, which attracted both leftist students and curious observers. Nevertheless, they also displayed a distinctive political orientation, which gradually became apparent and invited reactionary attitudes from the authorities and also fellow New Leftists.

The Meaning of “Freedom” in the Free University

The founding of the Free University of New York was still news in the latter part of 1965 and early 1966. Major and minor newspapers and journals, including the *New York Times*, *Life*, *Human Events*, *Harper’s Magazine*, and the *Village Voice*, featured the school in their periodicals. Some were very sympathetic to this youthful intellectual experiment, but others had their doubts about FUNY’s idea of “freedom,” and sometimes even a strong antagonism to its radical politics. While New York City officials suddenly intervened and threatened FUNY’s operations, Jack Newfield—a liberal journalist who was thought to be a supporter of youth movements—attacked FUNY regarding its meaning of “freedom” in the *Village Voice*. The controversy between the Free University community and Newfield resulted in the narrowing of the

American New Left, which isolated the young New York rebels as an extreme fringe group.

On October 27, 1965, the New York City Building Department issued an order without notice that the Free University of New York “cease operations” within 10 days because it violated New York City building code. According to a report in the *National Guardian*, this series of events was initiated by a *Journal-American* article, published three days before, that identified FUNY as a “draft-dodger school.” The fire department followed the Building Department to investigate Free University’s facilities by invading classes. Concurrently with these events, the *World-Telegram* accused the May 2nd Movement of shipping “supplies to the Vietcong.” Police started to cruise around the University, and the landlord of the building raised its rent from \$80 to \$250. On October 29, building department official Benjamin Lipowsky said that if “those commies” refused to leave, the city would “close the whole building down.” The Free University hired the acclaimed civil rights lawyer and ACLU director, William Kunstler, to litigate the issue. On November 8, the Building Department suddenly dropped the charges against FUNY, saying that the City “had no intention of bringing criminal proceedings” to the Free University. The *National Guardian* speculated that behind this sudden dropping of charges was John Lindsay, the Mayor-elect who wanted to “avoid civil liberties uproar on the eve of his taking office.”³⁴

Nevertheless, the harassment by the local authorities was simply a prelude to the following assaults on the Free University. The Free University people were not

³⁴ “Effort to Evict FUNY Dropped,” *National Guardian*, November 13, 1965.

vulnerable to conservative reactions because they had already engaged in authority-challenging activities such as travelling to Cuba and publicly protesting the War in Vietnam. They were not, however, prepared to receive an attack from Jack Newfield, a journalist and fellow liberal.

Newfield was born in Brooklyn in 1938, and joined the *Village Voice* in 1964 as a columnist to open a new genre of “advocacy journalism” with “a deeply personal investigative reporting that grew out of a consuming ethic and chased the new fact that could change policy or politics.”³⁵ Since he sided with the New Left and since FUNY often posted its advertisements in the *Voice*, Newfield’s bitter criticism against FUNY not only revealed the “limits of freedom” inherent in radical intellectualism but also implied that there was inevitable discord among New York’s leftist circles.

Newfield condemned Free University’s “excluding policy” as a violation of “the spirit of the public accommodations clause of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.” At a Saturday evening public debate titled, “The Morality of Science,” held by FUNY on November 6, 1965, Newfield observed that a “frail-looking, well-dressed youth of about 18” was denied admittance by FUNY staff because he wore two “Bomb Hanoi” buttons on his lapels. Newfield reported on the conversation between a girl at the entrance and Jim Mellen, and the debate between Herman Kahn, a nuclear scientist from the Hudson Institute, and Steve Newman, a May 2nd Movement activist. Kahn, who showed interest in teaching foreign policy at FUNY, was rejected by the

³⁵ Wayne Barrett, “Jack Newfield, 1938-2004,” *Village Voice*, December 21, 2004, accessed on September 5, 2009, <http://www.villagevoice.com/2004-12-21/news/jack-newfield-1938-2004/1>.

coordinating committee because he did not meet the select requirements. In a *Village Voice* article, Newfield insisted that this rejection was due to Kahn being “viewed with hostility by the peace organization” for his conservative stance.³⁶

At the meeting, a moderator made an appeal to the audience regarding the issue of “civil liberties” and the harassment by the NYC fire and building department. An audience member asked, “How come you could appeal to civil liberties after rejecting some people?” Newfield quoted answers from Newman and Mellen who stated that FUNY worked under a special kind of “civil liberty.” Newman replied, “This is one of the few democratic institutions in America” and “After a lot of debate we arrived at a consensus we wouldn't be open to everyone.” Mellen said, “I am surprised you asked that kind of question. ... Sometimes the cops are just waiting outside, waiting for a fight to start so that they can close us down.” After the debate, Mellen explained to Newfield that the coordinating committee had reached a consensus that “certain types of people – racists, Klansmen, Birchers – should be excluded” from their circle.

Moreover, Mellen angrily told Newfield:

I don't give a damn about the civil-rights law. I'm not going to let someone in here who might start trouble. ... I am wasting my time talking to you. I know what your politics are. Your paper only wants to hurt us. You never print the truth.

Newfield closed his report with a plea by “a pretty girl standing next to Mellen” who said, “Please write something nice about us. Please.”³⁷

³⁶ Jack Newfield, “The Limits of Freedom at the Free University,” *Village Voice*, November 11, 1965, 7.

Readers of the *Village Voice*, including Free University instructors and participants in the Saturday night event, immediately reacted to Newfield's report and several letters from them appeared in the following issues of the *Voice*. The complaints these letters presented focused on the following three points: the facts surrounding the event on November 6, the concept of "freedom" at the Free University, and Newfield's attitude towards reporting. An observer at the event claimed that the youth barred from entering the debate was not as well-behaved as Newfield depicted him to be, but a "boisterous" man. Walter Kaufman, who claimed to be the one who was denied entrance to the meeting, eloquently argued that the Free University was not "Free" and had never been "Free." He even suggested that the Free University change its name to "The Marxist University of New York," or "The Communist University."³⁸ Mellen insisted in his letter that neither he nor Newfield witnessed the FUNY volunteer worker ask the man with the "Bomb Hanoi" button to leave. Mellen also claimed that his words, quoted by Newfield in the article, were not correct and claimed that the "artificial inclusion" of the Civil Rights Act comment was "simply pandering to the liberal's potential distrust and suspicion of radicals."³⁹

Regarding the concept of "freedom" at Free University, Will Inman, a poet and the vice-president of FUNY, pointed out that Newfield disregarded the Free University's "right to decide its own definition of the freedom as practiced and

³⁷ Ibid., 7.

³⁸ Walter M. Kaufman, "FUNY Free?," *Village Voice*, November 25, 1965.

³⁹ James Mellen, "Mellen's Story," *Village Voice*, November 25, 1965.

preached there.” Responding to the Kaufman-FUNY debate, Paul Krasner, another FUNY instructor, simply questioned, “If the school doesn’t let people of opposing views in, how can it attempt to convert them?” Nevertheless, the overall reaction from the readers was sympathy towards FUNY and the *Village Voice* published the Free University’s claims that Newfield’s reporting was a form of “Liberal Hypocrisy” and a “Premature Report.”⁴⁰

What was behind the discord between a liberal a leftist and the Free University organizers? Newfield was thought to be an advocate of the New Left, but what he praised was not the New “Communist” Left, but the liberal New “Student” Left. In his article in the *Nation* on May 10, 1965, prior to the founding of FUNY, Newfield defined the new generation of radicals as the New Left:

They are a new generation of dissenters, nourished not by Marx, Trotsky, Stalin, or Shachtman but by Camus, Paul Goodman, Bob Dylan and SNCC – the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.⁴¹

The birth of this radicalism, Newfield explained, dates back to February 1, 1960 when four black students started the first lunch-counter sit-ins in Greensboro, North Carolina.

⁴⁰ Will Inman, “Liberal Hypocrisy,” *Village Voice*; Paul Krassner, “Premature Report,” *Village Voice*, November 18, 1965; Norman Solomon, “Defeating Purpose?” *Village Voice*, November 25, 1965.

⁴¹ Jack Newfield, “The Student Left,” *The Nation*, May 10, 1965, reprinted online on April 17, 2007, accessed on September 6, 2009, <http://www.thenation.com/doc/19650510/newfield/print>.

In Northern campuses, students inspired by Southern events started organizing the Students for a Democratic Society and the Northern Student Movement, which had “no roots in the organizations and dogmas of the 1930.” Once these groups were placed in the mainstream of the new American Left in mid-1960, other groups with a different orientation were defined as its “own extremist fringe.” Newfield found that the “most advanced form” of fringe grouping was the “Port Left” or “Pop Left” in the “new bohemia of the East Village, in New York.” Then he writes:

It is in the East Village that several thousand dropouts from society have coalesced to cheer LeRoi Jones’s scorn for Mickey Shwerner and Andrew Goodman, to join the Peking splinter, the Progressive Labor Movement; to confuse drugs and homosexuality with political actions, to buy “Support the National Liberation Front” buttons for a quarter.⁴²

Newfield further looked down on the New York radicals, saying that the “Pop Left” was “far more interested in style, shock and exhibitionism than in any serious program, Maoist or otherwise.”⁴³

Whatever Newfield’s personal disaffection with the “East Village” leftist cohort might have been, his definition of the American New Left consequently pushed the Free University of New York away from the mainstream of student radicalism in the United States. It was true that the SDS rapidly grew during this period, but considering the achievements of New York student radicalism in bringing the Vietnam

⁴² Ibid. Andrew Goodman was a Civil Rights activists who were murdered in Mississippi in June 1964.

⁴³ Ibid. Newfield later published the story of SDS founders in Michigan as the mainstream of the American New Left movement. Jack Newfield, *A Prophetic Minority* (New York: New American Library, 1966).

War into the New Left agenda, the lineage of the Progressive Labor Movement, from the May 2nd Movement to the Free University of New York, could not simply be put aside in the context of new American radicalism in the sixties. In addition, since the M2M was a loose organization and the Free University of New York was more like a mix-up of contemporary radical leftists in New York City, it is doubtful whether Newfield really needed to attack them. Nevertheless, his categorization of the New Left signified the inevitable rivalry between the SDS and the PL during the rest of the sixties. In addition, it clarified who were the New Lefts and who were not after the demise of the New Left Movement.

The city of New York was a long-time center of political activism in the nation, where a variety of radical groups preached their beliefs on the streets and competed with each other to seek the realization of their political ideas. In the fall of 1965, the SDS moved its national office from Manhattan to Chicago and started to grow rapidly. It is said that the SDS avoided the influence of New York radicals, many of whom defined their politics in terms of Marxism and other conventional Communist organizations. For FUNY, this meant that it could develop its unique political style in New York City without being affected by the massive transformation of student movements in the latter half of the 1960s.

The concept of the first Free University in the United States was constructed and materialized by a circle of people who were politically active in the New York metropolitan area. The leading figures of this movement were radical intellectuals who

had taught in college or studied in graduate schools. They were also vocal dissenters against the U.S. policy on the War in Vietnam during the May 2nd Movement, which initiated the anti-war demonstrations in the United States. Even though the M2M was formed as a front organization of the Maoist Progressive Labor Party, people in the M2M were more flexible in their ideology and did not pose any rivalry to other New Left organizations such as the SDS. In the spring of 1965, when the anti-war issue finally attracted the New Left after the Freedom Summer in the South and the Free Speech Movement in California during the previous year, these radical intellectuals started to organize themselves in order to establish the Free University of New York in Manhattan.

The opening of the Free University signified three major transformations in the movement and society. The first transformation could be observed in its style of education and politics. In the sixties, FUNY illuminated the role of the university in American society for the first time and set an example of scholars and students cooperatively creating an academic space of their own. The second transformation was seen in the reactions of the media and local authorities. Ordinary citizens and the media displayed a somewhat sympathetic curiosity towards the newly opened experimental institution of the New Left. They wanted to see who was involved and what they offered in the Free University. The media first reported on the uniqueness and eccentricity of the school, and then broadcasted its faults by presenting an outlaw image of the participants. Soon, the local authority started harassing the Free University of New York by regarding it as a subversive institution. The most

significant transformation occurred within the circle of the American New Left movement. Antagonism against the leftists in New York rose to the surface when a liberal journalist attacked them as being an extreme fringe group with communist ideology. As a result, the Free University of New York was put in a marginal position in the American New Left movement, which was allegedly led by the Students for a Democratic Society. These changes in society and its movements, however, never confined themselves to the activities of the Free University of New York. As a “clearing house” of radical intellectuals, it developed its own political movement in American society. The issue was U.S. imperial policy around the world, particularly the War in Vietnam.

CHAPTER THREE

“Free U. People”: The Radical Self-Education of the American New Left

The Vice President of the Free University of New York, Will Inman wrote in 1967, “The Free University of New York is a community in which I can seek out something of what I am, something of my possibilities as an individual human and as a social creature.” He described the school as becoming “a kind of delta of new ideas, falling out together in the meeting place of many streams.”¹ Inman affectionately called the instructors and students who gathered in the space of FUNY the “Free U. People.”

From July 1965 to March 1968, the Free University of New York ran eleven terms: summer and fall terms in 1965, winter, spring, summer and fall terms in 1966 and 1967, and a winter term in 1968. Throughout its operations, the Free University listed more than 130 instructors as its faculty members: some of them taught continuously from beginning to the end, others taught just one or two semesters, and a few others only let their names appear in its course catalogs. The list of names reveals the multi-layered networks of self-identified New Leftists in in the United States and the individually constructed connections with European radical intellectuals.

The number of courses offered at the school was only thirteen in the first term in the summer of 1965. The number of courses increased to more than forty from fall

¹ Will Inman, “Free University of New York: One Man’s View,” *Humanist*, May-June 1966, 80-82.

1965 to winter 1966, then slightly decreased into about thirty for the following year, and shrank to about 25 in the last two semesters. These numbers tell how the Free University rapidly gained momentum in the early phase from 1965 to 1966 and gradually shrank when instructors shifted their focus to radical politics in the later phase. The courses offered included a variety of subjects that not only reveals Free University's strong emphasis on topics such as Marxism, the Third World, racism, Freudian psychology, film, poetry, and radical politics but also indicate the lack of specific fields, such as the still embryonic women's studies, or ethnic studies, and environmental studies. This chapter explores the course catalogs of the Free University of New York from 1965 to 1968 as a way to analyze the uniqueness of the self-education of the New Left in the United States in the sixties. Radical education at the Free University was surely embedded in the context of the intellectual and political challenge to the knowledge of American society in the era.

Marxism and the Third World Revolutions

The Free University of New York was founded as an independent academic institution by spontaneous radical scholars and activists in and around the City of New York. These individuals shared a vague idea that universities in America had been "emasculated" and that their "intellectual vigor" should be revitalized by creating an institution that was part of a protest movement. The original twenty-six faculty members listed in the "Summer Catalogue 1965" consisted of groups of college instructors, graduate students, editors, union organizers, pacifists, socialists, poets, and

writers, all of whom already had manifest leftist or countercultural orientations.

Among them, the names of Marxist historian Herbert Aptheker, labor historian Philip Foner, and Beat poet Allen Ginsberg drew significant attention from the audience. As these figures did not offer any courses at the Free University, it can be assumed that they only lent their names for the initiation of the experimental college of young New Leftists. At the same time, it is suggested that the Free University was founded using the existing intellectual network of leftists, such as Aptheker's American Institute for Marxist Studies and Ginsberg's personal network of Village bohemians.

Nevertheless, there existed core organizers who initiated the Free University movement in New York: they were the veterans of the Student Committee to Travel to Cuba (SCTC) in 1963 and 1964 and activists of the anti-Vietnam War May 2nd Movement (M2M). Such members included President Allen Krebs, Charles Johnson, Gerald Long, Karen Sacks, Russell Stetler, and Roger Taus who visited Cuba in 1964, and Levi Laub, an organizer of the 1963 Trip. These people took on the role of teaching revolutionary subjects to students who wanted to learn about Marxism and revolutions both in the U.S. and the Third World.

President Krebs offered his courses on revolutionary Marxism consecutively from the first term in summer 1965 to the ninth term in summer 1967 before moving to London to join the collaborative effort to build an anti-university in London. His "Marxism and American Decadence," taught in the Summer 1965 term, was to examine American society from a Marxist Perspective. As the *Harper's Magazine* reported, the course was held as a series of seminars in which the instructor and

students have lively discussions on the selected subjects. Krebs continued the same course in the subsequent term and covered topics such as “Marx and Marxism, American imperialism, militarism, alienation, isolation, homosexuality, drug cults, and intellectual emasculation.”²

As an organizer of SCTC in 1963, Levi Laub offered courses that dealt with the Cuban Revolution from fall 1965 to summer 1966. In the faculty list, he was listed as an organizer of the Progressive Labor Party who was under indictment for leading the 1963 trip. As a “specialist” in the Cuban Revolution, he analyzed the “economic and social factors” that led to the revolution in the fall term of 1965. He then added guerrilla warfare in Cuba to his list of course topics, presenting it as an exemplary struggle for other Latin America countries to emulate. In summer 1966, he moved one step forward to discuss “Revolutionary Socialism” and the role of the revolutionary party in contemporary America by analyzing labor and student movements and Black liberation movement.³ The partisan politics of the Progressive Labor Party were also manifest in the course of Milt Rosen, chairman of PL. His “A Perspective U.S. Radicals” was an “attempt to define a political orientation for Revolutionary Socialism.”⁴ By arguing this, he aimed to find adherents to their revolutionary party. Nevertheless, Rosen’s class was offered only once, in fall 1965, while Laub’s course was discontinued after the summer of 1966. This fact implies that the political

² For the Harper’s Magazine’s depiction, see the “Introduction” of this thesis. Free University of New York [FUNY], Catalogue, Fall 1965.

³ FUNY, Catalogues, Fall 1965 and Summer 1967.

⁴ FUNY, Catalogue, Fall 1965.

orientation of the majority of the students and instructors did not necessarily align with the Progressive Labor Party's Maoist class struggle.

While the Progressive Labor Party did not gain a foothold in the Free University, the leading role in the radical politics of the Free University was played by the not-so-dogmatic activists of the May 2nd Movement. In particular, Russell Stetler, a young college student from Philadelphia, held the central position in the anti-war student activists' circle in New York at this time. Stetler did not grow up in the politically radical environment in New York City; instead he had become the "first highly visible" New Left activist in the greater Philadelphia area by the mid-1960s.⁵ He was born to a conservative Republican family, but became politically sensitive and critical in high school where he met two brothers who had politically active Old Left parents with Trotskyist identities. Stetler was intelligent enough to earn a Board of Education scholarship, and enrolled in Haverford College, an elite Quaker institution in the suburb of Philadelphia.⁶

At Haverford, he became involved in Civil Rights and anti-war activities and chaired the Haverford-Bryn Mawr chapter of the Student Peace Union (SPU). At the national convention of the SPU, he encountered writings of Bertrand Russell that were very critical of the U.S. policy in Vietnam. He wrote a letter to Bertrand Russell and Russell answered Stetler in a courteous manner, which encouraged him to become a committed anti-Viet Nam war activist. In March 1964, he attended a conference on

⁵ Paul Lyons, *The People of This Generation: The Rise and Fall of the New Left in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 53.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 53.

“Socialism and America,” where participants agreed to organize a new anti-Vietnam War student organization, called the May 2nd Movement (M2M), appointing Stetler as chairman. Stetler had joined the Student Committee to Travel to Cuba (SCTC) that summer and was under indictment for the banned trip. Even though Progressive Labor supported the activities of the M2M and the SCTC, Stetler did not join the PL because he did not feel comfortable with the PL’s ideological platform. Rather, he organized the Student Committee to Send Medical Aid to the Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam with student activists at Haverford in order to support the cause of national liberation in Vietnam by imitating a similar organization of Bertrand Russell’s in London.⁷

In 1965, Stetler moved from Philadelphia to New York to join the newly founded Free University of New York. Until spring 1967, he worked with Leonard Liggio, teaching about topics relating to U.S. imperialism and Third World nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. At thirty-two years old, Liggio was a “research historian and former college instructor.” He would later become a prominent advocate of libertarianism. Stetler and Liggio gave a lecture on “Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism: The Ideological Question in Vietnam,” in which they tried to juxtapose two camps – the “Free World” and the “Socialist Camp” – and introduce the Third World ideology as an alternate possibility. “Neo-Colonialism and Revolution in Asia, Africa, and Latin America,” offered in the spring term of 1966, dealt more directly

⁷ Lyons does not refer to Stetler’s involvement in SCTC, but mentions that he received a propaganda film via Cuba and showed it at the University of Pennsylvania and other campuses in Philadelphia. *Ibid.*, 53-57.

with the Third World and included reading materials by such authors as “Fanon, Nkrumah, Gerassi, Gilly, and Lin Piao.”⁸ From 1966, Stetler committed himself to working as a secretary of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation and ran the New York branch of the foundation with John Gerassi and others to campaign for the International War Crimes Tribunals. He came back to the Free University and gave a lecture by himself on “Theories and Agencies of Change in Contemporary America,” in which he was to discuss “the relevance of Marxism” and “theoretical and practical” weakness of the New Left.⁹

Roger Taus, “poet and editor of the *Free Student*,” also offered revolutionary courses. Recognizing the fact that “the total human revolution” was “sweeping the world,” Taus presented poetry and art as “a collective and profound reflection” of civilization and society in his courses, “Contemporary Revolutionary Poetry” in summer 1965 and “Art and Communism” in fall 1966. He then picked up Caudwell’s *Studies in a Dying Culture* for the workshop on *Weapon* magazine, a newly published literary magazine, for “writers, artists, poets, and photographers” in winter 1966, the last term he taught at the Free University.

Gerald Long was another instructor who was active in May 2nd Movement after participating in the 1964 trip to Cuba. In the course catalogues, his title was listed as “stevedore and philosopher” in summer 1965 and “student of philosophy, travelled

⁸ FUNY, Catalogues, Fall 1965 and Spring 1966.

⁹ FUNY, Catalogue, Spring 1967.

to Cuba,” in the fall 1965.¹⁰ In spring 1966, he was introduced as “Stevedore, philosopher, coordinator of American Liberation League.” After the May 2nd Movement was abandoned by its parental organization, Progressive Labor, Long co-organized with Stetler and other members of M2M to build the American Liberation League (ALL) to maintain their network and continue its anti-war political activities. In order to organize their activities, Long and the ALL coordinators used the space of Free University of New York. It was reported at a HUAC hearings in 1966 that members of the ALL meetings argued seriously about how to avoid “bourgeois failings” in the Marxist context, and how to conduct “self-criticism” as a Maoist practice. They made such banners for demonstration as “Victory for the National Liberation Front” and “Support [the] People’s Wars,” which McCombs claimed to be a phrase of Lin Piao.¹¹ From summer 1965 to winter 1967, Gerald Long taught mainly about Ethics and Marxism. He started his course, entitled, “Ethics and Reality,” with a general understanding of Western ethical theories including utilitarianism, intuitionism, and emotivism, then contrasted them with the Marxian ethical positions of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao, and Caudwell. Based on these understandings, he aimed to discuss the issue of “ethical dilemmas” in novels by Sartre, Malraux, and Hemingway or the “theoretical and practical development of armies and movements of

¹⁰ FUNY, Catalogues, Summer and Fall 1965 and Spring 1966.

¹¹ *Bills to Make Punishable Assistance to Enemies of U.S. in Time of Undeclared War: Hearings on H.R. 12047, H.R. 14925, H.R. 16175, H.R. 17140, and H.R. 17194, August 16-19, 1966, Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 89th Congress 2nd sess. (1966) (Washington, DC: Governmental Printing Office, 1966), 1047-49.*

national liberation.” In the summer session of 1966, he offered an introductory course on Marxism with such reading materials as *German Ideology*, *Anti-Dühring*, and *18th Brumaire*. His intention in introducing Marxism was to urge the students to use Marxism as an intellectual tool to understand the “contemporary reality.”¹²

The trip to revolutionary Cuba radicalized one young student from Michigan, Charles Johnson, who became an activist and instructor at the Free University. According to the passport data of the travelers that was exhibited in the HUAC hearings in September 1964, Johnson was born in Crystal Springs, Mississippi, in 1941. He did not have any experience in international travel or activities of the New Left, when he applied for a passport on June 2nd, 1964, just a few months prior to the Cuba trip.¹³ Johnson introduced himself as a “Black Marxist-Leninist” in the Free University catalogues, and taught continuously from fall 1965 to winter 1968, which was the second longest engagement among the instructors. Johnson provided a “historical-materialist analysis” on the intertwined issues of race and class in his course, “Racism, Cast, and Class in American Society,” offered in fall 1965 and winter 1966. In the course he explored the “African historical and cultural heritage of the Afro-American” in the history of the United States from slavery to the Civil War.¹⁴

¹² FUNY, Catalogues, Summer and Fall 1965, Winter, Spring and Fall 1966, and Winter 1967.

¹³ *Violations of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, September 3, 4, and 28, 1964, Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 2nd sess.* (1964) (Washington, DC: Governmental Printing Office, 1964), 1299.

¹⁴ FUNY, Catalogue, Fall 1965.

The change of his course titles clearly shows a radicalization of Johnson's political identity that reflected the development of the African-American racial struggle in American society. Johnson made a serious commitment to Maoism and the Black Power ideology in the spring of 1966. He saw the "Chinese people's Commune" as "the basic unit in constructing the communist society of the future in China" and tried to learn tactics of "guerrilla warfare" in China for liberating African-Americans in America and people in the world in his courses, "The Chinese People's Commune," "Mao for Beginners," and "Marxism/Leninism/Maoism."¹⁵ In fall 1967 and winter 1968, the last two terms of the Free University, Johnson reacted to the urban racial upheavals in the previous summer and offered a course that dealt directly with the future of Black power struggles. The course description reads:

Earthshaking eruptions in the ghetto threaten the American empire. What is the next stage in the black liberation struggle. What things have been revealed about U.S. society by the crisis. How are the whites going to react. A black Marxist analysis of the black rebellion and its portent for the future.¹⁶

James Mellen and Sharon Krebs, who had not visited Cuba but had joined the circle of activists in M2M, also played a leading role in organizing the Free University. Mellen offered four courses from summer 1965 to spring 1966 until he lost his teaching position at Drew University and left for Tanzania. His course titles were "The Instruments of American Imperialism," "Revolution in Latin America," "Foreign

¹⁵ FUNY, Catalogues, Spring and Summer 1966, and Spring 1967.

¹⁶ Punctuation reflects that of the original text. FUNY, Catalogues, Fall 1967 and Winter 1968.

Activities of the AFL-CIO,” and “Marx for Beginners.” Besides the introductory course for Marxism, Mellen followed his own research interests and argued that the structure of American imperial policies affected the lives of people in Latin American and around the world. As a college instructor, Mellen demanded that his students gain “a background in the study of political and economic institutions” in the United States and undertake “extensive reading.”¹⁷

Sharon Krebs was introduced in FUNY’s course catalogues as a graduate student of Russian literature at Columbia University and a Russian translator with an M.A. from the University of Michigan. Although only in her mid-thirties, she had the longest engagement in the Free University as a founder, instructor, Corresponding Secretary, and President from the first term in summer 1965 until the final term in winter 1968. Excluding the fall term of 1967, when she picked up five American novelists – Burroughs, Barth, Pynchon, Selby, and Sontag – and argued their influence and “chances for survival,” Krebs taught her specialty in Russian literature throughout her tenure. She began her courses with the nineteenth century Russian life and literature, then moved on to the study of life and literature in the twentieth century. Her courses in the first several terms seemed to be a survey on the Russian novels, but her intention was clearly stated in course catalogues: that the classes would discuss the literature within a Russian social context. That is, “within the slow spiraling of revolutionary momentum that lead, in 1917, to the cataclysmic destruction of the old

¹⁷ FUNY, Catalogues, Summer 1965, Fall 1965, Winter 1966, and Spring 1966.

order.”¹⁸ In her course, “Post-Revolutionary Russian Literature,” she aimed to “add the dimension of social criticism” by exploring “the revolutionary achievements and failures of society” in literature.¹⁹ Thus, throughout her courses Sharon Krebs consistently attempted to draw lessons from Russian society that could be used for realizing a revolutionary moment in contemporary American society.

Those instructors who were from the Student Trip to Cuba in 1963 and 1964 and the May 2nd Movement played a central role in founding the Free University of New York. Some were college instructors who had held teaching positions at colleges or had been fired from their colleges for traveling to a restricted area. The others were graduate students who had academic interests in particular fields and were very critical of the current state of American society that emasculated the university and exploited the people in the U.S. and the rest of the world. Many of them highlighted the importance of Marxism and the Third World Revolutions in their criticisms of the injustice of the American government.

Studies on the Left and the Free University of New York

The Free University organizers understood the necessity of inviting a wider range of intellectuals who could collaborate with them to create an independent space for radical intellectuals and students. One of the most heavily represented groups of people who contributed to the Free University were the editors of the *Studies on the*

¹⁸ FUNY, Catalogue, Summer 1965.

¹⁹ FUNY, Catalogue, Winter 1968.

Left. These included, Stanley Aronowitz, Lee Baxandall, Norman Fruchter, and James Weinstein. Staughton Lynd, who was not listed as an editor in the Catalog, was also affiliated with the *Studies* before the Free University was founded. These people brought to the Free University the sophisticated intellectual radicalism of the New Left which gave the instructors new possibilities for further activities.

James Weinstein was in New York with his wife, Jackie, when the *Studies on the Left* started its publication in 1959, but he was “marginally associated” with the circle of its editors, including Lee Baxandall, Martin J. Sklar, and others. At that time, Baxandall was studying literature at Madison, where he received a BA in 1957 and an MA 1958. He was especially interested in film and drama, which he could rarely watch in his conservative hometown, Oshkosh, Wisconsin. He translated Bertolt Brecht’s *Mother* into English and advanced theatrical knowledge in the graduate school. In 1960, he visited Cuba and contributed his translation of Che Guevara’s essay and a photograph taken in Havana to *Studies*. As an editor of *Studies on the Left*, Baxandall worked with Martin J. Sklar, who was studying the roots of corporate liberalism in the Wilson era. Baxandall later described Sklar as a “workingman” on the editorial board of *Studies* “who carried brick hods and was revered for” his theoretical investigation.²⁰

²⁰ Lee Baxandall, “New York Meets Oshkosh,” in *History and the New Left: Madison, Wisconsin, 1950-1970*, ed. Paul Buhle (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), 130-33. Sklar published his work almost forty years later, Martin J. Sklar, *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890-1916: the Market, the Law and Politics* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

In Baxandall's words, the editors of *Studies* were "glad to find an in-stater eager to connect to global forces and explanatory schema" as they published "the first new radical scholarly and political journal in twenty years." He later wrote about their enthusiastic lives in Madison as follows:

Housed in neglected two- and three-story clapboards, we were studious and very purposeful. Internal émigrés camped in a Siberia dreaming of a better future. The present, we all knew, wasn't a problem, but neither was it attractive. We could cope. None of us would flunk, none go hungry. There were taverns, mentors, sexual and intellectual liaisons. Life was pretty good even when we didn't clean or cook much.²¹

Weinstein had a long career as a labor organizer and historian of the American Communist movement since the 1950s. He was born in 1926 and grew up in New York City. He majored in chemistry at Cornell University, and, after serving in the Navy during the World War II, received a degree in 1949. He joined the Communist Party and became active in the union activities in the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers under the AFL and the International United Electrical Workers under the CIO. He faced a sudden turning point in 1956 at the age of thirty: he was "proletarianized" when he wondered if he would work in factories in the rest of his life. At the same time, he was disillusioned about the Communist Party after listening to Nikita Khrushchev's speech and observing the Russian invasion into Hungary. He

²¹ Ibid., 130.

then returned to school and received a Master's degree in History under Richard Hofstadter at Columbia University.²²

In 1960, Weinstein moved to Madison, Wisconsin, with his wife and started working as an editor of the *Studies on the Left*. The editors of *Studies* saw William Appleman William's investigations into corporate capitalism in the United States as a radical alternative to contemporary politics. As Weinstein later pointed out, *Studies on the Left* did not "directly" belong to the New Left movement; it started publishing before Students for a Democratic Society was organized in 1962. Nevertheless, even though they did not have direct connections to the newly emerged student movement in the North or the Civil Rights movement in the South, they soon became aware of the "potential" in these political activities.²³

In 1963, for the purpose of broadening its audience, the journal moved to New York, where, under the leadership of Weinstein, the editorial board invited Tom Hayden, Norman Fruchter, Staughton Lynd, and Stanley Aronowitz.²⁴ Tom Hayden was a graduate of the University of Michigan and a young leading organizer of the SDS. He would go on to draft the *Port Huron Statement* in 1962. He had just started community organization as SDS's Economic Research and Action Project in Newark,

²² James Weinstein, "Studies on the Left," in *History and the New Left*, 114-15; Miles Harvey, "James Weinstein: 1926-2005," *In These Times*, June 20, 2005, accessed March 23, 2013, <http://inthesetimes.com/article/2188/>.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Weinstein, "Studies on the Left," 116.

New Jersey.²⁵ Fruchter was a film critic and a novelist who published *Coat upon a Stick* in 1962. After graduating from Rutgers University in 1959, he worked as an “assistant to the editor” of the *New Left Review* to which he contributed a couple of film and literature criticisms and a few political commentaries on Eichmann’s trial, the Cuban Revolution, and the Soviet Union.²⁶

Aronowitz was a New York born trade unionist who had worked in a metalworking plants in New Jersey in the fifties after dropping out from Brooklyn College as a result of taking part in a student protest in Dean’s office. In 1960, when he was twenty-seven, he was put in charge of the organizing and boycott department of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (ACW). He then travelled around the nation for the ACW for several years, as he connected the Civil Rights movement in the South with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). At the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, Bayard Rustin appointed him as a labor

²⁵ For Hayden, see, James Miller, *"Democracy Is in the Streets": From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987).

²⁶ Norman Fruchter, *Coat upon a Stick* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1962); Norman Fruchter, “New Left Reviewed,” *Commentary*, March 1964, accessed March 25, 2013, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/new-left-reviewed/>; Norman Fruchter, “Where Is the Ginger Man,” *New Left Review* 1, no. 8 (March-April 1961), 56-58; Norman Fruchter, “The Savage Eye,” *New Left Review* 1, no. 2 (March-April 1960), 45-46; Norman Fruchter and Stuart Hall, “Notes on the Cuban Dilemma,” *New Left Review* 1, no. 9 (May – June 1961), 2-12; Norman Fruchter, “Jews and Others,” *New Left Review* 1, no. 9 (May – June 1961), 58-60; Norman Fruchter, “The Soviet Family,” *New Left Review* 1, no. 24 (March-April 1964), 102.

coordinator for the March. From 1964, he worked for the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers' Union (OCAW) as the Northeast Regional Organizing Director.²⁷

Staughton Lynd was engaged in the Freedom Schools Project of SNCC when he joined the editorial board of *Studies*. Lynd was born in 1929 to sociologist parents Robert and Helen Lynd, who co-authored an epoch-making case study of *Middletown*. Staughton's commitment to egalitarianism and peace activism derived from his Quaker background and his parents' socialist attitudes. He went to Columbia University to earn Ph.D. in History and was invited to Spelman College in the summer of 1961. In the South, he joined the Civil Rights movement and directed the Freedom Schools in the Mississippi Freedom Summer campaign of 1964. His experience in the Freedom School project led directly to the Free University experiment in New York. Lynd and other SNCC activists exemplified the fact that thousands of oppressed and segregated African-American students could have a precious opportunity for learning their own culture and a bright future in the intolerant capitalist society of America. Lynd later called for making "every school a freedom school" by explaining that, while free institutions, new associations, enterprises, and new styles of arts were possible during the transition from feudalism to capitalism, this process could not take place within the contemporary system of capitalism as the experience of trade unions suggests.²⁸

²⁷ Stanley Aronowitz, "About" and "Biography" in his official website, accessed on March 26, 2013, <http://stanleyaronowitz.org/>.

²⁸ Staughton Lynd, "Every School a Freedom School," in *From Here to There: The Staughton Lynd Reader*, ed. Andrej Grubacic (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2010), 74.

As Lynd, Hayden, Fruchter, and Aronowitz joined the editorial board, *Studies on the Left* had the possibility of becoming an intellectual organ of the New Left movement. Nevertheless, this did not happen due to a quarrel among the editors in the mid-sixties. The development of *Studies* and the editors' debates on the role of intellectuals in the movement is well documented in historian Kevin Mattson's essay.²⁹ Mattson argues that, in the years from 1963 to 1965, two camps emerged on the editorial board regarding how the New Left should stand in relation to the history of the American leftist movement. Weinstein, Aronowitz, and another editor, Eugene Genovese, insisted that "socialism, electoral politics, and coalition building" needed to be given priority over direct actions, while Hayden, Fruchter, and Lynd believed in the necessity of community organizing and protest activities. For Weinstein, especially, the success of the movement depended upon how they could avoid the "fatal errors of the past" by understanding the failure of the Old Left. He studied the history of the Socialist Party in the Progressive Era and saw it as an archetype of radical tradition in contemporary America. Weinstein and Aronowitz, along with Genovese, founded a Committee on Independent Political Action to engage in the electoral politics. *The Studies on the Left* lost its chance to be the think tank of the New Left movement when Fruchter, Hayden, and Lynd split away from Weinstein's group in 1965 and 1966. In Weinstein's recollection, they looked for "roots, but not in the factional wars of

Carl Mirra, *The Admirable Radical: Staughton Lynd and Cold War Dissent, 1945-1970* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2010), 50-55.

²⁹ Kevin Mattson, "Between Despair and Hope: Revisiting Studies on the Left," in *The New Left Revisited*, ed. John Campbell McMillian and Paul Buhle (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000).

Trotskyists, Schachtmanites, and Communists,” while the others, especially from the SDS, thought that they did not have any ties with the Old Left at all.³⁰

Even though the editors of *Studies on the Left* joined the faculty of Free University of New York as their rupture came to the surface on its editorial board, their involvement and teaching helped set the direction of the Free University in its early stage. Each instructor offered a unique course, focusing on his own interests in academic subjects or activities that represented a certain leftist position. In the FUNY’s first term of Summer 1965, Stanley Aronowitz offered “The Theory and Practice of Community Organization” and Staughton Lynd taught “American Radical Tradition to 1900.”³¹ In the catalogue, the stated purpose of Aronowitz’s course was to discuss “the need for community organizations, their limitations and politics, and how they fit into a radical consciousness.” As he continued teaching the subject until Spring 1967, his focus shifted to more practical techniques and strategies for building political movements based on the social theories of “Marx, Mills, Marcuse, and American pluralists” as seen in his course, entitled, “Perspective for American Radicals.”³² In 1967, Aronowitz left OCAW and stopped teaching at FUNY to go back to school to earn Bachelor’s degree.³³

³⁰ Mattson, “Between Despair and Hope,” 32, 36-39; Weinstein, “Studies on the Left,” 117.

³¹ FUNY, Catalogue, Summer 1965.

³² FUNY, Catalogue, Spring 1966.

³³ He received BA from the New School in 1968 and Ph.D. from the Union Graduate School in 1975, then he started teaching sociology at Graduate Center of City

While Aronowitz emphasized the practical aspects of his commitment to the movement in his courses, Lynd, Weinstein, and Sklar offered radical approaches to American history. Lynd's "American Radical Tradition," offered in the summer session of 1965, was concerned with the following questions:

Was there an American radical tradition before Debs? Were the Abolitionists revolutionaries or apologists for capitalism – or both? To what extent have American dissenters shared the presuppositions of the alleged American consensus regarding private property and the state? What are the American roots of the new radical ideas such as the creation of parallel institutions and civil disobedience?³⁴

The purpose of this course was to contextualize the new radicalism of youths in the sixties within the history of American dissent. This course was regarded as the former part of the complete history of the American radical tradition, with the twentieth-century part of the course was scheduled for the following term and taught by James Weinstein. Lynd returned to the Free University as an instructor in spring 1966, when he taught "W.E.B. DuBois" as a historian, and Civil Rights strategist, "a prophet of Twentieth Century anti-imperialist internationalism," and a communist.³⁵ Lynd's courses on the history of American radicalism were developed into a book, *Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism*, published in 1968.

University of New York. Stanley Aronowitz, official website, accessed on March 29, 2013, <http://stanleyaronowitz.org/>.

³⁴ FUNY, Catalogue, Summer 1965.

³⁵ FUNY, Catalogue, Spring 1966.

James Weinstein began his courses on American radicalism in the twentieth century in the fall term of 1965 by focusing on the examination and evaluation of the socialist movement in the United States. He dealt with such topics as Eugene Debs and the Socialist Party from 1900 to 1919, the socialist movement during and after World War I, the downfall of the socialist movement in 1924, the revival of the movement during the Great Depression and the WWII era, and Socialism and the Cold War. These topics indicate Weinstein's devotion to the Socialist tradition in the United States and his expectation that it could be a model for radical politics in 1960s' America. For Weinstein, Socialism was a counter ideology of liberalism "as neo-populism and as the strategy of the large corporations." He tried to derive a certain historical lesson from the failure of the socialism before WWII.³⁶ Weinstein collaborated with Sklar to offer an extensive reading seminar on "Problems of Social Revolution in Advanced Industrial Society: The Case of the United States" in the winter session of 1966. As Sklar himself taught about corporate capitalism in the United States from 1896 to 1929 in fall 1965, and from 1929 to the present in winter 1966, they shared a critical view of the "political economy" of US capitalism that subjugated the working class.³⁷

Courses on radical approaches to art and film were also initially provided by the editors of *Studies on the Left* at the Free University of New York. Based on his career as a theater critic and a playwright, Lee Baxandall offered courses entitled,

³⁶ FUNY, Catalogues, Fall 1965, Winter 1966, and Spring 1967.

³⁷ FUNY, Catalogues, Fall 1965, Spring 1966, and Winter 1967.

“Marxist Approaches to the Avant-Garde Arts” in fall 1965, “Theater as Social Text” in spring 1966, and “Freedom and Society in Modern Drama” in winter 1967.

Baxandall would discuss such writers as “Ibsen, Brecht, Peter Weiss, Blitzstein, Beckett and others” to explore their “social philosophy, social context and methods of content, language and culture.”³⁸

Norman Fruchter’s course on film criticism opened a path to the creation of the New Left film directors’ group Newsreel at the Free University. Fruchter’s first course in the fall of 1965, “Film Form: Propaganda into Art,” was scheduled to discuss the documentary films by “Eisenstein, Vigo, Flaherty, Cavalcante, Riefenstahl, Antonioni, Resnais, Baillie, Brakhage, and others.” His “An Approach to Experimental Cinema” in the winter of 1966 dealt with French avant-garde and American “Underground” cinemas created by “Rene Clair, Leger, Epstein, Kirsanov, Man-Ray, Dulac, Bunuel (Dali), Steiner, Deren, Broughton, Menken, Harrington, Maas, Hugo, Brakhage, Anger, Emshwiller, Baille, [and] Weiss.”³⁹ Cinema historian Michael Renov points out that there were two types of “factions” whose union formed the Newsreel movement: one was the group of “ideologues, the political ‘heavies’ whose Movement credentials and rhetorical skills were capable of intimidating opposition in mass meeting” and another was the group of people who connected their film making to “alternative-art making and self-expression” when the American New Cinema was

³⁸ FUNY, Catalogues, Fall 1965, Spring 1966, and Winter 1967.

³⁹ FUNY, Catalogues, Fall 1965, and Spring 1966.

booming. Fruchter was a leading figure of the former faction whose political background stood out among the organizers of the Newsreel.⁴⁰

The participation of editors from the *Studies on the Left* proves that the Free University of New York was not necessarily a deviant institution from the main stream New Left movement in the United States. Rather, as it is seen above, these New Left intellectuals played a key role in creating a space for radical education and exchange of ideas for younger activists and provided direction for them. Some of the editors tried to draw lessons from the Old Left experience for the contemporary movement, which could provide youthful New Leftists with an anchor to keep their movement as a native and authentic part of American society.

The Counterculture at the Free University

One of the greatest contributions of the Free University of New York to the American sixties was its countercultural drive in the courses that provided the New Left youths with the foundations for new ways of self-expression. The Free University offered a wide variety of workshops in filmmaking, poetry reading, writing, drawing, dancing, and acting from the beginning. These workshops sought to be not merely artistic but to have a clear emphasis on the leftist political inclination that reflected radical bohemianism in New York in those days.

⁴⁰ Michael Renov, "Newsreel: Old and New – Towards Historical Profile," *Film Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (Fall 1987): 272-73.

The “Film Workshop” at the Free University was initiated in fall, 1965, by Yves Edouard de Laurot, who had founded Cinema Engagé in New York in the previous year. De Laurot and Fruchter became the two leading figures in the Cinematographic Department of the Free University. Born in Poland in 1922, de Laurot participated in the resistance against Nazi Germany in European countries during WWII. After the war, he received degrees from Cambridge and Sorbonne Universities, then became involved in filmmaking and film criticism. During these years, he worked as an assistant for Jacques Becker, Peter Weiss, Federico Fellini, and Orson Wells. As he founded Cinema Engagé in 1964, he sought to “consolidate those among the dispersed filmmakers of America” as a powerful “social force.”⁴¹

At the Free University, Yves E. de Laurot directed both theoretical and practical training in writing scripts, directing, acting, and camera work. He aimed to educate his students in “an esthetic and philosophic foundation” for producing film, which, as he explained:

will fulfill a redeeming function in the society of men: “not merely to render, but originally to create through living metaphor, the essence of contemporary reality, and project it into the future.”⁴²

One of the striking features of his workshop was the introduction of contemporary European film schools – “the IDHEC in Paris and the one in Lodz, Poland,” – to emphasize “craftsmanship” to “ensure that content seeks justice in form, which alone

⁴¹ Nicole Brenez, “Edouard de Laurot: Engagement as Prolepsis,” *Third Text* 25, no.1, 55-65.

⁴² FUNY, Catalogue, Fall 1965.

can raise experimentation to a truly creative act.”⁴³ While teaching at the Free University, de Laurot produced his own work of *Black Liberation*, which was completed in 1967 and won several awards including the Venice International Film Festival for its “distinguished poetic value.” Inspired by Malcolm X and militant struggles of African-Americans, de Laurot described “the only authentic outcry of wrath, pain and solidarity” that came from “the Black people themselves.”⁴⁴

De Laurot’s film workshop was followed by Bob Machover’s “Filmmaking [sic]” in 1966, Allan Siegel’s “Filmmaking Workshop,” Hollis Frampton’s “Basic Film Making,” Mike Robinson’s “Documentary Film: Art and Society” in 1967, and Marvin Fishman’s “Film Workshop” in 1968. All of these instructors and filmmakers committed themselves to the grassroots politics in American society. At the Free University, they focused on the development of technical aspects in filming and sound recording by charging an extra twenty-five dollar laboratory fee. In 1967, Fruchter, Siegel, and Machover officially founded the Newsreel that connected the radical filmmakers to document people’s political struggle from a New Leftist perspective. Their workshops trained many of the future documentary filmmakers who led the activities of Newsreel, and later, the Third World Newsreel.⁴⁵

Workshops in drawing and painting, modern dance, and acting were also directed by professional artists, performers, and instructors in their field at other

⁴³ FUNY, Catalogue, Winter 1966.

⁴⁴ Interview of de Laurot quoted in Brenz, “Edouard de Laurot,” 60-61.

⁴⁵ FUNY, Catalogs, 1965-68.

institutions in the New York area. Paul Gershowitz, artist, teacher, and instructor at Community Cultural Center in Brooklyn, taught drawing techniques as a way of expressing “feeling and thoughts about life” from 1965 to 1966. Betty Enfield Smith, painter and lecturer who was writing a book on Fascism, offered a course for comparative studies of fascist trends in Germany and the United States as well as “Studio Workshop in Art” in 1965, which was later taught by Nancy Collin, a painter who graduated from Cooper Union and San Francisco Art Institute.⁴⁶

The body was defined “as an instrument of expression, stressing simplicity, directness, and freedom” in Stefanie Kaplan’s modern dance workshop in 1966. Kaplan received her B.A. in modern dance from Brooklyn College and was teaching at Education Alliance. Harold Herbstman, who was an actor and director in New York theaters, offered an acting workshop at the Free University from summer 1966 to winter 1968. He collaborated with other instructors and students at the FUNY to produce a children's play, “Karate and the Golden Duckling,” and directed “The Cell” by John Gerassi in an off-off Broadway theater.⁴⁷

The largest group of instructors at the Free University of New York were self-proclaimed poets. Approximately eighteen instructors, both professional and amateur, introduced themselves as simply a poet or as a poet in conjunction with other credentials. This tendency revealed the high prevalence of poetry writing and reading among New Left intellectuals in the mid-sixties. Notably, the Free University of New

⁴⁶ FUNY, Catalogs, 1965-67.

⁴⁷ FUNY, Catalogs, 1966-68. Gerassi’s “The Cell” was published in FUNY’s official journal, *Treason* 1, no. 1 (1967).

York listed leading Beat poet Allen Ginsberg as a faculty member in the fall term of 1965.⁴⁸ Although Ginsberg did not teach any courses at the Free University, his name undoubtedly encouraged other radical intellectuals and students to join the school. His name appeared for only one term, but instructors of Free University, especially president Allen Krebs maintained connections with him and later collaborated with him at an international convention of American and European leftist intellectuals in 1967.

The instructor who initiated the “Poetry Workshop” was Tuli Kupferberg, a famous Beatnik in his forties who had formed an underground rock band called “The Fug” with Ed Sanders in the previous year. Kupferberg was born in New York in 1923 and grew up in an East European Jewish community on the Lower East Side. In 1945, he committed suicide by jumping from Manhattan Bridge, which later provided inspiration for Ginsberg’s “Howl.” By the time he joined the Free University, he had already published dozens of works that made him a celebrity of the Beatnik era.⁴⁹ The Free University’s course catalogue also introduced him as the author and editor of such works as *Sex and War*, *3,000,000,000 Beatniks*, *Kill for Peace* and as a program chairman of the New York League for Sexual Freedom. Kupferberg directed the “Poetry Workshop” in the summer term of 1965 and taught “Politics and Personality” and “The Sexual Revolution” in the subsequent terms until winter 1966. The workshop consisted of the “reading and criticism” of students’ works. In “Politics and

⁴⁸ FUNY, Catalogue, Fall 1965.

⁴⁹ Ben Sisario, “Tuli Kupeferberg, Bohemian and Fug, Dies at 86,” *New York Times*, July 12, 2010.

Personality,” he discussed “the role of personality in a social revolution.” He tried to deal with many levels of personal identity including, radical, national, regional, local, generational, sexual, religious, Marxist, Anarchist, or Capitalist personalities. “The Sexual Revolution” directly addressed the problems of sexuality in American society.

The course description reads:

The “growing edge” of sex: frontier problems in today’s sexual revolution. The new climate: An historical perspective. Teen-age sex. Homosexuality in America. Sex and The Pill. What is a family? (Kerista). The New Legal Codes. The Quality of Sex. The Sex of Children. Bisexuality. Recent discoveries in physiology. Sex of the Primates. Sex and Politics. Sex and Drugs. The New Seal Humor. The Future of Sex. (And other topics). Guest lecturers.⁵⁰

In many ways, Kupferberg took a leading role in the countercultural sexual revolution and political movement for gay and lesbian liberation. Nevertheless, it was also true that his argument did not directly lead to the rethinking of gender relations in American society as the women’s liberation movement later did.

Ed Sanders, another member of “The Fug,” also taught at the Free University in 1965. Sanders was much younger than Kupferberg, as he was born in Kansas in 1936. Sanders went on to graduate from New York University. He later stated in an interview that he had become good a friend with Allen Ginsberg at the age of eighteen and met Kupferberg in the Peace Eye Bookstore that he opened on East 10th Street in

⁵⁰ FUNY, Catalogue, Winter 1966.

Village.⁵¹ Sanders taught “Revolutionary Egyptology” in which he discussed “Poetics, prophetic symbolism, total assault semantics and theory of Ra (beginners)” as well as the analysis of hieroglyphics and a theory of modern graphics.⁵²

While Kupferberg and Sanders taught only for a short term at the Free University, Will Inman, editor of poetry magazine *Kauri*, was engaged in the operation of the Free University as Vice President from fall 1965 to fall 1967. Inman was born in North Carolina in 1923 and received B.A. from Duke University in 1943. After graduation, he worked as a union organizer and became a communist in North Carolina in 1947. However, he dismissed communism in 1956, recalling later that:

I made all the mistakes a young revolutionary can make, short of violence, and lived to confront the grim fact one day that I had become a Communist first, a human being second.⁵³

Inman found “great cleavages in the Communist camp” and observed that former colonies in Africa and Asia achieved their independence. In this age of fluctuation, he saw that American policy was forcing the people of the world to choose from only two options: Capitalism or Communism. Inman argues:

I became more and more convinced that our government is becoming the conscious instrument of a brutalizing program designed to intimidate the

⁵¹ Matt Fink, “Ed Sanders: The Last Radical (Part 1),” *Paste: Signs of Life in Music, Film and Culture*, September 19, 2003, accessed on February 15, 2013, <http://www.pastemagazine.com/articles/2003/09/ed-sanders.html>.

⁵² FUNY, Catalogue, Summer 1965.

⁵³ Will Inman, “Free University of New York: One Man’s View,” *Humanist*, May-June 1966, 78.

world's people at the expense of their own desires and needs for economic betterment and self-determination.⁵⁴

In the late fifties, Inman moved to New York, where he worked as a journalist, writer, and editor. He started publishing the poetry newsletter *Kauri* in 1964.⁵⁵

Inman was asked to consider teaching at the Free University by Joseph Berke, a psychiatrist, when he was auditing Allen Krebs's class in the summer of 1965. Berke persuaded Inman to teach not only poetry but also his life, as he had experienced "so many turns and changes in thinking and doing," which he thought would be instructive to students.⁵⁶ For two years from the fall of 1965, Inman taught the course, "A Quest for Self," which he introduced in the course catalogue as follows:

Exploration of One Man's Life, not as a model to be mimicked, rather a revelation of many necessary turns, a baffle to transcend, suggesting revolution within, a search for integrity without dogma in a time of relative values.⁵⁷

Inman offered two other courses, "Individual Spiritual Awareness and Social Revolution" and "Individual Spiritual Awareness, Social Revolution, Alienation, Dialectics of Self-in-Group." Both courses aimed to provide students with a chance to search for an authentic self identity by introducing "Eastern wisdom and Western

⁵⁴ Ibid., 79.

⁵⁵ For Inman's biography, see "Preliminary Inventory of Will Inman Papers, 1910-2003," Duke University Libraries, <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/findingaids/inman/>.

⁵⁶ Inman, "Free University of New York," 79.

⁵⁷ FUNY, Catalogue, Fall 1965.

technical capacity” and “revolutionary transformation for person and people.”⁵⁸ Later in 1966, he added one sentence to his “A Quest for Self” course: “No answers promised; painful questions guaranteed.”⁵⁹

There were several other poets at the Free University who taught unique literary courses. For example, Ted Berrigan was a New York School poet and “bohemian” who edited “C” magazine in New York. In fall 1965, he taught “American Writing Now” by introducing the works of “John Ashberry, William Burroughs, Kenneth Koch, Charles Olson, Frank O’Hara, Jack Kerouac, LeRoi Jones, Ed Sanders, Terry Southern,” and others.⁶⁰ George Montgomery, an ex-instructor of creative writing at SUNY, New Paltz, taught “Poetry and American Life” and “New American Poetry” starting in winter 1966. Course catalogues introduced him as an editor of “one of the first poetry newsletters since the Korean War.” He was born in the mid-twenties and became an active poet in the mid-fifties when he worked for the Poet’s Theater in New York City.⁶¹

Poets at the Free University directly connected their fields of interest to the ongoing political struggle as instructors in other fields did. Poet and essayist Al Lee’s “Literatures and Public Art” and “Literature vs. LBJ” aimed to analyze “the

⁵⁸ FUNY, Catalogues, Winter 1966 and Spring 1966.

⁵⁹ FUNY, Catalogues, 1966-67.

⁶⁰ FUNY, Catalogue, Fall 1965.

⁶¹ FUNY, Catalogue, Fall 1967; “George Montgomery, Poet, Photographer and Curator, 73,” *New York Times*, April 14, 1997 accessed on February 1, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/1997/04/14/arts/george-montgomery-poet-photographer-and-curator-73.html>.

antagonistic contradiction between the literary and political establishments.”⁶² A. B. Spellman, African-American poet and commentator of WBAI, taught “Twentieth Century Radical Afro-American Social Thought” in fall 1965. This course dealt with major African-American thinkers, including “Garvey, DuBois, Richard Wright, Harry Haywood, E. Franklin Frazer, Harold Cruse, Elijah Muhammad, Malcolm X, Robert Williams, and LeRoi Jones.”⁶³ Roger Taus and Sotere Torregian were more like revolutionary poets. Taus, an editor of *Free Student*, the official newspaper of the May 2nd Movement, offered “Contemporary Revolutionary Poetry,” “Art and Communism,” and “*Weapon* Workshop” from 1965 to 1966. In these courses, Taus tried to provide students with chances to become familiar with literary works that reflected the revolutions sweeping the globe and communism, as well as to give students an opportunity to contribute to his new literary magazine *Weapon*.⁶⁴ Torregian, poet and coordinator of the Free University of Palo Alto, offered a series of lectures entitled “Poetry and Revolution” in 1966, in which he defined “poetry as a universal criterion of truth” and discussed the works of “Allen Ginsberg, Tuli Kupferberg, Ted Berrigan, Frank O’Hara, Frank Lima, Gerard Malanga” and “the Gang-Shag of the sprit.”⁶⁵ Interestingly, as indicated in the list of names, poets at the Free University of New York freely discussed and analyzed the works of other poet

⁶² FUNY, Catalogue, Winter 1966.

⁶³ FUNY, Catalogue, Summer 1965.

⁶⁴ FUNY, Catalogues, 1965-66.

⁶⁵ FUNY, Catalogue, Winter 1966.

instructors and sought to connect poetry with the ongoing liberation movements in the world.

Psychiatry and the New Left

Another group of instructors at Free University worth mentioning is that of psychiatrists. As media paid special attentions to their unique course offerings, psychiatry held a prominent position in the New Leftists' counterculture in the U.S. and did so at the Free University as well. The leading instructor in this field was Joseph Berke, M.D., an original faculty member of Free University in summer 1965. Berke, in his mid-twenties, had just finished an internship at a hospital and had joined Krebs and Mellen to organize the Free University. His course "The Psychotic Experience as an Archetype of Paradise Lost" was meant to "explore the experience of going-into-madness" with the recognition that madness was a key to understanding the entire panorama of "psychopathology."⁶⁶ Soon after the first term, Berke moved to London where he sought to build a London version of the Free University with British psychiatrists.

William Earwin was another psychotherapist whose course title invited the prying eyes of the media and their audience. In spite of their curiosity, his "The Search for Authentic Sexual Experience" was designed to seriously argue the sexual relations from a sociological perspective. Its course description reads:

⁶⁶ FUNY, Catalogue, Summer 1965.

This search will consist of exploring the idea of a universal sexual drive; of examining religion, anthropology and psychology for more meaningful answers to man as a sexual being; of considering the various dimensions of adult sexuality, with emphasis on the relationship of potency to the capacity for orgasm, and for perceiving reality; of gaining insight into the meaning of sexual freedom; and of setting foundation for a workable sexual ethos.⁶⁷

Despite the instructor's seriousness, the topic was sensational enough and invited more and more curious audiences. As a result, he had to limit the number of students to seven in the second term.⁶⁸

Peter Stafford's class, "Hallucinogenic Drugs: Their Uses and Social Implications," offered in fall 1966 and in winter 1966, was another unusual offering that captured media attention. Stafford was a specialist in the use of LSD in the mid-sixties. While he was teaching at the Free University, he had lived in the Village since 1964 and wrote a book on students and their drug use, which was published as *LSD: The Problem-Solving Psychedelic* in 1967. His courses considered the influence of drugs on "leisure, family life, and social revolution with emphasis on future impact" in their "pathological culture."⁶⁹

These psychology-related courses contributed much to the creation of FUNY's eccentric image. Nevertheless, these courses simply and seriously explored topics that were avoided in the established schools at that time. In later terms at the Free University, psychoanalysts presented their topics in relation to ongoing liberation

⁶⁷ FUNY, Catalogue, Fall 1965.

⁶⁸ FUNY, Catalogue, Winter 1966.

⁶⁹ FUNY, Catalogues, Fall 1965 and Winter 1966.

movements in the United States. Constance Long and Constance Ullman, both of whom were researchers for a trade union mental health project, offered the course, “Psychoanalysis and Marxism.” The course aimed to discuss the Post-Freudian psychoanalytic theories of Reich, Fromm, and Horney from a Marxist point of view to emphasize the role of “socio-psychology” in American society. Its reading list included “Franz Fanon, Che Guevara, and William Pomeroy.”⁷⁰

New Instructors and New Academic Approaches

The Free University of New York continuously invited new faculty members to offer unique courses until its closing in 1968. Since new instructors needed to be admitted by the coordinating committee of the school, faculty members were invited from the social milieu of the organizers. Nevertheless, the Free University sometimes featured such notable figures of the day as Truman Nelson, Conor Cruise O’Brien, and John Gerassi. In addition, Free University instructors endeavored to open a discussion on the conventional academic curriculums in the existing universities in 1967.

Truman Nelson, a historical novelist, joined the faculty of the Free University in the winter term of 1966. Will Inman described in a magazine article that Nelson, “whose focus on John Brown as America’s greatest revolutionary, does not turn him from the problem of alienation as modern man’s perhaps deepest problem.”⁷¹ A self-educated Marxist, Truman Nelson was born in 1912 and received a reputation for his

⁷⁰ FUNY, Catalogue, Winter 1967.

⁷¹ Inman, “Free University,” 81.

description of abolitionists' "guerrilla warfare in 'Bloody Kansas'" in his first novel, *The Sin of the Prophet*, in the early fifties.⁷² He taught at Free University for two terms, from winter to spring 1966. His courses were entitled "The Abolitionist Revolution: From Nut Turner to John Brown" and "The Revolutionary Decade in America, 1850-60." In these courses, Nelson extracted the significance of abolitionism for contemporary America by emphasizing "the dilemma of violence versus non-violence" in the anti-slavery rebellion of Nut Turner, and its "proliferation into pacifist, women's rights, utopian socialist, anti-war, and anti-nationalism phases." He also picked up Thoreau, Emerson, and Theodore Parker to argue "the revolutionary consciousness and morality of the decade" in the mid-nineteenth century."⁷³

O'Brien and Gerassi taught only one term in winter 1967 but they were retained in the network of Free University people for collaboration on political activities. Because of their reputations, their courses enjoyed great popularity at the Free University. O'Brien was often described with many titles such as writer, historian, diplomat, politician, journalist, and public intellectual. He was born in Dublin in 1917, and, after receiving Ph.D. from Trinity College in Dublin, he engaged in public service in Ireland. His critical role as a diplomat made him an internationally prominent figure in the early 1960s. He vocally called for the independence of Ireland and supported anti-colonialism relating to Katanga's independence at the United Nations. As a vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana from 1962 to 1965, he clashed with Chancellor

⁷² For Truman Nelson, see, "Introduction" for William J. Schafer, ed., *The Truman Nelson Reader* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989).

⁷³ FUNY, Catalogues, Winter and Spring 1966.

Kwame Nkrumah on the question of academic freedom and finally resigned from the position. He joined the Free University when he accepted the position of Schweitzer professor of humanities at New York University.⁷⁴ At the Free University, he taught part A of “Africa Today: Africa in International Affairs,” in which he introduced contemporary power politics in Africa with case histories of the Congo, Ghana, and Nigeria to discuss the concept of African unity.⁷⁵ O’Brien also contributed to the community of Free University instructors by helping James Mellen, who had been fired from Drew University, find a teaching job in the University of Dar es Salaam by using his connections to African intellectuals.

John Gerassi was also teaching at New York University when he joined the faculty of the Free University. Gerassi also had many roles, such as journalist, university professor, writer, and political activist. He was born in France in 1931 to a Turkish-born Sephardic Jewish Fernando Gerassi and Ukrainian-born Stepha Awdykowicz. His parents belonged to the international intellectual circle in Europe in 1930s where they became close friends with Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir. John was raised up in New York and attended Columbia University where he received his master’s degree. He then worked as a journalist for *Time*, *Newsweek*, and the *New York Times*. He had already been active in the anti-Vietnam War movement by

⁷⁴ For O’Brien, see, Conor Cruise O’Brien, *Memoir: My Life and Themes* (Dublin: Poolbeg, 1999); William Grimes, “Conor Cruise O’Brien, Irish Diplomat, Is Dead at 91,” *New York Times*, December 20, 2008.

⁷⁵ “Africa Today, Part B: Revolution in South Africa” was taught by Deirdre Levinson, instructor in English, New York University, who used to live in South Africa and was a member of Non-European Unity Movement. FUNY, Catalogue, Winter 1967.

running the New York branch of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation with Russell Stetler and other FUNY affiliates. His course at the Free University was entitled “Latin America – The Next Vietnam?” and in it he aimed to assess “the revolutionary potential” in Latin American countries by referring to the history of guerrilla warfare. He emphasized “the role of present-day institutions, national bourgeoisie, the army, the urban poor, and the role violence in the peasant liberation movements.”⁷⁶ It can be easily assumed that Gerassi’s personal connections with European intellectuals, including Sartre, helped bring FUNY instructors into the international community of leftists.

New instructors joined the Free University to cover the fields whose instructors left the institution, as well as to direct more focus toward particular areas of study. One visible group of instructors who emphasize the Free University’s political orientations came from the North American Congress of Latin America. The Congress was founded by New Left activists in New York City in February 1967 to publish newsletters that provided information about the major issues in the Americas.⁷⁷ Eddie Black, Loraine Fletcher, Fred Goff, Peter Henig, Mike Holocomb, David Konstan, T. Proctor Lippincott, Michael Locker, and Lois Reivich collaboratively taught the course “U.S. Dominion of Latin America,” which sought to “identify the ideology, individuals, organizations, and institutions within the U.S.” that determined “the destiny of Latin America.” It provided a wide variety of case studies in the Dominican

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ For the North American Congress on Latin America, see their official website at <https://nacla.org>.

Republic, Brazil, Colombia, Puerto Rico, and Guatemala with a focus on the “U.S. agri-business, counter-insurgency, foreign aid, and international monetary transactions.”⁷⁸

In the winter of 1967, in addition to the continuous offering of unique courses, the Free University of New York started a new experimental series of lectures, “Critique of Conventional Curriculum,” that re-examined the educational program in universities in arts and sciences. The areas covered by this initiative were: American History by Leonard Liggio; Comparative literature in Drama by Lee Baxandall and in the Novel by David Cauter; Russian Literature by Sharon Krebs; Economics by L. Marcus; International Affairs in Africa by Conor Cruise O'Brien and Deirdre Levinson and in Latin America by John Gerassi; U.S. Foreign Policy by M.S. Arnoni; Vietnam by Charlotte Polin and Walter Teague; Philosophy by Gerald Long; Psychology by Constance Ullman; Science and Math by Len Ragozin; Sociology by Allen Krebs; and World History by Leonard Liggio. This series was carried out for two semesters with some replacement of instructors. Although what was actually discussed in this series is a matter of speculation, this attempt reveals how the instructors of the Free University radically challenged the existing academic practice in the established schools. It was a dissent from the outside of the universities, but the Free University's independent position allowed the instructors argue against the conventional academism in a freer and livelier way. As each instructor already went beyond academic orthodoxy, this

⁷⁸ FUNY, Catalogue, Summer 1967.

was an official and collective academic dissent which would provide a chance for reshaping the academic discipline in universities.

This chapter has explored the catalogues of the Free University of New York from 1965 to 1968 to examine who taught at the school and what ideas and philosophies they propagated. Although this chapter could not cover the other unique instructors who contributed to the education and politics of the Free University of New York, it showed the position of the school in the larger context of the New Left movement in the United States. While the New Left emphasized direct actions to an increasing extent in the final phase of the sixties, radical intellectuals in New York maintained their space for self-education and argument. Even though the Free University lacked certain subjects such as women's studies or ethnic studies, because they had not yet become established fields, it covered every field from history to psychiatry to poem and film — all of which were directly connected to radical dissent in American society.

What is missing in this chapter is an image of the students who learned at the Free University. Due to the lack of materials, it is not easy to describe the educational effect that the Free University had, or the students who were affected. Nevertheless, one instructor may provide a key to understanding this aspect. Aaron Frishberg, who joined the faculty in fall, 1967, and taught about Bob Dylan, was an ex-student at the Free University. It was mentioned in the catalogues that he dropped out of high school in the summer of 1965 “during the week of graduation” and became a Free University

student that fall.⁷⁹ The Free University did not grant any credit or degrees, but it did train a high school dropout to become a radical intellectual.

⁷⁹ FUNY, Catalogue, Winter 1968.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Free University and the Vietnam War: Building a Domestic Base for the Movement

Once the Free University acquired the label of the “extremist fringe” of the New Left from “fellow” rebels, it became an easy target for the conservative elements of American society. The radical intellectuals at the Free University never stopped their political activities against the U.S. intervention in the War in Vietnam: on the contrary, they became increasingly vocal in their protest, which resulted in the firing of a university instructor in New Jersey in the spring of 1966, and subpoenas of Free University organizers to the House Un-American Activities Committee that summer. Nevertheless, since the Students for a Democratic Society had shifted their focus to the War a year earlier, the Free University never occupied a central role in the building national wave of the student anti-war movement. The radical intellectuals at the Free University sought their own ways of appealing against the War in the course of the Free University’s development from 1966 to 1967. They then chose to transcend the national boarder to construct an international network of pro-Third World, anti-U.S. imperialism movements. This chapter explores the Free University participants’ anti-war activities in domestic politics. In particular, James Mellen, Allen Krebs, Russell Stetler, Walter Teague, and American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) attorneys all played significant roles in stirring up the issue of the Vietnam War in their own styles.

Dismissal of James Mellen from Drew University

The Free University of New York came under government scrutiny because of individual members' activities, not because of the organization's political orientation: the Free University never had a political platform of its own. Initially, faculty members who affiliated with communist organizations were listed as suspicious individuals. Such individuals included: Herbert Aptheker, a member of the National Committee of Communist Party USA (CPUSA) and Director of the American Institute for Marxist Studies; Milt Rosen, president of the Progressive Labor Party (PLP); Levi Laub, leader of the PLP; Robert Sitton, a professor of philosophy who was fired from Brooklyn College because he rescinded his loyalty oath; James Robertson, a Marxist historian who led the Separatist Movement of Communism.¹ Then, gradually, other members who were increasingly vocal in the anti-war movement came under assault. One such example was Russell Stetler, a (May 2nd Movement) M2M member who was said to be sending "medical aid to the Viet Cong." Although Stetler admitted that he had personally engaged in such activities, he denied that the M2M and the Free University had anything to do with them. Regarding the purpose of the Free University, he told a college newspaper reporter at Pennsylvania State College that it was:

simply a concoction of left-wing extremist groups. Certainly there are Communists and other radicals teaching there. This only means it is a place

¹ Fulton Lewis Jr., "'Free Student University' Is Under Government Scrutiny," *Human Events*, October 16, 1965.

which offers those in the radical analysis the opportunity to express their views.²

Stetler indeed made good use of the Free University for his own style of anti-war movement. Using the resources of the Free University, he later founded a U.S. branch of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation which organized International War Crimes Tribunals in 1967.

A more serious attack hit a FUNY instructor when James Mellen supported a remark about the Vietnam War made by Rutgers Professor Eugene D. Genovese. At a teach-in at Rutgers University in previous April, Genovese, a well-recognized historian of the American South and slavery, stated:

Those of you who know me know that I am a Marxist and Socialist. Therefore, unlike most of my distinguished colleagues here this morning, I do not fear or regret the impending Viet Cong victory in Viet Nam. I welcome it.³

Rutgers University was run by New Jersey State, and 1965 was the year of the gubernatorial election in which conservative candidate Wayne Dumont Jr. demanded Genovese's dismissal from Rutgers University.

James Mellen, who was invited to a teach-in at Rutgers on September 30, declared that he would stand by Genovese and insisted that all professors in New Jersey follow him:

² Cecelia Hitte, "Stetler Defends M2M Activities," *Collegian* (State College, PA.), November 10, 1965.

³ "The New Universities," *The American Legion Firing Line*, May 1966, 2.

As a professed Marxist and Socialist, I do not hesitate to state my position. I stand side by side with Prof. Genovese. ... I profess my political viewpoints in class everyday and it is my view that if other professors in New Jersey teaching my subject do not do so they are abdicating their responsibility.⁴

Mellen never anticipated that his remark would make the news. His speech was conveyed by the press and created a fatal criticism against him among the conservative politicians and trustees of Drew University. Mellen later recalled:

It was an all-night teach-in, and I didn't speak until six a.m. An AP stringer was there, and he slept most of the night. But he woke up while I was talking and wrote down what I said. ... I guess I was naïve, but I didn't think anyone cared what I said. Well, it just caused a furor."⁵

On October 15, the Board of Trustees of Drew University met to discuss the issue of Mellen. Donald R. Baldwin, chairman of the Board, remarked at the opening of the meeting, "Gentlemen, we are here today to fire a man." President Robert Oxnam of Drew University told the Board that Mellen's statement was "totally irresponsible and contrary to everything Drew stands for as a Christian institution." The Board decided not to renew Mellen's contract for the reason that he did not fit into Drew's political science department's plan, that he did not have a Ph.D., and that he undertook "outside employment" at FUNY. In reality, there were ten other faculty members in the department who did not have Ph.D.s and instructors at FUNY received no salaries – they even contributed some money for founding FUNY. In the gubernatorial campaign, Republican candidate Wayne Dumont Jr. who emphasized Genovese and

⁴ Ibid., 8.

⁵ Viorst, *Fire in the Streets*, 474.

Mellen affair as “softness on communism,” was defeated by Democrat Richard J. Hughes.⁶ While Genovese kept his position at Rutgers University, Mellen lost his job. Even after he received a Ph.D., no college offered a position to this “troublemaker,” although he became a “hero” among anti-war activists. With the assistance of Conor Cruise O’Brien, who also taught at the Free University, Mellen sought a teaching position in Tanzania, where he would observe the people’s struggle for liberation on African soil.

HUAC and the Anti-war Movement

In the summer of 1966, the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) seized the Free University of New York as an evidence of a subversive anti-Vietnam War movement led by Communist sympathizers. The investigation before HUAC was well planned and utilized some significant informants to suggest that the Free University was a place of totalitarianism in which innocent idealistic liberal youths were corrupted by extreme leftists who had connections to foreign revolutionaries. The investigation, nonetheless, did not proceed as the committee had planned because of an unprecedented constitutional clash between the committee and the witnesses’ attorneys. This event signified a watershed moment, marking the point from which congressional crusades against anti-Vietnam war activism could not halt the growing movement any longer.

⁶ Roger Taus, “N.J. Prof. Fired,” *Free Student*, no 6 (1966), 2, 13.

A month previous, HUAC had scheduled investigative hearings on “Bills To Make Punishable Assistance to Enemies of U.S. in Time of Undeclared War” from August 16 to 19, 1966, on Capitol Hill. The bill was introduced by Texas Democrat Joe R. Pool in order to jail individuals who aid U.S. enemies in the Undeclared War in Vietnam for up to twenty years. Thirteen subpoenaed witnesses, all of whom were critical of the U.S. military policy in Vietnam, included two activists from New York: Allen Krebs, President of FUNY, and Walter D. Teague, Chairman of the United States Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, which HUAC claimed to be an organization to send medical supplies to Vietcong.⁷

When they received the news, the Free University organizers held an emergency meeting of the Coordinating Committee at which they discussed their strategy for the hearings.⁸ On August 14, two days before the scheduled hearing, the ACLU lawyers, including Arthur Kinoy and William M. Kunstler, who represented Krebs and Teague, stepped into a constitutional lawsuit against HUAC in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Kinoy was one of the most active Civil Rights lawyers of the day, and had successfully obtained a historically significant Supreme Court order to give district judges the power to stop the enforcement of laws

⁷ *Bills to Make Punishable Assistance to Enemies of U.S. in Time of Undeclared War: Hearings on H.R. 12047, H.R. 14925, H.R. 16175, H.R. 17140, and H.R. 17194, August 16-19, 1966, Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives*, 89th Congress 2nd sess. (1966) (Washington, DC: Governmental Printing Office, 1966).

⁸ Handwriting memo to Will Inman, n.d. Will Inman Papers, 1910-2003, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University [hereafter, Will Inman Papers].

that might violate the right to free speech in the case of *Dombrowski v. Pfister* in 1965.⁹ Kunstler was another radical lawyer who had dealt with significant civil rights issues and served as director for the ACLU since 1965. The two later became even more famous when they successfully overturned the charges against the Chicago Seven in 1969.

In their appeal, the ACLU lawyers argued that all the activities and ideas of plaintiff Allen M. Krebs and members of the Free University were “fully within the protection of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States” and they reflected “the exercise of fundamental rights of freedom of belief and thought, freedom of speech, assembly and the press, and freedom of academic inquiry and study.” The appeal also claimed that the purpose of plaintiff Teague’s involvement with the U.S. Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front in sending medical supplies directly to the National Liberation Front Red Cross were “fully protected by the guarantees of the First Amendment.” It then added the Committee’s belief that the National Liberation Front was not the enemy of the people of the United States and that “the best interest of

⁹ In his career, Kinoy joined many controversial cases for protecting Civil Rights such as the final appeal of Julius and Ethel Rosenbergs’ death sentence in 1953, the Chicago Seven case in 1969, and the case of Adam Clayton Powell Jr.’s discharge from the House of Representatives in 1969. He also joined the faculty of law at Rutgers University in 1964. Paul Lewis, “Arthur Kinoy Is Dead at 82: Lawyer for Chicago Seven,” *The New York Times*, 20 September 2003; Arthur Kinoy, *Rights on Trial: The Odyssey of a People’s Lawyer* (New York: Bernel Books, 1993).

the American People lies in recognizing that the affairs of Viet Nam must be settled by the people of Viet Nam themselves.”¹⁰

The reaction of the court was very surprising to the attorneys as well as to the HUAC members. On the day of the appeal, District Judge Howard F. Corcoran issued a temporary order to grant an injunction against holding the scheduled hearings on the 16th because he found that the question raised by the appellants was “not insubstantial.”¹¹ The ACLU, which had long been antagonistic to HUAC, had filed similar appeals before, only to have them declined by the court prior to the hearings. The ACLU regarded this series of investigation as “the herald of a new period of official suppression of citizen dissent,” and it commented to the news media that the order would “contribute a major new element in the vindication of individual rights.” “Even more importantly,” it added “judicial relief at the outset of such a hearing protects countless others who have not been subpoenaed, who in the past have feared to dissent while subpoenaed witness were litigating their rights.”¹² On the other hand, the Department of Justice, representing Congress, immediately asked the Court to

¹⁰ Dr. Allen M. Krebs et.al. v. John M. Ashbrock, et.al., “Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Judgment Relief,” The United States District Court for the District of Columbia, August 14, 1966, 2-5, in *American Civil Liberties Union Records and Publications: 1917-1975* (Ann Arbor, Mich. : University Microfilms International), Reel 57, No. 719 [hereafter, ACLU Records].

¹¹ “Order” and “Temporary Restraining Order” signed by F. F. Corcoran in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, 2157-66, August 15, 1966, *Brief and Appendix for Appellants, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Appeal no. 21382*, ACLU Records.

¹² John Herbers, “U.S. Judge Forbids A House Inquiry: Panel is Defiant,” *New York Times*, August 16, 1966.

dissolve the order, but the court suspended the decision until 10 a.m. on the 16th. The *New York Times* reported that “the picture was confused as to what would happen” the next day. The HUAC members fiercely claimed that Judge Concoran ignored the constitutional rule of independence of the three branches and insisted that “every member” of the committee would be at the hearing room at 10 a.m. the next day.¹³

At 10:15 a.m. on the 16th of August in the Canon House Office Building Caucus Room, Joe R. Pool called to order the meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Krebs and Teague were present to receive copies of the opening statement which explained the purpose of the hearings. Students and activists who had sympathized with the subpoenaed witnesses occupied the audience seats and reacted irritably to the remarks and statements made by the Committee members and friendly witnesses. After a series of appeals and requests by the attorneys of the subpoenaed witnesses, Chairman Pool denied all the requests for the reason that these were considered to be insults to the Committee and called on one of the three friendly witnesses, Phillip Abbott Luce.¹⁴

The committee’s tactic was to highlight the fact that organizations with which subpoenaed witness were affiliated had connections to foreign Communist governments and organizations. Luce was the one of the best informers because he was a converted activist who had been affiliated with the Progressive Labor Movement before it turned into the Party in 1965, and had served as a spokesperson in the Student

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ *Bills to Make Punishable Assistance to Enemies of U.S. in Time of Undeclared War*, 911-26.

Committee to Travel to Cuba in 1963. By answering the committee members' questions, Luce testified that the PL sought a Marx-Leninist Revolution to overthrow the U.S. Government even though it was a suicidal "kamikaze attack." Luce submitted letters and pamphlets as evidence to claim that the PL and the M2M were both familiar with Chinese affairs because they received a number of communications on a daily basis from Beijing through a Chinese news service in London, called Hsin Hua [Xinhua], and occasional letters from an American Communist in Peking, named Ana Louise Strong. He also revealed that, during the 1963 and 1964 travels to Cuba, travelers received financial support from a Cuban mission in New York and that the travelers brought back a film, entitled "Heroic Vietnam, 1963" from Cuba with the missionary's help. When someone on the floor shouted, "Let's stop this fink testimony. You get out of here," the audience reacted with "disturbance, applause, and demonstration."¹⁵

Although Luce only referred to the fact that there were a few people in FUNY's background organizations who had such channels to foreign communist organizations and governments, Luce's testimony successfully created a subversive image of the Free University of New York. This raised the tension of the hearings even higher, which caused an unparalleled confrontation between the ACLU attorneys and the Committee.

In the morning session of the second day of the hearings, a battle between the committee and the attorneys broke out. When the committee questioned another

¹⁵ Ibid., 926-65.

friendly witness, Philip A. McCombs, about Walter Dorwin Teague III, Attorneys Kinoy, Kunstler, and other ACLU lawyers stood up to protest. They raised the objection that Teague had no chance to cross-examine McCombs. Kinoy had made the same objection for Krebs the day before, but, once again, their objection was overruled by Chairman Pool. Nevertheless, they still protested in front of the Representatives as the record of the hearing shows:

Mr. Kinoy: May the record show we take a strenuous objection to your ruling.

Mr. Pool: Now sit down. Go over there and sit down. You have made your objection. You are not going to disrupt this hearing any further.

Mr. Kunstler: Mr. Chairman, you don't have to deal discourteously with an attorney in front of you. That is wholly un-American.

Mr. Pool: I will deal any way I want under the rules of this hearing. I have just told him to be quiet and I ask you to sit down now.

Mr. Kinoy: Mr. Chairman, let the record show – don't touch a lawyer. Mr. Chairman –

Mr. Pool: Remove the lawyer.

Mr. Kinoy: Mr. Chairman, I will not be taken from this courtroom. I am an attorney at law and I have the right to be heard.

Mr. Kunstler: Now it is time we heard this. Throw out all the attorneys you want.¹⁶

After Kinoy was forcefully taken out of the hearing room by marshals, other lawyers stepped forward and objected to the Committee. Frank J. Donner from New York argued, "I have practiced before this committee almost for a generation and I have never seen the brutal treatment afforded the counsel or any physical interference of the counsel that has occurred here; and, frankly, Mr. Pool, I am frightened" because Kinoy

¹⁶ Ibid., 1027.

was unnecessarily “choked, strangled.”¹⁷ Then, seven lawyers who represented subpoenaed witnesses issued a declaration to withdraw for the reason that they could not represent witnesses without their colleague and that attorneys would not “function in an atmosphere of terror and intimidation.” Then Allen M. Krebs left the hearing with his statement distributed to the committee. During these first two days of hearings, twenty-one people, mainly college aged, were arrested and booked for shouting and demonstrating in the hearing room and corridors.¹⁸

Krebs, in his statement, called the hearings a “grotesque circus” because “the twelve individuals subpoenaed here should be accused of plots, conspiracies and of possessing Peking gold.” This archeological inquisition was happening in the midsummer of 1966 when the United States was “the most powerful industrial nation in history.” For Krebs, it was “a nation, a white dominated island, a country threatened by the revolutionary storms in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and increasing racial ferment at home.” Krebs concluded the statement by saying:

As I leave this room, to my brothers who stand here after me today, this week next month – and there are signs that the Inquisition of the Sixties has now begun – you have my respect and my compassion.¹⁹

¹⁷ Ibid., 1031.

¹⁸ Ibid., 1039; John Herbers, “Lawyer Ejected by House Inquiry: Seven Walk Out,” *New York Times*, August 18, 1966.

¹⁹ “Allen Krebs Statement to HUAC, Wednesday 17 August 1966,” in *Bills to Make Punishable Assistance to Enemies of U.S. in Time of Undeclared War*, 1068.

In the afternoon, the committee resumed testimony of McCombs, a recent Yale graduate who had infiltrated the anti-Viet Nam War activities and the Free University of New York as a reporter. McCombs contributed to the committee's attack by showing evidence that students and faculty at the Free University had some form of accesses to Vietnamese political leaders and literature. In July, McCombs attended two classes at FUNY: One was entitled "Community Organization, Who, What, and Why" taught by African-American journalist Calvin Hicks, and another was "Vietnam National Liberation Fronts" taught by Charlotte Polin. McCombs claimed that the discussion in Hicks's class was centered on how to organize "Negro communities" and "the extent to which violence was justified" for that cause. He added that Hicks was "interested in instilling in" students his Marxist ideology. In Charlotte Polin's class, four or five students read both American newspapers and materials printed in Hanoi or Peking, which McCombs bought from Walter Teague III, to contradict US foreign policies. McCombs observed that Polin was "thoroughly and wholeheartedly behind the cause of the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong." In her class, Polin showed a copy of "Uncle Ho's letter" addressed to "My dear niece," dated November 25, 1965. The letter, submitted as an exhibit to the committee, showed Ho Chi Minh's appreciation to young Americans who were active in the movement against the "U.S. imperialist aggression" in Vietnam. The letter read:

I am glad to learn that you and many other young Americans are actively endeavoring under varied forms to help push forward the movement against the war of aggression in Viet Nam and in support of the Vietnamese people.

I highly appreciate these efforts of yours and of the American youth, students and other friends who are valiantly fighting for freedom, justice and for friendship between our two people.

The U.S. imperialist aggressors will certainly be defeated.

The Vietnamese people will be victorious.

I wish you good health and good success.

With affectionate greetings.

Uncle Ho²⁰

McCombs then told the Committee that people could see pictures of “Che Guevara and Castro, Marx, maps of Soviet Union” but not Lincoln or Washington in classrooms of FUNY. He concluded that FUNY was an “organizational center for left wing activities” where “idealistic, romantic, and existentialist” New Left people were “being subverted by the hardcore members of the old left” successfully.²¹

The two friendly witness, Luce and McCombs, testified as the Committee expected them to do. They successfully degraded the Free University in public by presenting a subversive image of the school even though they shared some personal ties to militant Marxists through the Free University. Yet the Free University never suffered serious damage after the HUAC hearings, and its popularity among youths in the Northeast grew rapidly, attracting more students and activists. This is because people learned through this event that the anti-war movement could no longer be stopped by congressional oppression through HUAC. At the closing of the four-day

²⁰ “Uncle Ho to Polin, 25 November 1965,” McCombs Exhibit No. 2-C, in *Bills to Make Punishable Assistance to Enemies of U.S. in Time of Undeclared War*, 1053.

²¹ *Bills to Make Punishable Assistance to Enemies of U.S. in Time of Undeclared War*, 1039-63. Other exhibits include “Price List for Vietnamese Literature,” Polin’s essay on North Viet Nam, pamphlets of U.S. Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, *ibid.*, 1049-63. See also, Philip A. McCombs, “The New American Revolution,” *National Review* (1965): 766-68, 786.

hearing, the Committee referred to a telegram sent from the Free University of New York that “subpoena Chairman [of the full committee E. E.] Willis to appear” before the Free University general meeting “to explain the actions of his committee” signed by ninety-seven instructors and students at the Free University.²²

“Revolution as a Measure of Mankind”

The Free University of New York was not controlled by any particular dogmatic Marxist faction as their critics insisted. Rather, it was more open to the leftist intellectuals and students in the New York metropolitan area, and, as a result, it attracted a variety of people from partisan Maoists to independent Marxists, from Civil Rights activists to community organizers, from war protesters to bohemians, and from counter-cultural artists to psychiatrists. Jim Millen later recalled that “it was a serious intellectual undertaking in many ways, and people learned a lot.” But he continues:

it was also a three-ring circus with all kinds of things going on, movies being shown, speakers making speeches, places to sign your name to petitions, places to organize a demonstration, and also crazy things like hippies coming to play rock music.²³

This mixture of radical politics and culture was created intentionally by the Free University organizers by guaranteeing instructors’ freedom on their subjects and

²² *Bills to Make Punishable Assistance to Enemies of U.S. in Time of Undeclared War*, 1211-12. Jerry Rubin was also subpoenaed to the hearings. He appeared in the uniform of the American Revolution of 1766, and his attitude was considered by the committee members to be “out of order,” *ibid.*, 1073.

²³ Viorst, *Fire in the Streets*, 474.

teaching styles. Once the Free University's Coordinating Committee agreed to invite an instructor to the Free University, the instructor took sole charge of his or her courses. Activists used this space to express their own radical visions and to recruit new members for their own purposes. As the Free University members came from a wide range within the leftist spectrum, it was not easy to conceptualize the University's politics as a united front. Nevertheless, certain political orientations which were broadly shared among the Free University people can be observed in its official magazine, *Treason*, which was published only twice during its three-year operation: in the summer of 1967 and in the winter of 1968. The Free University continuously developed a view of the political conditions of the United States and the world in terms of the existence of three divisions of the world.

The editorial of the first issue of *Treason*, starts with a sentence, "Revolution is now the measure of mankind." The pages of the magazine were filled with articles and letters that explored the revolutions at home and abroad. The editorial board consisted of the following instructors: John Gerassi, author of *The Great Fear in Latin America* and a professor of journalism at NYU, Frank Gillete, a painter and lecturer at New York University and Rutgers University, Allen Krebs, president of the Free University, and Sharon Krebs, Allen's wife and a graduate student in Russian Literature at Columbia University. The nine articles of the first issue are: Allen Krebs's analysis on American universities and their functional disturbance; Frank Gillete's account of the activities of the Revolutionary Contingent in New York, an organization that sought "an effective – that is, organic – alliance" with those revolutionaries physically

confronting imperialism in Latin America, Africa, and Asia; Charles Johnson's book review on Franz Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks*; a Peruvian guerrilla's account of the Peruvian Revolution; a translation of Che Guevara's message to the Tricontinental Congress, in which Guevara argues the necessity of creating "two, three, many Vietnams"; a drama and some pieces of poetry. Dozens of black and white photographs and pieces of political artwork are also included in the pages to illustrate the magazine. Although the disclaimer insists that the "opinions expressed in the magazine reflect the views of their authors only and should not be construed as the policies of the Free School of New York," readers received a message about the direction in which the Free University activists wanted to move though the journal's "revolutionary" tone.²⁴

The editorial argues for "revolution" in a very rhetorical way. In their understanding, the United States of America was the "most obvious" empire in world history, one that "exports Americanism" to assimilate and mutilate "the traditional symbols, national heritage and indigenous leaders of each of its absorbed colonies." Simultaneously, the empire "damns its own people to an unthinking, unthinkable existence" at home. The editorial urged its readers to reject Americanism and to be "traitors," to support those people whom British philosopher Bertrand Russell called "the world's fighters for justice." The editorials emphasized that the "American

²⁴ The Free University (School) of New York, *Treason* 1, no. 1 (Summer, 1967). In 1966, New York State ordered the Free University of New York to stop using the title of University because it did not meet the standards required for an accredited university. Thereafter, "The Free School of New York" became the official name that appeared on its course catalogs.

Revolution in progress” should be carried forward by people who reject the American imperial system to search for an alternative way of life. It did not urge the youths to pick up guns to fight against the empire; instead it urged them to promote the revolution by refusing to become a part of the world oppressor. In this sense, attending classes at the Free University was a political activity that rejected the function of established schools in the American system.²⁵

Contrary to the accusations made against the Free University by journalists and politicians, the Free University activists did not seek to overturn the U.S. government through violence at that moment. Thus, it can be assumed that the function of the Free University was not to “subvert” innocent New Left youths by bringing them to the Old Left, but to educate them on how to situate themselves in relation to the oppressor and the oppressed in the world and in the United States. What they should do then was not pick up guns, but to refuse to be the oppressors and to alter their own lives. As Joseph Berke later remarked, a sense of guilt was behind this revolution. They felt “too guilty about sharing the wealth of middle-class life and not enjoying the starvation of triangle-shirt workers.”²⁶ Those who carefully observed the political insurgencies that rejected the status quo backed by American imperialism naturally gained empathy for African-American revolutionaries at home and guerrillas in Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

²⁵ “Editorial,” *Treason* 1, no. 1 (Summer, 1967), n.p.

²⁶ Joseph Berke, “Free University of New York,” in *Counter Culture: The Creation of an Alternative Society*, ed. Joseph Berke (London: Peter Owen Limited, 1969), 225.

Thus, the coverage of *Treason* was designed to inspire its readers to understand and join the anti-imperial movement by demonstrating their rejection of the American way of life. Charles Johnson, for example, reviewed Fanon's *Black Skin and White Mask* and claimed that "the quest for integration represents only a transitory stage in the development of [the] Black freedom struggle." He concluded that "the destiny of the Black man is not white: His destiny is revolution." On the corner of the article page, there is a drawing of the Statue of Liberty holding a rope with a black man hanged at the end and Uncle Sam holding the rope at the other end.²⁷

The "Vietnamese Students' Appeal to the American Students" speaks to the readers more directly. This appeal was prepared by the Union of Vietnamese Students in France and it was translated into English for publication in the journal. The appeal points out that the "words of peace of American leaders," such as those of President Johnson, only led to the intensification of the war. The appeal then asked readers to understand why the Vietnamese "refuse to live in slavery" or to allow their "fate to be dictated by a foreign government." A photograph of Vietnamese girls with resolute faces raising rifles accompanied the article.²⁸

As the course and faculty list provided in the end volume suggests, education at FUNY became more radically directed toward international affairs. Among twenty-seven listed courses, nearly half of them dealt with Third World liberation movements,

²⁷ Charles Johnson, "Black Skin, White Mask: A Review," *Treason* 1, no. 1 (Summer, 1967), 54-55.

²⁸ "Vietnamese Students' Appeal to the American Students," *Treason* 1, no. 1 (Summer, 1967), 58-59.

the Cold War, and U.S. imperialism. Some courses focused solely the issues such as the Vietnam War, the Cuban Revolution, African independence movements, Maoism and the Chinese Revolution, and the Cold War. These courses included: “The Origin of the Village Commune in Vietnam” taught by Robert Dillon, a graduate student of anthropology at Columbia University, “Neo-Colonialism and Revolution in Asia, Africa, and Latin America” taught by Leonard Liggio, a former college instructor, and “Counter Revolution in Africa” taught by Richard Morrock, a graduate student and a contributor to the *Monthly Review*. In addition to these courses on foreign affairs, sociology classes were a major component of the course list. Most of the instructors teaching these courses explicitly identified themselves as Marxists and taught the Marxist “science of revolution” in courses such as the “Introduction to Marxism-Leninism,” taught by Len Ragozin, a member of the Progressive Labor Party.²⁹

Another characteristic of the Free University of New York in the summer of 1967 was that it emphasized cultural analysis and counter-cultural practices. Poets, filmmakers, and actors provided workshop-style courses to students. By then, the Free University had improved its book and film libraries both of which held collections of radical materials that were “rarely obtainable elsewhere.” It also noted that they held “a growing number of new foreign and domestic war protest films.” Furthermore, the Free University accepted radical paintings for display and submissions of experimental plays for performance from students and instructors.

²⁹ The Free School New York, “Summer Catalog,” *Treason* 1, no. 1 (Summer, 1967), 62-68.

The Free University organizers tried to connect radical politics with radical cultural experiences in the practice of “cultural revolution” in the United States. John Gerassi’s play, reprinted in *Treason*, was a good example of this practice of bringing out the revolution in society. The play “The Cell,” which was constructed as a cynical conversation between a prisoner and a prison officer, was performed at the Off Center Theater on 63rd Street in March of 1967. Another activity that the Free University started in February 1967 was organizing “radical alternatives to established high schools.” High school teachers and students came together at the Free University on Tuesdays to join informal projects and classes on topics such as “poetry and philosophy, the American Indian, creative ideas, and revolutionary activities.”³⁰

The emphasis on Third World in politics at the Free University had its roots in individual instructors’ experiences. Some had acquired such views through their personal experiences in Cuba, Vietnam, or other poor countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Some concentrated on examining the Third World instead of participating in Communist politics and partisan activities. Nevertheless, with the help of those travelers, many Free University instructors and students could extend their imaginations to transcend the national borders. Considering the fact that the majority of the student New Left in the nation focused much more on domestic politics or the university that they belonged in light of their authentic selves, the Free University members’ projection of themselves into the Third World was very distinctive in 1966 and 1967.

³⁰ Ibid., 68.

Still, when the *Treason* crossed the national border, the “subversive” magazine caused an overreaction by U.S. governmental officials. In July, Krebs and his friends drove to Canada with a load of 125 copies of the newly published *Treason*. They distributed the magazine to people there, and, when they came back to the U.S., “quick-witted” U.S. custom officials confiscated the remaining sixty-five copies. As the *National Guardian* reported in an article, the official quickly scanned the magazine and told them that “any magazine that advocates the overthrow of the U.S. government is illegal” even if it was U.S.-printed. Attorneys William Kunstler and Arthur Kinoy filed a letter of complaint to the U.S. Custom Bureau for the return of the copies. Krebs commented that it was a “preview of tomorrow” in which the political and moral censorship of the government was imposed on people’s lives.³¹ This border incident did not cause any further problems for the Free University of New York. Yet, it indicated the tension on the U.S.-Canadian border in the summer of 1967, when more and more drafted Americans tried to leave the U.S. due to the escalation of the War in Vietnam.

The harassments from the authority did not impact the fate of the experimental institution. People still called it the Free University of New York or FUNY, instead of the Free “School” of New York which was mandated by New York State. By the summer of 1967, the Free University had established its unique style and popularity among radical students and intellectuals in the New York metropolitan area. The

³¹ “U.S. Customs grabs ‘*Treason*’,” *National Guardian*, August 12, 1967, 5.

attacks from conservatives, local authorities, university administrators, and fellow activists that labeled FUNY as a “subversive” institution or a place for the “extremist fringe” only emphasized its uniqueness in the movement. This was possible because the Free University squarely faced the HUAC hearing with constitutional justice, while they democratically operated the school functions for an alternative education, radical politics, and counter cultural experiments. The Free University people’s uniqueness lies in their imagination, which encompassed the three worlds and allowed them to gain an understanding of their existence in relation to world affairs. While working under domestic conditions in 1966 and 1967, the Free University people began traveling beyond borders to physically and philosophically connect the United States to the world through their movement.

CHAPTER FIVE

International Efforts to Stop U.S. Atrocities in Vietnam: The International War Crimes Tribunal, 1966-67

From 1966 onwards, America's undeclared war in Vietnam was no longer just a fire on the other side of the Pacific. Since the May 2nd Movement (M2M) triggered the anti-war protest in New York City in 1964 and the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) followed the M2M in shifting their focus to the war issue, more and more students and ordinary citizens in the United States gradually recognized that their country was doing something unjust in the Far East. On March 26, 1966, twenty thousand people joined a demonstration in New York City, and on June 4, 1966, a three-page anti-Vietnam advertisement appeared in the *New York Times*, which included a petition signed by six thousand four hundred teachers and college instructors. The anti-war demonstration spread onto campuses and streets nationwide through the rest of 1966.

Ten months later, on April 4, 1967, Martin Luther King, Jr. appeared in the Riverside Church in Manhattan to declare his strong opposition to the U.S. intervention in Vietnam.¹ Theologian James Cone argues that King's understanding of the War had been consciously constructed in an international context since he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace in 1964, and that he had already adopted the description "a

¹ Martin Luther King, Jr., "Declaration of Independence from the War in Vietnam," in *Against the Vietnam War: Writings by Activists*, ed. Mary Susannah Robbins (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publisher, 1999), 100-110.

system of internal colonialism” through his activities in the slums of Chicago.² In short, his opposition to the U.S. policies in Vietnam was derived from the idea that the condition of the people of Vietnam and that of impoverished African-Americans in the United States were created by the very same U.S.-led system. This is why he connected the issue of the war expense in Vietnam to the issues of economic welfare to the poor in the United States. It is assumed that King’s remarks reflected a sense of urgency on both the domestic conditions involving the racial struggles and the international conditions surrounding the U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

The conceptual comparison between the people of the Third World and the people in color in the United States was one of the significant factors that affected the direction of the movement in the United States in the late sixties. This chapter and the next explore the events during which such an equation was repeatedly emphasized in the two year period from 1966 to 1967. Such events include the international anti-Vietnam war movement, especially the International War Crimes Tribunal held in Stockholm and Copenhagen as argued in this chapter, and the international gathering of leftist intellectuals in London and Havana described in the next chapter. In those events, the people of the Free University played the role of liaisons between the New Left movement in the United States and likeminded groups in other countries.

The International War Crimes Tribunal was, as historian Simon Hall called it, the “most ambitious” multi-national effort to stop the U.S. atrocities in Vietnam in the

² James Cone, “Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Third World,” *Journal of American History* 74, no. 2 (1987): 462.

sixties³. Despite its significance in the international peace movement and in the history of non-governmental tribunals in the twentieth century, it has never been treated carefully in the historical accounts of the American protest movement against the War in Vietnam. When the Tribunal was organized, it was ignored by the U.S. government, ridiculed in the American press, and challenged by domestic radicals. Mary Hershberger argues that discussing the War in Vietnam in terms of American war crimes still made many people, even radicals, “uneasy.”⁴ Charles DeBenedetti also argues in his history of the American anti-Vietnam War movement that, although it reflected the world opinion, the fairness of the tribunal was challenged even by New Left anti-war activists in the United States because it was thought to be “one-sided”; it relied heavily on documents provided by the government of North Vietnam.⁵ By exploring the activities of the American Branch of the Russell Peace Foundation in New York and the reactions of some American activists to the Tribunal, this chapter will show the ambivalent attitudes that the American New Leftists held toward the international discourse to stop the War. Nevertheless, a good number of American people supported the tribunal and played important roles in its operation on both sides of the Atlantic. John Gerassi and Russell Stetler, both of whom were teaching at the Free University of New York, led the American side by operating the New York

³ Simon Hall, *Rethinking the American Anti-War Movement* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 117.

⁴ Mary Hershberger, *Traveling to Vietnam: American Peace Activists and the War* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1988), 93.

⁵ Charles DeBenedetti, *An American Ordeal: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1990), 208.

Branch of the Russell Peace Foundation as Chairman and Executive Director respectively. They made use of the network and the space of the Free University to contribute to the Tribunal's success. Even though their effort was not taken seriously in the United States, the discourse created by the Tribunal was indeed a precursor to the domestic movement in its understanding of the world and the United States.

The Idea of the International War Crimes Tribunal

“I appeal to you, citizens of America, as a person concerned with liberty and social justice.” On June 18, 1966, Bertrand Russell, a ninety-four-year-old British philosopher, published an article addressed to the “conscience” of Americans whose government had sent nearly 400,000 troops to a small country in Southeast Asia. In the article, Russell compared the people of Vietnam to the Americans who fought the British for justice and freedom during the Revolution for their independence. He then wrote:

And so the American people are to be used as cannon-fodder by those who exploit not only the Vietnamese but the people of the United States themselves. It is Americans who have been killing Vietnamese, attacking villages, occupying cities, using gas and chemicals, bombing their schools and hospitals – all this to protect the profits of American capitalism.⁶

In this appeal, Russell used the historical analogy of World War II to evoke the American memory of the “good war” against Nazi atrocities, saying:

⁶ Bertrand Russell, “Appeal to the American Conscience,” reprinted in *War Crimes in Vietnam*, ed. Bertrand Russell (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2009 [1967]), 116, 122.

With the exception of the extermination of the Jews, however, everything that the Germans did in Eastern Europe has been repeated by the United States in Vietnam on a scale which is larger and with an efficiency which is more terrible and more complete.⁷

The idea of an International War Crimes Tribunal, which was often called the Russell Tribunal or the Russell-Sartre Tribunal, dates back to 1962 when Bertrand Russell carefully read reports on the “senseless brutality” of the War in the *New York Times*. In the spring of 1963, he sent a letter to the editor of the *New York Times* and claimed, “The United States Government is conducting a war of annihilation in Vietnam,” which was reminiscent of the atrocities of Germans in East Europe and those of the Japanese in Southeast Asia. The *New York Times* published Russell’s opinion with an editorial on April 8 and insisted that Russell’s letter reflected an “unfortunate and – despite his eminence as a philosopher – an unthinkable Communist propaganda.”⁸

Bertrand Russell’s international fame as philosopher and peace activist was highly established in the 1950s, when he received the Nobel Prize in Literature for his numerous writings “in which he champions humanitarian ideals and freedom of

⁷ Ibid., 121. The article was reprinted in *National Guardian* on July 30 and it was reproduced again and again to gain support from the American people to try the leaders of the United States for their crimes in Vietnam.

⁸ Bertrand Russell, “The Press and the Vietnam,” in Russell, *War Crimes in Vietnam*, 31-33; “Letter to The Times” and “Lord Russell’s Letter,” *New York Times*, April 8, 1963.

thought” as the Nobel Prize Committee officially announced.⁹ In those days, Russell devoted himself to anti-nuclear weapon activities including the issuing of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto and the establishment of the Committee of 100 against British nuclear policies in the 1950s. Then, in the 1960s, Russell played the role of a middleman in the Cold War diplomatic crisis. At the height of the Cuban Missile Crisis in October 1962, he sent telegrams to both U.S. President John F. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to urge them to break the deadlock of the confrontation. As was later reported in the *New York Times*, Russell denounced Kennedy’s actions as “desperate” and told him to “end this madness,” while he showed his expectation that Khrushchev’s “forbearance” would lead to “lowering the temperature.”¹⁰ His way of approaching the two Cold War leaders gave the American people the impression that he had a strong anti-American sentiment.

When the plan for the tribunal was announced in June 1966, the American media showed strong abhorrence and tried to discredit it, and the Johnson administration reacted in very negative ways. As historian Fujimoto argues, the U.S. government officially ignored Russell but hampered their ability to hold the Tribunal behind the scenes.¹¹ On August 25, 1966, Russell sent a letter of invitation to

⁹ NobelPrize.org: The Official Web Site of the Noble Prize, “The Nobel Prize in Literature 1950: Bertrand Russell,” accessed March 28, 2012, http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1950/.

¹⁰ Bernard Levin, “Bertrand Russell: Prosecutor, Judge, and Jury,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1967.

¹¹ Hiroshi Fujimoto, “The Johnson Administration and the Russell Tribunal,” *International Relations* 130 (May 2002): 76-91 [in Japanese].

President Johnson inviting the President to appear before the tribunal in his own defense. In the letter, Russell challenged Johnson by asking, “Will you appear before a wider justice than you recognize and risk a more profound condemnation than you may be able to understand?”¹² Johnson ignored the letter and did not make any official response to the Tribunal, but he started putting diplomatic pressure on supportive governments in Europe and Africa to interrupt the Tribunal’s non-governmental peace effort.

For the majority Americans, at least among those who recognized it, the Tribunal seemed to be an irresponsible foreign imposition of justice on U.S. foreign policy. However, there were several American activists who played significant roles in organizing the Tribunal. These included Ralph Schoenman and David Horowitz in London, and Russell Stetler and John Gerassi in New York. Ralph Schoenman was born in Brooklyn as the son of a Hungarian immigrant father. After graduating from Princeton University in 1958, he left the U.S. for Britain to join the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, to which Russell served as President. He then became Russell’s “left-hand man,” as a British paper described him, in the activities of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation which was launched in 1963.¹³ Russell sent Schoenman to North Vietnam in April 1966 to collect first-hand evidence that would be used in defending David Mitchell, an American citizen who was on trial for refusing to serve

¹² “Russell to Johnson,” August 25, 1966, in *Against the Crime of Silence*, by John Duffett ed. (New York: A Clarion Book, 1970), 18-20.

¹³ Dana Dams Schmidt, “Russell Inquiry Will Open Today,” *New York Times*, May 2, 1967.

in the U.S. Army in Vietnam, and for proving U.S. crimes in Vietnam at the planned Tribunal.¹⁴ David Horowitz, also a New York-born leftist who joined the foundation in London, later described in his controversial memoir that, “he was the only New Leftist I ever met who I felt could live up to our revolutionary rhetoric about ‘seizing the state’.”¹⁵ According to Horowitz’ account, it was Schoenman who indeed conceived the plan for the Tribunal and organized it in the Russell’s name.

Stetler and Gerassi were both on the faculty list of the Free University of New York. Stetler had been active in the Youth Against War and Fascism (YAWF), a youth organization of the Workers World Party, and had co-founded the May 2nd Movement in 1964. Gerassi was born in France in 1931 as the son of a Sephardic Jewish father and was raised in New York City as the Fascists gained power in Spain in the 1940s. He then attended Columbia University and entered the field of journalism before seeking an academic career. He published a book, *The Great Fear in Latin America*, in 1965. At the time that he joined the Free University of New York as an instructor, he was teaching at New York University. Gerassi, as Chairman, and Stetler, as Executive Director, ran the New York office of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, on 342 West 84th Street in Manhattan.

The mission of the New York office was to garner moral and financial support for the Tribunal in the United States. With limited resources, the New York office

¹⁴ Ralph Schoenman, “Report from North Vietnam,” in Russell, *War Crimes in Vietnam*, 131-32.

¹⁵ David Horowitz, *Radical Son: A Generational Odyssey* (New York: Touchstone, 1997), 129. This memoir was controversial because it was a declaration that he had converted to support conservative politics in the United States.

managed to send letters to possible adherents and to publicize their activities through radical journals. In a letter to a supporter, Susan Stetler, wife of Russell Stetler, mentioned that they would be ready to send speakers and films if the expenses and an honorarium were paid. The letter included Bertrand Russell's "Post Script: To the Conscience of Mankind," which emphasized that the responsibility of the Tribunal was to civilization and mankind throughout the world, and that it sought to halt the U.S. atrocities by preventing every man from becoming Eichmann.¹⁶

Gerassi and Stetler of the American Branch strongly anticipated a difficult situation for the Tribunal domestically and worked hard to garner support from American citizens. They used the *National Guardian* as their main medium, in which they repeatedly published Bertrand Russell's appeals and petitions. In a petition published on November 12, they insisted that "nowhere is this tribunal more relevant than in America" and that "only the American people can stop war crimes in Vietnam!" Under the banner of "We, the Undersigned," more than one hundred names, including many associated with the Free University of New York, appeared in the ad. It was clear that the supporting network was constructed mainly through personal channels at the Free University of New York. Names of the people who led the Free University, such as Allen Krebs, James G. Mellen, Will Inman, Paul Krasner, Walter D. Teague III, Irwin Silber, and James Weinstein can be found on the supporters list. Radical historians such as Herbert Aptheker, Eugene Genovese, and

¹⁶ "Letter From Susan Stetler to Katherine Baker," November 3, 1967, Box 64, Folder 22, Bertrand Russell Foundation, J. B. Matthews Papers.

Howard Zinn, as well as popular names such as Beat poet Allen Ginsberg and folksinger Barbara Dane appeared on the list as well. A tribunal member, Dave Dellinger, was also on the list, yet the SDS leader Carl Oglesby, who was later invited to the tribunal, was not listed at this point.¹⁷

Preparation Session for the Tribunal in November 1966

On November 13, 1966, the preparatory session for the International War Crimes Tribunal opened at Bloomsbury hotel in London. Members of the tribunal who had accepted Russell's invitation worked for hours and hours until the early morning for three consecutive days to discuss a number of significant issues. A participant from the New York Branch of the Russell Peace Foundation reported that they worked "somewhat in the style of a sleepless SDS convention!"¹⁸

The members who accepted Russell's invitation and gathered in London included: French existential philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre, Italian social activist Danilo Dolci, German writer Gunther Anders, Polish-born political historian and Leon Trotsky's biographer Isaac Deutscher, Yugoslav writer Vladimir Dedijer, Turkish politician and president of Turkish Workers Party Mehmet Ali Aybar, Italian lawyer

¹⁷ "We, the Undersigned, Support the International War Crimes Tribunal," *National Guardian*, November 12, 1966.

¹⁸ "Report: War Crimes Tribunal Opens in London," *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no.1, (December 1966), 4. Kinju Morikawa, a tribunal member from Japan, also remembered that he was very surprised to see the concentration of prominent and world famous intellectuals at an old age discussing the war and crimes. Kinju Morikawa, *Kenryoku ni Taisuru Teikou no Kiroku* [*A Record of Rebellion against the Authority*] (Tokyo: Soshisya, 2001) [in Japanese].

and politician Lelio Basso, Pakistani lawyer and politician Mahmud Ali Kasuri, French mathematician Laurent Schwartz, and Japanese civil liberties leader Kinju Morikawa. The only American who participated in the London session as a tribunal member was Courland Cox, who was deputized by Stokely Carmichael of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. According to the Foundation's announcement, other members who were expected to be present at the scheduled tribunal in April 1967 in Paris included Dave Dellinger, editor of *Liberation* magazine, Lazaro Cardenas, former President of Mexico, Wolfgang Abendroth, a German political scientist, Simone de Beauvoir, a French writer, Lawrence Daly, a British trade unionist, Amado V. Hernandez, a Filipino poet and labor leader, Mahmud Ali Kasuri, a Pakistani lawyer and politician, Floyd McKissick, the secretary general of the Congress of Racial Equality, and Shoichi Sakata, a Japanese scientist. The Tribunal members, Russell declared, would work as a commission of enquiry, and the commission would prepare the "prima facie" evidence for the tribunal.¹⁹

On the 16th, the last day of the preparatory meeting, they held a press conference, in which Russell read a statement and the tribunal members announced the aims and objectives of the tribunal. The tribunal was to prove that the Johnson administration was committing war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against peace by violating the international treaties that U.S. presidents had signed, such as the Geneva Accords of 1954, the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, the London

¹⁹ Bertrand Russell, "Postscript," in *Against the Crime of Silence*, ed. Duffett, 127-30; Karl E. Meyer, "'War Trial' Backers 'Unmoved' at Losses," *Washington Times*, November 15, 1966.

Agreements of Nuremberg of 1945, and the United Nations Charter of 1945. Based on these treaties, the Tribunal decided to ask following questions:

- 1) Has the United States Government (and the Government of Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea) committed acts of aggression according to international laws?
- 2) Has the American Army made use of or experimented with new weapons or weapons forbidden by the laws of war (gas, special chemical products, napalm, etc.)?
- 3) Has there been bombardment of targets of a purely civilian character, for example, hospitals, schools, sanatoria, dams, etc., and on what scale has this occurred?
- 4) Have Vietnamese peasants been subjected to inhuman treatment forbidden by the laws of war and, in particular, to torture or to mutilation? Have there been unjustified reprisals against the civilian population, in particular, the execution of hostages?
- 5) Have forced labor camps been created, has there been deportation of the population or other acts tending to the extermination of the population and which can be characterized juridical as acts of genocide?²⁰

It was also announced that the National Liberation Front and the government of North Vietnam were willing to provide the tribunal with information to secure the “accuracy and reliability” of the evidence and that “investigating teams” of experts in various fields would visit Vietnam shortly.²¹

The Tribunal and U.S. Media

The preparatory session in London drew significant attention from the press worldwide, but the American media largely ignored the Tribunal or tried to discredit it.

²⁰ “Report: War Crimes Tribunal Opens in London,” *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no.1 (December 1966), 6.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 7.

The New York Branch of the Foundation complained in its report that the American press, “for the most part,” either turned down the publication of the statements and information they were provided with, or used them in attacks against Russell.²² In short, American newspapers emphasized that the Tribunal was “left-wing leaning” and was not fair enough to judge war criminals in Vietnam. Newspapers found fault with the tribunal, for example, by introducing some African leaders who distanced themselves from Russell regarding the tribunal because, as President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania was quoted saying, they “objected to a serious matter like the Vietnamese situation being dealt with by trickery and dishonesty.”²³ A reporter of the *Washington Post* argued that reporters at the press conference wondered whether the tribunal was delivering “its sentence first and verdict later.” They questioned the Tribunal’s “clear distinction between aggression and resistance to aggression.”²⁴ As Russell had argued, and Sartre had stated in an interview with the French press, the Tribunal regarded the United States as a capitalist aggressor to the poor peasant country in Asia from its outset.

Conservative newspapers and journals reproached Bertrand Russell for his political stance. For instance, by quoting Sidney Hook, an American pragmatist who intellectually led an anti-Russell cohort in the United States, *Human Events* claimed

²² Ibid., 4.

²³ “Nyerere Shuns Viet War ‘Trial’” *Baltimore Sun*, November 15, 1966; Karl E. Meyer, “‘War Trial’ Backers ‘Unmoved’ at Losses,” *Washington Post*, November 15, 1966.

²⁴ Karl E. Meyer, Verdict of U.S. War Guilt Anticipated by ‘Tribunal’” *Washington Post*, November 17, 1966.

that Russell was “almost pathologically anti-American” and the Tribunal had no “moral standing in court.” The article discredited Russell by pointing out that he had once called for dropping atomic bombs on Moscow to oppose a Russian policy that rejected the Acheson-Lilienthal & Baruch Plans of 1946 and had wanted to establish an international Atomic Development Authority. It further revealed that Russell was attacked by an Episcopal bishop for being a “recognized propagandist against religion and morality” when he was living in New York in the 1940s.²⁵ The tribunal was not taken seriously in the Federal Congress either. Thomas J. Dodd of Connecticut attested that the Tribunal’s “important omission” was the “lack of any reference to the tens of thousands of Vietnamese men, women, and children murdered and mutilated by the Viet Cong terrorists [sic].” Dodd ridiculed the tribunal by claiming that Russell and the other members were like characters “out of Gilbert and Sullivan arranging for the trial.”²⁶

The *New York Times* was one of the newspapers that was the most cynical in its response to Russell and his tribunal. In the *Times*, British journalist Bernard Levin depicted the appearance of Russell in front of the audience at the London session in November as follows:

A stir, a bustle, a craning of necks; he comes! *He* comes? Say rather, without disrespect, it comes. For at last the precise nature of the ceremony on which we are attending has become clear. It is the equivalent of the religious custom of

²⁵ John Chamberlain, “Bertrand Russell Once Wanted to Drop Atom Bombs on Moscow,” *Human Events*, January 27, 1967.

²⁶ 112 Cong. Rec. A5865 (November 21, 1966) (statement of Thomas J. Dodd).

showing to the faithful the saint's bones, or vestments, or miraculously liquefying blood.²⁷

The reporter described Russell as “unimaginably old, immeasurably frail” and as “the holiest relic” of the international leftists. The article claimed that the verdict of the tribunal had been “determined in advance” on the ground of its member’s “bias” and that the worst part of the Tribunal was Russell’s “condonation of Vietcong atrocities.”²⁸ This article provides a very good example of the American media’s marginalization of the Tribunal that tried the U.S. for war crimes in Vietnam, one which they believed to be based on an inaccurate claim made by an old anti-American philosopher. For these pro-Vietnam war anti-communists, the “unfairness” of the Russell Tribunal was a sufficient reason for them to ignore this international rebuke on U.S. policies.

Building American Support for the Tribunal

In order to build support among U.S. citizens, the American Branch of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation circulated a series of mimeographed *Foundation Bulletins* from the time of the Preparatory Session in London in November 1966 to the opening of the tribunal in Stockholm in May 1967. The *Bulletin* included progress reports from the Tribunal, corrections to the mass media coverage, articles and opinions by tribunal members and supporters, and essay reviews of books on the

²⁷ Levin, “Bertrand Russell.”

²⁸ Ibid.

Vietnam War. These issues not only showed how the theoretical scheme of the tribunal was constructed, but also reveal how the radical intellectuals at the Free University devoted themselves to the international effort of the Russell Tribunal.

The American Branch of the Russell Foundation depended heavily on the Free University of New York for its resources. Chairman Gerassi and Executive Director Stetler asked faculty members to contribute their opinion pieces to the *Bulletin* and almost all the contributions by domestic supporters were from people somehow affiliated with the Free University. For example, the Free University's Vice President Will Inman reviewed a poetry anthology, entitled, *Where Is Vietnam?* edited by Walter Lowenfels calling it "a yeoman work" in the *Bulletin*. Leonard Liggio, who taught the course, "Imperialism and Anti-imperialism: the Ideological Question in Vietnam," with Russell Stetler, also contributed his critical reviews of books and articles about the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and Vietnam policy. Christopher Koch, a former Program Director for WBAI FM radio station, who visited North Vietnam after the U.S. bombing started, wrote an article in support of the Russell Tribunal. He urged readers to recall the judgment at Nuremberg which found guilty the "bureaucrats of an inhuman technology" just twenty years ago and asked if it was "justice" or the "vengeance of the victory."²⁹

²⁹ Will Inman, Review of *Where Is Vietnam? American Poets Respond, An Anthology of New York by 87 Poets*, by Walter Lowenfels, ed, A Doubleday Anchor Original, *Foundation Bulletin* 1, nos. 8-9 (March-April, 1967), 29; Leonard Liggio, Review on *Viet Cong: the Organization and Techniques of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam*, by Douglas Pike, MIT Press, 1966, *Foundation Bulletin* 1, nos. 2 (December 1966), 12-14; Liggio, Reviews on Viet Nam: Do We Understand Revolution? By Edward Landsdale, in *Foreign Affairs* (October, 1964) and *The End of Either/Or*, by

The New York Branch of the Foundation also used the space of FUNY as a library for 16 mm sound films and written materials for public use. Those films included Peter Gessner's "Time of the Locust" which documented atrocities and torture in Vietnam, the National Liberation Front's "Vietnam: Land of Fire," the Democratic Republic of Vietnam's "Days with the Youth Shock Brigade," and the Free University Workshop's "Dog Burning at Noon," which portrays "the ritual of extermination in an industrial wasteland."³⁰ As these titles suggest, the Free University of New York functioned as a storage house for imported films and materials from Vietnam, Cuba and other Third World countries for American leftists in those days.

To prepare evidence of U.S. war crimes, the Tribunal sent investigating teams to North Vietnam. Stetler and Shoeman visited Hanoi in November 1966 for a preliminary investigation. From December to early January, the first official team, consisting of economic historian of Southeast Asia Malcolm Caldwell of the University of London, journalism professor John Gerassi of New York University, French journalist Leon Matarasso, French photographer Roger Pic, economic professor Setsure Tsurushima of the University of Kyoto, and French mathematician Jean-Pierre Vigier of the University of Paris, traveled throughout North Vietnam to gather materials such as depositions, documents, affidavits, and other evidence for the

McGeorge Bundy in *Foreign Affairs* (January 1967), *Foundation Bulletin* 1, nos. 6-7 (February-March, 1967), 20-25; Christopher Koch, "In Supporting of the Tribunal," *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no. 5 (February 1967), 10-12.

³⁰ "Vietnam 1966: Films Available from the Free University of New York," *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (November 1966), 12.

planned tribunal.³¹ The second team included Schoenman, Carol Brightman, editor of the Viet Report in the U.S., French physician Abraham Behar, Dominican physician Gustavo Tolentino, British Pakistani activist Tariq Ali, and Scottish union leader Lawrence Daly. They visited Cambodia in January to examine border violations and interview civilian victims in NFL-controlled areas of South Vietnam.³²

Stetler reported on his November visit to Cambodia and North Vietnam in the third issue of the *Foundation Bulletin*. The purpose of his trip with Ralph Shoenman was to get “assurances for full cooperation” with the investigative missions of the Tribunal from the governments of Cambodia and North Vietnam. They successfully received these assurances and reported them at the inaugural meeting in London. What impressed Stetler in Hanoi was the high morale of the Vietnamese people, as he described, “Morale and confidence, elan and will – these depend on the concrete success of positive measures taken by the Vietnamese to deal with the war. The accomplishments are visible.” Stetler then described a scene of daily air defense action by Vietnamese as follows:

One afternoon while I was in Hanoi, the Vietnamese who worked in my hotel rushed outside as anti-aircraft guns crackled in the distance. I followed in time to see the vapors of the clashing missiles and reconnaissance jets. Two U.S.

³¹ “Report: Tribunal Sends First Investing Mission to Hanoi,” *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no.3 (January, 1967), 1.

³² “Second Investigating Team Arrives in Cambodia,” *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no.4 (January, 1967), 13. Other American observers in the investing mission included SNCC activists Julius Lester and Charlie Cobb, Civil Rights lawyer Conrad Lynn, and editor of *Viet-Report* Carol Brightman. See, Hershberger, 91.

planes were shot down (never to be admitted by the Pentagon). There are too many witnesses for an over enthusiastic gunner to risk exaggeration.³³

Stetler added that the Johnson administrations' bombings of non-military targets with anti-personnel weapons such as fragmentation bombs and "lazy dogs" only "stealed the determination of the people." Stetler was clearly committed to the "Vietnamese emphasis on preserving lives," while he rejected the American "cynicism to design, build, and use of such weapons."³⁴

John Gerassi's accounts of his travel to North Vietnam in the end of December and early January appeared in the *New Republic* in March 1967. As a member of the first official investigative mission of the International War Crimes Tribunal, Gerassi visited North Vietnam by way of Pnom Phen, Cambodia. His team investigated civilian air raids and the use of anti-personnel weapons by U.S. military forces in towns and villages in North Vietnam. Gerassi clearly noted that, "Never, in the 2,000 miles that I traveled in North Vietnam, did I escape the sight of bomb damage" of non-military facilities including schools and hospitals. The attacks using fragmentation "guava" bombs were evident from the pellets seen everywhere, "embedded in walls, in trees in telegraph poles – and in hundreds of kids." Gerassi observed that the Vietnamese were "determined and united" as "the frontline soldiers of all the poor countries of the world which are being threatened by the rich."³⁵

³³ Russell Stetler, "Report from Hanoi," *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no.3 (January 1, 1967), 8.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 8-9.

³⁵ John Gerassi, "Report from North Vietnam," *New Republic*, March 4, 1967, 13-16.

In addition to this evidence, one of the significant points of the tribunal members' analysis of the U.S. war crimes in Vietnam was that they found an array of parallel relationships between the oppressors and victims in the Vietnam War and in racism in the U.S. In his "Message to American Negro Soldiers in Vietnam," which was recorded for radio broadcast by the National Liberation Front in September 1966, Bertrand Russell specifically addressed the non-white listeners on the battlefield:

Today in the United States the brutality which the Vietnamese experience at the hands of the American army is experienced by American Negroes, whether in the North or South of the United States. ... It is clear that the same Government and the same power structure which commits these acts against Negro citizens of the United States is directing acts of cruelty against Vietnamese.³⁶

Russell appealed to African-American soldiers to understand that they were in the same situation as the Vietnamese people in relation to the U.S. government, and urged them to stop fighting the "dirty war."

Tribunal members assumed that the fight of the people in Vietnam was a fight for national liberation like the Algerian struggle against the colonial power of France. In Gerassi's words, France could win Algeria militarily but not politically, "and so it must be in Vietnam."³⁷ For tribunal member Stokely Carmichael, a struggle for independence was a synonym for liberation from racial oppression. He visited Puerto Rico in early 1967 and delivered a speech to the Puerto Rican people in Spanish, which

³⁶ Bertrand Russell, "Message to American Negro Soldiers in Vietnam," *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no.3 (January 1, 1967), 3.

³⁷ John Gerassi, "From Peaceful Protesters to an Inquiry into Crime: A Committed View of the Upcoming War Crimes Tribunal," *Foundation Bulletin* 1, nos. 6-7 (1967), 7.

was printed in the *Bulletin* of the American Branch of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. In his message, Carmichael pointed out that the Puerto Rican struggle for independence had a “close relationship” to the African-American struggle for Black Power and noted:

Brothers, we see our struggle linked to the struggles of the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America against foreign oppression, particularly by the United States. We all have the same enemy. For this reason, we strongly support your just struggle for independence. For this reason we support all peoples who are struggling for self-independence.³⁸

In this speech, Carmichael insisted that the “Afro-American masses” were taken advantage of by the U.S. government through the carrying out of the War in Vietnam and that those people who knew the hypocrisy of American democracy should unite for their goals of independence.

The discourse that connects the imperial oppression of people facing racial discrimination in the United States to the military oppression of those who struggled for self-determination in the War in Vietnam sounded too radical during this part of the 1960s. The Tribunal members accepted the justice of national liberation in the Third World and found similarities to such relationships in the African-American struggle in the United States. The Free University instructor Liggio also commented in the *Bulletin* that an alternative to the national liberation was “genocide” by the United States in the midst of the Vietnam War. This point would be emphasized again at the

³⁸ Stokley Carmichael, “Message to Puerto Rican People,” *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no. 5 (1967), 8-9.

International War Crimes Tribunal in Stockholm in May and in Copenhagen in November. Yet, the claim of national liberation did not easily fit into the discourse of mainstream New Leftists in the United States.

The Tribunal Sessions in Stockholm and Copenhagen

The International War Crimes Tribunal had originally planned to hold its first official session in Paris in the early spring, but it was compelled to change its venue due to the U.S. government's diplomatic intervention in relevant countries. The Johnson Administration officially ignored the tribunal and did not send official delegates. Secretary of State Dean Rusk answered the question of whether he would accept an invitation from the tribunal, and said that he had no intention of attending the Tribunal "to play games with a 94-year-old Briton."³⁹

The State Department, however, occasionally tried to intervene in the Tribunal by limiting its American staff's travels to and from Europe. Russell Stetler caught the attention of the State Department and, as a result of his travel to restricted areas, his passport was revoked on January 9, 1967. The freedom to travel had been a contested issue for New York radical intellectuals since they had organized the students' travels to Cuba in 1963. Now the people who traveled to North Vietnam, including Staughton Lynd and Russell Stetler, became targets of the passport office of the State Department. On the following day, ironically, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in the cases of the travelers to Cuba, *U.S. v. Travis* and *U.S. v. Laub et al.*, that the defendants

³⁹ "Horrors of War Film at Russell Tribunal," *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 4, 1967.

did not commit any criminal offence by traveling Cuba despite the State Department's ban.⁴⁰

The Johnson administration diplomatically approached the governments of possible host countries in Europe other countries that supported the Tribunal and pressured them not host the Tribunal. Russell's secretary, Shoenman, was detained by police in Paris in January and was denied entry to France by General de Gaulle. The French government did not issue entry visas to Tribunal members, so the Tribunal office decided to change its location to Stockholm. The Johnson administration then told the Swedish Foreign Office through Charge D'Affaires Turner Cameron that the U.S. government considered the tribunal to be "harmful to Swedish-American relations."⁴¹ Johnson's diplomatic maneuver against the Tribunal was evidenced by Johnson's presidential documents by historian Fujimoto. The American President forced heads of states who had originally supported the Russell Peace Foundation and the Tribunal to change their decisions.⁴²

The Stockholm session was held for nine days, beginning May 2, 1967, and consisted of nineteen members. This session aimed to provide evidence to support the

⁴⁰ "Report: Tribunal's Work Progresses, Despite U.S. Harassment," *Foundation Bulletin* 1, no. 4 (January 15, 1967), 13. Stetler himself argues the issue of freedom to travel in his essay. Russell Stetler Jr., "The Freedom to Travel," *Left and Right* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1966): 58-72.

⁴¹ Wilfrid Fleisher, "U.S. Cautions Sweden on 'War Crimes Trial'," *Washington Post*, April 27, 1967.

⁴² Fujimoto, "The Johnson Administration and the Russell Tribunal," 76-91. Those included Hailie Selassie of Ethiopia, Ayub Khan of Pakistan, Leopold Senghor of Senegal, Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia, Kenneth Kaunda of Uganda, Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, and S. Radakrishnam of India.

Tribunal's first two claims about U.S. war crimes in Vietnam: acts of aggression and the targeting of civilians. In the opening statement, Russell again compared the U.S. invasion of Vietnam to what Hitler had done in Europe, and remarked that this "revolutionary tribunal" was the test that Western Civilization met.⁴³ The Tribunal included three American members: Dave Dellinger, Courland Cox (deputy for Carmichael) and Carl Oglesby, Ex-Chairman of Students for a Democratic Society who joined as a new member in Stockholm.

In Stockholm, the tribunal's official investigating teams and delegates from each country reported their findings, and the nineteen members took testimonies from witnesses including specialists in various fields of the social and natural sciences as well as from victims of the U.S. bombings in Vietnam. Among them, Gabriel Kolko, professor of history at the University of Pennsylvania, presented a historical analysis of the U.S. aggression in Vietnam since 1945, and J. B. Neilands, professor of Biochemistry at the University of Southern California, gave testimony as a member of the third mission of inquiry during which they had observed evidence of American civilian bombings with anti-personnel weapons.⁴⁴

The facts about the atrocities by American soldiers shocked the media. The *San Francisco Chronicle* reported in a article that photographic records and films of human suffering were presented as evidence at the Tribunal. The "horrors of war" showed, for instance, "soldiers in American uniforms slitting open a prisoner's

⁴³ Bertrand Russell, "Opening Statement to the First Tribunal Session," in *Against the Crime of Silence*, ed. Duffett, 49-51.

⁴⁴ For the transcript of the trial, see Duffett, ed. *Against the Crime of Silence*, 49-312.

stomach, pressing a knife into another's throat and kicking and beating other prisoners who were bound hand and foot."⁴⁵ Then the most impressive and shocking moment came when the Tribunal heard the testimonies of four Vietnamese civilian victims of napalm and fragmentation bombs. Do Van Ngoc, a nine-year-old boy, for example, had "burns of third degree, about 15% of body" and "some keloid formation in the region of the groin." The boy explained that three U.S. planes attacked him and two of his friends while they were looking after oxen in a rice field in the village of Vihn Tuy, on June 16, 1966, causing them serious burns.⁴⁶

On May 10, after a series of testimonies and serious discussions lasting nine days, the President of the Tribunal, Jean-Paul Sartre, read the verdict:

1. Has the government of the United States committed acts of aggression against Vietnam under the terms of international law?

Yes (Unanimously)

2. Has there been, and if so, on what scale, bombardment of purely civilian targets, for example, hospitals, schools, medical establishments, dams, etc.?

Yes (Unanimously)⁴⁷

The tribunal also confirmed the involvement of the governments of Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea as accomplices in the U.S. aggression in Vietnam. In addition to announcing the verdict in Stockholm, the tribunal members made the

⁴⁵ "Horrors-of-War Film at Russell Tribunal," *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 4, 1967.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 218.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 309.

decision to close the London office and function only the Paris office that Sartre led. One of the Japanese members, Kinju Morikawa, later recounted the reason that Sartre and French participants did not want Shoeman to act on his decision without prior consultation with the Paris office, particularly on financial issues.⁴⁸

While the Stockholm session of the International War Crimes Tribunal gained extensive attention from the international press and their audiences, major American newspapers still made a great effort to ruin its cause by emphasizing the “unfairness” of the Tribunal and denouncing the Swedish government for allowing the Tribunal to be held in Stockholm. President Johnson expressed his dissatisfaction to Swedish Prime Minister Tage Erlander in private communication.⁴⁹ Yet the facts revealed in the Tribunal created such strong international pressure on the United States government that the State Department officially admitted to the use of “fragmentation bombs” in Vietnam on May 6, during the Tribunal Session. The coverage of the Tribunal by the American press, however, dramatically decreased after Stockholm, and they carried very few articles on the Copenhagen session in November. Thus the American press decided to dismiss the Tribunal, as did the government.⁵⁰

Nevertheless, the Copenhagen session became another blow to the American reputation internationally in regards to Vietnam because the Tribunal successfully brought American soldiers forward as witnesses to the atrocities for the first time in a

⁴⁸ Morikawa, 96-97.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 70. *Asahi Shimbun*, May 8, 1967 [in Japanese].

⁵⁰ See, Fujimoto, “The Johnson Administration and the Russell Tribunal,” 82-87.

public setting. Three U.S. military veterans who served in Vietnam, David Kenneth Tuck, Peter Martisen, and Donald Duncan, appeared to testify about their missions and experiences in Vietnam. Their eyewitness accounts of the inhumane war activities directed at civilians in Vietnam and of the racial division of labor among the military troops shocked the observers.⁵¹ In the United States, Vietnam War Veterans had started to join the anti-war activities in early 1967, joining groups such as the Spring Mobilization to end the War in Vietnam in New York City in April, and organizing themselves as the Vietnam Veterans Against the War in June. Yet, it was not until the fall of 1969, when the massacre in Mi Lai became public, that veterans' anti-war activities finally became a powerful force in the anti-war movement at home. Thus, it was a significant turning point when the Tribunal created a new form of protest against the U.S. policy in Vietnam and veterans decided to appear in public on this international stage.

After twelve days of testimonies, the International War Crimes Tribunal rendered a verdict on December 1, 1967, which acknowledged the U.S. violation of international laws regarding aggression to civilians, use of prohibited weapons, inhumane treatment of prisoners and captured armed forces, and genocidal activities. It also noted that the Governments of Thailand, the Philippines, and Japan were "guilty of complicity" in the U.S. war efforts in Vietnam.⁵² Although the Government of the United States neglected the event and did not defend itself in Copenhagen either, the

⁵¹ See, Duffett, *Against the Crime of Silence*, 403-513.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 643-50.

process and result of the Russell Tribunal inspired and irritated American radical pacifists who were sensitive to the international conditions that affected their political cause.

The Tribunal and the American New Left

The American New Leftists, who could have been strong supporters of the Tribunal, had long been ambivalent toward the international effort of pacifism led by Bertrand Russell and Jean Paul Sartre. Some American intellectuals and activists did not hesitate to join the Tribunal, but others questioned the fairness of the U.S.-absent tribunals, and others even attacked the political conditions of Europe where the Tribunal Sessions were held. Such ambivalent attitudes of the American New Left toward the Tribunals inevitably illuminate the boundary of their political imagination.

One of the most crucial catalysts that set the direction of young American rebels' attitudes toward the Tribunal was an article which appeared in *Ramparts* magazine in May 1967. While the Tribunal sessions were being held in Stockholm, David Horowitz arranged an interview with Bertrand Russell for *Ramparts'* editor Robert Scheer. Although Horowitz worked for the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation in the London office, he kept a certain distance from the Tribunal. He later recalled that it was because he did not like the way that Shoenman organized the tribunal and because he thought that their "cause" would be "compromised by dishonest agendas in the way the Old Left had been" in the Tribunal.⁵³

⁵³ Horowitz, *Radical Son*, 150.

The May issue of *Ramparts* featured Scheer's interview with Russell with his portrait on the cover. Thirty-one-year-old Scheer showed sympathy toward Russell, but, at the same time, was very critical of the Tribunal. He pointed out that what American critics could not "psychologically or politically" agree with about the Tribunal was that the Tribunal defined the role of the United States in the Vietnam War as the same as that of the Germans in the Czechoslovakian occupation, the French in colonial Algeria, and of Russia in Hungary. Then he claimed that the problem with Russell's activism was that he was too dependent on the framework of the "political liberalism of the 19th century." Scheer argues as follows:

And it is difficult to readily encompass the problems of revolution, underdevelopment and nuclear violence within that framework. The one principle which does clearly apply is that of self-determination, and Russell clings to it with ferocity. He supports the NLF against Americans because the NLF is fighting for self-determination in Vietnam, whereas the Americans are neo-colonialists.⁵⁴

Scheer further suggests that it was an irony that Marxist intellectuals including Sartre, Dedijer, Deutscher, Shoenman, and others, worked within the framework of Russell's English liberal political tradition.

For Scheer, the failure of the International War Crimes Tribunal was inevitable for the following reasons. Firstly, it would fail because of its "amateurish and amazingly poorly financed" organization for the scale of its operation. He cynically described that, "it is sad to think that people throughout the world expect this one-

⁵⁴ Robert Scheer, "Lord Russell," *Ramparts* 5, no. 11 (May 1967), 19.

woman office to save the peace, and ironical that it has actually done a better job of it than the more highly endowed peace operations throughout the world.” Another critical reason was “the nightmarish world of little left sects” created by Ralph Shoenman. Scheer emphasized that most of the volunteer workers in the Tribunal offices in London and Paris were “drawn almost exclusively from one of the Trotskyist groups and from a splinter of the Paris Maoists.” Shoenman’s sectarianism, he argues, caused a tension with Russell and Sartre’s broader aims of the Tribunal.⁵⁵ As evidence of this, Scheer pointed out that Sartre had decided to divorce the Tribunal from Shoenman’s control at the Stockholm session. Yet it was not because of Shoenman’s sectarianism but because of the arbitral operation of finance, as a member of the tribunal later explained. Thus the article represented Horowitz’s view on Shoenman and it dismissed the characteristics of New Left politics in Europe which were deeply rooted in the strong tradition of Communist activities.⁵⁶

The International War Crimes Tribunal missed one possible American member who could have played a leading role in Stockholm and Copenhagen. This figure was Staughton Lynd, a leading New Left intellectual with a long career of leadership in the Civil Rights movement and anti-Vietnam War activities. Lynd was a Yale professor of U.S. history and an original faculty member of the Free University of New York, where he taught the tradition of American Radicalism. In 1965, he travelled North

⁵⁵ Ibid., 19-23.

⁵⁶ Horowitz resigned his position in the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation in London after the Tribunal and joined *Ramparts* as a writer and editor. Horowitz, *Radical Son*, 151.

Vietnam with Tom Hayden during the American bombardment, which made him admired and respected by many politically conscious New Left youths in the United States. As a leading organizer who ran the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, Lynd could have been one of the most influential members of the tribunal, influential both to the international leftists and domestic New Leftists.

After careful consideration, however, Lynd decided to decline the invitation to the Tribunal from Bertrand Russell. Todd Gitlin later interviewed Lynd and recounted in his memoir that Lynd declined Russell's invitation because he did not see the Tribunal as being fair for both sides, Vietnam and the United States, and because he did not like the narrow circle of European Marxists. In late 1966, Lynd received an invitation letter from Bertrand Russell. Russell Stetler, as a representative of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation in America, visited Lynd in New Haven. Lynd expressed his understanding of the necessity of holding such an international campaign to stop the war. Nevertheless, he claimed that the tribunal would be "more credible" if it had witnesses at the trial from both sides.⁵⁷ He wrote back to Russell, saying:

I regard a systematic investigation into N.L.F. terror as entirely compatible with the solidarity I feel for the N.L.F. in its struggle. Such an investigation, I believe, would make the reasons for N.F.L. terror more understandable to world public opinion.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties*, 268.

⁵⁸ "Staughton Lynd to Bertrand Russell," January 13, 1967, quoted in Carl Mirra, *The Admirable Radical: Staughton Lynd and Cold War Dissent, 1945-1970* (Kent, Ohio: Kent University Press, 2010), 134. Mirra argues that, while Lynd insisted on fair testimony, Shoenman insisted that tribunal membership was closed in the spring of 1967. Mirra, 135.

The issue was whether he could recognize the revolutionary violence of NLF as tribunal members did. Needless to say, Lynd stood against the American foreign policy in Vietnam, but he did not welcome the victory of the NLF, either. He considered the NLF to be committing war crimes as the United States were, and wished for the NLF and the South Vietnamese neutralists to build a coalition for peace.⁵⁹

Gitlin argues that Lynd refused to work with the European Marxists because, in the past, Lynd saw a gathering of radical intellectuals in Europe as “the international Communist banquet circle” which reminded him of his bitter political experience with the American Communist Party. In Lynd’s eyes, the younger New Leftists were becoming so angry and impatient that they sought something more “lovable,” that is, “populations that were more so – the more remote culturally, the better, since less could be understood about them.” Lynd was afraid that the New Left youths “inverted the traditional American innocence, and located the ‘city upon a hill’ in the jungles of the Third World.”⁶⁰ According to Gitlin’s account, Lynd rejected both the Communist circle in Europe and the younger New Left in the United States who found a romance in the Third World. It was a symbolic turning point in the sixties, when a respectable radical intellectual who was bewildered by outraged youths turned his back on the increasingly militant activism.

⁵⁹ Arthur Jay Kinghoffer and Judith Apter Kinghoffer, *International Citizens’ Tribunals: Mobilizing Public Opinion to Advance Human Rights* (New York, NY: Palgrave, 2002), 115-16.

⁶⁰ Gitlin, *The Sixties*, 268.

Contrary to Gitlin's account, his behavior after rejecting the invitation suggests that Lynd was a little more ambivalent toward the Tribunal: he did not participate in the tribunal, but he still carefully observed the tribunal sessions and even encouraged Carl Oglesby, former president of Students for a Democratic Society, to join the tribunal. In his memoir, Oglesby remarked that Lynd gave him a call at the Peace and Freedom Center in the Yellow Springs and said, "The organizers see the American students as playing a key role in the anti-war movement. They want people from SDS and SNCC." Oglesby felt that joining the Tribunal was "irresistible" because he had admired Sartre very much.⁶¹ He was very proud to take part in the arguments and testimonies of the Tribunal with the European intellectuals. He recalls that his articles about the Tribunal published in the *Nation* in June 1967 were a great contribution to its "warm" intellectual community as one of the American participants. In the article, he accounted for the logic of the verdict in Stockholm and insisted that Vietnam was another Guernica, not Auschwitz, in which the United States was destroying the Revolution of Vietnam.⁶²

Among respectable Tribunal members, the revolutionary attitude of Peter Weiss made a strong impact on Oglesby's mind, while Vladimir Dedijer irritated him when the Yugoslav publicly challenged him for a "trivial thing." Dedijer criticized Oglesby for being nothing but an "imperialist and warmonger" because Oglesby introduced himself as an American to the members, not as "a person from the United

⁶¹ Carl Oglesby, *Ravens in the Storm: A Personal History of the 1960s Anti-War Movement* (New York: Scribner, 2010), 128.

⁶² Carl Oglesby, "Vietnam: This is Guernica," *Nation*, June 5, 1967, 714-21.

States.” Dedijer implied that people in the United States always ignored the fact that Americans included all the people in the North and South American continents and that such an attitude from U.S. citizens helped create the cause of the War. Although Oglesby was very confused, he felt that his own political attitude toward the War in Vietnam was close to that of the Tribunal members. He recalled, “These ultras of Copenhagen thought of politics in much the same way as did the ultras I’d begun running into around the movement that year, 1967, in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco.”⁶³

David Dellinger was more concerned about his citizenship as an American whose country was the aggressor in the War in Vietnam. Dellinger later explained that he accepted Bertrand Russell’s invitation to the Tribunal because there was an agreement that the aim of the tribunal was “to save lives, not to destroy them.” He then recalled that what impressed him most was not the intellectual celebrities of Europe, but the Vietnamese victims and American G.I.s who testified at the Tribunal.⁶⁴ Dellinger frequently reported on the tribunal sessions in *Liberation* magazine, for which he worked as an editor. He carefully chose words to help American readers understand the purpose of the Tribunal and its findings. For instance, he wrote in April 1966:

Ironically, Americans today find it difficult to conceive of themselves and their governments as capable of playing an evil role in history, in part because we

⁶³ Oglesby, *Ravens in the Storm*, 132.

⁶⁴ David Dellinger, *From Yale to Jail: The Life Story of a Moral Dissenter* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2010), 244.

are still misled by the crude anti-Nazi propaganda of World War II, which ignored mixed motivations, human inertia, man's capacity for patriotic self-deception and the complicated historical interactions that took many years to produce world war and death camps.⁶⁵

In Dellinger's analysis, most American people were still captured by "the oversimplified good-guys, bad-guys psychology" that forced them to think that their interventions were always "in defense of freedom." While he was very sympathetic to ordinary Americans who were "misled" by the Government and media, he reported shocking facts of aggression created by fellow Americans in a detached tone.

The whole issue of *Liberation*, January 1968, was dedicated to a report from the International War Crimes Tribunal. Editors of *Liberation* conveyed stories based on tape recordings and simultaneous interpretations of testimonies at the session. In his general report on the Tribunal, Dellinger emphasized the significance of the Tribunal to the American people and the world as following:

The Tribunal appeals to the people of the United States at its source. It appeals to the people of the United States to put an end to U.S. genocide. And finally, the Tribunal appeals to all the peoples of the world to act in the name of humanity and the name of solidarity with our Vietnamese brothers and with all other people whose lives and honor and integrity are threatened.⁶⁶

As an editor of the magazine, Dellinger did not forget to carefully balance its coverage for American readers by including Staughton Lynd's four-page dissent to the Tribunal.

⁶⁵ David Dellinger, *Revolutionary Nonviolence: Essays by Dave Dellinger* (New York: Anchor Books, 1971), 88-89. The essay was originally published in *Liberation* 12, no. 2 (April 1967), 7.

⁶⁶ Dave Dellinger, "Unmasking Genocide," *Liberation* 12, nos. 9-10 (December 1967 and January 1968), 12.

In the article, Lynd questioned the way the tribunal investigated the war crimes and stressed his position that, “a ‘crime’ remains criminal no matter who commits it.” Then he regarded the tribunal’s one-sided investigation as “a Stalinist approach,” into which recent leaderships of SDS and SNCC had fallen when they insisted on doing “anything” in order to defeat American imperialism.⁶⁷ Lynd did not criticize the cause of the Tribunal or the political orientation of the Tribunal members. Rather he threw suspicion on the Tribunal’s methods and warned young American rebels that they should consider carefully what American leftists could do in a domestic movement.

The significance of the International War Crimes Tribunal of 1967 in world history is well-proven by the number of non-governmental tribunals that modeled themselves after the Russell-Sartre Tribunal throughout the rest of the twentieth century. People organized such tribunals when they believe that crimes of war or international society could not be judged fairly by public agencies or nation states. Even though non-governmental tribunals’ verdicts have no legal power, the citizens of the world learned that the tribunals have the power to appeal to the human conscience. Then what was the significance of the International War Crimes Tribunal to American society and to movements regarding the U.S. policy in Vietnam? The answer can be found in the reactions of American individuals and society to the internationally constructed anti-Vietnam War discourse of the Tribunal.

⁶⁷ Staughton Lynd, “The War Crimes Tribunal: A Dissent,” *Liberation* 12, nos. 9-10s (December 1967 and January 1968), 76-79.

The message of the International War Crimes Tribunal was very simple: the United States of America should stop its atrocities in Vietnam because it violated the international treaties and committed crimes against humanity. The government of the United States officially ignored the Tribunal while it put diplomatic pressure on host countries in an attempt to prevent it. The media in general tried to discredit Russell or ridicule the Tribunal. American society was not yet ready to accept the fact that the United States was doing something wrong in the Far East. Only a few years later, when Russell died in February 3, 1970, did the *New York Times* carry a warm obituary that showed admiration for his life and activities, including his stance on Vietnam. It depicted Russell as follows:

A gentle, even shy man, Russell was delightful as a conversationalist, companion and friend. He was capable of a pyrotechnical display of wit, education and curiosity, and he bubbled with anecdotes about the world's greats.⁶⁸

The three passions he had, the writer claimed, were “the longing for love, the search for knowledge, and unbearable pity for the suffering of mankind.”⁶⁹ The media and society finally accepted the international message on the war and, in 1973, the United States officially finished withdrawing its troops from Vietnam.

The domestic protest movement greatly contributed to the change in American attitudes toward the war, but the reactions of radical pacifists to the Tribunal were not simple because they were concerned about the content of the Tribunal's message and

⁶⁸ Alden Whitman, “Governed by Three Passions,” *New York Times*, February 3, 1970.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

the process through which the message was created. The Free University instructors in New York were the most supportive of the groups that had contributed to organizing the Tribunal and travelling to Vietnam to obtain first-hand evidence. This is because they were accustomed to the analysis, shared by Tribunal members, that the peoples' struggle in the Third World was a liberation movement for self-determination. It is also because that they could accept the historical analogy that compared the war crimes of Nazi Germany and Fascist Japan to those of the United States in Vietnam. Russell and Carmichael added an observation to this logic: that the impoverished colored people in the territories of the United States and the people in Vietnam were being oppressed by the same group of American people who continuously sought capitalistic profit for its empire. Martin Luther King's speech in the spring of 1967 needs to be understood in this international context. Nevertheless, for the majority of the New Left, the Tribunal was not accepted because it lacked "fairness" for both the plaintiff and the defendant, as represented by Staughton Lynd's criticism. Some New Leftists, such as Robert Scheer, even rejected the idea of "self-determination" as the antiquated liberalism of the nineteenth century. The Liberation movement for self-determination was, however, the course of events in the Third World since the Second World War, and this swallowed the domestic movement in post-1968 America. Once they accepted this trend, the American New Left needed to figure out the best ways to maintain solidarity with the African-American and other liberation movements.

CHAPTER SIX

Ways for Revolution: The Discourse of Liberation and the Closing of the Free University of New York

In the early spring of 1967, when Gerassi, Stetler, and some other faculty members of the Free University began a domestic campaign for the International War Crimes Tribunal, the Free University of New York was enjoying the height of its popularity. Each class had “more than twenty-five or thirty” students registered and four of the faculty members, Allen Krebs, David Caute, Conor Cruise O’Brien, and John Gerassi, taught several dozens of students. Krebs even gave an “advanced” class that started late at night and went into the early morning, and Allan Shapiro was planning to organize the Free School SDS.¹ Backed by the fully functioning Free University, some instructors sought chances to exchange their ideas with their international leftist counterparts.

As the International War Crimes Tribunal in Stockholm and Copenhagen went on, two world-scale gatherings offered such opportunities to them: the Dialectics of Liberation Congress held in London in July 1967, and the Cultural Congress in Havana in January 1968. In these international conferences, radical intellectuals and activists from the First, Second, and Third Worlds met face to face to develop the idea of liberation and revolutionary social change in their countries and in the world. The process of the radicalization of the rhetoric of national and personal liberation in the

¹ Al Shapiro to Will Inman, February 17, 1967, Will Inman Papers. David Caute was a visiting professor at New York University at that time. Free School of New York, *Catalog for the Winter Quarter, 1966-67*, J. B. Matthers Papers.

international context, however, coincided with the militant turn of the worldwide movement in the late 1960s. On the eve of the drastic turn of the American movement, the Free University of New York decided to dissolve itself in the winter of 1968.

This chapter explores the two congresses, in London and Havana, which the Free University instructors took part in to analyze how the discourse of revolution was shaped at such gatherings and how it affected the movement in the United States as well as the life of the Free University of New York. This chapter also seeks the answers to the following larger questions. Firstly, how did the New Leftists in the U.S. and Europe situate themselves in the wave of national liberation movements in the Third World? Could American leftists integrate the imported idea of national liberation with the idea of personal liberation in the First World? And finally, how did the international interactions of leftists in the 1960s affect the course of the American movement? In short, the Free University of New York existed in the nexus of domestic and international movements and its existence and dissolution reflected the turn of the movement of the sixties in a global sense.

The Dialectics of Liberation Congress, July 1967

The Dialectics of Liberation Congress was held at the Roundhouse in London for sixteen days from July 15 to July 30, 1967. The organizers of the event intended to recreate a FUNY-style radical education in London where intellectuals and activists from the both sides of the Atlantic could exchange their ideas for social change in an era in which the violence of their governments overwhelmed humanity around the

globe. The organizers saw the U.S. War in Vietnam as a case that exemplified “violently” transforming the idea of the “enemy” into something “inhuman,” and under such human conditions, they observed, men destroyed each other.²

The idea of the Congress was brought up by four young psychiatrists in England and the United States: David Cooper and R. L. Laing from England, and Leon Redler and Joseph Berke from the United States. The leading organizer, Cooper, explained that they were “very much concerned with radical innovation in their own field – to the extent of their counter-labeling their discipline as anti-psychiatry.”³ Cooper moved from South Africa to London after graduating from the University of Cape Town in 1955 and worked for hospitals, specializing in phenomenological psychiatry. Cooper, with Laing, authored a book on the influence of phenomenological psychiatry on Sartrean existentialism in 1964, entitled, *Reason and Violence: A Decade of Sartre’s Philosophy*, which represented their focus on overcoming the methodological confinement of the human sciences by connecting psychiatric medicine to philosophy.

Joseph Berke, with his colleague Redler, joined Cooper and Laing to bring the idea of radical education to London. Berke was born in 1939 and studied at Columbia College and the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in Bronx, New York. Right after finishing his internship, he joined the Free University of New York where he helped open the school and taught a course, entitled “The Psychotic Experience as an

² David Cooper, introduction to *The Dialectics of Liberation*, ed, David Cooper (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1968), 7-9.

³ *Ibid.*, 8.

Archetype of Paradise Lost” in the Summer Session of 1965. He then moved to Kingsley, U.K., where he joined a circle of radical psychiatrists and tried creating a London version of the Free University. Although the “Free University of London” was not successful, they came up with the idea of holding a Transatlantic gathering of intellectuals and activists who committed themselves to progressive social change and pacifism.⁴

These organizers understood that the Free University’s radical education was possible because it had a variety of participants who constituted a mixture of theoreticians and activists. Berke argued that, in New York, many “politicos” who were mostly veterans of the May 2nd Movement interacted with theoretically oriented academicians from the New York metropolitan area and nationally famed leftist intellectuals in the space of experimental education.⁵ Imitating the structure of the Free University of New York, they tried to narrow the “gap between theory and practice” by inviting English anthropologist Gregory Bateson, German-born philosopher Herbert Marcuse, and French philosopher Lucien Goldmann to represent the “theoretical pole,” including Stokely Carmichael to represent the “activist pole.” From the Free University of New York, President Allen Krebs and John Gerassi took part in the Congress as panelists. Beat poet Allen Ginsberg, whose name was also on the faculty list of the Free University, attended to speak to the public in London. In

⁴ Martin Levy, “Joe Berke, the Congress and Radical Education,” *Dialectics of Liberation Website*, accessed May 16, 2012, <http://www.dialecticsofliberation.com/1967-dialectics/dialectics-participants/joseph-berke/joe-berke-the-congress-and-radical-education/>.

⁵ Ibid.

this way, activists and intellectuals from both sides of the Atlantic came together in an experimental space for radical intellectuals in London to share their ideas.⁶

Allen Krebs took part in a panel, “Anti-Institution Seminar,” with Simon Vinkenoog from the recently dissolved Provo, a countercultural movement in the Netherlands, Aage Rosendal Nielsen from the New Experimental College in Denmark, an activist from the Internationalists in Canada, and a student representative from the Free University of Berlin. These panelists introduced their movements at home to the audience and argued their strong concerns about the war, society, and their lives. They were all counter-cultural and anti-authoritarian in their own political and social contexts at home, and they defined themselves in terms of the systems and societies that they belonged to.

Krebs introduced the Free University of New York as a “microscopic particle within American society.” Although young leftists in the United States had organized Free Universities in New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Berkeley, Palo Alto, and other communities and towns by then, the number of the people involved in the movement was still very small. On the other hand, Krebs argued that a number of people, who were acting “as whites, as middle class” were “unable to escape from the orbit provided within the consciousness and context of the establishment.”

Nevertheless, Krebs claimed that he and his fellow activists tried to understand:

⁶ Cooper, introduction to *The Dialectics of Liberation*, ed. Cooper, 9. The congress was sound-recorded and released in vinyl record format as *The International Dialectics of Liberation Congress* (London: Intersound Recordings, Liberation Records, 1967).

why the hell America is a hell hole, why the hell America is a nightmare, just what the dynamics, just what the social structure, just what the history that the place has been, and a kind of thing one can use to live and apply and try and change.⁷

The “change” meant an “advancement of America as a society not only with respect to black people in America, not only with respect to Western Europe, but with respect to Asia, Latin America, [and] Vietnam.” Krebs emphasized that the Free University was concerned with further activities that the Third World initiated, and with what they could do in relation to the Third World.⁸

The concepts of “Third World” and “liberation” were the linchpin of the Congress, the understanding of which brought together the various participants from diverse backgrounds. The key for such understanding was, in Cooper’s words, the analysis of “destruction”: destruction of the self and destruction of the other. Cooper emphasized that Carmichael had argued that racism was a factor that destroyed human races, while Marcuse analyzed the self-destruction of the human condition as the “blind, frightened repression of natural instinctuality” in affluent society.⁹ Paul Sweezy, a Marxist economist and a founder of the *Monthly Review*, evaluated the destructive future of capitalism in the framework of the Third World. He insisted that

⁷ “Anti-Institution Seminar,” in the *International Dialectics of Liberation Congress*, DL20.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Cooper, introduction to *The Dialectics of Liberation*, 9.

understanding the Third World, which was in reality “a part of one of the other two worlds,” was “crucial” in order to foresee the development of capitalism.¹⁰

John Gerassi argued the contradictory nature of American diplomacy; that even though it was often criticized as imperialism, the United States believed the American Way of Life to be the most democratic and liberal in the world. He pointed out that “liberation” was used in two ways by the Congress. One was the liberation from “physical oppression” and from an “outward enemy,” while the other was the liberation from the “psychological oppression of the environment.” Nevertheless, there was a shared concern that the social structure or opponents that oppressed people needed to be overthrown, and one of the significant enemies was, Gerassi argued, the American imperialism that oppressed the people of the world. According to his argument, three groups of people were reacting to the enemies in different ways. People in the Third World, who were oppressed physically and mentally by imperialism, tended to react with violence. The second group of people, who were aware of the oppression but did not recognize the difference between its outward and inward consequences, tried to seek “a new form of consciousness.” This group included liberals and New Leftists in the United States and other First World countries who usually reacted lawfully and nonviolently. He then defined the third group as people who lived inside the structure of American imperialism and were directly oppressed by it. These were the people of color in the United States who often reacted

¹⁰ Paul Sweesy, “The Future of the Capitalism,” in *Dialectics of Liberation*, ed. Cooper, 97.

with “violence.” Gerassi emphasized that African-Americans were abused on a consistent basis but they challenged and resisted in their own way. Thus, he put the non-white Americans in the same category as the people of the Third World in terms of colonization.¹¹

The Dialectics of Liberation Congress was thus one of the significant events that provided evidence for the fact that “The Sixties” were constructed as an international web of intellectuals and activists. In the same way as the International War Crimes Tribunal, the Congress was made possible by the initiatives of the First World radical intellectuals in the United States and Europe. They juxtaposed the psychological liberation of people in an affluent society and the physical liberation of oppressed people in the Third World. Then they came to see non-white residents in the First World, namely in the United States, as the very subjects who needed to be freed from the colonizing forces of society.

Black Power and First World Intellectuals

In a recent historical analysis of the interconnectedness of student movements in the United States and West Germany, Martin Klimke refers to the Dialectics of Liberation Congress as a springboard for German students’ further acceptance of the African-American Black Power theory. Klimke points out that German SDS (Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund) representatives from Frankfurt were very

¹¹ John Gerassi, “Imperialism and Revolution in America,” in *The Dialectics of Liberation*, ed. Cooper, 72-94.

“impressed” by the appearance of Stokely Carmichael at the Congress in London because they had already started studying Black Power under the leadership of Rudi Dutschke and his American wife Gretchen in their Third World study group in 1966. By the time of the Congress, German radicals understood the Black Power movement as a model for the movements for liberation from imperialism and capitalism within the First World, which epitomized Che Guevara’s “foco” theory of Third World national liberation movements, as well as Herbert Marcuse’s theory of First World liberation movements. When German students observed the riots in Detroit that broke out in the early morning of July 23, German New Left activists further devoted themselves to solidarity with the Black Power movement in the United States.¹²

Despite the enthusiasm among European participants for the leading figure of the Black Power movement in United States, Stokely Carmichael later revealed that he himself was not really satisfied with the Congress. In his memoir, Carmichael explained that he had accepted an invitation to the Congress for the following three reasons. He wanted, first, to explain the concept of Black Power and to clarify what it really was in his own words. Secondly, as a representative of SNCC, he wanted to “make contact with revolutionary brothers and sisters” especially from Africa. Finally, he wanted to interact with immigrant communities from African and Caribbean countries in Britain that were newly forming Black Power identities. Most participants in the Congress, however, were not revolutionary activists as Carmichael expected but

¹² See, Chapter 4 of Martin Klimke, *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

“heavily theoretical” European intellectuals and academics. Carmichael even thought, “I’ve come here to waste my time,” and recalled:

And once the presentation began, the speeches, at least those I hear tended toward abstract psychology. About “alienation” and the “individual,” the psychological “dialectic” of *individual* liberation. Very Eurocentric.¹³

Carmichael’s visit to London was, however, not necessarily a waste of time. During his stay, he had a chance to talk to a local community of African descendants and to engage in conversation with an admired black radical intellectual, C. L. R. James. He was also contacted by the Cuban high commissioner and received an invitation to an international conference which was to be held in Cuba in August. Carmichael spoke about “Black Power” twice in London: once in front of an immigrant community from Africa and the West Indies, and once in front of European intellectuals and students at the Congress. The sound recordings of his two talks reveal the very sympathetic and enthusiastic mood of the audience of his talk to his “brothers and sisters” in London. In addition, he enjoyed meeting with students and community activists, including Michael X whom the press called the “British Malcolm X,” as well as some Asians, and liberal whites at the African House in London.¹⁴

While Carmichael spoke to his “brothers and sisters” by demonstrating his membership in the larger Pan-African community that embraced similar communities

¹³ Stokely Carmichael [Kwame Ture] with Ekwueme Michael Thelwell, *Ready for Revolution: The Life and Struggles of Stokely Carmichael* (New York: Scriber, 2003), 572-73.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 573-77.

in London, he addressed the radical theoreticians caustically. By quoting Frantz Fanon, he first pointed out that, since “black alienation is not an individual question” as Freud argues in his psychoanalysis, what the Third World questioned was “the system of international white supremacy coupled with international capitalism.”¹⁵ He then argued against cultural impositions on non-Western people by Europe and emphasized that the First World could not “grant anybody independence.” Based on this understanding, Carmichael and his fellows were struggling to “increase the revolutionary consciousness of black people in America to join with the Third World” to save their humanity.¹⁶

In his memoir, Carmichael recalled that “the single most moving moment” in London was the time when he observed the entire audience ardently applauding C. L. R. James for his talk on Black Power. In Carmichael’s words, “this slender, erect, almost frail figure with a startling chock of snow-white hair” who “elegantly” spoke on Black Power was “uncommonly gracious and generous” to him.¹⁷ Carmichael was not able to stay until the Congress was over because the British Government issued an expulsion order for Carmichael for being a “persona non grata.” He then left for Cuba to attend an international conference while a demonstration against the British government regarding Carmichael’s expulsion was being formed in London.¹⁸

¹⁵ Stokely Carmichael, “Black Power,” in *The Dialectics of Liberation*, ed. Cooper, 150.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 167-69.

¹⁷ Carmichael, *Ready for Revolution*, 580.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 582.

The Dialectics of Liberation Congress was undoubtedly a significant international event that brought together radical intellectuals and activists of the First World. They sought a theoretical common ground for the politics of liberation in the age of three worlds and created a transatlantic network of solidarity against the violence of global imperialism. Yet the arguments in the Congress also implied a discrepancy in the definitions for and the ideas of liberation. For those who sought an individual liberation in the First World, the question was psychological and personal, while, for those who sought a collective liberation of the Third World from colonialism, the question was not only cultural but also physical. The movement would progress forward more rapidly with this discrepancy embraced in the coming year of 1968.

National Liberation as the World's Imperative: The Cultural Congress of Havana

On October 9, 1967, Ernest Che Guevara was captured and executed in Bolivia at the age of thirty-nine. The death of the revolutionary hero only emphasized the urgency to stop U.S. imperialism in every corner of the globe. From the late fifties, Cuba had made a significant impact on the formation of the radical activism of the youth in the United States. Many of the leftist intellectuals who had organized the Free University of New York were indeed radicalized when they supported the Revolution in Cuba and visited its site. In the latter half of the sixties, the Cuban government hosted international conferences for the worldwide struggle for national liberation and

independence in Third World countries, to which First World intellectuals inevitably reacted¹⁹.

Five months after Carmichael attended the first Conference of the Latin American Solidarity Organization in August, 1967, about thirty delegates and invited guests from the United States gathered with more than five hundred people from seventy countries worldwide at the Cultural Congress of Havana from January 4 to 11, 1968. The purpose of the Cultural Congress was to develop a revolutionary ideology of the national liberation movement in the Third World. Irwin Silber, a leader of the American delegates, explained that these ideas of the new age were “being essentialized and expressed” by the worlds of “the offsprings of this ‘Third World’ – Mao Zedong, Fidel Castro, Frantz Fanon, Ho Chi Mihn, W. E. B. Dubois, Che Guevara, Patrice Lumumba, Malcolm X.”²⁰

Irwin Silber was an editor of the music magazine *Sing Out!*, and taught "Folk Music: Anachronism or Contemporary Ideological Arena, A Radical Approach" at the Free University of New York.²¹ Since he had visited Cuba previously to join a folk festival in Havana with folk singer Barbara Dane, he led a group of American Delegates. Silber's group, which represented “white America,” included Dave

¹⁹ The other international conferences hosted by Cuba included, The Tricontinental Conference of Havana in January 1966, The Latin American Congress of Students in August 1966, and Conference of the Latin American Solidarity Organization in 1967.

²⁰ Irwin Silber, ed., *Voices of National Liberation: The Revolutionary Ideology of the “Third World” as Expressed by Intellectuals and Artists at the Cultural Congress of Havana, January 1968* (New York: Central Book Company, 1970), xiii.

²¹ Free School of New York, *Class Catalogue, Winter Quarter, 1966-1967*, Tamiment Library.

Dellinger, Carl Davidson, Tom Hayden, Todd Gitlin, Bob Scheer, and some journalists and scientists. Yet, there was another group of representatives from the United States that represented “black America.” Ralph Featherstone of the SNCC headed the “separate” delegation of the African-American nation in the United States.²² As Dellinger reported in *Liberation*, the State Department denied permissions to some participants in the Congress on the grounds that the United States had restrictions on travel to Cuba. With this governmental intervention, Robert Lowell, Dwight MacDonald, Philip Rahv, Eric Bentley, Susan Sontag and others could not join this worldwide meeting.²³

Besides the delegates from the United States, well-known intellectuals, artists, scientists, journalists, lawyers, and social activists from seventy countries of the First, Second, and Third Worlds filled the list of five hundred attendants. One missing country was China, which did not send its representatives because they were engaged in the ongoing process of their own Cultural Revolution. From the First World, British delegates included, Ken Coates from the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation,

²² Irwin Silber, forward to *The Cultural Congress of Havana, 4-11 January, 1968* [pamphlet] (New York, 1968), 7. Featherstone had visited Japan with Howard Zinn in 1966, which led to the formation of Beheiren (Betonamu ni Heiwa o Shimin Rengo), or Citizen's League for Peace in Vietnam, a major anti-Vietnam war organization in the sixties in Japan.

²³ Dave Dellinger, “Cuba: The Revolutionary Society,” *Liberation* 13, no. 1 (1968), 8-12. The State Department asked the travelers to sign an affidavit not to join the Congress, which most of the participants ignored and came to Havana. Silber, forward to *The Cultural Congress of Havana*, 9.

psychiatrist David Cooper, historian Eric Hobsbawm, and Perry Anderson.²⁴ Bertrand Russell, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Austrian writer Ernst Fischer received invitations, but they could not join for health reasons. Instead, they sent greeting letters to the Congress. In his message, Russell emphasized the significance of the Congress held in Cuba because it stood as “a symbol of two vital processes”: the struggle for socialism and national independence, and artistic and scientific avant-garde movements. Sartre remarked that European citizens never forgot the “affirmation of the cultural emancipation of nations long oppressed culturally by colonialism and neocolonialism.”²⁵

The Congress was divided into five commissions: “culture and national independence,” “the integral growth of man,” “the Intellectual’s responsibility toward the problems of the under developed world,” “culture and the mass media,” and “problem of artistic creation, and of scientific and technical work.” After eight days of discussion, each commission submitted a resolution, and the Congress adopted the “Final Resolution on Vietnam,” an “Appeal of Havana,” and the “General Declaration of the Cultural Congress of Havana.” On the issue of the War in Vietnam, the Congress followed the verdict of the International War Crimes Tribunal:

²⁴ A list of participants was created by an American conservative institution as a result of the investigation on “subversive activities.” Pan American Union, Special Consultative Committee on Security against the Subversive action of international Communism, Organization of American States, *Cultural Congress of Havana: Study Prepared by the SCCS at its Tenth Regular Meeting, 1968* (Washington, D.C., 1968).

²⁵ Irwin Silber, ed., *Voices of National Liberation* (New York: Central Book Company, 1970), 6-8.

The Government of the United States, guilty of the crimes of aggression, has furthermore rendered itself guilty of the greatest war crimes – including the genocidal war which, by its amplitude and frequency, are crimes against humanity, in the very terms of the statutes of Nuremberg.²⁶

In its Appeal, the Congress emphasized that the people who gathered in Havana to proclaim solidarity with the people fighting against imperialism were intellectuals from all over the world. They understood that capitalist exploitation of people spanned all levels: “political, military, economic, racial, ideological, and cultural.” They then defined the intellectual’s duty as follows:

What is required for them [intellectuals] is support for the struggles for national liberation, social emancipation and cultural decolonization of all the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and for the struggle against imperialism waged in its very center by an ever greater number of black and white citizens of the United States.²⁷

The Congress declared that it would be a “new man” who should take the lead in the revolutionary transformation of society for national independence from colonialism.

Following the heroic example of Che Guevara, the intellectuals declared that they were willing to devote themselves to “armed struggle” for “a new and better life.”²⁸

²⁶ The Cultural Congress of Havana, “Final Resolution on Viet Nam,” in *Cultural Congress of Havana: Meeting of Intellectuals from All the World on Problems of Asia, Africa, and Latin America* by the Cultural Congress of Havana (Havana: Instituto del Libro, 1968), n.p.

²⁷ “Appeal of Havana,” in *Cultural Congress of Havana*, by the Cultural Congress of Havana, n.p.

²⁸ “General Declaration of the Cultural Congress of Havana,” in *Cultural Congress of Havana*, by the Cultural Congress of Havana, n.p.

Cuba again became the site where American leftists yearned for alternatives to their way of life in the United States. One of the SDS delegates to the Congress, Todd Gitlin, contributed his analysis of the American left and internationalism in *Liberation* magazine with excitement:

We look to Cuba not only because of what we sense Cuba to be but because of what the United States is not. For generations, the American Left has externalized good: we needed to tie our fates to someone, somewhere in the world, who was seizing the chances for a humane society. Perhaps we needed an easy diversion from the hard business of cracking America. Now we dig Cuba.²⁹

But Gitlin was cautious enough to warn that American leftists should not learn from the Cuban lesson because, he argued, “internationalism means total identification with somebody else’s revolution and an abandonment of our own calling, nothing less.”³⁰ Nevertheless, younger generations of American New Leftists overdosed on the revolutionary lives in Cuba, and travelers to Cuba gained a great respect from fellow leftists, as Columbia SDS leader Mark Rudd later did. They admired the new generation of Cubans, as Dave Dellinger observed, for “translating all noble phrases and revolutionary aspirations into the concrete realities of everyday life” and for “relating even the simplest daily events to the purpose” of Revolution.³¹ Thus the Cultural Congress of Havana had a significant impact on the American Leftists: it successfully popularized the concept of Revolution in the American movement. But

²⁹ Todd Gitlin, “Cuba and the American Movement,” *Liberation* 13, no. 1 (1968), 13.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 13.

³¹ Dave Dellinger, “Cuba: the Revolutionary Society,” *Liberation*, 13, no. 1 (1968), 12.

the Revolution in Cuba was a struggle for national independence, a struggle whose language did not easily fit into the liberation of middle class students in the First World.

The Dissolution of the Free University of New York

While some of the Free University organizers devoted themselves to international intellectual exchanges and the University enjoyed domestic popularity among radical youths, the Free University suddenly lost its organizational strength in late 1967. Then, in the winter of 1968, the nation's first New Left Free University ceased its operation after the winter term. Why did FUNY only survive for such a short period? Organizationally, the leading members' devotion to international activities weakened FUNY's unifying force too much for them to continue to run the school. Yet, at the same time, increasingly stark discrepancies within the movement regarding its direction inevitably forced the Free University members to decide upon the next step toward the future of the movement. The case of the Free University of New York indicated that the movement in general had lost the delicate balance between intellectual radicalism and political activism in the period after the spring of 1968.

On November 27, 1967, Will Inman, who had served as Vice-President for the Free University of New York since the fall of 1965, wrote a resignation letter to Acting Director Dan Shafarman. Inman notified Shafarman that he would resign from his position as the Free University's Vice-President and as a Coordinating Committee member "effective immediately." In the letter, Inman demanded that the Free

University be dissolved at the end of the current term and a new school “under the auspices of those who could be more frank about their intentions and directions” be re-established.³² Inman observed the unfortunate “personal warfare” and “political confusion” among the members so he felt that it was time for him to withdraw completely from the Free University.

Although the Free University of New York had enjoyed popularity with the younger generation since the summer of 1965, the process of dissolution started rather suddenly in the late summer of 1967 and only accelerated in the fall. The most significant cause was that leading members of the Free University, such as Allen Krebs, Will Inman, and Jim Mellen, had already left New York for their own destinations: London for Krebs, Washington D.C. for Inman, and Tanzania for Mellen. What happened next in the Free University community during this period can be read in Inman’s personal correspondence with Allen Krebs in London and Allen Shapiro in Montreal. One of the causes of “personal warfare” derives from Allen Krebs’ break up with his wife Sharon Krebs, and the “political confusion” that was created through financial as well as personal relationships among members. Yet, it should be noted that what really existed behind this antagonism was an anxiety over the future development of the peace movement.

President Allen Krebs remained in London after the Dialectics of Liberation Congress in July 1967 for the purpose of establishing a London version of Free

³² Will Inman to Dan Shafarman, November 27, 1967, Will Inman Papers, Duke University.

University with Joseph Burke and David Cooper.³³ During his absence, Krebs turned over the operation of FUNY to the new leadership of Frank Gillette in hope that he would bring a “dynamic energy” to “more fertile regions.” Nevertheless, Gillette failed to keep his leadership when the Free University Coordinating Committee faced a financial problem regarding a \$600 paycheck for Gerassi that was stolen by someone as no records were kept of the accounts during the summer term. Gillett was criticized for his inappropriate handling of the issue and came under attack from his fellows for his “egotistical and sensitive” characteristics and for acting like “the aristocrat of the leftist intelligentsia.”³⁴

The leadership crisis at FUNY further deepened when Allen Krebs’s break-up with Sharon overlapped with the internal discord among the Free University leaders. In Allen’s view, it was Sharon who was to blame for their catastrophe. Inman added that Allen was so devoted to Free University activities that Sharon came “second.” Some women who sided with Sharon formed a “female study group” and started criticizing the “male-dominated society” and the “male chauvinism” of Allen.³⁵ As the description here is drawn from personal correspondence between Allen Krebs and Will Inman, it surely needs to be verified with further accuracy. Yet, a more critical factor

³³ In a letter to Inman, Krebs requested a loan of one thousand dollars from FUNY to set up a Free School of London. Allen Krebs to Will Inman, November 29, 1967, Will Inman Papers.

³⁴ Allan Shapiro to Will Inman, December 23, 1967, Will Inman Papers.

³⁵ Allen Krebs to Will Inman, November 29, December 5, 1967; Will Inman to Allen Krebs, December 1, 1967, Will Inman Papers.

that led to the dissolution of the Free University was the sense that they were facing a watershed of the movement.

Inman felt strongly that their anti-war movement faced a critical turning point.

He wrote:

I think the peace movement has reached desperation hollow and has to start some bold new initiatives, something besides burning induction centers (which I'm not against but feel a futility in), something that can (if anything can get thru those beer guts) reach people. I know my work here at Free U, late as it is, will have to be aimed broad broad broad, or it won't reach nobody but a few sick hippies and a few bored SDSers.³⁶

Allan Shapiro responded to Inman's remark by admitting that the "new tactics must be devised." He called for a larger domestic "fight" in which white radicals would join black liberation movements in "violence, including sabotage" for solidarity with "the latest victim of imperialism."³⁷ The Free University community, however, never reached a consensus regarding where the movement should go.

When he was leaving the Free University, Inman wrote to Krebs:

The first time I remember seeing you was at Joe Berke's very first class: I audited it. ... You squatted skeptically near the door, and I thought, God the place is full of agents. I laughed again when I learnt you were boss and janitor of the FUNY.³⁸

³⁶ Will Inman to Allen Krebs and Allan Shapiro, December 31, 1967, Will Inman Papers.

³⁷ Allan Shapiro to Will Inman, January 8, 1968, Will Inman Papers.

³⁸ Will Inman to Allen Krebs, December 8, 1967, Will Inman Papers.

Inman then showed his gratitude to Krebs and lamented the political conditions of the United States and, especially, of New York City:

Lindsay is presiding over the overt fascination of New York City;
longshoremen teamed with cops yesterday to beat old men and young boys.
The legal face is being destroyed: we shall either have to find alternative
methods or be cooked.³⁹

Winter 1968

The second and last issue of *Treason*, the Free University's official quarterly magazine, appeared as a combined issue of volume one, numbers two and three in the winter 1968 when the Free University was holding its last term. The tone of the articles, reports, speeches, poems, and play in the issue implied that the movement had become more and more militant and that it was diverging in various directions. Reflecting the internal conflict of the Free University community, the editorial board consisted of only two members: John Gerassi and Sharon Krebs. Together, with four other production staff members, they carried contents that forecast the prospects of their movement, especially in terms of violence with frequent references to Regis Debray's "revolution within the revolution."⁴⁰

In the editorial, Sharon Krebs claimed the necessity for organizing "a movement within a movement." She argued that a "new coalition" in the movement

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ The names of the production staff are Aaron Frishberg, Gloria Johson, Robin Palmer, and Dan Shafarman. *Treason: Quarterly of the Free School of New York* 1, nos. 2-3 (Winter 1968), 2.

was being built by a younger generation of “college students, artists, heads and hippies plus an equal number of drop-outs from each of those communities,” insisting that it would not be controlled by the old coalition of conventional leftists. Quoting Debray’s conclusion that, “The guerrilla force is the political vanguard in embryo and from its development a real party can arise,” Sharon Krebs claimed that a new movement should learn the “lesson of Cuba” as “the first of new world anti-American revolutions.” Although she wrote in vigorous terms about creating a new movement, any program or direction that they planned to adopt was not presented. Instead, she only urged the movement to quit seeking “capitulation, compromise, and co-optation” and to be more “active,” “militant,” and “radical,” to fight back against the larger system.⁴¹

In his essay, John Gerassi detailed the history of American imperial violence and the revolutions in Latin America since the early nineteenth century to the recent formation of the new international solidarity in Latin America. Gerassi argued that interpretations of American policy in Latin America were dominated by liberal historians who admitted that the United States had been imperialistic in Latin America but insisted that such a tendency ended with the New Deal in the 1930s. In Gerassi’s analysis, American imperialism had always been operating to control raw materials, markets, and the internal development of imperialized countries. Toward the end of his essay, Gerassi quoted Che Guevara’s remark that, “Our soldiers must hate; a people

⁴¹ Sharon Krebs, “Editorial,” *Treason: Quarterly of the Free School of New York* 1, nos. 2-3 (Winter 1968), 1.

without hatred cannot vanquish a brutal enemy,” and argues that, contrary to liberal historians’ claims, contemporary people in Latin America were suffering even more from poverty imposed by American imperialism. He concluded,

This is why an honest man today must consider the liberal as the true enemy of mankind. That is why he must become a revolutionary. That is why he must agree with Che Guevara that the only hope to the people of the world have is to crush American imperialism by defeating it on the battle field, and the only way to do that is to coordinate their attacks and launch them whenever men are exploited, whenever men are suffering as the result of American interests.⁴²

Gerassi then referred to Regis Debray to explain the recent change of people’s “coordinated armed struggle” with the “creation of guerrilla fronts.” The significance of this change, he argued, was that, besides military effects, revolutionaries, who were not the “Moscow-lining” traditional Communist Parties, “must wage direct war against imperialism.” At the end of his essay, Gerassi reported the meeting of the Organization of Latin American Solidarity (OLAS) in August 1967, which Stokely Carmichael and other members of SNCC attended from the United States to build a new leading force of the people’s struggle against imperialism as a new “Marxist-Leninist-Revolutionary International.”⁴³

The issue of *Treason* was very evocative and included some poems and literary works that suggested the formation of a new and continuous protest movement. Those works included William Blake’s “London” written in 1771, an excerpt from

⁴² John Gerassi, “Violence and Revolution in Latin America,” *Treason: Quarterly of the Free School of New York* 1, nos. 2-3 (Winter 1968), 25.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 25-27.

“Romiossini” composed by Greek Marxist Mikis Theodorakis with a poem by Yannis Ritsos, who was a member of the Greek Resistance during WWII, and American counter-cultural poet Tuli Kupferberg’s “Fuck War.” These works presented the legacy of social dissent in the modern world, which gave an authenticity to the contemporary movement in America.

Some of the contents showed signs of the emergence of a new style of movement. Julius Lester claimed that, in East Harlem, “comrade Che is alive” even after his capture and execution in Bolivia in October 1967, meaning that Puerto Rican residents in El Barrio, or Spanish Harlem, were forming the identity of a “new man” who would fight against the inequalities imposed by U.S. imperialism.⁴⁴ The activities of the Puerto Rican community in the area led to the foundation of the Young Lords Party in New York, which became a vehicle for their national identity and later campus activities in the city.⁴⁵

Jerry Rubin’s speech at a debate of the Socialist Workers’ Party in New York on December 29, 1967, which was reprinted in *Treason*, was another example of rhetoric that exhilarated radical youths. Jerry Rubin, who was listed as a faculty member of the Free University, founded the Youth International Party with Abbie Hoffman on New Year’s Eve of 1968. The editor of *Treason* noted with photographic

⁴⁴ Julius Lester, “Che Is Alive on 103rd Street,” *Treason: Quarterly of the Free School of New York* 1, nos. 2-3 (Winter 1968), 12.

⁴⁵ See, Miguel Melendez, *We Took the Streets: Fighting for Latino Rights with the Young Lords* (New York, St. Martin’s Press, 2003); Johanna L. del C. Fernandez, “Radicals in the Late 1960s: A History of the Young Lords Party in New York City, 1969-1974” (PhD Diss., Columbia University, 2004).

evidence that, at the speech, Rubin appeared with “two bodyguards – a young man in a Bobby’s uniform and a young lady with an electric drill.”⁴⁶ Rubin ridiculed the Socialist Worker Party’s effort to organize a serious debate on the anti-war movement and declared as follows (printed in all lowercase):

i'm not interested in the so-called anti-war movement – i'm interested in detroit, newark, campus disruptions, everyone smoking pot, people learning to speak out and be different.
 the capitalist-money-bureaucratic-imperialist-middle-class-boring-exploitive-military-world structure is crumbling.
 the world laughs at america’s clumsy bully attempt to defeat peasant warriors called vietcong in a never-never land called vietnam.
 and in america we are all learning how to become vietcong.⁴⁷

No matter how mischievously he and his followers behaved, Rubin foresaw that in the year of 1968 there would be a massive disruption in Manhattan in spring and a panic in Chicago in August created by the American Youth Festival (Youth International Party).⁴⁸

The function of the Free University as a meeting place for radical activists in the New York metropolitan area was still intact until it closed its doors. While Jerry Rubin used the Free University as a springboard for his Yippie activities, the newly formed New York Radical Women’s Group held a citywide meeting at the Free University in February 1968. Female activists who sought the solidarity of all women

⁴⁶ Jerry Rubin, “‘cause something is happening,” *Treason: Quarterly of the Free School of New York* 1, nos. 2-3 (Winter 1968), 33-37.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 37.

and independence from the male-dominated New Left movement founded the group in October 1967. In January 1968, together with similar women's groups in the country, the New York Radical Women's Group led a counter march in response to the Jeannette Rankin Brigade demonstration, which was a "mild mannered liberal opposition to the Vietnam War," as an organizer called it. After the demonstration, they organized themselves to go "beyond a mere feminist stance to a position of seeing that women's liberation is intimately bound up with the movement for radical change in the U.S."⁴⁹ In her speech at the city wide gathering held at the Free University on February 17, Anne Koedt rebuffed the "secondary roles" of women in the movement and claimed,

We found strong parallels between the liberation of women and the black power struggle, being oppressed by a] similar psychological / economic dynamic so And [sic] the deeper we analyzed the problem, and realized that all women suffer from this kind of oppression, the more we realized that the problem was not just isolated to movement women.⁵⁰

The female activists later launched much more militant feminist activities through the rest of the sixties and seventies.⁵¹ The embryonic period of radical feminism coincided with the last phase of the Free University, which implied that the confusion of the

⁴⁹ Pamela Allen, "Opinion: Beyond a ... Feminist Stance," *National Guardian*, January 27, 1968.

⁵⁰ Anne Koedt, "Women in the Radical Movement," in *Notes from the First Year, 1968* by New York Radical Women, Documents from the Women's Liberation Movement: An On-line Archival Collection, Special Collections Library, Duke University, accessed, October 8, 2012 <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/wlm/notes/>.

⁵¹ For radical women's activities, see Alice Echols, *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-75* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989).

leadership at FUNY had something to do with the transition of the movement in which the oppressed subjects in society and in the movement came forward to fight for their own liberations.

The case of the Newsreel, later known as the Third World Newsreel, exemplifies such transitions of the movement in the late sixties and early seventies. The Newsreel was born in a Free University workshop taught by an independent film creator, Allan Siegel, in 1967. Some of the Workshop participants visited Washington D.C. to film an anti-war demonstration with 16mm cameras, footage from which became the Newsreel's first work, *No Game*.⁵² On December 22, five filmmakers, Marvin Fishman, Robert Kramer, Jonas Mekas, Allan Siegel, and Shawn Walker, organized a coordinating committee to lead the Newsreel which consisted of some thirty independent artists. In a fund-raising article contributed to the *Village Voice*, Jonas Mekas defined their purpose as to "provide an alternative to the limited and biased coverage of television news." He emphasized that the organization should "serve the needs of people who want to get hold of news that is relevant to their own activity and thought."⁵³ By March, the Newsreel was ready to distribute several unique films, including an interview with Noam Chomsky, a discussion with deserting sailors who protested the War in Vietnam, an essay of demonstration against the Pentagon, an analysis of the Jeannette Rankin Brigade demonstration, a documentary of 177th street

⁵² Scott MacDonald, *A Critical Cinema 3: Interviews with Independent Filmmakers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 207.

⁵³ Jonas Mekas, "Movie Journal," *Village Voice*, January 25, 1968.

in Manhattan, and a record of the “Mill-In” in New York.⁵⁴ Through the rest of 1968, the Newsreel filmed campus revolts and anti-war protest movements, including the student strike at Columbia University, and demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, which made the Newsreel very popular among radical activists in the nation. Since 1969, the Newsreel gradually shifted its focus to a variety of racial and sexual liberation movements in the United States, such as the Black Panther Party, the Young Lords, and radical feminism, to “visualize the internal colony” with newly trained filmmakers who included women and people of color. In 1973, they changed the name of organization to the Third World Newsreel, which represented the transition of leadership in their radical filmmaking activities.⁵⁵

Two Campus Revolutions in New York City, 1968-69

The transition of the movement after the demise of the Free University meant the emergence of Third World agents who embodied the idea of the internal colony which was imported and translated through the international exchange of activists in the sixties. This shift can be well narrated through two campus strikes in Manhattan – at Columbia University in 1968 and City College of New York in 1969 – that demonstrated that the “Third World Revolution” was brought to a very local arena where self-identified Third World people played a leading role.

⁵⁴ A Flyer of Newsreel, Box 440 Folder 7, Newsreel, J. B. Matthews Papers.

⁵⁵ Young, *Soul Power*, 145-54. See, also, The Third World Newsreel, “History,” Official Website, accessed October 8, 2012, <http://www.twn.org/>.

The Student Strike at Columbia University in April 1968, in which many of the Free University activists took part, was ignited by militant students who believed that confrontation with the university authority was the only breakthrough for their movement. As Mark Rudd, who recently came back from a visit to Cuba and became a leader of Columbia SDS, declared to Columbia University President Grayson Kirk at a memorial for Martin Luther King Jr. in April, a youthful anger directed against the University was a key ingredient of the strike:

Vice-President Truman says the society is basically sound; you say the war in Vietnam was a well-intentioned accident. We, the young people, whom you so rightly fear, say that the society is sick and you and your capitalism are the sickness... There is only one thing left to say... "Up against the wall, motherfucker, this is a stick-up."⁵⁶

The Six Demands of the Strike Coordinating Committee revealed the fact that students at Columbia were mainly concerned about two issues that represented different aspects of the movement: the University's disciplinary policies which affected their lives on campus; and the war and racism that defined society and politics.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Mark Rudd to Grayson Kirk, n.d. reprinted in *Up Against the Ivy Wall: A History of the Columbia Crisis* by Jerry L. Avorn (New York: Atheneum, 1969), 25-27.

⁵⁷ "The Six Demands of the Strike Coordinating Committee" reads,

1. All disciplinary probation against the six originally charged must be lifted, and no reprisals taken against anyone in this demonstration.
2. All construction of the Columbia gym must stop NOW.
3. The University must use its good offices to see that all charges against persons arrested at the gym site be dropped.
4. All relations with IDA must be severed, including President Kirk and Trustee William Burden's membership.

As documents and participants' memoirs suggests, the students at Columbia connected their existence on Campus to national and even global events with a strong sense of synchronicity that they were making history.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, they understood that a significant aspect of their movement was to liberate themselves within the framework of middle-class life in the United States. A document entitled "Declaration of Liberation" that was found in a building cleared by police argues that:

Among these is the right to Life, a big, full beautiful life -- without middle-class hangups like money, responsibility, examinations and grades, the puritan ethic, military service, and pressure. Another is Liberty, the right to come and go as you please whenever you please, without the government manipulations, crummy businessmen, religious spooks, uptight parents, the stupid CIA, the sadistic cops, and the really out-of-it college Administrators imposing their totalitarianism. Also, there is the pursuit of Happiness, the moral right to have a fun time, to blow your mind, to sleep around, to turn on, however and whenever you like -- so long as you don't interfere with anybody else.⁵⁹

It is clearly seen in this document that the "liberation" that student sought was not national or collective but very personal and based on their middle-class lives.

The influence of the Third World Liberation was seen all over the campus at the Strike, for example, from a banner with Mao Zedong's word "To Rebel is Justified" and NLF flags to Neru Shirts that students wore in liberated buildings. The

5. President Kirk's edict on indoor demonstrations must be dropped. The Strike Coordinating Committee [SCC], "The Six Demands of the Strike," n.d., 1967-72 Student Protest Papers, Folder E55, Columbiana Collection, Columbia University Library.

⁵⁸ See, Todd Gitlin, *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980).

⁵⁹ "Declaration of Liberation," reprinted in *Six Weeks That Shook Morningside*, by George Charles Keller (New York: Columbia College Today, 1968), 69.

black students, led by the Afro-American Student Society, expressed their identification to the Third World by hanging Che Guevara's face in a separately occupied Mathematics Hall that they renamed "Malcolm X University." Nevertheless, the presence and demands of black students were overshadowed by the din of confrontation between the larger number of white middle class students and the authorities.

In April 1969, one year after the Student Strike at Columbia University, students of the City College of New York, located on West 135th street, seized buildings to occupy its South Campus. The agents and demands of the CCNY Strike highly contrasted with those of Columbia University, even though both movements sought the liberation of students. The majority of the participants in the CCNY Strike were members of the Onyx Society, an African-American student association, and those of the Puerto Rican Student Association. Their Five Demands clearly reflected the increasing number of African-American and Puerto Rican students' collective desire for self-determination on campus and in society. These demands included the establishment of Black and Puerto Rican Studies as well as de facto free-admission for Black and Puerto Rican students.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ "Five Demands of Black and Puerto Rican Students" reads:

1. The establishment of separate school of Black and Puerto Rican Studies.
2. A separate orientation for Black and Puerto Rican freshmen.
3. A voice for students in the setting of all guidelines for the SEEK program, including the hiring and firing all personnel.
4. The racial composition of all entering classes should reflect the Black and Puerto Rican population of the New York City high schools.
5. Black and Puerto Rican history and the Spanish language should be requirement for all education majors. Reprinted in *The Campus*, February 9, 1969.

The transformation of the student movement in New York echoed two major historical events in the fall of 1968. One was the Strike of the United Federation of Teachers in Ocean Hill – Brownsville High School in Brooklyn. Another was the Strike of the Third World Liberation Front in San Francisco State University. The Teachers Union Strike challenged the racial relationship between African-American residents who sought community control in their children’s education and Jewish teachers who had been supporters of the civil rights cause for African-Americans until this event.⁶¹ Another significant event was an uprising by students of color in San Francisco State College. The activity of the Third World Liberation Front resulted in the creation of an independent Third World Studies program, later called the Ethnic Studies program, which signified that “Third World” people in the United States could unite and protest for their self-determination in American society.

In late 1968 and early 1969, Black and Puerto Rican students at City College rapidly developed their identity as part of the “Third World” existence. A leader of the strike, Serge Mullery, later recalled that they had started organizing themselves as follows:

The first decision of the Committee was to educate itself... we began to read... books I’d never heard of... *Wretched of the Earth*, *The Black Anglo Saxons*, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*... we viewed the “Battle of Algiers” a few times... we read Che Guevara... Stokely Carmichael... but Malcolm was the central figure in our thinking.⁶²

⁶¹ See, Jerald E. Podair, *The Strike that Changed New York: Blacks, Whites, and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Crisis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).

⁶² Interview of Serge Mullery by Conrad Dyer, April 12, 1989, in "Protest and the Politics of Open Admissions: The Impact of the Black and Puerto Rican Students'

They invited Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael, and community activists at Ocean Hill – Brownsville to Campus and broadened the coalition of “colored” students by including Asian-Americans as San Francisco students did. Their successful movement resulted in the establishment of the Department of Urban and Ethnic Studies in 1969 and “open admission” for Black and Puerto Rican students from 1970. At this point in time, what is called “the Third World moment” emerged in the City of New York.

The two campus uprisings at Columbia and CCNY illuminate the transition in the nature of the student movement in New York and in the United States in the sense that more and more self-identified “Third World” people at home joined and played a central role in the movement. Needless to say, these two events were deeply connected with movement’s philosophy of liberation which was created and fermented in the earlier sixties by radical intellectuals at home and abroad and with local movement networks that carried such tactics and philosophies from one event to another. Rather, the question here is: how did activists with relatively long careers in New York react to the emergence of new leading players in the movement?

Epilogue: The Ways of Revolutions

It can be said that the radical intellectuals who gathered at the Free University of New York greatly contributed to the creation of the Third World movement in New

Community (of City College)," by Conrad Dyer (PhD diss., City University of New York, 1990).

York and the United States both ideologically and philosophically by importing the international discourse of national liberation and enlightening young radicals as to the significance of solidarity with Third World people. Yet, when the Third World liberation movement emerged in the cities of the United States, they were compelled to think about what they could do for the revolution within. As an epilogue, the rest of this chapter traces the course of some Free University activists who took various paths in the liberation movement.

When Will Inman obtained a position as an artist-in-residence at the American University in Washington in spring 1967, he founded a Free University on the American University Campus. He devoted himself even more to the activities of the newly established Free University in Washington D.C. after leaving the FUNY. In March 1968, he confessed in a letter to a friend that he would like to be “a part of some larger perspective, something not so pedestrian and placid and nothing in its organism, something with fire and light.” He, nonetheless, was not captured by the political campaign but, as a poet and a teacher, he found himself “most moved when doing readings/questions & answer periods” with high school children who were “hungry for life on so many levels.”⁶³ In short, Inman chose a way in which he believed he could intellectually and peacefully educate the younger generation who would eventually change the society.

President Allen Krebs and Joseph Berke were other examples of individuals who kept seeking social change through alternative education. Berke later complained

⁶³ Will Inman to Aaron Frishberg, March 22, 1968, Will Inman Papers.

that the extreme militancy of some members had caused the dissolution of the Free University of New York, saying that it was “the politicians” who were guilty of diminishing further “possibilities which FUNY could have provided.” In his understanding, if the Free University could have been “a center for study and research” for teaching alternative thinking to young students, it would be “more relevant to the community than Columbia [University] or Brooklyn [College] or NYU.” He insisted that, instead, “the young, the really young politicians looked towards factory workers, Puerto Ricans, blacks, drop-out students,” and that “the culture wizards looked towards the college students, and Lower Eastside hippie and speed-freak population.”⁶⁴

Allen Krebs, David Cooper, and Joseph Berke desired to maintain an experimental intellectual space created at the Dialectics of Liberation Congress in the summer of 1967 and finally opened the Anti-University of London on 49 Rivington Street in the February of 1968. The structure and organization of the Anti-University were exactly the same as those of the FUNY. They defined three general orientations of the Anti-University as radical politics, existential psychiatry, and the avant-garde arts.⁶⁵ It can be said that Krebs and his fellows chose to seek a revolution through critical thinking and an alternative life style, in John Gerassi’s words, to “Make the Revolution by living it.”⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Joseph Berke, “Free University of New York,” in *Counter Culture: The Creation of an Alternative Society*, ed. Joseph Berke (London: Peter Owen Limited, 1969), 226.

⁶⁵ Roberta Elzy, “Founding An Anti-University,” in *Counter Culture*, ed. Berke, 231.

⁶⁶ John Gerassi, “Revolution by Lifestyle,” in *Counter Culture*, ed. Berke, 71-72.

Jim Mellen, took a very different course of radicalism. After losing his job at Drew University in 1966, Mellen found a position in the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania with the help of Conor Cruise O'Brien. O'Brien was an Irish writer and a politician who had served as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ghana from 1962 to 1965 and then joined the Free University of New York when he got a position at NYU. Besides classes at the University of Dar es Salaam, Mellen taught at a civil service academy in the city where he learned a lot about Africa and the Third World Revolution. Nevertheless, he felt uneasy when he found out that his whiteness made it difficult for him to join their revolution in which blackness was a key part of their unity. With this sense of uselessness, Mellen came back to New York on April 4, 1968, the day of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s assassination, and when he observed the subsequent riots in urban ghettos, he realized that "American Third World colonies" were finally rising up."⁶⁷

Mellen then joined the student uprising at Columbia University, where he met Mark Rudd of Columbia SDS, and started getting involved in SDS activities. As a theoretical leader of Third World Marxism, he promoted the idea that racism was at "the core of revolution" and that the white industrial workers were "the worst offenders" of the liberation of racially oppressed people in the United States.⁶⁸ Expressed in this way, they tried to fight alongside the Black Panthers, not with partisan Marxists who believed that any nationalism, including Third World

⁶⁷ Viorst, *Fire in the Streets*, 476-77.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 483.

nationalism and Black nationalism in the US, was a diversion from the real class struggle. This group of people formed the Weatherman (later, the Weather Underground) and started a campaign, called, "Bringing the War Home." Rudd recalled that they knew at that time that the people of the Third World did not want them to go too far and risk losing the general support of the American people which was necessary in order to change U.S. foreign policy. But they went further and started manufacturing bombs to recreate the violence of the Revolution on American soil.⁶⁹

Sharon Krebs was the one who also turned her anger toward militant activities in the post-FUNY years. News coverage reported her arrests for disorderly acts in a demonstration in 1968 and for bomb plots in 1970. On the night of July 24, 1968, Sharon Krebs was arrested for incitement to rioting with thirty-five other demonstrators at an anti-Vietnam war rally that targeted Vice President Hubert Humphrey's fund-raising dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria. Approximately one thousand demonstrators marched in Midtown Manhattan and a group of militant youths were charged with misdemeanors.⁷⁰ In another fund-raising campaign of federal politicians, Sharon Krebs, with her boyfriend Robin Palmer, intruded completely naked with a pig head on a tray held in her hands.

⁶⁹ Mark Rudd, *Underground: My Life with SDS and Weathermen* (New York: Harper, 2010), 142-53.

⁷⁰ "36 Youths Held in Tie-Up After Humphrey Protest," *New York Times*, July 24, 1968.

While she contributed articles to *Rat* magazine and other underground papers as a writer, she joined Weatherman and started planning bomb plots. At dawn on December 4, 1970, Sharon Krebs, along with other members of Weatherman, including Claudia Conine, Joyce Plecha, Christopher Tenkle, Richard R. Palmer, and Martin Lewis, was arrested on the charge of attempting to firebomb the First National City Bank branch on Madison Avenue on East 91st Street. The police claimed that they were placing four one-gallon milk cartons filled with gasoline on the day of the first anniversary of the death of Fred Hampton, a leader of the Black Panther Party who was shot by the Chicago police. After several months of investigations, the police revealed that they were planning to bomb other buildings including Nixon's law firm and New York University. Sharon Krebs was sentenced to prison for a maximum term of four years on May 7, 1971.⁷¹

The Free University of New York prepared an intellectual and ideological foundation for the transformation of the movement around 1968 and dissolved itself on the eve of the turn. Since 1965, or even earlier in the sixties, radical intellectuals gathered at the Free University actively engaged themselves in activities through which they negotiated their understanding of the relation of the United States to the world according to the concept of liberation constructed and practiced in the Third World.

⁷¹ Paul L. Montgomery, "6 Identified as Weathermen Sized in an Attempt to Bomb Here," *New York Times*, December 5, 1970; Arnold H. Lubasch, "Six Indicted Here in a Bomb Plot by Weathermen," *New York Times*, December 9, 1970; Juan M. Vasquez, "5 in Bomb Plot Here Sentenced: 3 Get Maximum of 4-year Terms," *New York Times*, May 8, 1971.

The Dialectics of Liberation Congress in London was a great opportunity for FUNY intellectuals who worked with radical psychiatrists in London to create a quasi-Free University space where theoreticians and activists from the both sides of the Atlantic exchanged their ideas on liberation. The Cultural Congress of Havana was another great opportunity for American New Leftists through which they came to understand that the Revolution for national liberation was the world's imperative in the year of 1968. Nevertheless, it was very ironic that, when the people of the Free University of New York saw new agents for social change emerge, agents with whom they might have been able to stand in solidarity, they redefined their movement based on how they could fight against the common enemy of social injustice with nationally or sexually identified groups. There were a variety of ways for voicing protests used by the members of the Free University. Nevertheless, the transformation of the movement did not merely mean that the movement was inevitably divided into fragments: rather, those fragments still constituted a larger whole that rebelled against imperialism within the leading empire in the late sixties and early seventies because the movement shared a basic understanding of social good in the age of three worlds

CONCLUSION

The trajectory of the Free University of New York and its activists illuminates several important aspects of the American sixties that have not been narrated well or have been avoided in the existing accounts of the decade. The first is the impact of the Third World imagination on Cold War American political activism and popular culture. The independence of colonized nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the post-World War II world was an imperative of the time that shook even the societies of imperial powers, including the United States of America. The second compelling aspect is that the internationally constructed idea of liberation was imported to the United States and translated by radical intellectuals and activists. The Free University of New York functioned as a major center for such activities, through which the domestic movement was defined. Thirdly, although the radical education at the Free University reflected the interests of New Left intellectuals, the position of the University was ideologically marginalized within the American New Left movement because American radicals were reluctant to accept the “foreign” ideas of national liberation and the accusations of U.S. war crimes in Vietnam. The fourth point is that the year of 1968 did not mark the end of movement; rather it was a turning point when the new radicalism brought into play the idea of liberation. Investigating the American sixties from the perspective of global interconnectedness—as inspired by Third World revolutions abroad—provides us with a somewhat different picture of the decade. The

Free University of New York existed in the historical conjuncture of the globally constructed sixties.

The Momentum of National Liberation in the Post-WWII World

The self-determination of nations was a historical imperative in the twentieth century. The growth of the United Nations clearly indicates this tendency as more and more nations achieved independence through self-determination. Especially after the mid-1950s, the majority of newly independent nations emerged in the Third World. The number of member countries in the UN nearly doubled from seventy-six in 1955 to one hundred forty-four in 1975. Sixty-three out of sixty-eight of the newly admitted nations were located in Africa, Asia, or Latin America¹

This number is historically significant, but more relevant was the idea of self-determination that mobilized native people in colonized lands to fight for independence. In the Declaration of Independence of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in 1945, Ho Chi Minh quoted phrases from the Declaration of Independence of the United States in 1776 and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen from the French Revolution in 1791 to suggest that the ideal of Vietnamese self-determination originated from the Western idea of the inalienable rights of human beings in the modern world. As shown by the cases of India, in British Empire, and Algeria, in the French Empire, the independence of colonized nations could not be

¹ The United Nations, "Growth in United Nations membership, 1945-present," accessed October 2, 2012, <http://www.un.org/en/members/growth.shtml>.

denied overtly by the suzerain powers of the First World in the twentieth century. Thus, when the United States intervened against nations that sought independence in the name of defending the free world in the Cold War, it faced an irresolvable conflict between causes for world peace and human dignity.

Diffusion of the Idea of National Liberation into the United States

For American radical intellectuals in the sixties, the contested ground for the liberation movement was at home as well as abroad. The discourse of the national liberation of colonized people outside the U.S. boarder was constructed internationally as newly independent nations joined world politics. Meanwhile, the world's most powerful country practiced its political or military power on those nations. The young radical intellectuals who came together to establish the Free University of New York played the role of a courier of ideas between the United States and the rest of the world.

The group of radical activists in the orbit of the Progressive Labor Movement inherited the legacy of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee and organized the student trip to Cuba in 1963 and 1964. Despite the core organizer's Maoist orientation, the participants in the tour were largely students who were not dogmatic or determined in politics but openly sensitive to what was going on at the site of the Revolution and around the world. These students not only absorbed the air of revolutionary fervor, but also learned that the people of the colonized world were rising up and fighting for self-determination against imperial oppression. Furthermore, they learned that their home

country, the United States of America, was the most serious obstacle to liberation—especially for Cuban and Vietnamese people. The media saw the emergence of this group of young leftists as the birth of a New Left group in New York.

As early as the spring of 1964, those new leftists who learned of the conditions of the world through Cuba, which functioned as a window to the Third World, organized themselves to start a protest movement against the U.S. policy in Vietnam alongside radical intellectuals in the New York metropolitan area. The newly organized May 2nd Movement became a matrix in which a unique combination of radical education and politics materialized as the Free University of New York in the summer of 1965. In the circles of radical intellectuals and activists in the New York area, the Free University functioned as a space for radical discussions on the issues of American society and the world, for exchange of ideas among various protest movements, and for countercultural experiments. In such an experimental space, a variety of new styles of radicalism were developed and brought into society.

The Free University served as a major transit point for the idea of liberation at home and abroad. The FUNY activists repeatedly went beyond the U.S. boarder to visit Third World countries or to participate in international gatherings with like-minded radical intellectuals in Europe and other countries. The International War Crimes Tribunal of 1967, to which FUNY activists contributed as the U.S. organizing staff, was the most significant event in the international anti-War protest that thrust the internationally constructed idea of War Crimes into the consciousness of people in the United States. The Dialectics of Liberation Congress in London in July, 1967, was a

more intellectually oriented gathering in which European and American psychiatrists, historians, and social scientists discussed the meaning of liberation with radical activists. In the Congress, these people discussed the issue of liberation in the First and Third worlds. The Cultural Congress of Havana in January, 1968, affirmed the course of events in world politics and declared that the national liberation movements of the oppressed people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America represented an ineradicable quest for human dignity.

The development of the Free University of New York suggests that the Third World idea of national liberation did not flood onto American soil suddenly in the late sixties; rather, it was philosophically embedded in the ideology of the post-World War II radical social movement in the United States from beginning to end. It also exemplified the fact that the Third World-inspired leftist circles were not racially confined, as is often emphasized in historical narratives. The majority of the FUNY radicals were white New Leftists who looked for a way to protest against the U.S. government along with Third World revolutionaries and with the people of color in the United States.

What these radical intellectuals imported from overseas and exported to their foreign counterparts can be epitomized by the following points. Firstly, they brought back the idea that national liberation was a world imperative in the twentieth century and that the people in the Third World who were struggling for self-determination were the ones with whom First World radicals should express their solidarity. Secondly, they introduced an international opinion that was critical of the U.S. attitude towards

the Third World, especially in regards to its military actions in Vietnam. Its message was that, since the United States was violating international laws and committing crimes against humanity in Vietnam, the people of the world must stop the U.S. atrocities there. Thirdly, the FUNY activists adopted the idea that, since the African-American people were the victims of American imperialism as much as the Vietnamese and other third world people were, middle-class youths who were enjoying comfortable lives in the United States should support their struggle to break down the colonialism within the United States. This struggle of African-Americans within the U.S. society was considered to be the vanguard of anti-imperial liberation movements inside the First World. Finally, these activists tried to theorize about the meanings of liberation, both in the context of the personal and psychological liberation movements of the First World and in the collective and physical liberations in the Third World. Nevertheless, they did not come to a consensus regarding how to connect different types of liberation movements in the First and Third worlds, which, in the end, left a variety of possibilities for rebels after 1968.

The Peculiar Nature of the American Sixties

The political stance and international advocacy of FUNY activists invited rejections and stern criticism by American society as well as by fellow New Left activists in the United States. Such reactions reveal the peculiar conditions of American sixties. Considering the political involvement of the United States in Vietnam, the reactions of the media and the authorities were not particularly surprising.

The media showed strong curiosity about the experimental education offered by the Free University in its early stage, but, when they observed that its activists were committed to undesirable protest against the U.S. war effort, they dismissed the Free University as a bizarre community of dropouts and extreme leftists. The local and Federal Governments and politicians demonstrated conservative reactions to FUNY by labeling it as a subversive organization of Communists in the context of the Cold War dichotomy.

What is striking is the fact that fellow liberals and New Left advocates rejected the political stance of the Free University and reacted defensively toward the internationally held opinion that the U.S. was committing war crimes in Vietnam. The image of New York City as a hotbed for the dogmatic old left was retained by most New Left youths throughout the sixties. The final relocation of the SDS national headquarters from New York to Chicago in 1965 illustrates this point. Indeed, the city was the home of the Maoist Progressive Labor Party and other socialist organizations that were involved with leftist activities in the 1930s. Nevertheless, the instructors and students who gathered at the Free University were not necessarily strict partisan Marxists. What distinguished them from the majority of the New Leftists in the United States was their age and intellectual maturity. The core organizers of FUNY were college instructors, graduate students, and some middle-aged professors who were invited to teach there: they were not students, but educators of young New Left students.

Their intellectual maturity was derived from their personal experiences in academia, politics, and society at home and abroad. It can be said that their ability to achieve an understanding of American society by integrating their own views with views from the outside was illuminating. They shared the memory of the holocaust in World War II with European intellectuals, and used it in discourse describing U.S. behavior in the Third World in the post-WWII era. They shared the cause of national independence with Third World intellectuals, so they did not dismiss the idea of self-determination as the old liberalism of the previous century as American critics of Bertrand Russell did. If the majority of the New Left clung to American innocence as the driving force of their movement, these radical intellectuals built their movement by carefully rejecting such innocence, even though it invited a defensive reaction from patriotic New Left advocates at home.²

1968: The Turning Point

Todd Gitlin might have been right when he argued that an excess of Third Worldism created the division and violence in the movement. Nevertheless, it was not only in the United States that the main part of the movement seemed to be halted when new agents of social change joined the struggle with new ideologies and tactics. For instance, in Japan, around 1969, Korean and Taiwanese students, who were the Japan-

² Patriotism is one of the significant keywords necessary for understanding the nature of the American leftist movement. See, Simon Hall, *American Patriotism, American Protest Social Movements Since the Sixties* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

born offspring of laborers forcefully brought to Japan before and during WWII, organized themselves for their own residential rights in Japan and forced mainstream New Left advocates to reflect upon their colonialist attitudes historically and in the current movement. The majority of innocent New Left students became terribly upset and disillusioned by the enthusiastic demonstrations after this event. But the movement did not end; it just changed its paradigm.³ A variety of significant social rights for Asian residents in Japan and autonomy of local communities were secured by the coalition of Asian and Japanese activists in the seventies.⁴

The cases of Japan and the United States suggest the fact that those countries held the unavoidable question of colonialism as part of the sixties movement from the beginning to the end. Perhaps, because the colonialism in foreign countries could be seen simply as a system of oppression and exploitation of neighboring nations through imperial power, the liberation movements of those people was often recognized in terms of a class struggle on a global scale. In other words, colonized nations were always the oppressed class in world politics and the world economy, thus those toward which the First World leftists expressed their compassion. The internal colonialism, on the other hand, was often defined in terms of race or ethnicity, which conflicted with

³ See, chapter fourteen of Eiji Oguma, *1968 Vol. 2: Hanran no Shūen to Sono Isan* [*The End of Revolt and Its Legacy*] (Tokyo: Shinyosha, 2009) [in Japanese].

⁴ Kazuyo Tsuchiya investigates the struggle of Korean residents in the Kawasaki area of Kanagawa, Japan. This study reveals that Korean activists imported black theology into their movement for social justice and that the Korean initiative worked together with Japanese progressive activists from the sixties to win residential rights. Kazuyo Tsuchiya, “Contesting Citizenship: Race, Gender, and the Politics of Participation in the U.S. and Japanese Welfare States, 1962-1982” (PhD diss., University of California – San Diego, 2008).

the class analysis of the liberation movement. In the United States, this was an issue that forced FUNY's organizers to choose their own ways in the revolution after the school's dissolution, and it is also reflected by the ideological conflict regarding race and class between the Weather Underground and the Progressive Labor Party in the post-1968 era.

The Legacy of the Free University of New York in the American Sixties

To put it simply, the Free University activists bridged the gap between the liberal fervor of radical intellectuals toward newly independent nations in the world in the 1950s to the domestic movement for decolonization in the 1970s, using the Third-World inspired understanding of human conditions at home and abroad. It was clear that the concept of internal colonialism in the U.S. developed from the African-Americans' strong sense of identification with people in the Third World struggling for Civil Rights and racial equality, but white radical intellectuals also helped to articulate this struggle using the language of the Third World revolutions. The FUNY activists provided a frame of reference for liberation movements at home and abroad. As a result, even though the Free University of New York did not last long, it contributed significantly to the making of the Third World movement in the United States in the seventies.

Another legacy of the Free University of New York was that it pioneered new fields of study in politics, culture, and society in post-1968 American universities. As FUNY sought to break every academic taboo, instructors and students were free to

discuss not only Marxism and the Third World status quo, but also countercultural literature and art in its experimental space. In addition, since those new fields were closely connected with the radical politics of every group of struggling people in American Society, the Free University movement contributed to redefine the American university as the place for instigating social change. If the existing universities lose this function, students and faculty can establish their own “Free University.” This idea of the Free University is still intact in the 21st century: in 2012, the students and faculty of the New York metropolitan area have again established a Free University of New York, which does not have any direct connection to the one in the sixties, but was constructed by activists involved in the “occupy” movement.⁵

The final legacy of the Free University of New York is that it exemplified the link between the American New Left movement and their international counterparts. Even though the threads of the trans-border network were thin compared to those of larger domestic movements, the impact of such activities on the imagination of the sixties cannot be overestimated. Thus, the American sixties were constructed by the global conditions of the era of three worlds, and its long-lasting influence on American society cannot be fully understood without assessing the endeavor to overturn the centuries-long colonialism in the modern world.

⁵ For the newly established Free University New York, visit its official webpage, accessed October 30, 2012, <http://freeuniversitynyc.org>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts and Document Collections

- American Civil Liberties Union Records and Publications (1917-1975). Microfilm. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1976.
- City College of New York. The Legacy of the Struggle Documentary Project Collection. 1989. Archives and Special Collections, Cohen Library, City College of New York.
- Publications Relating to the Free School of New York. Tamiment Library, New York University.
- J. B. Matthews Papers (1862-1986). David M. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Duke University.
- Publications Relating to the May 2nd Movement (1964-1965). Tamiment Library, New York University.
- Publications Relating to the Progressive Labor Movement. Tamiment Library, New York University.
- Students for a Democratic Society Papers (1958-1970). Microfilm. Glen Rock, NJ: Microfilming Corporation of America, 1977.
- Underground Newspapers Collection (1963-1985). Microfilm. Wooster, OH: The Division, 1970-1986.
- University Protest and Activism Collection (1958-1999). Columbia University Archives, Columbia University.
- Will Inman Papers (1910-2003). David M. Rubenstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Duke University.
- Documents from the Women's Liberation Movement: An On-line Archival Collection. Special Collection Library, Duke University. <http://library.duke.edu/Rubenstein/scriptorium/wlm/>.

Government Publications

Congressional Records

Hearings:

Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 2, July 1 and 2, 1963, Hearings Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representative. 88th Congress, 1st sess. (1963). Washington, DC: GPO, 1965.

Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 3, September 12 and 13, 1963, Hearings Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representative. 88th Congress 1st sess. (1963). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Violation of State Department Travel Regulations and Pro-Castro Propaganda Activities in the United States, Part 5, September 3, 4, and 28, 1964, Hearings Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representative. 88th Congress, 2nd sess. (1964). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Bills to Make Punishable Assistance to Enemies of U.S. in Time of Undeclared War: Hearings on H.R. 12047, H.R. 14925, H.R. 16175, H.R. 17140, and H.R. 17194, August 16-19, 1966, Before the Comm. on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives. 89th Congress 2nd sess. (1966). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Newspapers and Periodicals

The American Legion Firing Line

Asahi Shimbun [Tokyo]

Campus (City College of New York)

Chicago Tribune

Collegian (State College, PA.)

Columbia Spectator (Columbia University)

Commentary

Foundation Bulletin (Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, New York)

Free Student (May 2nd Movement)

Free University News

Harper's Magazine

Human Events

Humanist

Left and Right

Liberation

Life

Los Angeles Times

Nation

National Guardian

National Insider

New Left Review

New Republic

New York Times

Progressive Labor (Progressive Labor Movement)

Ramparts

San Francisco Chronicle

Treason (Free University of New York)

Village Voice (New York)

Washington Post

Washington Times

Books and Articles

- Anderson, David L., ed. *The Columbia History of the Vietnam War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Anderson, Terry H. *The Movement and the Sixties*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Andrew, John A. *The Other Side of the Sixties: Young Americans for Freedom and the Rise of Conservative Politics, Perspectives on the Sixties*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997.
- Aptheker, Herbert, ed. *Writings by W.E.B. Du Bois in Periodicals Edited by Others*, vol. 4. Millwood: Kraus-Thomson Organization Limited, 1982.
- Avorn, Jerry L. *Up Against the Ivy Wall: A History of the Columbia Crisis*. New York: Atheneum, 1969.
- Ballard, Allen B. *The Education of Black Folk: The Afro-American Struggle for Knowledge in White America*. 1st ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Barber, David. *A Hard Rain Fell: SDS and Why It Failed*. Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2008.
- Benin, Leigh David. *The New Labor Radicalism and New York City's Garment Industry: Progressive Labor Insurgents in the 1960s*. New York: Garland Books, 2000.
- Berke, Joseph, ed. *Counter Culture: The Creation of an Alternative Society*. London: Peter Owen Limited, 1969.
- Berman, Paul. *A Tale of Two Utopias: The Political Journey of the Generation of 1968*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1996.
- Biondi, Martha. *To Stand and Fight: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Postwar New York City*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Bradley, Stefan M. *Harlem vs. Columbia University: Black Student Power in the Late 1960s*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
- Braunstein, Peter, and Michael William Doyle. *Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and 1970s*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Brenz, Nicole, "Edouard de Laurot: Engagement as Prolepsis." *Third Text* 25, no.1 (2011): 55-65.

- Brick, Howard. *Age of Contradiction: American Thought and Culture in the 1960s*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1998.
- Brinkley, Alan. *Liberalism and Its Discontents*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Buhle, Paul, ed. *History and the New Left: Madison, Wisconsin, 1950-1970*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.
- Burns, Stewart. *Social Movements of the 1960s: Searching for Democracy, Social Movements Past and Present*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990.
- Calvert, Greg. *Democracy from the Heart: Spiritual Values, Decentralism, and Democratic Idealism in the Movement of the 1960s*. Eugene, Ore.: Communitas Press, 1991.
- Cannato, Vincent J. *The Ungovernable City: John Lindsay and His Struggle to Save New York*. New York: Basic Books, 2001.
- Carmichael, Stokely [Kwame Ture] with Ekwueme Michael Thelwell. *Ready for Revolution: The Life and Struggles of Stokely Carmichael*. New York: Scriber, 2003.
- Carson, Clayborne. *In Struggle: SNCC and the Black Awakening of the 1960s*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Chabot, Sean. *Transnational Roots of the Civil Rights Movement: African American Explorations of the Gandhian Repertoire*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2012.
- Cohen, Robert, and Reginald E. Zelnik. *The Free Speech Movement: Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Collier, Peter, and David Horowitz. *Destructive Generation: Second Thoughts about the Sixties*. New York: Free Press Paperbacks, 1996.
- Cone, James. "Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Third World." *Journal of American History* 74, no. 2 (1987): 455-67.
- Cooper, David, ed. *The Dialectics of Liberation*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1968.
- Cotkin, George. *Existential America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.

- Crowder, Ralph L. "Fidel Castro and Harlem: Political, Diplomatic, and Social Influences of the 1960 Visit to the Hotel Theresa." *Afro-Americans in New York Life and History* 24, no. 1 (2000): 79-92.
- DeBenedetti, Charles. *An American Ordeal: The Antiwar Movement of the Vietnam Era*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1990.
- Dellinger, David. *From Yale to Jail: The Life Story of a Moral Dissenter*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2010.
- . *Revolutionary Nonviolence: Essays by Dave Dellinger*. New York: Anchor Books, 1971.
- Denning, Michael. *Culture in the Age of Three Worlds*. New York: Verso, 2004.
- Duffett, John, ed. *Against the Crime of Silence*. New York: A Clarion Book, 1970.
- Echols, Alice. *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-75*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Elbaum, Max. *Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Mao and Che*. New York: Verso, 2002.
- . "What Legacy from the Radical Internationalism of 1968?" *Radical History Review*, no. 82 (2002): 37-64.
- Eschen, Penny Von. *Race Against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Fact-Finding Commission on Columbia Disturbances. *Crisis at Columbia: Report of the Fact-Finding Commission Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances at Columbia University in April and May 1968*. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.
- Fanon, Frantz. *A Dying Colonialism*. London: Writers and Readers, 1980.
- . *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967.
- . *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 1965.
- Farber, David and Beth L. Bailey. *The Columbia Guide to America in the 1960s*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Farber, David. *The Sixties: From Memory to History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- . "The 60s: Myth and Reality." *Chronicle of Higher Education* (1994): B1-2.

- Farrell, James J. *The Spirit of the Sixties: Making Postwar Radicalism*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Fields, A. Belden. *Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the United States*. New York: Praeger, 1988.
- Fink, Carole, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker, eds. *1968: The World Transformed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Fink, Matt. "Ed Sanders: The Last Radical (Part 1)," *Paste: Signs of Life in Music, Film and Culture*, September 19, 2003. Accessed on February 15, 2013, <http://www.pastemagazine.com/articles/2003/09/ed-sanders.html>.
- Foner, Eric. *The Story of American Freedom*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1998.
- . *Who Owns History?: Rethinking the Past in a Changing World*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003.
- Frank, Thomas. *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture, and the Rise of Hip Consumerism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Fraser, Ronald. *1968: A Student Generation in Revolt*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.
- Freeman, Jo, and Victoria L. Johnson. *Waves of Protest: Social Movements since the Sixties, People, Passions, and Power*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999.
- Freeman, Joshua Benjamin. *Working-class New York: Life and Labor since World War II*. New York: New Press, 2000.
- Frei, Nobert. *1968: Jugenderebolte und Globaler Protest*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2008.
- Fujimoto, Hiroshi. "The Johnson Administration and the Russell Tribunal." *International Relations* 130 (May 2002): 76-91.
- Gitlin, Todd. *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage*. New York: Bantam Books, 1987.
- . *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Gosse, Van. *Rethinking the New Left an Interpretative History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

- . *Where the Boys Are: Cuba, Cold War America and the Making of a New Left*. New York: Verso, 1993.
- Gosse, Van, and Richard R. Moser. *The World the Sixties Made: Politics and Culture in Recent America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003.
- Grubacic, Andrej, ed. *From Here to There: The Staughton Lynd Reader*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2010.
- Hall, Simon. *American Patriotism, American Protest Social Movements Since the Sixties*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.
- . *Rethinking the American Anti-War Movement*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Harvey, Miles, "James Weinstein: 1926-2005." *In These Times*, June 20, 2005. Accessed March 23, 2013, <http://inthesetimes.com/article/2188/>.
- Hershberger, Mary. *Traveling to Vietnam: American Peace Activists and the War*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1988.
- Hind, Robert J. "The Internal Colonial Concept." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26, no. 3 (1984): 543-68.
- Horowitz, David. *Radical Son: A Generational Odyssey*. New York: Touchstone, 1997.
- Isserman, Maurice. *If I Had a Hammer: The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New Left*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.
- Isserman, Maurice, and Michael Kazin. *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Jack Newfield. *A Prophetic Minority*. New York: New American Library, 1966.
- Jacobs, Ron. *The Way the Wind Blew: A History of the Weather Underground*. New York: Verso, 1997.
- James, Joy. "Harlem Hospitality and Political History: Malcolm X and Fidel Castro at the Hotel Theresa." Review of Reviews Rosemari Mealy's *Fidel and Malcolm X* (1993). *Contributions in Black Studies* 12 (1993-94): 107-10.
- Jameson, Fredric, "Periodizing the 60s." *Social Text*, nos. 9-10 (1984): 178-209.
- . *The Political Unconscious Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.

- Jamison, Andrew, and Ron Eyerman. *Seeds of the Sixties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Jones, Bryn and Mike O'Donnell, eds. *Sixties Radicalism and Social Movement Activism: Retreat or Resurgence?* London : Anthem Press, 2010.
- Kaiser, Charles. *1968 in America: Music, Politics, Chaos, Counterculture, and the Shaping of a Generation*. New York: Grove Press, 1988.
- Katznelson, Ira. *City Trenches: Urban Politics And The Patterning Of Class In The United States*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1981.
- Kazin, Michael. *The Populist Persuasion: An American History*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.
- . *American Dreamers: How the Left Changed a Nation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011.
- Keller, Charles. *Six Weeks That Shook Morningside*. New York: Columbia College Today, 1968.
- Kelley, Robin D. G. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2002.
- . "Identity Politics and Class Struggle," *New Politics* 6, no. 2 (1997). Accessed September 3, 2012, <http://nova.wpunj.edu/newpolitics/issue22/kelley22.htm>.
- Kelley, Robin D. G. and Betsy Esch. "Black Like Mao: Red China and Black Revolution." *Souls* 1, no. 4 (Fall 1999): 6-41.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. *The Trumpet of Conscience*. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Kinghoffer, Aurthur Jay and Judith Apter Kinghoffer. *International Citizens' Tribunals: Mobilizing Public Opinion to Advance Human Rights*. New York, NY: Palgrave, 2002.
- Kinoy, Arthur. *Rights on Trial: The Odyssey of a People's Lawyer*. New York: Bernal Books, 1993.
- Klatch, Rebecca E. *A Generation Divided: The New Left, the New Right, and the 1960s*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Klimke, Martin. *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

- Klimke, Martin and Joachim Scharloth. *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism, 1956-1977*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Kolko, Gabriel. *Confronting the Third World: United States Foreign Policy, 1945-1980*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 1988.
- Kunen, James S. *The Strawberry Statement: Notes of a College Revolutionary*. New York: Random House, 1969.
- Kurlansky, Mark. *1968: The Year That Rocked the World*. New York: Ballantine, 2004.
- Lauter, Paul and Florence Howe. *The Conspiracy of the Young*. New York: Meridian Books, 1971.
- Lavin, David E. Richard D. Alba, and Richard A. Silberstein, eds. *Right Versus Privilege: The Open-Admissions Experiment at the City University of New York*. New York: Free Press, 1981.
- Lederer, William J. and Eugene Burdick. *The Ugly American*. New York: Norton, 1958.
- Lehnartz, Klaus, and Allan R. Talbot. *New York in the Sixties*. New York: Dover Publications, 1978.
- Levy, Peter B. *The New Left and Labor in the 1960s, The Working Class in American History*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994.
- Luce, Phillip Abbott. *The New Left*. New York: D. McKay, 1966.
- . *Road to Revolution: Communist Guerrilla Warfare in the U.S.A.* San Diego, Calif.: Viewpoint Books, 1967.
- Lynd, Staughton and Tom Hayden. *The Other Side*. New York: New American Library, 1967.
- Lyons, Paul. *New Left, New Right, and the Legacy of the Sixties*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996.
- . *The People of This Generation: The Rise and Fall of the New Left in Philadelphia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- MacDonald, Scott. *A Critical Cinema 3: Interviews with Independent Filmmakers*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

- Macedo, Stephen. *Reassessing the Sixties: Debating the Political and Cultural Legacy*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1997.
- Malley, Robert. "The Third Worldist Moment." *Current History* 98, no. 631 (1999): 359-69.
- Mattson, Kevin. *Intellectuals in Action: The Origins of the New Left and Radical Liberalism, 1945-1970*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Matusow, Allen J. *The Unraveling of America: A History of Liberalism in the 1960s*. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney G. Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. *Dynamics of Contention, Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- McAdam, Doug, and Dieter Rucht. "The Cross-National Diffusion of Movement Ideas." *The Annals*, 528 (1993): 56-74.
- McMillian, John. *Smoking Typewriters: The Sixties Underground Press and the Rise of Alternative Media in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- McMillian, John Campbell, and Paul Buhle. *The New Left Revisited, Critical Perspectives on the Past*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2003.
- Melendez, Miguel. *We Took the Streets: Fighting for Latino Rights with the Young Lords*. New York, St. Martin's Press, 2003.
- Miller, James. *"Democracy is in the Streets": From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.
- Miller, Ron. *Free Schools, Free People: Education and Democracy after the 1960s*. Albany: State University of New York, 2002.
- Mills, C. Write. *Listen Yankee: The Revolution in Cuba*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1960.
- Mirra, Carl. *The Admirable Radical: Staughton Lynd and Cold War Dissent, 1945-1970*. Kent, Ohio: Kent University Press, 2010.
- Morikawa, Kinju. *Kenryoku ni Taisuru Teikou no Kiroku [A Record of Rebellion against the Authority]*. Tokyo: Soshisya, 2001.
- Neumann, Richard. *Sixties Legacy: A History of the Public Alternative Schools Movement, 1967-2001*. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.

- Newfield, Jack. *A Prophetic Minority*. New York: New American Library, 1966.
- Nicholas, Bill. *Newsreel: Documentary Filmmaking on the American Left*. New York: Arno Press, 1980.
- O'Brien, Conor Cruise. *Memoir: My Life and Themes*. New York: Cooper Square Press, 1998.
- Oglesby, Carl. *Ravens in the Storm: A Personal History of the 1960s Anti-War Movement*. New York: Scribner, 2010.
- Oguma, Eiji. *1968 Vol.1: Wakamono tachi no Hanran to Sono Haikei* [*The Revolts of the Youths and their Background*]. Tokyo: Shinyosha, 2009.
- 1968 Vol. 2: Hanran no Shuen to Sono Isan* [*The End of Revolts and Its Legacy*]. Tokyo: Shinyosha, 2009.
- Organization of American States. *Cultural Congress of Havana: Study prepared by the SCCS at its Tenth Regular Meeting, 1968*. Washington, D.C., 1968.
- Parlstein, Rick. "Who Owns the Sixties? The Opening of a Scholarly Generation Gap." *Lingua Franca* 6 (1996): 30-37.
- Perry, George C. *New York in the Sixties*. London: Pavilion, 2001.
- Podair, Jerald E. *The Strike that Changed New York: Blacks, Whites, and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Crisis*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Pope, Daniele, ed. *American Radicalism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Reich, Charles Alan. *The Greening of America*. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Renov, Michael, "Newsreel: Old and New – Towards Historical Profile." *Film Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (Fall 1987): 20-33.
- Robbins, Mary Susannah, ed. *Against the Vietnam War: Writings by Activist*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publisher, 1999.
- Rosenberg, Daniel. "Loyalty and Dissent: Free Speech at Adelphi University, 1964-68." *Long Island Historical Journal* 12, no. 1 (1999): 76-91.
- Rosenzweig, Roy, and Elizabeth Blackmar. *The Park and the People: A History of Central Park*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Rossinow, Douglas C. *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

- Roszak, Theodore. *The making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969.
- Rubin, Jerry. *Do It: Scenarios of the Revolution*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1970.
- Rudd, Mark. *Underground: My Life with SDS and Weathermen*. New York: Harper, 2010.
- Russell, Bertrand. *War Crimes in Vietnam*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2009 [1967].
- Sale, Kirkpatrick. *SDS*. New York: Random House, 1973.
- Schafer, William J., ed. *The Truman Nelson Reader*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989.
- Schlesinger, Arthur Jr. *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.
- Silber, Irwin, ed. *Voices of National Liberation: The Revolutionary Ideology of the "Third World" as Expressed by Intellectuals and Artists at the Cultural Congress of Havana, January 1968*. New York: Central Book Company, 1970.
- Sklar, Martin J. *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890-1916: The Market, the Law and Politics*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Students for a Democratic Society. *The Port Huron Statement (1962)*, Chicago: Charles H. Kerr Publishing Company, 1990.
- Suri, Jeremi. *Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- The Cultural Congress of Havana. *Cultural Congress of Havana: Meeting of Intellectuals from All the World on Problems of Asia, Africa, and Latin America* by the Cultural Congress of Havana. Havana: Instituto del Libro, 1968.
- Tilly, Charles. *Stories, Identities, and Political Change*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.
- Umezaki, Toru. "America '60nen Sedai' no Keisei [The Making of the 'Sixties Generation' in the U.S.]" *Rekishi Hyōron [Historical Review]*, 698 (June 2008): 58-72. [in Japanese]

- . “Breaking through the Cane-Curtain: The Cuban Revolution and the Emergence of New York’s Radical Youth, 1961-1965.” *Japanese Journal of American Studies* (Japanese Association for American Studies), 18 (2007): 187-207.
- . “Suwari komi kara Pōto Hyūron Suteitomento e: Nyū Refuto Undō no Keisei ni Kansuru Ichikōsatsu [the Formation of the New Left Movement: From Sit-Ins to the Port Huron Statement], 1960-1962.” *American Review* (Japanese Association for American Studies) 33 (1999): 171-190. [in Japanese]
- Unger, Irwin, and Debi Unger. *The Times Were a Changin': The Sixties Reader*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 1998.
- Varon, Jeremy, *Bringing the War Home: The Weather Underground, the Red Army Faction, and Revolutionary Violence in the Sixties and Seventies*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 2004.
- Viorst, Milton. *Fire in the Streets: America in the Sixties*. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1979.
- Wallterstein, Immanuel, Giovanni Arrighi and Terence K. Hopkins. *Antisystemic Movements*. New York: Verso, 1989.
- Williams, William Appleman. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. Cleveland: World Pub. Co., 1959.
- Westad, Odd Arne. *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Wright, Richard. *The Color Curtain: A Report on the Bandung Conference*. New York: World Publishing Company, 1956.
- Young, Cynthia Ann. *Soul Power: Culture, Radicalism, and the Making of A U.S. Third World Left*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Young, Cynthia Ann. “Havana Up in Harlem: LeRoi Jones, Harold Cruse and the Making of Cultural Revolution.” *Science and Society* 65, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 12-38.
- Yui, Daizaburō, ed. *Ekkyō suru 1960 nendai: Beikoku Nihon Seiō no Kokusai Hikaku [The Transborder Sixties: The USA, Japan, and Europe]*. Tokyo: Sairyusha, 2012.

- Benin, Leigh David. "A Red Thread in Garment: Progressive Labor and New York City's Industrial Heartland in the 1960s and 1970s." PhD diss., New York University, 1997.
- Dyer, Conrad. "Protest and the Politics of Open Admissions: The Impact of the Black and Puerto Rican Students' Community (of City College)." PhD Diss. City University of New York, 1990.
- Fernandez, Johanna L. del C. "Radicals in the Late 1960s: A History of the Young Lords Party in New York City, 1969-1974." PhD Diss., Columbia University, 2004.
- Tsuchiya, Kazuyo. "Contesting Citizenship: Race, Gender, and the Politics of Participation in the U.S. and Japanese Welfare States, 1962-1982." PhD diss., University of California – San Diego, 2008.
- Young, Cynthia Ann. "Soul Power: Cultural Radicalism and the Formation of a US Third World Left." PhD diss., Yale University, 1999.

APPENDIX

Faculty of the Free University of New York, 1965-68¹

Mark Amerling (Spring 1967)

Editor and publisher of *Topic Magazine*, ex-associate editor of *New York Broadsheet*.

Robert Ante (Fall 1965 and Winter 1966)

Instructor in geography, Queens College [Fall 1965].
Economic geographer [Winter 1966].

Herbert Aptheker (Fall 1965)

Historian, director of American Institute for Marxist Studies.

M.S. Armoni (Winter 1966 to Winter 1968)

Editor of the *Minority of One*, political scientist and author.

Stanley Aronowitz (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Trade unionist and editor of *Studies on the Left* [Summer 1965]
Trade unionist, Founder of CIPA [Fall 1967].

Charlie (Brown) Artman (Winter 1966)

Berkley anthropology student turned wanderer, now organizing a tipi village.

Lee Baxandall (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Playwright, essayist and an editor of *Studies on the Left* [Summer 1965].
An editor of *Studies on the Left* and *Chalk Circle*. To have two plays performed in New York this spring [Spring 1966].
An editor of *Studies on the Left* and *Chalk Circle*, playwright [Winter 1967].
Playwright [Fall 1967]

Joseph Berke (Summer 1965 to Fall 1967)

Psychotherapist and poet

David Berkman (Fall 1965)

¹ This is a list of names that appeared in the course catalogues of the Free University (School) of New York, from Summer 1965 to Winter 1968. As the "Fall Catalogue 1966" could not be located and there were a few pages missing from the existing catalogues, there are additional names that should be included.

Ed.D., Former TV producer; director; freelance writer; currently administering media utilization at a local college.

David Bernofsky (Fall 1965 and Winter 1966)

B.S. in education, Temple University, 1931.

Ted Berrigan (Fall 1965)

Editor of "C" magazine. Publisher of "C" Press books.

Edie Black (Summer 1967 to Winter 1968)

Staff member of North American Congress on Latin America.

Edward Boorstein (Summer 1967 to Winter 1968)

Economist, worked in Cuba for Revolutionary Government from May 1960 to September 1963, author of *Cuba: The Political Economy of Socialist Revolution*, Monthly Review Press, forthcoming.

David Caute (Winter 1967)

Ph.D. (Oxford). Visiting professor at New York University 1966-67, author of *Communism and the French Intellectuals* and *The Left in Europe Since 1789*; novels: *At Fever Pitch*, *Comrade Jacob*, and *The Decline of the West*.

Nancy Colin (Summer 1966 to Fall 1967)

Painter, graduate Cooper Union, B.E.A. San Francisco Art Institute.

Robert Davis (Winter 1968)

Independent Marxist.

Tana de Gámez (Spring 1967 to Winter 1968)

Writer and journalist, author of *The Yoke and the Star*, a novel of the Cuban Revolution, and *Like a River of Lions*, a novel of the Spanish Civil War.

Yves E. de Laurot (Fall 1965 to Summer 1966)

Film director, scriptwriter, co-founder of Cinema Engagé.

Robert Dillon (Summer 1967)

Graduate student of anthropology at Columbia Univ. Censured by Columbia President Grayson Kirk as one of a group that threw the CIA recruiters off campus. Co-founder of Village CIPA.

William Erwin (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Psychotherapist.

RobertOh Faber (Winter 1967to Winter 1968)

Drop-out, ex-businesswoman, poet and the editor of the forthcoming *OUT Magazine* [Winter 1967]

Drop-out, ex-businesswoman, poet and the editor of the forthcoming *OUT Magazine*. Acting vice-president of the Free School [Spring 1967]

Drop-out, ex-businesswoman, poet and the editor of the forthcoming *OUT Magazine* [Fall 1967]

Marvin Fishman (Winter 1968)
Filmmaker.

Loraine Fletcher (Summer 1967)
Staff member of North American Congress on Latin America

Phillip S. Foner (Fall 1965)
Historian; author of books on American labor history and Cuba.

Morris Forkosch (Spring 1966 to Summer 1966)
Professor of Law, Chairman, Department of Public Law, Brooklyn Law School, author of many books and articles on legal subjects.

Hollis Frampton (Winter 1967 to Summer 1967)
Independent filmmaker and photographer, professional lab technician.

John Frappier (Winter 1968)
Staff member of North American Congress of Latin America.

Aaron Frishberg (Fall 1967 to Winter 1968)
Dropped out of high school during week of graduation, summer of 1965; Free School student since fall of 1965.

Norman Fruchter (Summer 1965 to Winter 1966)
Novelist, film critic and editor of *Studies on the Left*.

Dan Georgakas (Fall 1967 to Winter 1968)
Greek-American poet, author of a forthcoming book on the American Indian.

John Gerassi (Winter 1967 to Summer 1967)
Author of *The Great Fear in Latin America* and *The Boys of Boise*; former editor of *Time* and *Newsweek*; director of the American branch of the Bertrand Russell Pease Foundation; currently, professor of journalism, New York University.

Paul Gershowitz (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)
Artist, teacher and instructor at Community Cultural Center in Brooklyn.

- Frank Gillette (Summer 1967 to Fall 1967)
 Painter, graduate of Pratt Institute, lectured at Amherst, N.Y.U., Pratt, lectured on McLuhan at Rutgers [Summer 1967].
 Acting manager of the Free School [Fall 1967].
- Allen Ginsberg (Fall 1965)
 Poet
- Martin Glass (Summer 1965 to Fall 1968)
 Instructor of literature, Yeshiva University [Summer 1965].
 Ex-instructor of literature, Yeshiva University [Summer 1967]
 Ex-instructor of literature, Yeshiva University. Now resident in Mexico [Summer 1967].
- Jack Godoy (Fall 1967)
 Studied in Cuba 1951-1956. Translator of Spanish for Revolutionary Contingent.
- Fred Goff (Summer 1967 to Winter 1968)
 Staff member of North American Congress of Latin America
- Eugene Goheen (Fall 1976)
 Playwright, producer, director.
- Dick Guindon (Summer 1966)
 Freelance cartoonist, on the staff of the *Realist*.
- Jim Harris (Winter 1967)
 Ex-instructor in electrical engineering at Stevens Institute of Technology; released after publicly posting Vietnam literature.
- Brad Harrison, III (Fall 1965)
 Certificate International Affairs, University of Freiburg, Switzerland.
- Hattie Heiman (Summer 1967)
 Dance major, Bard College.
- Lynn Henderson (Summer 1965)
 Instructor at Socialist Workers Party summer school and contributor to the *Militant*, a Socialist weekly.
- Peter Henig (Summer 1967 to Winter 1968)
 Staff member of North American Congress of Latin America.

Harold Herbstman (Summer 1966 to Winter 1968)

Actor, director; recently produced and directed "A Play for the General" off-off Broadway [Summer 1966].

Actor, director; recently produced and directed "A Play for the General" by Stefan Uhse, "the Cell" by John Gerassi off-off Broadway. To direct "Karate and the Golden Duckling," a children's play put on by the Work Shop Group at the Free School [Spring 1967]

Actor, director, producer; director of "A Play for the General" by Stefan Uhse and "the Cell" by John Gerassi, off-off Broadway [Summer 1967].

Calvin Hicks (Fall 1965 to Winter 1968)

Poet, community organizer, Independent Action Committee.

Mike Holocomb (Winter 1968)

Staff member of North American Congress of Latin America.

William Inman (Fall 1965 to Fall 1967)

Editor, *KAURI*, poetry newsletter [Fall 1965].

Editor: *KAURI*, poetry-newsletter; poet-in-residence American University, Spring 1967, Washington, D.C. [Spring 1967].

Charles Johnson (Fall 1965 to Winter 1968)

Economics student, Black Marxist-Leninist, visited Cuba, 1964.

Stefanie Kaplan (Winter 1966 to Summer 1966)

B.A., Modern Dance, Brooklyn College, now teaching modern dance at Educational Alliance.

John Keys (Sumer 1965)

Poet, author of *The Keys Bag*, a series of poems.

David Konstan (Winter 1966)

M.A. in Greek and Latin; Lecturer in Classics, Brooklyn College.

Paul Krassner (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Editor of *The Realist*.

Allen Krebs (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Director of the Free University of New York; formerly Professor of Sociology at Adelphi University, fired for traveling to Cuba, Summer 1964 [Summer 1965].

Manager of the Free School of New York; ex-assistant professor of sociology, Adelphi University, fired after traveling to Cuba, 1964. Subpoenaed to HUAC,

summer, 1966; fired in loyalty oath dispute, New School, fall, 1966 [Summer 1967].

Ex-assistant professor of sociology, Adelphi University, fired after traveling to Cuba, 1964. Subpoenaed to HUAC, summer, 1966; fired in loyalty oath dispute, New School, fall, 1966; now forming Free University of London [Winter 1968].

Sharon Krebs (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Graduate student in Russian Literature, Columbia University [Summer 1965].

M.A. in Russian Literature, University of Michigan [Winter 1966].

M.A. in Russian Literature, University of Michigan, Russian translator [Spring 1966]

M.A. in Russian Literature, University of Michigan, 1964; translator.

Corresponding secretary at Free School [Winter 1967].

M.A. in Russian Literature, University of Michigan, 1964; translator. President of the Free School [Winter 1968].

George Kruger (Spring 1966 to Summer 1966)

Editor of the publication, *The Internationalist*.

Tuli Kupferberg (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Poet, publisher of the Birth Press, including *Yeah*, a chronicle of the last days [Summer 1965].

Author: *Sex and War, 3,000,000,000 Beatniks*. Editor: *Kill for Peace, A Look at the White Problem* [Fall 1965].

Program chairman: N.Y. League for Sexual Freedom. Author: *Sex & War, Grace & Beauty of the Human Form, Christine Keeler Coloring Book* [Winter 1966].

Author of *Sex & War, Grace & Beauty of the Human Form, Christine Keeler Coloring Book, Fug* [Spring 1966].

Eileen La Rue (Winter 1967)

Painter, happening and pageant maker, member of The Pageant Players.

Levi Laub (Summer 1965 to Fall 1967)

Under indictment for leading trip to Cuba, 1963; organizer for Progressive Labor Party [Summer 1965].

On trial for leading trip to Cuba, 1963; organizer for Progressive Labor Party [Fall 1965].

Al Lee (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Poet, essayist [Fall 1965]

M.F.A., Iowa; poet and essayist, published in *Kenyon, Partisan* and *Yale Reviews* [Winter 1966].

- Deirdre Levinson (Winter 1967 to Spring 1967)
Resident in South Africa, 1958-62, member of Non-European Unity Movement and author of *Five Years*, a novel. Instructor of English, New York University.
- Leonard P. Liggio (Fall 1965 to Winter 1968)
Research historian and former college instructor.
- Walter Linder (Spring 1967)
Wrote for *Union Voice*, District 65's newspaper. Trade union experience: District 65 in the garment Center, 1950-52; local chairman, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks & Fright Handlers, 1953-63; currently, trade union organizer for P.L., President: the Railroad Workers Unemployment Council.
- T. Proctor Lippincott (Summer 1967 to Fall 1967)
Staff member of North American Congress of Latin America.
- Roy Lisker (Summer 1965 to Winter 1966)
Teacher, peace worker [Summer 1965]
Teacher, peace worker, indicted for draft-card burning, 1965 [Winter 1966]
- Albert Bernard Litewka (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)
Poet, author, translator. Instructor in English, University of California and at original Free University at Sproul Hall, Berkley.
- Michael Locker (Summer 1967 to Winter 1968)
Staff member of North American Congress of Latin America.
- Constance Long (Summer 1966)
B.A. in psychology, researcher trade union mental health project.
- Gerald Long (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)
Stevedore and philosopher [Summer 1965].
Student of philosophy; traveled to Cuba, 1964 [Fall 1965].
Stevedore, philosopher [Winter 1966].
Stevedore, philosopher, coordinator of American Liberation League [Spring 1966]. Coordinator of American Liberation League; Editor: *Liberation USA* [Summer 1966].
Editor: *Liberation USA*. Filmmaker [Summer 1967].
Filmmaker [Fall 1967].
Cultural editor, National Guardian [Winter 1968].
- Staughton Lynd (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)
Assistant Professor of History, Yale University [Summer 1965].

Assistant Professor of History, Roosevelt College, Chicago [since fall 1967].

Conrad Lynn (Summer 1966)

New York Civil Rights attorney.

Bradford Lyttle (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Participant in San Francisco to Moscow Peace Walk; member, Committee for Non-violent Action.

Bob Machover (Spring 1966 to Summer 1966)

Freelance Film editor. Currently working on feature length documentary on SDS-inspired Newark Community Union Project.

Jackson Mac Low (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

B.A. Brooklyn College, 1958; composer of poetry, music, theatre works.

David MacReynolds (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Field secretary, War Resisters League; Associate Editor, *Liberation*.

Shane Mage (Fall 1965 to Winter 1968)

Assistant Professor of Economics, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

L. Marcus (Spring 1966 to Winter 1968)

Professional economist and Marxist [Spring 1966].

Professional economist, co-founder of Village CIPA [Spring 1967]

Professional economist, co-founder of Village CIPA, author of *The Third Stage of Imperialism* [Fall 1967].

Bob Maurer (Winter 1968)

Chairman, Southern Africa Committee, University Christian Movement

John McDermott (Fall 1965 to Fall 1967)

Instructor of philosophy at Long Island University; associate editor, *Viet-Report* [Fall 1965]

Associate editor; *Viet-Report*, ex-instructor of philosophy, Long Island University [Winter 1967].

James Mellen (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Instructor of Political Science, Drew University [Summer 1965]

Secretary-Treasurer of the Free University of New York; Instructor of Political Science, Drew University [Fall 1965]

Secretary-Treasurer of the Free University of New York; Instructor of Political Science, Drew University (recently fired after public statements on Vietnam) [Spring 1966]

Ex-instructor of Political Science, Drew University, fired after public statements on Vietnam [Summer 1966]
 Ex-instructor of Political Science, Drew University, fired after public statements on Vietnam. Now lecturer at University College Tanzania [Summer 1967]

Joan Mellen (Spring 1967)

M.A. in English, Hunter College. Currently writing novel about Camilo Torres, the revolutionary Columbian Priest, and completing doctoral dissertation on values in novel.

George Montgomery (Winter 1967 to Winter 1968)

Poet, ex-instructor of creative writing, State University of New York at New Paltz [Winter 1967].

Poet, poetry reader on college circuit [Summer 1967]

Active poet on college campus scene. Ex-Poet Laureate at New Paltz. Editor of one of the first poetry newsletters since the Korean War. Now working on guerrilla novel. Published in *London Observer*, *Kauri*, *U. of Tampa Review*, *El Corno Emplumado*, *Entrails*, etc. [Fall 1967]

Edwin Morris (Winter 1968)

East Asian Institute at Columbia U. and East Asia Study Project of SDS Radical Education Project.

Richard Morrock (Summer 1967)

M.A. in International Affairs, N.Y.U., contributor to *Monthly Review*, *Viet-Report*.

Anis Nassar (Winter 1968)

Author of *Israel Uber Alles*

Truman Nelson (Winter 1966 to Spring 1966)

Author of *The Torture of Mothers* and books on American Slavery [Winter 1966].

Author of *Passion at the Brook*, *The Sin of the Prophet*, *The Surveyor*, *The Torture of Mothers* and *The Documents of Upheaval* [Spring 1966].

Conor Cruise O'Brien (Winter 1967)

Ph.D. (Trinity College, Dublin). Schweitzer professor of humanities, New York University, former representative of the United Nations Secretary General in Katanga and former Vice Chancellor of the University of Ghana.

James O'Brien (Winter 1966 to Summer 1966)

M.A. in American History, University of Wisconsin.

Bertell Ollman (Winter 1968)

Ph.D. Political Science teacher at NYU and LIU, author of *Marx's Theory of Alienation*, forthcoming.

Victor Perlo (Fall 1965 to Summer 1967)

Economist; author of books on American imperialism [Fall 1965]
Economist, author of *American Imperialism, Empire of High Finance, Marines in Santo Domingo, Vietnam Profiteers*; writer for *American Economic Review, International Affairs*, economic columnist for *Worker, Peoples World* [Spring 1967].

A. Pinkney (Summer 1965 to Winter 1966)

Sociology Professor, New York City.

Charlotte Polin (Winter 1966 to Summer 1967)

Staff researcher, Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam [Winter 1966].

Researcher, U.S. Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, author of books and articles on Vietnam [Spring 1966].

Author of articles and two forthcoming books on Vietnam [Winter 1967].

Fred Prastein (Summer 1967)

Electronics technician, formerly of General Electric X-ray.

Alex Prempeh (Fall 1965)

African Nationalist leader, organizer, lecturer.

Len Ragozin (Winter 1966 to Fall 1967)

B.S. Harvard; Sporadically active (but often armchair) Marxist [Winter 1966].

B.S. Harvard, member of Progressive Labor Party philosophy group, Free University Coordinating Committee member [Summer 1966].

B.S. Harvard, member of Progressive Labor Party philosophy group, Treasurer of the Free School [Winter 1967].

B.S. Harvard, Progressive Labor Party member and publications editor [Spring 1967].

Lois Reivich (Summer 1967 to Winter 1968)

Staff member of North American Congress of Latin America.

Bill Rinteln (Fall 1967 to Winter 1968)

Dick Roberts (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Assistant editor, *International Socialist Review*.

James Robertson (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Marxist historian and editor of *Spartacist*.

Mike Robinson (Summer 1966 to Winter 1967)

New York filmmaker [Summer 1966].

New York filmmaker, collaborator: "Troublemakers," feature-length documentary on SDS-NCUP [Winter 1967].

Milt Rosen (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Chairman, Progressive Labor Party

Ron Rosen (Winter 1967 to Summer 1967)

"Master" of Judo, Black Belt in Karate, Jiu Jitsu, Okinawate, Bo Jitsu, Brown Belt in Kendo and Yellow in Hombo Aikido. (Mark Amerling holds Black in Tomiko Aikido) [Winter 1967].

Anti-draft worker. "aster" of Judo black belt in Karate; seventh degree black belt in Tomoe Ryu JiuJitsu; blackbelt in Okinawate and Bo Jitsu; Brown belt in Kend; yellow belt in Hombo Akaido. Member of the All-Okinawan Karate and Jiu Jitsu Federation [Spring 1967].

Karen Sacks (Spring 1966)

M.A. Anthropology, Harvard University, Visited Cuba 1964.

Edward Sanders (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Poet, editor [Summer 1965]

Poet, editor and Fug [Spring 1966]

Carolee Schneemann (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Maker of kinetic theatre and sculpture.

Trent Schroyer (Spring 1966)

Instructor in the history of social thought, State University College, New Paltz, N.Y.

Peter Schumann (Summer 1965)

Director of the Bread and Puppet Theater.

Barbara Schwartz (Fall 1965 to Spring 1966)

M.A. in Anthropology, N.Y.U. [Fall 1965]

M.A. in Anthropology, N.Y.U., instructor of anthropology at Hofstra College [Spring 1966]

Irwin Schwartz (Fall 1965)

Graduate student in philosophy, Brooklyn College.

S. Shepard Sherbell (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Editor/publisher of *East Side Review*.

Susan Sherman (Fall 1965 to Winter 1968)

Poet, playwright, and philosopher [Fall 1965].

Poet, playwright, and graduate student in philosophy [Winter 1966]

Playwright, published in *Poetry Magazine*, *The Nation*, *El Corno Emplumado*, *Village Voice*. Plays produced off-off Broadway [Summer 1966]

Allan Siegel (Summer 1967 to Fall 1967)

Filmmaker.

Irwin Silber (Winter 1967)

Editor of *Sing Out*, national folk song magazine, author of several books including *Song of the Civil War* and *Song of the Great American West*.

Robert Sitton (Summer 1965)

Formerly Professor of Philosophy, Brooklyn College, fired for rescinding loyalty oath, Spring 1965.

Martin J. Sklar (Summer 1965 to Winter 1966)

Instructor of American history, State University College, New Paltz, N.Y.

Betty Enfield Smith (Winter 1966 to Spring 1966)

Lecturer, author, currently completing book on fascism [Winter 1966].

Painter and teacher of art, author [Spring 1966].

A. B. Spellman (Summer 1965 to Fall 1967)

Poet, commentator WBAI [Summer 1965].

Poet, ex-commentator WBAI [Winter 1966]

Peter Stafford (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Currently completing a book on students and drugs.

Evan Stark (Spring 1967)

MA in Sociology, Univ. of Wisconsin. Former teaching assistant at Univ. of Wisconsin. Presently a full-time lecturer at C.C.N.Y. Frequent contributor to political and literary journals.

Sattva Steiner (Winter 1967 to Spring 1967)

M.A. in Economics, New School for Social Research, taught Spanish, Berlitz Schools, Chicago and New York, contributor to *The Minority One*, *Graffiti* and others

Russel Stetler Jr. (Fall 1965 to Summer 1967)

An originator of campus protest against Vietnam War, founder of May 2nd Movement; under indictment of Cuba trip, 1964; Co-author (with Bertrand Russell) *War and Atrocity in Vietnam* [Winter 1967].

An originator of campus protest against Vietnam War, founder of May 2nd Movement; under indictment of Cuba trip, 1964; Co-author (with Bertrand Russell) *War and Atrocity in Vietnam*; coordinator of American Liberation League [Spring 1966].

Executive secretary, American branch, Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation; co-author, with Bertrand Russell: *War and Atrocity in Vietnam* [Winter 1967]. Executive secretary, American branch, Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation [Summer 1967].

Shane Stevens (Fall 1967 to Winter 1968)

Long-time resident of Harlem, author of *Go Down Dead*.

Roger Taus (Summer 1965 to Fall 1967)

Poet and editor the *Free Student*, newspaper of the May 2nd Movement [Summer 1965].

Poet and an editor of *Weapon* and the *Free Student*, newspaper of the May 2nd Movement; under indictment for Cuba trip 1964 [Winter 1966].

Poet and an editor of *Weapon* and the *Free Student* [Spring 1966].

Poet, editor [Winter 1967]

Student organizer for Progressive Labor [Spring 1967].

Walter Teague (Winter 1967 to Winter 1968)

Chairman, U.S. Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, subpoenaed to HUAC, summer 1966.

Sotere Torregian (Winter 1966 to Winter 1968)

Poet [Winter 1966].

Poet, now coordinator of the Free University of Palo Alto [Summer 1967]

Constance Ullman (Winter 1967 to Winter 1968)

M.A. in psychology, researcher for trade union mental health project.

Robert Verney (Winter 1966)

Contributor to the *Militant*, *International Socialist Review*, and author of several pamphlets on black radicalism.

Susan Warren (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Analyst and writer on Far Eastern affairs [Summer 1965].

Analyst and writer on Far Eastern Affairs. Lived in China over year and a half in early 1960s and traveled length and breadth of country. Formerly editor and contributor to *Far East Spotlight* and *Far East Reporter* among others [Summer 1967].

Alan Jules Weberman (Winter 1968)

Author of forthcoming book on Dylan.

Eric Weinberger (Spring 1966)

National Secretary, Committee for Non-Violent Action, formerly on field staff, CORE.

James Weinstein (Summer 1965 to Winter 1968)

Historian and editor of *Studies on the Left* [Summer 1965].

Historian and founder of CIPA [Fall 1967].

Myra Tanner Weiss (Spring 1967)

Labor organizer and socialist lecturer.

Robert Anton Wilson (Fall 1965 to Winter 1966)

Freelance journalist, lecturer on literature and science.