

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

- 2 -

Mike Harrigton will be my ally. I vaguely recall a conversation he ~~xxxx~~ and I had not too long ago in which he said he regretted the positions he took at the Port Huron Conference ~~xxxxxxx~~. But you might check this with him. Incidentally, I simply do not recall that Mike engaged in tirades - at least in any way that contrasted with the ~~xxxxxx~~ volume and intensity of Tom's remarks. Of Sleighman I will believe anything - though this ~~sent~~ sentence is not for quotation. ~~xx~~ Sleighman continued to be a cold warrior right through the first two years of the V.N. War ~~Q~~ - and for all I know, is still. I remember seeing him at a friend's ~~funeral~~, and he was still hacking away ~~xxx~~ in his crude, intellectually impoverished way - also not for attribution.)

Regarding participatory democracy, I enclose two articles writ by me - one that appeared long before the Port Huron Conference, one recently. (They both appear in William Connolly's anthology ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~, The Bias of Pluralism, published by Atherton.) You will have to check the following with Tom, but it is my impression that he got turned on to the idea of a democracy of participation, and, in any event, first started to think seriously about the theoretical dimensions of the ~~xxx~~ topic, when he took one of my political philosophy courses - a course I devoted to defending participatory democracy, attacking the conventional views expressed by people ~~x~~ like Schumpeter, Lipset, Dahl, et.al. - that is, broadly, the countervailing power conception of democracy. I also deal with the topic in the RADical Liberal, the chapter on democracy. The three will give a more complete answer to the question of what I thought and think participatory democracy means than anything I can say in a paragraph or two here. (I enclose also a recent review that appeared in the Progressive Magazine - of ~~Rxxxxk~~ Kenniston's, The Young Radicals in particular - that also contains pertinent remarks.)

About the teach-ins, I enclose an article I wrote for the Nation shortly after the first teach-ins occurred. Your recollections about Bill Haber are erroneous. The first idea was to hold a day-long Moratorium. When we switched to the teach-in idea Bill Haber was so delighted, ~~xx~~ he was ready to give us anything we wanted - including Hatcher's ~~b~~ Thub. The point was, the teach-in idea, as it did not involve cancelling classes, took him ~~xxxxxxx~~ and other administrators off the hook with Regents and politicians. Incidentally, the Regents came with an ace of passing ~~xxx~~ a resolution punishing us - I forget how - and only some nifty work by Irene MURPHY (she's in Bloomington, Mich., and is Gov. Frank Murphy's sister-in-law) averted that catastrophe. My article should fill in the details. Of course you are right that I was among the original signers of ~~xxxx~~ the Moratorium pledge, and the teach-in idea was invented in my home when about seven of us got together to see whether we could come up with some sensible and honorable response to a situation in which everyone was attacking us for failing to fulfill our responsibilities as teachers and no one was talking about the war. Incidentally, it irritates the hell out of me when various mass publications - including Newsweek and Life Magazine - give SDS the credit for the teach-ins. It was faculty imagination, faculty pushiness, and ~~xxxxx~~ a good measure of faculty energy that brought it off. Students like yourself and others were indispensable - but, at least in this instance, not the initiators.