

PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

This paper is for the purpose of introducing a proposed project for the County to the Neighborhood Groups (n.g.). If there is support for this project from the n.g.s it will be brought up at the County Convention for decision. Please discuss this project in your neighborhood groups.

This project was conceived in response to the Kennedy-McCarthy drive to recruit young people into the Democratic party. In order to counter this drive it is necessary to present, not only an alternative political position, but an alternative style of activity as well. One of the clearest distinctions between us and the establishment parties is our emphasis on building a grass-roots movement which will control the party. If we are to counter the McKennedy lure our youth program must also be a radical break from the traditional political use of young people as "rah-rah" kids, canvassers, cheerleaders, button-pushers, etc.

Essentially, the project consists of recruiting high school and college students, plus other youth to volunteer for full time work in the peace and freedom movement over the summer. These students would concentrate their efforts in two areas, (1) assisting and helping to build the n.g., (2) providing "shock troops" for county projects and emergencies.

Those n.g. who requested it would have some of the alternative members assigned to their n.g. to work with and assist the n.g. in such things as recruiting new members, campaigning for candidates, community involvement programs, leafletting, manning store front offices, etc. The organization of a youth project with it's own otherwise would not become involved in a n.g. or full time work for the movement.

Secondly, the Alternative project would, in addition, provide a hard-core of manpower around which the county could build county-wide programs. For example the Alternative project would be able to provide a corps of monitors for demonstrations who are accustomed to working together and who are available for extensive training. They would provide the manpower for any emergency operating, such as, a county-wide leafletting, or emergency demonstration (within the guidelines set by the n.g. of course). They would be a source of manpower that any n.g. could draw on if the need arose.

Thirdly, the Alternative project would have a special responsibility of involving young people in the party, of reaching and educating young people.

Hopefully this project would accomplish several things:

- 1) It would serve to radicalize and involve young people who might otherwise be insnared in the McKennedy web. It would give these young people a true view of the problems facing our society and give them experiance in grassroots organizing and politics. It would be part of a program of developing new leadership for the movement and country.
- 2) It would help build stronger n.g. by providing additional manpower and energy for n.g. projects. Because the Alternative members, all working with different n.g.s, will be meeting and working together much of the time, they will provide a means for real cross-polinization between the various n.g.s.
- 3) It would allow the county to mount effective action and programs on the base provided by alternative. Especially in regards to the opportunity the project will provide for the training of monitors, canvassers, organizers, mimeo operators etc.

Two things are needed for this project at this time. One is a discussion with-in the n.g. as to whether they think this is a good project and should be adopted, and also whether or not they would want Alternative members assigned to their group. Secondly, volunteers to work on a committee to set up Alternative, assuming it is approved.

Submitted by

Bruce Hartford
Delegate-S. F. State
4/1/68

STATEMENT OF CANDIDACY FOR THE 6TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
PEACE AND FREEDOM PARTY PRIMARY
by Walter L. Battaglia

I am interested in seeking the office of Congressman as the Peace and Freedom Party candidate, and hope to run in the primary election and in November. This statement shall express my views on a number of issues with which the P & F will have to deal in any meaningful campaign.

The Congressional Office

The Congressman should not spend the majority of his time in the halls and the cloakrooms of the Capitol. He should spend his time among the people of his District, finding out what they want, making proposals for implementation, and drawing up methods to implement programs already in effect. He should be an organizer of his District, making the decision-making process easily accessible to the people of his District by inviting the people into it and abiding by the decisions they make. He should spend time at the Capitol only in so far as it is necessary to submit proposals, initiate arguments for the proposals, and co-ordinate the activities of his staff. A staff of people from the District should be largely responsible for the "parliamentary manouvering" that goes on in D.C.; and this kind of activity should not, in any event, be a major portion of the activities of a P & F candidate or official.

An "effective" Congressman is not the Congressman who plays the power-politics game. He is not a toady who seeks influence, wheels and deals, compromises, and finally sells our Movement out, then to come back to tell us what a great job he has been doing. The Congressman is an active participant in the decision-making process by bringing the constituents themselves into that process. He is, in my view, the instrument of the people; not the tool of some tyrant in the White House or in a back room.

Responsibilities of Candidates and
Elected Officials

Our candidates and elected officials must be responsible to the people who have elected them, and who are involved in the Movement's decision-making process. This does not mean everyone -- it would be nearly impossible for me to represent the "warhawks" or racists. I would not and do not represent their views. It is perfectly obvious that an official or candidate can only represent some people. I take it to be my responsibility to represent the "some" who are in our Movement or who participate in our decision-making. This point is important, as it is the standard ploy of many politicians to respond to charges of racism by saying "I represent all the people, etc". How can they?

It is the duty of the opposition to organize and make effective their dissent. This is our present responsibility. In the future, it may be someone else who has this duty. Our goal should be to make our policies and methods of organization so attractive, that no sane person would want to do things any other way. The final test of the validity of our programs is their acceptance by the people and the active participation of the people in their implementation. The specific duty of P & F candidates is to organize, organize, organize! Candidates have a figurehead role, but they also gather and distribute information, and should be instrumental in explaining policies of the Movement to the general public and in co-ordinating the activities of the many groups within Peace and Freedom. A candidate must represent the general will of the Movement, but no candidate is to use his public statements to bend the Movement to his will. A candidate who cannot in good conscience represent the Movement or fulfill the duties of his elected office, should resign. I will fulfill that pledge, if I am the candidate.

The Powers of Government vs.
the People

I do not believe that, every time a problem arises in our society, we should run to the Federal Government and bring Federal intervention. To do so is to give up power to the Federal Government. The cliché is true: "you cannot legislate morality". Political, social, and economic problems cannot be resolved by legislation alone; they are resolved through the active work of the people themselves. If we are to be democratic and still implement the programs we urge, it is our responsibility to organize the implementation of these programs at the lowest level possible. We cannot let George (a Federal agency) do it, for we cannot then be assured of the results. We must be self-reliant.

This, it appears to me, is the basic organizing principle of the Black Power Movement, the Delano strikers, the National Liberation Front, and of the Peace and Freedom Party. It is also a principle guiding many new Unions, whose members are tired of being managed by the "benevolent" dictatorships of the proletariat --whether Union or Management.

I am not interested in creating a new technocracy, or a new bureaucracy. I am not interested in creating a society where everything is "good," where everyone is "happy", or where everything is generally uniform. Each individual must lead his own life, whether he make mistakes or not. I am wholly against any attempt to create through our Movement or by any other device, just another Government which governs in the "interest" of the people. The ultimate criterion, in my opinion, is that each of us should have decided upon his own affairs and should have given thought to his brother when he did so; but not that he always made the "right" decision. For the Stalinists -- who place ultimate value on that "right" decision -- I can offer only the use of a computer, wherein the lives and activities of a society can be simulated according to the "right"; but no person should ever be subjected to the management of his life by someone else.

People generally must have the power to make the decisions which affect them, and must take the responsibilities for implementing the decisions they make. It is not this way now, and it is this failure of American political life which I see as the basis of our war policies, our racism, and much else that is wrong. It is this failure which necessitates the Black Power Movement, the struggle at Delano, and the struggles of workers on the job against repressive conditions. I support the struggle of these people, because their struggle is basic to the revolutionary process of re-structuring our society.

Specific Issues -- General Statement

The War in Viet Nam: I support the position demanding withdrawal of troops now! The internal affairs of the Viet Nameese people are none of our business. The United States must not make, as a condition of withdrawal, any demand on the Viet Nameese in regard of their choices of institutions. It is my opinion that the NLF is the major viable organization in Viet Nam, but we must await the decision of the Viet Nameese before entering into further relations with Viet Nam. Our only unilateral duty to Viet Nameese people is to permit those persons who wish, as part of our withdrawal, to remove themselves from Viet Nam to do so. But the United States should guarantee nothing beyond the safety of their person; we should not guarantee the safety of their bank accounts.

The Minority Movements: I support the movements among minorities to take their just place in our society, and to decide for themselves what shall be the case in their communities. No one should abridge this right. Particularly, I support the demand that Huey Newton be set free.

Beyond these statements, I can say only that we must support the active struggle of minority groups for their cause; but it is they who must decide what the cause is and how to achieve it. Any other position perpetuates white people as a ruling class; and also abridges the principles of democracy.

Unionization: A new movement has appeared among Unions to free themselves from the domination of the AFL-CIO and the labor bureaucracy. IN San Francisco, the SSEU (Social Service Employees Union) is an example. This Union, of which I am a member, is organized in much the same way as the Peace and Freedom Party. It believes that on-the-job conditions can only be corrected by workers themselves, and rejects the idea that some outside business agent or representative is a necessity. Workers represent themselves and make their own decisions. This Union, and the others like it, represent a positive force in our society and should be supported by the Peace and Freedom Movement and its candidates.

The Organization of the Economy: We need regional planning committees, made up of people from the region who are responsible to the people of the region. But we should not give authority to these committees to enforce a plan. They should function to gather and distribute information, and help to co-ordinate economic activities. Basic control of economic activity should pass from the hands of large corporations and stockholders to the people who actually provide the service to society; that is, the workers. Workers are perfectly well able to manage themselves and their own enterprises. We must reject the snobbish notion that mere workers need "guidance" and that the intellectuals are needed to manage that "guidance." If worker's committees are empowered to run their own shop, large scale planning on the basis of co-operation will be possible and there will be needed no authoritative body to enforce bureaucratically made decisions. For those who say this cannot work, I respond: how do you know unless you try?

I support a guaranteed income for all people in the United States, but only as a temporary measure. There are many unresolved questions as regards how this plan would be implemented. I am opposed to Theobald's proposal, because it is, in essence, a proposal to keep the rich, rich, and gives no power to the poor to change it. A guaranteed income is a transitional measure necessitated by our "free enterprise" economy; but a re-organization of the structure of our economy to co-operative principles would eliminate the necessity of such a plan in most cases. I do favor immediate adoption of a guaranteed income, however, in preference to the degrading and repressive "welfare" measures we now have.

Other issues: I invite questions from the floor on any of the above or on any issue of importance; I shall try to answer the questions.

BACKGROUND, ETC

Name: Walter L. Battaglia

Address: 271 Corte Madera Avenue, Corte Madera, Marin County

Born: April, 1940, Needham, Mass.

Resident of California since 1963, having moved to Berkeley then. Moved to Marin in 1967. Currently separated, and I have 1 son.

Graduate of Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst., Troy, NY in Philosophy; attended 1 year graduate school at UC, Berkeley.

Occupation: Social Worker in various Bay Area counties; presently on assignment as a programmer to program social services projects. I work in the City and have for nearly 2 years.

Political Activities: Active VDC 1965-66, on Scheer Campaign Committee 66; in Berkeley Community for New Politics 66 - 67, active in Berkeley City elections 1967, and active in a committee of CNP which started the P&F idea in 1967. For personal reasons, I have been active in Union affairs only, since July, and am currently a Civil Service Representative for the SSEU.



WHY R.F.K. IS NOT A PEACE CANDIDATE

R.F.K. VOWED TO SUPPORT JOHNSON UNTIL IT BECAME POLITICALLY OBVIOUS THAT A PEACE-LIKE CANDIDATE CAN OBTAIN SUPPORT FROM THE ELECTORATE.

R.F.K. HAS NEVER SPOKEN AGAINST THE WAR, BUT ONLY AGAINST THE METHOD OF CARRYING ON THE WAR.

R.F.K. ENDORSES AND SYMBOLIZES THE WHOLE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM WHICH HAS MADE THE VIETNAMESE WAR NECESSARY AND DESIRABLE AS A TOOL OF THE U.S. IMPERIALISTIC EXPANSIONIST STRUCTURE. AN END TO THE WAR IN VIETNAM IS NEEDED. BUT.... DOES THE SOLUTION POSITED BY R.F.K. IN ANY WAY REMEDY THE INTERNAL CONDITIONS (I.E. FOREIGN POLICY, ECONOMIC SYSTEM) WHICH HAVE CREATED THE VIETNAMESE WAR, AND WHICH MAKE OTHER WARS NECESSARY FOR U.S. ECONOMIC SURVIVAL?

R.F.K. WANTS TO END THE WAR BY NEGOTIATIONS. THIS PRESUMES THAT THE U.S. HAS A RIGHT TO BE IN VIETNAM, AND IS FIGHTING TO MAINTAIN THAT RIGHT.

HOWEVER, WE CONTEND THAT THE U.S. HAS NO RIGHT TO BE IN VIETNAM WHATSOEVER. WE CONTEND THAT THE U.S. IS THE AGGRESSOR. THE ONLY MORAL SOLUTION IS IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL. IF JOHNSON WINS THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION, ROBERT F. KENEDY WILL SUPPORT HIM. FOR THIS REASON ALONE, R.F.K. IS NOT A PEACE CANDIDATE.

CONSIDER THIS CAREFULLY AND THOUGHTFULLY. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

SAN FRANCISCO PEACE AND FREEDOM MOVEMENT

55 COLTON STREET

PHONE 431-0383

"I AM NOT RUNNING UP THE WHITE FLAG OF SURRENDER NOR AM I SAYING WE SHOULD WITHDRAW ALL OUR TROOPS FROM VIETNAM."

R.F.K., S.F. CHRONICLE, MARCH 1968

RFK (like McCarthy) has voted for all war appropriations. Both voted for the fiscal 1968 Military Procurement Authorization Bill (\$20.8 Billion) and the 1968 appropriation for the Defense Department (\$69.9 Billion). Both voted against an amendment which would have reduced the appropriation by 10%.

RFK was absent on all voting on the draft. However, he supports the Pentagon position completely (19 year olds make more pliant soldiers). He is not opposed to the draft. RFK essentially agrees with the basic principles which underly the waging of the war. He is not against continuing U.S. domination over Southeast Asia.

The Peace & Freedom Movement demands that the U.S. immediately get out of Vietnam. RFK wants to maintain control in Vietnam by negotiating U.S. continued presence and "right" to stay in Vietnam.

The difference between negotiations and withdrawal is not a matter of degree. The "withdrawal" position means the right of self-determination for the Vietnamese people. The "negotiation" position implies that the U.S. has some legitimate interest in Vietnam - that it has something to negotiate. ~~That is not the case!~~

The assertion of the right to control Vietnam reflects the fundamental assumption of present U.S. foreign policy. Kennedy is conspicuously quiet about the presence of U.S. troops throughout the underdeveloped countries of the world. Thus he chooses to ignore the basic issue of our time. The right of oppressed people to self-determination and freedom from U.S. domination.

LBJ, McCarthy, or RFK differ only with respect to the tactics of conducting that policy of U.S. domination--whether by bombing or by negotiating can the U.S. best maintain its presence in Vietnam. RFK, who feels the U.S. can best remain in Vietnam by negotiating instead of costly bombings as before, play upon the legitimate anti-war sentiments of honest people who want an end to the war.

San Francisco State Peace & Freedom Movement

A POSITION PAPER
by Mike Schon

This is a paper written without anger, but a little sadly because of what has come to pass. It is written by one who is trying to become a good Quaker and who is genuinely concerned with the idealism expressed by the words "Peace" and "Freedom".

Since the Registration Drive was launched last September, I have served this organization in every capacity from State Chairman to ordinary club member working to change political thought in my own neighborhood. I have had ample opportunity to observe all our people and to draw a few conclusions from what I have seen.

In this paper I am going to say some things that are unpopular. They are unpopular because some members of our group are more interested in their own status (as powers behind a rather shakey throne), or in the propagation of their own sectarian positions, than they are in Peace and Freedom.

Some months ago, we registered many thousands of people for Peace and Freedom. Whether we like it or not, we did not register them in a "movement", we registered them in a political party. These thousands of people for the most part wanted to be able to go to the polls in November and be able to vote for real candidates who might credibly be able to serve if elected.

Whether we like it or not, most people did not register Peace and Freedom because they wanted some central command post for an armed rebellion.

Whether we like it or not, most people did not register Peace and Freedom because they believed in a "united front" of already existing Left wing organizations. Most Party registrants would be hard-pressed to even identify the various segments of our so-called coalition.

Most important of all, people did not register Peace and Freedom because they wanted to be "educated" by "enlightened" activists such as ourselves. The registrants in this Party are not a "captive" audience for our personal use.

We have proclaimed in very self-righteous terms that we are a real grass-roots movement. We have said that our organization is structured so that policy decisions are made from the bottom up not the top down, and this is patently inconsistent with the "We've got to educate them..." approach.

It is not enough to say that most Party registrants are not now active and don't really care. Seventy thousand citizens of California are still registered Peace and Freedom.

The purpose of this paper is to ask, WHO SPEAKS FOR THEM?

DO THE PETTY POLITICIANS IN OUR MOVEMENT SPEAK FOR OUR REGISTRANTS?

The national convention from which many of us have just returned saw potential candidates dropping in and out of nomination somewhat like ants at a picnic where there is too much food. It all depended on who got to them first to convince them that only they could "save the Party". Re-assertion of candidacy is always made with the excuse, "I have an unrepresented point of view which needs to be expressed". We may listen for such presentations at this convention.

God forbid that this party and it's future should ever really depend upon individuals who are so ego-involved as to see themselves as Messiahs in a Holy crusade!

DOES THE STATE STEERING COMMITTEE SPEAK FOR OUR REGISTRANTS?

Two weeks before Ann Arbor the State Steering Committee knew to a man that the national convention had been rigged for Eldridge Cleaver. The Steering Committee refused to act. What is sad about this is that Eldridge would have been the obvious choice of an unrigged convention!

Two weeks before Ann Arbor the State Steering Committee knew to a man that much of the money for national organizing had been lost, mishandled, or stolen. The Steering Committee refused to act! In the corridors of authority in our movement, what has happened to the words "responsibility" and "integrity"?

DO THOSE WHO SUPPORT A "JOKE" VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDACY SPEAK FOR OUR REGISTRANTS?

~~Do~~ most people register Peace and Freedom so they could vote for the most bizarre, "mind-blowing", underage, far-out nominees? Is this how you get enough people to support you so you can change the system?

When the news media contact our candidates and ask, for example, about the area of foreign policy, should we have candidates who are patently ignorant in this area? "What side do you support in Nigeria?" "What changes would you make in the Rio Pact?" "Who should the U.S. support in Kashmir?" "What about the Sudan?" Do our registrants want candidates who will answer these complex questions with hazy generalizations and four-letter words?

DO THOSE WHO SAY, "PEACE IS NICE, BUT IT ISN'T QUITE AS IMPORTANT RIGHT NOW AS FREEDOM" SPEAK FOR OUR REGISTRANTS?

Recently I have heard many of our activists mouth phrases such as "Justice comes out of the barrel of a gun!", and "You have to have freedom before you have peace!" (If this latter phrase sounds familiar, it should-- it's our State Department's explanation of why we're still fighting in Vietnam!!)

Is there no longer room for pacifists in our "Peace" Party? WHO IS THERE AMONG THE CANDIDATES YOU WOULD NOMINATE FOR VICE-PRESIDENT WHO REALLY SPEAKS FOR PEACE?

In all of this, I am not criticizing leaders of a "political" party for being "political".

I am saying that there is a time when, for the health of the Party, we must set aside the "ISC view", the "Radical Caucus view", the "Gregory Caucus view", the "Rubin Caucus view", and take the long view.

The enemy is not among us except as we allow petty partisanship to become that enemy.

The enemy is the National establishment- out there... not that other Caucus who may win all the debate points in having "their" choice nominated for Vice-president.

This weekend we will be making some important decisions-- important not because what we do here will immediately change the course of this nation. We are, at the moment, too inconsequential for that. This weekend is important because what we do here in one way or another will affect our own lives, our ability to work together, and the life of our party.

It is not too late to suspend our sectarian judgements for the idealism of the "Peace" and "Freedom" we talked about last September. It is not too late. It may, in fact, be just the right moment.

IT IS TIME TO ASK, "WHERE ARE OUR STATESMEN?"

IT IS TIME TO ASK, "WHO SPEAKS FOR THE MAJORITY OF THOSE WHO REGISTERED PEACE AND FREEDOM?"