

# COMMITMENT

a journal of the asylum

Volume 1, Number 2

October 18, 1966

## Big Game: Draft

## Tests Stanford

By Cyril Sia

# Riot by the Bay

By Robert Hass

After the riots at Hunter's Point, the Democratic mayor, Jack Shelley, went on television and attacked the discriminatory practices of the unions which had supported his election. Civic leaders began trying to find jobs for the angry young Negroes who had been throwing rocks and shooting guns at them a week before. This flurry of activity was accompanied, clearly, by a sense of relief, for the rioting in Hunter's Point did little damage and was, by any standard, a long way from the bloody insurrection in Watts.

All this should be encouraging, but I confess to the suspicion that the mayor and the labor bosses had prepared the script for his television appearance by the beginning of June. Official San Francisco knew that there was bound to be a riot sometime this summer and they knew that the Jim Crow unions in San Francisco are an expression of rank-and-file sentiment. The small, manageable Hunter's Point rebellion provided them with an opportunity to do what they could not do otherwise: open the unions to Negroes and get Federal money to create jobs.

At the Vanguard

Officer Alvin C. Johnson, gun in hand, stood, as it were, at the vanguard of civil rights progress in San Francisco. And that fact indicates, surely, that the jobs which everyone is now anxiously talking about have little to do with the disease that erupted in the southernmost part of the city.

I don't know the Hunter's Point project very well. I know a couple of cops who work in the projects and a few people who live in Bayview. Portrero Hill, which cuts the projects from view just south of Market and into which project Negroes have made their way, I know very well.

Immigrant Home

The Portrero was the home of the Irish and Italian immigrants who supplied the city's work force in the first half of this century, and many of those who have survived the Union Iron Works strikes in the twenties and the waterfront labor wars in the thirties still live there in a working class version of San Francisco's magnificent and peculiar Victorian grandeur.

It was in the Portrero at one of those Democratic Party spaghetti feeds which were always being announced from the pulpits of the Catholic churches that I first heard, when I was much younger, one of the favorite jokes of Irish politicians. Senator Eddie Maloney (he was

an assemblyman, but in San Francisco, south of the Slot, all assemblymen are called, honorifically, Senator) took an immense political dinner cigar from his mouth and drawled to a party hack who had asked him a question, "Don't call 'em cops; call 'em constituents."

The Senator is an old man now and the old men in the Portrero no longer gather on street corners because that is where the young Negroes gather. In their parlours you can still find them or on Market Street in the afternoons sporting plaid ties and plaid flannel shirts.

(Cont. p. 6, col. 1)

# A Berkeley View of HUAC

By Jerry Rubin

My reaction to a subpoena from the House Un-American Activities Committee was fairly typical of my generation. Someone described it as "subpoena envy." Those who were lucky enough to receive subpoenas had gleams in their eyes, and looked for the nearest TV camera, while those who were overlooked developed political inferiority complexes and began to think that maybe they hadn't done enough to damage America's military efforts in Vietnam.

That's quite a blow to a society which doesn't use concentration camps, book burning, and physical repression to discourage dissent. America's tactics are more subtle and more effective. America tries to scare. America tries to smear. America whispers behind the back, points the finger, and destroys the reputation. But our response to HUAC was to laugh and to say more, more. Give us more of the good old-fashioned publicity. Witnesses were pulled off the stand because they had more to say and I was yanked from the room when I objected to not getting a turn at bat.

No Longer Potent

HUAC no longer seemed so potent or useful. No one was scared of it. And the left no longer seemed so secretive or dangerous. It had nothing to hide.

The HUAC hearings beautifully symbolized this deep cleavage in American life--this deep generational cleavage. Two Americas faced each other, eager to do combat, to draw blood. There was no common ground. Parental America stood on the congressional pedestal trying to slap the hand of rebellious youth. Mind your manners, be grateful for what you've got,

(Cont. p. 3, col. 1)

The Stanford administration plans to give the Selective Service Test once again on November 18 and 19. Last year the University's cooperation with the conscription system precipitated a sit-in in the outer offices of President Wallace Sterling. At that time spokesmen for the Stanford Committee for Peace in Vietnam (SCPV), the Graduate Coordinating Committee (GCC), and the sit-in group declared that it was not "the honest function of any institution, and particularly of the University, to comply with the Selective Service System, whose criteria for selecting men to kill and be killed discriminates against the poor, the uneducated, and the racial minorities." The group also demanded that the University withhold all grades and class standings from the Selective Service System and that the University cancel all future draft tests.

The issue was partially resolved by the June 10, 1966 resolutions of the Stanford Academic Council, a body which includes all members of the faculty. The Council decided to permit the draft tests but urged that students themselves be heard on this issue which not only affects their lives, but compels them to cooperate with the injustices of the present system of conscription. They also advised President Sterling to find ways of acting in concert with other universities to end the use of grades as a Selective Service criterion.

So the draft exams will be given again, and after the fire last time, we may be in a position to consider the issues more calmly. There is no question that the Selective Service System discriminates against the poor. This fact the Academic Council admitted implicitly, and officials from Robert McNamara to President Sterling have echoed their concern. The problem is What Now? And the answer has already been provided by the Academic Council resolutions. Critical discussion of the role of the University vis-a-vis the draft should be initiated and that discussion should terminate in a campus-wide referendum on whether or not to hold the draft test on University property.

The issue is a painful one for most of us. It is not the justice of the war in Vietnam, although the war is monstrously unjust. It is whether the university as an educational institution dedicated to humane ideals can cooperate with the victimization of the poor. Closer to home, it is whether or not most of us are willing to be absolved from fighting a war in which most of us have not the conviction to participate by a system which sends poor Negroes and badly educated whites in our place.

Short of enlisting en masse in a war that is morally repellent and politically disastrous, there is not a great deal Stanford students can do about this situation, but we must do something, esp-

(Cont. p. 7, col. 5)



# Marcuse ...

(Cont. from p. 2)

that predominate in the political, and all other, spheres of our existence.

He would criticize Mills, I think, for his insistence on a conscious collusion of businessmen, government leaders, and Pentagon generals, a near-conspiratorial collusion which Mills sees as holding total power over our lives. For Marcuse political power is diffused, but that does not preclude the possibility of domination, which, according to Marcuse, does indeed exist in the totality of the system of domination-- a much more ominous conclusion than Riesman's. In Marcuse's own words:

As reification tends to become totalitarian by virtue of its technological form, the organizers and administrators themselves become increasingly dependent on the machinery which they organize and administer. And this mutual dependence is no longer the dialectical relationship between Master and Servant, which has been broken in the struggle for mutual recognition, but rather a vicious circle which encloses both the Master and the Servant. (ODM, p. 33)

## Impact of Technology

The impact of technology on our way of life is perhaps most apparent in the nature of our economy, its modes of production and distribution. Our economy, according to Marcuse, is a part of the system of domination in that it depends on the satisfaction of material needs in a world of relative scarcity of resources. The domestic problem is suggested by the phrase, "satisfaction of needs," for it has become increasingly clear that the concept of needs has been expanded to meaninglessness by an economy which constantly seeks to increase production.

It is perhaps not too arbitrary to distinguish between true and false needs in accordance with Marcuse's definition:

"False" are those which are superimposed upon the individual by particular social interests in his repression... Their satisfaction might be most gratifying to the individual but this happiness is not a condition which has to be maintained and protected if it serves to arrest the development of the ability (his own and others) to recognize the disease. The result then is euphoria of unhappiness. Most of the prevailing needs to relax,

to have fun, to behave and consume in accordance with the advertisements, to love and have what others love and hate, belong to this category of false needs. (ODM, p. 5)

The most alarming implication is that the individual is unable to perceive this distinction between true and false needs. In our society, the power of enculturation is so strong and the process of want-creation so effective that perception of needs is limited almost solely by the contingencies of income and role fulfillment.

A number of economists have expressed grave concern about these problems, the first of whom was probably Thorstein Veblen who described the phenomenon of conspicuous consumption and the eternal race between the quest for profits and overproduction. A more recent critic of some of the more deleterious aspects

of our economic system is J.K. Galbraith (The Affluent Society) who sees the problem of overproduction as the product of (besides general technological advance) two stimuli: business's desire to increase profits and government's responsibility to reduce the social and economic tensions of unemployment.

The result of this overproduction, according to Galbraith, is the phenomenon of want-creation or what Marcuse calls the stimulation of false needs. In this process, advertising is especially culpable, for it promotes consumer consumption as the primary criterion of status. Marcuse echoes Galbraith when he says,

Late industrial society has increased rather than reduced the need for parasitical and alienated functions (for the society as a whole, if not for the individual). Advertising, public relations, indoctrination, planned obsolescence are no longer unproductive overhead costs but rather elements of basic production costs. In order to be effective, such production of socially necessary waste requires continuous rationalization-- the relentless utilization of advanced techniques and science. Consequently, a rising standard of living is the almost unavoidable by-product of the politically manipulated industrial society. (ODM, p. 49)

## Growing Disparity

The problem, therefore, is that production is now valued over the goods that are produced. Hence the growing disparity in resource allocation between the private and public sectors of the economy simply because the private is more susceptible to stimulation and manipulation. For Galbraith, the problem is illustrated, for instance, by the amount of cosmetics our society consumes as opposed to its expenditures on higher education. Or, to put it another way, it has become painfully clear that it is easier to sell automobiles than rapid transit systems no matter what the relative social costs involved.

In sum, our advanced industrial and affluent society has moulded a population of Pavlovian automata whose material needs and wants are stimulated, manipulated, and even created in an interminable race to consume the goods produced by a system of production that has become increasingly prolific as technology advances.

The problem of the loss of oppositional and critical thinking is central to this discussion. According to Marcuse contemporary society is quite explicitly accepted and applauded by those whom it dominates and manipulates:

It is a good way of life-- much better than before -- and as a good way of life, it militates against qualitative change. Thus emerges a pattern of one-dimensional thought and behavior in which ideas, aspirations, and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action are repelled or reduced to terms of this universe. (ODM, p. 12)

The condition of "one-dimensional thought" is reflected in the ontology and epistemology which today dominate the primacy of operationalism in the physical sciences and behaviorism in the social sciences. Both share a totally empiricist and positivist and therefore non-critical outlook.

The insistence on operational and behavioral concepts turns against the efforts to free thought and behavior from the given reality and for the suppressed alternatives. Theoretical and practical Reason, academic and social behaviorism meet on common ground: that of an advanced society which makes scientific and

technical progress into an instrument of domination. (ODM, p. 16)

Here Marcuse establishes the crucial ideological link between the philosophic assumptions of technological rationalism and the system of political-economic domination which is the American system, the link between one-dimensional society and one-dimensional thought.

# Draft...

(Cont. from p. 1)

cially because the university administration is so reluctant to do anything on our behalf.

The administrators are, apparently, afraid of taking what seems to be a political stand on the war, but by refusing to act they are in fact taking an implicit stand both on the war and on the draft in its present form. And they are in this position, at least in part, because we have not taken into our hands a decision that is, as the Academic Council implies, properly our own.

We can ask the administration to move the draft exams off the campus and we can make it clear that, in doing so, we are making a protest against the present inequities of the draft system in the hope that our protest will expedite reform. The University need not be a halfway house between the ideals of American society and the injustices which make those ideals seem lurid and hypocritical. The referendum (which is hardly a great step forward) would at least assert that fact and dramatize the contradiction between our ideals and our actions.

If the referendum is passed, it will impose on those of us who wish to take the test the nuisance of having to cross the El Camino Real to do so, but that, surely, is a small enough price to pay. And if we will not do this much, then we might as well terminate the rest of our talk about the great society, about civil rights and justice and educational reform, and settle down to becoming the useful products and future leaders our society has spared us to become.

## The Specter

And you are no place,  
My shadowless companion,  
Inertia, lethargy  
(What shall I call you?),  
The indiscriminate  
And nameless,  
Quietly lethal.  
Catalytic,  
You claim me,  
Unmoved mover,  
With apparent claims,  
Familiar as breath is,  
Sometimes, in stillness,  
I near your faithful semblance  
But only find you distinct  
When you have vanished.

-- Kenneth Fields