

1970

## SDS Tactics as an Indicator of Aims Designed to Influence U.S. Foreign Policy

Robert V. Brennan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

---

### Recommended Citation

Brennan, Robert V. (1970) "SDS Tactics as an Indicator of Aims Designed to Influence U.S. Foreign Policy," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 23 : No. 7 , Article 8.  
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol23/iss7/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu](mailto:repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu).

*The mass media have presented the SDS as an organization primarily interested in domestic issues and concerned with foreign policy only to the extent that it competes with domestic programs for limited financial resources. In fact, however, the main thrust of the SDS program relates to U.S. foreign policy. The goal of the movement is the isolation of the United States from the world arena and a political revolution that brings to power an elite group of radicals.*

## **SDS TACTICS AS AN INDICATOR OF AIMS DESIGNED TO INFLUENCE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY**

A research paper prepared  
by

Major Robert V. Brennan, U.S. Marine Corps  
School of Naval Command and Staff

**Origin of the Students for a Democratic Society.** The social unrest and demand for change which have swept the country during the 1960's have been considered by many as phenomena of the times. The rebelliousness and dissident behavior on our college campuses have brought a new and distinct character to student movements. Different from historically recorded student movements, the new movement is national in scope and complex in nature. It is different because it endorses and engages in direct political activism. The communications media of the 1960's have shown the movement in its militant and revolutionary form; however, to understand the student movement it is necessary to delve into tactics and aims.

Democracy.<sup>1</sup> The league is the successor to the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, a group organized in 1905 to mobilize the country's intelligentsia to teach socialism and collective ownership throughout the Nation.<sup>2</sup> In June of 1962, 59 people attended what is considered to be the SDS founding convention at the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Labor Center in Port Huron, Mich.<sup>3</sup>

It was at this convention that the SDS manifesto, which has become known as the "Port Huron Statement," was first presented. This document called for massive public pressure to make the Government and the economy responsive to popular control and declared the bankruptcy of America's cold war policies. It further pledged SDS to work for the creation of a New Left and placed special emphasis on the potential of the university as a radical center. The

The SDS began in 1960 as the youth affiliate of the League for Industrial

preamble in the original text stated that the SDS program was "counterposed to authoritarian movements both of communism and the Domestic right." The "Port Huron Statement" also coined the phrase "Participatory Democracy" which called for a "town meeting" type government.<sup>4</sup> This gave further impetus to the type of organization that the SDS desired.

It was during 1962 that the SDS began to emerge as a potent force for campus activism. The movement, made up mostly of students, was initially felt to be liberally oriented but radically disposed. This radical predilection was evident in its distrust of compromise and its proclivity for direct action. The original SDS organization has grown from 59 students at 11 colleges to a present membership claim of 70,000 students at over 350 colleges and universities.<sup>5</sup>

In June of 1969 the SDS split into three factions: the Weathermen (also referred to as Revolutionary Youth Movement I), Revolutionary Youth Movement II, and the Progressive Labor Party (pro-Mao Tse-tung) group.<sup>6</sup> The Weatherman faction is militant in nature, while the other two factions advocate nonviolent, educational forms of protest—at least until the people's consciousness has been developed.<sup>7</sup> For the purpose of this paper, all factions will be considered as part of SDS.

**An Analysis of SDS Tactics.** The scenario of the SDS confrontation tactics has been widely reported in the mass media. Therefore it is not necessary to point out what has occurred at this or that university or meeting, but rather to bring about some understanding of the tactics used by SDS in its confrontations with the "establishment."

The SDS has attempted to develop a radical political consciousness among students by focusing their attention on the ties between the university as an

instrument to "channel" students by "pressurized guidance" into particular fields for the good of the "establishment."<sup>8</sup> In focusing attention on these relationships, the SDS has opened the way for their confrontations with the "system." In their view the "system" includes these targets: the university, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the Selective Service System, campus recruiting, and the Nation's industrial base.

In analyzing the SDS tactics with regard to the aforementioned targets, four techniques of confrontation keep recurring. These techniques include issues, coordination, propaganda, and "moral absolutism." Taken together they form a pattern which might be labeled a "template for analysis." Through a discussion of specific incidents and statements, the reader will gain the facility to analyze other areas of student confrontation with which he is more familiar.

The SDS in its confrontations with the selected targets has made great use of the "issues." The attempt is made in each case to connect campus issues, no matter how academic, to off-campus questions which are political. Carl Davidson, a former national SDS officer, has stated the necessity of tying the university ranking system to the Selective Service System and the ROTC issues to the "fighting of Aggressive [sic] wars of oppression abroad."<sup>9</sup> The University placement office has become the focus of their political action aimed at the national industrial base. The "immorality of napalm" is bound to Dow Chemical Corporation, and the students are urged to "run them off campus . . . because of their complicity in war crimes."<sup>10</sup> One other linking of issues was presented in the 1966 SDS Anti-Draft Resolution which tied the draft to the economic and foreign policy objectives of the United States.<sup>11</sup> The use of issues has been further crystallized in a statement by Philip A.

Luce, a former leader of the Progressive Labor Party.

Confrontation as a revolutionary tactic works like this: Manipulate people into a posture wherein they are in direct conflict with some power source and violence can be created. The first key is to broaden support for the apparent cause *through the rising [sic] of false issues*. Second, demand from the power source concessions that they can not or will not accept. Then claim that the student will have been thwarted and the only answer is peaceful but extra legal measures to gain the demanded changes.<sup>12</sup>

This creation of issues was to be seen even prior to the statement by Luce. At Columbia University in April of 1968, the Institute for Defense Analysis and the construction of a Columbia-owned gymnasium in Harlem became the great issues of confrontation.<sup>13</sup> However, Mark Rudd, the leader of the Columbia SDS, speaking of these issues at a lecture at Harvard, stated: "We manufactured the issues, the Institute for Defense Analysis is nothing at Columbia. Just three professors. And the gym issue is bull. It doesn't mean anything to anybody. I had never been to the gym site before the demonstration began. I didn't even know how to get there."<sup>14</sup>

The SDS has considered the "issues" as matters around which larger masses of students may be "radicalized" or "politicized" toward the eventual reform of other social institutions.<sup>15</sup> The purpose of these "issues" is not the solving of the Nation's problems, but rather to gain support for the organization's programs. The issues that are considered viable are those that will cause a reaction by the masses against the established order. The purpose is to show that incidents such as Vietnam are caused by the system and are not just an

aberration of it. In keeping with this, a leading member of the Stanford University SDS attempted as early as 1967 to close Vietnam as a "viable issue" because now even the university trustees desired a withdrawal.<sup>16</sup> The issues that gain support and sympathy from the masses but not the "establishment" are considered viable, and the coordination that is used to highlight these issues, through confrontation, is then planned.

One of the mysteries of SDS has been its ability to disseminate information and coordinate its complex activities on a national basis. It has been intimidated by some that the mass media's devotion of time and space to SDS activities has given the movement a means of coordinating the use of similar tactics.<sup>17</sup> This may be true for specific tactics, such as threatening to burn a dog as a symbolic gesture.<sup>18</sup> However, it still does not explain the coordination of the large "single-shot" event nor does it reflect the spontaneous character attributed to the movement by the media.

The SDS ability and use of effective coordinating techniques can be seen by the timeliness of their planning and the commonly known results of the following specific actions:

A. The first large-scale march (15,000) on Washington, D.C., in April of 1965 was planned by the National Council of SDS in December of 1964.<sup>19</sup>

B. The Columbia University demonstration was planned in detail in October of 1967 while the actual confrontation took place in April of 1968.<sup>20</sup>

C. The confrontations which took place at the Democratic Convention in June of 1968 were announced to the author of this paper approximately 7 months prior to the event.<sup>21</sup>

As with all revolutionary movements, SDS coordination techniques include the use of locally produced literature. One example of this close coordination is the linking of the 1966 Anti-Draft

Resolution at Berkeley with Carl Davidson's "Praxis Makes Perfect," which sets forth the tactics to be adopted.<sup>22</sup> Another example of the SDS capability to project the same view on different campuses simultaneously was significantly shown in April of 1969 when identical editorials demanding the abolition of ROTC appeared in 29 independent college newspapers.<sup>23</sup>

The importance of the media as a means of influencing campus activities has been fully recognized by the SDS. The organization feels that the student movement must: "(1) Try to gain control of as much of the *established* campus cultural apparatus as possible, (2) if control is not possible, they should try to influence and/or resist it when necessary and (3) develop a new counter apparatus of their own."<sup>24</sup> By having their own people on the staff of the campus media the SDS has attempted to gain, through the media, student body support for its programs.

The need of media control by the SDS can be viewed also from one other direction. Holsti has written that propaganda is most effective against youth and that it is most successful if it is the major source of information for a particular target group.<sup>25</sup> After gaining control of the local media or establishing counteroutlets for the dissemination of information, the SDS is able to bring to bear all the techniques and methodology of propaganda. The techniques employed are name calling (Marine Killers, Chicago Pigs), glittering generalities (the university exists to provide the military-industrial complex with trained manpower), transfer (capitalism is decadent; education in the United States is in its historically most irrational and decadent state), testimonial (the use of politicians and generals to criticize the Nation's policies), selection (the collection and promulgation of just those facts that support predetermined objectives)<sup>26</sup> and finally the bandwagon (all power to the people; all peace-loving

people recognize that . . .). The use of these techniques by SDS-sponsored media and the success of these methods are demonstrated by the rapid rise shown in the SDS influence and membership.

The SDS has attempted to gain support through the use of what Emil terms "agitation propaganda." This is a type of propaganda used by most revolutionary movements, and it is aimed at gaining support for issues. The effect of "agitation propaganda" may be of a relatively short duration. Through propaganda of this nature, SDS has been able to use its "issues" for great short-term advantages. The use of its controlled media lends itself well to this form of tactic which is often used to disrupt established order.<sup>27</sup> Once the confrontation has been gained through the issues and coordination, propaganda is the tool which moves the participants to action. The SDS then addresses the confrontation from a position of "moral absolutism."

The final technique which completes the "template for analysis" is the use of "moral absolutism" by the SDS. Moral absolutism is defined as a circumstance where the pursuit of ends regarded as supremely good and desirable legitimates the use of all means, including coercion and violation of the rights and freedom of others, which are believed to be necessary to accomplish the goals.

Although the faculty and students at Columbia endorsed the principle of an "open campus," the awards ceremony of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps was disrupted because the SDS did not feel that the NROTC had a right to be on the campus.<sup>28</sup> The "open campus" policy was further ignored when campus recruiting by the Armed Forces and industrial firms was disrupted, because the SDS stated these institutions were inherently evil.

The feeling of those within the movement is that SDS represents all that is good, and, therefore, this legitimates

any action that fosters "goodness." Feuer points out that this tactic is not new and was used by the Nazi Studentenschaft in 1933 and the French Student Movement (1932-1941), which supported Mussolini's imperialism and eventually sided with the Vichy regime. German students entered classrooms insulting liberal professors while justifying their disruption by arguing that only those with whom they agreed had the right to teach.<sup>29</sup> The Fascists felt, as the SDS of today, that the students should stop bearing the "burdens" of the old. Feuer also points to the irony of the French student movement's moral position in that it was credited with helping the French prepare for capitulation to the Germans. The SDS tactic of not allowing all to have freedom of expression has been vividly covered by the mass media during the 1968 presidential elections and during the visits of many guest lecturers to the college campuses.

The innovation of combining the four techniques of confrontation into a successful tactical mode has given the SDS a dramatic modus operandi which added to its own membership and gained for the SDS many temporary allies. The success SDS has enjoyed, using these techniques of confrontation, has exerted an influence toward a change in basic orientation, i.e., from protest to resistance. This program of resistance is best described by former SDS national secretary Greg Calvert who has stated, "No matter what America demands, it does not possess us. Whenever that demand comes, we resist."<sup>30</sup> The change from protest to resistance is framed by Carl Davidson in the following statement: "Do we work within the system? Of course we do. The question is not one of working 'inside' or 'outside' rather, the question is do we play by the established rules? Here the answer is an emphatic No."<sup>31</sup>

The SDS has exhibited the competence to direct the "movement" down

the path of participation through confrontation activism. The path of resistance, though incongruous to middle-class America, is the path that SDS has chosen to follow. The course of that resistance has been set by the leaders of SDS, and termination of this direction will come only through realistic approaches by the "establishment" to the problems of the society as visualized in the idealistic thought of the young. Society's problems must be solved to prevent the radicalization of the truly concerned youth. The template serves as a way to understand the actions that are taking place; it does not explain the SDS mystique.

**Core Influences on the SDS Movement.** A close examination of SDS and its activities reveals that the movement offers not a program, but a choice—a choice between "the revolution" and American democracy. Unfortunately, and possibly by design, the answers to what happens "the day after the revolution" are not laid out, and therefore this information must be derived from the movement's empirical design.

Some useful insights into the SDS as a sociopolitical group can be gained by examining the influences that have given the movement impetus. The movement has been greatly influenced by the writings of C. Wright Mills, Paul Goodman, Herbert Marcuse, Regis Debray, Robert Nisbert,<sup>32</sup> Staughton Lynd, Che Guevara, Carl Davidson, Thomas Hayden, and Carl Oglesby. The last three listed could be classified as the movements tacticians while the remaining are better identified as theoreticians.

C. Wright Mills turned to the intellectuals as the agents for social change. He observed that it was a handful of student intellectuals that moved the Cuban Revolution to fruition and that this made the Cuban movement different from previously known revolutions.<sup>33</sup> The revolutionary fervor was forged by bourgeois intellectuals who considered

themselves the base of a new order because their revolution was not economically determined or inspired.<sup>34</sup> Through the middle-class intellectual character that the SDS brings to revolution, a parallel can be drawn between the SDS and the Cuban movement. Similar to their emulated movement, the SDS views its revolution as founded on morality and its strength resting with the young intellectuals rather than with labor.

Paul Goodman, who has been labeled a freewheeling anarchistic spirit, has influenced the SDS into placing all of society in the political arena. In this way no phase of life is left untouched by political thought. There is a rejection on the part of SDS and Goodman to the separation of morality and politics. Jonathan Eisen and David Steinberg have credited Goodman's theories of behavior and social control with giving the movement its revolutionary impact.<sup>35</sup> If the political aims of the writers mentioned could be meshed, the synthesis would be an endorsement for a complete social revolution leading to a new world order controlled by a small elite group.

The ideal and term that has initially constituted a core influence on the movement is "Participatory Democracy." This is a decentralized system without real leadership which gives equal voice to all. The ideal is an attractive one; it places every individual in a position where he has a voice in the forces that shape his own life. Though it presents the individual a voice, it strongly rejects the contention that reform can be achieved through established parliamentary procedures.<sup>36</sup>

The SDS believes that its meetings should produce a unanimity of viewpoint; yet it still prizes a rebellious, strong-willed individualism and independence of mind.<sup>37</sup> Policies are set and action is determined by those who, in the maelstrom of discussion and debate, exert the most influence through

courage, articulateness, reasonableness, and sensitivity to the feelings of the group.<sup>38</sup> This method appears best suited to an action movement which mobilizes and focuses the moral energies of young people in brief, one-event actions. Nevertheless, the SDS defend the wider utility of this form of government by citing the successful control by workers of cooperative factories and citizen participation in classic town meetings.<sup>39</sup>

Critics of "Participatory Democracy" have argued that it is a vague, utopian notion that could never provide a workable system of government on a mass scale.<sup>40</sup> Initially students associated themselves with the rhetoric and ideology of the phrase Thomas Hayden had coined and have pushed it to reform society.<sup>41</sup> Staughton Lynd, who has compared "Participatory Democracy" with "Soviet Democracy," has since stated it may have been the product of a naive early stage of protest.<sup>42</sup> This same view of a revolutionary movement is attributed to Lenin by Feuer. Lenin felt that it was not possible for the working class to acquire the outlook to enable them to vote intelligently, therefore the minority must seize the state power. Then, holding the real power, they would "convince" the majority to accept its policies.<sup>43</sup> The "Participatory Democrat" likewise has shown no inclination to abide by elections or parliamentary procedures. The basic argument purports that, since the masses are nonparticipating, the elite activists must act on their behalf.<sup>44</sup> Critics of this method of government have termed "Participatory Democracy" as "Democratic Anarchy" fulfilled.

The use of the word "Communist" when dealing with any movement usually exposes the user to the wrath and label of "Red baiting" or "McCarthyism," but in the case of SDS the influence is too blatant and unequivocally present to be passed over in the cause of timidity. When the movement

was initiated in the early sixties, it appeared to be quite free of any subversive influence, but as the movement grew and gained support the statements and verbiage of the leaders tended to take on the language and fervor of Marxism. The movement's leanings were fairly well established in the midsixties with the many trips made by SDS members to Hanoi and Cuba. The leadership statements at the 1968 SDS Convention left little room for doubt. Bernadine Dohrn, the interorganizational secretary, stated that she is a "revolutionary Communist,"<sup>45</sup> and Michael Klonsky, the national secretary, has stated that their primary task "is to build a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement."<sup>46</sup> The distinction that they have made for themselves is that they are communists with a little "c" to distinguish them from the card-carrying Communists of the past.<sup>47</sup> The direction the movement has taken could be traced to the change in the preamble of the SDS Constitution in 1965. It was this change that allowed Communists to obtain membership in the organization. The preamble was changed because the leadership felt the section which stated that the movement was "counterposed to authoritarian movements both of communism and the domestic right" was negative, exclusionary, and smacked of "Red baiting."<sup>48</sup> Gus Hall, Secretary of the Communist Party, USA, stated that because of organizations like SDS, fronts were things of the past. As far back as 1961 Hall told his National Committee that they must give higher priority to the youth movement.<sup>49</sup>

During one visit to Budapest, SDS members met with North Vietnamese representatives. Upon their return to America they promulgated to the SDS membership the proper methods of organizing demonstrations in this country and provided information on the methods North Vietnamese employed to set up their youth cells in both Vietnams.<sup>50</sup> In 1968, during a trip to

Cuba, several SDS members were instructed by Huynh Van Ba, a representative of the Viet Cong, in the areas of effective demonstrations and the collecting of funds for the support of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.<sup>51</sup> The travel to Communist countries is not significant in itself, but the actions and writings of the travelers are. The writings and actions of Bruce Dancis, David Dellinger, and Carl Davidson upon their return give testimony that the ideology of SDS has more and more taken on a Marxist-Leninist coloration. Staughton Lynd has even mused that SDS meetings now seem indistinguishable from those of the Old Left sects of his youth.<sup>52</sup>

The influences and the direction of the SDS movement seem inalterable. They have manifestly made their objectives clear. By declaration and action, the crux of SDS ideology is to change the society by any method necessary. The SDS has charted a course for the future. The pattern appears not as a program of reform of the present foundations of democracy, but rather as a revolution to "smash" the American political system.<sup>53</sup> The discourse in confrontation is not reasoned and logical but rather a totalitarian philosophy which will not tolerate opposing positions.

There are those who feel the faction split of 21 June 1969<sup>54</sup> will bring about new and distinct positions, but it should be realized that this inner debate is not one of substance, but rather of form. The FBI has stated that the organization has drifted into the orbit of revolutionary thought and direction as laid down by Marx, Engels, and Lenin.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, the internal struggle may be viewed as a struggle over which form of Marxist revolutionary action will be followed. The SDS still appears to desire control over the destiny of their organization without Old Left or foreign domination; however, the direction of the movement augers against it.



**Foreign Policy Attacks Through Use of Domestic Issues.** The foreign policy of the United States has come under varied attacks by the SDS which project it as imperialistic in nature and spawned by the "military-industrial complex." The term "military-industrial complex," first uttered in President Eisenhower's "farewell address" of 1960, has given the movement a phrase by which they can claim legitimacy for their antagonism.<sup>56</sup> Through this oft-repeated statement the SDS has attempted to represent both the military and the Nation's industrial base as the cause for the world's ills.

As a consequence of this reasoning, the defensive posture of U.S. forces in Europe is distorted into the cause for the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the claim that the invasion proves the validity of the original defensive posture is dismissed as circular reasoning.<sup>57</sup> In essence, the criticism of foreign policy gives no thought to post-World War II developments. It simply denigrates as imperialistic any U.S. participation in overseas defensive arrangements. It does not accept Russian power as an external threat to all of Europe but equates the Czechoslovakia takeover by Russian military force to the United Fruit Corporation's pursuit of economic interests in Guatemala.<sup>58</sup> In this discourse the U.S. "military-industrial complex" is placed in the floodlight, while aggressive action of other powers, though decried, is placed in the background. The moral conscience of these young people appears to be attuned only to American actions, while other nations are free to operate in a galaxy of freedom from criticism of their policies.<sup>59</sup>

The term "foreign policy" has never specifically become a "watchword" for the SDS in its movement toward revolution; however, it has always been visible in its writings and discussions. In an examination of SDS targets and ac-

complishments, it would appear that an extension of views on all other fronts would disclose the influence they seek to exert on U.S. foreign policy. The amount of influence already subsumed by SDS successes in other areas can be used as an indicator of direction. This can be accomplished by an analysis of the domestic programs espoused and pushed by SDS which impinge on foreign policy.

There will be some who will state that these changes were inevitable or that the problems leading to change already existed. However, it is worth remarking that all past revolutions have seized existing problems as a vehicle, and the revolution has been furthered by repression of people who are attempting to follow understandable instincts in meeting legitimate needs.

The confrontations at Yale, Harvard, Cornell, and Dartmouth, among many institutions, have succeeded in highlighting the demand for the abolition of Reserve Officers' Training Corps on the campuses of America. The ROTC itself is in little danger of disintegration. However, the problem of student pressure is real when capitulation to the demands of a student minority is obtained from some of the oldest universities in the Nation.<sup>60</sup> The *Cornell University Chronicle* of 13 November 1969 ran a headline story that stated, "Student Survey Says 67% Support ROTC in Some Form."<sup>61</sup> This, like most polls, favored retention.

The exact purpose for abolition is brought out best by a young dedicated SDS leader from Trinity College in Hartford, Conn.:

By destroying ROTC, a strong student movement would contribute to stopping this war and wars like it; hence no one would have to go . . . The position of the College should be to refuse to cooperate with the Armed Forces

as long as counter revolution remains the objective of American foreign policy.<sup>62</sup>

The argument against ROTC is that the military's longstanding policy is one of securing worldwide markets which will be open to exploitation by American business and trade. Their case for abolishing ROTC rests on their contention that ROTC is essential to the smooth functioning of the "American military" in pursuit of its policies.<sup>63</sup> These demands for a change in the Nation's foreign policy by the SDS are not well known by the American public as the exposure given to the SDS by the media has distorted the actual parameters of the movement. The SDS has been represented as a campus movement with a heavy interest in domestic affairs, with the Vietnam issue depicted as an extension of the evils of the capitalist system. However, the SDS pamphlets and articles have actually little to do with solely domestic issues. What the SDS media demand is a change in foreign policy. The call is for "pressurized guidance" exerted on politicians who, they feel, are susceptible to pressure.

The recent change in the conscription laws of the Nation can be classified as a partial success for the SDS and fellow organizations. The agitation for the passing of this draft reform in 1969 can be traced in part to the 1966 SDS Anti-Draft Resolution. The change did not parallel the resolution; however, the demand for change was met during a period when the United States was heavily engaged in conflict abroad. The proposal for an "all volunteer force" will meet with the increasing demands to halt all forms of conscription. However, this still does not meet the basic objectives of SDS. In personal discussions with many SDS dissidents demanding such a change they have alluded to the "channeling" of the underprivileged into the military as a

byproduct of this "all volunteer force." Now SDS concern is on a different level. They ponder the fairness of a system that directs the choice of an individual who has limited opportunity in the job market. The foreign policy implications that SDS relates to the draft can be found in the following paragraphs of the 1966 Anti-Draft Resolution:

(2) . . . We maintain that all conscription is coercive and Anti-Democratic and that it is used by the U.S. Government to oppress people in the U.S. and around the world.

(3) SDS recognizes that the draft is connected with the requirements of the economic system and the foreign policy of the U.S.

(4B) National SDS will assist all efforts to organize within the armed forces, resistance to the U.S. foreign policy.<sup>64</sup>

The overtone of this domestic issue appears to have its actual base in the commitments of the United States abroad. Just as they previously tied "on-campus activities" to "off-campus questions," it is apparent that domestic issues are tied to foreign policy decisions.

The SDS has gained some success in its constant attacks on U.S. corporate industry. The purpose of these attacks has been to show the worker that the corporation is exploiting the people not only in the United States, but also abroad. The tactic has been to point out existing domestic inequities and to bring the worker's attention to concomitant wrongs in the world. SDS has depicted to the worker what they label an "imperialist pattern." The pattern in Vietnam is presented as the blueprint for the U.S. foreign policy of giving massive aid to oppressors of people all over the world. The Vietnam conflict is por-

trayed as rooted in the imperialistic nature of capitalism, where the great corporations of America exploit the cheap labor and raw materials of "third world countries."<sup>65</sup> The symbol of the corporate giant crushing and exploiting the worker domestically is thereby projected as the true image of U.S. activities abroad.

There are other substantial SDS accomplishments which may have subtle and far-reaching effects on the foreign policy of America. These successes include changes in college curricula, student control of the hiring and firing of professors, and student control of university funds. The curriculum of the university may, in the future, be taught in a structure where professors are granted tenure not by merit, but by emotion. This can be compared to post-World II Germany, where the students, by force, controlled the university and were responsible for the firing of almost 1,600 professors with whom they disagreed.<sup>66</sup> The result of such demands is a regenerative effect which reinforces the ideology approved by the militants. The foreign policy ramifications of these actions are apparent.

In every case the SDS has pushed for a change in the principles and policies of the Nation. They have shown their ability to mobilize mass action by concentrating on carefully chosen issues.<sup>67</sup> The movement disdains the democratic process and political liberty. It also disdains the process of continually balancing and rebalancing liberty and order, authority and independence, rights and obligations. Its foreign policy is in line with the Marxist dogma. To SDS it is not the results but the commitment that counts; T.R. Brooks in the article "Metamorphosis in SDS—the New Left Is Showing Its Age" states "SDSers couldn't care less that the Marxism-Leninism of Stalin murdered millions; that morally wrong 'means' wreak havoc with 'the noblest of ends,'

that violence only breeds violence."<sup>68</sup> A similar position on commitment was stated by Ted Gold, a former member of the Columbia University SDS. When confronted with the accusation by a fellow member that his views were those of a "rightwing extremist," he stated "Well, if it takes fascism, we'll have to take fascism."<sup>69</sup> Ted Gold was killed in New York City when a bomb exploded in a building suspected of housing "Weatherman" demolitions.

The program for "the day after the revolution" does not appear to have been written as yet, but the verbiage, influence, and direction of the movement have been spawned. Carl Davidson has stated that the decision will be made after the revolution as to what program they will follow. Che Guevara wrote that the revolution educates a man; first act, and out of action will come enlightenment.<sup>70</sup> The actions against basic institutions such as the military can only raise doubts in the eyes of U.S. allies as to this Nation's will to meet treaty commitments. This brings to foreign policy a problem of dimensions that cannot be easily measured. Grave harm may also result if our enemies are led to question the Nation's resolve and test its abilities. This view has already been expressed by some of our allies, who, because of our internal problems, have questioned our viability as a strong nation.<sup>71</sup>

**Conclusions.** The cynicism that prevails in the SDS for American political and social institutions has brought to the organization a high political consciousness and activism. The activism which has cried for "change now" has not concerned itself with the solutions to the problems it deplors. This lack of a coherent strategy for social reform continues to be the great criticism of the movement. The randomness of the movement's issues, though well planned in confrontation, indicates a degree of opportunism rather than a coherent

program. The evidence points to the continuance of this lack of concern for "the day after the revolution." The guiding light will continue to be disruption of all with which they disagree and a pattern of "revolution for the hell of it."

This movement, thought to be transitory by many, has completed a decade where it has proven its ability to foster change. The change accomplished radically or peacefully has given to the SDS the image as a catalyst for activism.

In keeping with this image and the protective benefits of the "student" label, the campus will remain the base of the movement, and the demands for change of all institutional apparatus that interferes with total freedom, as espoused by SDS, will be the goal. In the specter of militancy for change, the university will find once more that it is faced with legitimate, as well as illegitimate, requests for review of its present policies. The classrooms of the universities and high schools, like those of post-World War II Germany, are to be the scenes of over-growing confrontations dealing with all the issues of the day.

Personal experience in the realm of academia has left the author of this paper with the conception that the influence of SDS will be felt in educational circles for many decades to come. The reason for this prediction is the knowledge that many of the dissident young have been turning to teaching as a profession. This lends to the SDS a regenerative quality of influencing those who are most susceptible to propaganda relating to a cause. America's classrooms will provide that audience.

In these disrupting circumstances the classroom may very well become a forum, and the will of the students is going to be the deciding factor. If the educational structure is going to survive in this setting of disruption, the agitator's position will have to be put to the test of logical discourse. The other

students will have to be consulted as to what they think of the information being expounded by the SDS. The Students for a Democratic Society demand, under the guise of educational freedom, that everyone be open to questioning on the position that he represents. It will be up to the non-SDS students to demand the same right in the questioning of the SDS platform. If the student feeling for responsible discourse or their desire for learning is colored by apathetic unconcern, there is little that the non-SDS influenced professor will be able to do short of notifying the authorities.

Clearly the university will have to change. These changes must not be guided by emotional slogans, pressure, or preconceptions supplied by the SDS, but rather through reasoned approaches to existing problems. The key to success in managing the change without destroying the institution is the mature student. The student body must take on the responsibility for maintaining a free academic structure.

When faced with militant disruption, the university should present its position on issues to the students by fully explaining the problem and the possible consequences of acquiescence to the demands of the dissidents. The University must not take a "passive" role but an "active" one. This role should be one of soliciting opinion on significant issues from all major organizations, including the SDS, in an attempt to involve all segments of the academic community in the university workings. The responses and recommendations from these active procedures should be made known to the students and faculty through the use of the established campus apparatus. In involving the entire intellectual community in the affairs that affect them all equally, it would acquaint them with the seriousness of problems of the institution, financial and academic, and generate a feeling of mutual responsibility for solutions. This is not to

intimate that the wholly irrational demands of the SDS on issues that are irresponsible, and for which they show a marked ignorance, should be open for litigation. However, even in these circumstances, answers to SDS charges and the consequences of acquiescence to the SDS position could be presented.

The SDSers' wider goal is clearly one of radical change, not of constitutional reform. The movement, though factionalized, will continue to make its presence felt by supporting sympathetic political figures and by instigating violence in the street. The only counter to these actions will be to give to the people of the Nation viable alternatives to those offered by the radical minority. This minority has cloaked its demands in legitimacy so that it now draws support on specific issues across the broad spectrum of our society. Though there is little general support for the many confrontations and the attendant destruction engineered by SDS, the people who support or accept the other precepts feel—presumably like Pontius Pilate—that by washing their hands they are absolved from the consequences of a specific act. The failure in perception is that all movements perform acts that most people will agree with; however, the danger lies in the dastardly act with which most disagree, but which few will act to prevent. Mao Tse-tung states that, "All power comes from the barrel of a gun," and SDS has shown that it will bring the fight to the streets if necessary.

It must be remembered that revolutions only succeed if the established authority fails to use the means at its disposal to counter it. The means available do not have to be force, but in specific instances it may have to be. Legislative and judicial means of handling the problems of our times may head off a revolutionary confrontation. However, the SDS revolution will continue to project morality into politics and justice. There can be no quarrel

with a moral stand—but whose concept of morality is to prevail? In view of the polemical nature of the SDS "moral absolutism," there is adequate reason to be suspicious of their motives in this respect. This Nation was built on a precept of "justice for all." Although in reality perfect justice cannot be achieved by man, the country in conscience can do little else than to strive toward this goal—especially since it may mean its survival.

Nonpolemical justice, constructive change, and a sympathetic understanding of the problems of all segments of society would help to produce a Nation where the citizens realize that, "freedom begins only with the humble acceptance of membership in, and subordination to, a natural order of things, and it grows only with struggle, self discipline, and faith."<sup>72</sup>

The SDS demand for "change now" shows no inclination to self-discipline and faith. They have pointed to problems that are known to exist but have not offered any solutions or viable alternatives. The SDS message, which is fraught with disruption, is one of anarchy.

---

## BIOGRAPHIC SUMMARY



Maj. Robert V. Brennan, U.S. Marine Corps, graduated from American International College in 1958 with a degree in economics. Since 1959 he has served as an artillery officer in the Marine Corps, and his assignments have included tours of duty in Okinawa and Vietnam. He holds a master's degree in international affairs from The George Washington University and is a graduate of the Naval War College's School of Naval Command and Staff. Major Brennan is presently assigned to Force Troops, FMFLANT, Camp Lejeune, N.C.

**FOOTNOTES**

1. U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, "Students for a Democratic Society," Unpublished Report, Washington, D.C.: 1969, p. 22.
2. Richard E. Peterson, "The Student Left in American Higher Education," *Daedalus*, Winter 1968, p. 296.
3. James O'Brien, *A History of the New Left 1960-1968* (Boston: New England Free Press, 1969), p. 6.
4. Staughton Lynd, "The New Left," *The Annals*, March 1969, p. 69.
5. Barnard L. Collier, "SDS Scores Big Gains but Faces Many Problems," *The New York Times*, 5 May 1969, p.1:3.
6. "Crime Outlook Bleak Not Hopeless," *Boston Sunday Advertiser*, 28 December 1969, p. 36:1.
7. James K. Glassman, "Came the Revolution—and Only 400 Marched," *Boston Sunday Herald Traveler*, 12 October 1969, sec. 1, p. 31:3.
8. Peter Henig, "On the Manpower Channelers," *Essays on Draft Resistance, Our Fight Is Here*, SDS Pamphlet (Chicago: SDS, n.d., circa 1965-1969).
9. Carl Davidson, *The Multiversity: Crucible of the New Working Class*, Pamphlet (n.p.: n.d., circa 1967-1969), p. 11.
10. *Ibid.*
11. "SDS Anti-Draft Resolution," National Council Position Paper (Berkeley, Calif.: 1966).
12. Philip A. Luce, "How SDS Hopes to Disrupt America," *Human Events*, 15 June 1968, p. 9:4.
13. Jerry L. Avorn, et al., *Up against the Ivy Wall* (New York: Atheneum Press, 1969, c. 1968), p. 77.
14. Clarence Doucet, "Shapes of Protest," *Reprinted Series by The New Orleans Times-Picayune*, 23 May 1969-1 June 1969, p. 26.
15. Peterson, p. 313.
16. Collier, p. 30:6.
17. The author spent two school years recruiting for the U.S. Marine Corps at New England college campuses. The use of the media was told to him by members of the Students for a Democratic Society at Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., during the spring visit, 1968.
18. This was a tactic used to gather a crowd. The tactic was first employed on the campuses on the west coast. In the fall of 1968 it was used in conjunction with the visit by the Marine recruiters to the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass. It was threatened to be used again at the University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I., during the 15 October 1969 moratorium. There is never any real intention of actually burning a dog, but the purpose was to draw a crowd and then chastise the audience for getting upset about a dog while allowing the war in Vietnam to continue.
19. O'Brien, p. 12.
20. U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, p. 13.
21. Conversations with members of the Students for a Democratic Society at Bridgeport University, Bridgeport, Conn., and Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., during the fall term, 1967.
22. Carl Davidson, "Praxis Makes Perfect," *Essays on Draft Resistance, Our Fight Is Here*. p. 2-4.
23. U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, p. 9.
24. Davidson, *The Multiversity*, p. 12.
25. Kalevi J. Holsti, *International Politics; a Framework for Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967), p. 254-255.
26. *Vietnam Fact Sheet*, SDS Pamphlet (Ithaca, N.Y.: Glad Day Press, n.d.).
27. Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda—the Formation of Men's Attitudes* (New York: Knopf, 1969), p. 70-72.
28. Avorn, p. 287-288.
29. Lewis S. Feuer, *The Conflict of Generations* (New York: Basic Books, 1969), p. 285.
30. U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, p. 14.
31. Davidson, *The Multiversity*, p. 13.
32. Jonathan Eisen and David Steinberg, "The Student Revolt against Liberalism," *The Annals*, March 1969, p. 83.
33. Feuer, p. 249.
34. *Ibid.*
35. Eisen and Steinberg, p. 85.
36. Richard Blumenthal, "SDS—Protest Is Not Enough," *The Nation*, 22 May 1967, p. 657.

## 78 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

37. *Ibid.*, p. 660.
38. Bradford Lytle, *After Washington—Three Views*, Committee for Non-Violent Action Pamphlet No. 5 (n.p.: n.p., 27 August 1968), p. 1-2.
39. Blumenthal, p. 660.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Eisen and Steinberg, p. 85.
42. Lynd, p. 71.
43. Feuer, p. 410.
44. *Ibid.*
45. Anthony Ripley, "Student Leaders Voice Radicalism—New Left Advocates Back communism (with Small c)," *The New York Times*, 16 June 1968, p. 48:7.
46. U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, p. 19.
47. Ripley, p. 48:7
48. Thomas R. Brooks, "Voice of the New Campus Underclassman," *The New York Times Magazine*, 7 November 1961, p. 137.
49. Robert Betts, "Reds Grow Bolder on Campus," Copley News Service, Pamphlet, Reprinted from *The San Diego Union*, 1969, p. 5.
50. U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, p. 18.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
52. Thomas R. Brooks, "Metamorphosis in SDS—the New Left Is Showing Its Age," *The New York Times Magazine*, 15 June 1969, p. 14.
53. John Kifner, "Vandals in the Mother Country," *The New York Times Magazine*, 4 January 1970, p. 15.
54. John Pennington, "National Secretary's Report—RYM Walks Out," *SDS New Left Notes*, 30 June 1969, p. 1:1-3.
55. U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, p. 25.
56. Arnold Beichman, "Will Teacher Be the New Drop-Out?" *The New York Times Magazine*, 7 December 1969, p. 190.
57. Kevin Anderson, "On America's Responsibility for Czechoslovakia," Unpublished Article, Trinity College SDS, Hartford, Conn.: 1968, p. 3.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
59. George F. Kennan, *Democracy and the New Left* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1968), p. 134.
60. Carroll V. Glines, "Will ROTC Survive the Campus Revolt?" *Armed Forces Management*, August 1969, p. 43.
61. "Student Survey Says 67% Support ROTC in Some Form," *Cornell University Chronicle*, 13 November 1969, p. 1:1-3.
62. Stephen Keeney, "Why AFROTC Must Go," *Inside*, SDS Newspaper, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.: n.d., p. 1:3.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 2:2.
64. "SDS Anti-Draft Resolution."
65. Alan Gilbert, "Imperialism—the Bosses 'Run Away for Cheap Labor,'" *SDS New Left Notes*, 20 September 1969, p. 7:2.
66. Feuer, p. 285.
67. Frank Pinner, "Tradition and Transgression," *Daedalus*, Winter 1968, p. 139.
68. Brooks, "Metamorphosis," p. 32.
69. "U.S. 1970: the Radical Underground Surfaces with a Bang," *The New York Times*, 15 March 1970, sec. 4, p. 1:3.
70. Garry Wills, "The Making of the Yippee Culture," *Esquire*, November 1969, p. 266.
71. Howard T. Robinson, "Are Our Institutions Flexible Enough?" *Naval War College Review*, May 1969, p. 66.
72. Kennan, p. 11.

