The Free Speech Movement

Reflections on Berkeley in the 1960s

EDITED BY

Robert Cohen and Reginald E. Zelnik

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
Berkeley Los Angeles London

2002

The FSM and the Vision of a New Left

Jeff Lustig

It's hard to know what to make of the sixties. It resists comprehension in a way other periods do not. Looking back from the vantage of 1964 the meaning of the thirties or the forties seemed clear. Looking back, however, from the longer vantage of the present, the verdict on the sixties is still out. We have yet to agree on its meaning.

We have yet, in particular, to understand Berkeley's Free Speech Movement, an early struggle and an eventual catalyst of the largest mass student arrest in the nation's history. The problem is not with understanding what the FSM accomplished. It ran the writ of the First Amendment to the Berkeley campus and changed the identity of American college students in the process. It burned off the fog of Cold War repression. It lay the grounds for later antiwar protests. But what was the movement that did these things? A traditional reform campaign? A generational rebellion? A balked revolution? None of the terms seems quite right. The event defies the familiar categories as successfully as students in 1964 dodged the plans University administrators carefully laid for them.

The reason the FSM and other early sixties' movements—SDS in the East and SNCC in the South—elude our usual categories is that they were crucibles of a new kind of radicalism, seedbeds of a new Left. The Left that would emerge out of the bases they prepared would be a curious one, lacking a manifesto, a party, and even a unified theory. It would differ from what had preceded it and would often perplex veterans of the previous struggles. (Italian filmmaker Michelangelo Antonioni, researching *Zabriskie Point* in the Bay Area, grew perturbed by its activists' inability to name their party or present their overall program.) Its activists would invite the charge that they lacked "the convictions of [their] courage."[1]

But the early, relatively brief struggle in Berkeley still continues to generate interest and excite debate. Why? Because of the specific nature of its radicalism, I propose, and the new politics it already exemplified. The FSM in fact reveals something important about the sixties as a whole—that it was "radical" *before* it was left. The nature of its early radicalism is what made the later left "new." In the current period, amidst the confusion generated by the collapse of the theory and expectations that guided leftist thought for a century, much may be gained from looking back at the actions of people who already saw beyond the contending myths of the Cold War. They were people who had arrived early at the end of history.

IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE ACT

To understand this early period it is necessary to overcome an initial obstacle. The obstacle is raised by the fact that we know something that no one knew at the time—namely, that there *was* a "sixties." Everyone today from the most innocent freshman to the most cosmopolitan scholar knows that young people in those days scorned authority, broke rules, picketed businesses, and sat in because it was "the sixties." That's what people did. Embracing this notion, however, prevents us from understanding precisely what we need to explain.

No one who confronted authorities and risked arrest in 1963 or 1964 knew that there would be a "sixties." They could not explain their rebellion or anchor their identities with reference to a decade that had yet to be created. The problem is to explain their initial willingness to act without this reference, to retrieve their vital moments of decision from beneath the appearance of inevitability where they have been buried for many years now.[2] What exactly did the early protesters think they were doing?

The first place to go for an answer to this question is their own words. And the best distillation of those words as they appeared in a multitude of addresses, leaflets, and conversations is in the lucid speeches of one of their leaders, Mario Savio, particularly in his justly remembered summons to the Sproul Hall sit-in, December 2, 1964: "There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious," he declared, "makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part, can't even tacitly take part; and you've got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus, and you've got to make it stop. And you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free, the machine will be prevented from working at all!"[3]

This was an extraordinary appeal in the vocabulary of American politics, rare in its cogency and striking in its resort to the evidence of his listeners' hearts and bodies. It declined the familiar tropes of American reform and eschewed the appeals of the established left. Savio promised to bargain no

interests, delineated no class forces, and depicted no inevitable contradictions. (Having just returned from a trip to Cuba, I was struck by this at the time.) He even declined to assure anyone of ultimate victory, a standard element of most calls to action. Taken literally, indeed, his central metaphor hinted otherwise. The effect of bodies on gears is obvious, but so, unfortunately, is that of gears on bodies.

What he did do was to capture the existential posture of his listeners, the personal sentiments of the students gathered in Sproul Plaza, with remarkable precision. His language was radical in the etymological sense; it cut through stock phrases and conventional clichés to the *roots* of people's personal convictions. We Berkeley students had indeed come to feel that the knowledge industry celebrated by UC's president, Clark Kerr, was odious. The administrators' attempts to manipulate and deceive us did, in fact, make us sick at heart. We did feel ourselves faced by a machine that threatened the intellectual and political autonomy we came to the University to develop. But as products of the fifties ideology of a seamless, inescapable modernity, we had little real hope of beating the system. Confidence in victory was not one of our inspirations to action.

Beyond this special diction, Savio's statement gave voice to three themes that together explain the early decisions to act and the distinctive politics they forged. The first was the indictment of the University's practices on the basis of the society's professed values: free speech, civil rights, the necessity of education for democratic citizenship. It was the civil rights struggle that originally gave birth to the Berkeley struggle. And it was stubborn fidelity to free speech that ultimately transformed American college students from wards of random deans and coaches acting in loco parentis to young adults intent on following their own thoughts into action.

The last of these values, the commitment to a liberal education, developed in the course of the struggle itself. It was intimated from the start in calls for educational reform, especially in the publications of the student organization SLATE.[4] But Savio invoked it directly in indicating *why* the machine had to be stopped, revealing that his listeners had come to a sophisticated understanding of the historical choice facing American higher education. He spoke from within the controversy sparked by Kerr's recently published *Uses of the University* and in reaction to corporate analogies increasingly in vogue on the campus. "I ask you to consider: if this is a firm, and if the Board of Regents are the board of directors, and if President Kerr in fact is the manager, then . . . we're the raw material! But we're a bunch of raw material that don't mean to . . . be made into any product, don't mean to end up being bought by some clients of the university."[5] It was the prospect of being made into products by the knowledge factory rather than educated to be independent thinkers that galled students and forced them to explicate why they had come to the University in the first

place. It was in defense of their original intentions that they put the instructions from the ubiquitous IBM cards on their own buttons and picket signs: "Do not bend, fold, spindle, or mutilate."

In the course of the struggle we students began to affirm a different purpose for public higher education from the industrial service model proposed by Kerr. We began to insist that the original and still primary purpose of public higher education was political, in the broadest sense, not economic. It was to prepare people for democratic citizenship. Students were entitled to full rights of free speech and advocacy and entitled to discuss policies, debate positions, and prepare for off-campus actions (e.g., against segregated businesses) because they were citizens-in-training preparing to be members of a democratic public. Moving at this point beyond traditional ideas, FSMers forged a new understanding of the concept of a public along lines prepared by thinkers like John Dewey, C. Wright Mills, and Paul Goodman. We urged that the *public* in "public education" referred to more than a funding source, and we identified the overarching purpose of the whole enterprise: to prepare people to be members of democratic publics. Such publics would also, we hoped, revitalize democracy in an increasingly bureaucratized society. Disseminating political information and preparing for action through debate was not a distraction from higher education thus conceived but an essential part of it.[6]

The second notable feature of Savio's speech was its emphasis on action: action as the expression of belief and test of belief, and direct action also as the test of larger institutional realities. Savio's words themselves constituted an action moving others to act. The underlying point that the FSM had demonstrated from the beginning was that the essence of protest politics, beyond petitioning and meeting and issuing reports, was the taking of physical action. This will to act, this emphasis on taking a stand, had also been at the heart of the civil rights struggle in which Savio and others had participated. You "put your body on the line" in this tradition not because you were sure of success or historical vindication but out of a conviction that something that was deeply wrong had to be disrupted.

If the history of sit-downs and sit-ins runs back to the CIO of the late thirties, the history of public disaffiliation runs back to abolitionism and early dissenting churches. It is the tradition of moral witness emphasizing that one must, when faced with deep injustice, go beyond simply speaking one's mind or voting one's conscience. One must bear public witness, affirming that what is being done *is* an injustice and standing for the truth that is being denied. The decision to participate in direct action of this sort rarely claims epistemological certainty or strategic efficacy. It emerges on the far side of familiar phrases and strategies and constitutes a search for fresh words and explanations. Its intellectual method is that of the searcher and has more in common with Walt Whitman's or Jack Kerouac's man on the

open road than with that of confident liberals and "scientific" socialists.[7] It is firm only in the knowledge that some things will not be suffered further.

Henry David Thoreau had provided Savio with his central metaphor (Thoreau: "All machines have their friction. . . . But when the friction has its machine . . . let your life be a counter-friction to stop the machine"). And Thoreau may also have provided the best case for this kind of action. Anticipating the existentialists by a century, he urged that action proved not only belief but also who one was as a person. It was intrinsically "radical." "Action from principle, . . . the performance of right, changes things and relations; it is essentially revolutionary. [It] not only divides States and churches . . . ay, it divides the *individual*, separating the diabolical in him from the divine."[8]

This performance of right, this decision to reach deep into one's innermost convictions and then to act on them publicly, takes courage. It took staunchness in the wake of McCarthyism to risk blacklist and censure from the society and staunchness to confront an institution that held the keys to one's future. It also took intellectual courage to insist on finding one's own terms for the effort rather than retreating to the protective verbiage of others' struggles. In Berkeley there was a history of this courage that helped embolden the protesters, running from UC's loyalty-oath resistors of 1949–1950, to Fred Moore's lone anti-ROTC vigil in 1959, and up through the first soapbox speakers who defied UC's ban on political advocacy in the early sixties.

The tradition of moral witness was not the only tradition apparent in the FSM. We were also the beneficiaries of a group of skillful strategists sensitive to the demands of practical politics. "We were playing to win," another leader, Jack Weinberg, later put it.[9] And these leaders were capable of making the difficult but canny tactical judgments necessary to achieve that goal. The two approaches shaped and influenced each other, and both were necessary for the FSM's victory. But without the initial commitment to moral action, the early politics would not have achieved the distinctiveness it did, nor sparked the unexpected actions that repeatedly expanded the FSM's ranks and extended a sense of involvement within them.

PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

The third theme of Savio's speech, consistent with the concern for a new kind of public and manifested by the rally he addressed, was its dedication to participatory politics. Americans tend to think of politics as a conflict of private interests for preexisting goods, waged by representatives in remote legislatures. The people in Sproul Plaza, by contrast, had come to regard politics as an affair of the assembled movement seeking "goods" that were only then being created. Where most Americans feel that politics affects

only distant affairs, the student protesters had come to see its effects as close and palpable. "The issues of free speech and the factory, of politics and education . . . are inseparable" an FSM leaflet declared.[10]

Underlying this approach was a belief in the movement as a community rather than an interest group or reform association or even a centralized party. The same idea of "the beloved community" informed the struggle in the South and was explicit in SDS's *Port Huron Statement* of 1962.[11] "Although our issue has been free speech, our theme has been solidarity," a Berkeley leaflet issued in January 1965 announced. "We have joined together as a community. . . . By being willing to stand up for others, and knowing others are willing to stand up for us, we have gained more than political power; we have gained personal strength."[12] Whereas prevailing liberal assumptions pitted individual against community, this view recognized community as providing support for individuality and, indeed, providing the context for developing real, effective individuality.

These premises led to the conclusion that any democracy worth the name was a participatory democracy. It was a politics *by* the community and not simply for it.[13] The Berkeley activists broke with the age-old American fixation on representation as the essence of democracy and considered the exclusive reliance on representation to be an experiment that failed. They felt that the socialist experiment had failed, too; no party could presume to represent a class. Both Madisonian and Leninist traditions were seen as centralizing the means of making history and pointing in bureaucratic directions, making people objects rather than active agents of political affairs. This participatory approach generated a remarkably creative sense of politics in a few short years and also produced a number of new forms of mutuality. Politics seemed to be at once an expression of the common interest and a means for self-expression, something fun and rewarding rather than alienating. The commitment to participatory publics, finally, caused many activists to cease looking to the state as the preferred agent of democratic reform and even as the authentic voice of the public's interest, distancing them from a central tenet of Democratic and Old Left politics.[14]

RADICALS BEFORE LEFTISTS

The commitments to civil rights and liberties, moral action, and participatory democracy together defined a new vision of radical politics and gave rise to a bold, creative, and combative activism. Later, as many FSMers and veterans of SNCC and early SDS moved on to antiwar and Third World struggles and confronted the deeper realities of American politics, they also moved more consciously to the left. They developed the class perceptions that had been anticipated in their critiques of the knowledge industry, and a sensitivity to other forms of social domination, like race and gender. They came to understand that the contradictions they were attacking ran deep and that the interests they confronted were linked to a larger system of capital.

As they moved leftward the insights and commitments of the early years went with them. The commitment to direct action and large-scale public demonstrations remained distinctive of sixties protests. The activists' impulse to take their cues from their own subjective convictions rather than from "objective conditions" remained. And the desire for participation and forms of organization that would "prefigure" the desired future remained, anticipating the later emergence of non-Leninist forms of Marxism.[15]

A few observers sensed at the time that the student protesters had broken the established molds. In an unexpected descent into McCarthyism, UC's President Kerr was quoted in a newspaper interview as charging that "forty-nine percent of the [FSM's] hard-core group are followers of the Castro-Mao line."[16] The bizarre claim won him few supporters, but did capture the truth in a roundabout way. Kerr discerned that our vision was different. For those who understood the coded vocabulary of the times, the charge acknowledged what we were *not*—namely, Stalinists. We were not the Designated Enemy. Our presence was *totally* unauthorized, the worst thing imaginable from a manager's point of view.

Some more-recent accounts miss the distinctiveness of the period altogether. One familiar view sees the protesters as simply well-meaning reformers inspired by the Civil Rights Movement to become a "political force" and extend constitutional protections to those who lacked them. Theirs was simply another chapter in the unfolding chronicle of American democracy. This view, put best by Todd Gitlin and the *Berkeley in the '60s* documentary (and expressed in parts of the present volume), sees the early activists as having been most effective when they joined in "peaceable assemblies, striving for the utmost legality, accepting the rules laid down by the authorities." It judges them, however, as having thrown it all away when they shifted to the left, adopted a politics of resistance, abandoned pacifism, confused "strategy and identity," and squandered the moral capital they previously had accumulated. Becoming more extremist, they fell in with a bad lot (the Black Panthers) and finally forfeited larger public support.[17]

This interpretation makes a few valuable insights but fails as a summary overview. It charges the activists with later marginalizing themselves at exactly the same time it also credits them with retaining the ability to build the antiwar movement.[18] More to our present point, it fails again to explain why the early protesters engaged in the bold actions they did. People do not wrench themselves out of prepared life-paths and risk arrest simply because of well-meaning constitutional abstractions or because they decide

first to pursue a vocation of reform and then try to figure out the best way to do it. Utilitarians don't make rebellions.

People are moved to protest only when they feel a deep sense of wrong and when they are convinced that much will be lost if they do *not* act. They protest radically only when they no longer feel that existing wrongs will be remedied through the available channels. The issue *was* free speech, but that did not mean what is often assumed. It did not mean, for example, that their primary commitment was a procedural one. Theirs was initially a substantive commitment to civil rights. More broadly, a call for First Amendment protections in the context of the times was less a commitment to American rule of law than a protest against it. By the late fifties in the Bay Area such a call was redolent with the promise of disruption. It summoned specters of atheism and communism, allegedly pornographic poets and irreverent stand-up comics. A "free speech movement" was not something meant to reaffirm the American way but to shake it up. Many FSMers already felt deeply alienated from the American way and betrayed by its politics and were already seeking something different. They did not, again, have to wait till later years for their radicalism.

Things did change after 1964. The social context in which the FSM had arisen, with its distinctive mix of innocence and passion, disappeared. The increasing ferocity of the war, stunning failure of constitutional remedies, and escalating penalties for dissent destroyed the moral and political ecology of the early years. The civility many have noted could hardly survive when the authorities themselves broke the rules in murderous response to exploding ghettos at home and the Vietnamese abroad. The stakes of the game changed. Most activists, learning in the process, changed with them. That they would do so was determined not by a confusion of "strategy and identity" but by their sustained belief that action, in the context of community, was still the test of political commitment. This was not an apostasy but an evolution from their early politics.

Against this interpretation it has sometimes been charged that we early protesters could hardly have been radicals and harbingers of a New Left, because we were largely middle class in origins. We were not sons and daughters of blue-collar workers. We had not tasted the bitter fruits of toil and were, indeed, mostly beneficiaries of the American dream. This demographic point is certainly true; but the conclusion drawn from it is not.

The fact of the matter is that it was precisely because we were familiar with the American dream and knew its superficialities, deceptions, and hidden costs, that we beneficiaries were the ones most likely to become estranged from it. This may have been an unpredicted route to radicalism according to the canons of socialist orthodoxy. But it was youth who were well acquainted with American middle-class existence who challenged its hegemony and sought to develop qualitative alternatives to it, rather than spending their efforts trying to open avenues to it. They were no longer seduced by the ideas that external show could trump internal authenticity and that material acquisitions could make up for unfulfilling lives and work. The search for new ways was clear in their choice of heroes. SNCC writer Julius Lester wrote that in the late fifties we suddenly discovered alternatives to "catatonia" and Levittown. "While Fidel liberated the Sierra Maestra, the beat generation created a liberated zone . . . in San Francisco."[19] What linked Castro and the beatniks despite the vast differences in their personal and historical importance was that both had taken up residence outside the American dream. Both established liberated zones outside the presumably inevitable Brave New World.

So if the later battles provided "a poor training ground for practical politics,"[20] it was because the activists had never much cared about those politics in the first place. Many, influenced by the insights of the beatniks across the Bay and Sierra-bound dropouts in town, worried that even protest politics was a sellout. They were already attracted to Herbert Marcuse's "global refusal." For those who had checked out, the FSM was an acceptable reentry only because it promised aspects of an outsider's politics and something beyond the insider game.

MARIO SAVIO'S LEADERSHIP AND LEGACY

Standing next to me at one of the rallies in Sproul Plaza in fall 1964, Professor Norman Jacobson chuckled and offered a prediction. Despite all the fuss, he proposed, we protesters would be running the University in twenty years. He based his forecast on his own experience at CCNY and the example of Clark Kerr, who had come to Berkeley to do graduate work and support farmworker strikers in 1933 and stayed on to become UC president.[21] Apostasy was inevitable. I feared Jacobson might be right.

But he was not. Not even close. The people who were active in those years and went on to live in the nation's cities and towns, to work in public services and private offices, would later testify to the incapacitating effects of the early struggle for later business as usual. It left them with a permanent tic, an occupational disability when faced with standard operating procedures. Many would remain active, but in grassroots, offbeat ways. Something about the experience continued to clog the normal channels. Mario Savio himself died in 1996, at 53, doing almost exactly what he had been doing in his early years. He was teaching, drafting leaflets, living a barely secure existence on a lecturer's salary, calling meetings to which too few people came, calling them again, engaging the issues at hand. He publicly debated his campus president the day before his heart attack, opposing changes in the California State University system being forced, appropriately, by a protégé of Kerr.[22]

It was because of a rare combination of talents that Mario was a leader—became a leader—of a movement so skeptical of leadership. On one hand he was possessed of a unique eloquence, one that elicited not adulation or ardor but understanding and appreciation. He found the words to say what people felt but had not found the words to say, and with an accuracy and dignity that made them proud of their inchoate convictions. On the other hand, he was possessed of a formidable talent for sound, logical analysis. He was dogged in his study of documents, exact in his memory of details, and skillful in his explication of complex situations. Even hostile administrators came to rely on his construction of events. His were large gifts, and when you add to them a keen moral sensitivity and a private life more painful than most, the outlines of an exceptional person begin to emerge: impassioned but thorough, self-effacing but assertive, emotionally variable though morally fixed. He helped more than one generation find and keep their moral bearings.

Mario threw himself back into intensive political activity after the FSM reunion in 1994, when he saw the anti-immigrant, anti–affirmative action forces in California "threatening everything we ever fought for." If we sat back now, he asked, "what do our earlier efforts count for?" He and his wife, Lynn Hollander, had discussed it and concluded that, "if we're in for the lamb, we're in for the sheep," a Sicilian adage meaning that, if one were to be hanged, it might as well be for the full offense—a troubling remark from someone in visibly poor health.[23]

Speaking at FSM's thirty-year reunion, Mario explained why he never embraced formal Marxism and gave a good sketch of the sclerotized form of it that prevailed in the late fifties. Earlier the same day he had urged that NAFTA and GATT did not make overseas workers our enemies but *did* raise questions about the distribution of wealth at home. At the reunion ten years earlier, he had declared (with reference to Freedom Summer, 1964), "Either we succeed making [Nicaragua] the Mississippi of this generation or it will be the Vietnam of this generation."[24] And in a pamphlet he wrote with his son shortly before his death, he called for "an end to the disgrace of a massive 'underclass.'"[25] With class-conscious Thoreauvians like this, one hardly needs Marxists.

Quoting Yeats, he concluded one of his talks at the 1994 reunion urging that the poet had to have been wrong when he wrote that "the best lack all conviction, while the worst / Are full of passionate intensity." He insisted that it was the best who were passionate, or rather, he proposed, compassionate.[26] Displaying his convictions as fervently as he did, Mario was his own best argument.

I have not meant to romanticize the FSM or deny its shortcomings. A disposition to moral witness alone cannot sustain a movement, and a politics of authenticity may in time breed its own deceptions. The New Left would fail in the brief span allotted it to develop theories and forms of organization capable of sustaining the early vision. But the early FSM, though limited, was also seminal. Seminal because its method of action cut through clichéd rhetoric and deadened habits to awaken participants' sense of commitment. Seminal because it pointed the way to a more ennobling idea of politics than that with which we were familiar. And seminal because it began to frame a vocabulary for identifying the oppressions distinctive of our era and to develop forms of organization capable of helping us fight them together. The legacy of the FSM is the legacy of people who saw what was at stake and took a stand.

NOTES

1. David Lance Goines, *The Free Speech Movement: Coming of Age in the 1960s* (Berkeley: Ten Speed Press, 1993), 137.

2. Frank Bardacke notes the shift of perspective that occurs between a moment of decision and later reflection about it: "Before something happens it is impossible to predict. Immediately after it happens, it's 'easy to explain.' Within twenty years it has become inevitable" (personal communication).

3. Savio quoted in Goines, 361.

4. See Richard Fallenbaum, "University Abdicates Social Responsibility," *Cal Reporter,* 13 May 1963, in Seymour Martin Lipset and Sheldon S. Wolin, eds., *The Berkeley Student Revolt: Facts and Interpretations* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965), 64; and Bradford Cleaveland, "A Letter to Undergraduates," *SLATE Supplement Report* 1 (Sept. 1964), in ibid., 66.

5. Savio quoted in Goines, 361.

6. This view actually retrieved the older theory that universities are necessary for republican governance and that the primary value of higher education is political because it prepares people for democratic citizenship. See John A. Douglass, *The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850s to the 1960 Master Plan* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000), 20 ff., 44; and Bruce Kimball, *Orators and Philosophers: A History of the Idea of Liberal Education* (New York: College Board, 1995).

7. Savio prefaced the famous passage of his speech with an invitation—"I ask you to consider"—and not with an injunction or declaration. (I am indebted to Greil Marcus for this observation.) The suspicion of grand theory was a product of the fact that most who became leftists in the sixties had already become familiar with the failures and oversights of mechanistic and determinist Marxism from reading people like Isaac Deutscher, Albert Camus, and Jean-Paul Sartre.

8. Thoreau, "Civil Disobedience," in *The Portable Thoreau,* ed. C. Bode (New York: Viking Press, 1947), 113, 119.

9. Jack Weinberg speech at FSM reunion, Berkeley, 1 Dec. 1994 (notes on speech in author's possession).

10. "We Want a University" (FSM leaflet of 4 Jan. 1965), in Lipset and Wolin, 211.

11. *The Port Huron Statement* called for a new "kind of independence [that] does not mean egoistic individualism" and is founded on "fraternity and honesty"

(quoted in Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, eds., *The New Radicals* [New York: Vintage Books, 1966], 155).

12. "We have tried, in the context of a mass movement, to act politically with moral justification. We have tried to be sensitive to each of our supporters and the individual morality he has brought to the movement. . . . The concept of living cannot be separate from the concept of other people" ("We Want a University," 208–09).

13. Hannah Pitkin and Sara Shumer, "On Participation," *Democracy II* 4 (fall 1982): 43–54.

14. This view also distinguished theirs from the Port Huron approach, which, though participatory, still looked to the government, political parties, and Americans for Democratic Action. The new politics was so novel compared to the old that both Savio and Weinberg sometimes denied it was politics at all (Goines, 93, 99.)

15. On prefigurative politics see Wini Breines, *Community and Organization in The New Left, 1962–1968: The Great Refusal* (South Hadley, Mass.: J. F. Bergin, 1982). Coincident with non-Leninist experiments, many New Left veterans in the seventies and early eighties also reembraced moribund forms of Marxism-Leninism. See Jeff Lustig, "On Organization: The Question of the Leninist Party," *Politics and Society* 7 no. 1 (Nov., 1977): 27–67.

16. For one version of Kerr's statement, see Hal Draper, *Berkeley: The New Student Revolt*, 59. On the controversy over precisely what Kerr said, see Addendum to Cohen's Introduction to the present volume.

17. Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1987), 83, 292, 296; Mark Kitchell, *Berkeley in the '60s* (New York: First Run Features, 1990), documentary film.

18. Gitlin, 409, 411, and (his conclusions) 435, 438.

19. Lester, *Search for a New Land: History as Subjective Experience* (New York: Dial Press, 1969), 30–31.

20. Gitlin, 437.

21. Actually Kerr attended the famous Tagus strike of 1933 not as a supporter but as a "neutral" observer, a stance consistent with the later role he assumed. Anne Loftis, *Witnesses to the Struggle: Imaging the 1930s California Labor Movement* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1998), 30 ff.

22. On Savio's work at Sonoma State University, see Jonah Raskin's essay in this volume.

23. Savio remarks at the meeting that launched the Campus Coalition for Human Rights and Social Justice, Berkeley, 2 Apr. 1995 (notes on speech in author's possession).

24. Quoted in Robert Cohen, "The FSM and Beyond: Berkeley Student Protest and Social Change in the 1960s" (unpublished manuscript, Berkeley, 1994, available in Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley), 55.

25. Mario Savio and Nadav Savio, *In Defense of Affirmative Action: The Case against Prop 209* (Oakland, Calif.: Campus Coalition for Human Rights and Social Justice, 1996), i.

26. "That's what we have to convey to people. Not the message of immiseration, but the message of commiseration, of compassion" (author's notes, 3 Dec. 1994).