ably frank about his purpose. "I have attacked the conduct of many of the participants," he told his colleagues, "for several reasons, one of which is to rip away the façade of righteousness, smugness and respectability erroneously attributed to them, which allowed them to invade my home town and my state like a swarm of rats leaving an overturned hayrick."

Eight clergymen and a Catholic nun promptly called a press conference in Washington to refute the charges. Sister Mary Leoline, B.V.M., of Kansas City, said she found the conduct of the marchers beyond reproach. Letters from clergymen of all faiths, from all regions, have been pouring in to their Representatives, who obligingly place them in the Congressional Record. In the face of this avalanche of protest, the attempt to sling mud has backfired. But this will not stop the campaign to discredit the civil rights movement. The most likely next step will be to split the movement. Informers will be used; plants, masquerading as superluminals, are doubtless at work even now. Every effort will be made to isolate the movement by pushing it out of the mainstream of American protest. At the same time, renewed attempts will be made to keep civil rights within the American consensus, to tame and discipline it. In fact, its momentum may be more impeded by the attempt to domesticate it than by the attempt to smear it. Fortunately, the movement has so deeply stirred the conscience of the nation (see articles by George B. Leonard, p. 502, and Jack Newfield, p. 491, this issue) that neither effort is likely to succeed.

What Time Have You Got?

On Sunday, April 25, some 100 million Americans in twenty states advanced their clocks, thereby gaining a daily hour of light until the clocks are turned back on the last Sunday in October. But as the Transportation Association of America points out, these 100 million Americans were out of step with the other 80 million Americans who either shifted to D.S.T. at other times (or haven't shifted yet but intend to when they are good and ready), and that segment which remains on what the farmers call "God's time."

There is nothing divine about standard time, actually. The existing time zones were set up in 1883 by the railroads, whose conduct, in that era, was anything but godly in some cases. Prior to that sensible innovation, there were some 100 railroad "standard" times—eight different ones in Pittsburgh alone.

In 1918, Congress passed legislation making the railroad time zones official and charging the Interstate Commerce Commission with settling boundary disputes. The ICC still holds this authority, but daylight saving, of which most Americans approve, has thrown U.S. timekeeping into confusion. Atomic clocks can now divide one second into 100 billion precisely equal parts. Time-measuring devices can be set so exactly that two of them would diverge not more than one second in 5,000 years. Yet, according to Dr. William Markowitz of the U.S. Naval Observatory, the United States remains "the world's worst time-keeper."

It is a case of a good principle leading to a bad result. Americans treasure local option in all things, but when it comes to time, uniformity is more important than local whims. No one wants to force daylight-saving time on communities which do not desire it, but at least those that do could agree on uniform starting and ending dates. A bill before the Senate Commerce Committee, S. 1404, would make the last Sunday of April and the last Sunday of October mandatory for the transitions. If that is accomplished, perhaps in the distant future daylight-saving time or standard time can be made state-wide propositions. It would eliminate the untold confusion that now affects the railroads, the airlines, the telephone companies and a great many innocent users of these facilities.

Revolt Without Dogma

THE STUDENT LEFT

The first one now will be the last for the times they are a changin'.

Bob Dylan

A new generation of radicals has been spawned from the chrome tomb of affulent America. Any lingering doubts about this evaporated last month when 20,000 of the new breed pilgrimaged to Washington, D.C., to demand a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

These were the boys and girls who freedom-rode to Jackson; who rioted against HUAC; who vigilied for Caryl Chessman, who picketed against the Bomb, who invaded Mississippi last summer; and who turned Berkeley into an academic Selma. They are a new generation of dissenters, nourished not by Marx, Trotsky, Stalin or Schachtman but by Camus, Paul Goodman, Bob Dylan and SNCC—the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Their revolt is not only against capitalism but against the values of middle-class America: hypocrisy called Brotherhood Week, assembly lines called colleges; conformity called status, bad taste called Camp, and quiet desperation called success.

At the climax of the Washington march, arms linked and singing We Shall Overcome, were the veterans of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, freshmen from small Catholic colleges, clean-shaven in—
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intellectuals from Ann Arbor and Cambridge, the fatigued shock troops of SNCC, Iowa farmers, impoverished urban Negroes organized by Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), beautiful high school girls without make-up, and adults, many of them faculty members, who journeyed to Washington for a demonstration conceived and organized by students.

During the rally they heard the visionary voices of the new radicalism. Staughton Lynd, a young professor at Yale, who explained why he wasn't paying his income tax this year. Paul Potter, the brilliant president of SDS, who told them they must construct a social movement that will "change our condition," Bob Parris, the poet-revolutionary of SNCC, who urged: "Don't use the South as a moral lightning rod, use it as a looking glass to see what it tells you about the whole country." And there were Joan Baez and Judy Collins to sing the poems of Bob Dylan.

This is literally a New Left—in style, mystique, momentum tactics and vision. As Potter said in Washington: "The reason there are 20,000 of us here today is that five years ago a social movement was begun by students in the South." The two other major student groups of the New Left—SDS and the Northern Student Movement (NSM)—have no roots in the organizations and dogmas of the 1930s. The student groups affiliated with the old sects—Communist, Trotskyist and Socialist—remain small and isolated and are seen by the New Left as elitist, doctrinaire and manipulative. The enthusiasts of SNCC and SDS do not engage in sterile, neurotic debates over Kronstadt or the pinpoints of Marxist doctrine. They are thoroughly indigenous radicals, tough, democratic, independent, creative, activist, unresentful.

Many of the new dissenters are philosophy students, like Bob Parris and Berkeley's Mario Savio, rather than economists and political science students. Their deepest concerns seem to be human freedom and expression. Their favorite song is "Do Whenthe Spirit Is Free, and their favorite slogan is, "One Man, One Vote."

One phrase that they use a great deal is "participatory democracy," and they sing a chorus of "Oh Freedom" that says "no more leaders over me." At a SNCC-SDS organizers' institute on the eve of the Washington march, the young revolutionaries wrote poetry on the walls.

During the 1950s, the only symptom of campus disquiet was the Beat orthodoxy of pot and passivity. The Beats sensed that something was wrong with the America of brinkmanship, payola and green stamps, but lacked the energy and seriousness to do anything about it. So they withdrew into their own antisocial, nonverbal subculture to read the "spontaneous bop prosody" of Jack Kerouac. The magazines—middle-brow and slick—of the late 1950s were glutted with sociological hand-wringing about campus catatonia and excessive student concern with home, job and marriage. The label "The Silent Generation" was pinned and it stuck.

Nobody signed petitions. "It might hurt you later on," explained students weaned on McCarthyism. In 1959 Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, wrote with prophetic irony: "The employers will love this generation; they are not going to press many grievances. They are going to be easy to handle. There aren't going to be any riots."

Most of the new radicals date the birth of their movement from the first student lunch-counter sit-in at Greensboro, N.C., on February 1, 1960. In the days that followed, this pacifist tactic of non-violent direct action, which was to become the hallmark of their rebellion, spread spontaneously throughout the middle South—to Nashville, to Raleigh, to Atlanta. During the 1960 Easter vacation, 300 young Negroes, plus a few whites, assembled on the campus of Shaw University at Raleigh to found the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Roused by the first dramatic wave of sit-in demonstrations, students across the country turned to political action in the spring of 1960. Thousands marched on pickets.
et lines for the first time in their lives, in front of Northern branches of Woolworth and Kress department stores. Outside San Quentin, hundreds made a chill drizzle to protest the execution of Caryl Chessman. In San Francisco, thousands engaged in a riot against hearings conducted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In New York City, several thousand high school and college students refused to take shelter during a mock city-wide air-raid drill.

What began as an ethical revolt against the immorality of segregation, war and the death penalty, grew slowly during the next few years and began to take on political and economic flesh. Spurred by Michael Harrington's The Other America, the student movement began to leave the campus to confront the economic roots of racism and poverty. Some went to Hazard, Ky., to work with striking coal miners, others abandoned graduate school and promising careers to join SNCC or work with SDS and the NSM in organizing the black ghettos of the North.

Today, SNCC stands as the first monument built by the New Left. From its improvised beginnings in a single dreary room in Atlanta, SNCC has grown up to have 260 full-time field secretaries in the South, who work for subsistence wages. SNCC has become a magnet, pulling the entire civil rights movement to the left, pushing the NAACP out of the courtroom and into the streets, and fortifying Martin Luther King's redemptive love with social vision. SNCC's first sit-ins compelled the Supreme Court to revolutionize its definition of private property. SNCC's fertile imagination has generated the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP). And SNCC's special quality of nobility unged with madness first cracked the tradition-laden surface of Mississippi to make it a national disgrace.

SNCC has also been the crucible of much of the evolving humanist-anarchist philosophy of the new radicals: the idea that people don't need leaders; grass-roots organizing among the very poor, Quaker-like communitarian democracy.

SNCC's Bob Parris is so much an exile from leadership that he dropped his well-publicized last name of Moses last February and left Mississippi, where he was the first SNCC worker, to go to Birmingham to "talk to my neighbors." Says Parris: "The people on the bottom don't need leaders at all. What they need is the confidence in their own worth and identity to make decisions about their own lives."

Jimmy Garrett, writing in SNCC's April newsletter, expanded on the theory of egalitarian leadership:

We are taught that it takes qualifications like college education, or "proper English" or "proper dress" to lead people. These leaders can go before the press and project a "good image" to the nation and to the world. But after a while the leaders can only talk to the press and not with the people. They can only talk about problems as they see them--not as the people see them. And they can't see the problems any more because they are always in news conferences, "high level" meetings or negotiations. So leaders speak on issues many times which do not relate to the needs of the people.

Within SNCC, which has no membership, only staff, a Quaker style of consent has evolved, whereby decisions are delayed until the dissenting minority is won over. Occasionally this method causes observers from traditional liberal organizations to despair of SNCC's anarchy and confusion.

As for mounting insinuations of Communist influence within SNCC, Garrett says:

Man, the Communists, they're empty man, empty. They've got the same stale ideas, the same bureaucracy. When he gets mixed up with us, a COMMUNE does and a person develops, they're not subverting us, we're subverting them.

Like most of the New Left, SNCC is an-Communist rather than anti-Communist or pro-Communist.

Though less well known than SNCC, Students for a Democratic Society appears to be the most influential New Left group outside the South. On March 19, SDS organized a sit-in at the Chase Manhattan Bank on Wall Street to protest the bank's loans to the Union of South Africa, and forty-nine people were arrested. The April 17th Vietnam march, sponsored by SDS, attracted students from approximately 100 different campuses. And this summer about 500 SDS members will live in eight Northern cities where SDS projects are attempting to organize poor Negroes and poor whites into a populous coalition of the dispossessed.

In 1962, when it was reconstituted after a long period of inactivity, SDS was dominated by graduate students, meetings were conducted in sociological jargon, and the membership included many ADA-oriented liberals. Today, SDS has about sixty formal chapters and fifty staff members and has evolved a way-out foreign policy that opposes the West in Vietnam, the Congo and much of Latin America. Since these positions have not been accompanied by equal criticism of the Eastern-bloc nations, SDS has come into increasing conflict with its parent organization, the League for Industrial Democracy, which is dominated by social democrats and dependent on trade-union financing. SDS has also shifted its emphasis from campus recruiting to ghetto organizing and, in general, comes under SNCC's egalitarian and proletarian mystique. The group, however, has not lost its original intellectuality. President Paul Potter divides his time between graduate school and the ghetto project in Cleveland. Past President Tom Hayden, who did graduate work at the University of Michigan, is now an organizer in Newark. And one of the SDS organizers in Chicago is Richard Rothstein, a 21-year-old Harvard graduate and a former Fulbright scholar at the London School of Economics.

One of the major problems now confronting SDS is the role of those students who revitalized it in 1962 and who are now 24 to 26 years old. While they are eager for the newer recruits to become leaders, they themselves have no adult organiza-
tion into which they can graduate. Lately, the SDS internal bulletin has been filled with soul-searching essays on whether one can be a radical within his chosen profession, or whether a true radical must devote his whole life to revolutionary organizing. The long-range impact of the New Left may ultimately hang on whether or not the new crusaders can fashion in the next few years a new radical, national organization into which students can be funneled.

The Northern Student Movement started in 1962 as a band of students involved in the dual programs of fund raising on campuses for the movement in the South and of running tutorial programs for Negro school children in the North. Gradually NSM realized that the tutorial approach "treats symptoms without affecting causes," and today its field projects in Harlem, Boston, Hartford, Detroit and Philadelphia are engaged in rent strikes, block-by-block organizing and attacks on middle-class control of the war on poverty.

NSM executive director William Strickland, who wrote his Master's thesis on Malcolm X, insists: "We're not a New Left because we're not interested in a guy's memorizing Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution or some Stalinist with a line. We're interested in creating new forms and new institutions, like the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. We're interested in liberating energy, in people affecting the decisions that control their lives. Call us the New Democrats, or the New Realists."

Like most movements, the new radicalism has generated its own extremist fringe—a Pot Left, or perhaps more precisely, a Pop Left. This extremist tail of the New Left is seen in its most advanced form in the new bohemia of the East Village, in New York, although Berkeley's Dirty Speech Movement appears to have the flavor.

It is in the East Village that several thousand dropouts from society have coalesced to cheer LeRoi Jones's scorn for Mickey Schwerner 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.

So far the Pop Left seems far more interested in style, shock and exhibitionism than in any serious program. Maoist or otherwise Their gurus, playwright LeRoi Jones and writer Marc Schleifer, put SNCC down as nonviolent and middle-class. Schleifer claims he is "left of anything that exists in the world today," and that "Khrushchev is the symbol of white liberalism." They'll picket to legalize marijuana, but not for much else.

Determined to write their own philosophy and their own history, the new insurgents have become isolated from all previous generations of American dissenters. Already many of the 1930s revisionist liberals, once burned by Stalinism, have issued polemics of scorn and skepticism against the New Left. John Roche, former chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, accused the student zealots as early as 1962 of "naiveté about the intentions of the Soviet Union," and of "escapism and otherworldliness." Other Polonius-styled essays have followed from Daniel Bell, Max Lerner, Lewis Coser, Nathan Glazer, Irving Howe—and, of course, Sidney Hook, who recently issued a stern rebuke to the Berkeley insurrectionists. Many of the same writers and critics who recently eulogized the dead wobbles exorcise the much less violent SNCC workers.

Unfortunately, these unfounded attacks, plus a fierce identity of generation, have maneuvered the students into estrangement from the handful of radicals who fought so bravely through the 1950s, so that there might be a New Left today. Immediate predecessors like Socialists Bayard Rustin and Michael Harrington are repudiated on the absurd ground that they have "sold out to the Establishment"—Rustin because he supported the 1964 moratorium on street demonstrations and the compromise offered the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party at the 1964 Democratic Convention, and Harrington because he is a consultant to Sargent Shriver and Walter Reuther. The new radicals also reject the Rustin-Harrington theory that social change is achieved by an institutionalized coalition of church, labor, Negro and liberal groups re-forming the Democratic Party. The New Left sees institutions like the NAACP and the UAW as essentially impotent and believes that social progress can be won only by insurgent forces disrupting society.

The few older figures whom the new generation seems to respect come out of the radical pacifist tradition—men like Paul Goodman and the 80-year-old A J Muste. The once strong influence of C Wright Mills appears to have diminished since his death in 1962. And although they have a great hi-
den admiration for Martin Luther King, the young anti-heroes do recoil from the "cult of personality" that has sprung up around the Nobel laureate.

Five years ago, academics and liberals hunted frantically for heirs to the flickering torch of American radicalism. Now that a new generation has finally materialized, the liberals suddenly wish it were more domesticated, more anti-Communist, more middle class and less anti-liberal.

The strategists of the emerging radicalism dream of an anti-Establishment alliance of Southern Negroes, students, poor whites, ghetto Negroes, indigenous protest movements and SNCC—all constituting an independent power base of millions. Most likely they will fail in this utopian vision; certainly they will blunder as they grope for it. Perhaps the final impact of their rebellion will be small. But the impulse that drives them into the lower depths of America is the same one that motivated the Abolitionists and the wobblies. Like the anarchist strikers at Lawrence, Mass., in 1912, the new radicals want "bread and roses too."

Behind the Crime Scare . . . . . . George Shadoan

President Johnson's March 8, 1965, message to the Congress of the United States begins.

Crime is a malignant enemy in America's midst.

Since 1940, the crime rate in this country has doubled. It has increased five times as fast as our population since 1958.

J. Edgar Hoover tells us that the streets in our large cities are as paths in a jungle. The news media inform us in detail how a Long Island woman was slowly murdered by a maniac, as neighbors who "didn't want to become involved" looked on. New York subways are taken over at night by juvenile gangs who assault and kill innocent passengers. Crime statistics trumpet the continuing spiral of our degeneration. Police officials plead to be released from the shackles of the Supreme Court. We are called upon to support laws which will restrain the Court, release the police, and put the criminals in jail where they belong. Otherwise the nation will be destroyed. But the facts do not accord with this outcry, and a clarification of the real nature of the crime problem, the basis for the attack upon the courts, and the historical significance of the controversy is the purpose of this article.

Violence sells newspapers as well as television programs. Ever-mounting statistics lead us to believe that the streets are swarming with vicious criminals waiting to rape and kill. It is encouraging to note signs of resistance to this propaganda. James V. Bennett, before retiring from his quarter-century reign over the federal prison system, reported in a 1964 article, "A Cool Look at the Crime Crisis": "There is reason to believe that progress is being made in controlling crime if we study the data in depth. For example, in the past 30 odd years, the homicide rate has been cut in half, dropping from 8.9 per 100,000 of our civilian population in 1930 to 5.1 in 1962. The actual number of homicides declined for a time from the 10,500 that were recorded in 1930, and later rose again. In 1962 the total reached only 9,500 although the population had increased 50 per cent since 1930. We may conclude that the life of the ordinary citizen is a good deal safer than it used to be—despite the contrary impression created by the headlines." He also noted that despite public furor over the increase in bank robberies, the number of such crimes had decreased from 609 in 1932 to 461 in 1962, in which year the number of banks had increased by 5,300.

An N.B.C. White Paper of April 6 set forth even more pertinent figures. For example, the vast majority of homicides are the result of family disputes. The overwhelming percentage of aggravated assaults are husband-wife fights, which are not prosecuted because the wife refuses to prefer charges. Most thefts and crimes of violence are intraracial. Auto theft accounts for a considerable share of the FBI's "serious crime" category which has shown such an alarming increase in recent years, and these thefts are in fact mostly "joy rides"—temporary thefts by juveniles. The absolute increase in crime reflects, among other things, the fact that the post-World War II baby boom has reached adolescence—the age group accounting for the highest percentage of criminal behavior—rather than that moral values are disintegrating.

Throughout the nation, voices of other lawyers, criminologists, sociologists and some policemen are becoming audible in their dissent from the prevailing view. Historians agree that previous generations have been incontestably more lawless. It is also relevant that the general prison population of the country is declining, although the general population is rising. This could reflect leniency on the part of our courts, but does it?

The allegation that the Supreme Court has strait jacketed state and federal police has been widely spread and believed. And restrictions have been imposed upon the police despite protests that complete breakdown in law enforce-
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