

CACC

NEWSLETTER

June 1, 1970

[GUARDIAN OFFICE ATTACKED](#) GUARDIAN OFFICE ATTACKED

[CONSERVATIVE AND TRADITIONAL VIEWS](#)

[JERRY RUBIN](#)

[KUNSTLER CONTINUES TO PROMOTE BLOODSHED](#)

[CARTOON OF HERBERT MARCUSE](#)

The *Guardian* is a major source of inside information on the ideas and activities of the communists, anarchists, and associated revolutionary radicals. It has attempted to present the points of view of all elements within the Left. This has proved to be an impossible task.

The anarchists have invaded the premises of the *Guardian*. The attack was launched because the editorial writers of the *Guardian* favored the communist program of violence over the anarchist program.

The anarchists preach and practice individual terror including bombing, assassination, and kidnapping while the communists favor mass violence. Editorials in the *Guardian* had criticized the actions of those bombing buildings in New York and had stated that they were not in the long-range interest of the revolution.

The invasion is described in the *Guardian* of April 18, 1970, under a large heading "Guardian Office Attacked." Portions of the report are as follows:

"The *Guardian* was published clandestinely this week.

"At this writing, the *Guardian's* tenement office on East 4th St. in New York City's Lower East Side is empty following the violent invasion of about 50 assorted ultra-leftists, anarchists and other self-styled 'revolutionaries' who broke into the barricaded building about noon April 12 in an effort to prevent this issue of the *Guardian* from going to press.

"*Guardian* workers have not re-entered the building because they are attempting to publish the paper at a secret location. It is not known whether office equipment, files and other publishing tools have been stolen or destroyed.

"The invasion came after three days of picket lines, door blockades and other harassment outside the five-story building by an element that terms itself the 'Movement' but which has come under increasing criticism from the *Guardian* for adventurism. A recent *Guardian* Viewpoint condemning individual terrorism is known to have inspired some of the invaders to take action. They had vowed to block publication of the *Guardian* under its present political direction and to establish a 'liberated *Guardian*' more in line with their own politics.

"Differences between the *Guardian* and certain sections of 'the movement' made themselves apparent last spring and summer when this newspaper began to adopt a critical attitude toward 'left' adventurism and the substitution of small group revolutionary action for mass revolutionary struggle with the working class as the central force. . . In August, the *Guardian* position on the antiwar movement matured to an understanding of the primary necessity of building a broad united front around the issue of immediate withdrawal and for the continuing need for mass demonstrations against war, as opposed to the primacy of much

smaller ‘revolutionary’ actions against the war. The *Guardian’s* attack on the Weatherman group and its adventurist line continued this political progression. . . The editorial on individual terrorism a few weeks ago—wherein the *Guardian* sought to expose how such terror tactics defeat revolutionary objectives—was strongly criticized by some sections of the movement.

“The assailants failed, of course, to stop publication, but did manage to delay publication briefly. Anticipating an invasion and an effort to wrest control of the nation’s largest radical newsweekly from the hands of the staff cooperative, the *Guardian* decentralized its production apparatus to several other locations two days earlier, while maintaining a small crew of staff members barricaded within the building for defense and to give the impression that production was continuing as usual.

“The confrontation Sunday, April 12—the *Guardian’s* usual deadline for production—began with a picket line in the morning. At around 11 a.m., three men were observed trying to break into the back window leading into a vacant printing shop on the first floor. Shortly afterward, three other men carrying knives began climbing the fire escape to the top floor, which is used for storage, in order to break in from the top. They brandished their weapons at *Guardian* defender Steve Torgoff, 23, who tried to intercept them from a window.

“Moments later the mob broke into the top floor. The defenders—Carl Davidson, 26; Marion Munsell, 65; Leslie Sinsley, 24; Rod Such, 24 and Torgoff—raced to the fourth floor landing with improvised clubs to confront the intruders, who were pouring in by this time, outnumbering the *Guardian* workers about 10 to one.

“Such ran half-way up the stairs, followed by the others. Waving a crowbar, he demanded they leave immediately or ‘the first ones down these stairs are going to get their heads smashed. . . Who wants to be first?’

“The mob was held at bay temporarily and a political debate, laced with insults, ensued. Marion Munsell, a wrench in her hand, climbed to the front of the defense line. A six-year member of the *Guardian* staff, she sought to reason with the mob, telling how much she has learned from the youth movement, urging that they curb their impatience and ‘take a longer view’ of social change.

“Someone shouted: ‘Get out of the way, Grandma.’ Others jibed, ‘Look at the men using a woman to front for them,’ to which Munsell replied: ‘I am my own woman! No one is telling me what to do.’

“At this point one of the crowd leaped over the railing and began urinating in the direction of the defenders. Davidson shouted up to the attackers. ‘Look who you’re allied with—the scum of the movement.’

“Someone shouted: ‘We are the movement. . . We’re the people.’

“‘How many Panthers are supporting you?’ Davidson asked. ‘How many Young Lords?’ There was no answer.

“At this point, Jill Boskey, an anarchist who resigned as a typesetter for the *Guardian* two weeks ago, questioned Munsell about the wrench she was carrying. ‘We’re not the enemy,’ Boskey said. ‘I know most of you are not the enemy, but the enemy is among you,’ Munsell replied, reflecting the *Guardian’s* conviction that police provocateurs were among those seeking to destroy the *Guardian*.

“They started moving down the stairs. Boskey and another woman grabbed Munsell and lifted her feet from the stairs, attempting to move her. She struggled to get free. Men behind the two women leading the move down the stairs began pushing to break through the defenders. Munsell fell on the stairs and three men fell on top of her. Davidson hit the three of them with his pole. Someone leaped on him from higher up and both went down.

“The invaders paused temporarily as Munsell extricated herself, only to resume standing, arms outspread, blocking the staircase. Sinsley brought up a fire extinguisher and it was played on the invaders as they rushed down the stairs. A brief melee erupted. The defense guard was overwhelmed and the invaders took possession of a surprisingly empty office.” Pages 1 and 10.

The paper continues to be published clandestinely. It is amazing that a small group of fanatics, who cannot maintain harmony in the production of a small weekly newspaper, consider themselves competent to direct the complex affairs of all mankind. Human arrogance knows no bounds!

CONSERVATIVE AND TRADITIONAL VIEWS

An interview between Dr. Fred Schwarz and Dr. John A Gheddes, counselor and faculty member of San Diego City College, was recorded on video tape by the educational television station, channel 15, in San Diego. This program is now being utilized by educational radio and television stations. The text of the interview is as follows:

Geddes: Dr. Schwarz, the people in America, the conservative and traditional people in particular, have been very concerned for the past few years with the growing radicalism, the violence on campus. In fact, many observers believe that's where it started, and now it is moving out into the communities. We have a general idea that the Left is responsible for this, is providing the leadership for this, but that is a large term. Could you comment or help clarify what this big “Left” umbrella really is?

The Old Left

Schwarz: Yes, these terms are frequently confusing. The Left is subdivided into what is now known as the Old Left and the New Left. The Old Left is made up of the American Communist Party and the various organizations associated with it.

Geddes: What, for example?

Schwarz: For example, the Old Left has formed many communist fronts with special objectives: to protect society, to protect the foreign born, to work against war and fascism; things of this nature. These fronts are associated with the American Communist Party. There is also a small Communist Party, the Socialist Workers Party, which is Trotskyite.

The American Communist Party has been operating in the United States since about 1920, and the Trotskyite Communist Party since about 1930.

The New Left

In the last decade there has arisen what has been called the New Left, and this New Left has largely been located on the campuses. It is represented by organizations such as the Students for Democratic Society and by new Communist Parties such as the Progressive Labor Party which is a Communist Party affiliated with the Chinese Communist position. The

Progressive Labor forms a sort of bridge between the Old Left and the New Left.

The term “Left” indicates those parties, organizations, individuals and doctrines which believe and teach that American civilization, the American system of government, the American cultural heritage, is incurably diseased and must be destroyed. It must be torn up by the roots and destroyed. The Old and New Left are united in their purpose to destroy American civilization.

Geddes: Are there some subcategories in the New Left that are maybe different a little bit?

Schwarz: Yes, there are many subcategories. There are three major subdivisions at least within the Left, and there are further divisions within each subdivision. You can go on ad infinitum. There is tremendous sectarianism and division and fighting going on within the leftist ranks.

The three major subdivisions into which we can divide the left forces are: 1) The communists, 2) The anarchists, and 3) A rather disorganized group of people who have been influenced by the teachings of Herbert Marcuse whom I call the Marcusians. The thing that basically unites these groups is the determination to destroy American society.

The Communists

Geddes: What about the Communist group? What are the characteristics of this group?

Schwarz: These three groups to which I referred—the Communists, the Anarchists, and the Marcusians—agree that American society must be destroyed but they disagree rather drastically concerning what is to follow the destruction. The Communists, who have been in existence for many years, have their theories well worked out and these theories have been tried and practiced in a number of countries. The basic difference between these groups concerns what is to follow a successful revolution; what is to be substituted for our society once the revolution has been completed.

The Communists say that when our society has been destroyed, it must be replaced by a dictatorship. They call it the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Actually, it is the dictatorship of the Communist Party. The necessity for this dictatorship, in their thinking, comes from their interpretation of human nature. Karl Marx teaches that human nature is formed in the mold of the economic system. Communism teaches that the economic system of capitalism molds diseased character, makes evil people, and therefore, when you have had the revolution, you are left with these diseased characters, and you must have a period during which they can either die off or be cured. When they have cured the disease and perfected human nature, then and then only will they be able to introduce their better society or their ideal society as they say their immediate society is better.

Essentially, the communist program is revolution and destruction now, followed by the dictatorship of the Communist Party which creates a system which they call Socialism. In the communist dictionary, Socialism is the first stage which will lead to the second stage of communism. Socialism is a period of forced labor. The slogan of socialism is, “From every man according to his ability; to every man according to his work.” They think labor is the great therapeutic which will cure the selfishness of human nature, and when human nature is perfect, then and then only will communism be able to come into being. The slogan of communism is: “From every man according to his ability; to every man according to his need.”

Communism works for a revolution now and postpones the ideal society into the indefinite future. That is the big difference between the communists and the anarchists.

The Anarchists

Geddes: What about the anarchists? How do they—

Schwarz: the anarchists are a very significant, destructive, and revolutionary force. Many people think there is not much difference between the communists and the anarchists, but if we look at the two historically, communists and the anarchists have been fighting and killing each other for a hundred years. The first international broke up because of a conflict between Marx, the communist, and Bakunin, the anarchist. Lenin rose to power in Russia in conflict with the anarchists; he organized the Bolsheviks while he was arguing with and fighting the anarchists. Attacking the anarchists, Lenin said: “The anarchists have two laws. Law No. 1 is: ‘There shall be no laws.’ Law No. 2 is: ‘Law No. 1 is not binding.’”

When the communists (Bolsheviks) conquered Russia, the first group they exterminated consisted of anarchists.

Geddes: Is this a characteristic pattern, that the communists tend to—

Schwarz: Yes, it is. The anarchists are the allies of the communists in the revolution and the victims of the communists after the revolution, because the anarchists are great destroyers but they can’t build anything. Their doctrine of human nature is different from the communist doctrine, and it teaches that human nature is perfect now; that human nature now is fundamentally good, and the apparent imperfections of human nature are due to the distortions caused by authority. If you can abolish all authority, the harmony and perfection of human nature will immediately manifest itself.

Geddes: This must be rather attractive to some of our permissively raised youth.

Schwarz: The phenomenon of the last decade has been the revival of anarchy. We thought that the last gasp of political anarchy was in the Spanish Civil War. We didn’t hear of it for 20 years, and suddenly the woods are crawling with anarchists.

It is very easy to understand the appeal of anarchy to a youthful mind—“Do what you like under all circumstances.” You don’t need any training to become an anarchist. You can become an anarchist overnight simply by going into spontaneous revolt against all authority and doing what comes naturally.

Today there is a rebirth of anarchy. If you go to any radical meetings, you will almost certainly see the black flag of anarchy and the red flag of communism. The anarchists are very well represented in the New Left, in the Students for Democratic Society and in the forces promoting the riots and chaos. Historically the anarchists have always been prone to the use of individual terror such as bombing and assassination. Consequently, anarchy is a very significant and devastating factor in the forces of destruction of American at present.

There is a third group which is rather unique historically.

The Marcusians

Geddes: The Marcusians?

Schwarz: Yes, this Marcusian doctrine is a fascinating one because it introduces a new concept and a new element in the revolutionary process. Herbert Marcuse has faced a fact, which from the Marxian point of view, is most unpleasant. That is that capitalism is not creating its own gravediggers; that the working class and the workers are not revolutionary.

Marcuse says that the workers now have developed an instinctive attachment to capitalism. He says that the workers have become so attached to their automobiles, television sets and household gadgets that they have an instinctive attachment to capitalism and this makes them a conservative force. Therefore, you have to find an alternative revolutionary force, and Marcuse has developed a theory of revolution of the instincts—instinctual revolution. He has mixed the immiscibles in that he has recruited Sigmund Freud into the service of Karl Marx. He has taken the Freudian theory of the instincts and developed from it a technique which shows how civilization can be destroyed.

Geddes: But Freud thinks that communism is no good.

Schwarz: Freud is very definitely against communism because he says that in terms of human nature, it can't work. But Marcuse has found a teaching in Freud which can be used for the destruction of our society. Freud teaches that human energy comes from the instincts, and that there are two basic instincts, the sex instinct and the death instinct. The sex instinct gives rise to Eros and the life forces while the death instinct gives rise to aggression and the destructive forces. Freud says the energy of civilization is derived from these two instincts.

Discussing sex, Freud says that civilization can only exist if sexual indulgence is limited to monogamic, patriarchal, reproductive sex and all other forms of sexual indulgence are prohibited so that the energy that could have been expressed through them will now be available for the constructive work of civilization. Freud stresses over and over again that sexual license will destroy civilization.

Freud's objective was to sustain civilization, but the objective of Marcuse is to negate or destroy it. If Freud's teaching is true, sexual license will deprive civilization of its energy and bring about destruction.

Marcuse advocates the resexualization of the human body so that it becomes an instrument of pleasure instead of work. He promotes instinctual revolt which is based on such things as sexual indulgence and the general rebelliousness of the youth. He advocates "the great refusal" to accept the norms of society.

Marcuse attempts to answer the question, When present society has been "negated," what will replace it?

Geddes: What do you mean by "negated?"

Schwarz: He takes this from the Marxist-Hegelian terminology which teaches that there is a dialectical relationship in any situation. There are two forces in conflict with each other. There is the established force which is called positive, and there is a force seeking to destroy it which is called negative. Progress takes place in terms of the negation of the positive by the negative and ends with the destruction of the positive and a qualitative change. It is very complex; it is technical Hegelian-Marxist dialectical language, but negation of society essentially means its destruction.

When the question is asked, When American civilization is destroyed, what is going to replace it? Marcuse has a rather strange answer: "Use your imagination!"

Geddes: That could mean almost anything, but he must have some idea. What do you think that he would use in his imagination?

Schwarz: It is a mystical answer, but the Marcusians have used it as a slogan. During the French Revolution one of the slogans of the French students was, “All power to the imagination.”

What Marcuse imagines the new program will be, he has revealed in his book “Essay on Liberation” on page 89. It shows a remarkable similarity to the communist program. He discusses the organization of society after a successful revolution and the role of the anarchists. He says that anarchism by itself can never be a fully revolutionary force because such a force must be organized. He says that the anarchists have their part to play in the revolution, but they will be fulfilled in the revolutionary process itself. Once the revolution takes place, the anarchists have had their day. He stresses that the residual anarchist sentiment, which is against domination, will still have its influence because it will tend to make the “first phase” of the post-revolutionary society as short as possible, and he defines this “first phase” as the “authoritarian, bureaucratic organization of the productive forces.” So Marcuse here spells out a program—revolution, the end or anarchism, and the creation of post-revolutionary institutions which are authoritarian and bureaucratic. I want to know what authority appoints the bureaucrats.

Geddes: Marxian or a –

Schwarz: To me, Marcuse’s formula is a synonym for the communist “dictatorship of the proletariat.” There is a remarkable parallel between the two.

We have these three forces—communism, anarchism, and Marcusianism—combining for the destruction of the state, but the only ones with an organized plan for the post-revolutionary era, and an organization to carry out the plan are the communists, so I think it is a fair assumption that objectively they are all working for communist dictatorship.

Obscenity

Geddes: The question of obscenity bothers many people. These young people use obscenity in ways that really bothers people. Is there any tactic or rationale that any of the Left has developed for this premeditated use? For that’s the way it appears.

Schwarz: Yes, Marcuse discusses this in his writings. He shows how obscenity can be used to protect the negating or destructive forces from being co-opted, which means—being won over by the existing system. The big danger that Marcuse sees is that the young radicals can be integrated into the system, and instead of becoming part of the process to destroy it, they can be used to sustain it. How can they be protected against the danger of being co-opted?

If the conversation is made so obscene that a normal discussion with representatives of the establishment becomes impossible, there is no possibility of being co-opted. The weapons of obscenity and absurdity are protective mechanisms to prevent the negating forces and individuals being won over and diverted from destruction.

JERRY RUBIN

“When in doubt, burn. Fire is the revolutionary’s god. Fire is instant theater. No words can match fire.

“Politicians only notice poverty when the ghettos burn.

“The burning of the first draft card caused earth tremors under the Pentagon.

“Burn the flag. Burn churches.

“Burn, Burn, Burn.”—From “Do It!” by Jerry Rubin, Page 127.

KUNSTLER CONTINUES TO PROMOTE BLOODSHED

Attorney William Kunstler, who commended lynching when he addressed the United Front Against Fascism, sponsored by the Black Panthers on Saturday, July 19, 1969, continues to tour the United States making inflammatory speeches to youthful audiences, promoting violent revolution and bloodshed. The *New York Post* of Tuesday, May 12, 1970, reports his speech at the New School in New York, Fifth Avenue and 14th Street. Here are some of his statements:

“William Kunstler was at the New School saying in cool tones, almost matter-of-factly, that if students want to change this country, they must be prepared to die.

“‘If you believe,’ the attorney for the Chicago seven told 1000 students jammed into the vast lobby of the graduate building last night, ‘that such matters as the war, the shooting of Black Panthers and babies starving in Appalachia are wrong, truly wrong, then you must be ready to go to the wall if peaceful protest fails.’

“‘You must learn to fight in the streets, learn to revolt, learn to shoot guns. We will learn to do all the things the property owners fear.’

“‘Right on!’ a dozen youths cried. ‘Right on!’

“‘You may have to take that final step,’ Kunstler said, ‘You may ultimately be bathed in blood. So will others, but you will have to do it.’

“‘And don’t listen to parents who say you’re interrupting your education.’

CARTOON OF HERBERT MARCUSE

In our newsletter of April 15, 1970, I made the following statement:

“One outcome of this controversy is that Herbert Marcuse has been revealed as an intolerant bigot. The student newspaper of UCSD, the *Triton Times*, published a cartoon in their issue of April 10, portraying him in this role. This cartoon will be shown in our next newsletter.”

The following letter has been received from the Editorial Assistant to the *Triton Times*:

“My attention was called to your April 15 Newsletter in which you stated that a cartoon portraying Dr. Hebert Marcuse ‘as an intolerant bigot’ had appeared in the April 10 issue of the *Triton Times*. I must inform you that the cartoon did not portray Dr. Marcuse or anyone else in particular. Rather, I believe, it portrayed a personality stereotype visualized by the artist. In any case, the cartoon did not originate with the *Triton Times*. It was drawn by Ron Cabb of the Los Angeles *Free Press* and was supplied to us by Sawyer Press, a cartoon syndicate.

“I am disturbed by the implication that the *Triton Times* would endorse such a

characterization of Dr. Marcuse. The *Triton Times* has not taken any editorial position on that issue. (The viewpoint of the editors of the *Triton Times* is only expressed in the columns directly below the word 'editorials.' All cartoons and other opinion columns express the opinions of the writers.)

"I must ask you not to publish any attribution of such an opinion of Dr. Marcuse to the *Triton Times*, and to clarify in your newsletter the fact that the cartoon neither portrayed Dr. Marcuse nor indicated the opinion of the *Triton Times*."

"Thank you for your attention, (Signed) Carl D. Neiburger, Editorial Assistant"

The statements and conduct of Herbert Marcuse revealed him as an intolerant bigot.