

EDITORIALS AND OPINION

VIVA LA RAZA!

On March 27-31, the Crusade For Justice sponsored a national Chicano Youth Liberation Conference. The conference was the Chicano manifestation of the liberation movement of the Third World that is not only sweeping the U.S.A. but the rest of the world as well. This conference was a first in the Chicano movement. It was the first time, on a national level, that gangs from the barrios (slums), people from the campesinos (grape pickers, etc.), high school students, college students, guerrilla theatre groups (teatro Chicano and teatro Campesino), urban middle class organizers, welfare organizers, professors, teachers, lawyers and many others got together and asked questions like: Who are we? Where are we going? How do we get there? We had meetings, workshops, films, and dances. Many of us stayed up until three or four in the morning discussing things like organizational techniques or the role of the student in the movement. It was a fiesta. Following are some of the matters discussed and some of the conclusions reached.

Many, many hours were spent on deciding who we are. Chicano, Mexican, Mexican-American, Spanish-American, Americans of Spanish descent, Meicano, Latino, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Chicano and LaRaza are terms we are all familiar with. Happily, most of those attending the conference were well beyond the "I am a Spanish-American" or "I am an American" bag. But the Puerto Rican delegations from Chicago (The Young Lords) and New York forced many a southwestern Chicano — the one who shouts "Viva LaRaza" — to do some deep soul-searching. The Puerto Ricans had our names, spoke our language, identified with many of the things we identify with and considered themselves LaRaza. Many looked like me. Many were half Black and many were Black. There were a few Chicanos from the southwest who felt the term La Raza should be limited to "us." It was decided that this has never been true, nor should it ever be true. We all identified with each other on a cultural community level. La Raza had transcended and will transcend national boundaries, nationality, and race. This conference, then, was held by and for La Raza.

Those of us from the southwest are Chicanos and we identify with Chicanismo. Chicanismo is the form of cultural nationalism we identify with. It is a powerful unifying force and as such it cannot be underestimated. It cuts across the barrios, campos, and universities and makes us one. We are proud of our identity and our nationalism is the driving force of the movement.

However, to make a religion of "Brown is Beautiful" is potentially dangerous. It can play up to the man's game by keeping many of us thinking we can still make it in the system. Brown capitalists are still subjected and therefore committed to the continuing exploitation of the Chicanos. This country has always profited through a system that perpetuates divisions of hundreds of kinds, used against Chicanos, Blacks, Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Vietnamese and poor whites. This is the basis of racism in America.

We must not let cultural nationalism become a smokescreen for continued exploitation by the Bank of America, Rockefeller, and the Pentagon — White America. We must not only identify and maintain our cultural integrity, but we must identify with all the struggles of our movement. This analysis will lead us into affirming not only our cultural integrity but will move us to identify with all the struggles of oppressed peoples everywhere.

One aspect of the movement I was particularly interested in was the role of the university student. I talked to and listened to anybody I could, but mostly addressed myself to other university students and people of university age from the barrios. I was somewhat surprised, at first, by the scorn the university student was held in by the barrio voto. A comment I heard over and over was "when the shit starts to come down, those UMAs cats are nowhere around." What was meant? The student realizes that the University is directed towards maintenance of the status quo, that needs niggers and spics (one and the same). The student, then, is faced with the problems of making the university relevant to the barrios and campesinos — a very important and immediate problem. To do this, pressure must be brought to bear upon the university, for in its dedication to maintain the status quo, the university has resorted to violence, elimination of freedom of speech and assembly, cheating and lying, plus expulsion and arrest. The kid from the barrios realizes and accepts this. He's been subjected to that kind of treatment since he hit the streets. He knows where it's at. When his presence is needed at a high school walkout, or welfare picket — he's there. And when the shit starts to come down — he's there. The student talks a good confrontation, but when the shit starts to come down he's not there. He's drawing up some proposal or talking with some dean. He has to stay "clean." After he gets his degree, then he'll make a stronger commitment. In the meantime, let the barrio votos catch the shit, they're used to it, and besides he's making just as important a contribution doing his safe thing. So when the student should be at the vanguard of the movement, he is a tailend straggler. The sad thing is that in trying to change the university he must eventually confront it. And this means that in the end he must take the same shit the barrio voto is getting.

I talked to students from San Francisco State College, Berkeley, UCLA, and many others. The pattern these universities followed in denying our basic rights was the same. Students present their proposals for a Dept. of Chicano Studies or a Black Studies Program. The university laughs. The students get strong support. The university then buries the proposals in channels. Committees are set up to study the proposals. Nothing is done. The university gets more pressure. The university then "gives in" and sets up a couple of courses, or buys a few Chicano books. Most of the proposal is thrown away. Reasons given are usually lack of funds, of faculty, and of courses that are "academically relevant." The most basic and immediate rejection is that of self-determination. We must have the right to determine the content and structure of our programs. We must have the right to decide what courses and faculty are relevant



Attracting Students to Business

EDITOR'S NOTE: THIS ARTICLE IS REPRINTED FROM THE APRIL 1969 ISSUE OF "ANTIOCH NOTES" (VOL. 46, NO. 7). EDWARD E. BOOHER IS CHAIRMAN OF MCGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY AND THE CHAIRMAN OF THE NEW JERSEY BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

BY EDWARD E. BOOHER

In a recent issue of *Antioch Notes*, I pointed out that American business and industry were not effectively reaching bright, socially conscious young people. But reach them we must, and I think we can.

I have been a businessman for a long time, and I am convinced that an economic system that attracts talent and rewards it (not by money alone, as I will explain) will not only succeed, but will contribute to the success of society at large.

Therefore, it seems to me, business should demonstrate to talented young people that as members of an enterprise system they can have rewarding careers, as measured by what they add to the betterment of mankind as well as by their individual satisfaction and well-being. If this is what thoughtful young people want, then business must make evident its role in such an achievement.

Some months ago *Business Week* ran a cover story on one of our leading graduate schools of business. The star of its 1968 graduating class, according to the piece, was casting his lot with that most American of American businesses, the automotive industry. In casual conversation with a college senior, I commented on this, and his response, without reading the story, was "Who could ever sell his soul to the automotive industry — built-in obsolescence, chrome, and wasteful horsepower?" Yet, this particular young man could, I believe, benefit himself, business, and society by joining American industry.

No one needs to sing the praises of the enormous good that has come from automotive power, chemicals, electrical energy, or the endless products of Western technology. They have benefited society.

Most young people accept his, although not as uncritically as their fathers do. What they do not accept is the premise that industry has done enough, and henceforth society, without further effort or dislocation, will gradually heal itself. What stirs, frightens, and infuriates intelligent and sensitive youth most deeply is the suspicion that business has deluded itself into believing it has done enough and is neither willing nor able to do more.

Ironically, the indictment is not that business is malevolent toward the poor, but indifferent; not frantic to throw up barricades against minorities, but lethargic in tearing them down; not even that business will punish the young rebels, but will not rouse from complacency to hear what's behind the shouts.

If smugness and delusion indeed bespeak the condition of our society, I think that our giant institutions — government and universities as well as industry — are most vulnerable, for they are the most powerful ones and control the greatest output.

What then must business do to broaden its vistas and accept what I believe is its fair responsibility?

In general, business must build additional goals and performance yardsticks into its structure. By this I mean that the social achievement of a corporation must become a discrete component of its operating statement, its profit-and-loss tables, its annual report to stockholders.

Business needs to attract, encourage, and reward persons who sense a societal task that can and should fall to our economic enterprises. If we can make clear that a corporation's assets can be tangibly expanded by social achievements, then business is immediately more credible to the skeptical. Furthermore, it is not only young women and men in their twenties whose energies and passions we would move and charge; we could attract those already in their thirties — and sixties — whose fires have been tamped down.

How do we start?

First, enterprise must declare itself totally in

favor of a healthy, affluent society in which there are no poor. We know that we can produce such wealth, so why not take the lead in doing so?

To bring about our objectives, we would then need to use every device at our command, with the same vigor and intelligence that we employ in profitably producing the goods and services that we create.

Profit is still a key word, in my opinion. What needs to be changed is the cost concept. Whatever are industry's costs of doing what we have to do must be built into our price system. This change is no more novel than when industry was first asked to take on social security and other social costs. In spite of these indirect costs we have created the world's most profitable economic system, with profits continuing their upward trend.

But perhaps we need, in addition to dollars, another kind of profit unit that measures individual satisfaction and the performance and contribution an enterprise makes in social gains. Such a measurement would have to be very real to be meaningful. For example, it should not be a merit badge or an E for excellence. Surely our inventive behavioral scientists can devise what I can only suggest.

I am convinced that we can absorb into our profitable enterprise the additional costs needed to make this country as great as our young people demand that it be. I also think that we can create forms of units of compensation that will satisfy the spiritual needs of our oncoming generations.

We should start off with the most important cost, education. Not only can industry expand its programs of training the unemployable, but it can and should underwrite continuing education for all employees. The return on such an investment, both attitudinal and economic, I believe, would be enormous.

Nor has industry gone far enough in supporting the arts. America's growing population is increasingly literate and interested in the many arts that an affluent society can afford. While support of established programs is essential, of equal value in the long run could be industry's investment in avant-garde or experimental art forms and programs of the kind that not only young people thirst for. Industry should lead here, not lag.

Industry should continue its trend toward recognizing the individual as a separate, unique person and not try to mold him into a "company type." This sounds absurd in 1969, but there are some employers who do not tolerate the styles of the young or the mode of the times. It is amazing that one of the crack executives in the giant automotive industry is considered way out, off beat, slightly untrustworthy because he has eschewed the traditional both in his personal life and in the manner in which he directs a very successful division of General Motors. Imagination and individual taste are more important and attractive than meaningless convention.

Last, it seems to me that industry might try to be less foolish in how it promotes its products. For instance, last fall *The New York Times* carried a story on a "new model" introduced by a venerable name in the auto world. The first two paragraphs read:

"A push-button ashtray is offered as a luxury feature on the full-sized 1969 Oldsmobiles, which were shown to newsmen today.

"Other lines have shown luxury features to ease the strain of riding in a car, but it is doubtful that any other single item matches the innovation of the General Motors Corporation's Oldsmobile division."

Perhaps the reporter for the venerable *Times* had his tongue in cheek. I hope so.

VIVA LA RAZA, cont.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 4

to our lives. We don't need to be told what to think or how to do it; we are capable of determining on our own what kind of education we want and need. The concept of self-determination is basic not only to universities, but also to the people of the third world as well. If Chicano students want to know what they should be doing, I think the answer is apparent.

The workshops at the conference covered such things as art, dance, film-making, newspapers, poetry, plays, guerrilla theatre, techniques of organization in the barrios and campesinos, the role of the woman in the movement, the role of the student, politics, philosophy, and pressure. Out of this came the realization that the movement has its own "division of labor." It needs poets, playwrights, workers, men, women, and children. But above all, it needs people to get their own heads straight. We must realize that the system that oppresses us will not be changed through agencies it has set up to perpetuate itself. We must realize that the system rewards those Chicanos who sell out. They make it and wave their diplomas from suburbia at the people in the barrios and campos.

It's these same people who condemn their own people for being stupid and lazy. They want so badly to be Anglo that they profess the Anglo bullshit, more vehemently than any Anglo. Their letters condemn those who stand up for their rights. They are just another tool in the hands of the oppressor.

At the end of the conference, a plan was written up. It was called El Plan de Aztlan. Aztlan symbolizes the Chicano's roots in this land. Aztlan was an ancient Indian civilization in the southwestern United States. It pre-dated the Aztecs, Toltecs, and all other Indian civilizations. The Spaniards came and destroyed and conquered. No one knows now of Aztlan or the civilizations that followed it. They should and will. We don't have to look to the East Coast for roots or for pride. They are right here. The plan itself is a detailed blueprint of applying our philosophy to everyday life. It stresses our right to self-determination. The plan will be published and passed out all over the southwest. The giant is getting to his feet.

We left, after five days, a fiesta of love and life. The people came together and the magic happened. The seeds are sown. What will the harvest be?

MANUEL LOPEZ

AMEN CORNER

WOULD BE NICE...

KEEPING THINGS AS THEY ARE

Dear Editor:
At the risk of being labeled callous, I must question the logic of Annette Chandler, Mr. Godwin Obi, and others involved in soliciting the sympathy and aid for the Biafran people.

A facet of war that seems to escape some individuals' understanding is that it continues until one of the opponents (usually the loser) gives up the fight, or is rendered impotent. Biafra is involved in a civil war, initiated by their own declaration of independence, against the rest of Nigeria—and they are losing.

Miss Chandler's use of the term "innocent victims" in reference to the old men, women, and children who are suffering is a point worthy of examination.

Wouldn't it be nice if, when two groups of people disagree, they could round up their most able-bodied young men, drive over to the enclosed dueling grounds, and have at it? Battles at 10, 2, and 4, and bring your own seat cushion, please. Well, it just ain't that way, baby!

When a country declares war (a declaration of independence implies the willingness to back it up), they automatically pledge every man, woman, child, and dog towards that end.

I do not endorse any violation of the so-called "war crimes." I simply point out that, after reviewing their situation, determining their chances of winning, and taking a look at what history tells of wars—it was a matter of choice to begin and a constant responsibility to decide when to quit. To my mind, assistance in the form of food and medical supplies will only prolong the suffering. As Mr. Obi states, "the only salvation is an immediate stoppage of the war." With this I concur heartily—I question how Mr. Obi taunts us with the "threat of communism" interspersed with comments on the Americans' lack of humanity, and openly desires the U.S. to stop this suffering. America has given the lives of 50,000 men to help solve Viet Nam's problems and I ask you—who has suffered less because of it?

In short, Mr. Obi, you and your people want a second Viet Nam in Nigeria; I for one cringe at the thought!

JOHN E. WOLGAMOTT

Dear Editor:
Anyone who agrees with S. Peterson (*Amen Corner*, April 9) that his present and potential worth may not only be expressed in dollars and cents but also the criteria of his worth is the amount of dollars and cents he can demand in the market place—anyone who agrees with that and also agrees that the University is a kind of bank in which one makes money deposits with the primary objective of realizing a financial gain and the goal of life and education is to enter the grave a more expensive commodity than when one entered the world, anyone who agrees with all of that and thinks that is freedom should join Miss Peterson and expend every effort to keep the University exactly as it is.

Sincerely yours,
BILL HARRELL

FALSE ASSUMPTIONS

Dear Editor:
In reply to Mr. Bill Harrell's article in your issue of March 26, 1969 ("*Metaphysical Pathos*...") and to the one letter of comment that appeared last week, I thank those writers for presenting me with food for thought.
In a sense, sociology (and economics) can teach each of us much about his own life. The term "metaphysical pathos" is a mouthful, so I'd like to chew on it for a moment. Defining each, a dictionary (*Webster's New World — College Edition*) offers: (1) metaphysical—"beyond the physical or material; incorporeal, supernatural, or transcendental;" (2) pathos—"the personal or emotional element..." Combining these can bring thoughts anywhere from "positive thinking" to "what the hell's the use?" (neither necessarily an extreme). I'd like to paraphrase "metaphysical pathos" in one sense as the tragedy of false assumption, and suggest in passing that the last week's letter by S. Peterson might be in this category.

More generally, how often does each of us observe something (or think he has done so), draw a conclusion, and then act

on the basis of the conclusion? And how many of our conclusions are valid? Unamuno said "true science always leads to doubt and to ignorance" and "science is a cemetery of dead ideas." Substitute "knowledge" for "science," and where do we stand?

I think the University, and therefore society, needs more men like Bill Harrell. And I think (sensing the egotism here) that we need more people who recognize that we need more men like Bill Harrell.

WAYNE MARSHALL

A GAY MINORITY

Dear Editor:

Since you publish just about anything that is "far out" or offbeat in the *Fourth Estate*, I and a couple of other persons around here at the Denver Center were wondering if it would be possible for you to publish an article concerning homosexuality in the university. Perhaps you could investigate to see how much influence it has around here at the Denver Center and possibly see if it would be possible to organize some kind of club to cater to us homosexuals.

As far as I can see, we "gay" people are the only minority group around here that seem to have been forgotten in your paper. Perhaps an article or series of articles would help the straight people understand us better and prevent infimidation and ridicule of us. Now, let's be fair and not forget all minority groups, because we are actually no different from anyone else; we just have differing views on the type of sex that we prefer.

Your cooperation would be greatly appreciated and welcomed concerning this matter.

THE GAY MINORITY



The *FOURTH ESTATE* welcomes letters from its readers. Ideally, letters should be typed, triple-spaced on a 60-space line. Letters can be of any length as the relatively small volume of letters poses no editing problems. Unsigned letters will not be printed.

TOM HAYDEN AT D.U.

Tom Hayden, founder and first president of the Students for a Democratic Society, came to speak at Denver University on April 7. "I only speak at places that are supposed to be backwoods and reactionary," he explained.

Abbie Hoffman, of the Youth International Party, was sick in Chicago and couldn't make it. I was disappointed, having expected the dialogue between militant SDS and random Yippie factions to be revealing. As it was, the scheduled lecture turned into a kind of SDS information and strategy session. The first order of business was to tell the press to leave.

An SDS friend from Metro State College told me that DU activists simply don't do anything. It's easy to understand their relative inaction (though not total inaction—40 students were suspended last spring for a sit-in). With an administration that enacts irresponsible and summary judgments and harbors military research grants in secrecy, and with an inert middle-class majority of students, activists think carefully before they try anything.

Although the \$25,000-a-year average annual family income is misleading—the very rich bring up the average considerably—an obvious problem for activists at DU is complacency. Who fights for privileges they already enjoy? At the same time Black and other students on scholarship are afraid to take part in any demonstration. There are various reasons for inertia, even some surprising new ones: "The guys in my fraternity are so lazy, all they want to do is turn on."

According to one student, "the straightest-looking people have turned on." Although a majority of students are in favor of a change in prosecution of drug usage, few have raised their voices even against the University's tactics in dealing, beyond civil law, with drug offenders. Arrests seem to drive the marginally affected into seclusion.

Last year, a student who was turning on with his "friends" went to work for University security and informed on several people, including his roommate, who were subsequently suspended. That informer no longer attends DU but allegedly is working for the police somewhere in New Jersey. In an incident just last week, two students, one former student, and one non-student, all SDS members, were arrested by police as a result of a flimsy package of marijuana with postage due discovered in the Student Union to contain the drug by the director of security.

Universities' methods of dealing with student lawbreakers are changing. Hayden's roommate at the University of Michigan, Denver attorney Tom Lamm, explained that whenever someone would hit a cop and land in jail ten years ago, the University would quickly, quietly bail him out, to save its image. "He was out so fast that he didn't realize he had a legitimate gripe against anyone," says Lamm.

With an unusual background, Hayden reacted differently. While Lamm was placidly pursuing his course to law school, the beginnings of Hayden's radical politics were subtly taking shape.

I know nothing of what goes between that initial urgency in the potential radical and the realized expression in the committed. Some apparent inconsistencies in that committed radical might be explained if the interim were known. One of the apparent contradictions in the style of many radicals is involved with their habit of having the last word. Is it consistent to be so sure, even dogmatic, and in the same breath admit that "SDS doesn't have a monopoly on truth or holiness—do it your own way." Most people are likely to follow his advice rather than his example, but some people are doubtless frightened away by this approach.

Hayden is a kind of martyr for what he believes, not exclusively by his own choosing. I believe him when he says that the press won't print what he says (call it paranoia if you like). I believe that if I was not at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, I don't really know about it. His experience in the South, in North Vietnam, nearly everywhere he has been ("When they pick me up at the airport, they all say, 'This is the worst school in the world.'") has made him more than bitter or desperate. He admits, "At a certain point, it doesn't matter if I go down. I would like to go down with a maximum of understanding by the people. But I'm coming to a point of existential rather than political reality."

It's quite true that the press doesn't report what Hayden, the SDS, or similarly radical groups say, or most unjustly, do. I fail to report it because of my lack of experience, concern, conviction. Those people deal with a problem, they try to practice their ideas. Maybe Abbie Hoffman would support me in stating that just to see a notice, however misconstrued, of some struggle for liberation in the newspaper keeps the myth of freedom alive for those who want to believe in it. The mutual alienation between revolutionaries and established media is damnable, but it's built into the relationship.

Miss Universe in the *Denver Post*: "... the students don't seem to know what they want. They are against, against, against. But they don't know what to do or what to suggest as a replacement for whatever it is they don't like." (April 10, page 27, col. 6) It would be hard for the media to misconstrue the meaning of such everyday opinion. The basis for this deluded moralizing is the misconception that the status quo is the only possible reality. This falls directly into the narrow range of understanding of establishment media.

When a revolutionary demands that something stop, he's saying that it's an unnecessary waste of energy; the same function may be carried out by other elements of the system, freeing the energy, formerly wastefully deployed, for new projects. The risk involved in eliminating outmoded, ineffective parts of a system is simply one of temporary disorganization. Assuming that no one panics, reorganization is a relatively natural process. The specific outcome of the reorganization can not be known before it happens. Adventure! Even Miss Universe can dig that.

Tom Hayden does not know whether he will go to jail on his indictment over the Chicago Convention, whether he will "go down" over future incidents. Former DU student government member and current SDS member Steve Koester can't tell what his moves away from established political action may bring. But they are convinced that only by pressing for the things they want will they have the remotest chance of living the way they believe.

LUCAS

DENVER CENTER FOURTH ESTATE

Vol. 6, No. 27 1100-14th Street, Denver, Colorado April 16, 1969

FORMERLY THE DENVER CENTER SENTRY

The Denver Center *FOURTH ESTATE* is an independent newspaper published weekly by the students of the University of Colorado Denver Center, 1100 14th St., Denver, Colorado 80202. The *FOURTH ESTATE* is not published during final exam periods or during official University holiday periods.

The *FOURTH ESTATE* editorial offices are located on the mezzanine of the new first-floor Student Lounge area, in the Tower Building. Office hours are 10:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Telephone: 244-6081, ext. 364 and 365.

LANN MEYERS Editor-in-Chief
SUZANNE WEISS Managing Editor
CAROL BOOK News Editor
BILL LUCAS Copy Editor
DIANE WOLFE Feature Editor
SAM PACE Business Manager
PEGGY SALISBURY Secretary

PHOTOGRAPHERS: Peter White, Steve McCarter

CALENDAR: Stephen Hatch

CARTOONIST: Marty Armstrong

STAFF: Jackie Acosta, Tom Anderson, Alice Avila, Flo Berman, Annette Chandler, Bob Curley, Alan Czarny, Jo Elenbogen, Kiely Forrestal, Roxanne Frazier, Stephen Hatch, James Hicks, Jim Kirksey, Mark Lockwood, Marc Lombard, Walt Mundkowsky, Kern Nuttall, David Prebble, Terry Ragan, Michael Spears, Debbie Tessler, Gordon Tessler, Leda Thaler, Mike True, Alene Tsutsui.

The views expressed herein are not necessarily those of anyone except the student editors. Subscription rates are \$6.00 per year. Editorial offices in Room M110 of Student Lounge mezzanine in Tower Building, 1100 14th St., Denver, Colorado 80202. Represented by National Educational Advertising Service, Inc., 360 Lexington Ave., New York City, N.Y. Member: United States Student Press Assn., Washington, D.C. User of: College Press Service, CU News Service Bureau, and CU Denver Center Office of Public Information.

