

You can't give up on these New Rightists--they know that the Rockefellers, the J.J. McCloy's, the Averell Harrimans, the Paul Hoffmans, the Adlai Stevensons, and the John V. Lindsays run American society. (Here I am just naming some of the relatively few multi-millionaire businessmen and corporation lawyers known to the American public) And, like the New Left, the New Rightists don't like it.

It is your job to teach them that the new corporate system is the problem, not the motives and good faith of the corporate rich they call communists and dupes of liberal academics.

BLUEPRINT FOR NEW SOCIETY

Now, as to our second general need, blueprints for a post-industrial America. Blueprints are first of all necessary to go beyond more criticism. Any half-way moral idiot can criticize corporation capitalism, anyone can point to slums, unemployment, waste, phony advertising, inflation, shoddy goods, and on and on.

To be revolutionary, you have got to go beyond the militantly liberal act of offering some criticism and then asking people to write their congressman or to sit in somewhere so that the authorities will do something about the problem. And it is necessary for you to self-consciously begin to develop this plan because it is not going to miraculously appear after a holocaust or emanate mystically from the collective mind of that heterogeneous generalization called The Movement.

Individuals are going to have to develop aspects of these blueprints, wild, yea-saying blueprints that you can present with excitement and glee to Mr. and Mrs. Fed-up America. It is not enough to be for peace and freedom, which is really only to be against war and racism. It is not positive enough. As a smug little man from the Rand Corporation--a consultant for the other side--once reminded me, everyone, even him, is for peace and justice--the differences begin when you get to specifics.

Blueprints are also necessary to break the Russian logjam in everyone's thinking, revolutionary and non-revolutionary alike. Only by talking about concrete plans, thus getting people reacting to them and thereby developing their own plans, will people forget about Russia--a centralized, bureaucratic, industrializing country that is neither here nor there as far as you are concerned, and has no relevance to either your criticisms or plans.

In short, you have got to show people that your concern is America, that you love America, and that your moral concern is based upon what America could be, as compared with what it is. No one should out-American you. You, as revolutionaries, have a right to that flag. And if you don't feel like grabbing the present American flag right at this juncture, then reach back into American revolutionary history, to the unfinished revolution, for your flags. Like that great snake flag, that phallic message, of the Gadsden Rebellion with its prideful warning hissing out across the centuries: DON'T TREAD ON ME.

FORGET INTERNATIONALISM

The point is that you are Americans and that you want to build a better, a post-industrial America, that you want to use the base your forefathers gave you to realize the American dream. Forget all this internationalism talk. The foreign revolutions some of you hope to copy were fought by men who were fervent nationalists, not bigoted ethnocentrics who believed that no other nationalism was as good or moral as theirs, but nationalists who were of their people,

who loved their country and its culture, and who really lived and developed their own heritage.

The talked internationalism, they read widely, they were appreciative and tolerant of many other culture ways, but they were heart and soul products of their land and its traditions.

To throw away the potent psychological force of nationalism because it has been identified in this country with an Americanism that is often parochial and ethnocentric, and especially anti-Semitic, is to ignore, ironically enough, one of the few things you can learn from studying other 20th-century revolutions: a feeling for your country and its little nuances is an intimate and potent part of Western man.

If that sounds too narrow and unfeeling for some of you, I would add that it is probably wrong anyhow to think your internationalism somehow supports foreign revolutionaries. Don't you think the NFL and the Russians and the Chinese are big enough to take care of themselves? Isn't it perhaps a little bit paternalistic to think you are in any way helping those indigenous movements? Your task is here at home, and the way to get to this task is to develop a set of blueprints to go with your critique.

Now, I don't make these statements and this distinction between nationalism and ethnocentrism, as one who has not considered the problem long and hard. As a Freudian-oriented psychologist, I believe more than anyone, certainly more than you who subscribe to one or other of the environmentalisms that predominate in American social science, that people everywhere have the same basic psyche, the same wishes and fears.

I believe that the transition rites, myths, and rituals from tribes all over the world show that all men and women suffer from fears of separation from mother and group, that all men come to feel rivalry toward father and brother, that all men must go to the desert or the mountain to struggle for independence from their parents, and that all men have a strange sweet ambivalence toward death.

In short, I know that all people have the same problems, but I also know that there are such things as personality and culture--that is, that we all have slightly different ways of handling our wishes and fears. And since I know that these personality and cultural differences are in good part, if not totally, defenses against anxiety and wishes that cause anxiety, I recognize that to attack them, or to ask people to discard them without offering them a new set of defenses, is to invite resistance, is to invite fear and distrust. We are faced with the seeming paradox that men who share the same problems can easily come to mistrust or hate each other if one person's defenses threaten those of the other.

So I am saying that you should bypass these resistances, that as theoretical psychologists you should of course recognize the psychic universality of mankind, but that as revolutionaries you should also recognize that such a general truism is of no use to you in your day-to-day dealings with people if you are not sensitive to and sympathetic toward those individual and group defenses called personality and culture.

You have to recognize that we are all nationalists in the sense of our identity, and work with this fact, trying to bring out the best in your own national tradition.

If this sounds risky to you somehow, as something that might lead to outcomes you don't advocate, or to a narrow parochialism then you have underestimated the importance of blueprints in your revolutionary program. For it is the blueprints that are the key to transcending narrow outlooks and

ensuring that only the best in the American national character is more fully manifested.

It is the explicitly stated blueprints which ensure that some implicit retrogressive program does not come to tacitly guide your actions as a revolutionary movement.

PICTURE OF NEW SOCIETY

What could this post-industrial society look like? Naturally, I have a few suggestions, all tentative, and I will mention some of them. It is on this project that so many more people could become totally involved in the revolutionary process.

If it would be by and large intellectuals, academics, and students who would work on the analysis and critique of the growing corporation feudalism, it would be people from all walks of life who would be essential to this second necessity. You need men and women with years of experience--in farming, small business, teaching, city planning, recreation, medicine, and on and on--to start discussing and writing about the ways to organize that part of society they know best for a post-industrial America.

You need to provide outlets via forums, discussions, papers, and magazines for the pent-up plans and ideals of literally millions of well-trained, experienced, frustrated Americans who see stupidity and greed all around them but can't do a thing about it.

You need to say, for example, "Look Mr. and Mrs. City Planning. Expert trapped in this deadly bureaucracy controlled by big businessmen, draw up a sensible plan for street development, or park development, in your town of 30,000 people." "Look, Mr. Blue Collar Worker, working for this big corporation, how should this particular plant be run in a sensible society?"

MANY MUST BE NEUTRALIZED

In addition, the neutralization of large masses should be one of the prime goals of a program to develop and present blueprints for a post-industrial America. To this end each person in America should receive a short, simple, one-page handbill especially relevant to his situation or occupation. It would begin, for example, "Policeman, standing here protecting us from Evil at this demonstration, Where Will You Be After The Revolution?"

And then, in a few short sentences you will tell this bewildered soul that there will still be a great need for policemen after the revolution, but that policemen will tend to do more of the things that they like to do -- helping, assisting, guiding -- rather than the things that get them a bad name -- that is, faithfully carrying out the repressive dictates of their power elite masters.

You will tell him you know that some policemen are prejudiced or authoritarian, but you also know that is neither here nor there because orders on whether to shoot or not to shoot come from officials higher up, who are intimately intertwined in the corporate system.

Similar handbills should be prepared for every person. Some would hear good things, like more money and better health. Some would hear things that would surprise them or make them wonder, like "You won't be socialized, Mr. Small Businessman producing a novelty or retailing pets on a local level, because the socialized corporations can produce more than enough; and furthermore, keep in mind that government in a post-industrial America couldn't possibly harass you as much as the big bankers who won't lend you money, the big corporations who undercut you, and the corporate-oriented

politicians who over-tax you."

Others, for whom there is no good news, would get such cheery messages as "Insurance Men -- we hope you have other skills, like gardening or typing" "Corporate Manager -- we hope you like working for the anonymous public good as much as you liked working for anonymous millionaire coupon clippers." "CIA man -- we hope you are as good at hiding as you are supposed to be at seeking."

TALK TO THE NEW RIGHT

Perhaps most of all, there has to be a consideration of the role of Mr. John Bircher, Mr. Physician, Mr. Dentist, and others now on the New Right. These people are put off or ignored by increasing corporatization, and they have to be shown that their major values -- individuality, freedom, local determination -- are also the values of a post-industrial America.

This does not mean they will suddenly become revolutionaries, but it is important to start them wondering whether they would find things as bad in the new social system as they do in this system, which increasingly annoys them, exasperates them, and ignores them. They must be weaned from the handful of large corporations and multi-millionaires who use them for their own ends by talking competition while practicing monopoly by screaming about taxes while paying very little, and by talking individuality while practicing collectivism.

What would a post-industrial America look like? First of all, it would be certain American institutions writ large -- like the Pasadena water and electric systems, which are publically owned, like the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has allowed the beginnings of the same, productive, and beautiful development of at least one river region in our country.

In simple terms, the system would start from local controls and work up, like it used to before all power and taxes were swept to the national level, mostly by war and the big corporations. And, as you can see, it would be a mixed system, sometimes with control by consumers, sometimes with control by local government, sometimes with control by regional authorities, and sometimes, as should be made clear in the handbill to certain small businessmen, with control in private hands.

For many retail franchises, for many novelty productions, and, I suspect, for many types of farms and farmers, depending on region, crop involved, and other considerations, private enterprise may be the best method of control.

MUST BE FLEXIBLE

Some people will ask if, by promising some private ownership, we are pandering to a voting bloc. Is it like the old Communist trick of the United Front? The answer is a resounding NO. Any post-industrial society that does not maximize chances for freedom, flexibility, and individuality is not worth fighting for.

Given the enormous capabilities of corporate production, the economic and cultural insignificance of most small businessmen, and the very small number of family farmers, there is simply no economic or political or cultural reason to socialize everything. There is no "kulak" class, there is no "petty bourgeoisie."

Pre-industrial societies may have had to socialize everything to defend their revolutions against hostile forces but that is only another way in which your situation differs from theirs.

I have left the most obvious change for last. Of course the corporations would be socialized. Their profits would go to all people in lower prices (and thus higher

(Continued on page 12)