

Thursday, March 6, 1969

31

AN OUTRAGEOUS VIOLATION OF OUR RIGHTS
AS CITIZENS - WHETHER STUDENTS OR FACULTY -
IS TAKING PLACE!

Scanned and
uploaded to
Digital Conservancy
January 2009

The Hennepin County Grand Jury has issued an indictment in a "nicely-timed" reaction to the Morrill Hall incident, pinning a 4-count charge on our Black brothers and sisters, AND on "other persons whose identities are to the Grand Jury unknown."

This "et.al" catch phrase is a blank check, making ANY person on campus liable to arrest. This is clearly an inexcusable infringement of our constitutional rights and MUST NOT BE TOLERATED!

Does it seem curious that this indictment has appeared the very week before final exams? Does this smell like a purely political move? Could it be an attempt to show us that it just doesn't pay to stand up for our rights?

It is time to prove to the machinery that we will not be intimidated into compliant silence. But neither will we rise to the bait and react with violence. That would be suicidal, merely providing fuel for more indictments.

THERE WILL BE A NOON RALLY - TODAY - IN FRONT OF COFFMAN UNION, FOLLOWED BY A MASS MARCH TO CITY HALL IN A PEACEFUL DEMONSTRATION OF THE UNIVERSITY'S PROTEST. JOIN US!

LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA LA

Hand it to a stranger! Hand it to a stranger!

UP TIGHT ABOUT THE ARRESTS?

Three things need to be done:

1. Actions which demonstrate (a) solidarity in support of all students arrested, and (b) determination to have the indictments dropped.
2. Public rejection of the reprisals policy of the U. of M.
3. Criticism and ridicule of the uninformed, discriminatory, harrassing and WASPish attitudes and reactions of the Hennepin County Grand Jury and the Power interests they represent.

*

*

*

In pursuing these goals, however, we all need to be thinking clearly about the social realities behind the arrests. The following deals with one aspect of these realities.

Why expect that the State will not interfere in U of M affairs? It is a state university mainly financed by Minnesotan taxpayers. Therefore, when students are not servile, the way they're supposed to be, we can expect the State to interfere (as it is now doing). It is State power we are resisting.

Is it not naive to speak in terms of phrases like "our political rights" and "our constitutional rights?" What are our "rights?" They are those things which the power structure allows us to do. Nothing more. The authorities will remove any "rights" which help people to effect any substantial changes in the social structure, any real shift in who holds power, or any significant alteration in the status quo. In a society moving towards totalitarianism, any attempt to change the "safe" limits set by the power complex can be thwarted by the rulers who arrange for a change in "rights." For example, a local or national emergency may be declared (meaning "an emergency for the ruling power complex") and people cease to have the "right" to speak freely, to demonstrate or to protest. The only "rights" they have are those which the power structure knows it is safe to give them (safe, that is, for the power holders to maintain their own power and privilege). It was this kind of maneuver that was carried out by the U of M administration when it adopted the Report of the Commission on Campus Demonstrations: it simply said "You no longer have the 'right' to demonstrate in a way which disrupts the functioning of the University. Instead, the administration has the 'right' to punish students who take part in such demonstrations." [President Moos, who is a clever and sophisticated administrator, arranged for student representation on the body that drafted the demonstrations policy. Incredible as it may seem, student representatives naively agreed to this reprisals policy and, even worse, other student leaders failed to protest it when it was made public. It was adopted as official U of M policy without so much as a whimper.]

"Rights" is an ideological term with no real meaning in the objective world. The ordinary man-in-the-street generally thinks of the concept of "rights" as his protection from the caprices of the powerful. And this fits in nicely with what the power manipulators would like him to think. In reality, the concept of "rights" works for the rulers to confuse and confound those whom they manipulate (the ruled).

If the underdog wants to try to see the world as it really is he should rid himself of illusions about "rights," replacing the term with other terms.

Scanned and
uploaded to
Digital
Embervancy
January 2008

which do have real meaning, e.g. "wants," "desires," "interests," and recognize that the implementation of one's interests depends on POWER.

When the U of M administration says "you no longer have the right to hold disruptive demonstrations (so if you do hold them you will be punished)", what it really means is "if you act on your desires to hold disruptive demonstrations in support of changes which are in your interests, we will punish you because such demonstrations are not in the interests of the administrators."

Many students think it is in their own interests to work to up-grade the status of black people in our society. Most of the administrators think this is in their own interests also. But when a disruptive demonstration occurs, as one small step to achieve this goal, it conflicts with the administrators' interests in "running a tidy shop" (after all, they stand to lose their jobs if the educational process does not go on). Beyond this, of course, it conflicts with the interests of the power-holders, the racists, the economic exploiters, and so on--in short, the people who have an interest in maintaining the status quo (and who can bring about the firing of University administrators).

It can be seen, then, that when this translation is made from the ideological term "rights" to the realistic term "interests" what is revealed is A NAKED POWER STRUGGLE BETWEEN CONFLICTING INTERESTS.

It is not always clear as to just what interests are in conflict in any clash between groups in society. In the present situation there is probably a clash between racists and anti-racists! But racism is not the main issue: student leaders would still have been arrested if they were white. It is a deeper and broader conflict than a racist one. It is not just a clash between students and the power structure, because some students will approve the Grand Jury move, and some members of the power structure will be sympathetic towards the protesting students. Basically it is a clash between those whose interests are best served by keeping things the way they are (keeping students servile, keeping blacks servile and exploitable, keeping electors and taxpayers politically naive and ignorant, etc. etc.) and those whose interests are served by achieving more power, more autonomy, more freedom (advances towards self-governing students, self-governing and non-exploitable blacks, politically sophisticated and informed electors and taxpayers, etc., etc.).

We can keep the real issues clear by speaking in terms of conflicting interests instead of obscuring the actual state of affairs with euphemistic "rights" phrases which are used to disguise the true motives underlying them.

* * * * *

Having established (above) that the arrests are merely one move in a continuing power struggle between societal groups whose interests are in conflict, we should employ our tactics accordingly. It is short-sighted, weak-kneed and a sell-out to work exclusively towards having the indictments dropped. This should be the focal point about which a much broader struggle is being carried on.

For a start, one thing that needs to be done is to make it clear that we are mature, intelligent adults who are acting out of conviction, principle and compassion instead of fear, stupidity and ignorance. We need to make clear to the public that students consider they are quite capable of judging the moral worth of the actions of their fellow students; that in judging these actions to be justified in a particular situation they reject the paternalism implied in sanctions threatened by either the State or the

University administration; and that if the power-holders fail to respond to just requests by students, a continuation of the struggle is inevitable. Unless this principle is firmly held by student protesters, and explicitly stated to the public as a conviction which lies behind student demonstrations, those same demonstrations will continue to be seen as irresponsible, illegal and immoral violations of a lunatic fringe.

It is imperative, then, that the following fundamental statement of principle be given as much publicity as possible: when a body of students judges that a disruptive demonstration has been justified, it rejects and is opposed to any policy of reprisals, punishment or discipline on the part of either the University of Minnesota administration or State agencies; further, when sanctions (punishment, discipline) are imposed (in the face of rejection and opposition by a body of students) further demonstrations can be expected and, if necessary, they will be disruptive.

It is assumed, always, in disruptive demonstrations that wilfull destruction is avoided, at least by the demonstrators. If, in order to carry out the demonstration, property damage cannot be avoided, it should be kept minimal. Individual demonstrators should be held accountable only to their fellow demonstrators for property damage. This is in line with the assertion that disruptive demonstrators are responsible adults.

* * * * *

If you agree with the above and you are prepared to give whatever support you can, you are already a member of the

LIBERTARIAN ACTIVISTS