

SPARTACIST-WEST

Vol. 1, No. 9
Dec. 9, 1966

Published by the Bay Area Spartacist League,
P.O. Box 852, Berkeley, California

The Second Berkeley Revolt *Radicalization in Isolation*

The student strike at Berkeley, and the ferment on a number of other campuses throughout the nation, such as the University of Michigan, indicate that a significant new phase has been reached in the student revolt. Two years ago, Berkeley students sought to secure their rights of free speech and political advocacy on campus; now they seek a decisive voice in controlling their university. The 1964 Free Speech Movement revealed the total bankruptcy of the liberal administration and its dependence

on brute force to maintain its power, but that power was left intact. Now the students seek to alter that power. One year ago, Selective Service exams on campus and the reporting of students' grades by universities to the Selective Service department evoked widespread student protest. This year, Michigan students are insisting that the administration be bound by an overwhelming student vote against such exams and grade reports. Recognizing that university administrations serve the interests



While The Students Are Busy Attending Classes,
8000 Outside Agitators Secretly Plot Disruptions

of powerful forces in society at large, and not the interests of students and teachers, the students are challenging the authority of the administrators to rule on campus.

At the UC campus, this development arises out of the behavior of the administration since the FSM days, which has continued to use its administrative control to make and enforce policy decisions inimical to student interests. Indeed, the administration has been asking for it for some time since the FSM fight, and it is not at all surprising that this most immediate provocation of cops on campus was met with such a massive and spontaneous protest. Earlier in the quarter, a threat of

war non-student groups are prohibited. In a mass meeting that night to protest the arrests and the cops on campus, which began as a sympathy sit-in to the protestors in the main lobby of the Student Union, over-2000 students voted unanimously to strike. Conciliationist appeals, mainly by faculty members and a few students, were generally met with derision and scorn; they (like the administration itself) had nothing to offer in the way of alternative action except capitulation to the administration's arbitrary control of campus life. After two years of administration caprice and whittling away of FSM gains, the students were in no mood to hear talk of "reasonableness"

and three and teach strike.

Very f about quick but many FSM fight once the stand against It was t. movement down over cellor H special rulty mer. While the

STUDENTS MUST TAKE THEIR R

disciplinary action was made on David Friedman for the content of a letter criticizing the administration, and action was initiated against David McCullough for bringing student aid to the Black ghetto struggle against the Oakland School system. On November 14th, Chris Kinder, a non-student member of the Spartacist League, was arrested under the Mulford Act for handing out leaflets on campus. Finally, the administration threatened the continuance of rallies on Sproul Hall steps, a traditional podium for radical dissent on campus. Campus organizations of all political tendencies and non-political origins banded together in a Council of Campus Organizations (CCO) and gained widespread backing among students for another free speech confrontation. The administration extended its "moratorium" on action on this question until sometime later in the year because the Board of Regents voted to turn Sproul Hall into a classroom building in an obvious political move designed to ban steps rallies with the argument of "classes in progress" in Sproul Hall. The administration is banking on this trump card to divide the CCO coalition by neutralizing the faculty and liberal student majority whose main complaints are precisely such questions as the need for more classrooms, smaller classes, etc.

The strike was sparked when Alameda County deputies, at vice-chancellor Cheif's request, invaded the campus to arrest non-students among the protestors around a Navy recruiting table in the Student Union building. The table was authorized by "special arrangement" between the administration and the government, while anti-

and "meaningful dialogue."

The meeting adopted the following strike demands, which were again approved with near unanimity by the crowd of 8 to 10,000 which packed Sproul plaza at the noon rally the following day:

A general amnesty for demonstrators; a promise that the university will not call in police to break up protests; granting to off-campus groups and individuals the same rights as the Navy to set up tables on cam-

the strike merely "striking" December strike we out. It : ministra on camp in "extre coercion propriate. The facu substanti gents the cial mee ded Heyn especial ers," an ployees fired.

The a certain e student n movemer Academic and the : were a s sory one events ha point of t ulty has (stration l arbitrary however, more fr FSM, for bers, wa: ture of th of the lit

**DEFEND CHRIS KINDER!
SMASH THE MULFORD ACT!**

On November 14, Chris Kinder, a non-student member of the Spartacist League, was arrested on campus for handing out leaflets (and then falsely charged with resisting arrest). The Mulford Act helps maintain political persecution and administration power on campus.

Funds for defence are urgently needed.
Send contributions to P.O. Box 852,
Berkeley, Calif.

pus; open disciplinary proceedings for students with greater freedom of advocacy; and student participation in formulating rules for student conduct.

While the administration refused to negotiate with the strike committee on the excuse that "non-students" (Mario Savio) were on the committee's negotiating team, the official representatives of the state ruling class, from Governor-elect Reagan to Assembly Speaker Unruh, banded together with calls for investigations of the campus

l. In
the
h be-
sors
over-
rike.
culty
ner-
(like
o of-
cept
rbit-
: two
whit-
were
ness"

and threats of firings of faculty members and teaching assistants participating in the strike.

Very few students held any illusions about quick or easy support from the faculty, but many thought that the faculty, as in the FSM fight, would take a favorable stand once the students led the way with a strong stand against the administration atrocities. It was therefore a serious blow to the movement when the Academic Senate came down overwhelmingly on the side of chancellor Heyns and against the students in a special meeting attended by about 1000 faculty members on Monday, December 5. While the Senate resolutely "declare(d) that

and rightists in a crisis and their common reliance on force to maintain power. The recent strike, however, was more a confrontation between irreconcilable enemies than a process of discovery. The students mounted a strike overnight, instead of only after two months of negotiation and repeated provocations, as was the case two years ago. Distrust of the administration and resentment of its continuing power led to the call for student power; for a basic reordering of the university structure to give students a voice in the rule-making. Not so much out of fear or intimidation (which are certainly factors to be reckoned with), but out of their own basic interests as an

THEIR RADICALISM TO SOCIETY

strike
with
,000
rally
rs; a
all in
off-
same
cam-

the strike should end immediately," it merely "urged" the chancellor not to punish striking students for the events "through December 5th," thus implying that if the strike went on, punishment should be meted out. It said nothing beyond what the administration itself would say about the cops on campus, i.e., that such actions, except in "extreme emergency," and like the "mass coercion" of the strike itself, were "inappropriate to the function of a University." The faculty resolution, in fact, was not substantially different from what the Regents themselves had to say in their special meeting the next day. They commended Heyns, condemned campus "disorders," especially those "instigated" by "outsiders," and declared that all university employees who continued to strike would be fired.

established faculty in an established institution, the faculty rejected this and sought to maintain the security of their position in the established order as liberal advisors to the power structure.

After the Regents meeting, the teaching assistants and students, showing remarkable solidarity with one another in the face of their isolation (by this time, both the ASUC Senate and the Daily Cal had capitulated), decided in separate but coordinated meetings to call a temporary recess in the strike primarily because of final exams, which were only days away. Though they maintained their strength and solidarity throughout (strike committee survey's in the last few days of the strike indicated about 85% support), and though they did not capitulate but merely recessed, the students and TA's were aware of their virtual isolation, both within the academic community, and in society at large. This gave rise to strong feelings of "community," "love," and even "victory" among the students; but it was the unity, not of defeat, but of isolation. The only outside support of any significance came from the Alameda County Central Labor Council, whose executive committee granted official sanction to the striking teaching assistants union.

CT!
ion-
gue,
out
ith
elps
ad-
ded.
852,

The action of the faculty reflects to a certain extent the differences between the student movement of two years ago and the movement today. In the FSM struggle, the Academic Senate meeting of December 8th and the resolutions which came out of it, were a significant victory (though an illusory one in the long range, as subsequent events have demonstrated) and the high point of the movement. This time, the faculty has changed sides, though the administration has certainly not become any less arbitrary or capricious. The students, however, have become more determined, more frustrated, and more radical. The FSM, for many students and faculty members, was a process of education in the nature of the power structure, the bankruptcy of the liberal regime, the unity of liberals

Besides the increased radicalization of the students, the main (and perhaps primary) difference between the FSM and the current struggle is precisely this: the forces of "law and order" are on the offensive, both on campus and in society. Throughout the current crisis, the administration has sought to divide the movement by emphasizing the artificial barriers

stu-
cacy;
ating
rege-
e ex-
were
the
uling
As-
ther
mpus

The Second Berkeley Revolt

(which it determines) between "student" and "non-student" in the movement. On November 30 it sought arrest warrants for the "non-student" protestors only. During the strike, it refused to negotiate with, or have present at the negotiations, "non-student" representatives of the strike. In doing this, the administration was applying its chief lesson and victory since the FSM: the isolation of the student movement from the rest of society.

The Spartacist League, especially in connection with the arrest of "non-student" Chris Kinder under the Mulford Act on November 14th, has pointed out that this is a primary motive of administrative actions and a point which is very dear to it and to the ruling class generally. The FSM was sparked by the administration lackeys of the ruling class acting on behalf of the Bank of America and Knowland's Oakland Tribune, and other powerful elements in society who were under attack by students and the Civil Rights movement for their racist hiring practices. Objectively, the FSM served the administration's interests by concentrating student discontent and radicalism to a long, exhaustive fight on campus, where it couldn't really hurt the ruling class interests in society. This time, the administration is whipping up reactionary forces in society against the students while they are involved in a strictly campus dispute. Although the students won some gains in the FSM fight, they were unable not only to secure those gains against administration attacks in the future, but also to maintain and develop a viable link between student radicalism and the class struggle in society. The Mulford Act, passed in 1965, which has as its rationale the "protection" of the campus from "outside agitators," was symbolic of the isolation of the student movement desired by the ruling class; an isolation which has grown, with the growth of reaction generally, since the FSM.

The student movement has failed to break this isolation, and is in large measure responsible for its own predicament. While it swelled the ranks of the Civil Rights movement during the Mississippi Project and the Bay Area sit-ins in 1964, and while it led the anti-war movement to the point where vast numbers of people were not only informed about the war but opposed to it, it has failed to offer alternatives to the

two-party trap which gripped the country once again this November. The boycott of the election, initiated by dissident reform Democrats refusing to break with the Party, was symbolic of the abdication by the student movement of a political role. A socialist alternative, offered by the Socialist Workers Party went practically unsupported not only by the student movement, but by the revisionist SWP itself!

The student movement itself reflects the frustrations of the past two years, in which its efforts to change society have met with decisive resistance from the reactionary defenders of the status quo. Increased alienation from, and distrust of, the power structure has led to increased radicalization and the call for student power to institute a true "community of scholars" in the university. But the student power demand is symptomatic not only of the increased radicalization, but also of the increased isolation of the student movement. Frustrated by the failures of the civil rights movement, the anti-war movement, and the "peace" candidates, the radicalized liberal student is expressing his radicalism, as yet, only on the campus, in the form of demands that the administrators turn over their policy-making power to the students and teachers. As the Academic Senate resolution of December 5th indicates, however, a "community of scholars" is a hopeless illusion in a society where the LBJ's and Reagan's still hold undisputed sway. It is itself the product of frustration caused by defeats of efforts to alter the power structure in society through pressure tactics of protest and demonstration.

Agri-business and the defense industries will not give up their knowledge factory, and "campus disorders" will continue to be met with Brown-Reagan atrocities until an independent political movement based on the working-class succeeds in challenging their power at its source: their control of production. Radical students should orient their thinking towards the ideology of the revolutionary working-class struggle, and take their radicalism to society. --C.K.

SUBSCRIBE TO THE **SPARTACIST**

Box 1377, G.P.O.
New York, N. Y. 10001
twelve issues — \$1
six issues — 50¢

California subscribers also
receive Spartacist-West.