

1970

why we strike
Barnard College

some bare in baby blue jeans
 come, way from that death oven
 there, in status wonder,
 don't need to hide in the pool of
 white crystals
 or slave to a pile of signs
 petical orders
 or march dry behind no miles
 a hearted miles to crosshairs
 (admission one life only, a pin
 of blood down, and a fix a day)
 come 'way here
 way from hell of hot fire
 highway, petrichio no pools to
 minds
 seeds you up for a direct count
 calliac
 With comes they learn to walk
 brown lips, no white & white
 there ain't no innocent by-standers
 only the guilty dead
 guilty dead and guilty victims
 the only good last-remembered lives
 is a blood to be one day
 in brown day

stands in front, the blood
 first gully, hands, arms, neck
 right, fingers, white, neck, chest
 reflection, one to the bottom foot
 white, white, red, red, red
 stands in the blood, hard
 -stand, round, brown, callouses, white
 the heart, white, red, white
 to stand, red, with the blood
 red, red, red, the ground
 white, white, white, white, white
 the two, two, white, white, white
 we the blood
 we have seen, white, white
 of tomorrow
 we ain't white as y'all no more
 we ain't white as we no more
 we gonna raise from the dead
 we gonna raise all y'all from the
 the blood, white, white
 stands, cross, black, white, white
 wrapped, round, our, knees
 holdin our brains in the left hand
 our right hand, white, white, white
 bottles for our hearts

WHY WE STRIKE

GUERILLA LOVE

slushin in blood/ blk blood
 fred peggy bunchie ericka mark
 rafael frances albizo huey chacha
 malcolm rose bobby hutton joan
 bobby seale fred fred fred
 treadin in blk blood/ hard
 caked round brown callouses/ ankles
 blk blood chokin us/ nothin
 to breathe but/ spilt blk blood
 our feet touch the ground
 sidewalks hide hide/ beneath blk blood
 five ten two yrs old/ puddles of yesterday
 we are bleedin
 our lives ooze dried carcasses
 of tomorrow
 we ain't walkin on y'all no more
 we ain't walkin on us no mo
 we gonna raise from the dead
 we gonna raise all y'all / from the
 blk blood soaked earth
 struttin cross lenox w/ our intestines
 wrapped round our knees
 holdin our brains in the left hand
 our right hand rummaging broken wine
 bottles for our heart/s

come here lil baby blackness
 come 'way from that death ovah
 there, lil sistuh wonder.
 don't need to hide in no pools of
 white crystals
 or slave in a pile of alpha-
 betical orders
 or march dry behind no mules
 a hundred miles to crackerland.
 (admission one life only, a pint
 of blood down, and a fix a day)
 come 'way baby,
 way from halls of hot fire
 highway patrolin yo books & yo
 minds
 settin you up for a circuit court
 cadillac
 killin cause they fearin yo lovin
 brown lips, yo givin & sighin
 there ain't no innocent by-standers,
 only the guilty dead
 guilty dad and guilty scholar
 the only good loud-mouthed lover
 is a bleedin dyin one they say.
 lil brown baby,

GUERRILLA LOVE

we gotta gather our selves
purge cracked skulls of our blood
our blood is not for sale
blk blood ain't gonna be shed
ain't gonna be lost/ cept in childbirth/
blk folks ain't bleedin no mo
blk blood is the revolution
& i'm tellin you /
the shit is on.

come along
home
where there's no trick to turn
but food to grow
for
little
brown
babies.

Paulette Williams & Barbara Davis

May 18, 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Poem	
Preface	1
Chronology of Events	2
Barnard Faculty Statement	5
Faculty Group for Action Statement	6
Third World Coalition Position Paper	7
Statement of Graduating Seniors	8
Barnard Women's Liberation Position Paper	10
Statement from Members of S. D. S.	14
Statement of Undergraduate Association	19
Position Paper from Members of D4M	20
Statement from President of Dormitory Council	23
Position Paper from Independent on Strike Coalition	25
Position Paper from Independent on Strike Coalition	28

PREFACE

Thursday, April 30, 1970, President Nixon announced that American and South Vietnamese forces had been deployed into Cambodia.

Friday, May 1, 1970, a call went out from the people gathered in New Haven for the opening of Black Panther Party Chairman Bobby Seale's trial, for a National Student Strike in support of the following three demands:

- 1) that the U. S. Government end its systematic repression of political dissidents and release all political prisoners, such as Bobby Seale and other members of the Black Panther Party.
- 2) that the U. S. Government cease its expansion of the Viet Nam war into Laos and Cambodia; that it unilaterally and immediately withdraw all forces from Southeast Asia.
- 3) that universities end their complicity with the U. S. War Machine by an immediate end to defense research, R. O. T. C. , counterinsurgency research, and all other such programs.

This booklet, Why We Strike, was compiled by the Barnard Strike Coalition and contains position papers from organizations working in the coalition and from some independent members of the coalition. It also contains a chronology of strike events at Barnard and faculty statements concerning the Strike.

We felt it necessary for groups and individuals active in the Barnard Strike to clarify their analyses and commitments in order to, at least partially, eliminate the confusion and anger that divided the College during the Strike. It is our hope that the papers will be of help both in understanding what has happened at Barnard during the past three weeks and in arriving at a better understanding of the problems confronting our College and our society.

A CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS AT BARNARD COLLEGE AFTER THE CALL FOR A NATIONAL STUDENT STRIKE

The Barnard Strike Coalition was formed Monday, May 4. The coalition, within an hour some four hundred students strong, moved from McIntosh Lounge to an All-College meeting called by President Martha Peterson. President Peterson stated that while she was in sympathy with the goals that the National Student Movement wished to achieve, business at the College would proceed as usual. However, the students voted in support of the three national demands and also voted that Barnard go on strike, not against the College, but against the policies of the Nixon administration, and against business as usual at Barnard.

This vote was considered invalid by the Barnard faculty and administration, although about 1,200 students had participated in the decision. Therefore, Tuesday morning, May 5, President Peterson called an All-College assembly. At this meeting a document concerning optional grading procedures which had been written by the Faculty Executive Committee and two students from the Barnard Strike coalition was presented by Miss. Peterson. In addition, Tuesday and Wednesday were designated Moratorium days at Barnard College. Further discussion of what action would be appropriate for Barnard College as an institution was inhibited by the vocalized anger of some students against the College's current position, and by the failure of the faculty and administration to seriously consider the moral implications of their failure, as members of a University community, to condemn the war and racism. The students asked the College to condemn the Cambodia invasion and the war in Vietnam; the faculty and administration answered with proposals for pass-fail grading systems. This sort of communication was a recurring theme throughout the days that followed.

Professor Morton Klass urged the assembly to adopt his strong resolution condemning the invasion of Cambodia. Professor Sue Larson proposed that the College endorse the three demands of the National Student Strike Committee. After some heated discussion it was apparent that the assembled students, faculty and administrators, primarily disagreed on the first demand concerning the freeing of all political prisoners. The assembly did, however, vote to support Professor Klass' statement. Nevertheless, at the afternoon continuation of this meeting, Professor Caraley stated that the faculty was not bound by the vote in which they had participated that morning.

In order that the College might support the three national demands in more perfect unanimity, Professor Catherine Stimpson deleted the reference to Bobby Seale and the Black Panthers from the first demand and offered the remainder of the National Platform as a compromise proposal. Because of the ensuing confusion, the meeting was adjourned to reconvene the same

afternoon at 4 o'clock

At this meeting, however, a majority of faculty and administrators were absent, changing the All-College assembly into an All-Student assembly. It was announced that any decisions would not be binding for the faculty and administration. However, Professor Sue Larson's proposal in support of the three national demands in their entirety, was approved by a majority of the students. On the same day, the Faculty Group for Action was formed. This group, as opposed to the rest of the faculty, supported the goals of the National Student Strike.

Wednesday marked the final day of the moratorium at Barnard. The Coalition, disappointed that the faculty did not intend to support the strike at Barnard, decided to organize the student body on their own. On Wednesday afternoon, a letter was sent to the faculty meeting announcing that the Coalition intended to set up non-militant picket lines outside classroom buildings on Thursday. Due to faculty requests, the Coalition decided to abandon the idea of the picket lines, information lines and tables were to be set up instead.

Thursday morning, the strike at Barnard began with information tables with members of the Coalition standing behind them at the entrances of all Barnard classroom buildings. Students were allowed access to buildings but were urged to either discuss the war or grading procedures and to leave classrooms where business as usual was conducted. By 11 a.m., bomb scares had cleared out Milbank and Barnard Halls. The information lines were disbanded. Those members of the Coalition who had strongly supported information lines were disappointed at the failure of the lines that morning. They felt that the student body, without faculty support, would never mobilize itself for work on the three national demands. Therefore, some form of militant picketing as was in progress on the Columbia campus was deemed necessary. A majority of the Coalition voted to support militant picket lines for the following day. Instrumental in this decision was the Coalition's support and desire to further the six local demands of the Third World Coalition. Because of the decision to implement militant picket lines, Undergrad president, Pat McGrath, said that Undergrad would withdraw from the policy-making of the Barnard Strike Coalition, although Undergrad would continue to implement various anti-war programs as a part of the Coalition.

Friday morning, the Faculty Executive Committee called a special meeting with two Coalition representatives. The strike representatives clarified the Coalition's position on the militant picket lines, and also urged liberalization by the faculty of grading procedures. By 10 o'clock, the Coalition agreed that the picket lines were failing in their function.

The Coalition then sent three representatives to a noon faculty meeting at the faculty's own request. A Barnard alumna, '69, who was a supporter of the Coalition, explained the Coalition's position regarding militant

picket lines again. After the three representatives left the meeting, Pat McGrath addressed the body. She stated that Undergrad had asserted its independence from the strike Coalition and preferred to concentrate its energies on work for Columbia's Action for Peace group. The reaction from the faculty to these two statements was the approval of a pass/fail option in the major subjects.

By Monday, May 11, those involved in the Coalition were working on a variety of projects within and outside the Barnard community.

Other students chose to ignore the Barnard Strike Coalition's projects and worked with Columbia projects such as Action for Peace. Many students simply went home, untouched by the National crisis.

Although the strike at Barnard has come to an end, the crisis which precipitated the strike has not. It endures in the deaths of the Kent State 4, the Jackson 2, and the Augusta 6. It is perpetuated by the entrance of American and South Vietnamese troupes into Laos and Cambodia, and the spread of the war throughout all Indochina. It is with us in the continuance of racism in the United States and in the conflict between the executive and legislative bodies of our government. The crisis which afflicts our nation has been with us many years; it will exist for many years to come. It is only by our affirmation of human freedom, dignity, and justice for all people, our affirmation by our lives and work, that the struggle will be ended.

June Mee, Barnard, '71
Margo Sullivan, Barnard '71
Julie Rosenblum, Barnard '69

RESOLUTION APPROVED AT THE MAY 6, 1970 MEETING OF THE
BARNARD COLLEGE FACULTY

Whereas we, a majority of those attending a Barnard Faculty meeting on May 6, 1970, note with shock and dismay the tragic consequences on higher education, including the deaths of four college students, caused by the President's decision to widen and reescalate the Southeast Asian war by invading Cambodia and resuming the heavy bombing of North Vietnam, and

Whereas we, and other college and university faculties, have been fighting a difficult struggle to preserve the social fabric of college and university communities and to persuade our students of the efficacy of non-violent change and of the responsiveness of our political institutions to the will of majorities --

Now be it resolved that we deplore and condemn the heavy blow that the President's decision has struck against these efforts, particularly by his justifying rhetoric denying that the dispatch of troops across the border of a neutral nation constituted an invasion and by his acting unilaterally without consultation with or approval of Congress, to which the Constitution assigns the war-declaring power.

We have already expressed support for the moratorium on normal classroom activity for May 5 and 6 to express our shock and grief. We also recognize, however, the right of students who wish to attend classes again and pursue other scheduled academic activities and the obligations of the Faculty to provide instruction to any students wishing to receive it. We believe that the College's resumption of classes within the grading options authorized by the Faculty on May 5 permits any student to engage in peaceful and constructive protest and demonstration against the expansion of the Southeast Asian war, particularly activity such as that aimed at persuading the Congress to approve the Hatfield-McGovern Amendment to halt the funding of combat operations in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia and to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution that authorized American intervention in Southeast Asia.

STATEMENT FROM THE FACULTY GROUP FOR ACTION

MAY 5, 1970

In this time of national crisis there is an issue of conscience for every American. This issue is especially important for all members of the academic community. Mindless violence by National Guardsmen has killed unarmed students at Kent State University. The integrity of the students, faculty and administrators of our institutions of higher learning has been directly attacked by the highest officials of our government. National hysteria, arising from the war and from political and racial oppression is shaking the very foundations of American academic institutions. It jeopardizes the free pursuit of knowledge. In such circumstances, members of the academic community have a moral obligation to take action.

Consequently, we recognize as legitimate and valuable the protest of Barnard students against the war in Indochina and against political and racial oppression at home. We support the goals of the Barnard strikers. We support those members of the Barnard community who are engaged in other non-violent political activities. In the present circumstances we believe such activities to be an integral part of the educational process, an affirmation of basic values of the academic community, and a contribution to Barnard College. We hope that such activities will have the support of all members of the Barnard Community.

Helen Bacon	Robert McGinn	Paul Maramaldi
Peter D. G. Brown	Mary Mothersill	Ronald Grimes
John Elliff	Dorothea Nyberg	Ann S. Harris
Patrick Gallagher	Catharine Stimpson	John Snook
Serge Gavronsky	Frederick Warburton	Sylvia Sayre
Peter Juviler	Bette Denitch	Edward J. Kaplan
Sue Larson	Robert Hambourger	

THIRD WORLD COALITION POSITION PAPER

(as presented to all students of Columbia University including Barnard College concerning implementation of the third national strike demand-- an end to university complicity with war and racism-- accepted by the Barnard Strike Coalition, May 7, 1970.)

The Third World Coalition believes that the political, social, economic, and educational injustices which are being practiced in America today are rooted in the inherent racist system in this country: the Indochinese War, the colonization of Puerto Rico, the political prosecution of the Black Panthers are not just isolated incidences, but are direct manifestations of racism. The Coalition is dedicated to expose, combat, and eventually eliminate this cause. Hence, anyone who is seriously concerned with ending the war must open his eyes to the war's racist nature. There cannot be a national force to deal with the Indochinese war until we can cope with racism on the local campus and community levels. Based on this belief, the Third World Coalition will utilize Kent Hall in a nonobstructive manner as a coordinating center to further our struggle against racism and imperialism.

Specifically:

- 1) Abolition of the School of International Affairs, East Asian Institute, and other university functions that foster the exploitation of third world peoples.
- 2) Columbia University Trustee D. A. Frank Hogan drop all charges against the New York Panther 211.
- 3) End racist oppression of campus workers. Specifically, we support the demand of Local 241 of the T. W. U. for:
 - a) \$15,000./year compensation for the family of a black worker, Charles Johnson, who lost his life due to university negligence.
 - b) Job security for the Third World women workers in the dormitories.
- 4) Columbia University open up its vacant buildings to community residents, victims of Columbia's "Urban Renewal." Specifically, we demand an immediate cessation of the effort to expell Mrs. Juanita Kimble and her nine children from 130 Moringside Drive.
- 5) We support the worker's strike against the university in their demand for time off with pay to participate in the general debate around the issues during this time of crisis; only when students and workers go on strike together will this country be forced to get out of Asia.
- 6) The university strike must be continued until all the demands are met.

All Power to the People.

STATEMENT OF GRADUATING SENIORS

Students all over the country have gone out on strike over three basic issues. Many commencements have been cancelled. We at Barnard College support these issues and have decided to hold a commencement, making it a protest in and of itself.

First, we are calling for the United States government to cease its expansion of the Viet Nam war into Cambodia and Laos and to unilaterally and immediately withdraw all forces from Southeast Asia. We of the Barnard community are outraged that thousands of Asians and Americans are dying in this war. The civil affairs of a sovereign nation have been disrupted by an unconstitutional executive action. In the guise of creating a democracy, a repressive dictatorship has in effect been established. Political dissidents such as Ngo Dinh Dzu, who opposed Thieu in the 1968 national election, and others who supported a coalition government are now in jail.

The repercussions of these actions abroad are being felt at home. We have seen numerous resisters jailed for refusing to comply with the draft. We have seen G. I. coffee houses closed and their organizers jailed for six years. All dissent within the military is suppressed and stockades are overflowing. In the Presidio in San Francisco, twenty-seven G. I. 's sat down and sang "America the Beautiful" to protest the murder of a fellow G. I. by a prison guard. They received an average sentence of fifteen years at hard labor. The conspiracy dragnet enables the government to prosecute dissidents for a state of mind rather than for proven actions. Not only are dissenters being brought to trial and given outrageous jail terms on vague charges, but citizens have already been shot in cold blood at Kent State University; in Orangeburg, South Carolina; in Jackson, Mississippi; in Augusta, Georgia. In Chicago, Black Panther leader Fred Hampton was murdered in his bed by police. The seven black survivors of that police raid were charged with initiating the gun battle. Five months later, the charges were dropped on grounds of insufficient grounds. Why have no charges been brought against the police participating in the raid? This is only one well-publicized example of the deliberate elimination of the Black Panther Party in the United States. Why does a free country feel the need to eliminate such dissent? We deplore the growing political repression in our country. Therefore, we call for the U. S. to end its systematic oppression of political dissidents and to release all political prisoners, such as Bobby Seale and other members of the Black Panther Party.

Institutions have too long acquiesced in these policies. Specifically, war research has flourished on University campuses in the name of value-free

inquiry. Therefore we call for the universities to end their complicity with the U. S. war machine by an immediate end to defense research and all other such programs. Although Barnard is minimally involved in war--related research, we affirm that Barnard College and all other academic communities must not contribute to these fundamentally destructive activities.

May 18, 1970

BARNARD WOMEN'S LIBERATION POSITION PAPER

The involvement of Barnard Women's Liberation in the strike evidenced our concern that Barnard students support and work for the three national demands of the strike, and that they do this as the student body of Barnard. We felt it important that Barnard women act together politically and assume responsibility for their political actions. Previously, and especially during the 1968 strike, Barnard students who agreed with the political demands at hand went across the street to Columbia to work. This meant, in essence, that those women provided the same kind of labor to keep political activities going that women provide in any context - they typed, cooked, cleaned, lent moral support to the men, and kept quiet (or were ignored) during policy-making discussions. In other words, their significance as political and intellectual members of society was largely overlooked. As members of Women's Liberation we felt most urgently the necessity for Barnard Women to take a decisive role in the strike, because we feel that women must always assume responsibility and work independently on all issues that concern them. Women must take themselves and their ideas seriously in all situations, and especially in political ones.

It is obvious by now to most of us that the war in Southeast Asia is both brutal and inhuman, and furthermore that Americans are able to tolerate the brutality of this war in large part because they are able to dehumanize the people being killed. Asian peoples have known racism before in this country (in World War II concentration camps were established for Japanese-Americans while German-Americans were free to hold pro-Nazi rallies in Madison Square Garden). Although the motive of the Indochinese War is not racism, the fact of racism permits the war to be conducted in the overtly brutal fashion of Song My.

The same racism is apparent in the general public's response to the deaths, and to the lives, of Black people in America. Twenty-eight Black Panthers have been killed in the past four years, with little outcry even, as in the cases of Fred Hampton and Mark Clark, when those deaths were obviously murder for the purpose of political repression. Bobby Seale was chained, shackled and gagged because he attempted to serve as his own defense during a political trial. Most recently, the whole country erupted when four white students were murdered for participating in a peaceful protest at Kent State, while, when one short week later six Black people were murdered in Augusta, Georgia (and again some were innocent bystanders), the country remained virtually silent.

What is more insidious and more brutal for Blacks is that they daily face a society that finds it acceptable and unquestionable to place them in

ghettoes, to deny them adequate employment and food, to respond to them as less than full human beings. This racism is easily ignored by the larger society because, if it touches it at all, it only serves the larger society's interests (by tempering the economy, providing easily accessible and readily dismissable cheap labor, etc.). It is because the Black Panther Party so directly challenges the system that oppresses Black people that it is so necessary for that system to repress the Panthers.

It is more difficult for most people to see that women as well are dehumanized and exploited by this society, but it is an undeniable fact of life for most women. Women are constantly bombarded with advertising propaganda that insinuates that their only form of self-expression and fulfillment is in purchasing, cleaning, and being sexy. Myths about women's intellectual inferiority are similar in quality to such myths about Blacks. Women are considered closer to nature, more in tune with emotions, etc., but in fact the outcome of these myths is that women are relegated to the non-intellectual, service roles in our society. We call this dehumanization of women sexism. Sexism and racism go hand in hand to provide cheap labor and unquestioning subservience to those who benefit from them. Thus we might expect that once women were able to unite as determinedly against their own oppression and demand the restructuring of society to provide for women's total realization of their potential as human beings, that movement would be summarily suppressed as well.

Barnard and Columbia Women's Liberation released the following statement early in the strike. It reflected our understanding of the way in which the dehumanization of women, Asians and Blacks, and other non-white peoples are related and dependent on one another;

" Women's Liberation is a demand for the recognition of Women's full humanity. As such, it cannot be indifferent to war, mankind's supreme expression of inhumanity. Women's Liberation is a demand that women no longer be treated as objects. As such, it cannot be indifferent to another people's being treated as objects.

Beyond such general considerations are more specific reasons why we cannot, as women, ignore America's involvement in Southeast Asia.

A State which defines its power and influence in military terms is a state hostile to women, except as women conceive and nurture its cannon fodder and are able to "man" homefront

positions while, and usually only while, the men are away fighting. It is sometimes claimed that women make social and economic gains during wartime as a reward for their contributions to national defense. This is a spurious analysis. Some of us move into occupations and university places vacated by men. After the war we are once again pushed out of these positions and relegated to the home and to the glorified function of motherhood. This is exploitation, not progress. Although we are not drafted into the army, we are intimately involved in and damaged by this and all wars. War brutalizes all people and, within the context of this society, we are seeing reinforced sex role stereotypes of masculine aggressiveness and feminine submissiveness, concepts which we seek to eradicate. The "masculinity" of combat, the canard which tells the male that he is not a real "man" until he has the "guts" to kill another man is a pre-eminently fatal definition. As long as men value physical force and violence as a primary solution, women will be treated as unequals. We reject the image of ourselves as defenseless. WE WILL NOT HAVE THIS WAR FOUGHT IN THE NAME OF AMERICAN WOMENHOOD! For women who lose husbands, sons, lovers, brothers, the talk of gains rings especially hollow.

Out of a feeling of sisterhood with the women of Southeast Asia we must protest against this war. Women are being killed, maimed, raped and widowed in a war in which the neat distinctions between combatant and civilian do not hold, in which, indeed, women themselves appear as combatants. In this war against civilians, herbicides and defoliants used by the U. S. Government are known to cause miscarriages and the birth of deformed infants, thus extending this war against civilians to a war against all human life, now and for generations to come. An army of occupation almost invariably means prostitution, rape and degradation for the women of the country occupied. The racist aspects of exploitative sex in this war add a further dimension to the repugnance we must feel at American involvement in Asia. As Women, as Americans, and as human beings we must demand an immediate end to this war."

Recognizing how important these issues are, we felt it impossible to tolerate business as usual and ignore the issues raised by the three national demands. Understanding as well that we had a responsibility to take action as a community, we advocated a general strike for Barnard College in order that students, staff, faculty and administration might be free to take action to change the course of history in our country. We felt it especially important that Barnard, a major women's College, be

involved as an institution in the national wide strike against the war, against racism, against political repression. Finally, as members of Women's Liberation, we felt it significant, that because of the strike, Barnard women acted politically, vigorously and en masse, for the first time. Sisterhood became the unifying and fundamental principle of the Barnard Strike Coalition enabling women, despite diverse political philosophies and factional differences, to take a united stand on the issues that affect us all.

Ellen Nasper, Barnard '71

Lynda Horhota, Barnard '72

STATEMENT FROM MEMBERS OF THE STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

Why the Barnard Strike Never Struck

For a while it seemed that Barnard would strike, posters were up, leaflets were put out, armbands were put on and the strike, around three national demands, was put to a vote. And voted up. Yet Barnard never closed down and the strike was not carried through.

If one thing became clear during the course of the mass meetings in the Barnard Gym and the workshops held across campus, it was that there was no clear understanding of or agreement on the three national demands. Students were not unified in mind and could not be unified in action.

This article was written in an attempt to clarify one of the basic political questions which came to the fore during the strike, and to present the SDS position on these questions. The three national demands provide a natural framework for this discussion.

1. Barnard students demanded that: THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CEASE ITS EXPANSION OF THE VIETNAM WAR INTO CAMBODIA AND LAOS, THAT IT UNILATERALLY AND IMMEDIATELY WITHDRAW ALL FORCES FROM SOUTH EAST ASIA. Yet, they also endorsed a statement by a Barnard professor which called upon the United States to "return to the path of international law and justice." Return!!!

SDS believes that the United States has been following the same imperialist path for decades, and whether it dresses its men in battle fatigues or business suits before sending them down this path, the goal of the United States remains the same. And it is fundamentally unjust. SDS feels that the United States has no right to be in Vietnam, militarily or economically. Our government committed troops to Vietnam when a movement developed which threatened the future of U. S. economic domination of S. E. Asia (the argument that the U. S. is defending the right of the Vietnamese to choose democracy may be touching, but hardly convincing, when one stops to consider that the same government tolerates, or rather supports, dictatorships in Greece, Spain, Portugal, etc.)

Liberals would have us believe that economic "aid" from the United States would benefit the Vietnamese. On the surface, this argument might seem to be valid, as the U. S. has devastated the countryside and cities so, that the task of reconstruction would seem to be impossible without foreign assistance. But would foreign investment rebuild Viet Nam for the Vietnamese? Hardly!

We have only to look at the pattern of U. S. investment in other parts of the world to realize what path this economic "aid" would take, "generous"

loans designed to drive the country more and more into debt to the United States, development of an unbalanced economy, a flow of capital out of the country, etc. And to argue that foreign investment is good because it provides jobs, albeit wretched jobs, for some people, is like saying that peasants should be grateful to their overlords for throwing them crumbs after stealing their loaves. It simply will not do.

We have been taught to scoff at the notion that the U. S. is waging a war of imperialism in Viet Nam. Although most of us would not hesitate to call the French involvement in Indochina imperialist, many of us seem to balk when the term is applied to American involvement. Part of the problem undoubtedly stems from the fact that the word imperialism has been thrown around so much that the meaning has all but worn away. And because the word means so little to us, we feel that it cannot explain a war. "Times have changed. Things are more complicated," we think. "Imperialism is a thing of the past." Times have indeed changed, but imperialism has not withered away. The following advertisement run by our friends at Chemical Bank testifies eloquently to the existence of imperialism today.

WHEN YOU NEED SOMETHING MORE
DIPLOMATIC THAN A GUNBOAT

Times have changed. Empire builders can't shoot their way to success as they did in the bad old days. But there's nothing to regret about the passing of gunboat diplomacy: it was costly, it was risky, and in the long run it was ineffective. Today's way, the diplomatic way, is infinitely more efficient, but it depends on inside knowledge. That's why you'll do well to choose Chemical Bank as your international partner.

We know the people who count in the places that matter in more than 145 countries. Their first-hand advice, together with our experience in international finance will help you establish your-self diplomatically and decisively in any of the world's markets.

Whenever you plan to widen your business interests, start by talking to one of the London branches of Chemical Bank.

We must learn that liberal diplomats, the "enlightened empire builders" and the generals are all working for the same end, they merely employ different means.

2. Barnard students demanded (reluctantly) that the UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT END ITS SYSTEMATIC OPPRESSION OF POLITICAL DISSIDENTS, AND RELEASE ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS SUCH AS BOBBY SEALE AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY.

Yet they found a modified version of this demand which was proposed by a faculty member, much more palatable; the second version omitted mention of BPP members and did not demand the immediate release of political prisoners. The demand as it reads in full was only passed late in the afternoon, when many students had left the meeting.

This disagreement and lack of support on the Panther issue reflected (1) a lack of understanding of what repression is, why and when it occurs, and (2) a lack of understanding of racism, especially the role racism has played in the history of political movements in this country.

Repression is a lot more than a denial of one's civil liberties; we did not raise this demand in defense of freedom of speech. In America freedom of speech is always allowed until it turns into freedom of action, action for better living conditions, safer working conditions, higher pay, or an end to unjust wars. There have been many movements which have threatened such actions, and some which have carried it out, and all have met with repression. We fight it now not because Bobby Seale has "a right to speak" but because he is needed. We cannot allow the government to abscond with the leaders, and intimidate the rank and file, of our movements; if we do, our attempts at progressive action will go the way of all the rest, successfully intimidated, divided, and destroyed.

Strangely enough, much of the sympathy for the students shot at Kent State seemed to stem from the fact that they were depicted by the press as being "innocent" bystanders, people "innocent" of fighting against the war. Would the killings have been more justified if the victims were not innocent of war protest?!! Was the slaying of six ghetto dwellers in Augusta more acceptable to us because these six were "guilty" of rebelling against atrocious living conditions??

There is one gimick that those in power have been able to use with distressing success to make political repression "acceptable" to the American public: it is chauvinism, be it national, racial, religious or sexual. It is the ideology of superiority which teaches us to say, "I'm not capable of doing such outrageous things, but who knows what those Jews/Blacks/Immigrants/Women might do?" Mad bomb plots and fantastic murder attempts have been charged to Irish, Italians and

Eastern Europeans who were in reality heroic fighters for unions and a better life for working men and women. Two Jewish Communist sympathizers were framed up on an atomic bomb spy plot, so that the government could say: These Communists who (ahem) to be Jewish have sold your country to the Russians! Today we are told that the Panthers are out to bomb the Bronx Botanical Garden. Sounds familiar.

Blacks today, like national minorities in the past, are the most exploited part of the working population. With the worst jobs, lowest pay and worst housing, of course they are fighting back the hardest, hence they are the first to experience repression. Racism, antisemitism and nationalism have made that repression successful in the past.

Right now, though students hate to admit it, those same attitudes threaten to make it successful right now. We hesitate over the Panther "plot" to blow up the Botanical Gardens the way people hesitated over frame-ups of so called terrorist labor leaders, or atomic bomb secrets.

An even more serious example of racism is the reaction to the killing of the six working class blacks in Augusta, Ga. It happened a week after the Kent State killings, yet there was no reaction to the "Augusta 6." Why?! A rebellion against miserable ghetto conditions is an act much more politically significant than any campus strike, yet students could not view it as political repression worth fighting. "Oh well, they were looting after all, they were breaking the law." After a certain point, all effective political action means breaking the law.

III. Barnard students demand: AN END TO UNIVERSITY COMPLICITY WITH THE WAR.

Yet, they insisted that we were engaged in a strike of, rather than against, the University. To say that you are not striking against Andrew Cordier, the trustees of the University and the rest of the administration, and yet to say that you are striking to end counterinsurgency research and military research simply does not make sense. The trustees belong to the class that is fighting ruthlessly to control South East Asia and the trustee's administrators are doing their best to run an institution which will help them achieve that end. To say that you are striking against political repression but are not striking against a university notorious for its anti-union activities, does not make sense. As students we could't strike against the U. S. government and as students we would not strike against the university that represented that government. What was there left to do but drift back to work or go on vacation?

Though the strike failed, it had some positive aspects: Students realized for example, the necessity of spreading the ideas of the strike to the rest of the country, to the people who make this country run. It is one thing, we realized, for students to refuse to go to classes, and quite another for workers to refuse to go to work. We know which group has more leverage!

SDS agrees that the fight against imperialism must be fought by the working class. We further feel that students can best reach those workers close to us, campus workers. This is what SDS tried to do when it formulated its national program last fall around building a Campus Worker-Student-Alliance, and worked steadily toward that end all year. Here at Columbia University, many students helped campus employees fight firings, bad conditions and racist supervisors in the cafeteria, by organizing boycotts and picket lines, and all the demands were won. What is more, Columbia is the only University in the country where campus employees, both library and maintenance crews, struck in support of the student strike, against the war. In participating in the Campus Worker-Student-Alliance many students have learned for the first time about conditions working people face in this country, how closely connected to the war these worsening conditions are, and we were able to talk freely with these workers on political issues. The experience proved to many that what SDS has been saying is correct, that students and workers have much to learn from each other. Moreover, we discovered how racism is used right here on campus, by giving primarily Black and Latin employees the most unskilled jobs at the worst pay. (And there is no mistaking the role of the University administration in this issue!) Winning students and white workers to fight specific incidents of racism was a step forward for all concerned.

Next year at Barnard, we would like to build the same sort of alliance between workers and students on campus. It is our way of beginning, in the most concrete way we know, to build a nationwide alliance between black and white workers and the now student-based anti-war movement, to really end the war and fight for better lives for millions of working people around the world!

BUILD A WORKER-STUDENT-ALLIANCE!
FIGHT RACISM!

STATEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE ASSOCIATION

INFORMATIONACTIONUNDERGRAD ASSOCIATION
EXEC BOARD

We hope that this strike will maintain a unanimity of purpose, while permitting students with diverse views to establish their own priorities for action. In keeping with the intent of protesting national pro-grams of military involvement, political repression and war research, we offer these opportunities for constructive political action.

1) Continuing campaign to influence Congressional and Presidential decisions through letter-writing, with messenger delivery by Barnard students to Washington offices.

2) Work for peace candidates, now and in the summer

We can place you with New York campaigns now, and advise you as to the crucial races this summer in your area which will need you. We hope to provide information on the voting records and views of incumbents.

3) Barnard office for Action for Peace petitions -- will distribute and collect petitions.

4) Central Headquarters for information programs

Question-answering: What bills, favoring anti-war positions, have a chance of passage? What is the faculty doing? What workshops are taking place?

206 McIntosh Center

We envision the information tables as an admirable effort to inform students of the aims of the strike and of the ongoing opportunities for participation. If this intent is fulfilled, without hint of coercion or obstruction of buildings, we support this facilitation of communication which should result.

We further affirm the necessity of action, on and off campus, in support of the aims of the strike and the achievement of peace and an end to the growing violence in the nation.

Do you have any ideas for programs, any information, anything you'd like to see done? Come to 206 McIntosh -- we can add or change our programs freely to do the things you want!

POSITION PAPER FROM MEMBERS OF THE DECEMBER 4 MOVEMENT

The student movement in America has reached a real point of maturity. The call for a national student strike went out of a New Haven meeting, and less than a week later colleges and highschools all across the country were out on strike. Moved by the expansion of the war into Cambodia and the murder of four students at Kent State, places where there had been little or no political activity--Ohio University, University of Maryland, community colleges and white working class high schools-- shut down tight. Young people from different backgrounds and with different politics, were united by anger and by the knowledge that their brothers and sisters all over the country were also angry.

But for all the anger and all the motion, one thing became clear to alot of us. Kids, the same kids who were outraged about Cambodia and Kent, didn't feel the same urgency and outrage over the murders of six black people in Augusta, over two black students shot at Jackson State, over the trial of Bobby Seale and the continual persecution and murder of members of the black community in general and the Black Panther Party in particular.

Why are we enraged over Kent, and not about Bobby? Why has the peace movement turned to lobbying congressmen when Black people are being shot down in the streets? And why were we at Barnard constantly crying 'unity', meaning striking over Cambodia and not over the national demand calling for the freedom of all political prisoners? The reason is racism, and racism is something that has to be dealt with real quick, if we don't want the Movement to die, and if we don't want all our hopes for meaningful change to die with it.

Barnard women don't like to be told that they are racists, and for good reason. Most of us are not 'prejudiced', we have friends who are black, and we support civil rights legislation. But, as much as we may not like it, racism in America is real, and it's in all of us.

The way to deal with our own racism is not by beating our breasts and feeling guilty about it, and is certainly not by denying it. The way to deal with it is in action, action dictated by our unifying belief in the need for drastic social change.

The Black Panther Party is presented to us in the media as a bunch of black hoods with guns who hate white people. But the thousands of kids who were in New Haven and who've seen the Panthers before and since know that isn't true. The Ten-Point Program of the Panthers

articulates the real needs of the black people, and the black community knows it (the Harris poll shows that 70% of all blacks in America support the Party). The Panthers know that the controlling forces in this country won't and can't serve black people, and so the Party has established Free Breakfast Programs, health clinics and liberation schools to keep their people physically and spiritually healthy. The Panthers have also made clear that the policemen in the ghetto is not there to help and protect blacks, but is there to oppress them, and to murder them (Jackson, Fred Hampton, and more). And, perhaps most important for us, the Panthers say that the only thing that will make black people free, and the only thing that will make white people free, is a revolution that blacks and whites fight together, each in their own community. The government's response to the Panthers, as opposed to its response to the non-violent civil rights movement or the student movement, has shown all of us who is the real threat, who is hitting the power structure where it hurts. Four students were killed in the heat of the moment at Kent State, but the murders of Mark Clark and Fred Hampton were planned and carried out. The Conspiracy 7 were allowed out on bail after they were convicted, but months before Bobby had been sentenced to four years in jail for doing nothing more than demanding the right to his own lawyer.

The government knows who threatened it most, who offers to both black and white people the clearest road to change. It is up to us to pick up on that, it is up to us to realize that our strength and our leadership lies with the Panthers.

The peace movement can be defused by increased troop pull -outs that mean nothing to the Vietnamese and Cambodian people, who will still be oppressed. The student movement can be coopted by clever university presidents who get rid of R. O. T. C. , but still expand into the surrounding black community at will. Our anger at Kent can continue as the summer goes on, as black people are shot down for fighting for their rights and their lives. The only movement that can't be coopted, that can't be rerouted into other, safer issues, the only movement that will hit this country where it can do the most, that can bring about a real revolution, is a movement of white students and young people in general solidly in back of the black liberation struggle in this country. If we fight as hard over Augusta as we did over Kent, over Bobby as we did over the Conspiracy, then we are strong. If we let Nixon and Mitchell and all the rest of them know that white people will not go about their business as the Panthers are systematically jailed and murdered, then those men will be threatened. If we show them that we will resist the war at home against black,

brown and yellow people as and with as much staying power as we resist the war in Sotubeats Asia, the both of those wars will stop, and it will be the people who are the winner in both.

POWER TO THE PEOPLE!

FREE BOBBY!

FREE THE PANTHER 21!

STATEMENT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE DORMITORY COUNCIL

Some could say that the strike was the last desperate cry for recognition, within the American system, of the need for drastic change. I say within the system as there were many students willing--even after taking so much oppression-- to give the system one more chance. I watch this in the energies poured into Action for Peace and the Movement for a New Congress.

I am overwhelmed just thinking about where to begin working for solutions. Even the radicals are having difficulties, the rallies are getting smaller, Bobby Seale is still in jail despite a weekend of waving 'V' signs in New Haven, and one can have a Marxist identity crisis after being smashed by a flag-wielding working man who would rather be dead than Red. SDS has gone "conservative" in the spectrum of campus politics, while D4M waits around for spontaneous revolution, much like the early Christians used to wait for the second coming of Jesus.

As a result, one finds an increasing number of students located somewhere between the New Congress campaigns and the neo-Marxists. We cannot see a new promise really reaching solid solutions, and yet we are not quite ready to hit the streets with guns, besides, the mass rallies of students with hands waving the 'V' sign are uncomfortably similar to events that happened a little over thirty years ago.

In many ways the strike has been the most exciting and at the same time, the most depressing experience for us. We can see the massive mobilization of students, and still comes the question: for what are they mobilized? Peace candidates are fine: but when they get elected, they usually get caught up in the cogs, as the war, both abroad and at home, drags on... and on. And yet we cannot see the usefulness of hitting the street and adding our names to those who are slaughtered at Jackson or Kent. Many of us have tried to talk to older people, to faculty members, and to families, but our anger and despair is met by a blank or more often, annoyed reaction. We find that our professors are more interested in giving us exams and our families most worried about our grade point averages. They tend to lump us with the riots and the bombings or worse, they say that we will get over it all, after we grow older and know better.

Most serious of all is the lack of direction, long range goals and an effective and trustworthy national organization. We know what we do not want, and yet there is the problem of what we shall put in its place. More and more we head towards advocating revolution, but we find that the Marxist models of Russia, China and Cuba are irrelevant to the present conditions in the United States.

And behind our confusion is a suspicion that Marxism in general, when applied, can be just as brutal as capitalism.

The conclusion, if there is one, is rather negative. We are angry, and we will not "get over it" unless our elders who "know better" immediately find and begin applying positive solutions to problems such as the Indochina War, racism, poverty, and pollution, to name just a few. But as they are, in part the creators of the society which contains these ills, I cannot see, even in theory, any real moves in these directions. And as I cannot find in practice small signs of change, or even the willingness to listen, the only possible results is an eventual confrontation that will be violent and bloody with nobody winning.

June Yakely Barnard '71

POSITION PAPER SUBMITTED FROM AN INDEPENDENT MEMBER OF THE BARNARD STRIKE COALITION

I chose to strike primarily because I supported the goals of the National Student Strike and felt that a large movement of this kind needed support at the beginning if it was ever to be successful in sustaining people's interest in the machinations of governments for which they alone are responsible, namely college governments, municipal, state, and federal governments. I feel that a change in the nature of university relations with the federal government is long overdue. Student and faculty dissatisfaction, an immoral war in South East Asia, and their horror at the extent of political repression can no longer be sublimated into study which as presently defined is exclusive of political involvement. We, the comfortable economic and educational elite seem very like ostriches with our heads in the sand. Cries of shame at militant picket lines (which may or may not have been justified) fatally clouded the issue of whether the individuals in this college, students and faculty, could put aside two weeks of school and work together to organize long and short term programs around any or all of the national strike demands, all three of which are, in my mind, favored by the majority of college community members.

The Barnard faculty and administration crippled the strike at the college by clinging to the principle that if ten percent of the student body and faculty disagreed with the strike, that the rest of the people had an obligation not to ask the college to participate fully in the strike. Coercive grading arrangements for striking students were made instead of special arrangements for the minority of students who demanded their rights to go to class.

I did not see the strike initially as being against the college, mainly because the injustices foisted on workers by this college and its insensitive community expansion policies are pale by comparison to the repressive policies of our federal government both here and abroad. As the strike progressed however, my understanding of the situation changed somewhat. Perhaps it is necessary to rectify injustice on a grass roots level and educate members of smaller communities to their own responsibility to rid the larger group, the federal government, of its racist and imperialist policies toward the people who dissent from our system of government.

The following is my analysis of the meaning of the three National Student Strike demands:

The anti-war movement in this country has suffered because of a misconception on the part of people who are potentially a broad base of support for that movement. The misconception was that the Nixon administration is involved on a course of disengagement of our armed forces from South East Asia. This misconception drew large numbers of dissatisfied people away from actively working to end the war. The true colors of the present administration bared themselves for all to see when the movement to widen the war into Cambodia was announced. I feel that Nixon's move may have opened the minds of people to the hypocrisy of our country's foreign policies, and that these people might be brought into active participation in the anti-war effort. Without the support of these people the anti-war movement is powerless. I felt that students and faculty had an obligation to set aside business as usual and take advantage of the renewed interest in the (now) Indochina War --to organize the people inside and outside the university in a huge broadly based movement to end the war immediately.

I feel that people in the university community have a very strong obligation to defend the civil rights of the Panthers and other radically dissenting groups and individuals throughout this country from those who, out of fear or malice, prefer to end legitimate or illegitimate dissent by any means. I was shocked that the unprecedented condemnation of the Kent State murders was not forthcoming at any time during the past few years when non-white dissidents were murdered far more brutally and systematically, for example the case of the murder of Fred Hampton, a Black Panther, last December. Middle class and upper class white people are letting an unfounded, racist fear of non-white political power and non-white militancy blind them to the crucial issues of who is killing innocent people and who is responsible for racial conflict. Our inequitable judicial system is to blame, frightened, inexperienced, irrational police are to blame, corruption in city, state and federal governments is to blame, and finally, the apathy of the already comfortable people is to blame. The college, as an institution dedicated to free speech and the right of dissent, has no right to let its business go on uninterrupted while great numbers of people in this country and abroad are being deprived of their inalienable rights. Especially when the universities have both financial resources and more subtle power in influencing opinion to help combat and destroy a cancer in this society that must be dealt with, racism.

Concerning the demand that universities end complicity with the military industrial complex, I feel that while individuals must be free to do research of most kinds, war research is unthinkable in an institution which favors an end to the war. And the majority of people in the college and in most universities favor an end to the war, and I still, perhaps naively, believe that majority opinion should prevail in an institution's policies. Also, I think schools of higher learning must address themselves to another question. The School of International Affairs and The South East Asia Institute at Columbia University are symptoms of another, more subtle ill. Unless these places and ones like them stop training generations of "Ugly American" diplomats, who have no more respect for third world cultures than the general who orders a village napalmed, they should cease to exist.

Finally, students and faculty must take responsibility for the policies and conduct of the institutions for which they are the *raison d'être*. The paternalistic dependence on the administrators to deal with all practical problems must end. If this effort takes time from pure, unadulterated scholarship, then that must be. Students and faculty must take time from their normal activities to educate themselves to the methods and psychology of racism, war, and political repression. The notion that this sort of education is separate from the scholastic efforts toward a career is anachronistic. The college must seek to educate rational, independent thinking students to be citizens as well as narrowly trained professionals. We cannot cease to be concerned with our world for the years we are involved as full-time students.

Victoria Taylor, Barnard '71

POSITION PAPER FROM AN INDEPENDENT MEMBER OF
THE BARNARD STRIKE COALITION
(Regarding "business as usual" at Barnard)
Education versus Liberation

"Introduction to Oppression" may not appear in the Barnard Catalogue, but it is, nevertheless an integral part of the education we receive here. When we look for the roots of oppression we must ultimately confront the fact that it is people who oppress other people. The attitudes and life styles which make oppression, along with Mother and Apple-pie, an inherent part of the American character are taught and tested just as rigorously as any pre-professional course.

The overt forms of University oppression, racism, and militarism (e.g. war and counter-insurgency research, expansion, etc.) have been well documented already. I will concentrate on the more subtle and insidious ways in which the University promotes social psychosis; for it is the very form and style of higher education which prepares students to participate in an oppressive society.

Barnard education is based on a structure of authoritarian relationships. "In Loco Parentis" may have disappeared from the dorm rules but it is alive and well in the classroom. The relationship between students and faculty and administrators is a top-down one. Participatory democracy in terms of what is taught and how and in terms of most decision making, does not exist. We are well prepared to enter a non-democratic, authoritarian society without even noticing that anything is amiss. Our education is directed and controlled by others throughout our four years. We are given "freedom" to choose between long-established options in our courses and majors, "freedom" to choose between column A and column B in fulfilling our requirements. Following orders, following established patterns becomes our natural mode; for many, true freedom becomes a frightening impossibility. It is not accident that the American system of allowing "freedom" to choose between so-called alternatives which all essentially preserve the status quo (did you vote for Nixon and/or Humphrey?) fools so many people.

Probably the most frightening aspect of Barnard's paternalistic authoritarianism is the tremendous sense of powerlessness it fosters among its students. Under a totalitarian-like system, people are consciously aware that their power is being forcibly taken away; they can see themselves as being oppressed and can fight mentally or physically, against the oppression. However, at Barnard, we are told that we are a part of a "community of scholars" all working together for the same lofty ideals. We are told that the interests of those who have power over us are the same as ours; all decisions are made "for our own good". The "tea-party politics" of Barnard dictates that conflicts arise out of problems out of problems in communication; everyone is acting in "good faith" and it certainly would not be cricket to react too strongly against someone's well intentioned "mistake" (e.g. the recent conflict over the rules).

The existence of this attitude has a lot to do with the fact that Barnard is a nice, genteel, WOMEN'S college - women aren't supposed to assert themselves or take anything too seriously anyway. Rebelling against Barnard, like rebelling against poor old Dad who is trying so hard, makes us feel guilty. We become willing partners in our own oppression because we cannot see it as oppression. We are powerless because if, as we are told, everyone is working for the same thing, power is not an issue.

We are expected to hold a similar attitude towards American society. We are all supposedly working for the common goals of freedom and justice for all, hallelujah, amen! Any injustices in our society are "mistakes" which we are all trying earnestly to correct. Again, we are powerless if we believe that power is not the issue.

Barnard fans the flames of the competitive spirit, a mainstay of American capitalism by emphasizing grades. This competition pits students, who really have the same interest (learning), against each other to cash in on the materialistic goodies of Barnard society, much as the U. S. government plays the white working class against the Blacks and the poor. The working class, rather than perceiving the true source of their oppression--thenecessarily inflationary and exploitative policies of the government--is manipulated into believing that their greatest problems and their greatest threat comes from the Blacks and the poor.

Education at Barnard is fragmented. There is tremendous separation between disciplines, between the College and the community, and, most insidiously we are encouraged to develop the "academic" attitudes of emotional detachment from our studies, of "objectivity" and "value-freeness". This refusal to view knowledge in relation to its moral consequences results in such statements as this one from the President of the Stanford Research Institute: "Would you develop a more destructive atomic weapon? Yes, if there were a need for it and the contract was there. We don't have any crusades."

The intellectual elitism of Barnard College fosters the very undemocratic attitude that "experts" (i.e. professionals) are the only people truly competent to make decisions and furthermore, that they are probably "better people" than the masses of society. A popular justification for not taking a stand on the war or on racism or on political repression has been that only government officials and experts have enough knowledge of the situation to make judgements. Thus, moral responsibility is deferred to the powers that be and we have a President who thinks the "divine rights doctrine" should have a second chance.

There are two glaring omissions from this article--racism and the oppression of women as practiced at Barnard College. Only full articles