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Generations are as the days of toilsome mankind.--What the father has made, the son can make and enjoy, but he has also work of his own appointed to him.--Thus all things wax and roll onwards--arts, establishments, opinions; nothing is ever completed, but completing.

--Thomas Carlyle
PREFACE

In a drab, former coin shop at 4526 Roosevelt Way on the evening of March 22, 1967, the underground press came to Seattle. Since early February when the San Francisco intersection of Haight and Ashbury was becoming a household word, members of the Free University in Seattle had talked of starting a paper something like the Berkeley Barb. Among those envisioning a Seattle underground were three carry-overs from the beatnik era—Paul Sawyer, Paul Dorpat and Lorenzo Milam. Twenty-one-year-old Walt Crowley, long-time Helix writer and illustrator and the paper's current editor replacing Dorpat in July 1969, described them as "highly charged, very creative individuals, whose artistic alienation separated them from established society."1 Sawyer, then a Seattle Unitarian minister, and Milam, who would later start a Seattle beatnik radio station, helped Dorpat push the idea of an underground paper beyond the brainstorm stage. More than anything else, Dorpat's indefatigable desire to publish the paper probably carried the plan to its final stages.

A dream was coming true and the underground was about to become a reality. The next task was to adopt a

1Walt Crowley, interview at the Id Bookstore, Seattle, September 5, 1969.
name. Finally, after spurning names like "Swamp Fly" and "Peeping Fred," the word helix popped up. And, as Crowley put it: "Since the name Helix satisfied no one, it was immediately hailed by everyone as the perfect compromise."\(^2\)

With Dorpat as editor, the 2,500 copies of the first edition of Helix were promptly bought at 15 cents each. Circulation mushroomed to 16,000 by late spring, 1967, when it was rumored that migrant hippies from Haight-Ashbury were to "invade" Seattle. When the summer arrived and the hippies didn't, Helix circulation began to ebb. It looked for a while as if the paper might not thrive without the anticipated hippie subculture. The staff lost enthusiasm and the once-ebullient layout seemed to lose its sparkle. Sales tumbled through the fall until they finally stabilized at 5,000 in early winter. Anxiety and skepticism grew among the staff; it knew its paper was in the doldrums and that the future looked grim.

Somehow--perhaps due in part to Dorpat's tenacity--Helix survived and lived to celebrate a first anniversary, but not without undergoing striking changes. By the spring of 1968, Helix was no longer solely a spontaneous journalistic and artistic oracle. The people behind the paper were aware of their powers as a journalistic force, and with this

new awareness they felt a sense of renewed responsibility. Then came the Chicago riots during the summer of 1968. From these disturbances a social mood evolved, triggering in Helix key innovations that established the paper as a volatile political organ. According to Crowley: "Psychedelic propaganda in Helix was replaced with polemic and trips had to compete with facts. . . . For the first time Helix joined in the organization game and became something of a political force within and beyond the left."^3

Crowley contends Helix is a psychodrama, not a newspaper: "What you see every week is merely a by-product of a larger process. Helix is a highly charged gestalt, an integrated force field generated by a constellation of powerful and hungry egos."^4

In the following pages, this "highly charged gestalt" will be reviewed and analyzed to determine how the "constellation of powerful and hungry egos" sees itself and the world.

After having been intrigued by "hip" papers for some time, I decided during the summer of 1968 to do a thesis on the underground movement. Warren J. Brier, dean of the Montana School of Journalism and my committee adviser, liked the idea, but suggested I narrow the topic lest I get

^3 Ibid., p. 15.

^4 Ibid.
embroiled in more than I could handle. Heeding this advice, I headed for Seattle during spring break in March 1969, visited the *Helix* office, and talked to Dorpat about the possibility of doing the thesis on his paper. He agreed and I proceeded to orient myself to the task.

During the six days I stayed in Seattle, I watched as the March 26 issue was made up (an all night ritual each Tuesday), visited the Wallingford District *Outlook* offices (neighborhood newspaper at 42nd. and Woodlawn where *Helix* rents IBM typewriters), and got acquainted with the staff. When I returned to Missoula for spring quarter, I brought with me all 63 issues of the two-year-old paper. That quarter I began to index the papers and to plan the thesis.

During September, 1969, I again visited the *Helix* office for five days. That time I observed part of the work on the September 4 issue, looked in on the IBM's again, picked up summer back issues and talked with staff members. That visit tied up loose ends from the earlier one and culminated in lengthy interviews with Crowley and the *Helix* drama and film critic, Roger Downey. The philosophies of these and other *Helix* writers, poets, artists and photographers will be described in the following chapters.

No thesis is completed without the cooperation of many persons. My thanks, especially, to the *Helix* staff members who were generous with their time and energy. And, I owe a great deal to my committee members, Dean Brier,
Robert C. McGiffert and Gordon M. Browder, for their help throughout the completion of the text.
CHAPTER 1

THE UNDERGROUND PRESS: REVOLUTIONARY MEDIUM OF THE 1960'S

The tabloids known today as underground newspapers began in 1956 with the Greenwich Village weekly, The Village Voice. Until the advent of the Los Angeles Free Press in 1964, The Voice was the country's only regularly published anti-establishment newspaper speaking for the "hip generation." Though it spoke well for the beatniks ("hippies" of the 1950's), The Voice today seems almost "straight" compared with the many undergrounds that have sprung up since the hippie movement caught hold. Seeking a diversity of readers, The Voice became a composite of orthodox and radical philosophies.

Although the undergrounds vary in appearance and content, they manifest striking similarities. Usually tabloids, they may contain from four to more than 30 pages and may appear in black and white or color. Layouts often are intricate and may exhibit an array of imaginative photomontages and/or freehand art work. Printing procedures range from simple mimeographed copy to elaborate photo-offset processes. The Wall Street Journal has noted: "In Los Angeles, anyone can run off 5,000 copies of an eight-page paper at a local offset print shop for about $80. Ad revenue at the L.A. Free Press is about $5,000 a week,
two-thirds of it from national advertisers, particularly phonograph record companies.\footnote{Richard Stone, "The Underground Press Succeeds by Intriguing Rebels and 'Squares,'" \textit{The Wall Street Journal}, March 4, 1968, p. 15.} For those reasons plus an abundance of volunteer labor, few undergrounds have failed for financial reasons.

In the traditional sense, there is nothing very underground about the underground press. Like the orthodox media, "hip" papers are hawked on street corners and mailed without incident. In short, these oracles of psychedelic narrative, political diatribes and sexual liberation are available to the general public. The hippie-types, "flower children," advocates of the ultra-Left, and students are not the only audience. \textit{The Wall Street Journal} reported: "An \textit{EVO /East Village Other} readership study of 1,200 readers found that 71\% had attended college, with 29\% having graduated and 13\% having gone on to graduate school. . . . Among \textit{EVO} subscribers are about 500 enlisted men in the armed forces. . . ."\footnote{Ibid., p. 1.}

Though it frequently is said that "hip" papers are poorly written, inane and boring (doubtless the accusations are often valid), what the papers have to say cannot be ignored. And their stories reflect how an important segment
of the young generation sees today's establishment world. To them it is a dismal world indeed. In the words of Walter Bowart, former publisher and editor of EVO: "We're trying to warn civilization of its impending collapse... We try to offer as many alternatives as the mind can bear."3

Though undergrounds sometimes are irrational and irresponsible in attacks against the established order, what they say is relevant. Theirs is an important voice of the 1960's.

There is little doubt that the hippie movement helped the undergrounds soar from perhaps five publications in 1966 to between 150 and 200 (with an estimated circulation of nearly two million) by the summer of 1968. Writing in the Montana Journalism Review, Merilee Fenger discussed common objectives of the hippies and the underground press:

The underground press, primary source of fuel for the hippies' underground railway of revolt, evolved with the hippie movement... So the hippies and the underground press, seeking a different route to the doors of perception, formed the political underground...4

Ravaged by malnutrition, disease, drugs and tourists, the hippie cult of the Hashbury is dead. But the newspapers they helped create are very much alive. Although undergrounds have sprouted in several cities across the country, four are perhaps best known: the East Village Other, the

---


Los Angeles Free Press, The Fifth Estate and the Berkeley Barb. From the vehemently political Barb to the psychedelic EVO, underground topics are well covered.

The underground press began to flourish before the hippies came to the Haight. It all started when the then 36-year-old Jewish intellectual Art Kunkin—who had moved to Los Angeles and was employed as a tool-and-die maker—founded the L.A. Free Press in spring, 1964. Before starting the Free Press, Kunkin had been writing for the East Side Almanac (a Mexican-American weekly in East Los Angeles). He was dismissed from the paper for writing an article accusing President Johnson of incompetence in handling Mexican-American grievances. The dismissal was triggered when FBI agents—concerned about Kunkin's possible Communist affiliations in the past—began to question his editor. Kunkin borrowed enough money ($15) from friends to run off 5,000 copies of the new paper. The not so "artsy" but polemical Free Press quickly became a hotbed of controversy in the Los Angeles area; if the Los Angeles Times was for it, the Free Press was sure to oppose it. Kunkin says he founded the paper "to fill a 'political vacuum' left by 'Establishment' papers that support one or the other of the two major political parties."^5

Like most undergrounds, the radical and provocative

---

Free Press does not claim to be unbiased. "Hip" editors maintain that writing for an underground implies an involvement that rules out objectivity. Moreover, they don't see the orthodox media as ideals of objectivity. Claiming that journalistic objectivity is a myth, they regard the orthodox press as "captive" and "conveniently" incomplete. Viewing "straight" papers as chronicles of hypocrisy, "hip" writers aim to project a "total human experience" into every story. Kip Shaw, former Liberation News Service (underground news service) employee, evinced the underground view when he said: "We don't pretend to be completely objective in our coverage, but we do try for an honest subjectivity that will convey a sense of what it's like to be on our side of the story. The events aren't as important as the effect of the events on us as human beings." 

Undergrounds tell their stories the way they see them and feel them, and they do it with intense emotion. Because they are passionate, brash and sometimes shabbily written, "hip" papers can hardly be considered good journalism in the traditional sense. Thomas Pepper, former reporter and graduate student, recently wrote in The Nation: "The underground papers are not a quality press . . .

---

6 John Kronenberger, "What's Black and White and Pink and Green and Dirty and Read All Over?" Look, October 1, 1968, p. 20.
because they pander to their readers with a dexterity befitting the Establishment papers they criticize so bitterly. They offer nothing more than a stylized theory of protest." But he added that "the papers have awakened virtually all concerned to a real deficiency in American journalism . . . the fact that regular metropolitan dailies do not communicate with subcultures."7

The undergrounds—relying on shock tactics and liveliness—make no claims of impeccable accuracy; they even eschew many rules and trademarks of conventional news media. First, the undergrounds seek to ferret out what they consider distortions and omissions in "straight" news reporting. Then they present their own explosive and colorful interpretations of those shortcomings. That the undergrounds use scare tactics is no secret. Said Peter Legieri, 25-year-old law student and editor-publisher of EVO: "In burlesquing religion, airing taboo words and mocking political leaders, I hope to make the reader 'wince' and 'realize there's another alternative to his own world.'"8

Often using a vocabulary offensive to those outside their readership, undergrounds continue to test the patience

---


8 Stone, op. cit., p. 1.
of the "straight" society and the power of the courts. Uninhibited display of four-letter words and nude photography and art work have riled citizens in several cities and have led to arrests in Milwaukee and West Palm Beach, Florida. Avatar (elegant Boston underground) was confronted by an outraged Cambridge City Council for the conversational use of certain nouns and verbs. So the paper emblazoned the words four inches high on the front page. Fifty-eight of the paper's hawkers were arrested, but peace was restored when Avatar agreed not to sell to those under 18.

How do undergrounds view obscenity charges? Allan Katzman, 32-year-old co-founder of EVO, said: "We're not based on perfection; we're based on our own reliable responses to what's going on. If at times we're extremely obscene, it's because we're feeling obscene. We're not afraid of expressing our feeling... it's journalism through your fingertips." And when it was suggested to Dorpat of the Helix that his paper seemed to include more "obscenities" than, for example, the Barb or the Oracle, he said: "If it looks that way it's just because that's the way it turns out. We don't try to make Helix more 'obscene' or less 'obscene' than any other paper." But irrespective of

9Kronenberger, loc. cit.

10Paul Dorpat, from a discussion at the Helix office, March 25, 1969.
their editors' intentions, undergrounds across the country continue to crank out reams of stories and articles that slap hard at the Christian ethics of millions of Americans.

The "hip" papers--despite their chiding of the ordered society--have their own bourgeois versions of the AP and UPI wire services. To unify objectives and to make their papers less parochial, five papers founded a news service called the Underground Press Syndicate (UPS), in spring, 1966. The papers are: The Washington Independent, Seattle Helix, Austin Rag, The Paper of East Lansing, Michigan, and the Canadian Free Press. Within a year the syndicate had about two dozen members with a combined circulation of 264,000. Then in 1967 a second news service sprang up when Ray Mungo (Boston University '67) and Marshall Bloom (Amherst '68)--both radical editors of their college papers--founded the Liberation News Service (LNS).

Emphasizing politics, LNS soon was supplying inexpensive political coverage ($15 per month) to 400 outlets, including 100 underground papers. Mungo feels almost messianic about LNS and UPS (together forming a loose alliance called "The Alternate Media"); he believes the alliance represents the wave of the future. We've educated a generation that no longer buys or needs a daily paper. They believe us, not you. We represent an idea whose time has come. I'd much rather put The New York Times out of business than the New York police. It does much
more damage.  

Most undergrounds seem to be moving from cult religions and psychedelic drugs toward politics. *Avatar*, the *Free Press* and *Helix*, for example, have stepped up political coverage in recent months, while *EVO* (which grew out of the drug and hippie cultures) struggles for a new identity. The drug culture is dead, said Jeff Shero, editor of the *Rat*, which bills itself as New York's muckraking subterranean newspaper.

It's now impossible to believe in any kind of salvation from drugs. Kids get drafted or hit by cops on real or phony drug raids. The outside world keeps barging through your door and you've got to confront it.  

During recent months undergrounds have popped up on college campuses and in the nation's high schools. In May, 1966, *The New York Times* reported that LNS estimated the number of campus-affiliated undergrounds at 200, and that government spokesmen put the number of "hip" papers in the secondary schools at between 500 and 1,000.  

The article also noted that *The Times* surveyed underground organs on 13 campuses across the country. Among the "pernicious" papers investigated were: *The Argus*, Ann

---

11 Leo, loc. cit.

12 Ibid.

Arbor, Michigan; The Water Tunnel, Pennsylvania State University; The Old Mole, Harvard, and The Free Press, Temple University, Philadelphia.

Though campus undergrounds differ in quality and content, their common objective is to let orthodox society know how they feel about subjects such as the Vietnam War, treatment of racial and economic minorities, governmental fiascos and the hypocrisy of establishment America.

The college papers have encountered trouble from legal authorities and school administrators, mostly for printing "obscene" pictures and "smutty" words. The Water Tunnel, for example, was banned briefly on charges of obscenity only two hours after it appeared in January, 1969—inciting Penn State's first student protest in years.

Meantime, at Grinnell College (a traditional citadel of Middle Western conservatism), copies of the Pterodactyl (an off-campus publication) were seized by the state Attorney General. After suing the Attorney General for $11,000, the editors again are publishing. Though a Federal Court ruled out the obscenity charge, it wouldn't grant the $11,000 because the Attorney General is a state official.

The hippies of the Hashbury are only a memory, and there is reason to believe that the drug cult too may soon die out. But the underground press endures. Because "hip" editors and their staffs keep their papers abreast of the
changing times, the colorful papers would appear to have a future. Crowley, however, disagrees. Political under­
grounds, he predicts, eventually will be suppressed because they are becoming
an aggressive and specific threat to established institutions. By gaining followers who want to evolve outside the established mechanisms of social control, the papers are girding themselves for a confrontation.\footnote{Walt Crowley, interview at the Id Bookstore, Seattle, September 5, 1969.}
CHAPTER 2

ANATOMY OF THE Helix

Eight full-time and about 15 part-time contributors make the Helix a reality. Helix personnel, like those of most undergrounds, are not salaried. They donate their time and talent to protest an establishment press that they believe tells half-truths and lies and ignores racial minorities, the poor and other alienated subcultures.

Helix people are not motivated by money but by an insatiable passion to be involved in a "journalistic art form." Defining the Helix as an art form, Walt Crowley said:

Helix is artistic in the sense that it's terrifically creative and very personal. What we do with the paper is basically an artistic effort, whether it involves straight news reporting (which we've never succeeded in doing), graphics or the kind of professional writing I've been doing.1

Apathy toward profit-making is one criterion of an honest underground. Newspapers, to earn money, must hold content within "limits of good taste and decency" to keep advertisers. If an underground mollifies content to appease advertisers, it becomes an establishment paper. But most underground editors today are not getting rich and are

1Walt Crowley, interview at the Id Bookstore, Seattle, September 5, 1969.
operating on slim profit margins. One notable exception is Max Scherr's Berkeley Barb. In 1968 that paper netted $130,000 but the staff received no pay. On July 7, 1969, when Scherr's greed became intolerable, his staff walked out and started its own paper, the Berkeley Tribe, which was well received. More copies of early editions were sold in Berkeley (about 26,000) than the Barb ever sold.

According to Roger Downey—long-time Helix free-lance writer who became the paper's full-time drama and film critic in January, 1969—several book stores (including the Id in Seattle) started carrying the Tribe instead of the Barb when they got the story on Scherr.

Since it began as a hippie organ, the Helix has developed a professional-looking format and in 1969 had a circulation of about 14,000. When the paper "dropped" psychedelics and "turned on" to politics, it attracted a wider audience; no longer are "street people" the only readers. Downey says that "non-hippie types," such as housewives and ex-college students, now buy the paper. He adds that even a few businessmen—mostly theater owners and phonograph-record dealers—also read it. Seattle people buy 90 per cent of the papers, and he estimates that each is read by an average of three persons.2

2Roger Downey, interview at the Helix office, Seattle, September 5, 1969.
Expanding readership, extensive advertising and a business-oriented staff could turn Helix into a profitable venture. The paper now nets enough to meet expenses with just a few dollars left. Extra money goes in the "kitty," where, observing the honor system, staff members take it as they need it. The tacit policy has been "from each according to his ability to each according to his needs." The paper usually makes enough to pay the rent for full-time staff members.

Expenses for 14,000 copies—including photography, plates, printing and paper—run about $750, three fourths going for printing costs and the rest for photography.

One of Crowley's objectives as editor is to get Helix on a firm economic footing. Downey has the same objective and believes the paper has attained a status in Seattle where it can be more than "fun and games for a few people." Helix can become Seattle's only "honest" newspaper, he said, if it gets more advertisers and new people on the staff. But without new talent, he predicts the paper will "die on the vine." People who work on the paper too long, he said, repress it and cause talented people to get bored and leave. And he predicted that

---

3Ibid.
4Ibid.
rising printing costs would force the paper to increase the price to 25 cents an issue, which it did October 23, 1969. Many hawkers, however, had been getting a quarter for some time, either by selling the papers for that amount or by pretending not to have a nickel change.

**Helix** undoubtedly has the potential to make money. But would that entail tempering present philosophies? Would an opulent **Helix** evolve into something like the established media that Crowley calls "a one-way street and a private road where trespassers (Individuals trying to be heard through the mass media) will be shot down." In short, will the paper one day become the very thing it presently damns? Downey is no crystal-ball gazer, but he does predict that tomorrow's undergrounds will have to be super-sophisticated to survive. The really good ones, he said, may turn into something like the **Barb**, where someone buys the paper's name to "keep up the appearance of liberality and freedom, when, in fact, he is after the money." He said he knows of no underground today that is "out after the buck."

Undergrounds obviously are changing, Downey said. For example, he cited the **Los Angeles Free Press** as having been a daily newspaper in its organization for a long time.

---

5 Crowley interview.

6 After leaving Scherr, members of the **Tribe** tried to buy the **Barb's** name—reportedly for $140,000.
(its employes punch time clocks). "And Helix," he said--
"though Left and revolutionary--is becoming, to some
extent, a news and culture paper for the Northwest. Al­
though it entertains to survive, it can be serious if it
wants to."7

Helix offices occupy two modest brick-front build­
ings at 3128 Harvard East. The plain rooms are conserva­
tively equipped with essentials such as telephones, type­
writers, layout materials and a dark room. Except for IBM
typing, photo enlarging and photo-offset printing, the paper
is planned and put together there. During a typical week,
copy comes in Friday, Saturday and Sunday. By Monday the
first copy is typed on IBM's and serious thought is given to
layout. By Tuesday morning, a modicum of copy is laid out
and by 5 that afternoon the staff knows what most of the
ads will be. IBM typing begins in earnest Tuesday after­
noon and normally is finished by midnight. Layout (the
process most reflecting the staff's ability) starts between
5 and 8 p.m. Tuesday. About the relevance of this phase,
Crowley said:

Layout is a creative process, not mechanical.
It is dependent on the talent of the individual or
group creating. As with an art form the primary
concern is to communicate. Layout is a graphic as
well as literal media. . . ."8

7Downey interview.

8Walt Crowley, "Yes, You Too Can Be Your Own Editor!
Wow But First A Little Philosophy," Helix, June 19, 1969,
p. 2.
Helix people work all night synthesizing graphics, photos and copy into a consummate art work with a relevant message. With luck, the pages are laid out by 8 a.m. Wednesday. Layout then goes to nearby Lynnwood and is photographed the same day. At about 7 a.m. Thursday, negatives go to Mt. Vernon where the Skagit Valley Herald does the printing. Thursday afternoon the papers go on sale.

Owing to the photo-offset process, Helix can put out a sophisticated paper on a small budget. Prior to offset printing, it took considerable capital to print a comparable paper. And with the new process, creative people can lay out attractive and original pages by skillfully combining materials. A notably versatile medium is the photomontage, whereby selected portions of photos and/or graphics are cut out, then recombined to tell a new story. Pictures from old magazines, newspapers and record-album jackets frequently are used.

Though layout of early Helix issues was capricious and fascinating, it often was hard to read the stories. But now copy is more conventionally laid out, better edited and much easier to read. Final copy for early "psychedelic" issues was typed on conventional typewriters and Justa-writers. Then in 1968 the paper became less artsy when it started using IBM typewriters and began to streamline format by setting more type in standard columns.
Helix, like most undergrounds, gets most of its ad revenue from phonograph-record companies and local record shops, which often buy display ads of up to three full pages. Rock bands and other music groups appearing in the Seattle area frequently buy similar ads.

Salty classified ads always have been a colorful feature of undergrounds and a subject of controversy among "non-hip" readers. Helix runs about a half page of those bizarre ads, enabling "gay," "hip" and "groovy" types to find "where it's at" and to buy, sell and swap such diversified items as guitars, pickup trucks, art models and sex partners. These are typical of the paper's "far out" personal ads:

30-YEAR. MALE will embark Africa, Middle East, Asia, Europe--enough funds to cover two. Wants female only with iconoclastic philosophy and independent personality. Write immediately to Apt 304, 309 E. Harrison.

People wanted! Not rats in the rat race. International Communities now forming for city and rural co-ops. Contact I.C., P.O. Box 5166, Seattle, Wash. 98107.

Swinging Couple, she 25, he 35, seeking other couples and AC/DC gals interested in group activity. Box 5109, Seattle Washington 98107.


---

10Ibid., May 9, 1968, p. 23.
Helix wants to borrow a power sander to work over a worn wood floor. If you have one or know where we can get one for $0 or only a little, please call EA-2-0443.

REWARD for the old leather coat stolen in the clothes ripped off of the white van at 40th & University Sat. night. Please help! The coat belonged to my father (DEAD) tears. ME-2-3908 anytime.11

The Helix classified-ad rate is 10 cents a word. The deadline is 5 p.m. Tuesday, and the ads are not taken by phone.

Expressive photographs are vital to the underground "art form." Paul Temple takes free-lance pictures for Helix, but the paper welcomes prints from anyone having something to offer. Photos, photomontages, copy and graphics are artfully combined to make every issue a unique art experience.

Several artists have illustrated for Helix since it was started in March, 1967. Before the paper stopped writing about the psychedelic world, "mind-blowing" graphics along with "stoned poetry" no doubt were its main attractions. But as Helix evolved into a political organ, motley layout began to disappear; graphic headlines became rare and less copy and fewer pictures were arranged in baroque patterns. Though Helix format has become more orthodox, it is still very "hip" compared with "straight-looking" undergrounds like The Village Voice of New York and the Free Press.

11Ibid., September 18, 1969, p. 22.
of Los Angeles.

Crowley, long-time writer and illustrator for Helix, has contributed 20 cover illustrations and numerous cartoons and comic strips. His drawings and stories invariably carry political messages—often predicting that Western technocracy one day will bury itself and the rest of the world. Crowley has a penchant for describing the horrors of present-day war and the awesome aftermaths of a nuclear holocaust.

Underground photography and art often involve the matter of "obscenity." Though undergounds across the country have been harassed by "obscenity" charges, Helix has been censored only once—the printer blocked out a picture of a copulating couple because "it was in bad taste." Helix hawkers, however, have been "hassled" by police, and a few dealers have been busted—though presumably on charges other than selling the Helix. Helix has a policy whereby it and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) pay the defense fees for anyone apprehended while legally selling the paper.
CHAPTER 3

THE "TURNED ON" GENERATION

Early Helix issues often contained articles about drugs, but the subject is mentioned less since the paper shifted away from the psychedelic scene during the summer of 1968. Though the drug cult still flourishes, the focus of Helix and most undergrounds is on politics, not drugs. That fewer underground drug stories have appeared in recent months does not mean drug usage is waning. Considerable evidence points to increasing drug consumption—especially among those of high school and college age. *Time* reported:

A recent administration task force "conservatively" estimated that at least 5,000,000 Americans have used marijuana at least once. Dr. Stanley Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health, puts the total far higher: At least 12 million, and perhaps even 20 million. Pot is, of course, most widely used by the young. Yolles estimates that 25% to 40% of all students have at least tried it; on many college campuses, particularly on the East and West coasts and near large cities, the figure is 50%.  

Since undergrounds obviously aren't neglecting drugs at the expense of circulation, how is the trend explained? No clear-cut answers exist. Two possible explanations are (1) underground editors hope to reach more readers by diversifying subject matter and (2) though

---

many are using drugs, the novelty of the movement has died out. So much has been written about drugs that the topic now seems trite to many. Certainly the cult has hard-core users and frequent and occasional experimenters, but even those people don't want to hear drug cliches anymore—from the orthodox or the underground media.

Most Helix drug stories seem to reflect honest convictions about drugs. Every article on the legal aspects of marijuana suggests that present laws are too severe. However, the writers deplore the use of potent and addictive drugs such as opium and heroin, and most concur that "speed" offers the most dangerous trip. Opinions are divided regarding the dangers of mind-expanding drugs like LSD and mescaline.


The Food and Drug Administration Commissioner, James Goddard, is becoming increasingly outspoken. On three occasions—at Harvard, at the University of Minnesota and in an interview with this journal—he has taken a position on pot only slightly less permissive than the Berkeley Barb. Goddard buys the alcohol analogy, opposes laws prohibiting possession of marijuana, cautions against driving a car after smoking it, and says his only uncertainty is the possible long range effects of using the drug."...

---

The column also included statements from the Journal of the American Medical Association of August, 1967. Delay said the journal contains the only recent anti-pot literature. Though he doesn't accuse the journal of refuting marijuana data, he maintains that it views the drug as (1) playing a "rebellious role in society" and (2) causing a "psychological dependence that is a symptom of deeper problems." He insists that legalization of marijuana would overcome the first objection and that the second is irrelevant and vague because coffee, cigarettes and kissing one's wife can create the same kind of psychological dependence.

Two comments from the AMA journal:

In the United States, attitudes of rebellion against authority and thrill seeking are not uncommonly found among marijuana smokers.

The task of the physician is to learn from the patient what really bothers him at both conscious and unconscious levels, and what needs are being spuriously met at both these levels by taking marijuana. Delay contends that society's reaction to marijuana on the basis of myth and hysteria will not appreciably affect marijuana usage and will further alienate the generations. His philosophy is that "there is nothing unnatural about drugs," but he adds that "there is no drug which is good per se. Drugs are only good to the extent man can make use of them. We have a great

---

3Ibid.
4Ibid.
affinity to abuse almost everything.\textsuperscript{5} He isn't entirely clear when he says "psychedelic drugs are a poor teacher," but that "they may be the only teacher we have available right now." But he is lucid when he condemns junk (heroin) and speed. "I hate junk," he says. "Junk prostitutes the beauty of human existence. It is empty, it is escapist, it is a product of our cultural insanity." But junk for him doesn't come only through the needle: "A young man doing up his hit of smack \textit{heroin} is abusing God; a young housewife watching television is abusing God; they are junkies."\textsuperscript{6}

To promote the idea that marijuana does not directly cause criminal behavior, juvenile delinquency, sexual excitement and addiction to hard narcotics, Delay compiled in the December 15, 1967, \textit{Helix} a chronology of scientific findings. The article, "The Grass Roots," includes comments on research done at intervals between 1894 and 1967. Contrary to widespread opinion, studies of the effects of mind altering drugs are not a recent phenomenon. The story describes an 1894 British-sponsored study at Simma, India, on the effects of hemp. Results of the two-year study were published by the Indian Hemp Drug Commission in seven volumes totaling 3,000 pages. After conferring with some

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{6}Ibid.
800 doctors, coolies, fakirs, bhang peasants and others involved with the drug, the commission concluded:

1. There is no evidence of any weight regarding mental and moral injuries from the moderate use of these drugs.

2. Large numbers of practitioners of long experience have seen no evidence of any connection between the moderate use of hemp drugs and disease.

3. Moderation does not lead to excess in hemp any more than it does in alcohol. . . .7

Irrespective of its scientific merits, the Simma study is part of the growing body of knowledge on the effects of drugs. The press often has disregarded such scientific data to emphasize the evils of marijuana usage. The "La Guardia" report is a more contemporary case. That study, requested by New York mayor Fiorello La Guardia, was conducted by the New York Academy of Medicine and directed by Dr. George B. Wallace. Lasting from 1938 to 1944, the investigation involved numerous medical persons and extensive interviews in and about New York City. The report concluded that marijuana smoking is not physically addictive, does not lead to hard-drug addiction, does not cause major crimes and is not directly related to juvenile delinquency. Because the report got scanty press coverage, its findings remained unknown to much of the public until the appearance of David Solomon's book The Marihuana Papers in 1966.

"The Grass Roots" concluded with a statement from the November, 1967, M.D. Medical Newsmagazine:

Medical authorities now agree that marijuana users develop no psychological dependence or toleration for the drug, although habitual smokers may become psychologically dependent on it, as with cigarettes. . . .8

The magazine further stated that studies indicate "no direct correlation between marijuana use and violent crime and no substantiation that marijuana leads to addiction to stronger drugs."9

Helix criticized perpetuators of what it terms the "marijuana myths" in a review of The Marihuana Papers June 8, 1967. Deploring those who discount the La Guardia report for being "superficial and unscientific," the Helix writer was awed that people still hold pre-1937 (the first federal law against the use of marijuana was enacted in 1937) beliefs about the drug. He recommends Solomon's book and hopes it will mark "the beginning of the end of the myths." Confident that marijuana eventually will be legal, he said:

As one reads /The Marihuana Papers/, either straight through, or picking selections here and there, the conclusion is overwhelming--this harmless weed has obviously been misunderstood and misclassified as a "hard" or addictive narcotic, and once this is seen, its use will obviously be legalized. And when this conclusion is coupled with the obvious fact that use of the weed is expanding widely in all circles, one easily moves on to conclude that it is just a matter of a very short time before pot is as legal as, say,

8Ibid., p. 9a.

9Ibid.
alcohol or cigarettes. Exactly how and exactly when is a matter of detail—but that it will be legal seems assured.

Several Helix stories have supported the contention that marijuana is not a dangerous drug. On March 1, 1968, the paper printed a two-page fact sheet compiled from the 1967 findings of the Issues Study Committee of the Bruin Humanist Forum at Los Angeles. The introduction no doubt echoed the sentiments of many Helix readers when it said "the great marijuana controversy has drug on past the point of interest." The story said the "fact sheet" printed here should be 'the problem's' obituary," but that it won't be because "the facts of the matter' have never been of much interest to those unconscious cretins who continue to vociferously proclaim the dangers of marijuana."

Spurred by a desire to "right" the "wrongs" of the orthodox media, undergrounds often turn out passionate, biased stories. But "hip" papers have no monopoly on fact distortion. On August 16, 1967, for example, Delay chided the Saturday Evening Post for what he termed "irresponsible sensationalism" in an article on LSD. He claimed the Post used scare tactics in telling how LSD usage can cause chromosome or cell deterioration. In his opinion, the Post


sacrificed honest reporting to maintain sales. Especially misleading, he says, were the large black letters at the top of the page: "If you take LSD even once, your children may be born malformed or retarded." "To say at this point that LSD does not cause chromosome or cell deterioration is absurd," he writes, adding that the reader should be told that the quote is equally true if the word LSD is replaced by 'coffee' or 'New York air.'

Washington state has dealt with marijuana possession under two statutes: (1) the Uniform Narcotics Act (UNA), which is most often used and contains a felony clause and (2) the Dangerous Drugs Act (DDA), which contains a misdemeanor clause. In spring, 1969, a bill to change marijuana possession from a felony to a misdemeanor was passed by the Washington State Legislature. Governor Daniel J. Evans later signed the bill.

Meantime, "Pot Laws," an April 17, 1969, Helix article, criticized the bill, saying it contained a clause stating that selling grass still was a felony and that possession of more than 40 grams was presuming possession for sale. The article noted that judges had been reluctant to hand down the minimum five-year sentence for a felony conviction—especially to first-time offenders. Suspended sentences have been the rule, though a gross misdemeanor can

---

get the offender up to a year in jail. The Helix writer—suspicious of establishment motives—contended that "a basic reason for the bill was to offer an alternative to judges so they won't be as reluctant to hand down time."\(^{13}\)

Also, the article pointed to possible conflicts in arrest procedures. The police, for instance, might hear of dope being sold in someone's home. The home is raided and fewer than 40 grams of pot are found. On a first offense, the owner will be charged with a misdemeanor, not a felony. The search is legal for a suspected felony but illegal for a misdemeanor and the charge probably will stand up in court when police testify on "reasonable grounds" for search. But only time and test cases will determine whether these fears are warranted.

Most states have adopted the UNA and many judges seem to condone the federal ruling that marijuana is a serious narcotic drug. However, during the summer of 1968, a district judge in Bellingham, Washington, spoke against the statute. On June 20, Helix reported that after a University of Washington pharmacologist testified that marijuana is a low-potency drug with non-addictive qualities, Judge Jack Kurty dismissed possession charges against two Western Washington State College students.

On August 14, 1969, Helix discussed the Dutch government's new liberal policy on marijuana smoking. The article, "Dutch Grass: Legal, Almost," described two government-subsidized Amsterdam clubs where people congregate and smoke pot without fear of arrest. Helix did not imply that the Dutch establishment was acting out of love for the young generation; rather, it cited youth groups, organized in the early 1960's, as a likely reason for the experimental clubs. Whereas the Dutch Right Wing rebukes the government for sponsoring the clubs, they stay open primarily out of fear of angry Dutch youth. Meantime, marijuana remains otherwise illegal in Holland.

Though the article did not regard the clubs as a panacea for archaic attitudes on marijuana, it did close with a glint of optimism: "Even if the experiment ends tomorrow it has at least demonstrated that marijuana does not necessarily invite anarchy."14

On January 16 and February 27, 1969, Helix ran a marijuana "survey" with questions on the effects of pot. It asked: "How high did you get the first time you smoked marijuana? If not very high, how many times of smoking the stuff did it take to get stoned? What were the surroundings like? Has grass been plentiful? How would you judge its

quality?" etc. The last question reflects the frivolity of the survey: "Are you going to get up off your depressed ass this spring and design how you can help Seattle swing and sway with all the pleasures and creative imaginings you have harbored throughout the winter?" 15

Sixty persons responded and on April 17, then editor Paul Dorpat concluded:

Of the over sixty responses only two indicated that they had been smoking grass for longer than four years. Most had been turned-on within the last two years. Practically all of them got high "with a little help from their friends." The frequency with which friends have been "turn(ing) [sic] on someone they love" over the past two years has been so incredible that the use of marijuana has "escalated" several thousand fold. Nearly half of those that responded to our questions did a little dealing. But practically all of this was dealt to friends for little or no profit. . . . 16.

Such non-specific questions yielded few important facts, but the paper obviously did not plan the survey in the interest of science.

Though radically pro-marijuana, Helix expresses mixed opinions on the use of "mind-blowing" drugs such as LSD and mescaline. And the dangers in using heroin and the amphetamines (dextedrine, methedrine and benzédrine) are recounted in numerous articles. Though written from the standpoint of users, Helix drug stories usually don't

15"High," Helix, February 27, 1969, p. 27.

discredit scientific data. The paper does not deny, for instance, that LSD usage may cause chromosomal damage and/or an occasional bad trip ("freak out"), but neither does it exaggerate those claims.

Recognizing basic personality differences, Helix doesn't recommend mind drugs for everybody, yet it won't condone a legal system that keeps those drugs from persons who want them. In short, it believes the state must not decide whether or how one alters his consciousness. As Roger Downey put it:

Perhaps in 30 years most everyone in the country will have turned on in one way or another, and won't be frightened of drugs. A public that isn't frightened is willing to let people go to hell, or heaven, in their own way. Hopefully in the future, the inane question of whether drugs are to be legal or illegal won't be asked, and laws restricting individual behavior will no longer exist. What this country needs is another amendment to the Bill of Rights: That Congress, the Supreme Court, the President and every administrative agency right on down to the dog catcher, will make no laws restricting private behavior. Until this is done, I'm afraid we'll never be free.17

The September 29, 1967, "Dope" column comprised extracts from a Journal of Psychedelic Drugs article by David E. Smith, M.D. Discussing the physiological, emotional and medical aspects of LSD usage, Dr. Smith noted that most changes effected by the drug are psychological. About the physical effects, he said:

17 Roger Downey, interview at the Helix office; September 5, 1969.
On the physiologic side this compound acts as a sympathomimetic agent, which means it mimics the effects that are brought about when the sympathetic nervous system is stimulated. Thus, the pupils dilate after taking LSD, the blood pressure rises slightly, and the pulse quickens.

In Dr. Smith's opinion, the word hallucination often is misunderstood:

Hallucinations, and by a hallucination I mean a false sensory perception without a basis in external reality, are rather rare with LSD. What is more common is what we may call pseudohallucinations, where the individual may see something but at the same time also knows his perception doesn't have a basis in external reality. For example, he may see geometric forms of figures or brilliant colors, and he realizes that they really don't exist out there.

He describes a transition from the early euphoric state:

Early in the LSD experience, one is often noted to be euphoric and when the individual is asked, "Why are you laughing," the person says, "I don't know, really, but I just feel like laughing." This laughing can very rapidly change to sadness and crying with very small changes in the environment.

Dr. Smith also explains that the experimenter may see vivid color impressions in the sunlight. But if the sun goes behind a cloud he may "suddenly feel very blue and very sad, and it seems that everything in the whole world is turning gray."
Finally, he adds a note of pessimism for those who want LSD legalized:

It \textit{is} considered an investigational new drug by the Food and Drug Administration. That means that there hasn't been demonstrated for the drug either the requisite safety or efficacy with regard to its treatment utility to warrant its being made available on a prescription basis.\textsuperscript{22}

On July 20, 1967, Delay denounced Timothy Leary as a "carnival performer" who gives false images about the "great states of expanded consciousness" under LSD. "This is bullshit," Delay said, "and so are the newspapers who push the big bummer in the sky that's going to get you stories."\textsuperscript{23} Admitting that acid trips sometimes don't go smoothly, he said "something less than 5 per cent will flip out on an acid trip and perhaps 15 per cent will have some problems but will still come down."\textsuperscript{24}

Delay also told how to get pleasant effects from LSD: "One thing that creates problems is being hung up on a certain feeling or object. It is best to just let your mind float and drift, don't hang on to the good, don't hang on to the bad."\textsuperscript{25} He recommended 48 hours for the trip and a familiar setting, like one's apartment. A guide (perhaps a friend who has taken the drug) is needed to talk to first

\textsuperscript{22}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{23}Delay, \textit{op. cit.}, July 20, 1967, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{24}Delay doesn't say where he gets these percentages.
\textsuperscript{25}Delay, \textit{loc. cit.}. 
trippers" if they get paranoic and to make "downers" (drugs to abort the trip) available if the trip becomes unpleasant. Delay recommended Frenquel (a post-operative tranquilizer) as the best downer, but said it's a hard one to get because it's a prescription drug. He cited Niacinamide (a non-prescriptive B-11 Complex), available in drug stores, as the next best.

The article ends with these warnings:

... acid should not be taken during or close after liver trouble (hepatitis, jaundice, etc.) since it can prolong a trip into days and can be very physically depressing. Because of the fact that some people seriously flip-out, professional help is sometimes necessary. Work is being done to start a professional crisis clinic with no legal hangups. ... 27

Dr. David Bearman, Seattle physician, has written some of the "straightest" drug stories to appear in Helix. From December 15, 1967, to May 23, 1968, he contributed six articles on the dangers of using LSD, the amphetamines and heroin. On LSD and chromosomal damage, he noted in the April 25 issue:

The definitive answer is not yet resolved and so I must cop out. Presently there are 8 reported studies on this question; 4 definitely show an increase in chromosomal abnormality and 4 definitely do

26A Seattle "Open Door Clinic," staffed with volunteer physicians, psychiatrists and social workers, opened in October, 1967. It continues to meet the medical and psychiatric problems of the "hip" community. Patients can volunteer their services in lieu of paying fees.

27Delay, op. cit., p. 11.
As with any type of experimental inquiry there can always be a question as to sample size, control groups, experimental technique, or experimental bias. In regards to LSD and chromosomal damage it is safe to say that the question has been raised but is not conclusively answered at this time.29

In a May 23 article, "To Your Good Health," Dr. Bearman berated government officials and other "respectable and well-intentioned" people who, without the facts, claim that amphetamines, marijuana and opiates cause crime and accidents. However, he avoided social questions and pointed out medical implications of injecting speed. He said the average therapeutic dose of dexedrine is from 2.5 to 5.0 milligrams, but added that chronic users develop a tolerance and need greater doses to create a "high." Regarding dosage, he said:

Although severe reactions have been known to occur with doses of 30 mg. and death has followed rapid injection of 120 mg., people may use up to 1700 mg. at one "hit" and up to 15,000 mg. over the course of one day if tolerance has developed.30

The article also stated that chronic "speed freaks" (persons habitually injecting speed) usually are paranoid. They may imagine, for example, that friends are plotting against them or that their apartment is tapped by narcotics

---

28Scientific research now confirms that LSD usage can cause chromosome and/or cell damage.


agents.

Finally, Dr. Bearman warns that unsterile needles and impure drugs can cause disease and that non-medical use of drugs is illegal and can lead to prosecution.

Dr. Bearman—like others who write Helix drug stories—is against the use of heroin and morphine. On February 15, 1968, he denounced those drugs and backed his stand with a half page of statistics. Medical complications, he stated, can arise from unsanitary intravenous injections and/or from overdoses of the drug, causing pulmonary edema (fluid in the lungs). He cites four reasons for overdosage:

(1) Unknown concentration of street opiates—A recent study in New York of 132 "street samples" of heroin revealed that content varied from 0-77% heroin (2) A pusher may deliberately over-dose a user (3) Effects of tolerance—A user who has gone "cold turkey"/kicked the habit/ may begin again with the same dose that he last took. This may be an overdose because tolerance builds up to the opiates and a person needs ever increasing doses to get "high"; therefore with no tolerance after being off heroin the old dose may be an overdose (4) The police may be closing in on a seller and he may dump largely uncut opiates on the market, just to get rid of them...

Emphasizing that hepatitis is a constant threat to the heroin user, Dr. Bearman cited a study of 96 addicts where 41 were infected. And to show that opiate addicts are prone to death and disease, he noted a 12-year study recorded in the New England Journal of Medicine:

...the mortality of addicts was found to be

two to five times what would normally be expected and the excess mortality seems entirely caused by the addicts' own acts. . . .

Other **Helix** articles have warned that certain drugs are dangerous. For example, in August, 1967, the paper deplored the sniffing of Freon, saying it could be as dangerous to the nervous system as glue sniffing. Ironically, in the same story the writer told how to get the giggles by inhaling "laughing gas" (nitrous oxide) from a can of Reddi Whip.33

In April, 1967, a warning against smoking hydrangea appeared: "It contains three cyanide compounds, some of which are worse than the 'usual' cyanide. It will get you high, but it will also tear hell out of your brain and possibly finally kill you."34

On July 6, 1967, Delay cautioned "heads" on the then new mind drug STP (an experimental drug used to treat certain mental illnesses), explaining that the drug is much more dangerous than LSD and that large doses can produce convulsions, coma, respiratory failure or death. Another danger, he explained, is that STP trips can't be drug-terminated and they can last several days. Delay talked to local "heads" who had taken STP; most agreed it is risky for

---

anyone to take the drug without having tried LSD first. He ends the article with this:

It's definitely not for the novice; its longterm effects are not known; you have to allow three days anyway for the first trip; it is definitely dangerous but acid heads seem to be able to handle it without too much trouble.35

Despite "straight" stories claiming that illegal drug use is increasing, undergrounds are becoming indifferent to the subject. Today's "hip" editors want to discuss political and social problems with a cross-section of readers, and they know they can't do it with "stoned poetry" and "psychedelic prose."

Writers of Helix drug stories seem to agree that "turning on" can be a worthwhile experience. And many suggest that mind drugs can cause a kind of religious "awakening," whereby the user is made aware of an existence outside of and beyond normal limits of perception. Mind-expanding drugs create a new awareness in the user by lifting him out of the cliche world of order and plunging him into a milieu having neither labels nor definitions. The Helix contends that "spacing out" can be "groovy," but that would-be users also should consider possible legal, physical and psychological dangers.

The flower children of the 1967 Hashbury "spring of love" dropped out of a "hypocritical and false" society to form a new subculture with its own moral standards. Like most religious idealists, the hippies turned from the real world and searched for a utopia of peace and love. Adherents of a philosophy of "togetherness" (universal brotherhood), they believed that love was enough to unite men and resolve their differences.

Though the realities of the physical world killed the hippie movement, its ideals still live— influencing aspects of American life such as the thinking, dress and music of young people, antiwar sentiments, ultra-liberal political philosophies and the widening generation gap. And the "spring of love" obviously triggered in 1967 the "hip" newspaper explosion.

Early undergrounds displayed a kind of hippie-like freedom and spontaneity, and until mid-1968 most wrote about "hip" subjects such as universal love, psychedelic drugs, and "copping out" of society. Even when "hip" papers turned to politics, their "free" spirit didn't die. And "hungry egos" still are involved in "creative art works" that are the underground papers.

Walt Crowley implied that putting out an underground
is a kind of religious experience: "Helix is a personal journal of everyone who participates. It's the by-product of a very unique interpersonal ritual of a community of people." Calling layout a "key ritual," he said "we're not together to put out a newspaper so much as we're simply together to work the way we have to or want to."

The subject of morality has resulted in a communications gap between the establishment and the undergrounds. While the establishment accuses the undergrounds of fostering immorality, "hip" papers argue that "straight" morality is false and hypocritical. About undergrounds and social morality, Crowley said:

The papers reinforce the concept that establishment morality is hypocritical, decadent and destructive, and full of vast contradictions and shortcomings. The undergrounds are tangible manifestations that the old moral structure is inapplicable and not working.

Moreover, frank and uninhibited underground stories and pictures often shock establishment readers. They cannot associate nudity and "obscene" words with religious or moral criteria. "But those readers fail to realize," Crowley said, "that underground content is very moral stuff to the underground audience. It is a new morality (not immorality)

---

1Walt Crowley, interview at the Id Bookstore, September 5, 1969.

2Ibid.
defined in part out of resistance to established morality.\textsuperscript{3}

Helix warns that unless technology is tempered by better human relations, the establishment's moral turpitude will lead it to ultimate nihilism. On the October 13, 1967, Helix cover, Crowley depicted the horrors of uncontrolled technology: an atomic cloud rises above the remnants of a city; in the center foreground a TV screen shows the contorted face of a man fleeing from bombs and fire; from the rubble, a bloody arm futilely gropes in front of the grotesque face.\textsuperscript{4}

On the August 15, 1968, cover, Crowley illustrated how rampant technology could blast man back into the Stone Age: In the foreground, a savage stands behind his kneeling wife and child at the edge of a river. They are naked and the man holds a spear. A huge can opener (labeled "Progress"), looming in the background, is plugged into an "electrical outlet" in the sky. Brilliant light radiates from the "outlet," revealing the charred remains of a distant city, while a piece of a damaged nuclear device floats past the savage and his family.\textsuperscript{5}

Another skeptical view of man's future was portrayed on the August 16, 1967, cover. Crowley envisioned a

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{4}Helix, October 13, 1967, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., August 15, 1968, p. 1.
world after the demise of the human race. A robot kneels and places flowers next to a monument with an epitaph that reads: "In memoriam/ Homo sapiens/ Extinct."^6

Two Helix covers—January 23 and June 19, 1969—appeared to denounce egocentric society, while echoing Socrates' deathbed statement, "I am not an Athenian or a Greek but a citizen of the world." The January cover, drawn by William Ward, showed a Buddhist monk sitting on a cloud and grasping a symbolic heart. Above him the moon and another heavenly body embrace; below him a Star of David, with a human eye in the center, is encircled by the words "we are all one."^7 Those drawings, with others of birds, flowers and Cupid, remind one of Nietzsche's Cosmic Dancer. (Der Übermensch).^8 Nietzsche called his Cosmic Dancer a World Citizen, nimbly turning and leaping from one position to another—being born to resemble his parents, but related to all men. Huston Smith said of the Cosmic Dancer:

His roots in his family, his community, his civilization will be deep, but in that very depth he will strike the water table of man's common humanity and thus 'nourished will reach out in more active curiosity,

---


^8Nietzsche's "perfected" man (translated Overman) who he predicted one day would master human foibles and inherit the world. Nietzsche built his philosophy around 30-year-old Zarathustra, in the classic: Thus Spake Zarathustra.
more open vision, to discover and understand what others have seen...

Agreeing with the Helix idea of "oneness" (brotherhood), Smith said: "We shall all have our own perspectives, but they can no longer be cast in the hard molds of oblivion to the rest."\(^{10}\)

The June cover comprised numerous dotted lines running down from the top center. Doubtless denoting solar energy and space, the cover is orange at the top, yellow in the center and blue at the bottom. The words "we are one," "one" and several numeral "ones" are on the page.\(^{11}\)

Most Helix articles on religion focus on the Eastern faiths (Buddhism, Islam and Hinduism) and on the I Ching.\(^{12}\)

The Ching (also called the Chinese Book of Changes) was compiled in China during a 3,000-year period; it has been considered a book of wisdom, divination and magic, and prophesy.

Several stories featured the late Meher Baba, a popular Hindu who called himself the Avatar.\(^ {13}\) Nine issues carried his messages of love and selfless service to mankind.

---


\(^{10}\) Ibid.

\(^{11}\) Helix, June 19, 1969, p. 1.

\(^{12}\) Chinese literature cites four authors of the I Ching: Fu Hsi, King Wen, the Duke of Chou and Confucius.

\(^{13}\) A Godhead incarnated in human form. Unlike Christianity, Eastern religions accept numerous Avatars. Rama, Krishna and Gandhi are widely known examples.
Born Merwan S. Irani, in 1894 in Poona, India, he claimed that clues received early in life told him he was a unique and vital religious figure. Concerning that, Rick Chapman wrote:

Hazrat Babajan, a Muslim Sadguru of Poona, first revealed to Baba his Godhood with a kiss on the forehead and she said, "This son of mine (referring to Baba) will one day move the world. 14

Chapman also noted that Baba made early contacts with Sai Baba of Shirdi. That "Perfect Master," he added, who had hundreds of thousands of followers among both Hindus and Moslems, addressed Baba as "parvardigar" 15 at their first meeting.

Baba began a "period of silence" in 1925, communicating only by hand gestures for the rest of his life. Before the onset of that "silent" period, Baba said:

When I break my silence, the impact will jolt the world out of its spiritual lethargy. . . . What will happen when I break my silence is what has never happened before. . . . When I break my silence, the world will come to know that I Am The One Whom They Were Waiting For! 16

Baba always insisted that he would one day break "the silence" and "change the world." When Chapman interviewed the mystic at his camp near Bombay in August, 1966,

14Helix, December 19, 1968, p. 11.

15Muslim term meaning the "Son" or "Christ" aspect of the Hindu Trinity, the source of Avatars, or the incarnations of God in human form. Ibid.

Baba told him: "My time—the time of the breaking of my Silence—is coming nearer and nearer." But the awaited day never came; the Avatar died in silence. But the self-proclaimed Messiah never doubted his divinity; during the weeks before his death, he reminded his followers that he was more than a physical reality. "I am not of this body," he said. "Remember this!" Forever insisting he was infinite consciousness, Baba called his visible body "merely a coat that I wear for visiting." Only God is real, he said, and "I Am God In Human Form."

The Helix staff and its readers no doubt admired Baba most for his beliefs in universal love, happiness and peace. Love, not institutional religion, he said, is the urgent need of mankind. From love and understanding, Baba saw for man what Aldous Huxley termed a delicate and sensitive tenderness towards others; manifesting both as individual tenderness and as cosmic tenderness, the fundamental "all rightness" of the universe—in spite of death, in spite of suffering.

Extending his beliefs in "oneness" to the Avatars of the past, Baba said: "They Jesus, Zoroaster, Mohammed,

---

17 Rick Chapman, "We Are All One," Helix, January 16, 1969, p. 18.

18 Ust, loc. cit.

19 Meher Baba, "You And I Are Not We But One," Helix, February 13, 1969, p. 2.

Buddha, etc., have all been the same ONE . . . the same One Supreme Reality (God, Truth) manifesting in different times and places and different guises.\textsuperscript{21}

Baba didn't promise miracles and his spiritual messages were simple. Like Jesus and Guatama, Buddha, his greatest virtues were love and service to mankind. For when Guatama's devotees asked what he was, he replied that he wasn't a god or an angel or a saint—but only "awake." Baba believed that "love and service of one's fellow man cannot be taught; it can only be awakened, as the love of a child is awakened for its mother by its mother's love."\textsuperscript{22}

In six illustrations, Ward tried to portray the essence of Baba's religious thoughts. The drawings seem to imply that being at "one" with the universe is tantamount to being at peace with it. Sometimes Baba is depicted as the cynosure of an intricate drawing where surrounding flowers, animals, the heart, the eye and the numeral one symbolize love and unity. Juxtaposed with one series of drawings were these captions: "Compassion," "Open Your Heart," "Love Everyone" and "Be Natural."

Baba's devotion to universal love and brotherhood seems paradoxical in a world severed by political disputes, racial bigotry, economic and social class discrimination and

\textsuperscript{21} Helix, December 9, 1968, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{22} Smith, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 90.
religious feuding. But *Helix* seems to agree with Baba: Technology certainly may end the human race unless men overcome hatred and ill will and unite for the good of all.

Young people—impatient for a better world—sometimes chide the older generation for encouraging technology instead of better human relations. Though Baba admired youthful optimism, he insisted that it be tempered with patience and understanding. In a *Helix* article, "Message to Youth," he advised young people to seek freedom without being irreverent and caustic toward others. Energy and hope, he said, are the youthful virtues that must be balanced with other qualities. In a Heraclitian tone,²³ the mystic added:

Hope should be fortified by a courage which can accept failure without upset. Enthusiasm should be harnessed by the wisdom that knows how to wait with patience for the fruit of action. Idealistic dreams about the future should be balanced by a sense of the realities of the present. And the glow of love should allow itself to be illuminated by the full exercise of reason.²⁴

Baba wrote that freedom entails responsibility to others and that youthful action should be creative, yet

²³Heraclitus (c. 500 B.C.) was the Greek philosopher who cited the bow and lyre to show that world order is a harmony of opposed tensions. A balanced tension occurs between the frame and the string.

never destructive. Love and service must be the watchwords of youth, he concluded.

Baba's messages had universal appeal, yet most outside his coterie did not believe he was God incarnate. Even his closest admirers grew skeptical when he died without "breaking his silence" or otherwise proving he was God. Nonetheless, students of the mystic claim he reminded his followers to remain faithful in the face of a "tragedy" that he predicted would befall him.

My long-expected humiliation is near at hand... The love, courage and faith of my lovers will be put to severe test, not by me but by Divine Law. Those who hold fast to me at the zenith of this crisis will transcend illusion and abide in Reality.25

On February 13, 1969, Helix announced that the controversial Baba had died. The cable, received February 1, read: "Avatar Meher Baba dropped his physical body at twelve noon 31 January at Meherazad to live eternally in the hearts of all his lovers."26

Baba's intimate devotees believe the Divine Master still lives as infinite consciousness in all men. But short of a miracle tantamount to Christ's ascension, most people will remember him merely as a kind and gentle man who helped others replace illusion with self-knowledge. Agreeing with Baba's view on introspection was Aldous Huxley, who wrote:

25Ust, loc. cit.

26Baba, "You And I Are Not We But One," p. 2.
If most of us remain ignorant of ourselves, it is because self-knowledge is painful and we prefer the pressures of illusion. As for the consequences of such ignorance, these are bad by every criterion, from the utilitarian to the transcendental. Bad because self-ignorance leads to unrealistic behavior . . . and bad because, without self-knowledge, there can be no true humility, therefore no effective self-naughting, therefore no unitive knowledge of the divine Ground underlying the self and ordinarily eclipsed by it.27

Helix considers the I Ching a relevant book for today's world; Ching articles have appeared in five issues. The book's gentle pronouncements comprise some of man's earliest efforts to comprehend and relate to the redoubtable universe. The Ching first was considered an oracle but later, when the pronouncements were accorded ethical values, it became a source of wisdom. Evolving into one of Five Confucian Classics, the Ching provided the nucleus for Confucianism and Taoism.

Though the Ching originated in ancient China, the state of mind inspiring people to consult oracles is indigenous to all cultures. Throughout history, men everywhere have sought oracles to help them see meaning in seemingly coincidental phenomena. Even today the human psyche strives to bring together external and internal cosmic forces. Men always have tried to unlock the dark doors of cosmic mystery; only the ways of seeking answers have changed. Clues to

cosmic meaning have been sought in the paths of the stars, the vapors of the earth and in organic life. Vegetable life (the yarrow plant, in particular) was the principal force in the oracle of the Ching. When counted and separated in a certain way, the stalks revealed the secrets of the oracle. But since the yarrow-stalk method is complicated and slow, most modern Ching followers consult the book by tossing three coins. One toss of the coins yields either the line ———— (yang) or the line ———— (yin). Throwing the coins six times produces one of the Ching's 64 hexagrams (six-line figures).

The hexagrams are symbols for images representing the primary needs of man. The Corners of the Mouth (hexagram 27) symbolizes nourishment. Other images suggest kinds of personalities: Youthful Folly (hexagram 4), Revolution (49), Biting Through (21), etc. And some reveal situations in social life: The Marrying Maiden (54), The Family (37), etc. 28

Helix implied that the Ching, like Baba's teachings, helps one gain insight to self-knowledge and wisdom. Helix also seemed to agree with the Ching's non-causalistic way of viewing nature. Western man sifts, weighs, selects, classifies and isolates, while the Oriental mind sees everything

"altogether" in the observed moment.29

Opposing the Western concept of cause and effect, Helix suggested that man and universe, inside and outside, content and form, are indistinguishable. Helix articles on religion support such metaphysical theories as Nietzsche's concept of "eternal recurrence" and the Taoist idea of cyclic cosmic movement. Nietzsche claimed that the world of energy never is at rest and that universal energy is finite, but that time is infinite. Therefore, he said, all obtainable states of the universe have been attained before and will be attained again.30

Tao literally means "path" or "way," and in its quintessential form it exceeded the reach of the senses. In a secondary sense—though it still is primarily spirit rather than matter—Tao assumes a "flesh form" and informs all things. It can be thought of as nature's manifestation of Bergson's élan vital.31

Western concepts of "progress" or "improvement" are man-made value judgments never regarded by the ancients as part of the "flowing" universe. Confucius, who revered


the I Ching, clarified the Chinese concept of "perpetual flow" when he stood before a river and said: "Like this river, everything is flowing on ceaselessly, day and night. (Lun Yu, IX, 16)."  

Helix concedes that Western man has garnered a profusion of knowledge from the environment, but it insists that such "over abstracting" isn't necessarily wisdom. Though granting that abstract thinking is crucial to technology, the paper suggests that accumulated facts are an obstacle to self-knowledge. Western man, Helix implies, is too drunk with "intellectual prosperity" to relate to his fellow man. Aggrandized knowledge, it seems, has to be temporarily put aside before human beings can sincerely communicate. In short, to be more than clashing egos, people must both learn and forget. Taoism taught an ancient art that few Westerners have mastered: How to "neutralize" the mind to attain inward sublimity.

Pure spirit can be known only in a life that is "garnished and swept." "Only where all is clean" will it reveal itself, therefore "put itself aside." Perturbing emotions must likewise be quelled. . . . Desire and revulsion, grief and joy, delight and annoyance--each must subside if the mind is to return to its original purity, for in the end only peace and stillness are good for it. Let anxiety be dispelled and harmony between the mind and its cosmic source will come unsought.  

33Smith, op. cit., p. 187.
The Ching is a spiritual beacon in the lives of two Helix people--Paul Sawyer, whose ideas helped Dorpat and Milam start the paper, and illustrator William Ward, whose drawings attest to his confidence in the book. Sawyer, who left Seattle early in 1969, taught courses on the Ching at the Unitarian Seminary Star King at Berkeley.

A Helix article, "Rolling Stone," called the Ching a book that "guides the passions of one in love with his chances and coincidences." Sawyer, who Helix said often was "stuck with a great notion," frequently consults the Ching before acting. In fact, he left Seattle because he felt an impending mania that was too powerful for "relatively laid-back Seattle" and the I Ching told him to.34

The article also compared the Ching with Christ's teachings and the cyclic law of Tao:

It occurred to me that the ritual use of the CHING was like Christ's instructions to his disciples in the use of Holy Communion. Christ said, "Do this in remembrance of me." Similarly the prophetic formulas of the CHING involved less preknowledge of novel events than remembrance of the past in the future. This involves an understanding of I CHING as a game in the present in which all game-moves out of the past and into the future are circular and always return to the present. The entire process is the several masks of God remembering themselves through the HEXAGRAMS.

In the article "Ching," Jack Delay told how he

thinks the Ching can mitigate fear, mistrust and violence in modern society. Stringent laws to effect morality, devastating weapons to keep the peace, and fear and hate propaganda to mold behavior don’t belong in any society, he wrote. Implying that the world is on the brink of disaster because of fear, mistrust, confusion and violence, he admonished man to stop hating and to start “rediscovering honesty and love at the source of nature. The power of light must shine from the core of every man until it illuminates and unites all men.” But he emphasized that the Ching is no instant panacea for human foibles, adding that the book can do no more than point the “way.” Calling the Ching a catalyst for personal meditation and self-investigation, whose messages are relevant to everyone everywhere, Delay wrote:

The "I CHING" is both a book of wisdom and an oracle. It dates with the Bible and speaks in terms more basic than fable or myth. Its tone is neither mystical or intellectual. A universal source of direction is to be found in its text.36

On August 1, 1968, Helix used hexagrams to suggest that even peace-loving, ordered societies eventually erupt in chaos. There Ward juxtaposed abstract religious drawings with the first (The Creative) and the last (Before Completion) of the Ching’s 64 hexagrams. The first, comprising six unbroken lines, contained the caption: “1 All is

together the creative, heaven, god, the universe one is the beginning and end. . . ." Below the other hexagram of three unbroken and three broken lines, the caption was: "Now is a time of change, movement, manifest in all forms prepare for the new age of light. . . ."37

_Helix_ shares a religious view with Simone Weil, who said: "God has created our independence so that we should have the possibility of renouncing it out of love, so that we should for the same reason wish to preserve the independence of our fellows."38 Love, _Helix_ implies, must flood the heart before one can reject his own independence and grant the same to others. But love, it appears, can't become a reality until tranquillity (inner calm) replaces frustration and anxiety. Citing commentaries from hexagram 53 (Keeping Still, Mountain), _Helix_ emphasized the need to conquer inner tumult before confronting the outside world:

In its application to man, the hexagram turns upon the problem of achieving a quiet heart. It is very difficult to bring quiet to the heart. While Buddhism strives for rest through an ebbing away of all movement in Nirvana, the Book of Changes holds that rest is merely a state of polarity that always points movement as its complement. . . .39

37_Helix_, August 1, 1968, p. 3.

38Simone Weil, "Love of the Order of the World" (a paper used in guest lecturer Dr. Wayne McEvilly's _I Ching_ class at the University of Montana during summer, 1969. McEvilly is an assistant professor of philosophy at Montana State University, Bozeman), p. 12. (Mimeographed.)

39_Helix_, February 6, 1969, pp. 12-13, quoting the _I Ching_.
Helix sentiments toward the Ching are perhaps best expressed this way: As Jean Cocteau writes of opium, so Helix writes of the I Ching: "One must not take opium too seriously." 40

Helix opposition to Christian attitudes on sex and nudity might be summed up this way: Christianity has for centuries taught a sexual morality that contradicts human instincts. Every generation of Christians has inherited debased notions about how "sinful" the human body is. And well-meaning Christians still teach their children that sexual organs are "dirty," that they shouldn't be touched and that it isn't nice to gaze at naked bodies—even their own. Such perverted thinking is reinforced in children through childhood and adolescence. Then the marriage ceremony and some "until death do you part" gibberish from the preacher is supposed to make sex a natural and beautiful involvement. By revering the "beautiful soul" and despising the body, Christian moralists have frustrated man and caused him untold misery. Man is a composite of physical and spiritual forces and a religion that divides the body and spirit cannot be a healthy one. Man can be happy and content only if he is at peace with all the forces around him.

Recent rock festivals such as those at Woodstock and the Isle of Skye in England symbolize a newfound "religious freedom" for youth. Never have so many people come together to "groove" to music and to touch and be

40Willard Johnson, "A Beginner's Guide to the I Ching" (a paper used in McEvilly's I Ching lectures at the University of Montana in 1969. Johnson has studied the Ching under McEvilly), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)
near other human beings. Moreover, they did it in a spirit of mutual respect and love—without violence and disorder.

*Helix* has reported two Seattle-area Sky River Rock Festivals. The first was in 1968 near Sultan, the second a year later near Tenino. John Bircher's and others, horrified that thousands of long-haired "freaks" might "invade" their communities, opposed the Labor Day weekend festivals. Although the Sultan festival reportedly had passed without serious incident, the Tenino affair met considerable opposition. After the controversy led to a court injunction filed in Superior Court by the Tenino Chamber of Commerce and four persons owning land adjoining the proposed festival site, the court finally ruled in favor of the festival. According to *Helix*, opponents of the festival feared sanitation problems, rampaging crowds and the "perverted hippies" and their anti-social smoking and sexual habits. However, the Tenino festival—like the Woodstock affair two weeks earlier—went smoothly, proving again that thousands of people can come together in peace and harmony. And at Tenino, as at other festivals, young people weren't "up tight" about nudity and sex. Many removed all or part of their clothing and walked around the grounds without fear of being harassed or assaulted. Though establishment Christians laud the non-violence of the festivals, they do not like public nudity and regard extramarital sex as immoral. But Dorpat wrote that the
Tenino festival was more "religious" than orthodox Christianity can ever be:

SKY RIVER CITY was a kind of theocracy... But the god was too greatly dispersed through the crowd to be either the proud old Jehovah or the demonic Bale. The god was more like Dionysus eaten and drunk in continual sacrament by his drunk and reeling votaries... The religious arts there included the frequent resurrection of the body, and not in some heavenly spirit home, but in the tents and out of the tents of lovers. It was, we can safely speculate, this particular religious freedom—NAKEDNESS—that most disturbed the visiting authorities. All this dusty resurrected flesh seemed so unlike those normal Catholic mysteries like the magnificent assumptions and the virgin births and the transubstantiations and other such exceptional supernatural intrusions into "natural" law... 

As Crowley has stated, the young generation sees itself as very moral; only in the eyes of the older generation is it immoral. Ethics, he emphasized, are different today; "this is the age of the new morality." 

In rebuking obdurate religious dogma, Helix endorses "rebel" theologians who revolt against it. An interview with the controversial James E. Pike appeared in the September 29, 1967, Helix. Pike, former Episcopal Bishop of California, was in Seattle for an Episcopal convention. Asked whether he agreed with Alan Watts that psychedelic and mystical experiences are similar, Pike said they're identical. Fasting, he said, creates chemical changes

41 Paul Dorpat, "Weather Forecasting for the Amateur," Helix, October 2, 1969, p. 22.

42 Supra, pp. 41-42.
resulting from vitamin deficiencies that "lift the screen" just like mind-expanding drugs. Impressed with the fact that non-chemical experiments at the University of California medical school produced LSD symptoms in 45 minutes, Pike told the Helix: "I listen to everybody's trip I have time to hear . . . though I worry about the danger. . . ."43

Pike's book If This Be Heresy supported the "hip" generation's "new religion." Youth factions who "drop out" and those who are "activists" really aren't contradictory, he said. Using the terms Gnosis (entering into what's already there), and Eschatology (creating and moving things), Pike described two contemporary religious trends. He referred to be ins and love ins as examples of Gnosis and sit ins, teach ins and demonstrations as forms of Eschatology. "Both are part of what it means to be a man," he said, adding that "maybe there has to be a balance."44

Another "rebel" theologian—Art Melville, 35-year-old Catholic priest who in 1961 left Boston's Maryknoll Seminary and went to Guatemala—was interviewed by the Helix. While in Guatemala, Melville was appalled that 2 per cent of the people own 80 per cent of that country's

43"Bishop Pike: Interview," Helix, September 29, 1967, pp. 8-12. Pike died while vacationing in the Holy Land. His body was found September 7, 1969, on a rock ledge in the Judean Desert about five miles from the Dead Sea, six days after he had abandoned his stalled vehicle to seek help.

44Ibid.
farmland. He and other priests and nuns agreed that the Guatemalan poor should crush an oligarchy that lets them earn only 40 cents a day where "the cost of living is higher than in the United States." Those desperate peasants, Melville told Helix, should resist the oligarchical class by both military and non-violent methods. After helping form a group called AVILA (avoid Vietnam in Latin America), he was expelled from Guatemala through the joint efforts of that country's government, the American ambassador there and his own religious superiors. The interview preface revealed the paper's respect for Father Melville:

When Father Art came home, his church suspended him from priestly duties. But he is always and forever a priest (the blessed oils cannot be washed away) and he continues to give those asking solace of a religion, catacombs and cadillacs.45

Helix religious articles suggest that traditional Christianity often is non-germane to today's youth. Young people today seem alienated from institutional religions that do little but preach rigid dogmas and pander to the old and the sick. Today's youth, like those of every generation, need spiritual solace to complete their lives, but they want and deserve a "religion for the times." Such a religion may yet spring from the new underground churches where ministers are teaching Jesus' ideal of selfless love

and service to man instead of corrupt dogma. Young people seek a worthwhile faith. Can the churches provide it?

Finally, the young contend that religions must stop feuding over differences of dogma. A Universal Church is as urgently needed as a world community of nations. Religion is a crucial human experience. It is every man's "conscious awareness"—a cosmic adventure too sacred to be undermined by hidebound theologians with cramped conceptions of spiritual needs. Nietzsche said of such petty provincials: "Think of the tremendous fuss these pious little people make over their little trespasses! Who cares? Certainly God least of all."46

CHAPTER 5

THE NEW SEXUAL MORALITY

Helix, like most undergrounds, vigorously upholds the young generation's new sexual morality. Rebuking traditional Christian sexual ethics, Helix articles suggest that sex per se is neither sinful nor dirty and that only its consequences can be harmful. As modern science eliminates the hazards of extramarital sex, old moral standards become less relevant. Medieval sexual ethics, Helix implies, no longer are relevant in today's world of miracle drugs and birth-control pills.

Helix argues as follows: Morals are subject to change, and social behavior becomes immoral only when it harms others. The essence of human nature is constant, while morals are flexible and relevant to individual and group needs. Morality, then, is determined by rules that work for a particular social group; when the rules no longer work, they are immoral. Thus, in spite of what dogmatic religions imply, laws can't determine morality. Instead, laws are the result of individual and group feelings about morality. As long as a man's passions do not bring harm to himself and his neighbors, he does not need antiquated moral laws. This is what the young generation's new sexual morality is about. Its behavior is moral because it is right for this generation; it is immoral only
to those judging it from the Judaic-Christian point of view.

A recent *Helix* column, "Sexology," by Don H. Somerville, defined the kind of sexual morality the new generation "grooves" on. After Somerville vented his liberal opinions on sex behavior in several issues, people calling themselves "concerned Christians" began sending caustic letters. A question frequently asked was, "Do you believe in free love?"

In the September 25, 1969, column, Somerville told the "concerned Christians" that sexual freedom (with responsibility) should be "everybody's thing." In a Nietzschean tone, he reminded them that Christianity is the enemy of sexual freedom and enjoyment, and that religion (implying dogmatic faiths) is a disease born of fear, is anti-sex and anti-life and is a source of untold misery to the human race. About repressing the passions, Nietzsche said:

> Every naturalism in morality—that is, every healthy morality—is dominated by an instinct of life. . . . Anti-natural—that is, almost every morality which has so far been taught, revered, and preached—turns, conversely, against the instincts of life. . . .

Somerville said that Christians, claiming love will solve man's problems, won't face a very real fact: "Love is not an abstract, mystical thing, love is the result of knowing someone physically as well as mentally. It is

---

even the results before and after fucking."² And he added that with present control of venereal disease and effective birth-control measures, fun and pleasure now dominate the man-woman relationship. Sexual union, he said, is the most complete way for human beings to communicate mutual understanding, appreciation and admiration, adding that sex is a "sharing experience" that can bring friends as well as husbands and wives closer together.³

Somerville flayed the establishment for its moral judgments when he wrote:

Truly healthy human beings believe that only violence is obscene. Sexual behavior, when not corroded by the violence of masochism or sadism, can and should be beautiful and sublime. The person who thinks sexual freedom is an evil is sick and in need of corrective therapy.⁴

He also might have noted how establishment advertising debases sex. Advertisers display nearly nude persons to sell or promote products, yet many of those same advertisers consider wholly nude bodies (not representing a product or gimmick) immoral. Such thinking suggests that it is moral to commercialize sex but immoral to view the naked body for its own sake.

³Ibid.
⁴Ibid., August 28, 1969, p. 11.
Ironically, the undergrounds disparage the establishment for exploiting sex, while they print their own sex ads. Such ads seem to contradict the new morality philosophy, yet "hip" editors often must choose between this kind of "mild" hypocrisy and going broke. The Helix staff has debated whether to continue printing sex ads. Some argue that portraying sex in an unhealthy and exploitative manner contradicts revolutionary ideals and principles of sexual liberation, while others do not think sex ads are politically or otherwise offensive.

In a letter to the Helix November 27, 1967, one reader even claimed that record album ads are capitalistic mockeries of the socialistic movement. "It really is perverting," he wrote, "to see Columbia Record ads by 40-year-old dunce technocrats, that say, 'the man can't bust our music.'" Most of the cost of albums goes to the corporation hierarchy, the letter said, and Helix and its readers are being used when they buy those records. The letter writer doubtless is just as angered by sex ads in undergrounds. As he put it: "If they [capitalistic advertisers] say it in Life or Newsweek, it's obvious they're at home with their bedfellows in the sty; if they say it in the Helix it means that the people's newspaper can't survive without money." In conjunction with a November 6, 1969,
ad for three sex movies, Helix asked for readers' opinions to help settle the sex ad controversy.

Comparing establishment society's egoistic motives with its sex customs and calling sexual monogamy a "prison-like custom we've inherited from our Judeo-Christian, guilt-ridden, insecure ancestors," Somerville said:

To conceive of one's spouse as a personal property that will be soiled if handled and admired by another is the epitome of egocentric arrogance and demeans human dignity to the level of "thingness." The concept of group, or social, or shared sex (perhaps succinctly described by the phrases: CO-marital or INTER-marital sexual relationships) is the answer to the problem of how to break free of our society's superstitions and taboos.6

Somerville blasted the world's social structures, which, he said, have "distorted and suppressed the natural functioning of the body, including natural sex play of children and natural sexual intercourse in adolescent and adult life."7 His brash attack on social ethics gives an inkling of the frenzy Bertrand Russell caused 40 years ago, when he wrote:

.... it is above all in the realm of sex that early moral teaching does harm. If a child has been conventionally educated by somewhat stern parents or nurses [doubtless implying well-meaning Christians], the association between sin and the sex organs is so firmly established by the time he is six years old that it is unlikely ever to be undone throughout the rest of his life. ....8

6Ibid.
Somerville, like Russell, maintains that unnatural laws and customs thwart the "strong flow of basic human energy," causing that energy "to emerge in a thousand corrupt ways." Men whose natural sexual functions are frustrated finally either "tear their neighbors heads off" or absolve themselves of responsibility by "throwing the whole thing in God's lap."

Also, he said, it is absurd for man to separate reproductive from intellectual functions. "There may be several 'reproductive' organs, with varying functions, but there is only one sex organ--the whole human body, from the hair on your head to the tips of your toes."\(^9\)

Finally, Somerville insisted that sexual partners (whether one's spouse, "shack up" or occasional bed partner) need to have "alot, \(\text{sic}\) in common." "Existentially," he said, "personalities can't merge, but it's every individual's uniqueness that gives a real zeal to all human relationships . . . including sexual relations."\(^10\)

In a November 7, 1967, column, "Dump Truck Baby," John Cunrick explained how an inconsistent society reproves homosexuality yet sanctions boxing matches. Consenting males, he wrote, aren't allowed to conduct their private sex lives, yet they can climb into a ring intending to pound

\(^9\)Somerville, loc. cit.

\(^10\)Ibid.
each other silly. "And people can even come and **watch**
 Italics in the original, getting incredible, strange
 thrills through their pale little heads in complete safety.
 Even voyeurs masturbate; sports fans just sit."\(^{11}\) Cunnick
 wonders what kind of society allows men to destroy each
 other in front of sadistic onlookers, but refuses to let
 them share mutual affections.

 Undergrounds frequently are harassed by courts for
 **printing** what are deemed sexually obscene pictures. **Helix**
 so far has avoided the courts, but on one occasion a nude
 photo riled citizens and generated much controversy. That
 picture, a nude front view of Don Scott—Seattle-area
 teacher who recently wrote two books—appeared as part of
 a **Helix** article, "A Vigintillion in Numbers Is." The story,
 by Paul Dorpat, told of Scott's background and described
 his books.\(^{12}\)

 **Helix** reacted in the next issue to those who said
 the Scott photo was "in poor taste," "disgusting" and "going
 too far." Calling them "the princes of the Kingdom of
 Death" who were upset in "the Valley of the Crotch," the
 paper accused the irate readers of "subverting the living
 body with their aesthetic game." The intellectuals, **Helix**

 ---

\(^{11}\) John Cunnick, "Dump Truck Baby," **Helix**, November 2,

\(^{12}\) Paul Dorpat, "A Vigintillion in Numbers Is,"
said, restrict "real sexuality" to the area of the groin, consider the rest of the body beautiful but not particularly sexual, and view the genitals as ugly and apart from the rest of the anatomy. So, as Somerville sees it, beauty to the intellectual is a "head turn on," not a "body turn on." Noting that beautiful bodies often are frigid, he added that anyone who needs beautiful sex partners to "turn on" isn't very erotic.

Again reproaching Christianity, Somerville said that "had the early moralists left the genitals uncovered, the organs would have blended naturally with the rest of the body. And the rarified and compensatory aesthetic game would not have occurred to anyone." Because sex organs are hidden and "ugly," he suggested that many people think of sex as a prize to be won, instead of a "finely tuned" communicative process. Someday, he predicted, when the sex organs lose their special significance, people will stop fearing them and building special monuments to them. "Censorman is the prince of that country where the genitals are hidden, ugly and dirty." 13

Undergrounds and factions of the "old morality" continually disagree about what is moral and what isn't. "Straights" are awed by blatant displays of "immorality" in the undergrounds, and "hip" people deride establishment

members who support the Vietnam War and patronize TV programs of violence but who view sex as disgusting and dirty. A June 5, 1969, letter to the Helix, typifies "hip" attitudes toward "obscenity":

What is obscenity anyway? That which conjures up in the mind images provocative of distrust and nausea! Does sex conjure up disgust and nausea? I can only feel sorry for those thus afflicted. What kind of things produce disgust and nausea in your mind? In my mind it is people that are up-tight about four-letter words but can't get up-tight about napalming babies in Vietnam. Or people who would not dream of having recruiters of the Mafia or Murder, Inc., on the campus but see nothing wrong with the Dow or United Fruit recruiters on the campus. It is part of society's sick mentality which has made sex dirty instead of beautiful and the human body a source of embarrassment rather than pride. . . . 14

Embittered by the generation gap, the letter writer concluded that young people have to free themselves of the hang ups laid on them by a sick society and that they must accept the natural functions of love and not be ashamed to use plain language to discuss plain things. The letter was signed: "Make me not war!" 15

Helix euphuistically "put on" the intellectuals in a photomontage story called "Chastity." Included was a photo of a prim and proper young lady who said of dirty words and poor people:

What I know of the life of the lower classes, and especially of the gypsies, seems to indicate that among

15Ibid.
uncultivated people obscene words are perhaps more markedly invested with pleasure, and do not differ essentially from the rest of the vocabulary, as compared with the state of affairs among the cultivated. . . . 16

Since prostitution exploits the primal sex urges, and usually doesn't involve an "intimate" sexual union, one would expect *Helix* to oppose it. Though most of the paper's writers imply that sex with a whore is little more than a kind of surrogate release, they agree with Bertrand Russell that prostitution is necessary in a monogamous society. In *Marriage and Morals*, Russell said:

> So long as the virtue of respectable women is regarded as a matter of great importance, the institution of marriage has to be supplemented by another institution which may really be regarded as part of it--I mean the institution of prostitution. . . . 17

And since the virtues of foreign women should also be revered, *Helix* ran a brief article from *Atlas* magazine on "what G.I.'s really need." Quoting Raquel Welch, sex symbol who recently helped Bob Hope entertain troops in Vietnam, the article said:

> Sending girls like me to Vietnam to entertain the troops is like teasing a caged lion with a piece of meat. . . . I'm not criticizing our boys' thoughts or feelings one bit, I'm just telling you what is going through their minds. . . . Deep down inside I think it would be best if stars like me stayed home and the government sent off troupes of prostitutes instead. After all, when you get right down to


it, those boys want relief, not more frustration.\textsuperscript{18} Helix articles suggested that prostitution lowers the incidence of rape, does not cause a rise in crime—and, in fact, may even help hold a marriage together. But the city of Seattle disagreed and was so determined to purge its streets of prostitutes that it hired women to pose as streetwalkers. "Justice is devoid of reason," Helix said, "when legal agents break laws to tempt law-abiding citizens."

A December 9, 1968, article, "The Law is the Trick," told how a pair of Seattle "prostitutes" accosted two college-age men when they stopped their car at a curb. After a brief conversation, the men agreed to go with the girls for a "quickie." But since neither party trusted the other, the "ladies" asked for half the money (five dollars) and promised to follow the men in a cab. Instead they ran over beside a building and began writing on the money. At that instant, three plainclothesmen suddenly appeared and arrested the men.

After two appearances before James A. Noe, Seattle Municipal Court judge, the men got a choice between a verdict of guilty and another continuation for six months. According to Helix, Judge Noe planned to grant an acquittal in six months if the men "keep their noses clean" and donated

35 hours to a community service project. Evincing the ironies of a sexually deranged society, the article said the men were arrested "in the name of Society for possessing the emotional motivations of the very Ego Society created through twenty-one years of subtle games, lessons and environmental controls."\(^{19}\)

On March 13, 1969, Helix printed a letter by an outraged citizen to Judge Noe. Lambasting the Judge for his hidebound stand on prostitution, the writer said he had known prostitutes in Europe and in this country and that he was convinced that prostitution "is a positive benefit to society and the city of Seattle." It is time, he added, that society stops using police-state tactics to suppress prostitutes and begins to recognize them as human beings carrying on a necessary activity.\(^{20}\) Helix endorsed the letter by recommending books on the role of the prostitute in society.

On April 11, 1968, Helix printed an interview with Jefferson Poland, founder of the Bay Area Sexual Freedom League (SFL). In Poland's words, "I started SFL as an agitation ticket for legal abortion and nude wade ins at beaches in a San Francisco park." Several sexual freedom groups sprang from Poland's original idea. One that still

\(^{19}\)"The Law is the Trick," Helix, May 9, 1968, p. 2.

exists, he said, is the SFL, Inc.—comprising middle-class people who just like to go to nude parties but who are not interested in challenging the system." SFL, Inc., started in the Bay Area and now has members from many regions, including 30 or 40 in Seattle. Bay Area members, he said, just sit around in their suburbia-type homes with barely enough guts to organize their own nude parties.21

In early April, 1968, Poland visited Shoreline Community College in Seattle to introduce the SFL and to show a film on nudist colony activities. Helix reported that seven administrators, two students and one faculty member previewed the film April 4 and decided it couldn't be shown. Poland said the group told him the film didn't arrive in time for students to be consulted about showing it. The comments were "polite but vague" and "unfortunate but typical." Dr. Richard White, president of the college, said later: "In my judgment, the film is in extremely bad taste if not indecent and therefore inappropriate for showing on this campus."22

Asked why he was nude for the Helix interview, Poland said "I did it for the photographers. Don't you know the media has replaced reality, reducing everything to a


22"Poland Revisited," Helix, April 25, 1968, p. 3.
photograph? And furthermore we all have a license to do whatever we're notorious for doing."^3

Poland wrote "The Death Issue," the only significant story on abortion yet to appear in the Helix. The July 31, 1969, story proposed abolishment of abortion laws. Poland implied that the real issue in the abortion controversy is how to define "life" and "murder." He reasoned that if the term murder is extended from "depriving of (fully realized) life," to "depriving of the chance for life," then abortion must be murder." The population explosion, warned Poland, has to be curbed, and man really is left with two choices: To murder sperms, ova or fetuses--or to propagate new lives at every whim.

Poland chided anti-abortionists who uphold war and capital punishment and decide that "Vietnamese children are better dead than Red." Berating the adamant Catholic Church and its disciples, he concluded:

The hands of the Catholic Church drip with the blood of adults, yet it pleads with us to spare the lives of fetuses. I can think of only one logical synthesis of those two positions: that the whole point of life is character-testing and moral judgment, hence to be born so that it will have its fair chance to be bombed for being Asian, electrocuted for being a rapist, or roasted in hell by a malevolent Jehovah.24

Helix delights in mocking establishment views on

---

23Iverson and Wagner, loc. cit.

sexual morality. A synopsis of a 1940's film, "Pick-up Girl--The Girl He Can't Forget," told how "moralistic" society deals with a young woman who cohabits with a sailor and a middle-aged man. The girl confessed to the judge that she "sinned" with the older man because he could buy her things she had always wanted but couldn't afford. Later the girl's parents learn she has syphilis. When her father wants to take her to California with the rest of the family, the judge says "she'll have to be segregated from the healthy children until she is cured." Peter, the boy next door, who knew that poverty led her astray, planned to marry her and wants to help her escape from the probation officer. But she stalwartly refuses Peter's help and decides to "take her punishment to make herself worthy of him."25

On October 17, 1968, Helix exploited sex to emphasize that the G.O.P. isn't the answer to the black man's woes. The photograph of a pregnant black woman wearing a "Nixon's The One" button clearly got the message across.26

Helix is only one of many undergrounds telling about the sexual revolution that is sweeping the country. Today's young people are finding, and doubtless will carry over to their children, common-sense morals that are in tune with their way of life. By reducing the hazards of extramarital

26Helix, October 17, 1968, p. 11.
sex, modern science has laid the groundwork for a new sexual morality. And because young Americans feel less frustrated, fearful and guilty about sex, they appear to be mating earlier and more openly than previous generations. Describing America's "changing mood," and claiming that sex is the major issue separating the generations, Fletcher Knebel summed it up when he said: "The boy-girl sexual revolution is deep and wide, and Puritan America is gone forever."27

Undergrounds accuse the orthodox press of speaking to middle-class America while ignoring economic and racial minorities. They contend that what "straight" editors call news judgment really is a dangerous form of censorship verifying reporters' biases toward minorities and their problems; therefore, objective news reporting really does not exist and establishment papers are too obsessed with profit-making to care about minorities. Furthermore, "hip" papers claim that the establishment media--being more concerned with making money than with printing the truth--crank out sycophantic stories and editorials to appease advertisers and consumers. John Cunnick wrote in the Helix column "Dump Truck Baby":

Newspaper space and position is a strange thing, anyway: One tends to get the feeling that news events come already labeled PAGE ONE, ABOUT 10,000 WORDS. Take almost any non-filler story in the paper, fill it out with statistics and comments about informed sources, and imagine it on the front page: bang, it's important news. Somewhere, some editor has to sit down and decide whether an assassination will sell more papers/ attract more attention than, say, a gold crisis.¹

Since attracting readers is essential to making a profit, "straight" editors are said to select stories that

consumers want to read instead of exposing the truth about poor minorities. Because poor people buy fewer consumer goods, capitalist newspapers can't "afford" to print their opinions about their own problems.

By being disinterested in profits, "hip" papers can ignore subtle and non-subtle censors—such as advertisers and consumers—and specify how corrupt bureaucrats and greedy entrepreneurs exploit minorities. Undergrounds seem to champion A. J. Liebling's pessimistic view of the orthodox press:

. . . I take a grave view of the plight of the press. It is the weak slat under the bed of democracy. It is an anomaly that information, the one thing most necessary to our survival as choosers of our own way, should be a commodity subject to the same merchandising rules as chewing gum. . . .

*Helix* always has reproved the establishment media for printing "half truths and lies" about the status of blacks, Indians, working-class whites, hippies and other "fringe" groups. While not claiming that all "straight" reporters deliberately slant their stories, *Helix* does imply that they conveniently omit many relevant facts. Emphasizing the importance of diverse news reporting, Liebling said:

... I'm not saying that the harried press association men are always wrong, but that different reporters see different things or the same things differently,

---

and that the reader . . . has a right to a diversity of reports.\textsuperscript{3}

Most undergrounds, however, imply that the orthodox press does not offer such diversity—that the right of free speech may be jeopardized if the press doesn't give the people a wide range of opinions.

Underground writers predict that outbreaks of racial violence will continue to plague American cities until all white men accept the black man and treat him with dignity and respect. The Watts riots of August 12-16, 1965, admonished white America to rectify 300 years of black suppression or watch its cities become rubble. Watts and other scenes of racial violence have shown that what Dr. Martin Luther King termed "man's inhumanity to man" is a deep social illness that must be cured. Angry black militants like Stokely Carmichael, Huey Newton and Eldridge Cleaver are reminding "whitey" that the price of apathy toward the black man is death and destruction. Behind chilling slogans like "Burn Baby Burn" and "America: Change It Or Lose It," black militants gave their white brothers an ultimatum: Change this racist country or watch it burn.

Though Seattle has avoided a major race riot, disagreements between militants and non-militants on how to settle race problems have resulted in disturbances. On

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 72.
March 14, 1968, *Helix* ran part of a dialogue between a local white and what the paper called "a more-or-less militant black." Pro-violence groups in Seattle, the article said, disapprove of "Uncle Toms" sitting on the Seattle Civil Rights Board. Militants accused the "white Niggers" of bootlicking and siding with the governor, mayor, city council, county commissioners and the press. At the apex of the establishment hierarchy, they complain, are such "exploiting" enterprises as the Boeing Company, the First National Bank, Washington Mutual Savings and Rainier Beer.

Living conditions in Seattle's Central Area (predominantly black district) are abysmally like those in Harlem or Hyde Park, the article said. Referring to congressmen who voted against the Rat Bill, *Helix* implied that while rat may be a funny word to politicians living in suburbia, it isn't humorous to black men in the ghetto.4

"Whitey" has to understand, the article warned, that Malcolm X was the last black leader who could walk down an avenue after a riot and say "cool it, Brothers." One reason given for widespread riots was that blacks no longer have grass-roots leaders who can communicate with city hall and the Man.5 *Helix* said that more and more

---


5Factions of the white establishment that exploit and suppress the black man.
blacks refuse to be appeased by establishment promises of
token equality and jobs.

Programs won't get it because it's people not
machine parts that are being dealt with. And these
people want equal opportunity, not jobs. They don't
want a hung-up job at the Boeing Company and no rights
to use the community. . . .6

Blaming the Man for America's shameful ghettos,
black militants warn him of the long, hot summers ahead:

In any area where the pimp is a paragon, where
women turn to hustling because bread is hard to come
by, where kids cut school and hang out because home
is a hassle and the classroom not meaningful or in­
volving, where food costs more than in other parts
of town, where insurance rates on furniture, for
instance, are higher by design, where people live in
homes they call "Kingdoms of the Roaches"... there
is bound to be violence on a grand scale come "those
wailing nights."7

And the black man will overcome oppression in those dark
nights, wrote poet-playwright LeRoi Jones:

We are unfair
And unfair
We are black magicians
Black arts we make
In black labs of the heart

The fair are fair
And deathly white

The day will not save them
And we own the night.8

In spring, 1967, while Seattle black militants were

6 Helix, loc. cit.
7 Ibid., p. 11.
8 Jimmy Garret, "And We Own the Night," The Drama Review, No. 4, XII (Summer, 1968), 62.
planning a school to teach young blacks to make and use demolition weapons, Al Cowles, executive secretary of the Washington State Board Against Discrimination, arranged for them to meet with Governor Daniel J. Evans. At Evans' request, the militants listed these demands:

1. A multi-service center in the black community to help people receive state services.
2. A law preventing ADC mothers from losing stipends when their children become employed.
3. Jobs beginning at the state government level.
4. Scholarships for minorities at state colleges and universities.
5. Minority history courses in all Washington schools.
6. An Afro-American culture center in the ghetto.

Militant response to the governor's request encouraged the Central Area Committee for Peace and Improvement (CAPI) to propose the Central Area Cooperative of Seattle, Inc., to deal with Central Area problems.

The Man controls the Central Area, said Helix, explaining that "white non-residents own 100 per cent of its major businesses, 60 per cent of its real property and 90 per cent of its small businesses." It added: Local banks do not make loans to Central Area blacks for economic development. Finally, lack of black ownership and capital creates frustrations that can lead to violence. The Central
Area co-op hopes to eliminate the ghetto by giving ghetto people pride of ownership and accomplishment and a means of self-help.9

Ghettos, Helix implies, are inexcusable in affluent America, and unless whites help abolish them, more blood is likely to run in the streets.

Gary W. Owens (a black) predicted in the April 11, 1968, Helix that racial violence would erupt in Seattle. "In the summer nights ahead—as in the past 400 years—whites won't grasp 'blackness' and will destroy hopes for non-violent racial harmony," he said. Moderate black leaders continue to preach non-violence, but they forget the under-35 black men who are dealing with the problems their parents wouldn't face, Owens wrote, adding: "While parents stay inside this summer and eat watermelon and watch TV, their sons and daughters will be taking care of business."

Lambasting the Seattle area's "two faithful newspapers" (the Seattle Post-Intelligencer and The Times) for referring to the black movement as vandalism, Owens said "the black man's mind can only psychologically and strategically prepare for the ensuing battle." Opposing white liberals, he claimed that integration had not been the key to racial harmony in Seattle. He invited white liberals

who preach integration to move to the Central Area and to send their children to black schools. Come see how we live and get to know the apathy surrounding the Central Area in 1968, he wrote. Owens, who abhors "Uncle Toms" and "white Niggers," said black people in Seattle want and will get land, bread, housing, education, clothing, justice and peace by any means necessary.10

Most undergounds seem to agree that orthodox papers omit or play down stories of police brutality against minority peoples. The February 1, 1968, Helix, gave LeRoi Jones' account of how he was beaten when arrested in 1967 for unlawful possession of two revolvers. According to Jones, he and a companion were stopped in Newark, New Jersey by two carloads of shotgun-armed police who accused them of shooting at the police cars. "When we denied the shooting," Jones said, "we were pushed into the paddy wagon and were beaten and questioned all the way to the police station." He said one officer tried to kick him in the groin and another hit him in the stomach. The police director at the station smiled and said, "They got you didn't they?" Jones claimed he later discovered that a policeman had taken $65 and a checkbook from his wallet.

The judge read one of Jones' Black Power poems

that had appeared in the *Evergreen Review*. Suggesting that Jones had participated in a plot to burn Newark, the judge told him: "You are sick." Jones retorted, "Not as sick as you are!" Jones was fined $1,000 and sentenced to not less than two and a half years in prison for, as the judge put it, "possession of two revolvers and two poems." "You represent the will of a crumbling structure," Jones told the judge, "and I am the free black man..."11

The May 15, 1969, *Helix* commented on racial disturbances in Tacoma, Washington, a few days earlier. The trouble began when two officers with arrest warrants stopped their car beside a young black and asked him to get in. According to a "straight" press report, the black man's female companion grabbed the officer's night stick, hit him with it, then fell on the ground yelling "police brutality." Another report—which *Helix* said was confirmed throughout the ghetto—claimed that the woman fell down screaming when the policeman jabbed her in the stomach with the stick for cursing him. A shot from a nearby building wounded an officer as he tried to get the black couple into the car. There was no evidence, *Helix* said, to support the Tacoma mayor's charge that black militants and outside agitators caused the disturbance, but Tacoma's "mini-riots" will lead to further street fighting "unless the city recognizes that

a serious breach exists between black and white communities and that more policemen are not the answer.  

Helix printed several stories on the 1968 Poor People's Memorial Day weekend march on Washington, D.C. "Poor power--not white nor black power"--is needed to change priorities and policies of the government's war on poverty, wrote Henry Erlich. He said anti-poverty programs are impotent and dying because Congress and the administration are indifferent to poor people's misery, and the current OEO budget of about $2 billion is only a fraction of what is needed to operate programs such as Headstart, the Job Corps and Vista. It is indeed sad, Erlich noted, that of 29 million poor people in this incredibly rich country, only 5.4 million are aided by government commodities, food stamps and other programs. He said the OEO Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition found that--while malnutrition is increasing among the poor--1.4 million people have been dropped from aid programs in the past six years. The board also has charged that U.S. Public Health Service and Department of Agriculture officials have only a "scant, superficial and unsatisfactory knowledge of OEO programs."

Erlich suggested that because America's automated economy now demands more consumers than producers, the Protestant work ethic that links dignity with productive

---

work is becoming passe. No longer can the system create meaningful jobs for its citizens, he wrote, implying that a guaranteed annual income is as vital today as full employment was in past decades.

"Certain elements within Congress" charged that the Poor People's campaign was organized and supported by militants and Communists, Erlich wrote, adding that congressional hearings were scheduled solely to limit the campaign. Warning affluent Americans and their political puppets, he said:

The poor people of America are not marching on Washington to check out the cherry blossoms or the Washington Monument. . . . They mean business . . . and if the Government doesn't respond adequately to the demands presented to it by the Poor People's Campaign, it may not have another opportunity to respond to much of anything.13

Helix reported July 3, 1968, that an estimated 100,000 Americans joined the residents of Resurrection City to support the Poor People's Campaign and its demands at the June 19 Solidarity Day March. According to Helix, about half the marchers were white and more militant than those comprising the 1963 Civil Rights March. The "We Shall Overcome" togetherness characterizing the 1963 march had given way to "an atmosphere of cool anger and purpose. . . . And for many, the government on whose doorsteps they demonstrated, had become the enemy, not the savior of

America's poor." Antiwar and "Up Against the Wall, Mother Mother Fuckers" banners were carried, but there also were plenty of less radical King, Kennedy and McCarthy buttons.

Marchers "did their own thing," Helix said. Farm workers talked about the grape boycott; Indians passed out leaflets about fishing rights; angry blacks debated the merits of blowing up the Washington Monument and an old Spanish-American woman sold "Last Chance for Non-violence" bumper stickers for a quarter. But according to Helix, the marchers didn't really listen to the long speeches about inequality in America; they already knew about that and were in Washington to remind Congress and the American people about it.

During the summer of 1968, Helix began protesting a U.S. Supreme Court ruling giving Washington State the legal right to regulate off-reservation Indian fishing. A September 4, 1968, story claimed the state used conservation as an excuse to deprive Indians of fishing rights guaranteed them by government treaties dating to 1854. Helix claimed those treaties (involving the Nisqually and Puyallup tribes) never were legally abrogated and that the Indians

15Infra, p. 96.
16Infra, pp. 90-91.
17"Poor People's March," loc. cit.
are not depleting salmon stock or threatening future runs. Indians practice conservation because it is vital to their existence, the paper noted, adding that they never take more than 5 per cent of any year's total salmon catch, while commercial companies normally take about 80 per cent. "For example," Helix said, "the 1963 non-Indian commercial catch was more than nine million salmon. In the same year the Muckleshoot Indian catch was seven hundred."  

Helix announced September 4 that Washington Indians--aligned with radical groups such as SDS and the Peace and Freedom Party (PFP)--would hold a "fish in" at Frank's Landing on the Nisqually River near Olympia, to exercise legal treaty rights and to establish the right to fish in their "usual and accustomed" places. Several Indians were arrested and had their nets and boats confiscated when they appeared at the landing and began fishing in their "usual way." The September 26 Helix reported that in recent years the state had confiscated more than $25,000 worth of Indian fishing equipment and had collected $5,000 in bail since the "fish in."

Governor Evans clarified his stand on Indian fishing rights in a December 2, 1968, letter to the Seattle PFP:

... the state recognizes that Indians may fish unhindered on their reservations and in streams adjacent thereto. But when they fish away from their

18 Helix, August 29, 1968, p. 4.
reservations, they are subject to state fishing regulations in common with others. . . .

PFP accused the governor in a return letter of having the same "racist mentality" which it contended has prevailed in his administration. Denying that the Supreme Court upheld Washington State's stand on Indian treaties, PFP claimed that the court merely gave the state permission to take reasonable conservation measures. PFP reminded the governor that following the court's decision, restrictions on Indian fishing were supposed to be reviewed at a state hearing, but that the hearing was never held.

PFP also denied the governor's claim that only 30 or 40 dissidents—often influenced by outside individuals—are demonstrating, while most Indians have obeyed the rulings. Both Indians and non-Indians, PFP wrote, have the same goals: To free themselves from a racist system that has waged war against minority groups everywhere. "We are not outside agitators," the letter said, "but rather people who have a sense that is tied to the destiny of all poor and exploited people in this country and in this world. We don't expect you to understand that."

Despite a long and bitter campaign, the court ruling prevails and the Indians in 1970 appeared to be losing their

---


20Ibid.
fight for non-reservation fishing rights. Max Smith reported in the December, 1968, Helix that Thurston County Superior Court Judge B. J. McLean had sentenced a dozen Indians for illegal fishing. "The judge wore his black robe and the dour expression of a man in a TV ad who has heartburn, but has not discovered Tums for the Tummy," as he pronounced the Indians guilty and told them to save their complaints for the summation. According to Smith, the judge seemed programmed to ignore Indian treaty rights and questions on why the fishing resource can't be managed so everyone can equitably take from it. Smith said he had the feeling that Adams (a leader in the fishing rights struggle, who was facing the judge) was reading the judge's mind: "Why are you bothering His Honor with this, confusing me with claims to human rights and the like? I drew up the papers sentencing you days ago."

Probing the American Indian's character and culture and claiming that the red man is struggling to retain a way of life that few white men understand, Bob Owen wrote:

Indians are neither blood thirsty sic savages nor noble natives. They are people whose heritage and lives are based in the outdoors, in physical labor, in symbiosis with their environment, in loose familial groupings knowing the law of right, and in artistic as well as cultural relations to nature rather than to the self. The product of this life is a person intimately related

---

to all that goes on around him, more interested in living change than in progress and finally a man whose satisfaction is found within rather than outside his existence. 22

Helix began in February, 1969, to protest the destruction of Seattle's Pike Place Market. The 20-square acre market, between Elliot Bay and the downtown business district, had opened in 1907, when wholesalers (called commission men) were cheating farmers and the public by dumping farm surpluses to hike prices. Farmers were told that their produce was spoiled and worth little. Soon they began bringing fruit and vegetables to Pike Street where they were guaranteed fair prices. By 1927 the market comprised more than 400 farmers and eventually was controlled by a local farmer, Joe Desimone. To preserve the market, he put the land in trust funds before he died.

In 1963 the Federal Urban Renewal Office issued a $4.2 million grant to "modernize" the market. In July, 1964, citizens hoping to "retain the tone and flavor of the market," formed an anti-urban renewal group called Friends of the Market. Helix agreed with the Friends that the market—embodying more than mere dilapidated buildings—should be refurbished but not razed and rebuilt.

There is no way the Market can be torn down, rebuilt and still be the Market. It exists as more than buildings, more than smells, and more than people—

it exists as all of those, thrown together in an area to mingle and settle for sixty years.23

The February 20, 1969, Helix printed a petition by the Friends called "Let's Keep the Market!" At that time the group had obtained 42,000 signatures.

Early Urban Renewal plans called for wholesale leveling of the market. A later plan (proposal 23) stated that the large central market building would remain, but that surrounding shops would be replaced with modern ones. The new structures, Helix reported, would include "high-rise (26-story), high-rent" apartments to enhance discrimination against the poor and to net the city more tax dollars.

Labeling Proposal 23 the "Big Lie," Helix said March 13, 1969, that the plan called for a "renewal" of the main market building at an estimated cost of $20 a square foot or a total of $1.5 million. This "renewal," the paper said will not only change the character of the presently economically sound market but also will destroy its future as a low-cost market. And that's what it is and where its strength and character come from. The market as we all know it just won't exist.24

Helix admitted that certain old buildings around the market should come out, but it recommended that they be replaced with small structures to retain the "quaintness


and character of the Pike Place community.

Despite considerable opposition—the Friends finally got 53,000 signatures—Plan 23 became a city ordinance in August, 1969. However, the "renewal" project was indefinitely stymied when the city tried to get the job done faster by working under the Neighborhood Development Plan (NDP). After it already had allocated $175 million to be shared by 234 other cities, the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) office stopped approving NDP funds. President Nixon later cut the same amount from the budget.

Calling the temporary halt a "reprieve from the wrecking bar," Helix nevertheless claimed "slumlord" Desimone had created a backlash against poor tenants by raising their rent 15 per cent. He and other apartment owners, the paper said, argued there was no reason to fix the buildings when urban renewal was sure to take over.

Helix has helped oppressed California farm workers publicize their grape boycott, which began in 1965. The paper announced October 31, 1968, that the Delano, California, Grape Strike and the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (UFWCC) had forced grape sales down 20 per cent. Helix advised readers to ask local store managers not to stock grapes and to "picket stores that don't cooperate."25

By asking readers not to shop at Safeway Stores,

Helix hoped to get California grape workers—some were earning only 90 cents to $1 an hour in 1967—a living wage. Safeway (the world's second largest supermarket chain) claimed to be neutral in the grape strike, but according to Helix it had bought enough scab grapes to guarantee the growers a huge market. Safeway also tried to get other supermarkets to handle grapes, the paper noted.

It is no accident that Safeway exploits the workers and favors the growers, said Helix, naming several Safeway directors and officers who own agricultural spreads or manage companies that own them.

"Safeway now stands between farm workers and the justice we seek," UFWOC representative Cesar Chavez told Safeway. "Continue in silence to sell California table grapes and we will be forced to make you feel the pricks your conscience has somehow spared you."26

The September 18, 1969, Helix, reproached the University of Washington for buying scab-picked California grapes. "Seattle's non-partisan, value-free academy of truth is again involved in its favorite activity—strike breaking," the paper reported, adding that it's up to students to start a boycott to get the scab grapes off campus.27

27 "University Scabs on Grapes," Helix, September 18, 1969, p. 5.
Advocating economic and social equality for all peoples, *Helix* writers denounce what Che Guevara termed imperialism's "divide and conquer" tactics. And they suggest that economic and political power groups make a "living lie" of the Constitution by splitting people into social and economic classes. American democracy has to be a myth, the paper implies, when thousands of people in the world's richest nation lack adequate housing, diets and medical care.

*Helix* warns that America must abolish widespread economic and social disparities between the wealthy elite and oppressed millions or New Left radicals (SDS, Black Panthers, etc.) may plunge the country into violent revolution. Unless corporations and bureaucracies stop segregating and exploiting "inferior" peoples (blacks, Indians, Mestizos and others of non-Anglo Saxon parentage), those people undoubtedly will unite, liberate themselves and finally destroy America's cities.
CHAPTER 7

THE REGRETTABLE WAR

The United States government in 1970 still fostered the slaughter of American soldiers and Vietnamese people in an illegal, immoral and futile war, despite mounting anti-war sentiment, reported the Helix. Bitterly opposing American intervention in Southeast Asia, the paper accused capitalist opportunists of meddling in a civil war and backing a Saigon regime wanted only by a wealthy minority of the Vietnamese people. Labeling the Vietnam struggle a war of exploitation and genocide against underprivileged peoples, Helix said it was absurd to think the American government had even a remote interest in the Vietnamese people. Certainly no other American war had been more openly and fervently denounced. That the war goes on, said the paper, proves that the capitalists are sustaining it for economic and political reasons.

"The suffering and death of millions [In Vietnam] has to do with the fact that those empowered over us have decided to die to the last man." Expounding on capitalism's nihilistic mania, the article said:

It is an important thing to know about the repressive masters of war who fantasize the sweet meat of Vietnam, that they have faced doom, and decided themselves that they are better off dead. They face it in the acid smile of a beautiful girl in a phone company commercial. How strange a species to accept
death instead of happiness! . . . Everyone is talking about polarization. What it amounts to is that there are those who want to live and work together and those who would murder that hope because they personally have none. 1

"Will the government ever admit that it is at war with less than the silent majority?" Helix asked. "Or that it has ever done anything illegal?" Implying that the American effort to exterminate Asian peoples is deplorable and inexcusable, the article said:

We have used only fourteen million pounds of tear gas and lung gas in Vietnam since 1964. Our herbicides have only killed 1,000 peasants and 13,000 livestock in Vietnam. We have sprayed only four million acres with crop poisons. Has our lily-white government ever done anything wrong? 2

War is vital to the military-industrial complex and American "pride," Helix said. If the Boeing Company can boost its work force, "it doesn't really matter that a million Vietnamese and 40,000 Americans have been killed." And since humility is not a prevalent virtue in masculine societies, 3 defeat in Vietnam would cause a lot of "red necks" to take on crimson faces. Suggesting that the American government values national "pride" above human lives, the paper ended a 1969 pre-Christmas article with:


3 Advanced technologies where rationale, the exact sciences and competitive production of material goods are considered the path to ultimate "Truth."
"Far better that we kill a few more thousand Vietnamese and Americans than that a politician or general has to blush." The article was signed "Merry Christmas."\(^4\)

Helix, proposing an immediate end to U.S. imperialism, warned that the United States—comprising 6 per cent of the world's population—cannot continue to consume annually 60 per cent of the world's resources. Peace is more important than raping underprivileged countries and "sooner or later we are going to have to tighten our belts and pull in our troops." America uses physical force—not rhetoric—to rule the free world, said the Helix, adding that this country has military missions in 50 countries, has given military aid to 78 countries since 1950 and now has 1.2 million servicemen stationed abroad. By contrast, Russia has 320,000 troops in four East European countries.

Calling American foreign policy "basically dishonest and destructive," Helix accused the U.S. government of "taking everything it can get and giving little as possible in return."\(^5\)

War and brutality seem to be synonymous; atrocities seldom if ever are limited to one side. Paul Temple wrote in the Helix that neither side in the Vietnam conflict "would come away unblemished if the only issue was who has


killed the most children." But to consider only the issue of napalmed babies and dive-bombed schools and villages is in his opinion to over-simplify the Vietnam fiasco. The real atrocity is America's blundering efforts to win "The Other War" ("The Hearts and Minds of the People").

Helix claimed President Johnson tried to buy South Vietnamese loyalty and intensify America's "pacification effort" by creating a military-government agency called The Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support (CORDS). Calling CORDS programs an utter flop, Temple said "what had promised to be a massive cooperative program reaching all levels of the Vietnamese government "is being run by civil service or military-trained Americans who are ignorant of Vietnamese culture and language. CORDS's major failing has been its handling of refugees, he said. When a village is suspected of supporting the VC, the villagers are moved to a new hamlet and the old one is defoliated for "security" reasons. Destroyed villages then become dust-bins or mud baths—depending on the season.

CORDS people obviously have no concept of the Vietnamese way of life, wrote Temple. Each family gets a few sheets of tin and some wood for a house that "is a decent oven in the midday heat but totally inadequate as a dwelling

---

—a great contrast to the shaded yards and cool homes the farmers are used to."

The whole pacification effort is a military objec­tive, said Temple; CORDS can never atone for the death and destruction it has already induced. Persistently scorching countrysides and butchering people, we seem to have learned little, except that U.S. technology can turn paradise into hell and happy people to despair, he wrote. "The casualties are horrible enough without the slow cultural asphyxiation faced by the survivors."

An anonymous Vietnam veteran said in a Helix inter­view that "all Vietnamese hate us because we have to blow up everything. Our main enemy is the peasant we profess to be protecting." Vietnam is a PR man's war where soldiers charge up and down hills before TV cameras that bring the evening news to settle our stomachs and to help sell the war, the veteran said. He added that nearly everyone he met in Vietnam—including officers—called the war "a meaningless and hopeless mess."

The Helix antiwar crusade has included articles on how to avoid the draft by emigrating to Canada. The second issue (April 13, 1967) urged draft-eligible men to heed their consciences and to choose Canada over the draft.

7Ibid., p. 14.
"General Hershey wants you to drop napalm on Vietnamese children, distribute candy bars and liberate the entire subcontinent back to the Stone Age."\(^9\)

The paper reported February 1, 1968, that anyone "classified 1-A or who is otherwise harassed by draft boards" can emigrate to Canada as easily as other Americans. Stating that American emigrants to Canada cannot be extradited or deported for breaking selective service laws, Helix told would-be soldiers how to enter Canada and how to apply for citizenship. (Immigrants are eligible for citizenship after five years.) Anyone planning to stay in Canada should apply for landed immigrant status, the paper said, adding that immigrants can work, attend school and live the same as Canadians. However, they cannot vote or carry a Canadian passport and can be deported for a variety of well-defined offenses.

Four common ways of attaining immigration status were cited:

1. Nomination: Anyone having a close relative who is a Canadian citizen or landed immigrant living in Canada is readily admitted.

2. Mail from outside Canada: An application is obtained from the Immigration Division of the Department

of Manpower and Immigration, Ottawa, or from a Canadian Consulate in the United States. The form is completed and sent to the Canadian regional office closest to where the applicant wishes to settle.

3. In person from within Canada: It takes from six weeks to three months for visitors and students to apply from within the country.

4. In person at the border: Most Americans cross into Canada to work or visit, then return to the border to apply.

Helix reminded emigrants that government officials of every country dislike "long hairs" and that only "clean-cut, self-confident and stable" individuals are likely to impress interviewing officers.

Emigrants to Canada must face a bleak reality: They cannot return to the United States without facing up to five years in jail. "Renouncing U.S. citizenship may be a way out," the paper said, advising future emigrants to get more facts by sending for a pamphlet called "The Anti-Draft Programme." 10

Another article pointed out that increasing numbers of Americans were being denied entry into Canada. According to the story, three young men (one slightly bearded) whom

customs officials mistook for "a band of beatniks"—were removed from two tourist buses and questioned by officials about such things as their grade points and attitudes on LSD and pot. After wiring for money and being detained for a day and a half, they "were advised to turn around and head south." Suggesting that Canadian bureaucracy is as unpalatable as the American variety, Helix said: "If one had money and friends and then looks [both italics in the original] like one has monied friends, entry is easy." But these young men didn't qualify; they "had the stuff but not the style."^11

Helix reported March 14, 1968, that 2,500 ex-Americans were living in Vancouver, B.C., as landed immigrants. Lauding those who defy U.S. military policies by emigrating to Canada, the article said:

The American expatriates in Canada are living the Revolution: They are carrying on lives of individual human protest with the consciousness that nationality is a fiction perpetrated by governments, sanctified in paper work, worshipped in symbol, and glorified by false emotion.^12

Life in Canada has its drawbacks, the paper said. The "romanticism of the revolutionary myth is absorbed by the day-to-day greyness of living." But most draft dodgers conclude that it is no harder to make it in Vancouver than


^12"Want to Get Away From It?" Helix, March 14, 1968, p. 6.
in Seattle or Los Angeles.

Vancouver teems with unskilled laborers, but professional openings—especially for teachers—are plentiful, said Helix, adding:

'It's ironic that those Americans with the ingenuity and foresight to forsake their country in defense of their own principles, will educate generations of young Canadians.'

George Bumper—an ex-American who in 1969 lived in Vancouver—said in a November 27, 1969, letter to the Helix:

Most of these people [recent immigrants] came to Canada to escape an overpowering right-wing political system, where freedom is only a word that people are brainwashed into thinking they possess... Convinced that only armed revolution can stem American aggression, he wrote:

By coming to Canada young men do not escape from wage slavery; but they do escape military conscription if they have not already served their time. A military that is a tool of the wealthy of the U.S. used to prevent people's revolutions around the world using brutal methods. These weapons, used by soldiers who are of the working class, who have been brainwashed since birth to believe that it is their patriotic duty to go into the military and be prepared to murder any peoples that their leaders say are the enemy... Helix has further rebuked U.S. draft laws by vigorously supporting conscientious objectors. Asserting that religious denominations cannot define a man's conscience,

---
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Helix claimed it is ironical and asinine that CO laws refer only to "churchgoers." Many of today's CO's reject establishment religion, "but their beliefs still are profoundly moral and religious." The article asked what it means for CO's to act according to their consciences:

What is conscience anyway? Is it a catchword for cowards or is it the most human thing about human beings? Is it belief which goes beyond opinion or concept to ethical choice backed by personal commitment: Belief with guts! . . .

Conscience is not inconsistent with democratic rule --Thoreau, Gandhi and Camus proved that, the article noted. And when ethical conscience is subjected to external authority, "mankind gets Buchenwald."

The government should grant CO classifications to any young man who refuses to perform genocide, regardless of whether he belongs to a specific religious sect, Helix said, adding that CO's in Washington State have been consistently denied recognition. The CO's tireless fight against inhumane draft laws helps people throughout the world: "If one American withholds himself from killing one Vietnamese, perhaps another American will not . . ."

The selective service has given few CO deferments
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since the Vietnam build-up, Helix reported. Prior to the escalation, about 80 per cent of CO applicants were being released; in 1969 the percentage was described as negligible compared with the number of men who morally object to the war.

Prior to the Vietnam war, most Americans probably believed that only the enemy tortures prisoners and murders women and children. So it is understandable that the American public has reacted to reports of G.I. atrocities in Vietnam with shame and regret.

Helix accounts of G.I. brutality include an interview with Dr. Alje Vennema, a Dutch physician who headed the Canadian Medical Mission in Vietnam between March, 1964, and August, 1968. The interview—held prior to Vennema's December 19, 1967, Paris antiwar conference testimony that U.S. firepower was killing and injuring civilians--first appeared in the Haagse Post, a Dutch weekly.

Vennema said American soldiers occupy a country where they are not wanted, so they avenge their frustrations by murdering men, women and children. And the G.I.'s seldom know who the enemy is because "everyone is wearing black pajamas!" Moreover, people in villages like Sontra, Song-lam, and Songmy "are almost 100 per cent for the liberation front," but villagers ignore names such as Liberation Front, NLF or Viet Cong. They speak of the Vietminh--as though they are still fighting the French--and refer to the fighters
as "our own people."

Vennema said he had treated several prisoners tortured for allegedly aiding the Liberation Front or for being unable to identify themselves properly. Some were immediately killed while others were arrested and questioned by the secret police, he said. "When they did not confess, they were kicked and burned with electricity, the women especially—their nipples—with field telephones."

Vennema said he got them "when they were nearly dying and nothing could be gotten out of them. I could help some, but many did not survive."

American soldiers taken prisoner are not tortured, Vennema said. "The reason Americans die is psychological." With unvarying, scant diets and malaria and snakes working against them, "why should they be tortured too?"

Americans use gas to force NLF soldiers out of tunnels, he said. The gas damages the lungs and is especially lethal to the Vietnamese. (More than half of them are said to have TB.) Persons in the tunnels have about 30 seconds to get out safely.

I treated a little boy who had been sitting in a tunnel, but I could not save him. I was able to save his sister, but her lungs will remain severely damaged. . . . 18

Vennema had contended in a September, 1967, letter

to The Washington Post that American soldiers are guilty of mayhem and murder in Vietnam. The U.S. command in Vietnam called the doctor "anti-American" and refused to assist him further.

Other U.S. atrocities in Vietnam were described in a reprint of an interview with Paul Meadlo, Vietnam veteran who took part in the My Lai slaughter. (The interview, by Mike Wallace of CBS, was televised November 24, 1969.)

Meadlo said his squad rounded up 40 to 50 villagers and "placed them like a little island in the center of the village." At Lieutenant William Calley's command "I started shooting into the group at about 15 feet, firing four clips or something like 67 shots." Meadlo said he fired on automatic and couldn't be sure how many he'd killed "cause they were going so fast. I might have killed 10 or 15 of them."

"Men, women, and children—and babies?" asked Wallace.

"Men, women, children and babies," answered Meadlo. Asked how he could shoot babies, Meadlo replied, "I don't know. It's just one of them things."

Asked how the villagers reacted to the massacre in which an estimated 370 persons died, Meadlo said:

---

19 The Army has charged Calley with the murder of 109 Vietnamese civilians and has announced that it will bring court martial proceedings against him.
they was begging and saying, "no, no." And the mothers was hugging their children and, but they kept right on firing. Well, we kept right on firing. They was waving their arms and begging. . . . .

Admitting he still dreams about it, Meadlo said:

"I see the women and children in my sleep. Some days . . . some nights I can't even sleep. I just lay there thinking about it."21

A reader, who signed his name Paul, contended in a letter to the Helix that the blood of the Vietnamese massacres is not solely on the hands of American soldiers. "I'm an old man--not a soldier--but you can see the blood on my hands," he wrote. "It was I who massacred all those innocents at My Lai." Disturbed over the government that coerced him into killing, Paul regrets having "gone sheep-like to the polls to support a democratic process that the war lords take as a vote of confidence."

Paul's bloody hands have always haunted him. Despite participating in antiwar marches and writing protest letters, "it stayed there," he said--"the blood on my hands, always dripping." Sometimes he asked his friends if they could see it. But few could and mostly they wanted to change the subject. Hoping My Lai will help more Americans "see the red on their hands," he wrote:

20 "I Might Have Killed 10 or 15," Helix, December 4, 1969, p. 12.
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. . . the pressing thing to me is the blood on my hands which is copious beyond endurance. It is as though I spray the cowering peasants of Mylai again and again. I see them crumple before a hail of lead. I hear the sound of my rifle as its slugs raise the body of the little boy trying fruitlessly to cover his wounded brother. I see the unbelieving fright in the eyes of the mothers as I lay death upon their children.

Now you know who is guilty. It is I; just look at my hands!22

Heartily supporting the nationwide October 15, 1969, peace moratorium, Helix called it "the first demonstration of antiwar sentiment which the mass media took seriously as a political event." News media--viewing the moratorium as more than the work of "ego-tripping radicals"--gave the demonstrations "a newly-admitted respectability. Suddenly, all sorts of people were against the war; senators, clean-cut students, Wall Street brokers. . . ." The demonstrations--no longer the exclusive property of leftists and blacks--were becoming a basic part of U.S. political life.

The October moratorium proved that the peace movement had come a long way, Helix noted. People no longer were debating whether, but rather how, to end the war. The paper was especially concerned with President Nixon's reaction. The moratorium was too big for him to pass off as the work of malcontents and lunatics. "America's leading used car salesman granted the 'legitimacy' of the demonstrations but denied it was part of the 'democratic process'--a

frighteningly totalitarian piece of doublethink." And certain Nixon administration spokesmen said the moratorium gave everyone a chance to "'get it off their chests,' to express their dissatisfaction and then to go back to normal life." Optimistic that the November demonstrations would disprove that analysis, the article said:

Changes in the political life of the United States are coming fast. Every week its leaders are shown to be more corrupt, more transparent. Every week its "democratic process" is shown to be more hollow, more meaningless. The moratorium, and next month's demonstrations are important components in the process of exposure.23

Helix described the November 15 Seattle moratorium activities this way:

Organizing at the Federal Courthouse, about 4,000 marchers—chanting "Peace Now!" and "One, Two, Three, Four, End This Damn War!"—filed through the downtown area, finally stopping at the Federal Office Building. There the demonstrators cheered loudly, released 500 helium balloons, then left in the rain.

Again, as in October, a cross-section of Seattle residents convened to demand American withdrawal from Vietnam. But the demonstrators and hundreds of others across the country were left with a sobering fact: The war did not end; the senseless killing and destruction goes on. And worse yet, warned Helix, is the threat of still more

"wars of liberation":

... today the U.S. bombs tiny Laos more than it ever bombed North Vietnam. And today U.S. bombers fly regular napalm raids over all the northeastern provinces of Thailand. Today the American CIA commands and finances an anti-communist army in Laos, and the majority of U.S. troops in Thailand are there to fight Thais, not Vietnamese.24

Proposing that U.S. imperialism clearly extends beyond the borders of Vietnam, Helix said it is time for peace demonstrators to decide how hard they want to work for peace and what tactics they will use. American capitalists helped finance French colonialism and now are intervening in Vietnamese, Thai and Laotian revolutions, the paper noted, adding that peace movement participants should:

1. Demand that all American forces be removed from foreign soil.
2. Incorporate new constituencies--especially working people and high school and community college students.
3. Support the demands of the 40 million non-white and Third World Americans.
5. Be prepared to struggle for what it believes is right.25

The peace movement has gained considerable impetus

---
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since California Governor Ronald Reagan said two years ago that "the price of immediate peace could be 1,000 years of darkness for generations yet unborn." Times have changed and more people are becoming aware of what this war is all about, said Helix, adding:

They have learned that the government in Saigon is run by a corrupt and brutal clique of petty tyrants who serve only the Americans, the rich Saigon landlords and themselves. They have seen more than 40,000 American men die in Vietnam, while a few American corporations have made fortunes manufacturing weapons and other war materials.26

Most Helix writers seem to agree that what they call the imperialists' pogrom in Asia ultimately will fail. U.S. war lords, they charge, wage a hopeless and insane war in Southeast Asia—a war that weighs heavily on the consciences of many Americans and much of the rest of the world.

The Vietnamese people and the people throughout Indo-China and Southeast Asia and peace and justice-loving people all over the world are highly indignant at, and strongly protest against, the criminal war mongering and aggressive acts of the U.S. imperialists.27

For the sake of posterity, the Nixon administration should consider Peking's April, 1965, warning: "The U.S. imperialist road of 'escalation' is one gradually leading to the grave. Lying ahead is not an arch of triumph, but a dark hell of death."28

28Ibid., p. 429.
CHAPTER 8

THE NEW LEFT AND THE SEEDS OF REVOLUTION

Revolutionary politics in 1969 and early 1970 superseded drugs and esoteric religion as the principal theme in the "hip" media. While some radical writers warn of an impending revolution, others maintain that the transition already is under way. Insisting that capitalistic institutions alienate human beings and restrict their freedoms, undergrounds predict that New Left ideals will pervade those institutions and free millions of people from economic and social servitude.

Exploitative capitalism (especially in America), say the undergrounds, is a monster spawning and nurturing an economic elite at high cost to the masses. Endorsing socialists such as Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, "hip" papers argue that all men have a right to natural resources and material wealth and that capitalists are interested solely in amassing profits and do not care whether all or few people buy their goods. Institutions that create and sustain social, economic and political inequality by buying and selling morality and encouraging people "to look out for themselves" are false and immoral and must be changed, say the radical media.

Viewing modern capitalism simply as a more "palatable" kind of colonialism, undergrounds are asking
minority peoples everywhere to resist the power structure, peacefully if possible but forcibly if necessary. Although revolution—often signifying anarchy and bloody confrontation—frightens many, it can come about subtly and peaceably. Many people, including underground writers, maintain that potent revolutionary forces already are transforming American society. Recent events indeed suggest that our social order is changing more swiftly than ever before. The "big push" began in the 1950's with the Greenwich Village beatniks. Then came the pulsating new rock music, large-scale civil rights marches, vehement antiwar protests, the hippies and the radical New Left. As the New Left defies the status quo and police batter heads to protect it, America appears to be polarizing into distinct camps—the radicals and the establishment.

Some radical writers imply that only bloody revolution can transform America's constitutional promises into a working democracy. Others—though perhaps agreeing that revolution is inescapable—believe it can come about quietly and without confrontation. Helix political writers—denouncing what they term capitalism's gross inequalities—have said that unless exploiters modify practices, they will be crushed by internal and/or external forces.

Crowley decries bloody revolution. In the August 1, 1968, Helix, he asked young radicals precisely what they meant by advocating a revolution with a "bigger than life
R." Admitting that the subject of revolution is frightening, he said "it's not so much the event itself (although that causes me no little concern) that worries me, but rather people's attitudes toward it." Asking readers to think about what a revolution in America would entail, he suggested it is futile to play word games about revolution unless one has the energy and perseverance to see it through. "I confess that I may lack the intelligence, courage, the resolve, or even the desire to do that," he admitted. "And I don't know anybody in any better shape." He then asked the "big R people":

Could you kill someone? Maybe in the heat of the moment we could all kill a "Racist Fascist Mother Fucking Pig of a Cop," but even stereotypes bleed and moan and have wives who'll miss them. And anyway, isn't that part of this odious evil we supposedly oppose?

More than sweat, revolutions also seem to be accompanied by a great deal of blood. I dislike bleeding. It always struck me as a shameful waste of a valuable resource. Maybe you, gentle reader, have more to spare than I.  

If you think America is so decadent that only violence will change it, then "stop farting off," he said. But if you "feel things aren't really that bad and that change can be wrought within the existing framework of American society, then stop bastardizing the word revolution."  

---
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Some radicals, however, claim that confrontation politics is the only way to rid "imperialistic" America of violence, poverty and social oppression. While agreeing that Americans have a right and duty to oppose unpopular government policy, Crowley implied that anyone desiring a bloody struggle with establishment police and militia has to be more desperate than sane. Almost any action, he insisted, would be wiser than overt revolution—especially when the rebels lack definite strategies and workable plans for new leadership. Yet certain factions of the New Left, such as the Black Panther Party, disagree. Panther member Huey P. Newton, for example, claims that "the spirit of the people is greater than the Man's technology." It is a noble slogan, but spirit alone cannot overcome riot guns and billy clubs.

Black militants are impatient to avenge 300 years of bondage, but they must realize that a physical victory against the system still is inconceivable, Crowley said. Radical groups are insane if they think they have the physical and spiritual unity and the weaponry to smash this country's sophisticated militia. Calling bloody revolution a total involvement and a game for keeps, he added: "Revolution for the hell of it is a cute idea. Bleeding to death from buckshot is not so cute."  

---

Herbert Marcuse—philosopher and political writer whom The New York Times has called "the ideological leader of the New Left"—also abhors bleeding and termed it "unrealistic and utopian" to imagine that the New Left could invade Washington and occupy the Pentagon. Convinced that the rebels cannot forcibly seize power in this highly developed industrial society, he said they must be content to infiltrate the system locally and regionally. Confident that society is ripe for revolution, he is optimistic about New Left goals:

... we all feel, we experience, we have it in our bones, that this society is getting increasingly repressive, destructive, of the human and natural capabilities to be free, to determine one's own life, to shape one's own life without exploiting others.⁴

Crowley said fighting the "pigs"—who are not the real enemy of the American people—causes only death and destruction and retards the fight against the real foe: "The now polite, now barbarous, authoritarianism of the liberal establishment or corporations and bureaucracies."

Implying that man is rebellious by nature, Crowley called revolution a strange process that is hard to comprehend and harder to direct. Revolutionaries, he said, are the misfits, malcontents and leaders who lie dormant in tranquil societies, but who emerge when social structures

start to dissolve. Calling the revolutionary the elan vital of new social order, he wrote:

The revolutionary is not the new man, he is only the parent. The revolutionary is the link, the living dialectic. Within him the old order is dying and the new is being born. He is the uneasiness coexistence /sic/ of the old and the new.5

While suggesting that man is incurably rebellious--both metaphysically and politically--Crowley seemed to agree with Albert Camus that revolutions historically have been little more than anti-climactic phases of ever-changing social orders. The revolutionary, Crowley said, "is peculiarly adapted for the twilight"--for those times when the masses finally agree that the social order (not the rebel) is insane and that revisions are inescapable. So, after completing his work, the revolutionary becomes anonymous in the new structure that already is planting seeds for the next transition.

"It is the revolutionary's fate to seek but never to find," Crowley wrote. "His sole relief is to fight, to transcend through struggle the alienation of himself from his world, of the past from the future."6 Yet Crowley is more optimistic about rebellion and revolution than is Camus, who said:
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While even the collective history of a movement of rebellion is always that of a fruitless struggle with facts, of an obscure protest which involves neither methods nor reasons, a revolution is an attempt to shape actions to ideas, to fit the world into a theoretic frame. That is why rebellion kills men while revolution destroys both men and principles.  

Revolutions and governments always have been nebulous concepts, Camus noted, because "the movement that seems to complete the circle already begins to describe another at the precise moment when the new government is formed"; the only true revolution would be the definitive revolution.  

Hinting that man's nature precludes a "final" revolution, Crowley equated human personality (component physiological and psychological characteristics that define the human being) with the immutable chemistry of life: Men and societies, like molecules and cells, try to maintain harmony by reacting to environmental extremes. But man's conscious will--by which he imagines himself free and the architect of his destiny--breaks the analogy between him and the microbes. For despite man's ability to control partially the forces around him, he can never anticipate the future. "Enslaved by his own nature and only dimly aware of his universe, man can effect change, but the outcome of those changes doesn't necessarily coincide with

---
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his plans."

Though social and political revolutions always have threatened to overturn stagnant societies, Crowley implied that today's sophisticated social orders become obsolete faster than before: Many people think today's world is "on a bummer"; they're groping for anything--fascism, love, "ticky tacky" homes, Zen Buddhism--to bring a moment of light into their dreary lives. But they delude themselves; improvement is merely an illusion whereby one justifies change by calling it progress. Yet euphemisms work wonders. Men who know their only hope is hope itself cling to life and struggle on. Alluding to the futility of it all, he wrote:

Humanity is an organism composed of little parts called people, noisy and blind creatures with a bent for teleology and a lust for prophesy, they grope through their existence and sometimes discover humility. And when it is all over, imperfection and despair, fulfillment and frustration, hate and inequality remain. Like atoms we rearrange but do not change.⁹

Nietzsche too pondered man's struggles with himself and the external world. Though confident that a few "chosen" men have the potential to rise to new heights, he scoffed at the idea of a Marxist utopia. Nietzsche predicted exercise of the "will"--that something in man that he called invulnerable, unburiable and capable of breaking rock--

would enable the exalted few to gain precedence over the masses. He said life is a harsh struggle where the strong and the healthy rise above the weak. "Men are not equal. Nor shall they become equal. What would my love of the Overman be if I spoke otherwise?" Recognizing human inequalities, Nietzsche praised the Overman—who he said would replace God as the ultimate creative force—and damned the masses, or rabble, as he called them.

Because the journey to the Overman is long and arduous, Nietzsche knew that only unique and resolute men could complete it, so there always will be disparities among the rabble as they confront each other in their petty power struggles:

On a thousand bridges and paths they shall throng to the future, and ever more war and inequality shall divide them. . . . Good and evil, and rich and poor, and high and low, and all the names of values—arms they be and clattering signs that life must overcome itself again and again.11

Crowley seems to agree with the Greek writer Nikos Kazantzakis, who said man possesses a "superior essence" (analogous to Nietzsche's "will") causing him to be restless, unsatisfied and non-conforming. In The Saviors of God, Kazantzakis described that compelling "force" (God) that

---

10 Supra, p. 43, see footnote 8.

makes man—as Camus once said—"the only animal that
refuses to be what he is":

We, as human beings, are all miserable persons,
heartless, small, insignificant. But within us a
superior essence drives us ruthlessly upward.
From within this human mire divine songs have
welled up, great ideas, violent loves, an unsleeping
assault full of mystery, without beginning or end,
without purpose, beyond every purpose.12

Some radicals—who claim that class wars are not
inevitable but that a Marxist utopia is—insist that polite
revolutions are a myth and that violence is the only way to
eradicate the bourgeoisie. "In order to change the world
we've got to understand what's wrong with it, and then
destroy it—ruthlessly," said John Hoyland, a young British
radical.

The July 17, 1969, Helix printed Hoyland's letter
exchange with Beatle John Lennon—letters, apparently
inspired by the Beatle album "Revolution," that had appeared
in the English socialist biweekly, The Black Dwarf. Claim­
ing Lennon and the Beatles pander to capitalists that they
pretend to despise, Hoyland said the Beatles' only honest
revolutionary music came while they were momentarily high
on acid. Reminding Lennon that rich men who give lip ser­
ice to socialistic ideals are hypocrites, Hoyland asked
him if he someday would let the "prolies" take over his

12Nikos Kazantzakis, The Saviors of God: Spiritual
Exercises, (trans.) Kimon Friar (New York: Simon and Schus­
businesses, or if he would call the police instead. "After all," Hoyland wrote, "you are a businessman and Businessmen Must Protect their Interests!"

Hoyland said revolutions are not born of cruelty or madness but of "love"—a most intense love pitting itself against the suffering, oppression and humiliation created by capitalism. Any love that does not defy those evils is sloppy and irrelevant,¹³ he wrote, referring to the kind of rebellious "love" that Marx said would inspire the bloody worker-bourgeois Armageddon. And a similar passion induced Che Guevara to say:

... the true revolutionary is guided by a great feeling of love. It is impossible to think of a genuine revolutionary lacking this quality. Perhaps it is one of the great dramas of the leader that he must combine a passionate spirit with a cold intelligence and make painful decisions without contracting a muscle. Our vanguard revolutionaries must idealize this love of the people, the most sacred cause, and make it one and indivisible. . . .¹⁴

Hoyland contended the privileged class is so sick with greed it will do anything—murder, torture, destroy, foster ignorance, apathy and selfishness at home, and burn children abroad—to keep its power.

"You're on a destruction kick," Lennon told Hoyland in a return letter. "People are what's wrong with the world.

¹³"You Want a Revolution, Well . . .," Helix, July 17, 1969, p. 15.

Do you want to destroy them? Ruthlessly? Until you/we change your/our heads there's no chance." We're involved in more than a class war and unless sick minds are cured, no revolution can succeed, he said, adding that "nothing but sick heads fucked up every institution from communism to Buddhism."

Hoyland insisted in a subsequent letter that he had been misunderstood: "I really can't blame people and I wouldn't want to shoot all the capitalists." How else can they behave in a system "which by its nature is competitive, puts profit before principle and places power and privilege in the hands of a few at the expense of many?" Blaming capitalism for man's gluttony, Hoyland predicted that all competitive societies would evolve into cooperative utopias:

Given such a society a lot of people (rich/poor) are necessarily selfish, narrow-minded, unscrupulous. They have to be. That's the way the system works. Build a better form of society—one based on cooperation and participation and sharing—and people will respond accordingly. And we know this will happen, because we see history moving inexorably towards this kind of society—both in the capitalistic countries and in communist ones.15

Hoyland reproved the Beatles for suggesting in "Revolution" that rebels should free their minds instead of engaging in open rebellion. "Why instead? Why not as well?" he asked. Many radicals

15"You Want a Revolution, Well . . .," loc. cit.
already have "changed their heads" but decided that it isn't enough. "You simply can't be completely turned on and happy knowing that kids are being roasted to death in Vietnam, and that everybody's individuality is being stunted by the system." 16

Dave Lippman said in another *Helix* article that the Beatles are no longer a major catalyst for rebellious youth: "Though John Lennon still shocks the establishment with naked album covers, he is too inconsistent and too often counter-revolutionary to be looked up to any longer." The Western bourgeoisie is starting to respect the Beatles for their exploitative capitalistic dealings, he wrote, but added that it might be a long time before the group is fully accepted. Still, their drift toward the Right is inevitable and regrettable, said Lippman, adding:

I grew up with the Beatles and learned all my music from them. And I don't think I ever had any illusions about that, had Lennon and McCartney been my classmates, they could be relied on to seize a building when the time came. 17

The Beatles' move to capitalism suggests that hero worship may be not only fruitless but also dangerous to the revolutionary cause, Lippman said, warning that other artists and writers backing the New Left (Marcuse and poet-musician Bob Dylan, for instance) also may forsake the liberals. But


it is easier for Marcuse to keep in touch with the people, he said, because he writes about tangible political problems and is open to attack from leftist writers with whom he exchanges views.

Dylan, who works in a more obscure medium, could "keep himself down-to-earth by granting more interviews," Lippman suggested, adding that "we [the New Left] have a great deal of respect for him, so we will just wait and see what course he chooses." 18

The Helix implied that Western society is a victim of what Marx termed the "fetishism of commodities." It is programmed to want whatever goods the capitalists produce in this exploitative society where "things are in the saddle and rule mankind" and where men and women feel detached and alienated from the economic elite. 19 So, as Crowley noted, profit potential—not human needs—determines production:

The basic priority of capitalism then is not the production of actual goods but the production of additional capital. The flow of capital is thus the basic rhythm of this society with which all other social activity is synchronized. 20

New Left radicals say real freedom remains a myth

18Ibid.


so long as capitalists and their "things" control men's minds. Certain people, however (including mind-drug advocate Timothy Leary), claim that since freedom—like religion—is a private state of mind, radicals should not actively work to free others. Leary has said that "if all men could only free their heads, everything would be all right." So—applying the universal to the particular—he reasoned that when one man "frees his own head," he is free. Why then are the radicals always trying to free everybody else? he asked.

Disagreeing with Leary and viewing life as a struggle of slave against master, the Helix claimed that slaves who find freedom in their heads and deny the outside world only reinforce their bondage. And the slave further reaffirms his subservience if he worships an ultimate master (Christian God or other lofty idol). For the earthly master wins again by convincing the slave that God grants all dispensations and favors through earthly middle-men (kings, bishops, premiers, presidents, etc.).

While agreeing with Nietzsche that organized religions perpetuate servitude and should be abolished, the article implied that only self-reliant and responsible men dare kill their gods. Reminding atheists of their "religious" obligations, the article emphasized that anyone who "frees his head" through self-enlightenment should help others free theirs. "For without freedom for all men, no
one man can be truly free."²¹

Quoting from Camus' *The Rebel*, the same article denounced those who accuse political activists of "egoism or juvenile tactics." Deeming rebellion the *raison d'être* for human existence, Camus suggested that Descartes' *cogito* defines consciousness as rebellion defines man's daily trials:

The malady experienced by a single man becomes a mass plague. In our daily trials rebellion plays the same role as does the "cogito" in the realm of thought: It is the first piece of evidence. But this evidence lures the individual from his solitude. It founds its first value on the whole human race. I rebel—therefore we exist.²²

Many New Left disciples agree with Marx that competitive capitalism encourages racism and imperialism and leads to irreparable disparities between the "haves" and the "have nots." New Left factions met at the New Politics Convention in Chicago (August 29-September 5, 1967) to formulate a program of liberation for alienated Americans. But the convention, *Helix* reported, rapidly split into two groups—blacks and whites. Tensions developed when the blacks (they make up an estimated 50 per cent of the country's radicals) learned that the convention's steering committee was only one-third black, and more bitterness ensued when Alabama and Mississippi blacks couldn't find a

---

²¹"And a Missal from Left Field," *Helix*, March 6, 1969, p. 11.

²²Ibid., quoting from Camus' *The Rebel.*
place to stay in Chicago.

The convention speech by CORE leader Floyd McKissick convinced many white radicals that the black movement may be far more sophisticated than their own. He said:

The black man's problems are basically different from those of the alienated white man--and blacks are going to solve their own problems in their own way. . . . If our liberation requires the destruction of the existing American institutions, then so be it! We are prepared to die to see our people liberated from American oppression.23

Radicals at the 1967 convention specified numerous "social ills" that they agreed to attack. According to Helix, the convention recommended educational and action programs against "the continuing destruction of America's cities by business, the police, the military, the Vietnam War and the draft." Cooperatives and schools for radicals were proposed to help combat social injustice and inequality.24

Although SDS has been weakened by internal power struggles and vague objectives, it has successfully disrupted the status quo on several campuses. Riots occurred at Columbia April 23, 1968, when SDS challenged the university's administrative policies and protested its


24 Ibid.
construction of a gym at Morningside Park (one of few city-owned parks available to Harlem residents).

Helix reported the radicals also were opposing suspensions of six students who had demonstrated against a secret campus research group (the Institute for Defense Analysis). SDS had linked the clandestine group to the Defense Department and the CIA.

What began as a nonviolent demonstration ended in student seizure of four main classroom buildings and President Grayson Kirk's office. Helix said the Columbia demonstration was more than just an "eastern Berkeley." A week after the demonstration began, LNS called it "a new, more fluid style of revolutionary activity on the American campus." Agreeing with LNS, Helix said the Columbia disturbance had passed the physical stage and was moving toward a much more significant phase.

Helix said the clash with police April 30 not only failed to quell the demonstration but encouraged uncommitted blacks and whites to join the rebels in a massive student strike that "may permanently affect the university." It said the administration had lost its power to make things happen and the "paraphernalia of modern education" probably wouldn't return to Columbia in the near future; "the power to make things happen is now out there on the campus where students and teachers are getting together informally for the first relevant education most of them on either side
have experienced.25

The SDS-sponsored demonstration against the ROTC at the University of Washington in March, 1969, was the biggest protest movement in that school's history. Calling the demonstration a success, Helix reported that it clearly overshadowed an ASUW-sponsored student meeting planned to detract from the SDS action. Success was partly due to SDS leaflets discussing the ROTC issue and encouraging students to side with the rebels, Helix noted, adding that by overreacting campus organizations stirred up more publicity and student interest than SDS could have alone. Campus hysteria had been mounting since the SDS announcement a few weeks earlier, at a demonstration against recruiting representatives of United Fruit Co., that its next target would be ROTC.26

Three Helix writers--Crowley, "Rio" Cauldwell and Scott White--gave first-hand accounts of the demonstration. "SDS is patting itself on the back for what it considers a brilliant piece of campus agitation," Crowley wrote. "While the demonstration was by no stretch of even a cynic's imagination a failure, its success is seriously qualified." Criticizing SDS for not educating students about ROTC, Crowley said the rebels' main accomplishment was avoidance

of a clash with counter demonstrators such as the Young Republicans and that beyond that, SDS leadership fizzled. Lack of expected violence and the large number of participants were the highlights of the demonstration, he wrote. "The demonstration succeeded primarily because the University failed to provoke an incident which could have justified the repression of student dissent."27

Cauldwell, marching with the demonstrators, described the anxiety and tension among rebels and onlookers as the group passed fraternity and sorority houses and the ROTC building. He wondered what would happen when long-haired, sign-carrying SDSers confronted campus "straights." "Some fraternity chaps sang anti-SDS slogans, two sorority chicks looked nauseated and other people looked disgusted, but we moved on," he wrote. People joined the marchers until there must have been 12,000, he said, and despite claims that "Seattle is laid back," students showed a willingness to support student dissent.28

Many marchers appeared to be obsessed with the idea of possible violence, White reported. "The topic everywhere was violence. Would the police be called in? What would they do if the police came?" Despite SDS assurances that
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the demonstration would be peaceful, news media had played up violence until everyone expected it--perhaps even wanted it--White wrote. Alluding to the strange phenomenon of mob hysteria, he said one girl was afraid she would miss the excitement if she went to the University Center to eat; it reminded him of the 1968 Chicago riots when people killed time by drinking beer because they knew there would be no excitement until later when the police arrived.

White, who admitted he disliked large crowds, said those thousands of people reinforced his fear of being trampled in a mob crazed by violence. After leisurely strolling through several buildings, the line of rebels passed through ROTC headquarters chanting "ROTC must go." Officers and cadets stood at attention as the rebels walked by and saluted, then left peacefully.29

"SDS has succeeded beyond its wildest dreams in awakening the campus politically," Roger Downey wrote in the March 20, 1969, Helix. He said SDS leaders convince by what they do--not by what they say--and they act to change the shape of things. Summing up their objectives, he wrote:

Insofar as I understand SDS "orthodoxy," their principal objective is the "politicizing" of the public through mobilizing opinion on specific issues, hence grapes (exploitation of labor), bananas (U.S. business imperialism in Latin America), ROTC and so on.30

29Ibid.

30Roger Downey, "Before the Storm," Helix, March 20, 1969, p. 3.
Yet, Downey implied, SDS efforts at the University of Washington might not have been quite as successful as the crowds indicated. He said:

Many new SDS supporters are interested in action rather than distant goals and are disinterested in revolutionary theory;

Because the idea of freedom (especially their own) intrigues them, they keep SDS from becoming an effective political force with well-defined goals;

The irony is that SDS wants the impossible: To define and attack issues, but not to become an issue itself;

A long-range question lingers for SDS members: Where do we go from here?31

Before SDS can effect permanent changes in university policy, it must define its present status, then move forward, Milton Freedman said in the March 20, 1969, Helix. SDS first must build a political consciousness on campus by defending those rebels (nine at the time of the article) whom President Charles Odegaard has suspended, he said, adding that "their fate is a matter of concern to the movement."

Confrontation machinery is divided between SDS and the administration, Freedman wrote. SDS controls strategy,
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tactics and direction, but the administration's over-all attitude and planned counterattack are still unknown. But that doesn't surprise SDS; the group always expected to work under those handicaps, he said.

Implying that a severe communications gap existed between Odegaard and the rebels, Freedman contended the president displayed "no understanding of the roots of the white student movement. He has no idea of where it came from, why it is growing and what its goals are." And it is erroneous, he said, that the administration seemed to consider SDS a small, isolated group lacking real contact with the rest of the campus.

Downey agreed with Freedman that the administration and SDS were "poles apart" and "functioning on different wave lengths," but he claimed that the administration clearly outlined its strategy. Odegaard promised to suspend all students identified in photographs taken during the demonstrations, said Downey, but he clearly did not intend to suspend 200 students. Instead, he appeared to be carrying out "selective suspension." Downey commented that all suspended students had been active in one or more radical organizations (SDS, Black Student Union, Union of Mexican-American Students, etc.) and that the administration hoped to stop SDS action by threatening to suspend participants and by promising to observe the rebels' political activities.
Downey also agreed with Freedman that the administration—by being more concerned with the rebels' behavior than with their attitudes—apparently missed the point of the demonstrations. So long as Odegaard objected to SDS's disorderly conduct, rather than its ideals, he said, Odegaard was ignoring the "depth of feeling and breadth of sympathy that the rebels have aroused. What an absurd attitude for any university administrator to have.32

The establishment often condemns radicals for demonstrating instead of resolving disagreements through dialogue. Helix reported April 17, 1969, that several anti-Odegaard letters in the University of Washington Daily had not prompted "the invisible man" to retaliate. But when challenged in Argus—a 75-year-old weekly calling itself the publication for "anyone who is anybody in the Northwest"—the "good doctor" became upset enough to rebut. Marvin W. Baker—a University of Washington student who Helix said "didn't write like an SDSer"—started the dialogue April 4 by asking Argus readers to respond to SDS charges against the United Fruit Company and the ROTC and the University's involvement in those affairs. Baker said he wanted "reasoned rebuttals" to SDS charges and none of the usual gibberish about nasty long-haired people who are shoddy and rude and use disruptive tactics.

32Downey, op. cit., p. 2.
Odegaard replied a week later. The president apparently didn't read Baker's letter carefully, Helix said, because he wrote just the opposite of what was asked for. "He talked about SDS tactics, the university as a place for 'dialogue, not confrontation,' but never about the university and United Fruit or American interests in Latin America."

"Not once," Odegaard said in the letter, "has SDS addressed any sort of proper petition to the 'university and its President.'" (Capitalization emphasis is Odegaard's, Helix noted.) Stating that Odegaard never has been willing to answer SDS charges of any kind, Helix quoted further remarks in the letter:

The tactics of SDS . . . are not the tactics of responsible debate. They are a bold effort to impose the will and the opinions of a few on the rest of the University.\textsuperscript{33}

Arguing that Odegaard's remarks would not satisfy students interested in SDS charges, Helix said the letter exchange showed that dialogue was not likely to resolve problems of student militancy. "SDS raises questions of real substance, but Odegaard replies in terms made of the finest fluff--answering nothing. . . . The old gentleman either can't comprehend SDS thinking--a sure sign of hardening of the mental arteries--or he knows he can't answer and hopes

\textsuperscript{33}"Anecdotes and Pleasantries," Helix, April 17, 1969, p. 15.
to placate everyone by getting something on paper." But the fact the University president had spoken was not enough, the article concluded, for Martin Baker's questions were relevant as long as there were people who would question.34

SDS members not only disagree on how to disrupt the capitalist system but also seem to lack workable programs to replace what they destroy. Members of the establishment call SDS negative because it destroys rather than builds. But many SDSers--agreeing with Lenin that "violence is the natural midwife of social reform"--feel compelled to arm themselves against the "violent bourgeoisie." About the "war that cannot be avoided," Lenin wrote:

Social-Democracy has never taken a sentimental view of war. It unreservedly condemns war as a bestial means of settling conflicts in human society. But Social-Democracy knows that so long as society is divided into classes, so long as there is exploitation of man by man, wars are inevitable. This exploitation cannot be destroyed without war, and war is always and everywhere begun by the exploiters, by the ruling and oppressing classes.35

Some SDSers argue that temporary anarchy is positive since it makes politicians uncomfortable and causes them to quickly reestablish social harmony. So if the renovated social order differs from the old, the rebels insist that their efforts have been constructive. Intelligent rebels
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no doubt realize that since they cannot crush the capitalist system (they would need enough followers with the guts, will and weaponry to beat the militia in a bloody showdown), their reforms must come through normal political channels. Since SDS obviously isn't big enough and tough enough to win street battles with the power structure, open confrontation seems futile and senseless.

The October 2, 1969, Helix criticized SDSers who advocate fighting in the streets: "The time is right for educating, for agitating and for struggling where SDS can win, but the New Left still is far too small to win in open revolutionary struggle." Helix charged that Weatherman-leading SDS faction that issued a jingoistic leaflet—may control SDS national policy but obviously doesn't control itself. The leaflet, entitled "The Time is Right for Fighting in the Streets," said:

The thing is this: the man can't fight everywhere. He can't beat the Vietnamese. And when other Vietnamese start, man, he's just going to fall apart. SDS is recruiting an army right now, man, a people's army, under black leadership, that's gonna fight against the pigs and win!!!

SDS is too idealistic and its false militancy can lead only to defeat and despair, the article concluded.

SDS hopes to effect rapid changes in capitalistic institutions by demonstrating on campuses. Although SDS

---

has made administrators cognizant that a potent radical force exists, internal political strife has seriously weakened the organization. After more than a year of controversy, SDS finally split into the Revolutionary Youth Movement (RYM) and The Progressive Labor Party (PLP) at its June, 1969, Chicago convention.

According to Helix, RYM forces—those grouped around the old SDS national office—accused PLP forces and its caucus of sympathizers (Worker-Student Alliance /WSA/) of sabotaging revolutionary struggles. RYM backers at the 1968 convention had failed to oust the then relatively weak PLP from the organization. Since then, however, PLP's influence has grown steadily. The party led the anti-ROTC demonstration at Harvard, and it now comprises the dominant groups at San Francisco State College and at Berkeley.

Recent ideological rifts prompted the SDS national office to expel PLP and to formulate four principles of rebel unity. Those principles, which Helix termed "recent practical expressions of SDS chapter activity," are:

1. Universal cooperation with and support of the Black Panther Party (BPP).
2. Support for the South Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front (NLF) and for revolutionary governments such as those of Cuba, China, North Vietnam, Albania and North Korea.
3. Emancipating women by helping them get equal
wages and opportunities for employment, ending their subordination to men and stopping advertisers from exploiting their bodies.

4. Support for the stand against anti-communism "so that this can no longer be served up to the American people in various forms to keep them from knowing who their real enemies are."

These principles "are the basis for SDS study, ideological struggle and the transformation of the group into a serious revolutionary youth movement," Helix reported. But it said the principles were drawn up to help SDS redefine itself—not to give local chapters an excuse to expel members who may have reservations about some guidelines. Helix said the SDS national office had little choice but to expel PLP and WSA. Charging that the break-away groups are serving the "pigs," helping U.S. imperialists prolong the war and thwarting the student revolution, the paper noted:

PLP /Including WSA/ was expelled from SDS because in practice they have repeatedly obstructed the advancement of our revolutionary movement and because their actions objectively have served the interests of the imperialists rather than the oppressed people of the world.37

According to the article, the national office has reproved PLP and WSA for condemning the BPP, "particularly at a time when the Panthers are suffering incredibly heavy

37"SDS A Step Forward?" Helix, July 3, 1969, p. 4.
repression by the power structure."\textsuperscript{38}

\textbf{Helix}, hoping to clarify the confusing RYM-PLP power struggle, said: RYM claims that the world's greatest injustice is the reign of stronger nations over weaker ones. Whereas PLP—arguing that capitalist control of workers is the greatest evil—contends that all nationalism (including the BPP) is reactionary and plays into the hands of the capitalists. RYM calls such thinking "objectively racist." PLP also believes that by negotiating, the NLF will sell out the Vietnamese people. RYM calls this "objectively anti-communist."

\textbf{Helix} suggested that unity may no longer be desirable for the rebels and predicted that tomorrow's SDS may comprise smaller groups uniting on an ad hoc basis.\textsuperscript{39} Marcuse also has said that the New Left's real strength may lie in what he terms "a kind of political guerrilla force" (comprising small radical groups concentrating on local levels). It's ludicrous to fear Left splits, he maintained. "Only the Right, which has no ideas to fight for, is united!"\textsuperscript{40}

Finally, in seeking an alternative to RYM and PLP-WSA

\textsuperscript{38}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{39}\textit{"The SDS Convention: A Layman's Guide," Helix, July 3, 1969, pp. 4-5.}

\textsuperscript{40}\textit{"Marcuse Perspectives," loc. cit.}
politics, Helix wants what may not exist: Humble anti-elitist rebels who have real faith in the revolution.

Helix always has supported the BPP's struggle against the Man. Opinions of Panther leaders such as Eldridge Cleaver and Huey P. Newton have appeared in several issues. Cleaver, articulate BPP Minister of Information and author of *Soul On Ice*, has described the frustrations of being black in a white man's society. The July 3, 1968, Helix, reprinted a Cleaver interview with Marvin Garson of the *San Francisco Express Times*. Garson asked Cleaver what groups or movements he referred to when he said in *Soul On Ice* that "the young white society offers hope for the black movement." "We [Panthers] want to have contacts with all groups that are moving to change America," Cleaver answered. "We're aware of categories like SDS, but we're also aware of individuals who aren't standing still." Cleaver made it clear that the Panthers aren't excluding older people:

> There are lots of old people who are very beautiful and they produce results and they work incessantly to bring about change. . . . /But many of them/ are hung up in fighting a die-hard battle to maintain the status quo. . . . Still you can't draw rigid age lines. I'm 33 myself and I trust me. . . .

Asked whether black-white race relations are getting better or worse in the Bay Area, Cleaver answered: "I think

---

racial tension is increasing, particularly in this election year. Racism is being used by reactionary forces in political arenas." He accused racist political candidates of trying to frighten white Americans by haranguing about violence in the ghettos. That white Americans even listen to George Wallace, he said, indicates that they are receptive to racist appeals— all white politicians are racists; each takes a particular stand that he hopes will draw votes.

Asked whether he thought white radicals should fight white racism in their own communities, Cleaver said that job will be much easier when black people are liberated. Then we can make specific targets out of those vague hostilities (exploitative merchants, police departments, political manipulation of the power structure) that are floating around.42

Cleaver said he was seeking the presidency (on the Peace and Freedom Party ticket) primarily to develop a national force of black and white activists. We need nationally what we have here in Alameda County, he said. "Here where the BPP and the PFP are working together, there has been a very favorable decrease in pervasive, undirected hostility and racial tension."43

Cleaver, in an April 25, 1968, Helix reprint from The San Francisco Bay Guardian, said the BPP coalition with
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the Alameda PFP "is based on what is recognized as a dual status of so-called minority people in this country"; blacks, Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans have full constitutional rights on paper, but since those rights often are denied in reality, minority people have developed a national consciousness. Cleaver explained that to intensify that consciousness, the BPP needs to "get whatever mileage it can out of its paper status." Though favoring BPP-PFP unity, he emphasized that certain white radicals must realize that black community problems have to be met and resolved by black people and that "our conditions" for a coalition with the PFP are that black problems won't be ground through white negotiating machinery.44

Helix announced August 29, 1968, that Cleaver "surprised most white supporters and dismayed many" by choosing Jerry Rubin as his running mate at the PFP's first national convention in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Cleaver easily won the presidential nomination, getting 155 delegate votes to 54 for his closest rival, Dick Gregory. Helix said that by picking Rubin, Cleaver showed he still believed white radicals could help liberate the black man. Alike in many ways, Cleaver and Rubin are spurred by that "great feeling of love" that Che Guevara said marks the true

revolutionary. Earlier, while Rubin and the Vietnam Day Committee were leading 15,000 people in an illegal march through Berkeley, Cleaver wrote from his jail cell:

I'd like to leap the whole last mile and grow a beard and down whatever threads the local nationalism might require and comrade with Che Guevara. And share his fate, blazing a new pathfinder's trail through the upbeat brain of the New Left. . . . I'd just love to be in Berkeley right now, to roll in that mud, frolic in that sty of funky revolution. . . .

Cleaver emphasized in the Helix that the PFP wouldn't try to woo disenchanted McCarthyites in November, but would seek "the lumpen proletariat in the urban centers. We're going to organize the hippies, the yippies and all of the young people of the psychedelic culture."

On November 27, 1968, Cleaver went into political exile in Algeria after the Adult Authority parole board revoked his parole on charges of possessing a rifle and associating with disreputable people. A month earlier, Helix had carried a PFP petition to keep him out of prison. Subheaded "everyone is innocent until proven guilty," the petition stated that Cleaver was out of jail on legal bail and that the California governor (with his "Adult Authority"), the California courts and the federal courts "had better realize that everyone— including Eldridge Cleaver— is innocent until proven guilty."

The International Committee to Defend Eldridge Cleaver (ICDEC) contended in the January 9, 1969, Helix that Cleaver was "a victim of naked, shameless political persecution who had been denied his constitutional rights to due process of law." Maintaining that Cleaver's parole was illegally revoked, ICDEC claimed that the Adult Authority parole board's charges were false and contrary to the Superior Court order, which, according to Helix, said:

Cleaver's only handling of a firearm (the rifle) was in obedience to a police command. He did not handle a hand gun at all. There was nothing one way or the other to show a conspiracy or a situation calling for the application of the doctrine of aiding and abetting. Hence, nothing supported either the possession of a firearm or the assault charge.

As to the charge of association with individuals of bad reputation, the report indicated that two or three of those named had "police records," but nothing to show whether any had been convicted of anything, or whether Cleaver knew of their arrest record.47

Cleaver was said to be "in political exile because a man of his convictions cannot get justice." The parole board's action was unjust and illegal, the committee claimed, because Cleaver wasn't allowed to defend himself at a hearing and legally, after the board charges the parolee with a violation, he is granted a hearing to present his defense and enter a plea. ICDEC also claimed the board holds secret meetings, doesn't inform parolees of procedures and violates federal law by not publishing proceedings "for

47Helix, January 9, 1969, p. 10.
"If we are to give more than lip service to concepts of freedom and justice, we must support Cleaver," ICDEC said. "If Cleaver doesn't get his freedom, it is just a matter of time until all our freedoms are further reduced. His is not a personal struggle but a political one."^48

The views of Huey P. Newton—BPP Minister of Defense serving a prison term for the 1967 slaying of an Oakland policeman—also have appeared in the Helix. For example, "Fear and Doubt," an essay of his published in 1967, appeared in the Nov. 7, 1968, issue. There Newton, like Cleaver, explores the conscious and unconscious implications of repressed black men living among whites: "The black male is a man of confusion. All his life he has been taught that he is an inferior approximation of humanity." Because he "is not sophisticated regarding the socio-economic milieu," the black man begins to believe that blacks are poor because they are inferior. How can he help but feel less than a man in a society where everyone is judged by his occupation and material possessions? Because the black man often is unemployed, his wife and children cease to respect him and he becomes ineffectual both in and out of the home. So the alienated black man—who becomes a consumer but not a producer—has to turn to the Man "to feed his family, to
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give him a job and to educate his children." Finally, loathing himself, he asks "who am I? Am I a very old adolescent or am I the slave I used to be?"49

The July 18, 1968, Helix contained a Newton interview that first appeared in The San Francisco Bay Guardian. Asked to comment on Senator McCarthy's remark that "black power is good power and I support it," Newton replied:

I'm sure that everyone throughout America and around the world is becoming educated to the black liberation movement. I am confident that as blacks continue to organize and educate, more and more of the world's colonized people will rebel. White radicals, too, finally are realizing that to be revolutionaries they'll have to identify with revolutionary people and act in accordance with the philosophy of revolutionary people.

Newton said that if whites and blacks are truly united in the revolutionary struggle, white radicals must avenge police attacks on black citizens by attacking the police who patrol white communities.

Blacks view the police as an occupying army placed in their communities to contain them. The police are the same everywhere. They're protecting the establishment -- the status quo. We've got to deal with them before we can deal with other political brutalities, such as poor housing and inadequate food.50

Reminding Newton that carrying guns has caused the Panthers a lot of trouble, the interviewer asked if there


was an alternative. "No, there is not," Newton answered, adding that black people have no other avenue to get the leverage and the power they need.

For us to seize power in any way is forbidden fruit. If we had seized that power in whatever way, we would have been criticized, brutalized and killed for it, because the power structure doesn't want to give up any of its power.51

Following the December 4, 1969, Chicago police raid, in which Panther leaders Fred Hampton and Mark Clark were killed, Helix said: "The United States government is escalating its campaign to destroy the BPP and choke off the black liberation movement." More than 300 Panthers have been jailed during the past two years, and more than 30 have been murdered, the article said, proving that the power structure has no answers to the people's problems.

Panthers are political prisoners because they lead a loud and active fight for human freedom, the article said, adding that "in Amerika [sic] it is the winter of the dog. The Chicago pig squad murdered chairman Fred Hampton in cold blood. A fascist arm extends from Wall Street and Washington."

Criticizing the news media for saying Panthers are little more than hoods and criminals, the article pointed out that the party sponsors free breakfasts for more than 10,000 children (of all races) every day.

51 Ibid.
The article warned radicals not to stand by idly while Nixon's "fascist forces" stamp out the Panthers, adding:

To sit and watch the destruction of the Panthers by the national pigs is the same as watching the international pigs try and destroy Vietnam. We have to get in motion, all of us people who see what's coming down in Amerika /sic/ and join together with the Panthers and all oppressed peoples to fight this Amerika consumer-fascism that is coming straight from Wall St. through Nixon to the pigs who pull the triggers. . . . Everyday it grows late for us. We are all being backed up against the wall in our bodies and in our minds.52

*Helix* became closely involved in active politics when Crowley announced— in the September 26, 1968, issue— his candidacy for District 32-A (roughly the University area) State Representative. Realistically skeptical of his party's chances at the polls, Crowley said PFP had no desire to "win" the positions it is contesting. The party has other objectives in mind, he said. It hopes to show the people that public offices— not elected officers— are their real enemy and the major threat to human survival. "Our institutions are constructed so that the true seats of power are far removed from even token interference by the people they rule."53

Another *Helix* article stated that the PFP will have


failed if it gets thousands of votes in November and withers away in December, but it would be worth all the trouble if the "noise and hoopla" of the election result in a stronger, more dedicated and better organized party. PFP stands for participatory democracy and, the writer hoped, it won't "fall heir to the closet full of petty woes that have haunted and eventually destroyed similar groups." 54 Marcuse expressed a similar hope for the New Left:

Political activity and political education must go beyond teaching and listening, must go beyond discussion and writing. The Left must find the adequate means of breaking the conformist and corrupted universe of political language and political behavior. The Left must try to arouse the consciousness and conscience of the other, and breaking out of the language and behavior pattern which is imposed on all political activity, is an almost super-human imagination, namely the effort to find a language and to organize actions which are not part and parcel of the familiar political behavior.

55

Admitting he really isn't "the political type," Crowley humorously commented: "My candidacy is a sure sign of the deterioration of the American political system." He confessed that his ego "has a hardy appetite" and claimed he had no personal political goals, because "I am also an inveterate coward and political exhibitionism does entail a certain risk."

Crowley granted that PFP "probably is the most...

promising formation of the New Left." He rebuked it for taking itself too seriously. PFP still lacks ironic humor and humility, he said. "Humility is a big hunk of crow to swallow at once, and it is a mighty concession for young egos to make to reality."^57

Crowley wrote in the October 3, 1968, Helix, that despite hopes to the contrary, his candidacy had weighed him down. One cannot help becoming involved in such a complex game, he said, still maintaining that the office is irrelevant but that the issues are crucial; it is painful enough for one to admit not having the answers, but worse yet to realize that no one has them. "Perhaps there are no answers. Perhaps politics is one gigantic game of self-delusion, and history only a common myth, and the future a mass hallucination."

Still, he said, "I am frightened, disillusioned and angry about a society that seems to be devouring itself." He implied that America's political and economic institutions have become so reactionary, ruthless and inflexible that they are incapable of absorbing rapid social changes without becoming something totally different. "Radical change is tantamount to death for institutions that have become a burden on society as a whole." He encouraged

^56Infra, p. 161.

^57Crowley, "Weltschmerz," September 26, loc. cit.
responsible people to begin replacing institutions that are irrelevant or destructive to society, and he said everyone must cooperate to design a workable plan for the future. Among his campaign priorities were:

1. End imperialism: America must not retreat from participation in the world community but she must dismantle her empire: An empire supported by money from American corporations and government and the blood of American troops and innocent people--your money and your blood.

2. Rational control of resources: Man cannot survive in a poisoned and depleted environment; he must control his natural as well as his social ecology.

3. Democratic control of the productive forces in this society: If we don't control them they will control us.

4. The right to live: Needs no explanation or justification.

5. Student and faculty control of the University.

6. Rapid-transit freeways are not the answer to the problem of getting from point A to point B.

7. Drugs: Marijuana must be legalized; it's less addictive than nicotine and less harmful than alcohol. The hard drugs must be controlled and their users treated, not imprisoned. Drug use is symptomatic not so much of personal weakness but of social weakness.

8. The Avenue: The "hippies" or whatever are human
beings not stereotypes; they have the same rights as anyone else. They are not criminals, rather they are the victims of an absurd society.58

PFP got few votes at local or national levels but did manage to unite small numbers of activists across the country. The party's exact number of votes may never be known, Helix reported, since "most election boards are both white and square and do not care much about votes that are black, red or un-square"; but the votes are unimportant, because PFP hoped only to educate and organize and wasn't serious about electing anyone.

"It's a pretty safe assumption," Crowley wrote after the election, "that I was thoroughly trounced at the polls." Though relieved that the campaign was over, he admitted he rather enjoyed the political game and had had a good time rapping with the people. "Bullshit is such a fine art." He referred to a campaign appearance before the Seattle Municipal League—"theatre and politics are indistinguishable." When the League asked "absurd questions about tax reform," Crowley said he really upset the members by saying: "My policy is to tax the shit out of Boeing! The League then decided I was unqualified for the legislature, but I preferred to view it the other way around."

Recounting the frustrations of a radical seeking

elected office, he concluded:

Now that the elections are over, I and the Left will probably get back to our true love—ideological incest. But I hope not. If you can endure those interminable rapes of Robert's Rules of Order, facetiously referred to as "meetings," please join the radical movement of your choice.

If you don't, the Left will talk itself into the ground. So long as the Left remains virgin, we'll all be screwed.59

At the risk of becoming a "debilitated whore,"60 the New Left must become intimate with the people or forego its dreams of a renewed and liberated social order. As Helix has stated, slaves who have freedom of mind but who deny the outside world reinforce their servitude.61

Helix articles in 1969 and early 1970 continued to endorse both violent and non-violent overthrow of the "economic elite and their enslaving institutions." And most Helix spokesmen—while disputing points of strategy and tactics—seemed to agree with Marcuse that the common enemy is capitalism and that the New Left offered the best hope of subduing it.

Helix writers also implied that technological man is certain to exterminate the human race unless he stops raping the earth, his fellow men and himself. But many believe

60Supra, p. 156.
61Supra, p. 131.
that a New Left revolution can avert that calamity. Moreover, the ultra-idealists among them may even think the movement will culminate in the unprecedented "definitive revolution." Most activists, however, probably foresee the revolution as a mere temporal transition of social and/or political ideals (i.e., a circular movement leading from the old system to the new, which also will someday yield to radical forces).

Nevertheless, "revolution is America's one slim chance of survival," wrote Crowley, adding that although ours is a dynamic age, we cannot wantonly ignore our heritage. Emphasizing that "tomorrow's society must both inherit and transcend the old," he said:

Throughout the past decade, a new awareness has been spreading among America's young and disenfranchised. Slowly, painfully, they have been becoming aware of the inadequacies and contradictions existing in this society. In these people the struggle to reharmonize man and society has focused. Fundamentally their awareness is the inadvertent by-product of the existing institutions. Their struggle now is to define a new social order which harmonizes this awareness with behavior. They are adapting to the cultural pollution of capitalism.

Temporal revolutions are likely to overthrow social orders as long as human beings lack the humor to endure a

62 Supra, p. 123.
64 Stepping momentarily beyond the human; setting aside the ego to become fully human; accepting the futility of life and becoming overwhelmed instead of doing the overwhelming. Definition given by Dr. Orville V. Clark, University of Montana assistant professor of philosophy, during a February 10, 1969, class lecture.
"definitive revolution." But man probably won't take himself less seriously (i.e., more humanly) until he fully understands himself and how to relate to the external world. As Alan Watts—who insists that man must free himself from self-contradictory rules—has said:

No one who has been coaxed into belief that he is nothing but his ego, or nothing but his individual organism, can be chivalrous, let alone a civilized, sensitive, and intelligent member of the cosmos.65

"Higher beings" transcending the "hoax of separateness" understand that they are merely fleeting, dispensable parts of an eternal cosmic game. Humble and endowed with true humor, perhaps they can even attain the "spirit of the knight, who—knowing that even mortal combat is a game—willingly 'plays with his life.'"66 Such warriors would seem to have something in common with Nietzsche's Overman:

To be unable to take one's own enemies, accidents, and misdeeds seriously for long—that is the sign of strong and rich natures... Such a man simply shakes off with one shrug much vermin that would have buried itself deep in others; here alone it is also possible—assuming that it is possible at all on earth—that there be real "love [italics in the original] of one's enemies."67

But the "humanness" permitting this kind of love still is beneath the dignity of most "thinking" men. As


66 Ibid.

67 Kaufmann, op. cit., pp. 451-52, supra, pp. 43, 125. Nietzsche denied the possibility of a "definitive revolution."
Crowley has noted, being "human" is a mighty concession for the ego to make to reality.68

Yet the Dutch phenomenologist Remy C. Kwant thinks there is hope. History, he has said, can awaken man to his "humanness." In his book, Phenomenology of Expression, he wrote: "Because we are able to look deeper into history and social structures, we are more conscious than our ancestors were of the historical and social facticity of our existence." Today man knows that he is a mutable and contingent species and that his power is rooted in powerlessness,69 he said, implying that when one concedes that he is neither God nor indispensable, he is a step nearer to being "human."

Beware, said Camus, of pompous revolutionaries who "want to make the earth a kingdom where man is God."70

68Supra, p. 157.
70Camus, op. cit., p. 132.
AFTERTHOUGHTS

The deluge of underground papers emerged after the "Hashbury" hippies expressed disdain for those "dual and phony" members of society who they said "esteem the intellect and elude the passions and spirit." Helix speaks for descendants of that "spring of love"—impatient youth who cannot reconcile American affluence with poverty, war, bigotry and constraints on human freedom.

Today's young people know the horror and insanity of war; they have grown up in a world threatened by nuclear annihilation. Viewing modern war as the sequel of mis-directed egos, the young appeal to society to turn hate and aggression into understanding and love. They ask profit-crazed capitalists to stop exterminating underprivileged peoples and to abolish discrepancies between the affluent and the destitute. Man's despicable mania for power and dominion over others obviously stems from his own insecurity. But enlightened and righteous men do not need whipping boys to affirm their worth. Perhaps there is yet time for man to sublimate energy and passion into creative—not destructive—ends.

The young want to be at peace with themselves, their fellow men and the earth. Mother earth, though generous, is not inexpendable; even she is running out of favors. Clever man's technology is closing in on him, and he may not be
able to remedy the technological backlash simply by con­
triving more intricate machines. Western man is exhausting
the earth and his own rational games are bringing him to
the eve of destruction. Man is more than formulas and
computations; he is human. If he does not know that he
will not survive.

Many young people insist that only their peer group
--not the "pious" establishment or previous generations--
can provide them with relevant moral standards. Establish­
ment legislators, say the young, enact laws to protect
themselves from what they fear and do not understand.
Young people think it is inane that paranoic old men have
the power to say, for example, how or whether others can
chemically alter their perceptual awareness. One thing is
sure: The young do not cherish the moral pronouncements
of the older generation.

The "now" generation especially loathes puritanical
(anti-natural) religions for teaching shame and contempt
for the body. Sexual organs are a natural part of every
physical-spiritual being; they are more than extrinsic tools
to fulfill duties or conquer victims. Sexual intercourse
can be man's most divine human experience--involving a
sublime union of body, mind and spirit. People do not
possess sex organs; they are those organs.

Most undergrounds today encourage youth to become
politically involved. They seldom condone social-political
apathy or advise readers to use drugs and occult religions to escape the real world. Staying forever high on drugs can be expensive, impractical and unhealthy—even lethal. And crashing (coming down from a high) means ultimately facing one's "hang ups" with the real world. Nor are meditative religions everybody's utopia; it often is hard for Western minds to "attune" to Eastern and mystical religions.

During 1968, undergrounds everywhere became aware of their journalistic power and social responsibilities. Seeking changes in a "static society," radical editors knew they had to reach a wider audience and that "stoned" poetry and mazy layout would not inspire potential rebels to organize and work for the revolution. So New Left politics became the radical media's new raison d'être. Possessing boundless energy and a newfound sense of urgency, underground writers lashed out at society's social and political institutions. New Left spokesmen—including advocates of both violence and non-violence—began expounding in virtually every underground in the country. Polemics became the vogue; artsy layout and "far out" poetry had had their day.

The underground movement still flourishes and shows signs of being a potent journalistic voice in the 1970's. Crowley has predicted that diverse liberal elements will continue to spawn new versions of the underground press.
But he believes the establishment will quash all radical media if they become a serious threat to the system.

It is hard to say how much the radical media have and will influence society. Downey put it this way:

The underground press is a set of house organs for what may someday be a new society, or what may be just a footnote to the history of the one that's already going downhill. History may see us /undergrounds/ simply as another death throes of society: But I'm certain in my own soul that what passes for contemporary society is on the way out. 

And Crowley said:

Undergrounds may not have a specific definite effect on social attitudes, but they are definite symptoms of an overall change. They reinforce the feeling that establishment morality is decadent and destructive. 

This thesis had to have an ending, but it is merely an arbitrary one. The previous pages—or perhaps even twice that number—are not enough to give a consummate account of nearly three years (more than 100 issues) of the Helix. Just as the photographer tells his story by "freezing" phases of passing events, I have tried to identify and describe the paper's aims and achievements by selecting and evaluating certain representative articles, graphics and photos. But since new and relevant stories and pictures appear weekly, each chapter becomes passé almost before it

---

1Roger Downey, interview at the Helix office, September 5, 1969.

2Walt Crowley, interview at the Id Bookstore, September 5, 1969.
is completed; consequently, this narrative, of necessity, comprises periodic interpretations of an underground organ that is moving with the times. Finally, then, the finished work is an inchoate semblance of what the Helix is all about. If the thesis helps readers understand the Helix and other undergrounds, then it has served an important purpose.
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