

Those were the days, the days when the *New York Review of Books* put on its cover a diagram of a Molotov Cocktail, when the measured use of force—even violence—gave way to guns and talk of revolution, when mass movements gave way to small groups and provocateurs, when activists eagerly awaited—even as they criticized—the next explosion of the Weathermen. For the oppressed, stealing from the Man, burning, and killing became standing up, fighting back. Where conservatives sought vengeance on the sinner, and liberals found fault in sinful social conditions, New Leftists saw criminal violence as a rational response to oppression and a step in the long march toward personal liberation and social revolution.

(The following is excerpted from Steve Weissman's article "Berkeley and Freedom: Comments and Criticisms," Atlantic magazine, October, 1966.)

Many people, including FSM [Free Speech Movement] lawyers, have defended the FSM Sproul Hall sit-in as a final form of petition for ends (free speech) which everyone accepted. I oppose that view, for petitions grant the legitimacy of pre-existing authority, imply a harmonious reintegration into "the system" after redress of grievance, and suggest an ongoing consensus about ends, if not about means....

Still, the Great Sit-in was a strong-arm, uncivil, disruptive act, justified by the end of unrestricted advocacy and by the need to struggle for a free university. Moreover, force will continue to be necessary and justified as long as the American university deprives students of their voice in decisions that affect them, supports the politics of a repressive status quo, and subordinates intellectual activity to security clearances and the national interest.

(The following is excerpted from Steve Weissman's unpublished manuscript, "Not Letting the State Do Its Thing," 1967.)

Progress and order, change and stability—this weighing and balancing remains Liberalism's greatest strength, but also its greatest defect. For, in the balancing, liberals assume a possible harmony of interests among competing social groups. "Justice," argued James Madison, "ought to hold the balance" between debtors and creditors, between "those who hold, and those who are without property...."

Today's liberals are no less balanced, no less reasonable. Doves call for moral leadership of the world, for new policies in Vietnam, for negotiations with the National Liberation Front. But they offer no way out, no policy to complete U.S. withdrawal.... Throughout, the liberal proponents of "peace" assume that both sides can cooperate, that some balance can be found between the desire of the Vietnamese (the Thais and Laotians, too) for national independence and the desire of doves and hawks alike to maintain a U.S. presence ("Peace and stability") in Southeast Asia....

Order Vs. Progress

Domestically as well, liberalism's commitment to procedure and orderly process remains comfortably above the fray. The morning after every summer riot, liberals can be found nodding their heads in vigorous agreement: of course order must be regained before progress can be made. They only later discover that without continued disorder "pacification first, reform later" never seems to get very far beyond legislation to train and equip Tactical Mobile police units.

Opposition to change will come not so much from the radical right, but from the liberal center. Liberals will condemn the incivility of demonstrators, the bad taste of accusing leading statesmen of murder "(LBJ, LBJ, How many kids did you kill today?)" They will defend "free speech" and "academic freedom" against the hordes of the New Left. They will even raise the spectre of a new fascism from the left.

'Party Of Order'

Against this liberal "Party of Order," radicals might protest the inadequacy of evolutionary change, the incompatibility of progress and order, the impossibility of changing the majority's counter-revolutionary assumptions with responsible dissent.

Yet, liberal belief to the contrary, rational argument alone will never overcome the concentration of power and the ideologies which support it. Only the concerted and forceful action of a growing radical movement offers any hope at all. And that hope in turn depends upon our own conviction that, as Herbert Marcuse put it, the task "is not that of finding a compromise between competitors, or between freedom and law, between general and individual interest, common and private welfare, in an established society, but of creating the society in which man is no longer enslaved by institutions which vitiate self-determination from the beginning."



Daniel Ellsberg

Daniel Ellsberg was born in Chicago in 1931 and grew up in Detroit, where he was a scholarship student at Cranbrook School. He graduated in 1952 with highest honors from Harvard College, majoring in economics. From 1952-53 he studied at King's College, Cambridge University, on a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship. In 1954, he voluntarily enlisted in the Marine Corps in which he served as a rifle company commander, and he extended his term of service for a year in 1956 in order to accompany his battalion to the Mediterranean during the Suez crisis. He later became a member of the Society of Fellows at Harvard University, and in 1962 he received a Ph.D. in economics.

From 1959 to 1964, Dr. Ellsberg was a strategic analyst at the RAND Corporation and a consultant to the Department of Defense. During that period he worked primarily on problems of strategic deterrence and control of nuclear forces by the President. He was a member of the CINCPAC Command and Control Study, 1959-60, and of the (General) Partridge Task Force on Presidential Command and Control in 1961. He participated in Defense and State Department staff working groups serving the Executive Committee of the National Security Council during the Cuban missile

crisis of 1962. In 1964, he was sole researcher on a project sponsored by Walt Rostow, then Chairman of the Policy Planning Council of the State Department, to study patterns in high-level decision-making in crises, with unprecedented access to data and studies in all agencies on past episodes such as the Cuban missile crisis, Suez, the Skybolt decision, Berlin, and the U-2 incident.

Dr. Ellsberg was Special Assistant to John T. McNaughton, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, in the election-and-escalation period, 1964-65. He spent two years in Vietnam, 1965-67, first as a State Department volunteer on General Edward Lansdale's senior liaison team, and then as Special Assistant to William Porter, the Deputy Ambassador.

In the fall of 1967, Dr. Ellsberg returned to RAND, where he began work on the McNamara study of U.S. decision-making in Vietnam, now known as the Pentagon Papers. He remained active as a consultant to high Government officials throughout this period.

Soon after the Pentagon Papers were published, Dr. Ellsberg was indicted on two criminal counts that could have brought a maximum sentence of ten years in prison. In December, 1971, that indictment was

superseded by a 15 count indictment that named Anthony J. Russo, Dr. Ellsberg's former RAND colleague, as a co-defendant. Dr. Ellsberg now faces a possible sentence of 115 years in jail on twelve criminal counts including charges under three statutes: espionage, theft of Government property, and conspiracy.

In April, 1972, Dr. Ellsberg completed a book of analytical and background essays on Vietnam policy begun in 1970 for the M.I.T. Center for International Studies. The major essay, "The Quagmire Myth and the Stalemate Machine," was awarded by the American Political Science Association as the best paper at its annual meeting in 1970. His book, *Papers on the War*, published by Simon and Schuster, was released last year.

(The following quotations are excerpted from Ellsberg's book *The Papers and the War*.)

"What is evident is that the President's role was not passive, 'inadvertent,' nonresponsible; it did not merely reflect bureaucratic pressures or optimistic reporting, or the assurances of the adequacy of his chosen course. Contrary to most public accounts, the last two elements simply were not present in 1961. Nor were they—I found to my surprise as I looked through past intelligence estimates—present in 1950 or 1954-1955.... In each of these years of decision, what stood out from among the internal documents was the President's personal responsibility for the particular policy chosen. And in each case, as in 1961, this fact of his responsibility was concealed from the public by misleading accounts of the internal matrix of advice and predictions on which he supposedly based his decisions."

"I am speaking of the limitations not only of public awareness but of the best analyses by 'experts'—former officials, radical critics, journalists or academic specialists. No one known to me—and that includes myself—seems to possess as yet an adequate comprehension of the forces, institutions, motives, beliefs, and decisions that have led us as a nation to do to the people of Indochina what we have done as long as we have. No one seems to have an understanding fully adequate, that is, either to wage successful opposition against the process or effectively change it; or even adequate to the intellectual challenge of resolving the major puzzles and controversies about the way the process works today and has worked for at least the past quarter-century."

"Or is it possible that the American

people, too, are part of the problem; that our passivity, fears, obedience weld us, unresisting, into the stalemate machine: that we are the problem for much of the rest of the world?

"It is too soon to conclude that. There is too much information to be absorbed from the Pentagon Papers and the disclosures and analyses that are beginning to follow; too many myths and lies to be unlearned; habits too strong to be changed so quickly in a public that has let its sovereignty in foreign affairs atrophy for thirty years....

"To be radical is to go to the roots; and in Dwight Macdonald's phrase, 'the root is man.' The stalemated killing 'machine,' so far as there is one, is made of men and women, of human habits and relationships that they have made or maintained, and that can be unmade by them."

"Randolph Bourne said during the First World War, of which he was a lonely opponent: 'War is the health of the state.' But that is not true of all the branches and institutions of the State. The role of Congress, for example, is much diminished, and so is that of the courts and of the press. War is the health of the Presidency, and of the departments and agencies that serve it, the Executive branch. In no other circumstances can the President and his officials wield such unchallenged power; feel such responsibility and such awful freedom."

"What happened here was the gradual habituation of the people little by little to being governed by surprise; to receiving decisions deliberated in secret; to believing that the situation was so complicated that the Government has to act on information which the people could not understand or so dangerous that, even if the people could understand it, it could not be released because of national security. And their sense of identification with Hitler, their trust in him made it easier to widen this gap, and reassure those who otherwise would have worried about it."

"This separation of government from the people, this widening of the gap took place so gradually and so insensibly, each step disguised or associated with true patriotic allegiance or with real social purposes. And all the crises and reforms (real reforms too) so occupied the people they did not see the slow motion underneath, of the whole process of the Government growing remoter and remoter." (Quotation reprinted in Ellsberg's book from Milton Mayer's *They Thought They Were Free*, Chicago, 1966.)

Moderators

Cary Ridder is a junior in History who grew up in Washington, D.C. After coming to Stanford in 1968, she left in the spring of 1970 to work at the People's Medical Center in East Redwood City for a year and a half. She was a delegate to a conference of North American women and Southeast Asian Communist women in Vancouver in April 1971. Having returned to Stanford in the spring of 1972, she mentions poverty and women's rights among her major political concerns.

Mark Noble is presently a graduate student in the Department of Genetics, where his main interest is behavioral genetics. His undergraduate work was done at Franklin and Marshall College in Pennsylvania, where he majored in biology and philosophy, and was a campus leader in both the anti-war and environmental movements. His main political concern is the development of an ecologically viable world community.

Anne Hetherington is in her third year at Stanford, as a Human Biology major. Occasional participation in on- and off-campus peace marches, extensive work for the McGovern campaign on campus, and living at Columbae House have given her the beginning of an understanding of American politics and the importance of non-violent radical involvement. She hopes to participate in setting up clinics for those who have no easy access to doctors, while educating herself and others as to the salience of population control, ecology, and finding a cure for Republicanism.

*Kevin Smith is a sophomore in Political Science. His political experience has included three weeks with the Friends Committee on National Legislation's Washington, D.C. office in the spring of 1971, and an internship in the Washington office of Michigan Congressman Don Riegle during the summer of 1972. He plans to return to Riegle's office this coming summer. In addition, he served as Opinions Editor of *The Stanford Daily* from September 1972 through January 1973. His primary political interest is seeing that more "good" men get elected to Congress—a body which he believes, perhaps somewhat naively, is not completely beyond salvation.*



The Stanford Committee on Political Education (SCOPE) was formed last fall by people who had worked on the McGovern campaign and who saw the need for an ongoing organization to plan and coordinate projects at Stanford related to the issues raised during the McGovern campaign.

The ASSU and the Stanford chapter of the National Lawyers Guild have joined with SCOPE in sponsoring this conference.

The conference has been costly. We are presently in great debt, and would appreciate any contributions to help defray our expenses for the speakers and the booklet. Tax deductible contributions can be sent to: SCOPE, 205 Tresidder Union, Stanford, California 94305. Thank you.



