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Abstract

*Studies on the Left* was an academic journal formed by graduate students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in early 1958, and first published at Thanksgiving 1959. Designed as an outlet for young radicals to build ‘An Intellectual Community Committed to the Radicalism of Disclosure,’ it’s most influential scholarly contribution was the theory of corporate liberalism, which concluded that alternatives to capitalism in the United States had failed to take root because the leaders of the largest corporations in the Progressive Era (1896-1920) had worked together with government and labour unions to co-opt reform. They did so in order to preserve the corporate system of accumulation - a system predicated on the stabilisation, rationalisation, and continued expansion of the existing political economy, and the sublimation of radical alternatives.

Alarmed by the conclusions reached in their historical work, the editors used *Studies* for a dual purpose; to further investigate the nature of the corporate liberal society, and ‘to help lay the theoretical basis for the emergence of a new radical politics' in the United States*. Studies* published articles on the issues of Cuban Revolution, the Sino-Soviet split, the history of the American Socialist Party, the New Left, and the effect of Senator McCarthy’s anti-communist crusade on ‘academic freedom,’ all within the context of exploring the potential for intellectuals to rival labour as an agency for radical societal change.

This thesis, the first extended study of Studies, examines the motivations and influences of the editors and the debates that they spawned*.* Over an eight-year period, Studies gained a reputation for being the “theoretical organ” of the New Left, its analysis of domestic and foreign politics inspiring a new generation of students to think politically and intellectually. Academics have usually studied the New Left as a succession of movements rather than an intellectual episode, and comparatively little has been done to examine academic influences on the movement. With this in mind, this thesis will explore the intellectual issues that *Studies* grappled with in its attempt to provide a relevant platform for young radicals, while assessing its influence in effecting change.
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# **Introduction**

*Studies on the Left*

Writing to James Weinstein in December 1963, Stephen Ambrose, the future biographer of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, pledged his support to the journal *Studies on the Left*, of which Weinstein was now the principal editor.[[1]](#footnote-1) Persuaded of the merits of mandatory racial integration by his experiences at Louisiana State University, Ambrose offered to contribute an article outlining how events such as the ‘Annual Integration Dinner’ had contributed to a more harmonious atmosphere on campus.[[2]](#footnote-2) Though characterised as a conservative by many of his ‘liberal’ peers, Ambrose had recently put up Freedom Riders at his home before their departure for ‘Jackson [Mississippi] and jail’, much to the chagrin of his colleagues who refused to do the same out of concern for what their neighbours would think. Having lamented in a previous letter the fact that he was married with a child, and that it would have been fun to be able to go and ‘raise a little hell in Mississippi’, he stated his desire to publish in *Studies*, not for the prestige – ‘let’s face it, at least in the South it would hurt more than help’ – but for his own ego.’[[3]](#footnote-3) It would offer ‘visible proof I’m helping the cause, whatever that is.’[[4]](#footnote-4)

The proposed article never appeared. Encapsulating the convoluted political motivations of the movement however, Ambrose’s letter acts as a summation of the equally conflicted legacy of *Studies on the Left*, which by 1963had gained a reputation as the foremost intellectual journal of the New Left. Through its eight-year history, the journal forged a new spirit of intellectual confidence and ambition among ‘radical’ scholars in the United States. The study that follows is an analysis of the community that created *Studies on the Left,* the debates it spawned, and its impact on New Left and academic thought. It will consider the various ways in which the editors of *Studies* sought to influence the movement and assess its overall contribution as an actor and participant. In doing so, it will offer a further re-balancing of the historiography of the 1960s, which is still dominated by a narrative focus on the rise and fall of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and its associates; the optimistic birth of the New Left out of the civil rights movement, and its latter degeneration into the same sectarian radicalism that had marked its Old Left predecessor. The example of *Studies* demonstrates that the intellectual history of the New Left is more complex and multi-layered, in which *competing* radicalisms vied for prominence.

*Studies on the Left*

First published at Thanksgiving 1959, *Studies* emerged from the membership of the Wisconsin Socialist Club, a student society at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Counting among its members a number of graduate students in the Department of History, its editors initially intended *Studies* to serve as a journal of radical theory that would be circulated on the Madison campus; however, they soon shifted their focus towards national publication, having been encouraged by indications of a radical revival across campuses in the Midwest and beyond.[[5]](#footnote-5) Based in Madison for four years and then in New York from March 1963 until it ceased publication in August 1967, the journal carried in its pages editorials and articles that supported the Cuban Revolution, objectivity in scholarship, the Sino-Soviet split, the history of the American Socialist Party, the rise of fascism, Bertolt Brecht and experimental theatre, and the effect of Senator Joe McCarthy’s anti-communist crusade on academic freedom.

At its zenith, *Studies on the Left* boasted a circulation of over 10,000 per issue, and counted among its editors some of the foremost left intellectuals in the nation, including Staughton Lynd, Eugene Genovese, Lloyd Gardner, Ronald Aronson, and James Weinstein.[[6]](#footnote-6) It published articles by William Appleman Williams, Gabriel Kolko, Murray Rothbard, and Harold Cruse, and courted academics from across the left, including Herbert Aptheker, the future critic of liberalism Christopher Lasch, and Jesse Lemisch. Collectively, these scholars rejected the conservative intellectual mores of the 1950s; the ‘Consensus School’ of scholarship, based on the premise that the development of modern industrial society in the United States had been a shared experience predicated upon class collaboration coalesced around a shared interpretation of liberalism. Conflicts between groups had arisen not as a means of overthrowing the liberal consensus, but merely as a defensive reflex towards the adjustment of informal, locally orientated autonomous communities to large scale, national, formal institutions, characterised by bureaucratic structures of authority. According to those scholars who partook in the ‘American Celebration - Louis Hartz, Daniel Boorstin, Richard Hofstadter, Daniel Bell and others – the belief that the United States had been wracked by ideological class conflict was a myth.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Seeking to refute this ‘celebration’, as C. Wright Mills put it, the *Studies on the Left* editors attempted to demonstrate that ideological conflict was central to the American experience.[[8]](#footnote-8) It was true that alternatives to American capitalism had failed to break through into the mainstream, yet it was also true that the Soviet Revolution of 1917, and the Sedition Act of 1918 – which robbed the American Socialist Party of its leadership – had prompted American Marxists to shift its frame of reference of the *entire* socialist movement away from the United States and towards the Soviet Union. Stripped of its vitality, neither the Socialist Party (SP) nor the Communist Party was consequently able to take advantage of the widespread public discontent with corporate power during the Great Depression and the New Deal period. By the 1950s, when Daniel Bell published *Marxian Socialism in the United States*, he felt confident in stating that his book acted as a coda for that movement which had passed.[[9]](#footnote-9) Through *Studies on the Left,* and events such as the Socialist Scholars Conference, a growing number of ‘New Left’ academics ‘set out to redeem American Marxism’ and recover the early promise of the Socialist Party.[[10]](#footnote-10) It was the 1919 split between the immigrant supporters of the Russian Revolution, and those who had previously envisaged the SP as a ‘radical, authentically American mass movement’, that had caused the party to lose much of its support. The legacy of that fracture, James Weinstein wrote, ‘was the alienation of American socialism.’[[11]](#footnote-11)

Sharing a disenchantment of the shibbolethic and sectarian organising structures of the Old Left with students at other Midwestern universities, many of the *Studies on the Left* editors had been members of the Labour Youth League (LYL), the youth organisation of the American Communist Party, which maintained a presence on the Madison campus well into the mid-1950s. Disillusioned by Nikita Khrushchev’s revelations of the Stalinist Terror of the 1930s, and the invasion of Hungary by Soviet forces in February and November 1956 respectively, and also by the illiberal policies of contemporary administrations which had failed to alleviate urban poverty and civil rights injustices, the editors hoped to produce a new body of radical theory that would lay the theoretical basis for a new radical politics. Rejecting much of the counterculture of the day – to them the ‘protest’ of the Beat Generation appeared aimless and without a political focus – they tasked themselves with defining the function of socialist intellectuals in a climate, which had rejected radical scholarship, and had purged Marxist scholars from the academy. Defending the right of academics to follow ‘the less travelled path’ in pursuit of scholarship that would contribute to the reconstruction of society, they looked to produce work that would fundamentally challenge the Cold War liberal consensus, and sought to utilise *Studies* as a platform for intellectuals to be politically effective.[[12]](#footnote-12)

It is perhaps difficult now to comprehend the bravery of the editors in deciding to plot such a course. Though much of the ‘Communist espionage’ that proved the ‘main rationale for the political repression of the McCarthy era’ was unfounded, the ‘McCarthy era’ was the longest and most widespread wave of political repression’ in American history. From the late 1940s through much of the 1950s, a coalition of bureaucrats, politicians and activists ‘hounded’ a whole generation of activists of being Communists, or fellow travellers. The direct and indirect damage done to institutions that were targeted by McCarthyism was considerable – Hollywood, universities, the civil rights movement, and labour unions bore the brunt – and the human cost of the suicides, the books not written, the courses not taught, and research not undertaken as a result of the oppression is unquantifiable. Even by the early 1960s, for young academics, association with left politics was an occupational risk, punishable by non-renewal of contract or tenure denial.[[13]](#footnote-13) In such a climate, the creation of *Studies*, a journal that identified itself as overtly socialist, was an act of bravery.[[14]](#footnote-14)

As well as charting the varied intellectual discussions that took place within the America New Left, the study will consider its transnational dimension. Whilst analysis of the New Left in America have focused almost entirely on protest activity, in the case of the British New Left, scholars have emphasised the intellectual debates which circulated amongst the editorial board of the journals *The New Reasoner*, *Universities and Left Review*, and their successor journal *New Left Review*. While histories of the American left have gone as far as to assign demarcation lines between the Old Left and the New, there has been little evidence put forward that the movement on one side of the Atlantic was influenced by the other. This study attempts a beginning; an analysis of how the *Studies* editors, influenced by *New Left Review*, attempted an emulation, in order provide the New Left with the theoretical concepts they felt were necessary to forge a new movement and to guide their radical activity.

Contributions

The most significant intellectual development to emerge from *Studies on the Left* in this formative period was the theory of Corporate Liberalism. Introduced in an article by editor Martin Sklar, the term was originally a concept used to analyse how Woodrow Wilson’s domestic and foreign policies had served as the components of the modern capitalist order. However, it was then used interpreted by his fellow editors James Weinstein, David Eakins, and Stephen Scheinberg, as a challenge to the ‘Consensus School’, who concluded that the policies of the United States government since the Progressive era had been guided by a consensus forged between the state, labour, and enlightened capitalists. These interests had led efforts to solidify the emerging corporate order by supporting reform on many important social and economic issues in order to pacify socialists and radicals among the workers, middle-class reformers, and the ‘anarchists among businessmen’ whose commitment to laissez faire values threatened political stability. By the end of the First World War, Weinstein claimed in his 1967 book *The Corporate Ideal in American Capitalism*, the leaders of the large corporations and banks had secured a loose hegemony over the political structure of the United States.[[15]](#footnote-15) They had done so by leading a new politics, which had been known as the New Nationalism and the New Freedom, yet could be more accurately described as ‘corporate liberalism.’ ‘Underlying all, or most of the new politics of these years’ Weinstein wrote, ‘was an awareness…that the social order could be stabilised only if it moved in the direction of…social responsibility. Dissatisfaction with the increasing polarisation of American society and the apparent decline in the influence of some social classes created a climate for change. In that climate many movements grew. The one that was truly conservative triumphed.’ It had done so in the name of liberalism.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Influenced by the implications of the Corporate Liberalism thesis, the *Studies* editors came to conclude that it was the liberal establishment which held responsibility for the Cold War, with the ‘ultra-right’ playing a subsidiary role. However much the Far Right threatened liberal democracy, the ‘heavy fire’ aimed at it by radicals was misplaced, for the Right only derived its strength from the failure of the Cold War policies of ‘liberal’ administrations. As the prescriptions of the radical conservatives were not attractive to the Corporate Liberal elite they were not believed to represent an immediate threat, but grew stronger the longer the Cold War went on without ‘victory.’ Incorporating proto-Marcusian and proto-Gramscian theories of social control, hegemony and co-optation, the editors slowly moved to a more overt Gramscian position, which stressed the necessity of building a counter-hegemonic consciousness in favour of an alternative social system that would counter the efforts of the corporate elite to maintain power through ideological control. In order to create the new socialist reality, the editors proposed, radicals had to have a comprehensive understanding of the current system.[[17]](#footnote-17) In these years, the Corporate Liberal critique found favour among movement leaders, in particular the speeches and books of SDS President Carl Oglesby, and the term subsequently entered the student activists’ lexicon.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Such an approach was evident in their early analysis of the civil rights movements, when they considered whether the future integration of African Americans into American society might depend on fundamental changes to American society. Likewise, they argued, the exposure of the sham battle between ‘freedom’ and ‘communism’ hinged on the necessary intervention of radical intellectuals in challenging the worldview of the Cold War ideologues. They accused liberal scholars of failing to practice their responsibilities as social critics, who remained too focused on their roles as ‘pragmatic archivists’, and showing an unwillingness to address the myths, dogmas, and ‘malfunctioning’ of society.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Having pre-empted the New Left, the *Studies* editors latterly came under considerable pressure to take a leadership position within the movement, as students began to search for antecedents that would help to place their activities within a radical context. Though the movements continued to grow in strength, the absence of a body of critical social theory and analysis caused the editors to remain sceptical as to whether *Studies* could fulfil such a position, or whether the United States could even claim to have a New Left at all. Some viewed the movement participants as largely non-ideological, who were simply protesting against injustice; others considered themselves New Left only in the sense that they sought to free themselves from the dogmas which had paralysed the Old Left; and some remained convinced that the British example represented the appropriate model. It had after all, the Labour Party, and various platforms from which to advertise its message, and its intellectuals were more established within academia. In any permutation however, the editors believed that any ‘radical’ movement had to be preceded by ‘new thinking’ about American society and its role in the world.

In what became a core contention, the editors and the readers grappled with the question of whether young intellectuals should reconcile themselves to a career path characterised by scholarly dispassion and the objective pursuit of knowledge, or whether it was possible for scholars to also be activists. The editors had committed themselves to the pursuit of knowledge that could radically challenge mainstream academic scholarship, which they believed was complicit in the perpetuation of the Cold War consensus. Yet they also admitted that they were finding it harder to remember why they had decided to get into ‘the intellectual racket’, or what they wanted to say.[[20]](#footnote-20) Prevailing standards of scholarship, it appeared, were acting as a self-censoring device for the radical work they wanted to produce.[[21]](#footnote-21) As the New Left grew, they struggled to reconcile their commitment to theoretical discussion with their ‘role’ as inspiration to the movement. Was it, for example, the duty of academics to produce scholarship that was immediately relevant to the movement and to wait for a political organisation to emerge spontaneously from within its ranks, or was it the duty of academics themselves to act as the vanguard for a new party, developing the theoretical content that would underpin its program?

Following its relocation to New York in 1963, *Studies* slowly reconfigured its editorial board as its contributors attempted to apply their theoretical work to protest movements. It brought on-board an economist, a literary critic, and – most importantly – activists involved in community organising projects who advocated ‘participatory democracy’ as an alternative to Marxian socialism.[[22]](#footnote-22) They oversaw a series of themed issues, and later, a series of reportage which appeared under the ‘With the Movements’ banner, commenting on the community organising projects organised by SDS, and debating intellectual and practical activism, increasingly from an overtly socialist perspective. Sharing a consensus that socialist organisation was desirable within the movements, the editorial board nonetheless split over different interpretations of what the role of the journal should be in developing and implementing theory. They split too over the extent to which individual factions within the movements, most prominently within SDS were significant to this process, or whether that organisation was in fact a substitute for the development of a coherent political program. The older editors, concerned that the New Left might make the same mistakes as its predecessor by failing to ground their radicalism in an American context, were similarly accused of proposing an un-implementable *unworkable* theory as an antidote for *mindless* activism.[[23]](#footnote-23)

These splits ultimately proved irreconcilable. Intrigued by the concept of participatory democracy, which rejected pluralist attempts at community organising and coalition building with spontaneous and non-hierarchical forms of organisation, the editors rejected the calls of the older *Studies* editors, who favoured the development of a new movement and party to challenge the Democrats and Republican liberal majority. Ultimately, three of the movement orientated editors resigned, and *Studies* returned once again to critical theoretical and analytical work, the board pushed forward towards the development of a new socialist political organisation built around a party modelled on the pre-1919 Socialist Party as led by Eugene Debs.[[24]](#footnote-24) In order to spur a revival of socialist ideas, editor James Weinstein ran for office in the 19th Congressional District of New York on the Committee for Independent Political Action (CIPA) ticket in 1966.

The following year, a further split among the board occurred on similar lines. Should the journal move towards being the theoretical organ of a new intellectual grouping focused on developing a socialist party, or return to reporting on and influencing New Left movements. The journal ceased publication, with two successor journals promised. However, only one, *Socialist Revolution*, ultimately appeared. The following year, James Weinstein organised a group of academics, including several *Studies* alumni, to launch a preliminary organisation to begin defining the problems of industrial society, with the aim of creating a new party. By that time, Weinstein had moved to San Francisco, where he began planning *Socialist Revolution* as the organ for that movement. Encouraged by his own efforts in running for Congress, he would spend the next two years on the project, believing that to build a successful party would need an organisation, a journal, and a newspaper.[[25]](#footnote-25) Later, he became a founder member of the New American Movement (NAM) a socialist organisation that existed through the 1970s and into the 1980s.[[26]](#footnote-26) After spending time in England as a teacher at the University of Warwick, Weinstein moved to Chicago to start a newspaper called *In These Times*.[[27]](#footnote-27) The editors’ conclusions continued to be influential in setting the tone for *Socialist Revolution,* and other journals, such as *Radical America*, as successors triedto revive the intellectual strand within SDS, which *Studies* had abandoned.

Having been used as a framing device by a number of historians, in the 1970s, critiques of Corporate Liberalism started to emerge. Social scientists and editors on the *Socialist Revolution* board in the mid-1970s, who in attempting ‘to bring the state back in’, challenged the conclusions that the state itself was under corporate control.[[28]](#footnote-28) In the field of history, scholars such as Elizabeth Sanders, in an effort to demonstrate that Corporate Liberal historians had marginalised protest, showed how agrarian movements succeeded in their efforts to apply political pressure in the Congress.[[29]](#footnote-29) In the Progressive Era, for example, rural voting districts often held the balance of power in reform. Even scholars closely associated with corporate liberal theory have sometimes critiqued it: Gabriel Kolko, Ellis Hawley and Martin Sklar himself each sought to clarify their views on Corporate Liberalism after the 1960s. Sklar particularly, returning to the work he had put to one side in the early 1960s, clarified that Corporate Liberalism had been a worldview – a *weltanshauung* – rather than a political movement. [[30]](#footnote-30)

Although *Studies* had been short-lived, its importance to the radical intellectual world of the 1960s – and indeed beyond – is worthy of study, for the work it produced, the figures it drew to its pages, its grappling with fundamental problems, and importantly, the dynamic of its editors who worked to together to produce the journal. As the historian Warren Susman claimed in the early 1990s, *Studies* reflected a ‘desperate groping’ for a new theory. ‘I can’t tell you how important I found *Studies* even when I was upset with it’, he recalled, for ‘it was terribly important simply because it existed... [and] remarkable for the number of things that continue to have value.’[[31]](#footnote-31) In the same manner, former editor James Gilbert recalled the eagerness with which he anticipated the action orientated *Studies* editorials, which he read ‘as avidly as I had once read the opening statements in the *Monthly Review.’[[32]](#footnote-32)* Such positive readings, many of them collected in Paul Buhle’s *History and the New Left*: *Madison, Wisconsin 1950-1970* have influenced the existing view of the journal as a vibrant and vital intellectual influence on the New Left. Through a close reading of the journal and related correspondence, this study will account for this reputation, whilst providing a new perspective on its activities in a tumultuous decade.

Contextualising the New Left

Surveys of the New Left, Stephanie Bateson has noted, can be roughly divided into three subsections or waves.[[33]](#footnote-33) The first which includes Paul Jacob’s and *Studies* editor Saul Landau’s *The New Radicals,* Christopher Lasch’s *The Agony of the American Left*, Kirkpatrick Sale’s *SDS* and Irwin Unger’s *The New Left: 1959 - 1972* were overtly partisan in their support or criticism of the lasting influence of the New Left and its cultural milieu.[[34]](#footnote-34) Emerging in the mid-1980s, the second wave was characterised by publications written by former participants in the early New Left, such as former SDS members Todd Gitlin, James Miller, Maurice Isserman and Wini Breines.[[35]](#footnote-35) All four identify 1968 as the key turning point in the narrative of the New Left away from the spirit of the Port Huron Statement, and towards militarism and violence, of which they are critical, with fundamental problems within the organisational structure of SDS shouldering much of the blame. Since the mid-1990s, a new generation of historians have produced surveys that examine aspects of the New Left in more detail. Typical of this development are Doug Rossinow’s *The Politics of Authenticity*, which focuses on the importance of Christian liberalism as a medium for organisation within the New Left; Rebecca Klatch’s *A Generation Divided*, a comparative study of the SDS and the right wing Young Americans for Freedom (YAF); and Jennifer Frost’s *An Interracial Movement of the Poor’: Community Organizing and the New Left*, a critical history of SDS’s community organising projects.[[36]](#footnote-36)

It is only relatively recently that an analysis of the intellectual roots of the New Left has been seriously attempted; until that point a majority of scholars have been satisfied to identify the Port Huron Statement as the intellectual genesis of SDS and the movements.[[37]](#footnote-37) Characteristic of this shift is Nick Witham’s examination of a ‘New Left Atlantic’, which he defines as a ‘transnational intellectual space in which a political sensibility emerged that saw the goals of the British and American New Lefts as essentially intertwined, thereby forcing those involved to ‘transnationalise…their scope of critique and concern.’[[38]](#footnote-38) On a more definitional level, Van Gosse, Christopher Phelps and Howard Brick, in an approach similar to that of Maurice Isserman, have questioned the demarcation lines between the Old Left and the New Left. Van Gosse, for instance, claims that the distinction lies in the move away from class politics towards a more diffuse set of ideological concerns. Phelps meanwhile has gone further in suggesting that young radicals of the late 1950s created the ‘Old Left’ as a ‘retroactive appellation’ into which all the faults and foibles of the ‘reductionist, mechanistic, and dogmatic’ left could be thrown. *Studies*,for example, drew on the ‘transatlantic play’ of movements on both sides of the Atlantic, in presenting a ‘new’ radicalism sufficiently vigorous to escape the tragedies ‘besetting older lefts*.[[39]](#footnote-39)*

Though the ‘New Left’ offered an open-ended radicalism which focused on values, and was often marked by concerns with race, gender and sexuality, there were considerable similarities between what was new and what was pre-existent. The New Left’s rejection of apathy, its mockery of the atypical ‘professional revolutionary, and its critique of ‘scattered, demoralised’ radicalism, could be found within an earlier generation. *Studies* editor and New Left historian Staughton Lynd himself considered Dwight MacDonald’s call for a New Left and C. Wright Mills’ critiques of bureaucracy, derived from Max Schactman’s views of the late 1940s, as ‘the First’ New Left.[[40]](#footnote-40) James Weinstein had sought to develop a socialism ‘rooted in American realities’ that borrowed from the collective insights of subsequent movements, but which took its main inspiration from Eugene Debs’s Socialist Party of the 1910s and 1920s. Howard Brick has noted that Weinstein and Sklar ‘viewed themselves as socialists outside the New Left.’ Martin Sklar identified as ‘an extremely Old Left thinker’, and Eugene Genovese called himself ‘an unreconstructed Old Leftist.’[[41]](#footnote-41) Yet at times these same editors appeared more ambiguous in their opinions. In this way *Studies* served as a bridge between Old and New Lefts: the editors continually grappled with the relationship between old and new.

The move towards a more nuanced approach to the intellectual character of the New Left is gathering momentum. In a chapter and essay, Kevin Mattson has identified the need for academics to examine the New Left as an episode in intellectual history. Even though many New Left leaders thought of themselves as intellectuals, and were influenced by C Wright Mills, Paul Goodman, and William Appleman Williams, analysis of the American New Left, has largely ignored their influence. Focusing on the implications of the fear of co-optation within the *Studies* board over the journal’s analysis of Corporate Liberalism and the welfare state, Mattson concluded in 2003 that the *Studies* editors hoped, yet expressed doubts of the capability of, the New Left to move beyond single-issue protests against racial oppression, poverty and the Vietnam War, and to adopt a coalition politics that could bridge different identities. Its failure to achieve this, Mattson stated, had bequeathed to future generations a succession of protest movements, and a vague idea for participatory democracy that was never realised. Though the *Studies* editors’ eventual vision of recreating the pre-1919 Socialist Party had not been viable, the journal had acted as a place where ideas could be drawn into a dialogue with social movements, yet unlike its counterpart *New University Thought,* ithoped to work independently to reconstruct society in an overtly socialist program, rather than working inside the Democratic Party. When the two journals ceased publication, a chapter in American intellectual history came to end. ‘Unresolved tensions between radicalism and liberalism, intellectual commitment and truth telling in an academic world, and political change and co-optation’ remained, Mattson concludes, ‘but without the younger thinkers to address them.’[[42]](#footnote-42)

Other scholars have focused on placing *Studies* within a regional context, which focuses on the perceived radicalism of the Midwest, and Wisconsin in particular: a state whose flagship university had made important contributions to progressive thought and historical writing over the preceding decades. To Paul Buhle and Matthew Levin, the editors of *Studies on the Left* emerge as individuals who took advantage of Madison’s radical tradition to go against the stereotype of movement ‘anti-intellectualism’ through a serious engagement with ideas.[[43]](#footnote-43) The development of the Socialist Club and *Studies*, Buhle suggests, was theclosest American counterpart to the contemporary British New Left of E.P Thompson, Christopher Hill, and Eric Hobsbawm; like their British colleagues, they had broken with the Communist Party and orientated themselves closely to a domestic radical tradition. Uncomfortable with the New Left’s tactics of direct-action, their historical inclination, influenced by a distinct Midwestern radicalism, remained evident as they sought to base their politics on serious scholarship*.*[[44]](#footnote-44)This distinct Midwestern voice, imbued with ‘a faint but unmistakable provincialism’ and a distinctly, ‘American dialect’, David Brown has noted, had been characterised by sympathy to populist politics, and criticism of the United States’ drift towards empire and unrestrained capitalism.[[45]](#footnote-45) Whether in the claim that the frontier had promoted democracy rather than the cities, the belief that common citizens rather than intellectuals’ best understood the national interest, or the insistence that open door imperialism endangered national security and welfare, Wisconsin had led the way.[[46]](#footnote-46) In this milieu, *Studies* was an ‘experiment’, a challenge to the ‘acquiescent and quiet conservatism of the academy which shared more with the European ‘communal coffee-shop culture’ than with the Cold War campus. Most of its editors hailed from New York and sought to understand how the Madison environment influenced their thinking.[[47]](#footnote-47)

The attempt to place *Studies* within the context of currents in American intellectual thought, however, have neglected to assess its place within the New Left. Though the journalis frequently praised for its influence over the movement, it frequently attracts only a cursory reference in historical work, in stark contrast to the British New Left, whose scholarship has until recently been dominated by the academic circle around *New Left Review*.[[48]](#footnote-48) In 2005, Van Gosse described *Studies* as the major theoretical magazine of the new radicalism, ‘which helped revive socialist debate among American intellectuals’, but took the claim no further.[[49]](#footnote-49) Meanwhile, Richard Flacks’s recent essay on the intellectual roots of the Port Huron Statement, published in a major retrospective published to celebrate its fiftieth anniversary, also demonstrates both the significance and marginalization of *Studies*. Flacks identifies the Wisconsin-based C. Wright Mills as a major influence on the Port Huron author Tom Hayden, and suggests the influence of *Studies* was evident in the second SDS statement ‘America and the New Era’, which identified the main political threat to democracy in America in dominant political, corporate and institutional elites. By 1964, he argues, ‘the New Left’s identity was being shaped by struggle’ against Corporate Liberal control, as radicals drew on the work of another Madison academic William Appleman Williams in their calls for a new domestic policy that would change American global priorities. For the architects of the Port Huron Statement however, Flacks claims the concept of corporate liberalism ultimately proved an inadequate guide to the ideology or the politics of the American ruling class.[[50]](#footnote-50) Nonetheless, his account shows how ideas being worked out in *Studies* filtered through to shape better-known aspects of New Left politics, without adequately discussing its role.

An effort has also been made to account for the role of *Studies* in the development of a new ‘American Marxism’ inspired by the work of Antonio Gramsci. First introduced in the pages of the journal by Eugene Genovese, Gramsci sought to account for stasis rather than revolutionary change, meshed with Genovese’s own studies on the slave South, as well as the corporate liberal analysis which implied that the state and enlightened elements among the business elite had been able to contain class conflict through a hegemonic ideology of liberalism. Both Andrew Hartman and Tim Barker had identified *Studies* as an outlet for the dissemination of an Americanised Western Marxism, which was less pessimistic than its European counterpart, but more rigorous ‘in its attention to literary form and cultural theory.’[[51]](#footnote-51) Barker, has demonstrated how Martin Sklar’s and Eugene Genovese’s studies of ruling class ideology broke with the economic determinism of orthodox Marxism to stress ‘the power of ideological worldviews in organising society and legitimating class domination’, stressing that any radical movement would have to contest these ideologies with an alternative worldview; a post-industrial socialism.[[52]](#footnote-52) Though the perception of the New Left as being ‘not very congenial’ to intellectual work has some validity, the ‘very existence’ of *Studies*, Barker insists, and its concern for the role of intellectuals in social change’ acts to qualify those assumptions. Whilst SDS might have succumbed to Old Left style sectarianism in the late 1960s, it is important to remember that a ‘more thoughtful and constructive’ New Left Marxism was alive in the *Studies* circle.[[53]](#footnote-53)

Framing and Sources

This study analyses the efforts made by the *Studies* editors to build an intellectual community that would reinvigorate left politics on university campuses and beyond; define academic objectivity and defend academic freedom; historicise the nature and parameters of Cold War society; influence the student movement by challenging it to think intellectually about its origins and ultimate purpose; and create a new political organisation that would provide the movements with an organisation and a focus. It does so by following two distinct strands: the immediate impact of the journal on those it attempted to influence, and the impact of its intellectual contribution to scholarship. It will begin in 1958 amid some of the earliest stirrings of the New Left on university campuses in the American Midwest. That year members of the newly created Wisconsin Socialist Club attended the Midwest conference of Socialist Clubs in Chicago, and SDS founder Alan Haber joined the ailing Student League for Industrial Democracy, the precursor to the organization he went onto establish, and set about revitalising it. In 1961, with the Port Huron Statement still another year away, the *New Left Review* editors in Britain encountered a reinvigorated movement in the United States. ‘No one cares about the Left Clubs, but they do read the *Review*’, Norman Birmbaum described. ‘They could use some ideas, and it is disappointing to think how we’ve bogged down when they’ve just begun. There is a strong if diffuse universities left, the old socialist party of all organs has revived, and there are peace demonstrations…as well as a really corking sit-in campaign.’[[54]](#footnote-54)

The intellectuals within the *Studies* circle hoped to influence young radicals to build a new movement from the ground up, searching historically for a radical ‘useable past’ that could inspire the creation of a new political party. They found themselves at odds with a movement who desperately wanted change, but were suspicious, even unwilling, to accept political organisations based on hierarchical organisations, reluctant to act politically beyond protest and resistance, and struggled to formulate broad strategies in favour of single issue politics. The following chapters trace these dilemmas from the foundation of the journal through to its closure in 1967. They show how past and present were enlisted in the search for a counter-hegemonic politics, and how the journey towards this endpoint was reached. *Studies* early commitment to ‘literary form and cultural theory’ roughly coincided with the period in which the journal was based in Madison, during which time the development of the journal was largely overseen by Eleanor Hakim, a self-proclaimed ‘radical aesthete’ who had joined the board of editors shortly after the publication of the second issue in the Spring of 1960.[[55]](#footnote-55)

Hakim left the journal in acrimonious circumstances shortly after the move to New York in March 1963, paving the way for the editorial ascendancy of James Weinstein, by that time the principal financier. Between 1963 and 1965, *Studies* focused largely on historical studies and political theory, while moving closer toward engagement with the New Left, recruiting Staughton Lynd, Norman Fruchter and Tom Hayden. Following the split between the academic and New Left faction, the journal moved towards a final phase, which focused again on theory, but with a growing sense that it should directly address the formation of a politically active outcome such as a movement or a party. In spite of these fluctuations, a typical issue might contain an editorial, in which an overt political or intellectual view was expressed, two or three long form academic articles, Notes and Communications section, occasional documentary sources, the odd letter, and a section of critically focused book reviews. At different times, the journal pages were accompanied by an attractive cover design, either a drawing, or a provocative photo. Towards the end of its life, it adopted a more uniform and scholarly looking design.

While volumes of *Studies* themselves provide the backbone to the thesis I go further than most historians who have written on the journal in drawing extensively on a rich body of archival material. The contents of these archives provide ample evidence of how the editors dealt with the dilemmas I have outlined above. The *Studies on the Left* Recordsat the Wisconsin Historical Society in Madison, Wisconsin, contain much of the correspondence pertaining to the journal, a great deal of it written by Eleanor Hakim, who worked on the journal extensively from 1960-63 and took the concept of ‘intellectual community’ seriously; her correspondence is voluminous and engaging, skating from comments on the passing intellectual scene to the day-to-day running of the journal. The collection is complemented at Madison by correspondence found in the James Weinstein Papers, which covers the immediate aftermath of the collapse of the journal and the development phase of its chosen successor *Socialist Revolution* from, 1967-1970. These two collections have been used in previous work on *Studies*, but only selectively, meaning that much of value has been neglected. The same can be said for the archive of the Madison campus newspaper the *Daily Cardinal,* which fills in many gaps encompassing the activities of the editors in their pre-*Studies* days. Similarly, the *Socialist Review* Records at Temple University contain correspondence covering the final year of *Studies* and the development of *Socialist Revolution* through to the departure of Weinstein from that project.

The study will also draw on previously unused collections. Following her death in the mid-1980s, Eleanor Hakim’s Papers were donated to the Lesbian Herstory Archive in Brooklyn, and the 26 boxes there contain further material that underline the efforts she went to during *Studies* Madison years to provide the journal with a distinct intellectual voice. The collection is currently unsorted, and there is further potential to examine her place as a rare example of a female intellectual within the New Left. I also use the Martin Sklar Papers, which were donated to Emory University in Atlanta following his death in early 2014. Largely ambivalent to efforts to chart the history of the journal, Sklar neglected to discuss his contribution to *Studies* at length during his lifetime, meaning that previous treatments of the journal lack firsthand perspectives of the very person who created it. His collection contains both correspondence and other vital documents dating from the development period of *Studies*, including many of his ultimately unpublished works.Letters from the personal archives of *Studies* editor Michael Lebowitz concerning the breakdown of the journal have also been consulted.

Though efforts have been made to be as inclusive as possible as regards to giving a voice to all the editors, there are limits to this approach. The main primary source base of this study comes from the letters written by the editors to other editors and their wider circles. These papers are dominated by Hakim, Weinstein, and Sklar, and to some degree Lebowitz. As it is reported that Eugene Genovese left no archive to be deposited, his contribution as an editor is somewhat clouded, though in the later years of the journal, he appears to have played an active role in advising James Weinstein and the journal. One suspects however, that many letters that would have elucidated on his role are simply lost. Due to the way that Eleanor Hakim approached her work on the journal between 1960 and 1963, the *Studies* records at the Wisconsin Historical Society are very much weighed towards the Madison period. The Weinstein Papers and the Socialist Review Records contain a small number of additional *Studies* correspondences. It is interesting to note that of the records of the journal, the one form of source that does appear not to have been kept for prosperity are the minutes of meetings.

What collectively remains however, still allows us to form a rich picture into the minds and activities of a group of intellectually minded individuals who came together to form a journal. In fact, the richness of the source base allows us a rare opportunity to analyse not only the content of *Studies on the Left*, but the method by which the journal was put together, and the interactions between the editors. As the subject for a study in the Periodical Studies genre, *Studies* is unique, given the fact that most histories written about journals are restricted to the analysis of form and content, in the absence of a collated and deposited archival collection being available. Within this study, for example, it is impossible to know for sure what the editors of *New University Thought*, a rival to *Studies*, thought about their competitor, or how they approached the merger negotiations, which occurred sometime in 1959, for the simple fact that the archive for NUT cannot be located.[[56]](#footnote-56) Likewise, despite its long history and reputation, only fragments of papers relating to the British *New Left Review* exist, scattered across a number of archives. In the case of *Studies* therefore, a scholar can reach beyond the form and content of the journal, and understand the dynamics, which existed behind the scenes. The sum of the two source bases, the journal and its archives allow a study that is both intellectual, and institutional.

With the opportunity provided by this correspondence, this study therefore attempts to place the activities and thoughts of the editors within the wider context of the New Left. How and to what degree, for example, was their activism in Madison, informed by their Jewish cultural heritage, as compared to that of Christian activists in Texas in the Deep South? How did Eleanor Hakim’s experiences as an editor compare to the experiences of other female New Left activists, whose testimony of sexism with the movement has been well documented? How did the editors react to contemporary events, and how did they assess the work of critics who challenged their work? This study will attempt contextualise these experiences within the broader context of the New Left in the United States. However, the plethora of source material does sometimes raise complexities, chief among these isolating a precise definition of what it meant to be ‘radical.’ The word radical was used liberally by the editors, yet it is never given a precise meaning. What did it mean to be radical? Given the editors political views, radicalism could be equated as being synonymous with socialism, however, from an intellectual point of view, it could be taken to mean ‘a fresh perspective’, or scholarship that engaged its reader of how its work revealed new perspectives on society.

A comprehensive analysis of *Studies* will therefore, fully account for its importance as a prominent manifestation of New Left intellectual thought. This thesis argues that *Studies* should be seen as a significant voice in 1960s radicalism that provided a forum for the circulation and debate of emerging intellectual ideas and influenced a generation of activists and scholars. Through an examination of the archival material, it will provide an insight into the considerable efforts undertaken ‘behind the pages’ to foster a cohesive political outlook through the medium of a journal. In dissecting those debates, the thesis will try to understand more clearly the intellectual divides that existed within the New Left in the United States, and illustrate how the vision outlined by SDS and the Port Huron Statement was just one of a number of competing political positions for the movement. In the minds of *Studies* editors, the New Left was as much about attempting to create a distinctively American radicalism as it was about community organising and participatory democracy.

Many of the debates raised by the *Studies* editors persist today. What does objectivity in scholarship look like, and is it even desirable? Should activists work within the political system to influence the main parties towards their views, or should they work outside the system through a third party? Is liberalism an emancipator and a transformative political ideology or does it only work to maintain the status quo? Is the point of a political party to lead and gain political power, or is it to educate and change worldviews? Like many small journals, *Studies* struggled to make itself relevant in an age of considerable upheaval, yet its reputation as a publication that made an important intervention to the intellectual world of 1960s radicalism is well deserved. It is time its story was fully told.

# Part One: The Birth of Community

## Chapter One: “A Journal of Research, Social Theory and Review”

Writing in the mid-1960s, Lewis Coser staked a role for the ‘high-brow’ magazine in ‘bridging the gaps’ among various ‘compartmentalized intellectual milieux’ in the United States.[[57]](#footnote-57) Unlike in Britain, where *The Times Literary Supplement*, *The Listener*, *The Spectator*, and *The New Statesman* expressed ‘the interests’ of a ‘relatively integrated intellectual community’, not one publication existed in the United States, Coser claimed, which had achieved the same effect.[[58]](#footnote-58) Counteracting the ‘incestuous’ tendency’ towards over-specialisation, and a drift towards departmental exile, a series of little magazines – *Partisan Review, Commentary, The Yale Review,* and *The Chicago Review –* had bound together intellectuals who might have otherwise withdrawn into their own disciplines, yet intellectual life remained fragmented across cultural and geographical lines.[[59]](#footnote-59) ‘Even literary men in California’, did not read the “New Yorkish” *Partisan Review*; *The Yale Review*’s reach did not exceed the Eastern Seaboard; and the reach of *The Chicago Review* did not generally exceed the city limits.*[[60]](#footnote-60)*

Fifty years later, historian and journalist David Marcus wrote similarly of *Dissent,* the journal co-founded by Coser, Irving Howe, and a ‘motley crew of socialists, European émigrés, failed novelists, academics, and untenured gadflies’ in 1954.[[61]](#footnote-61) The typical political ‘little magazine’ of that era, he suggested, had been founded ‘in a living room over a coffee tray’, without the sponsorship of Party or movement.[[62]](#footnote-62) Expressing socialist views, for its editors, meant spending a life existing ‘precariously on the margin…struggling constantly for a bit of space’ existing at a time of national uncertainty, the journal knew what it was opposed to, without exactly knowing what it wished to propose.[[63]](#footnote-63) Nonetheless, these small ‘aspirational communities’ offered ‘worlds in waiting…left of the possible’, opposed to the more ‘institutional sites of political action’, which had moderated in the years following the Second World War. The ideas that these radicals brought forth, their ‘light propaganda’, had produced an impact ‘within the cultural front’ – the Gramscian ‘war of positions.’[[64]](#footnote-64) Perhaps this ‘was all one [could] do as a radical in America’, a country ideological anchored towards the “liberal tradition.”[[65]](#footnote-65)

Though Marcus did not refer to *Studies on the Left* in his article – he offered Margaret Fuller’s *The Dial* in the 1840s,W. E. B. Du Bois’s *Crisis* in the 1910s, *Partisan Review*in the 1940s, and *New Left Review*in the 1960s – his evocation of these publications is one which matches the experience of the University of Wisconsin-Madison graduate students who launched *Studies on the Left* in late 1959. Like the editors of *Partisan Review* and *New Left Review*, they hoped to ‘push political culture to the left’, providing ‘counsel and criticism’ to a radical constituency.[[66]](#footnote-66) Recognising that they would only ever play a supporting role in any ‘larger-scale social change’, they hoped that their work could serve as one facet to ‘create a new world’.[[67]](#footnote-67) Their power and influence, would lay in the ‘realm of ideas’, sometimes achieving mainstream recognition, and perhaps even over public policy, their complaints and arguments’ providing a ‘language of language of opposition for activists’ and the ‘liberal’ state.[[68]](#footnote-68)

Returning to Lewis Coser; in the conclusion of his book *Men of Ideas*, first published in 1965, Coser noted how the peace movement and the movement for racial equality, had mobilised the political energies of intellectuals, breaking down ‘institutional and professional barriers’ between intellectuals from diverse backgrounds to coalesce around shared political issues.[[69]](#footnote-69) Subsequent analysis of these movements, broadly categorised as ‘The New Left’, have noted the distinctive attitudes towards ‘community’ adopted by activists who came of age in the 1960s.’[[70]](#footnote-70) In her study of ‘community’ within the New Left, sociologist Wini Breines proposed that community was ‘integrally connected’ to anti-organisational, *prefigurative,* politics of in the 1960s; not in the ‘abstract and instrumental sense’ but in a ‘more direct, more total, and personal network of relationships’ emphasising the wholeness of individuals in society rather than pre-determined roles based on status.[[71]](#footnote-71) Desiring of ‘a sense of wholeness and communication in social relationships’, activists had worked to create non-capitalist and communitarian institutions, from which ‘the seeds of liberation’ could be sewn.[[72]](#footnote-72) Their lived actions would prefigure the society that they hoped to create.

As we will find over the course of this thesis, what was true for activists was not necessarily true for intellectuals. With notable exceptions, the intellectuals of the left were highly suspicious of the ‘anti-organisational’ activism of the New Left. The *Studies on the Left* editors, while enthusiastic in their support for the civil rights movement and the peace movement, were more suspicious. One does find much in common with Breines’s conception of the left and their lived experience in the late 1950s and early 1960s, yet there are also notable differences. The *Studies* editors came into left-wing politics via membership of political societies and national organisations such as the Socialist Society, the Student League for Industrial Democracy and the Labor Youth League. They forged a community, which, however modestly, worked towards a dramatic transformation of American society, adopting socialist values which they hoped to see implemented cross society.[[73]](#footnote-73) Similarly to the New Left activists who constituted the membership of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) they opposed bureaucratic organisation, but importantly, this did not lead them to reject organised politics altogether. They too feared that their movement might degenerate into an oligarchic structure, yet this was to be avoided through vigilance and active participation, rather than the outright rejection of structure and hierarchy implicit in ‘participatory democracy’.[[74]](#footnote-74)

*Studies on the Left* was a microcosm of this debate. The desire of the editors to overcome the political upheavals of 1956 - the Hungarian Uprising, and the revelations of Khrushchev’s ‘Secret Speech’ at the conclusion of the 20th Communist Party Congress, which revealed the true extent of Stalinist era atrocities – led them to forge a new outlet for their political impulses. Whilst reforms in the various Communist parties proved fleeting, a burgeoning movement of young activists in the Midwest sought a ‘reformation’ of left-wing politics, free of the sectarianism and bureaucracy of the ‘Old Left.’[[75]](#footnote-75) Resisting efforts to commit to a ‘line’ imposed on them by an organisation; they worked to develop a distinct position more attuned to the realities of American life. We will presently explore these experiences, which ultimately manifested in the birth of a now journal focused around the task of building a movement for a world in waiting.[[76]](#footnote-76)

The Cold War Campus

Coming of age as politically involved students in the early-to-mid 1950s, the future *Studies on the Left* editors participated in a vibrant political subculture. As members of the Labour Youth League (LYL), the unofficial ‘coordinating body’ for most of the campaigning organisations on-campus – including the Student Council (organising candidates under the auspices of the USA Party ticket) and the student wing of Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) – they played a key role in political life on campus, campaigning for anti-discrimination bills, ‘peaceful existence and cultural exchange’, academic freedom and civil liberties.[[77]](#footnote-77) Founding *Studies* editor Martin Sklar, who arrived in Madison on a Ford Foundation Pre-Induction Scholarship in September 1951, recalled an older generation of World War II veterans who gave these organisations leadership and maturity from which ‘younger members’ could learn.[[78]](#footnote-78)

Joining Sklar were fellow New Yorkers Jeffry Kaplow, Henry Wortis and Arnie Lieber. Collectively drawn to the LYL they left an indelible impression on campus life ‘They were very funny, wonderful, free in their spirits’, historian Herbert G. Gutman later recalled. ‘Radical but a whole separate generation from the Old Left true believers I had known.’[[79]](#footnote-79) Wortis and Lieber in particular achieved notoriety for the openness with which they advertised their political affiliations.[[80]](#footnote-80) ‘It was decided that the infamous Henry Wortis and Arnie Lieber…’ Nina Serrano later reminisced about her time as an organiser of the Madison branch of the ‘Joe [McCarthy] Must Go’ campaign, would ‘not be encouraged to visit the office’ for fear the campaign would be ‘tainted by association’ with the pair.[[81]](#footnote-81) Wortis later testified before the United States Senate Subversive Activities Control Board regarding his activities in the LYL.[[82]](#footnote-82)

A less divisive figure, Sklar was a non-active ‘FDR New Dealer’ in his teens, yet had belonged to a political household.[[83]](#footnote-83) His father Kalman, a union lawyer, had worked for the Biscuit and Cracker Workers of the Amalgamated Bakery and Confectionary Workers Industrial Union in the New York Nabisco Plants.[[84]](#footnote-84) His brother Richard, a graduate of the University of Utah on a Naval Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC) Scholarship, was denied his commission after refusing to sign a loyalty oath.[[85]](#footnote-85) He later helped to organise the American Association of University Students for Academic Freedom (AAUSAF).[[86]](#footnote-86) Once at university, Martin followed his example, frequently attacked the University for undermining free speech, and the Student Senate for its inability to advocate for better education facilities, and an end to housing and employment discrimination.[[87]](#footnote-87) ‘Whatever the functions the University of Wisconsin might serve’, he explained in the *Daily Cardinal*, ‘the most important is the education of an enlightened and freedom-loving citizenry. It is…the responsibility of students to oppose not only Congressional inquisitions of the schools, but also other such inquisitions and other threats to civil liberties wherever they may arise.’[[88]](#footnote-88) Consequently, Sklar was identified to be a ‘campus politico’, and ‘comie (sic) relief’, heading the American Legion blacklist of campus subversives.[[89]](#footnote-89) This did not stop him serving, for six months, as the leader of the Wisconsin region of the National Student Association, though he was eventually ousted by delegates from the University of Milwaukee.[[90]](#footnote-90)

Aside from meetings, LYL activities included invited speakers and debating events, which attracted the ire of campus conservative groups such as the Young Republicans and the Wisconsin chapter of the American Legion, and more moderate left-wing organisations such as SLID whose branch founder, Gabriel Kolko, regularly clashed with the LYL, denouncing them as Stalinists.[[91]](#footnote-91) The claim of the LYL to advocate ‘socialism’, he once wrote in the *Cardianl*, was ‘pure double talk’; ‘the very nature of the Soviet Union and the root of the dictatorial character’ had arisen from its ‘perfectly capitalistic’ use of power. Their sole value was as an ally ‘in the fight against black and red fascism.’[[92]](#footnote-92) Both Kolko and historian George Rawick were also members of the Socialist Club – sponsored by William Hesseltine of the History Department – which advocated ‘democratic socialism…political freedom as well as economic freedom’ and deplored ‘totalitarianism of all kinds – ‘whether the Fascism of Hitler or the Communism of Stalin or the hate mongering of the Ku Klux Klan.[[93]](#footnote-93) They and others would ‘hold court and play bridge’ in the bar of the Memorial Union.[[94]](#footnote-94) When asked years later whether he wished to contribute to the journal, Rawick refused, stating that during his time in Madison editors had accused him of being an FBI agent.[[95]](#footnote-95)

While the Hungarian Revolution and Khrushchev’s ‘Secret Speech’ proved demoralising to ‘most’ of its members, at the time of its disbandment in 1957, the LYL was larger than it had ever been. Its members had taken the decision to disband, Martin Sklar later noted, because ‘people wanted to be openly socialist.’[[96]](#footnote-96) Colleague Ronald Radosh similarly recalled the desire of members discuss openly their politics.[[97]](#footnote-97) Saul Landau however, described a more chaotic chain of events. Having invited Pete Seeger to sing on campus, the University Music Committee lodged a complaint that as a political organisation, the LYL could only invite speakers and not musicians. Despite reassurances that Seeger was going to lecture, and would only sing to illustrate his points, the Committee arrived at the performance with stopwatches, determined to prove that the time Seeger spend singing exceeded the time he spent talking. Out of desire or necessity, the LYL had disbanded.[[98]](#footnote-98) Some retreated to the Student Peace Centre (SPC), a Christian pacifist organisation, while others set about forming a new organisation, the Wisconsin Socialist Club (WSC).[[99]](#footnote-99) One of several a new Socialist Clubs to appear on Midwestern campuses in 1957, the creation of the WSC was one of the earliest signs that the threat of McCarthyism might be receding. Collectively, the new clubs represent the earliest efforts made to build a New Left in the United States.[[100]](#footnote-100) Like their British contemporaries who had coalesced around the journal *Universities and Left Review*, the Campaign of Nuclear Disarmament, and the Partisan Coffee House in Soho, students in the United States formed new organisations, years before Alan Haber began to revitalise the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). ‘A New Left’ was required, Frank Fried, of the Chicago Eugene V. Debs Forum stated at the inaugural WSC meeting in the Autumn of 1957, ‘to replace the one which had so abjectly failed to create a movement…intertwined with the American people…and American problems’, and not ‘overburdened with concerns for the Soviet Union.’[[101]](#footnote-101) There were so many American problems to be solved, yet left-wingers had overly concerned themselves with Russian developments, at the expense of the development of an indigenous socialist movement.[[102]](#footnote-102)

Elected as the inaugural Chair of the WSC was Peter Jenkins, an Englishman undertaking graduate studies in History chosen for his eloquence, and his identification as a non-Stalinist social democrat, characteristics that reflected the desire of the member to move towards a more cosmopolitan outlook.[[103]](#footnote-103) ‘We attracted large numbers of Trotskyite guitar-pluckers and fellow travellers’, he later wrote. ‘We also staged the first-ever New Leftist student demonstration and considering how those spread in the next ten years, I think I started the second American Revolution almost single-handed.’[[104]](#footnote-104) This new attitude drew new recruits, but also new critics. ‘If these radicals are not Communists’, one critic asked after a visit by *Daily Worker* journalist Joseph Starobin, ‘why do they persist in bringing in such discredited and tainted characters?’ Their ideas were alien to the mind-set of the region. ‘Is it not revealing that, of all the officers of this club, none hail from Wisconsin or the Middle West, but all come from New York or New Jersey, and that its Chairman is not a citizen?’[[105]](#footnote-105) The stereotype of the West Coast radical appeared very real, and was not lost on the WSC board members. ‘Most of the members of the Labor Youth League’, Saul Landau confirms, ‘were white Jewish New Yorkers’. Madison provided an ‘enclave, a home away from home’, for those seeking to replicate the intellectual élan of the East Coast.[[106]](#footnote-106)

At a time when national organisations struggled to retain members, the creation of new was a notable occurrence by the left-wing press. ‘Among the youth’, Tim Wohlforth wrote for the *Young Socialist*, was an eagerness to overcome the old factions and work together, witnessed in the formation of new clubs in Philadelphia, Denver, Detroit, San Francisco and New York.[[107]](#footnote-107) There had been ‘tremendous and highly significant strides forward’ despite the differences between groups, and ‘disillusionment’ amongst older activists.[[108]](#footnote-108) The Hungarian revolution had ‘shaken the minds of a large part of the socialist-minded workers throughout the world’, and therefore, the success of the clubs had provided a pathway to the rebuilding of a socialist movement.[[109]](#footnote-109) Moving forward, Wohlforth felt, required co-operation among all the clubs, in order to build a united national movement, to revitalise the American socialist movement.[[110]](#footnote-110)

In the spring of 1958, the *Young Socialist Forum* took the first step towards an effort to build such a movement, organising a Midwest Conference of Socialist Youth, in Chicago. WSC members attended for the first such conference in a generation, which sought a ‘wide-scale discussion among socialists of all tendencies – organised and independent’.[[111]](#footnote-111) WSC member and *Studies* associate Matthew Chapperon supported these aims; the reason ‘for coming down here’ was to ‘make more contacts so we can have a wide variety of activity’ and ‘to get socialist ideas out.’[[112]](#footnote-112) Subsequent efforts to build an ‘independent, broad, and militant youth organisation’ based on the editorial policy of the *Young Socialist* however*,* were rejected at a conference held at the AFL Labor Temple in Detroit in December of that year.[[113]](#footnote-113) Having hoped for a re-groupment of ‘revolutionary socialist youth’ Tim Wohlforth’s protestations that such an organisation would act as a progressive force to restore civil liberties and academic freedom, did not persuade delegates still wary of the sectarian legacy of the Old Left. ‘Any genuine unified socialist youth movement’, Martin Sklar and Ronald Radosh declared, ‘had to be based upon student participation and co-operation among representatives of vary socialist perspectives’, rather than a doctrine expressing a singular point of view.[[114]](#footnote-114)

The Wisconsin Socialist Club

Assuming the Presidency of the WSC for the 1958 Summer Semester was Saul Landau, who had recently returned to Madison to undertake graduate studies.[[115]](#footnote-115) A native of the Bronx, Landau had been recruited into the LYL by Henry Wortis as early as 1953, where he learned the ‘ABCs of Marxism and Leninism’ and the basics of campus organising.[[116]](#footnote-116) The 1958-59 academic year was one of growth for the society, firmly establishing itself with speakers such as Clive Jenkins MP, Socialist Party leader Norman Thomas, as well as University of Wisconsin historian George Mosse.[[117]](#footnote-117) The Club, Matthew Chapperon explained to the Club’s Faculty Sponsor, was ‘profoundly concerned with the state of things in America and in the world’ and had introduced a series of ‘socialist theoretical education seminars’ focused on the ‘philosophical, economic and social analysis’ of Engels, Marx, Lenin and other socialists.[[118]](#footnote-118) At the behest of Lee Baxandall, the club had also performed a version of Berthold Brecht’s *The Measures Taken* (The Decision). ‘Almost apologetic’ in undertaking the performance, the members advertised it widely, even informing Dean Garberg, the ex-CIA officer who kept track of ‘the University’s reds’.[[119]](#footnote-119) The charm offensive failed, with accusatory graffiti left on the wall outside the theatre.[[120]](#footnote-120) ‘People were still talking about it even then’, *Studies* editor Michael Lebowitz recalled of his arrival in Madison in the autumn of 1960.[[121]](#footnote-121)

The onset of the sit-in movement and the House of Un-American Activities (HUAC) protests in San Francisco, attracted greater numbers of people to increasingly ambitious WSC events. Soon after the HUAC protest, Frank Wilkinson of the National Committee to Abolish the un-American Activities Committee visited, to discuss how students might work to abolish a ‘most outrageous and anti-democratic force.’[[122]](#footnote-122) They later rallied around William Appleman Williams of the History Department following his summons to appear before HUAC.[[123]](#footnote-123) They marched by the Wisconsin State Capitol to mark the anniversary of *Brown v. Board of Education*, listening to speeches by Governor Gaylord Nelson, and University of Wisconsin President Conrad Elvenjem.[[124]](#footnote-124) And they sponsored a visit by W.E.B. Dubois, who told students that the protests in the South were the first step towards forging a new socialist movement. ‘We have gone insane’ he stated, ‘with the idea that the world is going to be ruled by physical force. More than any other nation on earth or in time, we are spending fantastic sums of money to prepare for war…in Wisconsin one hears the winds of spring.’[[125]](#footnote-125) Left-wingers too felt the ‘winds of change’, for without factions and sectarianism, campus activism was ‘more fun.’[[126]](#footnote-126)

More ambitious was the Mock Socialist Convention organised over the Easter weekend of 1960, aimed to shadow the mock Democratic and Mock Republican conventions held on campus. Over three days, attendees formulated a prospective socialist platform for that years’ election, and also heard from invited speakers, such as Myra Tanner Weiss, independent socialist candidate Joseph P. King, and Joseph Lambrecht, the ‘hitch-hiking socialist orator’ who had ‘thumbed his way through a blizzard from Iowa’ as part of his tour of the West Coast and the Midwest.[[127]](#footnote-127) Saul Landau chaired a panel on socialist foreign policy with Weiss and William Appleman Williams, which pledged peace with the Soviet Union, and a scrapping of nuclear weapons.[[128]](#footnote-128) Well received among left-wing circles, *The Militant* hailed the conference as being indicative, along with the broad action for civil rights and civil liberties, of a socialist revival among students.[[129]](#footnote-129) Even the *Daily Cardinal* spoke positively of the event. Attendees, mostly students from New York, they stated, had presented to the public ‘a platform which will cut across lines of class, region and field of employment. A truly cross-sectional Socialist party would, they felt, bring ‘some badly-needed new life’ into domestic politics.[[130]](#footnote-130)

The new decade also witnessed a period of growth for the New Right on the Madison campus; the Wisconsin Conservative Club (WCC) being one of the ‘most poignant’ examples of the William F. Buckley inspired movement to combat ‘the growing popularity of New Left ideas.’[[131]](#footnote-131) Led by Alan McCone, a member of the Buckley-backed Intercollegiate Society of Individualists, the society frequently clashed with left-wing students in the *Daily Cardinal*.[[132]](#footnote-132) The Socialist Club were ‘the children of the left, the liberal mentality.[[133]](#footnote-133) ‘Other “liberal” and socialist groups on the campus’ had ‘shown naiveté about international communism’, he explained, but none had ‘so consistently gone out of their way to extol and apologise for the Soviets and the Red Chinese.’[[134]](#footnote-134) The WCC attracted high profile speakers, including Buckley and conservative theorist Russell Kirk.[[135]](#footnote-135) In March 1959, six months before *Studies* was first published, the club distributed an ideological survey among the history, economics, and social sciences faculty, and released the first issue of their own journal, *Insight and Outlook*.[[136]](#footnote-136) ‘An ideological battle’ was being waged on campuses across the country, the first editorial declared, the ‘disillusionment of two world wars and their ugly aftermath having discredited innumerable radical and optimistic schemes that promise to solve the problems neatly.’[[137]](#footnote-137) Eager readers of Friedrich von Hayek’s *The Road to Serfdom*, the editors believed the real fight to be found in a defence of freedom, and opposition to the ‘doctrinaire utterances of modern liberalism’, and the ‘totalitarian despair’ of the welfare state.[[138]](#footnote-138)

*Studies on the Left*

By the time of the appearance of the first issue of *Insight and Outlook*, preparations were already underway within the Socialist Club for the publication of its own journal. Acting as the ‘semi-official’ and ‘extremely under-paid managing editor’, Martin Sklar met with other interested WSC members in the second floor cafeteria of the Memorial Union.[[139]](#footnote-139)Joining him were historians Lloyd Gardner, Stephen Scheinberg, Carl Weiner, Saul Landau and David Eakins, literature student Dena Samberg, and physicist Joan Bromberg.[[140]](#footnote-140) Searching for a title, Sklar stated his wish for something ‘understated and un-melodramatic’, to which Gardner immediately suggested *Studies on the Left*. Sklar added, ‘A Journal of Research, Social Theory, and Review.’[[141]](#footnote-141) Together, the group created a provisional list of discussion areas that they hoped might ‘arouse intellectual curiosity’, including ‘Current myths in American scholarship’, ‘The role of socialist parties in American politics’, ‘The application of the concept of alienation to American society’, ‘The concept of the “Socialist Man”, ‘Class Structure in American society’, and ‘The political and academic structure of American capitalism’.[[142]](#footnote-142) Musing over what had driven them to undertake this ‘irreverent deed’, Sklar asked the other editors whether their motivation was to court scholastic disdain, to defy the muse of respectability and job security, or to pursue the notoriety of political proscription.[[143]](#footnote-143) The emphasis, Lloyd Gardner recalls, was to produce a journal that was on the left, but ‘didn’t rant and rave about the revolution that was surely coming.’[[144]](#footnote-144)

Other individuals more peripherally involved at the outset were James Weinstein and William Appleman Williams. A native of New Yorker, political activist Weinstein had been visiting Madison each summer since his marriage to Jacquelyn Cronick, a friend of Sklar’s first wife Doris Jackson.[[145]](#footnote-145) A former Communist Party member, Manhattan LYL organiser and American Youth Congress delegate, he had spent several years working in a factory despite holding an undergraduate degree from Cornell, and had begun a Masters at Columbia under Richard Hofstadter after a period in the Navy.[[146]](#footnote-146) He also knew Saul Landau through a connection in the LYL, and this was how he came to know of the *Studies* project. Donating money to get the project off the ground, he was listed as a New York correspondent prior to his relocation to Madison in 1960 to undertake further graduate students.[[147]](#footnote-147) Believing that *Studies* was the start of ‘something’ broader than the organised left, he suggested that the editors target the ‘unaffiliated, unidentified, and independent’ socialists rather than the ‘old time boys’.[[148]](#footnote-148) ‘We must be able to present all points of view in our magazine’, he explained, ‘but we will only be able to get away with it if we are identified with none, and if as a broad a group as possible are in on the founding of the magazine, and on the adoption of this principle.’[[149]](#footnote-149) Over-identification with a particular faction of the left would be fatal to such a strategy.

Williams, on the other hand, was a revisionist historian of US foreign policy. Williams had completed his Ph.D. in Madison in 1950, taking up a tenure track appointment at the University of Oregon in 1952. He had returned on a Ford Fellowship for a year in 1955, and then permanently in the autumn of 1957 as a handpicked replacement for Fred Harvey Harrington, who had accepted a promotion to Chair of the History Department. Williams dazzled students with his lecturing style and open debate sessions, creating ‘an intellectual excitement that would not otherwise have existed.’[[150]](#footnote-150) He quickly became a regular visitor to the Socialist Club. ‘Could we have held this meeting three years ago?’ he asked during one meeting. Socialism was relevant to Americans because it could ‘relieve the psychosis of recession and depression’, by offering a true alternative to corporate capitalism.[[151]](#footnote-151)

Initially wary of *Studies’* chances of success, Williams offered to contribute an article to the second issue, meaning, Lloyd Gardner remembers, ‘if we got that far, he would take us seriously.’[[152]](#footnote-152) Having proved successful, Williams felt the journal could ‘develop into something significant as an intellectual movement within academic circles, [and] perhaps attain the stature in the United States that the *Universities and Left Review’* had attained in Britain.[[153]](#footnote-153) While at Oregon, his copy of that journal had ‘bounced around the History Faculty’, and soon after he arrived in Madison, he had joined the board of *American Socialist*, which like *Studies* sought to engender a new radicalism based on domestic concerns and American principles.[[154]](#footnote-154)

Having discussed the idea for most of 1958, during which time the scope of the journal was expanded to that of a national publication, it was decided to aim for a late 1959 launch.[[155]](#footnote-155) Having recognised that the principles of American democracy – law, liberty, a free press, and a responsible government – had been distorted, *Studies on the Left*, the editors believed,would represent an expression of ‘the health and the sickness of radical and socialist scholarship and theory’ and its ability to propose an alternative to the status quo. Itwould test whether ‘questionable creatures’ such as they actually existed in the United States.[[156]](#footnote-156) ‘The standards of scholarship’ would be high, ‘the contributors highly varied and ranging from young whipper-snappers to old pros’, Martin Sklar promised.[[157]](#footnote-157) ‘It is not a political journal in the sense of being orientated toward contemporary issues as such, but a scholarly journal orientated toward contributing to a better understanding of social development and change…particularly with respect to the United States.’[[158]](#footnote-158) The ‘unaffiliated, unidentified, independent socialists’ would bring a fresh tone to such a discussion, avoid ‘stodginess’ and would demystify the American condition.[[159]](#footnote-159)

In order to raise funds, Saul Landau made regular trips to New York and Chicago, collecting small donations.[[160]](#footnote-160) Funding from left-wing activist Carl Marzani and the Rabinowitz Foundation allowed the editors to employ Carl Weiner to co-ordinate promotion efforts and respond to the increasing volume of correspondence that was arriving from across the country, while Martin Sklar’s housemate Carl Parrini, and his wife Sandy, helped with some of the copy-editing of articles.[[161]](#footnote-161) Each day, he would pick up the mail from the P.O. Box a few blocks down from Randall Stadium, and would distribute the new submissions among the board members. Accepted manuscripts were then given to Sandy Parrini.[[162]](#footnote-162) ‘Students all around the country’, Saul Landau wrote to Carl Marzani, were waiting ‘with bated breath’ for *Studies* to be published.[[163]](#footnote-163)

At some point during that first year of planning, discussions were organised with graduate students from the University of Chicago who had also decided to start their own journal, *New University Thought* (NUT). The Studies editors ultimately rejected the proposal over the matter of whether the combined journal should be overtly socialist.The NUT editors opposed the use of ‘left’ to describe the project. ‘They argued…that the name ‘Studies on the Left’ would alienate potential readers before they could turn the magazine’s cover’, James Weinstein and David Eakins later recalled.[[164]](#footnote-164) The NUT board proposed that the journal could contain ‘radical’ content, but without the ‘fear-inducing labels’ or any explicit statements of purpose – the editors could be radicals or socialist, but the journal would portray them as ‘militant liberals.’[[165]](#footnote-165)

The first issue of NUT appeared in March 1960, with a lead article written by David Riesman, author of *The Lonely Crowd*, which criticised college youths for their lack of commitment to efforts to alter or improve society in spite their dissatisfaction with contemporary society. Marking its launch, *Studies* editor Eleanor Hakim remarked that that ‘rare bird’, the independent radical, ‘found only in the wilds and the student and post-graduate journals’, was now spreading its wings.[[166]](#footnote-166) The *Studies* editors however, continued to reject the stance taken by the NUT board to start out ‘with a liberal image’ and then slowly’ bring the ‘readership leftward’, which had ‘destroyed and confused the left in the past.’[[167]](#footnote-167) Never seriously considered, the idea of a merger was nonetheless revisited even as both grew in popularity.

“Radicals in the Poisonous Groves of Academe”

Released in time for Thanksgiving 1959, the first issue of *Studies* sold well. Responses were ‘encouraging, to put it mildly.’[[168]](#footnote-168) Having targeted 1000 subscriptions by June 1960, over 600 had been reached by February, including the university libraries of Harvard, the University of Indiana and the University of Michigan, professors and graduate students, and labour leaders both ‘in and out’ of the AFL-CIO.[[169]](#footnote-169) ‘To our knowledge, 16 bookstores on the east coast, West Coast and the Midwest are carrying the journal.’ Martin Sklar boasted to Herbert Gutman. ‘Our manuscript horizons broaden steadily, and we have raised the money necessary to pay for the second issue.’[[170]](#footnote-170) With subscriptions came positive reviews. *Studies* represented a new forum for radical scholarship, one reader announced, from which radical scholars could escape narrow factionalism and ‘set lines’ to help build a new Progressive movement.[[171]](#footnote-171) Historian C. Vann Woodward saw *Studies* as a ‘welcome sign’ that graduate were fighting back against an academic system that wished to anaesthetise them to the myths and realities of American life.[[172]](#footnote-172) ‘You have certainly given all in your fight for the good cause’, Jeffry Kaplow applauded, ‘coming close to committing academic suicide. Note, however, that what I think of ivory tower universities is such that the mere thought of making a career in one of them sometimes prompts suicide tendencies.’[[173]](#footnote-173) After visiting the editors, Tom Wohlforth of the *Young Socialist* remarked that *Studies* had sent a signal to the ivory towers that young radicals were reacting against the ‘straitjacket’ of academic discipline, even though as graduate students, they appeared reticent to fully express their political views due to their desire for acceptance within academia.[[174]](#footnote-174)

There were also negative responses. Some readers questioned whether *Studies* could produce any originality in an already crowded field. ‘Just what is your magazine going to do that magazines like *Liberation, Dissent, Monthly Review, Anvil, The Call, International Socialist Review, The Nation, Progressive, New America, New Left Review, Committee of Correspondence, Tribune, Peace News…*ad-infinitum, are not already doing?’ asked Chuck Lang. ‘Capitalist individualism has certainly saturated the pores and cells of leftists. Everyone and his leftist brother wants to publish a magazine! To do what? To duplicate, triplicate, and quadruplicate material that is already being duplicated by the magazines already in existence. And to H Bomb the pockets of leftists who are trying, with much difficulty, to keep the existing journals alive.’[[175]](#footnote-175) Others asked why the editors had reserved the pages of its journal for ‘socialist’ scholarship. Having heard Saul Landau speak at a conference in Cleveland, Horace Meldahl had been inspired to write an article that was latterly rejected because it had been addressed to ‘non-socialist’ readers. ‘If the people of the left (the side my heart is on) were in a majority, we would need to address our appeal only to them. But since we do not have a majority, we must appeal to others to join us until we do…Thus we need to know how to appeal to non-socialists to build a majority.’[[176]](#footnote-176) Meldahl’s comments suggest that the approach favoured by the editors of *New University Thought* did have merit.

Opinion also divided over the extent to which the journal has struck the right balance between scholarly rigour and readability. ‘I have a feeling that two things are meant by this’, contributor Paul Breslow mused to Martin Sklar. ‘[That] we’ve heard it all before…and [that] your magazine is nicely printed on something better than the toilet paper generally used by radical publications.’[[177]](#footnote-177) James Boyer May, publisher of the influential magazine *Trace*, criticised the journal for its detached and dull academic nature.[[178]](#footnote-178) ‘Your writers have exhibited practically no stylistic development (which is precisely the weakness of today’s liberal periodicals) – people generally are not moved by detached abstractions, but by sincere communications of feelings and indignations.’[[179]](#footnote-179) There was a need, he reminded editor Arthur Hack, to allow writers to ‘sound off’, to generate some controversy, and to make readers use their imaginations.[[180]](#footnote-180)

At least one critic, Irving Kristol, believed the opposite to be true. Strongest among the ‘rash’ of ‘little left-wing’ magazines, *Studies* might easily suffer the same fate as the ‘journalistic’ and ‘quasi-sociological exposes’ of C. Wright Mills and Vance Packard, becoming ‘part of the entertainment industry’ if it was not careful to enforce a sense of rigour.[[181]](#footnote-181) Young Americans appeared trapped in a dilemma, both on the left and on the right, of how to be radical without becoming eccentric and detached from reality. The ‘basic fact’ however, was that American political thought was dominated by a liberal orthodoxy so strong that the radical movements could only gain preponderate influence in the case of the nation entering a ‘severe mental and psychological unbalance’.[[182]](#footnote-182)

Despite these mixed messages, the *Studies* editors could be proud of what they had achieved. Having set out to build a ‘workable way’ for them to engage in political activity on the University of Wisconsin campus, they had succeeded in reconfiguring a political community which appeared on the face of it to have been shattered by the political events of 1956. They had taken this a step further by linking up with a growing network of similarly minded people, and by launching their own journal. Influenced by Brecht, Melville, and the ‘surrealistic manifestos of Breton and Aragon, and Hauser’s history of art’, they abandoned sectarianism and moved towards cosmopolitanism.[[183]](#footnote-183) While some questioned the value of their publishing endeavour, the editors wore the positive reviews they received as a badge of honour that would underpin the further development of the journal during its time in Madison. Theirs was a prefigurative effort which sought not to rush into the formation of a national movement bound by the will and agenda of one organisation, but an attempt to coalesce like-minded radicals around a journal, so they might deduce what was required to build a socialist movement that was centred around the realities of life in the United States.

**Part One: The Birth of Community**

## Chapter Two: The Search for Community

Who were the *Studies on the Left* editors? Founding editor Saul Landau once claimed that they were ‘white Jewish New Yorkers’, who in Madison encountered an ‘enclave, a home away from home’.[[184]](#footnote-184) But what does this really mean, and how might have this have led them to engage in political activism and to form a journal? Matthew Levin, in his history of the New Left in at the University of Wisconsin during the 1960s, provides a succinct reading of what the accepted *folklore* of the 60s movement in Madison.[[185]](#footnote-185) Attracting ‘a mix of students; home-grown Wisconsin and Midwest radicals’, and out-of-state students – many of them Jews from New York and New Jersey – Madison provided a ‘dynamic intellectual and activist culture’, which blended ‘East and Midwest, radical…[and] liberal’ politics’, with an ‘unorthodox faculty led by…William Appleman Williams’.[[186]](#footnote-186) It was this melting pot, Levin claims, which gave rise to the conditions under which the University permitted the presence of the Labour Youth League chapter, and which shielded the students who formed Studies *on the Left* from political attacks.[[187]](#footnote-187)

The prominence of East Coast Jewish voices in the ‘left-leaning student organisations’, could be attributed partly to the belief, Levin suggests, that Jewish students drew on their ethnic backgrounds, which revolved around ‘family and community traditions of radical political activism’ which continued on campus, ‘contributing to the development of new political directions’, which rose after the ‘collapse’ of the Old Left.’[[188]](#footnote-188) As radical activity strengthened in the mid-to-late 1960s, so did calls from conservatives to reduce out-of-state enrolment, in order to ship New Yorkers – perhaps a euphemism for Jews – ‘back to New York’, given their propensity to sit-in buildings rather than ‘ in class’.[[189]](#footnote-189) This conflation had begun as far back as the 1930s, following the creation of Alexander Meiklejohn’s Experimental College, which had attracted a significant out-of-state enrolment but proved a hard sell to native Wisconsinites. [[190]](#footnote-190) In spite of the existence of anti-Semitism, Madison gained a reputation for being a ‘beacon of tolerance’ into the 1950s, in spite of the conflict between Midwestern and New York Jews – Midwestern Jews more interested in ‘the conformist goals of American college students…material success, social status, and marriage…’ and New Yorkers more concerned with ‘intellectual life and radical thought.’[[191]](#footnote-191)

In order to construct an accurate portrait of the *Studies* editors, it is necessary to analyse their intellectual concerns, and to assess the degree to which their concerns were unique to the Jewish voices within the New Left. How did their experiences compare to non-Jewish activists, and are there any comparisons that can be made? Scholars have identified the found, important role played by faith in propagating the New Left in the Christian south, particularly within the realm of Christian existentialism and its emphasis on the ability of faith to overcome alienation. A ‘talismanic’ term to characterise the ‘spiritual and psychological malaise’ of society, alienation was described by intellectuals of the 1950s as being a ‘fundamental aspect of the human condition, responsible for the various maladies of contemporary life – juvenile delinquency, rising divorce rates, to substance abuse and the popularisation of alternative lifestyles.[[192]](#footnote-192) Recognising this drift amongst their peers, students took up activism as a means of recovering ‘a sense of personal wholeness by healing the wound of society.’[[193]](#footnote-193) Alienation was of equal concern to the editors of *Studies on the Left*, yet unlike their Christian counterparts, they would find solace through different channels.

Alienation and the Beat Generation

The *Studies on the Left* editors came of age at a time when a belief that American society was suffering from a general ‘malaise’ or feeling of ‘weightlessness’ had become prevalent in popular culture.[[194]](#footnote-194) It is not surprising therefore, that students pondered the ‘sources and meanings’ of the middle-class alienation attributed to them by intellectuals such as Arthur Schlesinger Jnr., who proposed that Americans were living in an ‘Age of Anxiety.’[[195]](#footnote-195) The source of this anxiety, an inability to cope with the cultural impact of industrialisation, had left the nation vulnerable to the totalitarian impulses of communism and fascism, making it all the more essential that freedom ‘regain its vitality’ as a ‘fighting faith.’[[196]](#footnote-196) Like other students who participated in the earliest incarnation of the New Left, the *Studies* editors identified alienation not in the traditional Marxist sense – alienated from the means of production – but as ‘estrangement’ from mainstream society, and sought an antidote in a renewed social commitment to a radical community. [[197]](#footnote-197) Life in Madison, editor Eleanor Hakim noted, was much less alienating that on the east and West Coasts, where factional splits ‘25 years behind the time’ had impeded intellectual growth.[[198]](#footnote-198) Attracted by Wisconsin’s liberal tradition, and the relative isolation of Madison, those with ‘left wing commitments’ and those seeking to undertake such a commitment could ‘freely re-think, work out, and develop’ their own ‘brand’ of radicalism, even if the Progressive tradition of Wisconsin had lost much of its turn-of-the-century dynamism.[[199]](#footnote-199)

On the Madison campus, the work of two writers helped to shape the editors understanding of alienation. The first was Fritz Pappenheim, who’s *The Alienation of Modern Man*, caused a great deal of discussion on campus following its publication in 1959. [[200]](#footnote-200) Isolated events, Pappenheim believed, could not explain the pervasive alienation that Americans were feeling. Rather, a combination of technological issues such as automation, and social phenomena as varied as fascism, bureaucracy, and the corruption of politicians, had aggravated a sense of malaise.[[201]](#footnote-201) Theologians, philosophers and political scientists had lamented the failure of democratic institutions to bring about a genuine participation in society, yet even they had failed to understand that alienation was not the fault of ‘a few isolated and most fortuitous occurrences’ but was in fact pervasive.[[202]](#footnote-202) ‘What can be done?’ Pappenheim asked himself. ‘My own answer is somewhat pessimistic as far as the immediate future is concerned. We must realise that there is no short cut in our fight against alienation. Many cures are suggested: to transcend the materialistic spirit of our age, to improve our schools and our educational methods, to strengthen neighbourhood feeling and grassroots responsibility…But I cannot feel that they are adequate remedies.’[[203]](#footnote-203)

We cannot reduce the forces of alienation unless we are ready to build up new and different socio-economic institutions…If our goal is to overcome alienation by fostering bonds between man and man, then we must build up institutions which enable man to identify his ends with those of others, with the direction in which his society is moving.[[204]](#footnote-204)

The building up of new groups and formations was one, as we have seen, was characteristic of the New Left approach to politics. Among the editors, Martin Sklar pondered at length whether the alienation felt by the worker and corporate director, the artist and the farmer, might also be found among academics. Was their work simply a ‘product for sale…in the all-powerful limbo of the marketplace of ideas?’[[205]](#footnote-205) If so, the only way to resume normality was to make a commitment, to adopt the stance of a radical partisan, biased towards the reconstruction of universities and society, and towards the relentless pursuit of knowledge.[[206]](#footnote-206)

The second influence was William Appleman Williams, who lectured on alienation in his study groups, and ultimately published his thought in *The Great Evasion: An Essay on the Contemporary Relevance of Karl Marx and on the Wisdom of Admitting the Heretic into the Dialogue about America’s Future.* Musing about his own understanding of Marx’s thoughts on relationships ‘in the course of capitalist production’, *The Great Evasion* discussed how American society had over-emphasised the individualistic, egoistic side of man in the market place, at the expense of those that were social and humanitarian.[[207]](#footnote-207) Socialism, Williams stressed, could anchor politics in local communities, where individuals could actualise themselves through democratic participation and meaningful work.[[208]](#footnote-208) The cybernation of production perhaps, held within it the potential to open up additional time for personal development, creativity, and relationship building, stimulating the building of a community that was more cohesive and less materialistic, a reformation predicated on small economic units that could build a ‘physical America that was “beautiful instead of ugly.”[[209]](#footnote-209) Only then could humans overcome their alienation, and explore and expand the ‘frontiers’ of human existence.’[[210]](#footnote-210)

Biographers later identified Williams as having displayed characteristics of Christian socialism. Identifying with individuals from the American past who sought the balance the public good with commercial expansion, and others who joined egalitarian communities in the pre-capitalist era, some historians identified his ‘strand’ of leftist politics as being hostile to the ideal of progress as defined by corporations and ‘efficiency-minded thinkers’; nostalgic for the ethics of co-operation which in fact bound communities together.[[211]](#footnote-211) Antithetical to these instincts were also the behaviours which had given rise to the ‘Beat Generation’. Their increasing levels of narcissism, it appeared to Williams, were a mirror held up to the sickness of a society that could not overcome its alienation.[[212]](#footnote-212) The editors largely agreed with this rejection; ‘Beat’ literature was an immature, incoherent, and self-indulgent form of social protest, which could never hope to influence radical change. The Beats ‘peddled a faux alienation, built on the religious poetry of aimlessness’ rejecting social and political engagement in favour social of withdrawal.[[213]](#footnote-213) A small minority of intellectuals, journals, and hack writers, they, like the hipsters before them, had divorced themselves from society, setting out on an ‘uncharted journey into the rebellious imperative’ of the self. The idea that a new society could emerge from these ‘energies’, *Studies* contributor Paul Breslow claimed, was a ‘crack pot position’: it could only lead to a society built on un-enlightened self-interest and juvenile sensual satisfaction.[[214]](#footnote-214) Within the civil rights movement and on the university campuses however, there was hope.

Attracting the ire of the editors were the ‘weekend beatnicks’ who had descended on the Los Angeles neighbourhood of Venice.‘They live the kind of life that all of us have dreamed about’, Saul Landau wrote in a review of Lawrence Lipton’s *The Holy Barbarians*, ‘…based on ‘self-indulgence to the nth degree.’[[215]](#footnote-215) These same Beats, and their ilk, subsequently submitted their literary efforts to *Studies.* ‘We waste hours reading, and writing rejection letters for articles and letters for articles and essays and what might be called the personalised book reviews that are submitted by a frightfully large number of self-infatuated beatniks and others on that end of spectrum!’, Eleanor Hakim complained to Morgan Gibson.[[216]](#footnote-216)The Beats claim to radicalism was wholly false, and it seemed that anyone who ‘spits in the public eye’ could consider themselves ‘ipso facto a radical...They are undisciplined poets… [and] rebellious adolescents.’[[217]](#footnote-217) More broadly, it fell on Hakim to ‘weed out’ articles from those whose radicalism was felt to be ‘self-indulgence’ rather than a genuine commitment.[[218]](#footnote-218) Such people proclaimed that they were ‘in the continuity of the American revolutionary and literary tradition.’[[219]](#footnote-219) Such work had the potential for much darker consequences, its ‘animalistic infantilism’ and worship of the self and power, could quite as easily generate the conditions which had given rise to fascism.[[220]](#footnote-220)

Despite their misgivings, the editors did sense that the onset of the movements had coaxed many Beats to re-engage with society. Some concluded that within the Beats and their descendants lay forms of social protest that could engage young radicals in a way that *Studies* could not. ‘Is hip, Beat, naysaying protests a valid form of positive concern with social issues?’ Arthur Hack mused to Paul Breslow. ‘Can such self-advertising negative protest and proposed resolutions of self-indulgence be regarded as a serious manifestation of ‘radicalism?’[[221]](#footnote-221) For James Weinstein, the Beats had simply given up on any hope that the United States might reform. ‘These people reject the present society and see no hope for progress here. Men like Ferlinghetti, Leroi Jones, Mark Schleiffer, who went to Cuba, saw for themselves a society in which alienation was gone or rapidly going, and attached themselves to politics.’[[222]](#footnote-222) Their reaction indicated that a meaningful movement of the left in the United States was possible, but that it was the responsibility of journals like *Studies* to assist individuals in overcoming their rejection of ‘all things social.’[[223]](#footnote-223)

How might therefore, this sense of cultural and social alienation be overcome? The *Studies* editors were, overall, strongly inclined towards an intellectual response, yet there were editors – Arthur Hack for example – who speculated that other approaches might yield a response. Another was Saul Landau; following a period spent in Europe working for C. Wright Mills, and in New York as a book editor, Landau had briefly returned to Madison, before settling in San Francisco, where he encountered the ‘post-beat’ movement.[[224]](#footnote-224) He met Ron Davis, the Director of the San Francisco Mime Troup, who invited him to read for a part in their adaptation of Arnold Westker’s *Chicken Soup and Barley*. He went on to co-write the Troupe’s renowned performance piece, *The Minstrel Show or Civil Rights in a Cracker Barrel*, which addressed both race and class issues. ‘The *Minstrel Show*’, Landau recalled, ‘tried to use humour to open up issues around race at a time when it had become difficult to talk about racial themes in certain correct circles…It wasn’t the use of the “N” world that was keeping the majority of black people in poverty; it was an economic and social system that had hopelessly entwined race and class.’[[225]](#footnote-225) Davis later contributed an article to a special literary edition of *Studies,* which tried to reconcile political and aesthetical radicalism as concepts with much in common. ‘My own impression is that many young people have a post-political reaction’, he explained. ‘They have excluded politics from all parts of their lives for so long, they can no longer comprehend talk of social movements. Despite this, kids are walking on ad-hoc picket lines yelling “Freedom Now!”‘ The next step was them to participate in picketing.[[226]](#footnote-226) More than any other editor, Eleanor Hakim attempted to broaden the scope of *Studies* to incorporate outlets for literary and cultural radicalism.[[227]](#footnote-227) The left, she felt, expressed such ‘extraordinary ignorance and indifference’ towards cultural concerns, that substantial numbers of ‘intelligent humanists’ were shying away from identification with the left because of its failure to accept literary criticism as radical.[[228]](#footnote-228) In a pair of articles on Brecht, she identified the ethos of Brecht’s ‘parables of modern civilisation’ as a fight to achieve ‘individual authenticity’ in a ‘re-organised, constructive, integrated and rational society.’[[229]](#footnote-229) Their power to transform society, however, was injured by the existence of the ‘cultural apparatus’, the institutions that dictated how a work of art was brought to the public in the era ‘of speculators, promoters and middlemen’.[[230]](#footnote-230) The establishment, she claimed, had the power to appropriate, distort, and nullify dissent through a process of stripping away the political and philosophical content of art in order to maintain the status quo. Consequently, Americans were only able to focus on the ‘entertainment value of the object lesson of the play’, remaining incapable of overcoming their alienation until society could be reintegrated along lines that were more just.[[231]](#footnote-231)

The responses to Hakim’s articles demonstrated the split among the left wing over the issue of culture. Philip Corwin, for example, responded positively, the *Studies on the Left* editors were ‘acting heroically, despite living in a corrupt society. Herbert Gans, whilst echoing Brecht’s maxim that ‘the society which needs a hero is rotten’, felt that Hakim expected too much of art and theatre; it could only affect occasional changes in attitudes among a minority of ‘high culture’ audiences.[[232]](#footnote-232) ‘Society doesn’t change because some artist says it ought to. He plays a role in social change…but it is so infinitesimal that if he were not around, things would not be much different.’[[233]](#footnote-233) Placing a copy of Picasso’s Guernica in every living room, subway station, or television program, would not change the world ‘one iota’.[[234]](#footnote-234) Following Hakim’s departure from *Studies* in March 1963, the editors remained interested in matters of alienation, and a commitment towards intellectual endeavour as the ‘most effective resolution to cultural alienation.’[[235]](#footnote-235) To what degree this emphasis was a result of the trope of Jewish intellectualism, as described by Thorstein Veblen, it is interesting to note that in other areas of the country, the birth of New Left activity appears to be inspired more by a religious commitment, rather than an intellectual one.

Alienation and Jewish Identity

In his study of New Left activists in Austin, Texas, *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America*, Doug Rossinow demonstrated the important role that religion played in the birth of the New Left. Much of the early energy of the movement, he suggested, could be attributed to activists, who out of their own distaste for the problems of modern life – apathy, sexism, racism, or religion – sought solace through an engagement with the Christian existentialist movement, as a catalyst for their engagement with activism. Far from the stereotype of the ‘metropolitan’ Students for a Democratic Society activist of the late-1960s, activists in Texas, inspired to activism through their exposure to the social gospel, and the teaching of theologians such as Paul Tillich, Rudolf Bultmann, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer.[[236]](#footnote-236) They learned that individuals could reach a state of inner wholeness and ‘authenticity’ by overcoming their estrangement to God; the opposite of ‘existentialist alienation’ in the same way that ‘commitment’ was the opposite of ‘social alienation.[[237]](#footnote-237) Their engagement with the civil rights movement taught them the centrality of the creation of an authentic ‘beloved community’ for overcoming alienation, an understanding that found form in the Port Huron Statement’s assertion that ‘the goal of man’ was to find ‘a meaning in life’ that was personally authentic.’[[238]](#footnote-238)

When viewed through the lens of ‘alienation’ much of Rossinow’s analysis finds equivalency within the political movements on the similarly provincial Madison campus. In the late 1950s, activism on the Madison campus attracted both Jews and Christians. Ellamea Calvert, a Methodist student from Benton, Wisconsin, formed the Student Peace Center (SPC), a pacifist Christian organisation affiliated to the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) in 1955, and it attracted students of all faiths who wished to campaign against militarism and nuclear testing. It defined its aims as helping ‘to educate for peace…to provide a channel through which people who have a concern with peace can give concrete expression to it on campus.’[[239]](#footnote-239) Their early meetings were held in the Baptist Student Center, which along with the campus YMCA was an early hub for civil rights activity, such as the 1956 protest in support of the Montgomery Bus Boycott, supported by the SPC, the Baptists, and the YMCA. In 1957, Nina Serrano, who was Jewish and from New York, was elected Chair, and that year counted fellow WSC members Saul Landau, Martin Pearce, Arthur Hack and Chapperon among its members. The SPC also organised an Anti-Military Ball, a satirical song and dance review as a protest against the campus Military Ball – organised by the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC). The 1960 edition included a three-act musical revue, co-written by *Studies on the Left* editor Lee Baxandall, and starring several other board members.[[240]](#footnote-240)

It has long been established, and assumed, that individuals from Jewish backgrounds, predominately third generation immigrants whose parents’ lives had ‘intersected with the Old Left’ were over-represented in the student movement of the 1960s.[[241]](#footnote-241) However, they generally displayed few signs of overtly Jewish behaviour. They were neither Zionist, or fluent in Yiddish, but ‘deracinated and acculturated’ Americans who inherited a Jewish radical tradition from their parents that was imbued with the ‘activism of the union hall’ rather than the synagogue.[[242]](#footnote-242) This ‘secular Jewishness’, stimulated a concern with intellectual endeavours, and an adherence to radical views, maintained by the high level of intellectual interest and strong emphasis on higher education in Jewish households.[[243]](#footnote-243) Of the Madison campus in particular, it has been suggested, the support structures of the Old Left – the left wing schools and summer camps – played as big a role as the home in perpetuating the lineage of the Jewish radical.[[244]](#footnote-244) The Jewish profile of the campus political societies alarmed Rob Ross, a founding SDS organiser, who wrote to C. Clark Kissinger, a Madison student, of his reservation that the Left was not ‘a New Left’, but a revival of the old…with all the problems that entails.’[[245]](#footnote-245) In response, Kissinger confirmed that Madison was ‘the home of the Old Left…As you perceived, the Madison left is built on New York Jews.’[[246]](#footnote-246)

What were the differences, if any, between Christian and Jewish activists within the New Left? The founders of the organised movement organisations – the majority of them Jewish – felt that the movement had succumbed to anti-intellectualism, whereas non-Jews worried that profile of the Madison campus was, by virtue of its religion, too heavily associated with the Old Left. An oft-told story about Martin Sklar provides an example of a struggle between the duality between scholarship and action. One the eve of his departure to participate in the 1961 Freedom Ride, Paul Breines was approach by Sklar, who encouraged him to remain at his desk in Madison to undertake theoretical work, less it become ‘lost in the shuffle for action.’[[247]](#footnote-247) ‘Perhaps only Marty Sklar could have made such a proposal’, Breines later recalled, but it was characteristic of the pre-occupation with ‘ideas and intellectuals’ in Madison at that time.[[248]](#footnote-248) Recalling the story years later as an example of the differences between the *Studies* editors and the movements, historian Jesse Lemisch reminded James Weinstein that even if they opposed ‘existential politics’, to build a movement, or a political party, older members of the New Left had to make peace with the activities of people with whom they disagreed.[[249]](#footnote-249)

The backgrounds of the *Studies* editors present a fascinating cross section of circumstances and attitudes within the Jewish New Left. Born in Manhatten in March 1934, Carl Weiner moved to Brooklyn at the age seven with his family. His Father, who served in World War II, was born in Mogilev, Belarus, in 1906. A mathematician, he emigrated to the United States, studying at the City College of New York and becoming a teacher in the New York school system before moving to Hodstra University, where he eventually became Assistant Professor of Mathematics. Attending Queens College alongside fellow editor Eleanor Hakim, Carl interacted with Europeanist scholars who were ‘generally on the left…not Communists’ but ‘socialists’.[[250]](#footnote-250) He then moved to Madison for graduate study. ‘Madison was a great place; we were free and everything else, although I think a lot of Wisconsinites then and now would say we were alien… You could even identify as a Marxist and people would laugh at you maybe and say that’s old hat, but…I, myself, never suffered any kind of sense of persecution.’[[251]](#footnote-251) The only repercussion that Weiner recalled was that his father, who had stood as a candidate for State Representative for the American Labor Party, and whose resignation from the New York school system was linked to McCarthyism, once asked him to leave the board of *Studies on the Left*.[[252]](#footnote-252) His future wife Ruth, also a student at Madison and from a Union family, recalls the political scene at Madison as a blessing; ‘I hung out with kids who were political and…could be whoever I was….It wasn’t a disadvantage to be Jewish or left.[[253]](#footnote-253)

When confronted with the notion of their Jewish heritage, theeditors recall ambivalence. James Weinstein recalled being touched by his orthodox heritage, but not in a way that he could relate too. ‘I’ve never thought for a minute of being anything other than Jewish’, he reminisced later in life. ‘But I never believed in any of it…I had an Orthodox bar mitzvah [and] learned to mimic the words of the section of the Torah…But I had absolutely no idea what any of the words meant...that was probably the second to last time I went to synagogue.’[[254]](#footnote-254) Stephen Scheinberg, who later became National Officer of the Canadian B’nai Brith and Chair of its League for Human Rights, and Co-Chair of the Canadian Friends of Peace, recalls that Jewish identity in Madison was never an issue. ‘The Jewish red diaper babies of *Studies* were not deracinated, not torn from orthodox backgrounds, but following their parents. My parents were leftist Yiddishists, so I did have a cultural background, but I saw no evidence that my colleagues had much of that. I might drop in at the Hillel, but only as a gastronomic Jew, to eat a bagel. We were interested in civil rights, in black issues, U.S. foreign policy and nuclear testing. Jewish identity did not arise as an issue.’[[255]](#footnote-255)

Helen Kramer, who joined the board in 1961, identifies a position that takes those social concerns one-step further. Although the editors of *Studies* could be considered atheist, the ‘Jewish prophetic tradition’, the values of solidarity, compassion, and ‘healing the world’, were to her, strong unconscious motivators.[[256]](#footnote-256) Having previously only undertaken one term of Hebrew as a child, in later life Kramer joined a Conservative synagogue. With the dreams of an American socialist movement looking remote by the early 1980s, a fresh connection to the Jewish faith permitted her access to a new community.[[257]](#footnote-257)

‘Healing the world’ or Tikkun Olam as it is commonly known, is a concept which has played a role in modern Judaism since the late 1960s, long after the *Studies* editors left Madison, however, as an unconscious actor, the roots of the term have a strong connection with its campus. Many have attributed Tikkun Olam to Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel, a professor of Jewish mysticism at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, who advocated a transformation of contemporary life in Western societies. It was however, the publication of the first *Jewish Catalog* in 1973, and in particular an article by Arthur Waskow, which urged readers to ‘plant a tree somewhere as a small Tikkun olam – fixing up the world – wherever the olam most needs it.’[[258]](#footnote-258) The Catalog sold over 100,000 copies, leading to two further volumes. Waskow later politicised and expanding the meaning to encompass a variety of causes, from environmentalism to anti-Vietnam War activism and community work.[[259]](#footnote-259) Into the 1970s and 1980s, it was adopted as a motto for the New Jewish agenda under the stewardship of Rabbi Gerald Serotta.[[260]](#footnote-260)

A contemporary of the *Studies* editors on the Madison campus, Waskow too was disengaged from the Jewish faith as a student, and was more influenced by radicals such as Henry George and W.E.B. DuBois, as well as his professors in the History Department, Howard K. Beale, Merle Curti, Merrill Jensen, and in the Sociology Department, Hans Gerth. ‘Except for Gerd Korman [a historian of the Holocaust]’, Waskow recalls, ‘I don’t think any of the Jews, including me, were at all interested in Judaism or Yiddishkeit. For me, Torah and the Prophets became important only as I absorbed the transforming week between [Martin Luther King’s death in 1968 and the Pesach Seder one week later. The Freedom Seder and my whole Jewish trajectory grew out of that moment.’[[261]](#footnote-261) Recent scholarship by Doug Rossinow has charted the key role that Waskow played in the effort to form a Jewish religious left in the United States, based on his own realisation of an ‘integrated life of protest, politics, and faith’, which ultimately found form in his ‘Radical Haggadah’ which presents the story of Exodus as a metaphor for liberation struggles.[[262]](#footnote-262) It was at Madison that Waskow began this journey of discovery.

\* \* \*

It was not until *Studies* relocated to New York that Jewish issues were discussed at any length in the pages of the journal. Joining the board soon after it arrived was Norman Fruchter, who described how his alienation from religion had prompted a feeling of ‘weightlessness’ and drift.[[263]](#footnote-263)

A semi-observant Jew in childhood – he had attended Hebrew School at a conservative temple – Fruchter developed a semi-antagonistic relationship with Judaism from an early age; he loved the prayers, rituals and ceremonies, but became ‘alienated’ by the clannishness and the ‘restrictive lenses’ that were central to the relatively clustered Jewish community of Camden, New Jersey.[[264]](#footnote-264) Moving to England in 1960, Fruchter contributed film and theatre reviews to several journals, and worked as an assistant to Stuart Hall, the editor of *New Left Review*. His article, ‘The Jews and Others’, downplayed the existence of an American Jewish community, of which a plethora of organisations and welfare groups constituted the remains of an assimilated minority, a community which no longer existed. Orthodoxy, the true definition of Judaism, was extinct, and its children were ‘drifting.’[[265]](#footnote-265) A victim of the Holocaust via his religion, his Judaism now appeared an object of fascination for liberals who now imbued Jews with the same characteristics of marginality as they did African Americans. ‘For millions of estranged, isolated Americans, the Jew was the familiar explorer and inhabitant of the territory of alienation…inheriting the remains of a culture, a religion, and a complex tradition’ that he was now alienated from, intensifying the élan of alienation which existed generally in society.[[266]](#footnote-266)

Returning to the United States in 1962, Fruchter joined the political organising efforts of the Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP) in Newark. At the same time, he worked on a novel, *Coat Upon a Stick*, published the following year. Focusing on the life of an embittered elderly Jewish man, presented several characters alienated from their faith. His son Carl, a third-generation immigrant, has maintained cultural ties to Judaism, but identifies as an American. ‘I wanted to be like them’, he muses. ‘How could I tell my father I wanted to do what the goyim did?’[[267]](#footnote-267) Zitomer, a general store owner, has an epiphany and feels sinful for having exploited his customers; Rabbi Davis looks upon his congregation with sadness, and is disillusioned with his faith – as a student he had sworn an oath to live in the world as a rabbi and a socialist, but had lost faith in both.[[268]](#footnote-268)

In his most notable contribution to *Studies*, Fruchter defended Hannah Arendt’s analysis of the Adolf Eichmann trial. Her work, Fruchter noted, had proved controversial because of two assertions. The first, that Eichmann was not evil, having displayed no hatred of Jews, but had simply suffered form an ‘inability to think’ about the consequences of his actions, and second, that the Jewish councils set up at the behest of the Nazi’s had caused a greater number of fatalities. Considered the bitterest ‘public dispute’ regarding the Holocaust, Arendt insisted that she did not sympathise with Eichmann. Critics however, lined up to attack her ‘twisting and distorting’ of the facts.[[269]](#footnote-269) Arendt, Fruchter believed, had challenged the ‘myth of the victim…of separateness’, which many Jews had used to avoid the dilution of Jewish cultural values of social justice and use of the intellect under the pressure of integration into American society. ‘Today’, Fruchter proposed, ‘the Jew shares with most middle-class Americans a barren but inflated religiosity, a binding set of material imperatives, an increasing inability to see himself as a social individual with communal…and personal responsibilities, and a consequent increase in loneliness, despair…and mental illness characteristic of social atomisation.’[[270]](#footnote-270) The state of Israel was the culmination of the ‘victim myth’, offering a permanent refuge. Arendt had detached Eichmann, the Holocaust, and Israel from the myth, describing Israel not as a haven, but as a nation typically involved in the same policies, atrocities and warfare as most other states.[[271]](#footnote-271)

Despite being ‘attacked by all the usual sources’, Fruchter was pleased with the overall reaction to his article. ‘A few years later I met Arendt at a reception in New York and, amazingly to me, she remembered the piece and knew who I was. I remember that she stroked my cheek and murmured, “You’re so young”. I guess she expected that someone much older had written it.’[[272]](#footnote-272) His own efforts to overcome his alienation through writing and participation in the New Left projects in New York demonstrates an affinity, which the *Studies* editors found attractive, and as we have seen, was active and vibrant across religious lines in Madison. As we shall see, they also crossed gender lines.

Alienation and the Gendered New Left

Much of Doug Rossinow’s analysis of the New Left in *The Search for Authenticity* is guided by the leadership provided by Casey Cason (later Casey Hayden, following her marriage to *Studies* editor and student leader Tom Hayden). Cason had grown up in Victoria, Texas, raised by a mother and an aunt who had ‘imbibed’ her with a sense of equality with men.[[273]](#footnote-273) An active participant in the Christian Faith and Life Community, she was inspired to find personal redemption through social transformation.[[274]](#footnote-274) Dismissing the ‘pompous oratory’ of her male counterparts in SDS, she viewed activism rather as a ‘woman centred’ atmosphere of planning and organisation. Sara Evans has noted that those few women who were politically involved on campuses tended to feel isolated and unhappy, and that the civil rights movements had provided them with an outlet for their beliefs and the hope of a community.[[275]](#footnote-275)

As the movements developed, Rossinow noted, this more egalitarian atmosphere faded, and in terms of sexual equality, SDS appeared far from radical.[[276]](#footnote-276) In 1965, Cason attempted to expose this drift, issuing a pamphlet which stated that a sex and caste system was at work within the movements, which forced women to ‘work around or outside hierarchical structures of power’ which potentially excluded them, or at the very least, placed them in subordinate roles to men.[[277]](#footnote-277) The caste system dictated ‘who cleaned the freedom house’, who filled the secretarial roles, and who filled ‘the leadership positions’, along gender lines. Women, she felt, were being held back from full participation in the movement.[[278]](#footnote-278) A landmark document, ‘Sex and Caste’ proved one of the central documents in demonstrating that the New Left marginalised women. With women relegated to administrative and menial tasks, and many reluctant to speak out in meetings, it might have appeared that they were content to do the ‘shitwork’.[[279]](#footnote-279)

Among the editors of *Studies,* Eleanor Hakim provides an interesting contrast to Cason, confirming and confounding much of what has been written about the role of women in the New Left. Scholars have noted that at the time of ‘the Cold War and the feminine mystique’ student activists ‘uniformly’ came from the middle-to-upper-middle professional and middle classes.[[280]](#footnote-280) Jewish rather than Christian, from New York and not the South, lower middle-class, of mixed Middle-Eastern, African, and East European heritage rather than ‘white’ Hakim described her upbringing as a ‘thorough-going melting pot New York lower-middle-class Jew’ whose parents’ cultural values ‘cancelled one another out.’[[281]](#footnote-281) Her father Sol was a Sephardic Jew born into a ‘déclassé’ cotton trading family in Kartum, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, who emigrated to the United States in 1929 after the British had ‘placed a price on his head’ following his activities in ‘the Hebrew Defence organisations against Arab pogroms.[[282]](#footnote-282) He found work as a furrier in the fur-garment industry, which was being ‘swallowed up by the big corporations.’[[283]](#footnote-283) Scholars have noted how the garment industry produced its own unique pressures. An expansive industry offered opportunities for economic advancement, and those who encountered social mobility were less likely to retain a commitment to socialism. Bosses used scarcity to push ‘shop’ loyalty over solidarity among individual workers.[[284]](#footnote-284)

Hakim’s mother Renee, on the other hand, was an Ashkenazi Jew from Poland, who had spent her early life travelling back and forth from Europe after her family settled in lower Manhattan, where she received a ‘typically Orthodox’ upbringing. Forced to leave school after the 8th Grade to support her family, Renee worked in a shop whilst raising Eleanor and her siblings.[[285]](#footnote-285) Conforming to their respective Jewish heritages, her parents were a contrast. Her father was more open to the world, and more integrated into non-Jewish culture, while her mother was more ‘traditionally’ raised ‘blond and blue-eyed and Aryan looking…peasant-farmer stock.’[[286]](#footnote-286) Recalling a telephone call with her father when she announced that she had joined the *Studies* board, she described how her mother had been very upset, whilst her father tried to ‘smooth the breach’, whilst deflecting away from his own earlier radicalism.[[287]](#footnote-287)

A self-confessed ‘distant and alienated person’, Hakim relocated to Madison from New York to study English following a period of study at Queens College.[[288]](#footnote-288) She had chosen to study at Queens not because it was the ‘best of the City schools in the liberal arts’, but through her desire to ‘get away from the itsy-bitsy bourgeois Jewish girls’ who attended her neighbourhood high school.[[289]](#footnote-289) Admitting to having a ‘rather reactionary attitude’ towards feminism, she claimed to understand the problems that women faced in society, yet admitted that a lack of first-hand experience of sexism had made it hard for her to relate to the experiences of others. ‘I know – from I most of all my peers…how crushing, stifling, frustrating, and unfair the position in which the female is placed in this society’, she admitted to her friend Muriel Haynes Adams. ‘But I know this intellectually and through observation and sympathy…not…from any personal…emotional experience.’[[290]](#footnote-290) Perhaps, she said, this made her an ‘odd duck’, but in this respect, she might not be ‘reactionary or myopic, but simply fortunate.’[[291]](#footnote-291) Having long mulled over ‘the problem’ of being a girl – she identified as a tom-boy in her younger years, knowing that she was not like other ‘prissy girls’ who were like their mothers – she believed that she could be ‘whatever she wanted to be.’[[292]](#footnote-292) ‘So I was something of an existentialist from the very beginning – but never a feminist!’ she joked. ‘That is, I never suffered from, had to rebel against, or break out from the “position of the woman in our society” – simply because I was never in it. A fluke, to be sure.’[[293]](#footnote-293) Why was it, she wondered, why other women allowed themselves to be ‘trampled over’ by men?[[294]](#footnote-294)

Hakim shouldered a considerable amount of responsibility in the functioning of *Studies on the Left* during the period the journal was based in Madison, and examples of similarly placed contemporaries are hard to come by. Nicolette Carey, the partner of *New University Thought* editor Otto Feinstein, appeared on the masthead of the first issue as Managing Editor, and had previously occupied a similar role as Associate Editor of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. A lack of archival sources, however, means it has been hard to establish the extent of her role. *Root and Branch* counted Ruth Markovitz and Serena Turan Scheer (partner of founder Robert Scheer) on its masthead, and Elissa Horowitz (partner of editor David Horowitz) and Florence Loewenberg (partner of Peter Loewenberg) among its Associates. Of these other women, Carey was a frequent contributor to NUT, and Ruth Markowitz provided an analysis of West Side Story to *Root and Branch*, which only ran to two issues. By comparison, Hakim was one of only two women (the other being Joan Scott) to contribute to *Studies* in its eight years of publication. Across the Atlantic, Janet Hase, the full-time office manager of *New Left Review* during its first iteration, concluded that her efforts to organise the office and the functioning of the journal were ‘derided and misunderstood.’[[295]](#footnote-295)

Aside from her views on her own understanding of feminism and her own sexuality, as a woman, Hakim was not immune to the occasional sexist and bigoted comments she received from men. One contributor to the journal expressed ‘misgivings’ over corresponding with a woman named Eleanor, because a previous acquaintance of the same name during his university days had been ‘rather unattractive, not very bright, and continually hysterical…I can still hear her piercing voice now!’[[296]](#footnote-296) For that reason, he requested that Hakim send him a photograph of herself, and details about her background. ‘Where did the Arab name come from…fill me in pictorially and biographically. I will be glad to do the same on request.’[[297]](#footnote-297) When another person expressed doubts at the validity of *Studies* political stance, a letter from Hakim persuaded him that while he still had ‘reservations’ about the ‘soul of *Studies on the Left’*, he had been persuaded otherwise about hers.[[298]](#footnote-298) ‘Hell, if you would only understand that you can’t build socialism in one country you would really be a first-rate woman. And I suspect you may be that now – although given like most women to some sort of idealistic mystical nonsense. Oh yes, I am a male chauvinist!’, he wrote, to which Hakim responded, ‘Since you stated in your last letter that you are a male chauvinist, I shall not strike a plaintive note.’[[299]](#footnote-299)

Hakim resigned from the *Studies* editorial board in March 1963, following a ‘bust up’ with James Weinstein and Martin Sklar which had begun in Madison, and then concluded in New York after the journal had relocated. Suffering from a cold, Hakim had slept for most of the journey from Madison, during which time she had been ‘attended by two Galahads.’[[300]](#footnote-300) Concerned about the future direction of the journal and the role that the wider editorial board would play, Hakim expressed frustration that the pair had, for over a year, refused to address her concerns. After threatening to resign, she was told that she had no reason to resign, apart from her own ‘paranoia’ about the future.[[301]](#footnote-301) Commenting on the mass of ‘unappetising’ letters which had attempted to psychologise her departure from the editorial board, long-time Associate Carl Weiner remarked that he was not surprised, noting that ‘at least three’ of the four women who had worked on the journal had ‘left with bitterness’.[[302]](#footnote-302) Having previously laughed off cries of ‘male chauvinism’ on the board, he admitted that even if in her case it was a coincidence, the regularity of the occurrence was becoming uncomfortable.’[[303]](#footnote-303)

In later years, Hakim would admit that on occasion, there had been ‘elements’ of male chauvinism on the *Studies* board, but that it had not necessarily meant that it was a sexist environment. Unlike the other women editors, she claimed to Weiner, she had made sure to function as an editor. ‘Still’, she admitted, ‘there are analogise to the role of the woman in a marriage, who keeps up all of the social relations and running of the household, and takes care of the kid, until such time as the kid turns out to be a prodigy and then hubby steps in to take all the credit.’[[304]](#footnote-304) Her disassociation with *Studies* had many of the dynamics of a divorce, insofar as she faced the embarrassment of relating to mutual friends and former colleagues now as a single individual rather than as a member of a social unit.[[305]](#footnote-305)

When, in the early 1980s, asked to discuss ‘*Studies* and sexism’ for Paul Buhle’s collection of Madison reminiscences, she explained how the other editors had valued her as someone who provided a perspective that had no experience of the Old Left. If exploitation had occurred, she suggested, it had not been sexist exploitation, ‘as it…might have been with Joan Bromberg…or even…Dena [Samberg], or what Sandy Parrini feared’, but had come about as a consequence of her differing views on democratic humanism and ‘sexist pre-occupations’ with ‘revolutionary power.’[[306]](#footnote-306) The final split was made due to irreconcilable ideological differences.[[307]](#footnote-307) If one takes this testimony at face value, then one might be persuaded to discount any notion that the *Studies* board was guilty of sexist behaviour. She had been ‘one of the boys’, extending to her ability to ‘drink them under the table at the 602 Club.’[[308]](#footnote-308) As we will see, there is a sense that Hakim did undertake much of the legwork for the journal, with others claiming equal credit.

Years later, James Weinstein also addressed the topic of sexism on the *Studies* board, and within the broader New Left. He lamented how the position of women on the left appeared to disintegrate in the 1960s compared to his experiences in the 1940s and 1950s. Among women members at that time, the ‘women question’, ‘male supremacy’, and ‘white supremacy’ he explained, had been taken seriously, with sexual divisions of labour abandoned.[[309]](#footnote-309) The ‘frequency and crassness’ of the sexist behaviour within the New Left however, shocked him; ‘He wanted to review a book by an old friend, Aileen Kraditor’, Sara Evans noted, but that the ‘men on the staff of *Studies on the Left*…laughed at the idea’ of reviewing ‘a book by a woman!’ At first, he had considered this a joke. ‘Then I realised it wasn’t.’[[310]](#footnote-310) Within SDS, he witnessed a subordination of women’s roles, their permitted contribution seemingly limited to making sandwiches, waiting on tables, and ‘[getting] laid.’[[311]](#footnote-311)

If the New Left was indeed more egalitarian in its infancy, the early experiences of Cason and Hakim, who played leading roles, certainly provide evidence that this was so. As we will find in later chapters, those early traits of co-operation, equality, and community, based in a progressive and sometimes religious tradition, nurtured by Christian existentialist in Austin, and William Appleman Williams in Madison, were gradually replaced within the movement by the more masculine traits of ‘macho stridency’ and ‘militarist fantasy.’[[312]](#footnote-312) Even on the *Studies* board, efforts to build an ‘intellectual community’ were largely cast off in favour of a more programmatic approach, focused toward building a political party. It is to this duality, between a true intellectually community, living for its own sake, and a political vehicle, that we now turn.

**Part One: The Birth of Community**

## Chapter Three: *Studies on the Left* as Intellectual Community

‘*Studies…*is still a lone wolf’, *Studies on the Left* editor Eleanor Hakim exclaimed to her friend Muriel Haynes Adams in early October 1962.[[313]](#footnote-313) [An] independent journal…appealing to no particular political segment of the population was nonetheless attempting to publish ‘engaged critical scholarship and analysis.’[[314]](#footnote-314) Referencing a recently published pamphlet, which had invited scholars ‘of all shades of conviction’ to join ‘An Intellectual Community Committed to the Radicalism of Disclosure’, she reiterated to Haynes, an advertising executive who had offered assistance, that *Studies* had to promote itself if it was to successfully broaden its readership and contacts. ‘As you should have guessed by now…*Studies* is just plain weak! Not only is it difficult to find knowledgeable people here in the States…*Studies* is weak in all contacts…and we are far too provincial, failing to keep up with the British publications.’[[315]](#footnote-315) This was not to say that radical scholars did not exist, she emphasised, but that they rarely wrote critically in a political sense, for either widely circulating publications or scholarly journals, or ‘even, alas, for small journals.’[[316]](#footnote-316) It was a source of irritation therefore, that the ‘penny-pinching’ of her fellow editors, who did not appear to be taking the idea of building an intellectual community seriously, had hindered her efforts.[[317]](#footnote-317)

The frustrations expressed by Eleanor Hakim that October remained unresolved by the time that the journal relocated to New York the following March. Over the course of the previous year, a state of acrimony had developed regarding the future direction of the journal and the role of the wider editorial board. Emotions boiled over, and soon after arriving in New York, Hakim resigned. Her departure, more than the move itself, represents a crucial movement in the development of the journal, which had already gained the reputation of the premier journal of the New Left. Following her departure, *Studies* drifted away from its original conception as a platform for young intellectuals to publish their work, and toward a more programmatic approach under the control of James Weinstein, which emphasised the role of journal as a platform for the creation of a new political movement. David S. Brown has called *Studies* a ‘less polished incarnation’ of New York’s *Partisan Review,* which in its Madison years, reinvigorated left politics among those who sought to cast off their alienation and build a ‘culturally respectable radicalism.’[[318]](#footnote-318) It created a space where the intellectual wing of the New Left could ‘cut its teeth.’[[319]](#footnote-319)

In assessing the validity of this statement, and to gain a greater understanding of the community that the editors, and particularly Eleanor Hakim, hoped to create, it is necessary to explore the relationship between radicalism and scholarship as envisaged by the editors. Did the formative experiences of the *Studies* editors, for example, influence their understanding of what an ‘intellectual community’ was? How did their cultural backgrounds influence their radicalism? How did they seek to apply their efforts to creating an ‘intellectual community’ and how did this interact with other forms of community extolled by the New Left? Paul Buhle has suggested that their efforts constituted an Americanised version of the ‘First New Left’ associated with British academics such as E.P. Thompson, John Saville, Ralph Miliband, and Raymond Williams.[[320]](#footnote-320) While the history of that movement has largely focused on the intellectual debates instigated by its intellectual circle in their journal *New Left Review,* scholars of American history have largely categorised the New Left as a mass protest movement.[[321]](#footnote-321) Correspondence from the archives supports the idea that the editors saw themselves as building an American equivalent to *New Left Review*, and that they hoped to build a wider international network of left-radical scholars. Though these attempts rarely proved sustainable, they add weight to the claims made by historians that their existed a ‘transatlantic play’ within the movements at this time.[[322]](#footnote-322) This ‘New Left Atlantic’, Nick Witham suggests, provided a ‘transnational intellectual space’ in which the aims of the British and American New Left’s became ‘intertwined.’[[323]](#footnote-323)

Commitment and the Birth of Community

In the mid-to-late 1950s, the New Left, first in Britain and then in the United States, came to believe that academics could make ‘political commitments’ without impairing their academic judgement.[[324]](#footnote-324) With copies *Universities and Left Review* and the *New Reasoner* reaching the United States, it is not surprising that these notions reached the *Studies* editors in Madison. Martin Sklar, Saul Landau, and Stephen Scheinberg had all taken their first radical steps within the Labor Youth League, whilst James Weinstein had been politically active since the 1940s. While living in New York he had joined the Fifth District FDR-Woodrow Wilson Club, and had served as campaign manager to Manfred Ohrenstein for his successful run for the New York State Senate.[[325]](#footnote-325) In between his studies, he had spent four and a half years working for the Emerson Radio Corporation in their New York factory, ‘ritually running for office in the International Union of Electrical Workers.[[326]](#footnote-326)

During his time in Madison, Martin Sklar similarly took on work as a manual labourer, and during his year in California in 1960, he did shifts as a fruit picker and a dockworker, boasting about shifting ‘15 tons of bananas for United Fruit onto Union Pacific freight cars.’[[327]](#footnote-327) A while later, he was hired by the AFL-CIO Agricultural Workers Organising Committee as a researcher; it was the ideal job he claimed, for combining scholarship with work within the labour movement.’[[328]](#footnote-328) He was however, prone to taking his working class ‘shtick’ too far. Back in Madison, Sklar would maintain his ‘working man’ persona outside of the workplace. ‘On a good many evenings’, Stephen Scheinberg recalled, ‘we ended our studies with a beer at the 602 Club, a bar in which the gay clientele occupied the front portion and the lefties in the back. Marty worked for a while in factory jobs and turned up in his dirty scruffy work clothes. We tried to tell him that the real working class showered and dressed before going out, but Marty played the determined proletarian.’[[329]](#footnote-329)

For those who were yet to make a political commitment, the coalescing of the movements created an irresistible opportunity to get involved in politics. The New Left, *Studies* editor Staughton Lynd claimed, held an ‘existentialist commitment to action’, even though it lacked a ‘firm grasp’ of how that commitment would manifest itself.[[330]](#footnote-330) It ‘opened everything up to scrutiny’ in the ‘naïve belief’ that democracy would be enriched by an ‘energetic will for collective action from below.’[[331]](#footnote-331) A matter of months after the first issue of *Studies* appeared in the autumn if 1959, a burst of student protest activity on Northern campuses in support of the sit-in movement gave the editors hope that such action would provide real change. Beginning with a non-violent sit-in of the Woolworth Department Store in Greensboro, North Carolina, several similar protests occurred throughout the first week of February across that state, before spreading across the South into the summer, while in northern cities, picketers marched outside of Woolworth’s and similar department stores. Students in Madison carried signs with such messages as ‘Jim Crow and Academic Freedom Cannot Coexist’, ‘Protest Unjust Jailing of Tennessee Students’, ‘Equality is Indivisible’, and ‘Jim Crow Must Go.’ During the sit-in, *Studies* editor Saul Landau asked the storeowner to write a letter to the head office asking for the end of segregation policies in Southern states.[[332]](#footnote-332)

In the scramble to attract scholarly debate on the ramifications of the broader civil rights movement to the pages of the journal, and to move away from the ‘narrow academic materials’ of its early issues, the editors invited Eleanor Hakim to join the editorial board.[[333]](#footnote-333) A frequent attendee of the sit-ins, organised by the Student Peace Center and the campus chapter of the NAACP – ‘my feet still hurt from putting in a full day’, she wrote to Martin Sklar after one such demonstration – Hakim had largely resisted any previous engagement with left politics.[[334]](#footnote-334) The political orientation of her ‘old…Stalinist left’ friends in New York made no sense to her ‘politically’, ‘humanistically’ or ‘individualistically’.[[335]](#footnote-335) ‘Something of an existentialist…post 1956’ when her Stalinist friends ‘went down like flies never to recover’, she felt that now was the right time engage, given that sectarians no longer held a monopoly on what was radical, and that the Civil Rights movement had escaped the narrow thinking associated with the Old Left.[[336]](#footnote-336) ‘I’ve escaped all of the wounds, scars, and suspicions of Stalinist-Trotskyite in-fighting…The ardent defenders of this and that faction’. [[337]](#footnote-337) She felt ready now to commit herself to building an American socialism.[[338]](#footnote-338)

With the upcoming third issue of *Studies* presenting a crucial milestone in terms of subscription renewals, Martin Sklar stated that the editors had to reshape their conception of the journal.[[339]](#footnote-339) Hakim’s first intervention was to offer a comprehensive critique of the *Studies* project, and the editorial of its second issue. ‘Civil Rights and the Birth of Community’, had praised not only the Civil Rights movement in the South, but also the manner in which students on northern campuses had cast off their alienation, forging a new sense of solidarity and community based on mutual support for the southern protestors.[[340]](#footnote-340) Excited by these developments, the editors had proposed topics of study for a symposium on the movement, however, Hakim believed this demonstrated that *Studies* was already suffering from signs of ‘middle-age’, its editors too ‘caught up’ in their historical documents and dissertations to make an active commitment to the ‘radical rebirth’ of community in Madison and beyond.[[341]](#footnote-341) Declaring that it was time for sociologists, historians, economists and psychologists to take advantage of the ‘unlimited opportunities to test theory and practice’, had given the impression that the editors were abdicating their responsibilities as radicals.[[342]](#footnote-342) Was the radical scholar to be ‘a radical and gadfly’, impassioned by a deeply felt understanding of ‘human worth’, outraged by the injustices of society, or a ‘self-coerced servant of the ministry of culture’, in the dictatorship of ideas, and the format ideas?[[343]](#footnote-343) In order to survive, *Studies* had to move away from the safe radicality of analysing the ‘functionings and malfunctionings’ of the world as it had existed two and three hundred years previously, and start proposing ‘possible solutions and prognostications’ for contemporary society.[[344]](#footnote-344)

Hakim was not alone in her criticisms. After re-reading the editorial ‘three times’ to ensure the editors not ‘satirizing tongue-in-cheek the academic world which they both are part of and in rebellion against’ Tim Wohlforth declared in the *International Socialist Review* that the editors were ‘unconsciously satirizing themselves’, reducing a mass struggle to the level of a ‘community welfare project for budding sociologists.’[[345]](#footnote-345) Ignoring the fact that communities in which the civil rights struggles took place had been ‘torn asunder’ by profound inter-racial and inter-generational conflicts, the editors appeared less enthused by the possibility that the Southern struggle was opening a ‘breakthrough’ in the fight for a more equal society, but the opportunity it afforded to academic analysis.[[346]](#footnote-346) ‘The vision of these poor… students asking for a cup of coffee only to be pounced upon by an army of professors accompanied by graduate students carrying the professors’ briefcases’, was too much an earnest vision.[[347]](#footnote-347)

In later years, Hakim recalled how the *Studies* editors had initially dismissed the civil rights movement as ‘bourgeois’.[[348]](#footnote-348) The middle-class black students sitting-in at the Woolworths counter had not initially fitted into the Old Left modes of revolutionary working-class movements. However, once they realised that the movements were ‘something more than cups of coffee’ they ‘went about New Left-izing themselves’, in order to understand what the New Left was, and the role that *Studies* could play within it.[[349]](#footnote-349) ‘They knew that it represented some sort of upheaval, though they couldn’t say what’, she later wrote.[[350]](#footnote-350) ‘I was the link to this new radical spirit.’[[351]](#footnote-351) Martin Sklar admitted that the second issue had been overweighed to ‘the academic, esoteric side. [[352]](#footnote-352) In their search for ‘clarity, objectivity…and truth’, the editors had sacrificed ‘journalistic readability’ for dull academic conventionality.[[353]](#footnote-353) *Studies* need not be doctrinous, or its articles all-encompassing; the editors were not the ‘guardians of truth and light, and holding back articles until all ‘irrefutable proof’ was provided was a needless task.[[354]](#footnote-354) ‘How are you going to “test it”? Set up a lab experiment? Start socialism in the U.S. tomorrow?’ What was needed was commitment. If *Studies* was going to be an exciting journal, it had to ‘take joy in upsetting’ people and provoking a ‘swirl of controversy’ in its pages, ‘getting enough left-intellectuals ganders up to the point of their throwing themselves into the world of writing because *Studies* readers are a worthy audience.’[[355]](#footnote-355) Thus, writing to Madison graduate George Cunningham at Texas Southern University in April 1960, the board admitted that while they did not ‘ordinarily publish reportage-type articles’, *Studies* were willing to make an exception in the case of the sit-ins. It may well be’, they admitted, ‘that we are witnessing the beginnings of a great historical movement that will deal a fatal blow to the Dixiecrat system that will result in basic restructuring of political party alignments nationally.’[[356]](#footnote-356) ‘Contributions of the first importance to making our nation a better place for all and to the successful outcome of the present struggle for democracy’, were therefore required.[[357]](#footnote-357)

Conversely, the editors debated the precise role *Studies* could serve within the new movements. The student protesters, Martin Sklar wrote, lacked an ideology, rather they were dissenting ‘issue-orientated protest movements’ which lacked ‘any overall left-wing orientation or grasp of the injustices’ that they were fighting against.’[[358]](#footnote-358) Compounding this, the lack of an organised movement, Eleanor Hakim responded, stymied the extent to which *Studies* could offer ‘directly programmatic political stands.’[[359]](#footnote-359) ‘Who are we, what are we, where do we come from, and where are we going, and just what the devil is the “New Left”‘, she pondered.[[360]](#footnote-360) In common, activists shared a mistrust of the ‘dogmas…and the lack of humanitarian respect for the individual’ of the Old Left, but lacked ‘sureness beyond their feeling of responsibility to humanity.’[[361]](#footnote-361) *Studies* could help, she felt, by tackling contemporary issues and pointing the way to action, if it could decide where itself stood. On the hot contemporary issues, Cuba, ‘and in future, Africa’, the journal could educate people, who would then take their own independent stands.[[362]](#footnote-362) The risk of failure was martyrdom to the ‘rationalist humanist imperative’, or a retrenchment into the ‘ivory tower’ as exiles of ‘a lost movement.’[[363]](#footnote-363) Martin Sklar was more sceptical, expressing the hope that the new movements would produce a ‘deeper and more significant journal’ of their own.[[364]](#footnote-364)

The confusion over the way forward was reflected among the journal’s readers and contributors. ‘On the Ideology of the Campus Revolution’, a ‘Communication’ published in the fourth issue of *Studies*, and later reprinted in several volumes of documents, demonstrated the uncertainty that activists felt subsequent to undertaking their commitment to radicalism. Dale Johnson, a graduate student of sociology at the University of California, explained the connections between the HUAC protests, the organisation of SLATE, a campus political party, the picketing of the local Woolworths, and the protests against the ROTC as signs that the movements were coalescing into new forms, free of the ideologies of the past. Those participating were radicals, who had awoken from their apathy due to their frustration with the ‘impotence and agnosticism of contemporary liberalism.’[[365]](#footnote-365) ‘Most of us radicals would agree with Daniel Bell that the post war years have witnessed ‘the end of ideology’, he admitted. ‘This is the voice of a disillusioned man whose ideology is anti-ideology.’[[366]](#footnote-366) Activists found existing political forms to be either redundant, or resistant, to their protest. Lacking a programme or ideology of their own, they were drifting in ‘the rough and uncharted seas’; the ‘huge waves tossed up from the depths of the conservative tradition and state authority’ could yet destroy this new impetus.[[367]](#footnote-367) They ‘unhesitatingly’ expressed what they were against, were ‘less sure’ of what they were for, but were united by their humanism and their acceptance of democratic principles.[[368]](#footnote-368)

*Studies* editor Saul Landau was convinced that the protests highlighted by Johnson in California were characteristic of the moment in which a generation of young radicals, having internalised the ideals propagated by their radical and left-liberal parents, put their own ideals into practice. For the first time, he stated, Beats had turned their concern to the concrete issues of racial equality and peace, supporting the Freedom Rides of 1960 and 1961, and demonstrating against HUAC’s San Francisco hearings. Their style, dress, and décor affected activists, as ‘arguments about politics began to include discussions of sexual freedom and marijuana.’[[369]](#footnote-369) Not simply a haven of ‘beats, kooks and potheads’, the movements were made up of young people who were committed to the best values of the American tradition. Discarding Marx, Lenin and Trotsky, who held little relevance to American problems, they found a new hero in Castro, ‘the man of action, the man without an ideology.’[[370]](#footnote-370) Landau was not alone in his increasingly scepticism towards the influence that scholarship could have on the movements. There was a fear, Jeffry Kaplow warned the editors, that scholarly scepticism might itself become an excuse for inactivity. As the editors became more concerned with ‘defending their historic prerogatives as intellectuals’, becoming detached instead of ‘doing something’ to break down isolation and alienation.[[371]](#footnote-371) In this sense, the duality between political commitment and scholarly commitment presented conflicting advice to the *Studies* editors of what it meant to undertake a political commitment.

Cosmopolitanism and Community

From the outset, the editors of *Studies on the Left* were keen to form links with like-minded activists and intellectuals abroad. The success of *The New Reasoner* and *Universities and Left Review*, and latterly *New Left Review* in Britain gave them hope that their own efforts might be successful. ‘If the English can keep up such a steady flow of ideas in ULR we should be able to at least put up a reasonably decent show’, Saul Landau wrote to an early subscriber.[[372]](#footnote-372) The fact that even American socialists were largely ignorant of other countries allowed *Studies* to act as an educative tool to remedy ‘pathetic’ factional battles and help the left look outwards.[[373]](#footnote-373) Responding to their efforts to recruit a London correspondent, Gar Alperovitz, who had completed his graduate students in Madison, remarked on a similar effort undertaken by the British to redefine the problems, the ideals, and the strategy of the movement. ‘The most impressive thing’, he described, ‘is the psychological setting of the group which styles itself the “New Left”…Dogma is dead and, in its place, are the first signs of a new conceptual apparatus and a new set of intellectuals.’[[374]](#footnote-374)

Following the ‘disappearance’ of former Socialist Club chair Peter Jenkins into ‘the fogs of London’, Martin Sklar had expressed his doubts as to whether any links with Britain could survive an Atlantic crossing, but Alperovitz game him new renewed hope. ‘Your letter indicates that U.S. socialism has begun to emerge from its backward-dependent epoch and into the modern industrial age: before we only imported socialists from England – now we are exporting them.’[[375]](#footnote-375) The hope was that the two journals – *Studies* and *New Left Review* – could form an ‘Anglo-American entente’ for socialist renewal.[[376]](#footnote-376) The next year, Saul Landau visited London, drawing the journal into closer association.[[377]](#footnote-377) In 1962, Ralph Miliband and his partner Marion Kozak visited Madison, and was impressed by the ‘level’ that the *Studies* editors ‘were operating at’, admitting that ‘not even NLR’ had brought together such a wide mix of impressive young socialists.[[378]](#footnote-378) It was ‘possibly an exaggeration’, wrote David Eakins, ‘but a sincere tribute nonetheless.’[[379]](#footnote-379)

Unbeknownst to Eakins and his fellow editors was the fact that *New Left Review* had been in a state of disarray almost since the time of its inception.[[380]](#footnote-380) Uncertainties about its political direction, its potential audience, the role of its large and divided board, and the role of its ‘overloaded’ office, had been exacerbated by the failure of a much-vaunted fundraising appeal.[[381]](#footnote-381) Committees set up to address the activities announced in its first issue existed in name only, and visitors to the office ‘found [Stuart] Hall and Janet Hase hopelessly busy with paperwork and organisation routine…burdened with the expectations of the whole movement.’[[382]](#footnote-382) It was only in 1962 that the journal began to find a degree of stability under the stewardship of Perry Anderson. While the *Studies* editors liked to imagine that their journal might mirror developments in Britain, they understood the barriers to such a relationship. The provincial nature of their journal, Hakim noted, prohibited access to the British publications, and it was priced too highly for most foreign academics and students.[[383]](#footnote-383) As an alternative, she proposed that *Studies* might set up branch offices in San Francisco and New York, in the same way that New Left Clubs had been set up on British university campuses. The alternative was that the journal might stagnate and become ‘the toy’ of successive generations of left-wing students.’[[384]](#footnote-384)

Domestically, the editors cultivated a friendly rivalry with other left-wing publications such as *New University Thought* (NUT) and *Root and Branch*.[[385]](#footnote-385) Though envious of their newsstand sales, Eleanor Hakim nonetheless felt that the success of NUT could be attributed to its more moderate stance. ‘*Studies* is…high class and intellectual and therefore loath…to grub around placing journals in stores and on stands.’[[386]](#footnote-386) NUT had specified, like *Studies*, the need for radicalism, ‘in the sense of getting to the root of things’, but its argument was ‘watered down and liberalised into wishy-washiness’.[[387]](#footnote-387) When suggestions of a merger began to reappear, Martin Sklar emphasised how different the journals were in intent, purpose and education. ‘[It] would probably result in a monumental hodgepodge’, he wrote, ‘particularly so if the editorial board were to have two effectively functioning heads, one in Chicago and one in Madison…[Lets] see if we can’t develop instead a spirit of mutual co-operation and friendliness based upon a premise that the two journals are complementary rather than at loggerheads.’[[388]](#footnote-388) Hakim agreed. ‘NUT falls between two stools’, she explained to one subscriber.[[389]](#footnote-389) ‘I used to quip that [it]…was the stepping-stone to *Studies*...they at least seem to be interested in discussing significant matters in a wide variety of areas. The only problem is that they hamstring themselves, and thereby prevent [themselves from] dealing with such…matters in a significant way.’[[390]](#footnote-390) In spite of their differences, the editors of the journal would keep up a friendly rivalry.[[391]](#footnote-391) Given the strife of the over-wieldy *New Left Review* board, which contained such iconoclastic individuals as E.P. Thompson, John Saville and Ralph Miliband, the journals were probably strengthened by remaining apart.

On the West Coast, *Root and Branch* was a journal formed by a group well known to the *Studies* editors by the time it published its first issue in 1961. During his sabbatical in San Francisco during 1960-61, Martin Sklar became involved in the civil rights movement, securing elected to the local committee, and with the help of his *Studies* connections, educating its membership on what had been happening in the northern movements. Living in ‘penury’, he spent his spare time working up his long-awaited *Studies* article and began selling copies of *Studies* to the many of the prominent radical book shops around town, including the famous City Lights, the U.C. Corner and International, the Cloven Hoof and Penguin Island.[[392]](#footnote-392) It was through these activities that he met a group of graduate students active on the board of the *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, who were impressed by the ability of *Studies* to attract manuscripts and to keep up its publication schedule.[[393]](#footnote-393) Identifying an opportunity for growth, he suggested that the group be allowed to participate in determining the economic and sociological content of *Studies.*[[394]](#footnote-394)‘We already do have Associates or Representatives in New York and Berkeley, which will probably develop into something on the order of New Left Clubs – which is obviously the pattern we’re trying to follow.’[[395]](#footnote-395) The board worked together to formulate theme topics, to demonstrate that they were concerned with vital issues, and considered introducing Associate Editors.[[396]](#footnote-396)

The relationship almost saw *Studies* break into publishing, just as *New Left Review* had in 1960 with its edited collection of essays *Out of Apathy.*[[397]](#footnote-397)Following a trip to Cuba, Robert Scheer and Maurice Zeitlin had made a number of impassioned speeches about the revolution, and had been approached by Lawrence Ferlinghetti, the owner of the City Lights Bookshop in San Francisco, with the offer for the two to write a book, which he later passed on when it proved too academic. It was then that Sklar suggested to the board that the book be published as a Studies on the LeftPress book. After being rejected by sixteen publishers, *Cuba: Tragedy in Our Hemisphere* was finally published by Grove Press. Zeitlin lamented the *Studies* editors’ lack of ambition. ‘*Cuba: A Tragedy in our Hemisphere* could have been a *Studies* book. But you seem to apply the same stuffy academic standards to the not-yet-definitive writing necessary.’[[398]](#footnote-398) However, recalling the incident years later, Sklar reminisced that he had rejected the work claiming its argument that Castro had been forced into Marxism by U.S. intransigence was unsubstantiated and invalid. ‘My view was that it was wrong to try and build support among Americans for the Cuban Revolution by pandering to American liberal prejudices and pretending Fidel was “really” a liberal.’[[399]](#footnote-399) The dream of an American version of New Left Books had failed to materialise.

In collaboration with Saul Landau, Scheer and Zeitlin soon set about creating a journal of their own; that they believed would overcome some of the weaknesses of *Studies*. *Root and Branch* would combine some of the academic elements of *Studies* with analysis of contemporary politics and culture. Whilst working at City Lights, Scheer had reserved space in the magazine rack for both *Monthly Review* and *Studies*, but found that their popularity was limited; young radicals did not appear to see their content as useful.[[400]](#footnote-400) ‘You know what everyone thinks of *Studies*? (By everyone I mean four or five people)’, Landau wrote explained to Eleanor Hakim. ‘They think that it is very professional and dull.’[[401]](#footnote-401) Similarly, to Martin Sklar, he admitted that the reach of *Studies* was limited. ‘We can picket, speak from soapboxes, publish our little papers and magazines, write nasty letters, and even run an occasional candidate. We accept their rules, and thus we lose.’[[402]](#footnote-402) Maurice Zeitlin agreed; it was questionable whether the young left should put its efforts into purely academic exercises. ‘A journal with the appeal of a combined *Studies* and *Root and Branch*’ he suggested, would be irresistible; *Studies* would be the‘weapon of scholarship’, and *Root and Branch* would apply it to the contemporary world.[[403]](#footnote-403) Martin Sklar expressed sympathy with the idea that students should ‘get out’ of the universities, so that they could bring an intellectual consciousness to the movements. [[404]](#footnote-404) They could combat the ‘historical mindlessness’, of the movement, but also repair their own false consciousness: many academics were deceiving themselves when they characterised their thinking as radical, when it was in fact liberal. ‘We have appropriated the mind of the ruling class’, he stated, ‘and painted it radical colours.’[[405]](#footnote-405)

In any event, Bob Scheer used the second issue of the journal to launch a critique of both *Studies* and NUT. ‘The number of such alienated intellectuals’, he noted, ‘is now much larger than at any time than since the war, but the gap between them and society is also greater.’[[406]](#footnote-406) The two journals had created a space for young academics to apply their tools to radical critiques, and their editorial boards were ‘the most important source of ideas and leadership’ for the New Left movement.’[[407]](#footnote-407) The problem however, was their capacity to delude young academics into believing that they could pursue a successful academic career by making radical political contributions, and their own delusion that the rest of society shared their academic views. ‘The university is home’, Scheer explained, even to the *Root and Branch* editors, ‘and the other one frightens the hell out of us.’[[408]](#footnote-408) Universities as institutions could not in of themselves generate the commitment required to change society, beyond ‘setting the record straight.’[[409]](#footnote-409)

The appearance of *Root and Branch* did not overtly concern the *Studies* editors. Martin Sklar expressed his feeling that editorial boards often drifted toward ‘pig-headedness’ when judging papers outside their own perspective, admitting his own preference for information and thought-stimulation over ‘form and style.’[[410]](#footnote-410) James Weinstein found Scheer’s comments to be one sided, and criticised his failure to discuss any of the ideological tendencies of the non-academic New Left.’[[411]](#footnote-411) Eleanor Hakim understood its potential to present insights not widely accessible to left-wingers, yet viewed the results as appearing sophomoric and amateurish.[[412]](#footnote-412) Radical intellectuals, she claimed, had a history of ‘forsaking their role...and integrity’ for the sake of belonging. She stood instead with Mannheim, who had warned that while radical intellectuals had to free themselves from ideology, they hat to remain committed to both political causes and social action.[[413]](#footnote-413) The fear then was that simply by engaging too frequently with the mainstream, that intellectuals might be co-opted and lose sight of their previous radical stance. Journal editors would cease to be ‘the gadflies of power’ and become ideologues for political interest groups.’[[414]](#footnote-414)

More threatened by the presence of another rival journal were the editors of *New University Thought*.[[415]](#footnote-415) ‘Did I ever tell you the story of the time I met [Otto Feinstein] in Madison during the time of the National Student Association Congress?’ Eleanor Hakim wrote to Hal Orbach. ‘He was moaning and groaning and rocking back and forth as if lamenting the wandering in the wilderness of the lost tribes.’[[416]](#footnote-416)

‘Hya Otto’, I said, ‘Isn’t it a beautiful day. How are ya?’

‘Oh, terrible terrible…Did you hear about those people who are planning to start a new magazine on the West Coast? Ach, it’s terrible.’

‘Sure, I heard about *Root and Branch*. Isn’t that great? I think it’s wonderful.’

‘Wonderful?’ ‘What’s wonderful about it? ‘It’s terrible. Everybody in a different region of the country wants to start his own magazine. What’s the matter with them? They have no sense. It’s terrible.’

‘What’s terrible about it Otto…It proves that there really is something called the New Left, and that earlier publications such as *Studies* and NUT were no accident. There are all kinds of magazines that need to be published. The more the merrier.’

‘Ach no, it’s all wrong. Instead of starting their own journals they should work with the ones around and strengthen them.’

‘But Otto, we can all work together and yet have a number of journals. People have different approaches and stresses, and there’s room for new journals to fill them. Besides, by your reasoning, only the first few magazines in the field should be allowed to exist.’

‘That’s right’, He said.

‘But Otto, by that reasoning, only *Studies* and NUT should be allowed to exist.’

‘That’s right’, he said, and raised his finger, prophet-like, ‘And even those two should have been one.’’[[417]](#footnote-417)

Though she admitted that Feinstein’s reaction was ‘a very funny story’, she stressed that it had not been funny when he went out to the West Coast, and reportedly tried to ‘wreck’ the founding of *Root and Branch*.[[418]](#footnote-418) The incident highlights the competitive nature of the relationship between the various journals in the period, and the seriousness with which they approached their work, but also the conscious effort made by the *Studies* editors to build connections with other journals both in the United States and abroad.

In spite of Feinstein’s opposition, *New University Thought* went on to achieve notable successes of its own, counting Kenneth Boulding, Richard Falk, S. I. Hayakawa, Herbert Kelman, Guenter Lewy and David Reisman among its patrons. [[419]](#footnote-419) In February 1963, Feinstein visited Columbia University to help organise the Universities Committee on the Problems of War and Peace, an organisation whose committee membership, founding statement, and newsletter closely overlapped with NUT’s call ‘to make specific use of the special talents of academic people in discovering, developing and articulating information and suggestions relating to the problems of war and peace.’[[420]](#footnote-420) Two years later, after the sustained bombing of North Vietnam began in earnest, NUT and the Universities Committee organised meetings and workshops on college campuses around the country and arranged an International Conference on Alternative Perspectives on Vietnam, held in Ann Arbor in September 1965. In 1966, Feinstein and other anti-war Democrats established the Conference of Concerned Democrats, an organisation crucial to Eugene McCarthy’s Democratic Party primary run. A special January 1968 issue of *NUT* asked ‘Why McCarthy?’ contending that their candidate had ‘provided a nucleus around which those of us who despair of the entrenched leadership of both national parties can organise and show our strength as a bloc.’[[421]](#footnote-421) In the same issue, ‘What You Can Do’ emphasised the power of the university as a powerful organising base. Students on every campus, Feinstein claimed, could organise an Issues and Politics 1968 conference, the results of which would be sent to the media, potentially influencing the outcome of the primaries in favour of McCarthy.[[422]](#footnote-422)

Community Betrayed

By the end of 1961, *Studies on the Left* was gaining a reputation as the intellectual centre of the New Left.[[423]](#footnote-423) ‘We are overflowing with manuscripts’, Martin Sklar boasted, ‘and have in a true sense become a major centre to which radical scholars are sending their work.’[[424]](#footnote-424) With the original board now scattered around the Midwest and beyond, it was not surprising when the editors announced in mid-1962 that they journal would be moving to New York. ‘The bright eyed graduate students who had formed the journal back in 1959’, Eleanor Hakim explained, had given ‘little thought’ to the fact that ‘most people eventually grow up, and go and get their PhDs and take up job appointments in various places across the country’.[[425]](#footnote-425) The editorial board had shrunk, putting ‘a tremendous strain’ on the remaining editors at a time when the journal was continuing to grow in popularity, ‘and unfortunately, a gap in the graduate school generations’, meant that there was ‘really no one else ready to be brought onto the board.’[[426]](#footnote-426) Opinion among the readership appeared largely in favour; Madison was too ‘provincial’ a place for an ambitious journal with hopes of focusing beyond academia.[[427]](#footnote-427) To stay in Madison would be an ‘indulgence in sentimentality’; condemning it to a long decline in the hands of successive generations of graduate students at the very moment, it held the potential to transcend the status of a ‘transient student mag’ into a ‘fully adult professional journal.[[428]](#footnote-428) As long as it could avoid getting caught up in the ‘frequently depressing atmosphere of the New York left, Herbert Shapiro suggested, *Studies* might benefit from getting ‘a bit more out of the academic cloister.’[[429]](#footnote-429) There was a sense therefore, that the journal could only fulfil its potential once it moved outside of the university and into the *real world.*

It is more likely that the *Studies* board moved to New York out of practical necessity. James Weinstein had purchased a brownstone house in Manhattan and intended to move there within six months.[[430]](#footnote-430)Eleanor Hakim was sceptical about the potential success of the move; expressing doubts, she hoped that the journal was now well-defined enough to withstand the ‘negative influences’ of New York, and that by maintaining and furthering their connections, they could avoid swapping one provincialism for another.[[431]](#footnote-431) She recognised the need for funding, and sought solace in the signs that a new breed of radicalism was developing in New York that appeared compatible with their aims.[[432]](#footnote-432) *Studies* could draw together and forge links between the ‘various independent individuals and groups’ which constituted the movements.[[433]](#footnote-433)

With the time of the move fast approaching however, Hakim’s attitude soured. Having faced criticism over her insistence that the journal inform its readers of the news, if only to put a stop to the rumours of an ideological split among the editors, she was then rebuked for her overly familiar relationship with contributors – Hakim was a prolific correspondent – and told to adopt a more business-like tone.[[434]](#footnote-434) ‘Mike [Lebowitz] and I objected to this’, she explained to Muriel Haynes Adams. ‘*Studies* is not like a formal journal… [And] the development of the journal in the radical mainstream…required more than the formal business letters.’[[435]](#footnote-435) With Martin Sklar taking a sabbatical in California, and James Weinstein spending his days in the Wisconsin Historical Society undertaking research, it had fallen on Hakim to run the journal ‘single-handedly’ from 1960-1962.[[436]](#footnote-436) ‘I handled most of the manuscript correspondence, and….with out of town associates…all of the editing as well as co-ordinating the proof-reading, hooking and most of the following through with the cover artists, all of the notes to readers and advertising, and all of the promotional work.’[[437]](#footnote-437) Having functioned as the ‘anchor-man’, she had felt from the very start that her fellow editors were functioning in an ‘immature and unprofessional way, her efforts to promote the journal treated with ‘hostility…derision…passivity and indifference…Whatever I did for the journal was what I “freely chose to do, and was not, to their minds, necessary.’ [[438]](#footnote-438)

After the return of Martin Sklar to Madison had been more equitably shared, but most of the editors continued to give very little time to the journal; ‘they read manuscripts…but apart from certain interests in history, they made no real effort to go out after people or material.’[[439]](#footnote-439) James Weinstein had taken over the ‘psychological leadership, the business-management, and the title of co-ordinator, which in a ‘shadow way’ Hakim kept up with most of the ‘substantive tasks.[[440]](#footnote-440) Feeling that the radical intellectual community she had worked to build in Madison had been subsumed by an overtly political focus towards building a new party-like structure, saw little hope for *Studies* if it continued to renege on its founding principles. The journal would descend to the level of ‘radical rag’, an organ for a few power personalities, to which people would contribute not out of a sense of united effort and endeavour to get to the truth of things, but just to the opportunistic end of getting published.[[441]](#footnote-441) It was ‘the same old story of the betrayal of the intellectuals’, she reflected to Hal Orbach, ‘of a certainly…mentality and need to be self-serviant, sans principles and values.’[[442]](#footnote-442) Why hadn’t she taken a stronger stand, she wondered; partly because that in the small community of Madison, the sense of ‘all being chums’ had been stronger, and one could concern oneself with the job to be done, without analysing the ‘underlying dynamics and ramifications…I failed to distinguish between real and ideal potentiality.’[[443]](#footnote-443)

In its remaining years of publication,James Weinstein gradually came to exert full control over *Studies* - ‘I…captured *Studies on the Left’* he admitted to the *Village Voice* in late-1966 - while Hakim briefly toyed with forming another journal.[[444]](#footnote-444) ‘Different people…have half-kidding, half-joking, but more than half-serious, mentioned starting another magazine’, she wrote to Harold Orbach, ‘not to rival *Studie*s but to be more creatively critical. It turns out that half the intellectuals in New York are and have been thinking about founding one sort of journal or another.’[[445]](#footnote-445) Such a journal would provide a platform for ‘intellectual and cultural exiles’ who lacked a forum ‘on which to stand.’[[446]](#footnote-446) She spent the remainder of the 1960s teaching ‘esoteric’ courses in European philosophic literature at the New School, as well as the City University as an instructor on its SEEK program, as well as contributing articles to *The Nation* and *Salmagundi.*[[447]](#footnote-447) In the 1970s, she turned her hand to playwriting, including *Eliphant and Flamingo Vaudeville* (1972) and *A Lesbian Play for Lucy*.[[448]](#footnote-448) Reflecting on the alienation that she had felt around her in the 1960s, Hakim would later suggest that ‘nihilism’ was the virus of the twentieth century, evident among ‘the poor and disinherited’ students that she taught on the SEEK courses, and among the open admission students she would later teach at Queens College. Witnessing true alienation caused her to further turn against those who had made alienation ‘chic’ whilst themselves retaining the safety net of the world of elite art and culture.[[449]](#footnote-449)

Years later, Hakim assessed that *Studies* shouldforfeit its claim to having strengthened the American intelligentsia.[[450]](#footnote-450) In failing to reconcile its editors’ defensive attempt to prove that left-wingers could be good scholars, its desire to analyse American history with up-to-date left-wing theories, and in its commitment to radical socio-cultural analysis, it had reneged on its promise to creating a new intellectual and cultural *politique.* Rather, it had succumbed to the allure of political expediency, ‘failing to stand against the half-formed, demi-intellectual’s scorn for the intellectual’s outsider role and commitment to subtle and complex analyses.’[[451]](#footnote-451) Thus, did it contribute to the sowing of the seeds of an anti-intellectual’s nihilism among the student class?’[[452]](#footnote-452) Having set out to build an intellectual community, *Studies* had devolved to the status of a journal to which individuals contributed to for academic prestige.

The Myth of Community

Several attempts have been made to assess the nature of the community encompassing *Studies on the Left* and its milieu, forming a contested narrative. In the immediate aftermath, both Martin Sklar and James Weinstein admitted that the journal had a huge impact on the left in Madison and beyond. *Studies*, Sklar explained, had drawn people to the left ‘who otherwise would have thought that the left didn’t represent any substantial body of thought.[[453]](#footnote-453) In *For a New America*, an edited collection of articles from the journal, Weinstein and David Eakins eulogised that *Studies* had helped to revive radical scholarship in the United States, and had helped to create a new ‘radical understanding of American political economy.’[[454]](#footnote-454) On the other hand, Saul Landau lamented the fact that it had been ‘*hard-forme* to read…It did become more movement orientated but it never really got rid of that…pedantic…graduate school quality…But it did become a little more readable.’[[455]](#footnote-455)

The first writer to reflect on the communities that thrived in Madison from the mid-1950s to the early 1970s was Paul Buhle. Inheriting an oral history project from Lee Baxandall in the late 1970s, Buhle sought to chronicle the ‘dialectic between Madison radical thought and practice, seen through the development of an “American radicalism” during the 50s through the 60s.’[[456]](#footnote-456) Buhle had arrived in Madison in 1967 with his journal *Radical America,* formed out of the SDS Radical Education Project. He met with William Appleman Williams, who suggested that he, as *Studies* had done a decade earlier, apply for a Rabinowitz Foundation grant.[[457]](#footnote-457) In many ways the inheritor to *Studies* ‘radical graduate enthusiasm for history’, *Radical America* too offered a socialist strategy whilst urging intellectuals to participate in political activity.[[458]](#footnote-458) Though the two journals shared a critique of the ‘imperial juggernaut’ of Cold War America however, they differed in their heritage – the *Radical America* editors had no lived memory of the Old Left ‘proletarian shibboleths.’[[459]](#footnote-459) Its members shared a small-town Protestant radicalism rather than the ‘New York Jewish ambience’ of *Studies*. Buhle positioned the journal as more sympathetic to underground culture; cartoonist Gilbert Shelton designed *RA Komiks*, a special issue of *Radical America* full of his illustrations.[[460]](#footnote-460)

Believing that earlier anthologies of *Studies* and *Radical America* had set an ‘intellectual slant on everything that happened’ in Madison, to the detriment of any focus on wider cultural milieu, Buhle aimed to bring Madison ‘in from the cold’ as a place of radical ferment’, in the same mould as New York in the 1910s-1930s.[[461]](#footnote-461) ‘With all the words spent on the “New York Intellectuals”, he wrote, there was room for the ‘Madison intellectuals, who went left instead of right, outward to mass history rather than inward to aestheticism and who shaped intellectual politics just as much, if more subtly and (until now) with far less credit.’[[462]](#footnote-462) The Socialist Club and *Studies* had been the closest counterparts to the British New Left of E.P. Thompson, Christopher Hill, and Eric Hobsbawm, movement active academics who had collectively ‘rewritten’ British history. ‘American political activism revived from the Cold War doldrums in the civil rights movement’, he explained. ‘Nowhere but Madison did a fresh burst of *intellectual* energy so clearly mark off a new spirit from the old.’[[463]](#footnote-463)

Published in 1990, *History and the New Left: Madison 1950-1970* offered a combination of testimonies and an appendix of essays. Five former *Studies* editors contributed: Saul Landau, Lee Baxandall, James Gilbert, James Weinstein and Eleanor Hakim. Collectively, Buhle claimed, they showed that the journal had succeeded, amid growing doubts about the welfare state and a ‘long-festering crisis’ in mainstream liberal academia, in creating a public presence for a new history.[[464]](#footnote-464) James Gilbert recalled Weinstein, Hakim, and Martin Sklar as being the most important intellectuals on the left in Madison, each of them representing a different approach to scholarship, that was best captured in their editorials and in the ‘endless discussions’ that took place on campus and in the 602 Club.[[465]](#footnote-465) They were “emigres’ camped in a Siberia dreaming of a better future.’[[466]](#footnote-466) Martin Sklar was a ‘father figure’, remote, but revered intellectually.[[467]](#footnote-467) William Appleman Williams proposed that if one believed that the left of the *Studies* editors had been a New Left, as an opposed to an Old Left, then they been far more central to its development than movement figures such as Tom Hayden and Mario Savio.[[468]](#footnote-468) And Warren Susman stated that *Studies* had existed as ‘a muckracking journal on a higher level’, important simply because it existed, remarkable for its cosmopolitanism, but frustrating for its blocking out of fascinating people and currents on the local scene in its concentration on history.’[[469]](#footnote-469)

Notably absent from the Buhle project was Martin Sklar, who declined to participate, citing misgivings with the proposed list of interviewees, which under-represented women and African Americans, and the fact that Buhle had allowed ‘present-day differences of opinion to determine the selection of authors or interviewees’, most notably in the case of Ronald Radosh, who by that time had moved to the political right.[[470]](#footnote-470) ‘Your list… is rather too monochromatic’, he explained, ‘and more dictated by present-day affinities than by an objective and historically sound approach to understanding and disclosing a past period that was far more richly multifaceted and complexly constituted.’[[471]](#footnote-471) More candid was his response to Jeffry Kaplow, who had sent to Sklar a copy of his own contribution. [[472]](#footnote-472)Admitting his dislike for oral history, he admitted that Kaplow’s account, though ‘charming’, came across as a ‘puff-piece of self-promotive, self-congratulatory, and self-justifying myth making.’[[473]](#footnote-473) The Madison project had been flawed since its inception, existing as a species of ‘ego swinging’ and self-promotive myth making presented as ‘History’ or ‘Memory.’[[474]](#footnote-474) Its thematic conception – ‘the Creation of Radical World Views’ had created a phony ‘mystique’, and could not be counted upon as a piece of serious historical research. The last thing the world needed was more ‘flim-flam romanticising’ about an ill-defined conception of radicalism.[[475]](#footnote-475)

Kaplow defended himself, and the validity of reminiscence, not as a historical record, but as an element from which history could be written, a tool which had to obey the ‘canons’ of the discipline to the extent that it did not contradict the facts that had already been established ‘Is it not history? Is it therefore myth?’ he asked of Sklar. ‘To be myth, it must be demonstrably false… What I wrote is not myth, but simply my version of the truth…My memories, like them or not, trust them or not, respect them or not, what harm is there in them? What I wanted to do was to evoke my feelings, my milieu, my growing-up time.’[[476]](#footnote-476)

A decade later, Sklar had not changed his mind, as is evident in his response to a solicitation from Buhle regarding his biography of William Appleman Williams, in which he expressed concern about the various inaccuracies in Buhle’s account of the origins and the development of *Studies*.[[477]](#footnote-477) As late as 2013, Sklar was reminding people that characterising *Studies* as a ‘William’s student publication’ was another widely circulated myth. ‘Some who years later came to be thought of as Williams students were actually Harrington Students. Most editors were neither, [and] many were not even in history.’[[478]](#footnote-478) He had reason to be irritated, for it was by then a commonly held belief that *Studies* had been created by Williams’s students.[[479]](#footnote-479) Sklar never produced his own analysis of his *Studies* days, perhaps to his own detriment. ‘You have suffered for a very long time for lack of the recognition you deserved’, historian Alfred F. Young wrote to him in 1994.’[[480]](#footnote-480) Such recognition would continue to elude him.

Whether or not *Studies* could have sustained a radical publication as envisaged by Eleanor Hakim in the journals early years is unknown. Writing in his 1968 study of *Partisan Review*, former *Studies* editor James Gilbert spoke of the ‘immense’ importance of the little magazine in the twentieth century as the ‘public birthplace, the homestead, the prison... and the rescue mission’ for new movements in literature and politics. ‘If that function is now somewhat less important, since many writers have joined the universities or found access to large circulation magazines’, he wrote, ‘this development is in some sense due to the success of the little magazine in popularising dissident intellectuals.’[[481]](#footnote-481) In analysing the uses and limits of radical scholarship, critiquing Cold War society and the student movements, and proposing an alternative radical politics, *Studies* came close to matching this description, yet in the split between those editors who envisaged the journal as an intellectual community existing for its own sake, and those who advocated that the journal take a more programmatic approach, we can see the eclipse of the former in favour of the latter. Despite their disagreements over the ultimate purpose of the journal, *Studies,* founded ‘in a living room over a coffee tray’, represents the most deliberate effort made by individuals within the early New Left to cultivate an independent radical voice based on ‘radical’ intellectual principles.[[482]](#footnote-482)

# **Part Two: The Radicalism of Disclosure**

## Chapter Four: Objectivity and Commitment

‘People get used to being pushed around and…led by the nose, especially if there are no compensating rewards’, editor Saul Landau wrote in early 1959, as efforts to launch *Studies on the Left* gathered pace. [[483]](#footnote-483) ‘This is especially true in the academies where the odour is more subtle and delicate. But some of us have more sensitive noses…and we can no longer eat from the tempting but dirty plate offered by academics to their students.[[484]](#footnote-484) Having eaten the same diet offered by ‘high powered academic minds’, the tasting of the ‘forbidden fruit’ of radical scholarship presented them with a frightening choice. They could trade it back in for ‘three squares a day of tried, but not true academia’, or persevere, and endure a barrage of criticism from ‘patriotic’ professors who had ‘everything to lose.’[[485]](#footnote-485) A school of ‘dissenting’ knowledge, Landau felt, could offer a ‘fresh…intellectual reasoned beginning in scholarship…for change, not…[the] status quo, making a start along the road towards the creation of a new body of scholarship.[[486]](#footnote-486) *Studies* could debunk the accusation that socialist scholarship was inferior to ‘traditional’ scholarship, liberating the ‘significant’ work of young graduates from the desk drawers of the academies.[[487]](#footnote-487) Labelled propagandists and inferior scholars, the rehabilitation of socialist scholarship in the public eye would be no easy task, so bound up was the profession in the imperatives of the Cold War.[[488]](#footnote-488)

Published later that year, the first issue of *Studies* echoed this sentiment, its editorial, ‘The Radicalism of Disclosure’, reflecting the anxieties that the editors felt as young scholars, offering the journalas a meeting place, where in spite of philosophical and political differences young radicals could ‘join in their common dissatisfaction…and work harmoniously and creatively toward the future.’[[489]](#footnote-489) Taking aim at academics who used ‘objectivity’ as a way of justifying an acceptance of the status quo, they recalled their early education, when they had sought to ‘understand the functioning of the galaxy’, and how the reality of academic study, learning by rote and the replication of traditional, acceptable genres, had rung hollow. ‘Scholarly dispassion’, they proclaimed, ‘is the true medium of the scholar satisfied with (or browbeaten by) things as they are.’[[490]](#footnote-490) As graduate students, they felt a personal stake in academic life, but felt hampered by the intrusion of prevailing standards which acted as an ‘automatic censoring device’, a pretext of ‘objectivity’ that trimmed, deflated, and confined their work.’[[491]](#footnote-491) There was hope, they claimed, for those radical scholars who still pursued their intellectual labour with integrity and commitment might still investigate the origins, purposes and limitations of institutions, and create the means and application of a *reconstruction* of society, if given the opportunity and the space. ‘We hope that the radicalism of what is disclosed’, they declared ‘as it increases and matures, may provide knowledge and theory for the future growth of a radicalism of what is proposed.’[[492]](#footnote-492)

Historians of the United States have long characterised the 1960s as a pivotal moment in the development of their profession. The upheavals of the civil rights movement and the Vietnam War forced a confrontation between older establishment academics and a new generation of ‘radical’ scholars, who in questioning the ‘relevancy’ and ‘truth seeking’ elements of their work, and who offered a fundamental critique of the history and the university as a place of learning. The end of the McCarthyism it is suggested, witnessed the coming of age of a new generation of scholars who rejected the false ‘objectivity’ present in many of the prominent historical texts of the 1950s.[[493]](#footnote-493)

At the centre of this movement for change, Peter Novick and Jonathan Wiener have asserted, were the group of young intellectuals within the orbit of *Studies on the Left*, including editors James Weinstein, Martin Sklar and latterly Eugene Genovese, Staughton Lynd, and their contemporaries Jesse Lemisch, Barton Bernstein, Aileen Kraditor and Christopher Lasch.[[494]](#footnote-494) *Studies* presented, they claimed, a challenge to the belief that history could aspire to a pure objectivity in its calls for young radicals to break down the ikons of established scholarship and produce work that, rather than simply curating facts, would contribute to the development of a new radical politics. It was in Madison, Wiener suggests, that the New Left intellectual community was born; there that the search for a ‘useable past’ that could inspire the creation of a new radical politics led historians to reinterpret recent American history as an era of ‘corporate liberal’ ascendency, characterised by the use of expansionary foreign policies to secure markets abroad and the pursuit of a liberal political economy at home.[[495]](#footnote-495) The maintenance of this status quo, they believed, was supported by a coalition of an increasingly sophisticated corporate sector, co-opted union leaders, and successive government administrations, which ceded to the passage of labour reforms as a means of shoring up a hegemonic liberalism against socialism on one side, and market fundamentalism on the other.[[496]](#footnote-496)

Attracting criticism from conservative academics who criticised their work as being plagued by ‘present-mindedness’ – warping the past to explain contemporary bias – and young radicals who demanded that academics produce work that was relevant to current political concerns, the work of the *Studies* editors and their circle divided the profession.[[497]](#footnote-497) In return however, these academics offered an interpretation of history which rejected the present-mindedness they perceived in the ‘consensus’ interpretation of American history.[[498]](#footnote-498) While Novick, Wiener, and many others have charted this narrative of conflict, their accounts have largely sidestepped the role played by *Studies* in shaping the confrontation. As David Brown has hinted, the early 1960s produced a ‘hunger for deviance’, a desire for radical dissent that could create new identities and oppositional subcultures, which demanded the development of schools of historical writing that would ‘rally round their sustaining orthodoxies’, with *Studies* taking the lead in seeking new roads to post-liberal historiography.[[499]](#footnote-499) Kevin Mattson has lamented that earlier attempts at participatory democracy in the 1960s had been ‘crowded out’ by an ascendant conservatism.[[500]](#footnote-500) Though New Left intellectuals had left their mark, he claimed, their work had been cut off from social movements and wider public debates ‘precisely because of their academic nature.’ In the case of *Studies*, the editors’ preparation for academic careers had led them to ‘political acquiescence, or at least a withdrawal from public debate.’[[501]](#footnote-501)

There is, however, a degree of exaggeration in these statements. There was no homogenised New Left School of history; there were marked differences between the work of corporate liberal scholars such as Martin Sklar, James Weinstein David Eakins, neo-Marxist scholars such as Eugene Genovese, and most crucially, ‘New Left’ historians such as Staughton Lynd. Lynd’s attempt to draw links between historic protest movements such as the American revolutionaries and the New Left drew a great deal of criticism, and was poorly received in *Studies.*[[502]](#footnote-502)

In the late 1960s, a third strand of history pioneered by Jesse Lemisch, prompted a shift away from elite history, including the work of the *Studies* editors, and towards ‘History from the Bottom Up’, constituting a ‘necessary’ rebalancing of history away from ‘great white men’, and towards a history of the ‘inarticulate’; the great mass of people who did not ‘leave behind a trail of documents.’[[503]](#footnote-503) In judging the merits and shortcomings of each of these approaches, the *Studies* editors played a key advocacy and dissemination role during the 1960s, a key decade in the development of the historical profession.

In order to understand the complicated relationship that the *Studies* editors it is necessary then to understand what the *Studies* editors intended in producing their corporate liberal thesis, and how the broader academic and radical community received it. Considering how the editors came to understand the nature of objectivity and academic freedom as students is vital if we are to understand, the steps they took to define the radical voice within the historical profession, and the resistance they encountered from conservative voices who rejected their work as ahistorical. In doing so, we will assess their impact upon the historical profession and how the differences between their conclusions and those reached by other New Left scholars undermined the notion of a united New Left historiography.

The University of Wisconsin and Academic Freedom

In November 1960, Andrew Hacker hailed *Studies on the Left* as the best of several journals produced by university students to have appeared that year – *New University Thought* (University of Chicago) and *Point Sixty* ( a Philadelphia undergraduate collective) being two other notable examples.[[504]](#footnote-504) *Studies* appeared the most mature; its editors better informed to the intricacies of academia and reality. A Marxist intellectual revolt against ‘mildly liberal, perhaps even conservative’ professors – who had trimmed their ‘ideological sails’ at the height of McCarthyism – had ‘only just begun’, and the *Studies* editors were best placed to offer the 1960s generation a new radical scholarship.[[505]](#footnote-505) In the 1950s, domestic achievements had been described, rather than analysed, as part of a ‘celebration’ of the American system, with historically radical movements redefined as essentially conservative in character.’[[506]](#footnote-506) Influenced by William Appleman Williams and C. Wright Mills, these young scholars were interested, Hacker claimed, in power; ‘racial prejudice, the nuclear arms race and the ‘debasement of culture’ was madness to them.[[507]](#footnote-507) Their hope: that knowledge could change society.[[508]](#footnote-508)

Playing a central role in the development of these attitudes, Hacker felt, was the radical heritage of the University of Wisconsin, whose radical traditions ran deep. It was the ‘the birthplace of Frederick Jackson Turner’s frontier thesis’, and the Wisconsin Idea – the close relationship between the University and the Progressive Party led by the La Follette family. In the early years of the 20th Century, Wisconsin led the way in history and labour economics, and this tradition lived on in the *Studies* editors who were now its custodians. Their commitment to investigating ‘the origins, purposes and limitations of institutions and concepts’ having begun, their ‘coming to power’ would in time impact upon intellectual life in the United States in profound ways.[[509]](#footnote-509)

Hacker’s words were not lost on the editors, who speculated whether radical grassroots were actually growing in the ‘ivory towers’ of the University.[[510]](#footnote-510) This was the ‘age of the middle-class wandering scholar’, Eleanor Hakim explained to Richard Chase, and the editors of *Studies on the Left* had ‘wandered far’.[[511]](#footnote-511) Arriving in Madison, many had been attracted by the ‘remains’ of Wisconsin’s liberal tradition; the intellectual vigour of the History Department, the ‘respectable liberalism’ of Governor Gaylord Nelson, and the *Progressive* magazine.[[512]](#footnote-512)

Founded as a public institution in 1848, and enlarged following state land acquisitions in the 1860s, the University of Wisconsin developed its reputation in the late 19th century as an influx of social scientists began to question many of the assumptions of the dominant *laissez faire* system. Notable among those who relocated to Madison were historians Frederick Jackson Turner, economists Richard Ely and John Commons, and sociologist Edward A. Ross.[[513]](#footnote-513) Collectively, they built the foundations of *The Wisconsin Idea*. ‘People moved from the University to State departments and back again with extra-ordinary facility’, Harold Groves claimed, prompting a ‘remarkable…cross fertilisation of ideas’.[[514]](#footnote-514) Perhaps best demonstrating this phenomenon was the work of John Commons, whose legislative career was crowned by his work on constitutional labour legislation, published in 1916 as *Principles of Labor Legislation.[[515]](#footnote-515)*

The integration of the social sciences into the existing University structure was not a smooth process. As faculty members began to produce conclusions that contradicted the existing social orthodoxy, a backlash ensued from the Board of Regents, who took offense to the ‘radical’ statements emanating from their classrooms. In 1894, Richard Ely was accused by Oliver Wells, the Wisconsin Superintendent of Public Education, of being a socialist, who had encouraged ‘attacks upon life and property.’[[516]](#footnote-516) Having fought to hire him as the head of the University’s new graduate economics program, President Charles Kendall Adams defended Ely, asserting the institutions commitment to academic freedom. Ely’s friends launched a nationwide publicity campaign, and successfully defended him against the charges in a *mock* trial. Though he revised his political opinions in the years following the incident, Ely defended the rights of other academics to speak their mind and encouraged the University to employ professors who had been dismissed from posts at other institutions. This included his two protégés, John Commons, who had spoken out on economic issues at Syracuse, and sociologist Edward A. Ross, a sociologist forced to resign from a high-ranking position at Stanford.[[517]](#footnote-517)

The legacy of the hearing upon the university was substantial. The 1910 graduating class gifted the University a bronze plaque which quoted a key portion of a statement released by President Adams following the hearing, which pledged that regardless of conditions elsewhere, at the University of Wisconsin, ‘investigators’ should be ‘free to follow the indications of truth wherever they my lead’, through a continual process of ‘sifting and winnowing’ for the truth. Initially reluctant to accept the gift, believing that it held some ulterior political motive, it was only two years later that the Board of Regents finally accepted the plaque, whereupon it was placed in the basement of the Main Hall. It was a further two years until the plaque was installed in its prominent location at the front of Hall following a direct plea to University President Charles Von Hise on the occasion of their fifth anniversary reunion.[[518]](#footnote-518)

In the decades which followed, University faculty frequently collaborated with students to defend the University when it was criticised for its ‘radical’ activities, even going as far as to instigate a travel fund for students so that they could travel across the state, defending the University under the auspices of the Public Relations Committee.[[519]](#footnote-519) In the post-war era, as the University began to expand, loosening the bond between academics and students, yet the university continued to support academic freedom for faculty members and its students.[[520]](#footnote-520) This became evident in the post-war relaxation of the policies for inviting speakers from off-campus; before WWII student groups had to get official permission from the University, in order to protect the university from public criticism, and to protect students from being swayed by demagogues and ideologues, with the University President at times reviewing applications personally.[[521]](#footnote-521) In 1949, the University Board of Regents revised the ‘sifting and winnowing’ statement to address contemporary discussions of ‘the future of human society’ and the role of the University in critically studying the ‘proposals and claims’ of ideologies deemed alien to the United States, emphasising the right of free enquiry, but also of the obligation of the institution to continue teaching the foundations of the ‘American way of life, economical political and social, and the entire cultural life it makes possible.[[522]](#footnote-522)

There were occasional controversies, which prompted debate about whether the revision had been appropriate. In 1952, an invitation made by the Labour Youth League (LYL) to Abner Berry of the communist *Daily Worker* prompted controversy, and four years later, Commander G.E.Tipple of the Wisconsin American Legion demanded that the Student Life and Interest Committee (SLIC) ban the LYL, and that the University library be audited for subversive texts.[[523]](#footnote-523)

In 1962, the Wisconsin Socialist Club – of which many of the *Studies* editors remained members, was heavily reprimanded for its ‘invitation’ of Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev to speak on campus. Later in the decade, as the *Daily Cardinal* became more activist in character, two rival newspapers were founded; the *Badger Herald,* set up by more conservatively minded students, and the *Wisconsin Week,* sponsored by the University administration.[[524]](#footnote-524) Such incidents aside however, enough of the University’s radical tradition survived for the *Studies* editors to understand that the Madison campus, and particularly the History Department, was a place where political expression was provided a degree of protection from the ravages of McCarthyism.

The Smoking Room of History

The History Department of the University of Wisconsin-Madison during the 1950s has attained the status of folklore.[[525]](#footnote-525) Prominent activist faculty members included George Mosse, an émigré German active in the reform wing of the Wisconsin Democratic Party and communicator of the ‘key values, images, secrets’ of what it meant to be an intellectual of the left.[[526]](#footnote-526) William B. Hesseltine, a Civil War scholar and sponsor of the pacifist monthly *Liberation,* had opposed President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s foreign policy in the lead up to the Second World War.[[527]](#footnote-527) Both Merle Curti and Howard K. Beale were vocal proponents of academic freedom.[[528]](#footnote-528) Admirers of Charles Beard, the Progressive historian and founder of the New School of Social Research, Curti and Beale defended Beard when, in the 1950s, his scholarship was critiqued for abandoning the ‘objectivist dream’ in favour of ‘modern and sceptical relativism.’ [[529]](#footnote-529) Following his death in 1948, Curti considered writing a biography of Beard, though this failed to materialise following complications with his widow Mary.[[530]](#footnote-530)

Following the end of WW2, Curti became increasingly critical of American foreign policy, and like Beard, was attacked from within the historical profession for his refusal to lend support to the Cold War.[[531]](#footnote-531) In 1952, he offered a direct response to Samuel Eliot Morison’s earlier denunciation of Beard, speaking in favour of relativism and presentism, which he viewed as being realistic and pragmatic approaches by which history could be conceptualised. Two years later, he used his annual speech as President of the American Historical Association (AHA) to rail against scholarship, which abandoned objectivity to reflect the ideological imperatives of the fight against Soviet Communism.[[532]](#footnote-532) On campus, he opposed the shift in alignment of University priorities to those of the Government, which favoured research with practical application of the biological and natural sciences, over the acquiring of knowledge in the social sciences and humanities. Those latter disciplines, Curti felt, were vital to helping the public navigate and increasingly complex world.[[533]](#footnote-533)

Like Curti, Howard K. Beale was a vocal opponent of the Cold War, and the influence of the Government policy on campus. Following WW2, Beale believed, the United States had neglected the aspirations of developing nations and had taken the side of dying imperialism. Desperate to improve conditions in their own countries, leaders of Third-World countries had adopted the most appealing programme available to them, and Western powers had handicapped themselves by failing to refute their imperialist image.[[534]](#footnote-534) ‘We place too much emphasis on force in combatting this revolution…if we don’t bestir ourselves, a considerable portion of the world will go Communist without a gun being fired. In the battle of ideas, Beale stated, America had chosen to depend on military might, and had let the Communists win the people on faith in their ideas. American had to require a focus in spreading Christianity and democracy.[[535]](#footnote-535) ‘If we have it, the Communists will wither away before our superior ideas.’[[536]](#footnote-536) If forced to sign loyalty oaths, professors could not discover and publish new truths, important to human progress, or maintain the self-respect and morale necessary to good teaching. Moreover, if students were forced to undertake mandatory ROTC training, then that would violate the effort to mould independently minded citizens, given that the purpose of the armed services was to teach men to act with unquestioning obedience to authority.[[537]](#footnote-537) ‘It is not the function of the state or the University’, he explained in the Daily Cardinal, ‘to provide for the national defence.’[[538]](#footnote-538)

A long-time member of the American Civil Liberties Union, Beale was best known academically for his 1936 report *Are American Teachers Free?* An 855-page opus focusing on the limits which schools placed on teachers’ freedom of speech, manners, and conduct.’[[539]](#footnote-539) He joined Curti in defending Eliot Morrison in a 1953 polemic, ‘The Professional Historian: His Theory and Practice’, which criticised the dull and esoteric scholarship of his peers who had acquiesced to the practice of only ‘approved’ scholars being allowed access to important documents; critical analysis had been abandoned as the price of admission.[[540]](#footnote-540) Censorship of this kind, he stated, made a mockery of the objective method.[[541]](#footnote-541) On campus, Beale brought his activism to bear by debating William F. Buckley, and participating in ‘Academic Freedom Week’ events.[[542]](#footnote-542) ‘I am not convinced’, he explained in one article, ‘that you can get subversives with loyalty oaths’, for many idealists had joined and then dropped out of the organised left since the 1930s, returning to a ‘normal, useful life’ after a brief flirtation with radicalism.[[543]](#footnote-543)

Having served as the leader of Beale’s discussion groups, it is likely that *Studies* editor Martin Sklar learned much from this elder statesman.[[544]](#footnote-544) Having set up a branch of the American Association of University Students for Academic Freedom (AAUSAF), Sklar wrote in defence of the LYL stating that only united action by all students against calculated attacks in the name of spreading of democracy could avoid the destruction of the University ‘as envisaged by the Wisconsin Idea.’[[545]](#footnote-545) Many academics, he felt, were diverting their choice of subject matter and analysis towards ‘safe’ channels of inquiry, to avoid possible organisation.[[546]](#footnote-546) Sociologists produced ‘minute studies in depth’, economists built ‘carefully constructed abstractions’, and philosophers buried themselves in ‘the technique of procedure’; such was the ‘rot’ that an entirely new ‘intellectually reasoned’ understanding of the past and present was required, one capable of a comprehensive and independent re-evaluation of the current state of the nation.[[547]](#footnote-547)

Focusing on those ‘few synthesising minds’ whose conclusions had been ‘cast into limbo’, Sklar demanded that the University move beyond mere data-collection and self-congratulation and pursue a ‘knowledge and understanding of social development.’[[548]](#footnote-548) Surviving ‘on the fringes of academic respectability’, work such as that by C. Wright Mills had been retarded by the pressures of the Cold War campus.[[549]](#footnote-549) Their work may even be censored from some college reading lists’, Sklar stated, ‘but their effect has been made even if it was indirectly brought to the students through the work of others.’[[550]](#footnote-550) Students were demonstrating against the Velde, Jenner, and McCarthy investigations, he explained in the *Daily Cardinal*, because they did not believe that membership of the Communist Party was grounds to judge an individual’s competence to teach; accusations could not be ‘waved around as an insult; they had to be substantiated.[[551]](#footnote-551)

Outside of the History Department, sociologist Hans Gerth was similarly predisposed to academic freedom. A refugee from Nazi Germany with connections to the Frankfurt School of Social Research, Gerth was influenced by the interdisciplinary Marxist research undertaken there, which focused on the role of social theory as a critical tool to emancipate the individual from oppressive social structures. He made a modest career translating Max Weber into English, often in collaboration with his graduate students C. Wright Mills and Don Martindale; Weber, he thought, was one of the last professors to combine ‘detached contributions to science’ with a role within the intellectual political vanguard, fighting against ‘the Treitschke’s’ who used cloistered academic halls as forums for political propaganda at a time when political and religious beliefs might block an individual from academic employment.[[552]](#footnote-552) Influencing successive generations of students, Gerth was reinvigorated by the socio-political action of the early 1960s, and for a time acted as a father figure to the *Studies* editors.[[553]](#footnote-553) ‘He was more than a teacher’, Eleanor Hakim wrote, ‘he was a personification of modern sociocultural history – an exile mentor figure with whom we could identify.’[[554]](#footnote-554)

It was not only the editors who recognised the value of the University and the History Department as an influence for the journal. Martin Bronfenbrenner, a former lecturer at the University, heralded their efforts as a revival of the values of an earlier age. It was ‘high time, he explained, that Wisconsin liberalism revived itself, admitting his shame at not having accomplished something similar during his time at the University. ‘In [that] period…it had degenerated into worship at the shrines of the prevailing labor skates – meaning [Jimmy] rather than [Walter] Reuther. I presume the revival owes more to [William Appleman] Williams in History and Hans Gerth in sociology than to any of my fellow economists’.[[555]](#footnote-555) Similarly, Don Bray praised the editors for their radicalism at a time when anxiety of being overlooked for federal grants had diluted the quality of intellectual discourse in American universities. ‘The behavioralists, it now seems abundantly clear, say the kinds of things which college presidents, foundation executives, and State Department officials want said. In the social sciences, ‘objectivity’ has become the refuge of the unimaginative, the timid, and the kept.’[[556]](#footnote-556) As a graduate student in the Department of English at Madison, Eleanor Hakim herself had expressed her concerns about the quality of scholarship and of teaching techniques, which appeared to function ‘in a time-space vacuum’, where literary technique was studied ‘in and of itself without being related back to the work as a whole, and without relating the work to life and reality.’[[557]](#footnote-557)

Having expressed their dissatisfaction at the limits of inquiry set by Cold War imperatives in their opening editorial, the editors, in an article written by David Eakins, rebuked in detail the ‘false objectivity’ of the Consensus School’ in ‘Objectivity and Commitment’. No scholar, he admitted, would go as far as to claim that objectivity had been ‘immaculately conceived…or that it arose in an academic vacuum’, however, in the experience of the editors, the concept had received an ‘intense buffeting’ in the ‘political and ideological’ battles of the Cold War.[[558]](#footnote-558) Those on the left in particular had suffered at the hands of the centrist and conservative scholars who used objectivity as a ‘delimiting or negative device’ to discredit Marxist scholarship; objectivity, meaning the ‘honest use of evidence’, had been used as an excuse to investigate, and sometimes blacklist, academics from the academy.[[559]](#footnote-559) Some of the finest and most enduring scholarship, Eakins pressed, had originated from ‘clearly committed’ scholars from the left, whilst some of the dullest and most inconsequential work in circulation had originated from scholars who declared themselves politically ‘neutral’.[[560]](#footnote-560) For either the committed, or neutral, scholar, objectivity and academic freedom were two parts of an important whole, and left or Marxist scholars were entitled to an equal stake in the academy.[[561]](#footnote-561)

‘Objectivity and Commitment’, Andrew Hacker declared, represented a significant contribution to the scholarly debate about objectivity. If anti-Marxists unanimously concluded that true freedom was to be found in the United States, how could they claim that they had reached that conclusion ‘unhampered by preconceptions’, when the ‘objective sorting of evidence’ by ten thousand historians and social scientists had resulted in an unanimous verdict that freedom could be found ‘in his own backyard.’[[562]](#footnote-562) Eakins had rightly noted that Marxist theories of society were far more ‘varied and many-sided’ than the economic determinism attributed to him in the United States, and it was evident that the *Studies* editors had displayed intellectual capacities far removed from earlier generations of Stalinist apologists.[[563]](#footnote-563) Unlike *New Left Review* (NLR) which offered radical prescriptions and solutions to social problems, *Studies* appeared to peter out ‘in a surge of Jeffersonian nostalgia for…the days of the sturdy yeoman farmers… [and] for a world of competitive small business.’[[564]](#footnote-564) If the *Studies* editors wished to continue in NLR’s stead, Hacker concluded, they would soon have to make a further commitment to socialism.[[565]](#footnote-565)

The editors however, seemed no more reassured even after they had so vocally raised their concerns. At the very moment when they were most needed by society, they explained, great numbers of intellectuals were continuing to neglect their responsibilities toward society; they had marched off in the other direction, substituting critical inquiry for scholarly taxonomy and pragmatic archivism – ‘detailed and minute studies’ – whilst claiming to hold the monopoly on ‘objectivity’.[[566]](#footnote-566)

The ‘mass centre’ of acquiescing liberals, moderates, and conservatives, had for too long applied harsher standards of objectivity to the left than even the far right, with even a cursory coverage of socialist thought having disappeared from most university reading lists; any deviation from accepted positions on the Korean War, American foreign policy, and free enterprise had been silenced.[[567]](#footnote-567) Even existing radical scholars appeared more interested in defending their past activities than escaping the tyranny of compartmentalisation.[[568]](#footnote-568) ‘The fight against phantom historical objectivity’, Eleanor Hakim explained’, was a fight against establishment efforts, abetted by White House liberal intellectuals…to form a ‘monolithic ideology of Peace and War’ which labelled dissent as subversive’ and led the nation ‘down a suicidal path’, towards a ‘Festung America’.[[569]](#footnote-569) At least however, young historians were realising the futility of the search for a *phantom* objectivity in favour of making a commitment to radical scholarship.[[570]](#footnote-570)

The editors were under no illusion that theirs was a minority opinion within the academy, or that being associated with *Studies* might have repercussions on their careers. Writing to Martin Sklar, sociologist James Vander Zanden passed up the opportunity to subscribe to the journal, not least because of its Communist connections making it ‘a little “hot” for an academic working in the South to touch.[[571]](#footnote-571) Admitting his lack of interest in reform - ‘the world is the world as it is’ - Vander Zanden claimed that he had made peace with things as they were in an attempt to ‘strive’ for happiness. ‘I love teaching and my students are very responsive’, he explained. ‘I have a good job; I feel I can express myself freely and uninhibitedly…My stuff has been accepted on the basis of its scholarship and I have no gripes whatsoever.’[[572]](#footnote-572)

Suggesting that Sklar might find satisfaction in the same, he suggested that a ‘good many gripes’ that ‘leftists’ had about having their work rejected by established journals, rested in part, on the poor quality of their scholarship. ‘It is also my opinion that some of the work of yours that I have seen would make established journals. If you find satisfaction in what you are doing, good. If not, try something else that you think might.’[[573]](#footnote-573) Such rejections aside, *Studies* attracted a following among young academics, who in looking to make a commitment to radicalism, had made stands in favour of academic freedom, and in some instances, had paid the price.

Defending Young Scholars

Though the glare of McCarthyism upon the academy never gain did reach the heights of the early 1950s, in the 1960s, academics and intellectuals of the left still attracted suspicion from university governing bodies and from the Government.[[574]](#footnote-574) The connection between political unacceptability and academic competence, David Eakins noted, had first appeared in 1948, when a number of Communist professors were expelled from the University of Washington, in spite of the fact that no accusations of ‘unfitness’ to teach had been brought forward.[[575]](#footnote-575) Subsequent cases investigated by the Association of American University Professors found that political affiliations rather than ‘objectivity’ concerns had been the core reason for the dismissals.[[576]](#footnote-576)

Into the 1960s, universities continued to target young academics, who without tenure, could easily be despatched from their positions if they attracted controversy. Why was it, ‘as a general rule’, Eleanor Hakim asked Robert Scheer, that university faculty members lagged behind students when it came to partaking in political activities.[[577]](#footnote-577) ‘To what extent…had McCarthyism survived?’[[578]](#footnote-578) Hoping to address the harassment and dismissal of political active faculty members around the country, Hakim secured an interview with Richard Drinnon, a Fulbright Scholar and faculty member at the University of California History Department, who had been denied an expected promotion by his Review Committee, who claimed that his forthcoming book on early twentieth century radical Emma Goldman lacked scholarly merit.[[579]](#footnote-579) The decision flew in the face of Drinnon’s reputation as a popular lecturer, although one who courted controversy on and off campus; his class ‘A Critical View of American History’ had emphasised a negative view of American history since 1776; and he was a strident critic of HUAC, bomb-testing, and capital punishment.[[580]](#footnote-580)

In accepting to help, Scheer admitted that other factors might have played a part in Drinnon’s case. Academics at the University of California, he claimed, were pressured to publish, and the effect that this had on the lives of young scholars was profound. Some rented apartments ‘close to the campus’ so that precious movements were not lost ‘running up to their houses in the hills.’[[581]](#footnote-581) With one uncompleted manuscript on a topic which most historians did not take seriously, it did not matter how good a teacher Drinnon was, or whether he had taken unpopular political stands (other employees in the History Department had taken ‘wild stands’ on the recognition of China, East Germany, and the ROTC); he simply not been prolific enough.[[582]](#footnote-582)

Drinnon had been converted to radicalism after reading Vernon Parrington’s *Main Currents in American Thought* whilst studying at Willamette University. Believing that the University had a responsibility to defend its members from attack, he lamented that fact that the nation was experiencing a ‘flight’ from academic freedom. Junior faculty members were particularly vulnerable to attack, their senior colleagues advising them to ‘bury themselves in the stacks’ and to churn out journal articles, remaining silent on academic and political matters until their gained tenure, by which time, they might have reconciled themselves to the system, bought a house, and had a family.[[583]](#footnote-583) Under these conditions, their work cultivated an abstract intellectualism, written according to the demands of ‘publish or perish’.[[584]](#footnote-584) ‘You have in the universities’, Drinnon explained, ‘a business school mentality which sees the business relationship as the only real one in society…We must cry for the need of utopias in a time when survival itself has become a utopia.’[[585]](#footnote-585) It was only the dissenting historian, confronting the smug and complacent middle classes, who could ‘understand the turbulence beneath the apparently calm surface’, and identify the causes of the alienation which had frequently shattered America’s composure.[[586]](#footnote-586)

Published by University of Chicago Press, Richard Drinnon’s *Rebel in Paradise: The Biography of Emma Goldman* was provided a positive review in *Studies* following its release. Drinnon’s case proved inspirational to the editors, who pledged to further examine ‘the place of the intellectual of conscience’ in the increasingly ‘corporatized’ university system.[[587]](#footnote-587) Their next opportunity came in November 1962, when Samuel Shapiro, an Associate Editor of *Studies* and Assistant Professor of History at the Oakland campus of Michigan State University was informed that his offer of a contract renewal (that would result in him being offered tenure) was being withdrawn. Unlike Drinnon, there appeared no outward indication of dissatisfaction with Shapiro’s performance. His articles had appeared in *The New Republic,* the *Economist*, and *Commentary*, and though they were critical of United States foreign policy towards Cuba, he had denounced the country as being a Communist dictatorship and police state. In response, University Dean George Matthews had claimed that Shapiro’s work was ‘on a level with journalism’, rather than the scholarship befitting of a man worthy of tenure.[[588]](#footnote-588)

Defending Shapiro, the *Harvard Crimson* stated the peculiarity of the case; Shapiro had been effectively dismissed, even though he was one of only five of sixty Oakland History Faculty members to have published a book, a biography of Richard Henry Dena.[[589]](#footnote-589) ‘If a scholarly work means that it must be so obscure and pedantic as to be unintelligible, we see little merit in scholarship.’[[590]](#footnote-590) ‘If Shapiro is a journalist, then so is Harvard Professor Arthur Schlesinger Jnr, who wrote *The Age of Jackson* and is published in *Reporter* magazine.’[[591]](#footnote-591)The issue, the *Studies* editors wrote, cast an interesting light on the ‘publish or perish’ maxim, and raised questions regarding which subjects were suitable for intellectual inquiry, and which are deemed ‘unworthy of such devotion.’[[592]](#footnote-592)

Further cases demonstrated the care and sensitivity young academics had to practice in their public statements. During the 1965 National Teach-in, Eugene Genovese, by that time an editor of *Studies,* propelled himself to national attention, and to the centre of the race for Governor of New Jersey, when he stated that American foreign policy was ‘crude, rational and predatory’ and that he welcomed the ‘impending Vietcong victory’.[[593]](#footnote-593) Republican Party challenger publicly demanded that incumbent Democratic Party Governor Richard J. Hughes pressure Rutgers University to oust Genovese from its History Department. Though Genovese made it clear that he was not a member of any political organisation, and that he respected personal liberty, the campaign gathered momentum, with former Vice President Richard Nixon supporting the removal campaign in the *New York Times.*[[594]](#footnote-594) ‘If the war in Vietnam is lost and the victory of the Communists which Professor Genovese says he “welcomes” becomes inevitable’, Nixon claimed, ‘ the right of free speech will be extinguished throughout the world.[[595]](#footnote-595) Genovese later signed the ‘Writers and Editors War Tax Protest’ pledge, refusing to pay any Vietnam related tax surcharge.[[596]](#footnote-596)

The following year, the Rutgers Board of Regents was awarded the Meiklejohn Award for Academic Freedom by the American Association of University Professors, in light of their conduct during the Genovese affair.[[597]](#footnote-597) ‘What are its ground rules’, Ronald Radosh asked of academic freedom.[[598]](#footnote-598) ‘What if any, are its limits? Does an instructor, particularly one employed by a State university, have the right to favour the victory of an opponent in times of war?’[[599]](#footnote-599)

This question of limits was tested firstly by Jesse Lemisch, a friend of the journal, and subsequently by *Studies* editor Staughton Lynd. A first-term Assistant Professor at the University of Chicago, Lemisch was refused tenure in the autumn on 1966, prompting a range of protests including the formation of an ad-hoc committee, a public meeting with the Chair of the History Department attended by 200 students, and handbills distributed by the local branch of Students for a Democratic Society.[[600]](#footnote-600) Lemisch accused the University of impeding the growth of knowledge by self-selecting what it thought was scholarly, defining as ‘nonsense, what is to be weeded out.’[[601]](#footnote-601) Radical scholars had to oppose authority, deference and hierarchy both in the classroom, and in the professional association.[[602]](#footnote-602)

A Faculty member at Yale, Lynd was rejected tenure as a consequence of his political activities, most notably a trip made to Vietnam with Tom Hayden and Herbert Aptheker.[[603]](#footnote-603) Before joining the Editorial Board of *Studies*, Lynd had outlined to Eleanor Hakim his belief that radicals had to enter the mainstream of scholarly discussion as much as possible.[[604]](#footnote-604) and that good work, however iconoclastic, could get published as long as it was of equivalent quality to mainstream academia…My hope…is just that the student never be encouraged to despise the scholarly apparatus, but rather to…go beyond the pigeon-hole monograph and dry-as-dust style to write vividly about basic matters which passionately interest him.’[[605]](#footnote-605) At odds with the university system, Lynd increasingly decried the ‘upward scramble’ of the academic career path as an instrument to produce middle class men shacked from political activism.[[606]](#footnote-606)

The effect of these cases, the editors concluded, were wholly negative; universities, Eugene Genovese argued, had to reject the role that had been placed upon them by their special institutional arrangements with the military, big business and the CIA as ‘cadre training schools’.[[607]](#footnote-607) The tradition of academic freedom was still important, as was the ‘myth’ of the ‘community of disinterested scholars.’[[608]](#footnote-608) Echoing that sentiment, James Weinstein imagined the utopian university of the future, free of the ‘publish or perish’ mantra, and focused on self-fulfilment rather than knowledge accumulation.[[609]](#footnote-609) Jesse Lemisch agreed; the current system impeded teaching and the pursuit of truth. ‘The ideal of the university as a community of scholars constitutes one of the finest features of the civilisation we inherit from the past’, he explained. ‘If the reality falls far short of the idea, socialists ought to be the staunchest champions of the ideal; they ought to be easily identified as men who advance specific programs for bringing the reality closer to the ideal.’[[610]](#footnote-610) It was in the hands of the radical intellectuals to help remould the academy.

Towards a New Past

As ‘New Left History’ began to be defined as having characteristics independent of mainstream scholarship, it faced the difficult takes of legitimising itself within the profession and defining its purpose to activists. It did this firstly by setting up its own conference of socialist scholars, through the publication of edited collections which focused on new interpretations of history, and by forging a distinct identity within the American Historical Association. A first step was taken in 1965, when Eugene Genovese and his fellow Rutgers academics Lloyd Gardner, Warren Susman and John Cammett formed the Socialist Scholars Conference (SSC) as a platform for left-wing and radical scholars to present their research and to foster scholarly exchange.[[611]](#footnote-611) Intending the conference to be non-political and nonpartisan, the SSC ultimately ran for five years from 1965-1970, growing year on year, but becoming more political as the years passed. Far exceeding expectations, the first conference recorded 870 attendees, a ‘landmark for the American Intellectual Left’ and a ‘brilliant success.’[[612]](#footnote-612)

One of the few weaknesses of the conference, the *Studies* editors claimed, was that it had been overly academic in tone. Not knowing the profile of the attendees, many of the panels had erred ‘on the side of academic caution rather than political boldness’, with those in the audience impatient to hear how the work of the panellists related to struggles in the political sphere.[[613]](#footnote-613) A lecture by Warren Susman on conservatism in the United States was interrupted by an audience member who shouted, ‘If this is the way socialist scholars behave…long live the peasants and the worker.’[[614]](#footnote-614) Elsewhere, a panel discussion between *Studies* editors Staughton Lynd, Eugene Genovese and Norman Fruchter ended in acrimony, with Genovese and Fruchter disagreeing with Lynd over the possibility of the ‘looming domestic crisis’ concluding with a revolution.[[615]](#footnote-615) Though they believed that a non-partisan approach was necessary, the editors believed that future conferences had to engage with broader issues, and to recognise the link between ‘academic and political responsibilities’.[[616]](#footnote-616)

With *Studies* editors taking on substantial roles on the SSC organising committee, subsequent conferences drew in larger numbers, but bore witness to further confrontations between academics and activists.[[617]](#footnote-617) Attaining critical mass in 1967, 3000 participants squeezed into the New York Hilton, prompting the committee to issue a statement reminding attendees that the Conference was not a political vehicle.[[618]](#footnote-618) It didn’t work; during a crowded lecture by Herbert Marcuse on industrial society and youth, Abbie Hoffman jumped on state and demanded that Marcuse stop talking and start smoking.[[619]](#footnote-619)

The incident prompted the organisers to reposition the 1968 conference ‘in a more scholarly and select direction’, moving back to Rutgers in an effort to break with ‘the young loud-mouths.’[[620]](#footnote-620) A reduced turnout however, did not resolve the tension.[[621]](#footnote-621) ‘The general feeling among those in this tendency is two-fold’, James Weinstein explained to libertarian scholar Leonard Liggio.[[622]](#footnote-622) First, ‘[that] the only valuable work intellectuals can do for the movement is to do research on specific problems…Intellectual work in this view is simply a service to activism, not a guide. Second: that the movement had a right to expect intellectual work to be immediately and apparently relevant, a corollary of the first, which leads movement people….to attack every intellectual activity that does not serve as a guide to day to day tactics.’[[623]](#footnote-623) This was ironic, Weinstein noted, considering that those who attacked the SSC were also opposed to the formation with an organised platform.[[624]](#footnote-624)

As ‘New Left’ academics began to publish their research outside the confines of the SSC, others attempted to reconcile their conclusions with what had come before. Irwin Unger, in a major essay delivered during a panel at the 1967 Organisation of American Historians, declared that in the pages of *Studies*, and in the work of Staughton Lynd, significant changes were taking place, as a new generation of intellectuals sought to bring ‘historically native radicalism’ up to date, creating a usable past onto which their ‘resent Cold War fears and frustrations’ could be projected.[[625]](#footnote-625) While it was true that many historians of the middle generation had been influenced by a conservative political bias, most of its scholarship was characterised by neutrality.[[626]](#footnote-626) Most disturbing therefore, was this new generations exaggerated present-mindedness; their work was not ‘enlisted in the good fight’, for objectivity, but governed by ‘the concerns of the outside cultural and political world.’[[627]](#footnote-627)

The paper was cause for much discussion following its publication in the *American Historical Review* later that year. James Weinstein accused Unger of blatantly misstating his views and making him appear ‘simpleminded’, while Eugene Genovese praised William Appleman Williams’ ‘dignified and illuminating response to the paper’ which neutered John Braeman’s ‘shameful exhibition’ during the OAH panel, a performance of ‘breathtaking ignorance…personal slanders, abusive language, and undisguised ideological malice’ towards the New Left.[[628]](#footnote-628) Assuring Weinstein that Unger’s argument was so ‘badly argued’ that it would ‘hardly influence anyone’; Gabriel Kolko suggested that the article had been ‘an excellent advertisement’ for *Studies.*[[629]](#footnote-629)So offended by the article was historian Marvin Gettleman that he circulated a letter of protest to academics. Unger had commended the New Left for its freedom from the confines of ideology, he stated, but had reduced the views of a disparate, amorphous group of historians to a ‘neurotic maladjustment to present day American society, with a compulsion to project that maladjustment back into the past.’[[630]](#footnote-630) When the letter reached Martin Sklar however, it was given a cold reception; it reeked, he admitted to Ronald Radosh, of ‘respectability chasing’ and ‘more scholarly-than-thou’ snobbery.’[[631]](#footnote-631) Rather than composing ‘cry-baby, self-righteous letters of reply’, Unger out instead to be congratulated for opening up the pages of the AHR to New Left historians, giving them the opportunity to write essays that would bring their new historiography to a state of self-awareness and critical self-appraisals. This, Sklar insisted, they would not get from ‘self-edifying and congratulatory jousts’ with elder historians.[[632]](#footnote-632)

What was *also* needed, Sklar was pained to point out, was an analysis of what, if anything, was different about the New Left approach to historiography; on what principles and modes of reasoning was it predicated? Besides difference in commitments, what separated the historical roots, implications and consequences of New Left history from those of centrist and conservative scholars? Such questions could be better answered if a ‘Susman, or a Williams, or a LaFaber, or a Gardner…penned a long essay for publication in the AHR, taking up the issues raised by Unger, as well as other pertinent ones and assessing as well the current “ethical neutrality” or “objectivist” position, which Unger represents, for its ideological content.’[[633]](#footnote-633) What did ‘new radical history’ even mean? ‘This new, new business is tiresome…and…the battle-cry of auto and soap hucksters…The term “radical” I’ve always felt…to be “radically” inept to describe our (or my) thought and to describe anything approaching revolutionary consciousness – ‘radical’ is for the petty bourgeoisie.’[[634]](#footnote-634)

These words of advice went unheeded. The following year, Barton Bernstein published *Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History,* a collection of articles including contributions from *Studies* editors Michael Lebowitz, Staughton Lynd, Lloyd Gardner and Eugene Genovese. This new history, much of it restricted to ‘university monographs, or tucked away in historical journals’ beyond the reach of the public, without constituting a new synthesis, broke with the status quo, offering approaches and interpretation that ‘emphasised the ideological cleavages of the past more than did the historians of the fifties.[[635]](#footnote-635) The following year, a David Horowitz edited collection *Corporations and the Cold War* carried articles by William Appleman Williams, David Eakins and Lloyd Gardner.[[636]](#footnote-636)

The editors also found allies across the ideological divide in the form of libertarian economist Murray Rothbard. Concluding that the New Right, led by William F. Buckley’s *National Review*, had become too wedded to Cold War interventionism, Rothbard sought new intellectual allies who shared his distaste of the Cold War and bureaucratic New Deal style centralisation. In 1965, he established *Left and Right*, a journal designed to forge links between libertarianism and the New Left. Appreciative of William Appleman Williams’s efforts to rehabilitate the legacy of Herbert Hoover, he submitted to *Studies* a review of Albert Romasco’s *The Poverty of Abundance: Hoover, the Nation, the Depression*, as an example of how liberal historians had incorrectly portrayed Hoover as the quintessence of laissez-faire. ‘Romasco accomplishes this’ Rothbard stated, ‘by consistently downgrading Hoover’s extensive use of government action and by playing up his windy voluntarist rhetoric. Unprecedented acts of federal intervention are transmuted…into ‘the new individualism’, ‘cooperative individualism’ and...’ enlightened conservatism.’[[637]](#footnote-637) In association with *Studies* associate Ronald Radosh, Rothbard later published a collection of articles, *A New History of Leviathan*, which included contributions from Williams, Martin Sklar, and David Eakins.[[638]](#footnote-638)

Of the articles published in these three collections, it was Jesse Lemisch’s ‘The American Revolution as seen from the Bottom Up’, which most overtly attempted to outline a new historical synthesis. In questioning the pretentions of historians towards objective social science, Lemisch highlighted the sophisticated attempts made by earlier generations of scholars to generalise the American experience by imposing the values and experiences of a minority elite class demographic universally downward onto society. Their work had influenced a belief that the history of the United States had been marked by consensus and classlessness, foreclosing the idea of conflict. A sympathy for the powerless, Lemisch claimed, would bring historians closer to objectivity through study of societies as they appeared from the bottom rather than from the top, and how the beliefs and conduct of elites affected society.[[639]](#footnote-639) Expanding on these views in an SDS Radical Education Project (REP) pamphlet ‘Towards a Democratic History’, Lemisch proposed that a new form of non-elite scholarship would uncover the radical ideology of the common man. ‘We need a new historiography which starts with a bias which says that history can happen from the bottom up, that the people can often act from good reasons, expressing genuine grievances’, he explained. The task of the radical historian was to seek out an understanding of the complex processes by which ideology was formed.[[640]](#footnote-640)

Critics of Lemisch’s approach accused him of gross delusions. Mistakenly equating ‘democratic’ behaviour with ‘sympathy for the common man’, Lemisch had merely reversed the roles of protagonists in the major events of the revolutionary past; the ‘good guys’ had become the ‘bad guys’ and the bad good, a contrarian technique which replaced ‘the right’s myth of the people as a great beast, with the left’s myth of the people as glorious revolutionaries, a ‘fictive perspective’ of a radical tradition that did not exist.[[641]](#footnote-641) At his worst, Lemisch had looked for a tradition that could sanction the behaviour and outlook of the Harlem riots. ‘A radicalism which refuses to perceive men for what they are’, Joan and Donald Scott stated, ‘which cannot understand how relationships among men operate and change, is doomed from the start. Blind to reality…it imprisons us in a fictive world of our own, out of touch with mankind.’[[642]](#footnote-642)

Lemisch did not disagree with the Scotts in claiming that history was the result of the ‘interaction among real people on top and on bottom of the social order, and that the task of the radical historian was to ‘seek understanding of the complex process by which ideology is formed…the process by which experience and consciousness formed and changed.’[[643]](#footnote-643) ‘Fine words: the Scott’s and I are in total agreement.’[[644]](#footnote-644) The problem was that they, and many others, did not offer any viable method by which historians could explore the ‘connections between the ideology of the inarticulate and their activity.’[[645]](#footnote-645) So long as scholars failed to achieve a detailed history from the bottom up, there would be no true comprehension of what radicalism was; rather it would be based on ‘unproven assertions’.[[646]](#footnote-646) Rather, Lemisch called for a history based on the basic assumption that the articulate had historically acted in a rational manner, and therefore, to assume an occurrence as the Harlem riots had involved ‘mindless violence’ because it did not succeed, or because it was inarticulate.[[647]](#footnote-647)

Much like Lemisch, *Studies* editor Staughton Lynd had searched the past for previously unidentified radical antecedents for the New Left. As early as 1963, he had suggested in *Studies* that the New Left had to overcome its taboo in relation to socialism if it was going to identify a usable past to inform its activities.[[648]](#footnote-648) In confronting this problem, Lynd asserted that the democratic mythos’ of an older radicalism, expressed by Thomas Paine, Henry Thoreau, and the Abolitionists, could help the New Left ‘nurture to maturity the seedling planted…in 1776.’[[649]](#footnote-649) As the ‘custodians of such memories and dreams’, historians could move beyond inclusive research into the past, and help the movement envisage alternative futures ‘on the basis of…our past experience’, prophesying, for example, the variety of likely outcomes in the Vietnam conflict.[[650]](#footnote-650)

In response to his statement, Robin Brooks reviewed Lynd’s *Anti-Federalism in Duchess County* for *Studies*, highlighting that Lynd had failed to prove that the American Revolution had been a period of class conflict. The book highlighted a key dilemma for the New Left, for it raised questions regarding whether the class distinctions in the 18th Century could be compared to those of the 1960s. Though Lynd was correct in refusing to allow the American Revolution to be surrendered to the Consensus School, Brooks concluded that the men who made the American Revolution had nothing directly to say to the New Left of 1963.[[651]](#footnote-651) ‘Their radicalism is not ours, their revolution is not ours! Something of their aims, their methods, and their spirit can be useful to radicals two centuries later, but for the most part we must make our own history’.[[652]](#footnote-652) Eugene Genovese would later plea for the New Left to abandon the search for a monumental history of radical heroes in a review of Lynd’s later work, *Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism.*[[653]](#footnote-653)

Into the later 1960s, New Left historians continued to advocate for ‘activist’ history. At the 1968 New University Conference in Chicago, Lynd proposed that intellectuals should fight ‘academic unfreedom’ by focusing on ‘those problems which are central to the experience of their generation.[[654]](#footnote-654) One possible solution, he claimed, was to maintain a foot solidly off campus, combining activism and intellectual work. Divesting from the ‘bait of tenure’, scholars could overcome the alienation they felt through direct participation within the movement.[[655]](#footnote-655) They could throw ‘fresh light on what it meant to be a radical intellectual, what a university was, and how intellectual function could crystallise out of ‘mindless activism.’[[656]](#footnote-656) Disliking what he had heard, Jesse Lemisch wrote a memo which was quickly distributed around the conference, agreeing that intellectuals could provide the movement with relevant information, but rejecting Lynd’s assertion that historians should produce ‘relevant’ scholarship.[[657]](#footnote-657) ‘Would they be expected to better use their time studying contemporary matters’, he asked. ‘We have been told that’s where it’s at baby, if not in the ivory tower but in slashing professors’ tires, which seems to include all professors who do not adjust their research to the needs of the movement…What kind of enduring left will we have in this country if Left intellectuals feel that they have to apologise for leaving the picket line to go back to the ivory tower.’[[658]](#footnote-658)

The reaction among the *Studies* editors was mixed. James Weinstein and Eugene Genovese believed that the search for a ‘usable past’ rather than an analysis of class dynamics and social forces was marring ‘much of the new Left-wing historiography’ with a crude economic determinism that adjusted ‘historical analysis to immediate political pressures.’[[659]](#footnote-659) Lynd’s contribution to radical historiography, Eugene Genovese declared in an article co-written by Christopher Lasch, had to be evaluated as part of the effort of the New Left to establish a foundation for their political movement. His ‘moral absolutism’ had ‘abrogated the historians’ obligation to objectivity’ and represented a contempt for the intelligentsia.[[660]](#footnote-660) This went a little too far, declared Weinstein; calling Lynd a ‘demagogue’ was not useful, even though he needed to be ideologically smashed.[[661]](#footnote-661)

The two competing conceptions of scholarship came into conflict at the 1969 AHA conference. The previous year, a caucus of radical historians within the AHA had decided to stand Staughton Lynd as President the following year against the official candidate, Robert R. Palmer, and to pass a resolution denouncing the war in Vietnam. In typically combative style, Eugene Genovese denounced the Lynd group as ‘totalitarian’ for attempting to impose the resolution, and urged the association to ‘put them down, put them down hard, and put them down once and for all.’[[662]](#footnote-662) The motion fell, as did the attempt to install Lynd as President.

Following the conclusion of the conference, Jesse Lemisch wrote to James Weinstein, commenting that even within the most ‘aristocratic and deferential’ of professions, radicals could challenge the old-guard, yet had to understand that such actions came with enormous implications.[[663]](#footnote-663) ‘Staughton’s program is basically street history; help the panthers and other extra-professional goals.’[[664]](#footnote-664) Most historians present had viewed the conflict as a confrontation between good and evil’, while young students had likened Genovese’s behaviour to that of’ Chicago Mayor Richard Daley.[[665]](#footnote-665) Weinstein was not impressed. ‘I read Staughton’s piece in *Liberation* on the... meeting and got almost as annoyed with him as I was at Gene’s insanity.’[[666]](#footnote-666) Scholarship, Weinstein felt, was more effective form of political expression for a historian than sit-in protests.[[667]](#footnote-667)

On the final day of the conference, Jesse Lemisch presented a highly anticipated paper entitled ‘Present-Mindedness Revisited’, not knowing that John Higham, himself an early critique of the Consensus school, had already circulated it to the other panellists without informing him.[[668]](#footnote-668) Taking aim at those historians who had attacked present mindedness, yet were guilty of it themselves as a result of the pliant scholarship, Lemisch claimed that it was those on the left who spoken to young intellectuals of the real issues, and of a better world which had ‘not been seen before.’[[669]](#footnote-669) ‘The politics which mainstream historians have admired are unreal and unprincipled; their history has aimed further to insulate those politics from reality’, he claimed.[[670]](#footnote-670) The establishment could fire, expel or jail radical historians for their activism, but the left would continue to present ‘real’ alternatives’ to the academic status quo, and such action undertaken would only cause to expose their own Cold War activism. ‘You cannot call apologetics ‘excellence’, he warned, ‘without expecting the most rigorous and aggressive of scholarly replies.’[[671]](#footnote-671)

Looking back on the presentation, Lemisch wrote of his surprise at addressing a room of 600 and recalled people ‘gasping’ and exclaiming ‘Jesus Christ’, at what he was saying. ‘If the left has made any progress this time’, he wrote to Weinstein, ‘it is in spreading the idea that people can and should do this... I agree that this is not by itself politics, but I think that it’s tremendously important... because of its habit of confronting and challenging.[[672]](#footnote-672) Students, Lemisch claimed no longer believed professors such as William Leuchtenberg, Daniel Boorstin, and Samuel Eliot Morison.[[673]](#footnote-673) Unpublished until the mid-1970s, Lemisch’s piece remains influential among scholarly circles. The concerns raised in his article, which were introduced a decade earlier in the first issue of *Studies on the Left,* demonstrates the influential role that the journal played in propagating the debate about objectivity and presentism within the New Left.

Bringing History Back In

The 1969 AHA conference proved the apex of the confrontation between New Left ‘activists’ and traditional scholars. Into the 1970s, left historians shifted away from confrontations with the historical establishment, and towards regional conferences with mixed attendances, and a job crunch among faculties encouraged AHA members to join labour unions and advocate for legislation to help historians find non-teaching jobs.[[674]](#footnote-674) Identifying as Marxists, both Eugene Genovese and William Appleman Williams went on to serve as Presidents of the OAH. Paying tribute to Williams, who had served as OAH President in 1980, Genovese noted that Williams had been the first socialist historian to lead a major graduate seminar at an American university, enabling him to train young people.[[675]](#footnote-675) In these times, it was still hard for scholars on the left to gain public acceptance. In 1976C. Van Woodward had thought a lengthy battle with the administration at Yale over their decision to invite Herbert Aptheker to teach a one-semester course on W.E.B. DuBois.[[676]](#footnote-676) It was Williams who had ‘cracked [the]…monopoly’ allowing socialists to build up a school of thought that could be perpetuated through the teaching of graduate students.[[677]](#footnote-677)

What had been true of Williams was subsequently true of the *Studies* editors, many of whom attained long standing positions in academia. After teaching at the University of Rochester, Martin Sklar secured an Assistant Professor position at Northern Illinois University with only a Master’s Degree, on the back of endorsements from Williams, Eugene Genovese, Fred Harvey Harrington, and Carl Parrini. Both at Rochester and NIU his seminar groups were renowned for its intensity.[[678]](#footnote-678) In December 2000, he and a few his former students formed the William English Walling Society, and a special conference was organised to honour his contribution to scholarship.[[679]](#footnote-679)

Among the other editors and associates, Lloyd Gardner, Ronald Aronson, Paul Breines, Eugene Genovese, Stanley Aronowitz, David Eakins, Ronald Radosh, and Michael Lebowitz, all went on to teach in universities. Though James Weinstein only taught briefly in England at the University of Warwick, his contribution to scholarship remained respected, and his thinking was influential among the staff of *In These Times*, the socialist newspaper he founded with Martin Sklar in the mid-1970s.[[680]](#footnote-680) Throughout this period, social history - the study of women, workers and minorities became increasingly popular, offered a haven for radically inclined historians.[[681]](#footnote-681) Staughton Lynd remained involved in with New Left organisations into the 1970s, but also gravitated to working class union movements. Intellectuals, he believed, could offer ‘accompaniment’; meaning, individuals with professional skills could live among working-class communities, offering services from their own skill set; in his example those of a historian recording oral history, and subsequently as a labor lawyer. In the mid-1970s, he retrained as a labour lawyer.[[682]](#footnote-682)

A product of the ‘post-*Studies on the Left* generation’, *Radical America,* filled the gap for ‘a radical interpretation of history’ which *Studies* had ‘mostly vacated since its move to New York in 1963.’[[683]](#footnote-683) In contrast to the *Studies* editors however, who had experienced a ‘cordial and intellectually-rewarding relationships with…faculty members’, at the University of Wisconsin, the *Radical America* editors shared more fractious and antagonistic relationships, based on struggles to democratise curricular decisions.[[684]](#footnote-684) More ambivalent to the historical profession and its push towards the production of ‘dry monographs… and patriotic textbooks which didn’t rock the status quo’, as ‘tangible evidence’ of academic merit, ‘usually accessible only to other historians.’ historians… In the constant struggle to advance, the history profession attained an unhealthy atmosphere.’[[685]](#footnote-685) They found much utility in Jesse Lemisch’s ‘bottom-up’ history and supported the Radical Caucus of the AHA as an important vehicle for linking scholarly and political interests.’[[686]](#footnote-686)

Into the 1980s and 1990s, several the *Studies* editors expressed alarm at the domination of new forms of historical writing. Martin Sklar lamented the passing of the grand narrative history in favour of monographs that analysed social groups in isolation. ‘Many historians have taken a utopian point of view in their understanding of U.S. history’, he wrote in 2003, ‘particularly with respect to labour history, the more recent ‘social history’, political history, and capitalism and socialism.’[[687]](#footnote-687) Having co-opted ‘pet’ movements as radical or dissenting, and perennially failed agencies of change, they had erroneously conclude that that American society was irredeemably ‘capitalist’, ‘conservative’, and static. It was the propagation of these views, Sklar believed, that was the truly conservative position.[[688]](#footnote-688) Historians had to ‘Bring History Back In’ as a corrective to history which had ‘depolitised’ history’ in favour of charting the successes of social movements, motivated by an ahistorical allegiance to party, faith-based, or ideological callings.[[689]](#footnote-689) Such ideological privileging among supposedly ‘radical’ historians ignored the fact that history had to account for both ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ studies and matters of the state were as much a social history as any other sector of society. The new social history increasingly lacked an adequate focus on periodisation, of the developmental capitalism, market-class relations, and nation-states, and ignored political, legal, and institutional trends.’[[690]](#footnote-690)

It was a result of these concerns that Sklar joined Eugene Genovese’s new Historical Society.[[691]](#footnote-691) Founded in 1998, the Historical Society was a response to the ‘disarray’ that Genovese had felt within the academy, which cut across political lines from ‘the Marxists left to the traditional right’ and motivated by identity politics: ‘the attempt to impose a particular ideological line and to compartmentalize the work so that it becomes a search for identity and self-expression rather than dealing with objective reality.’[[692]](#footnote-692) Reviewing *Reconstructing History: The Emergence of a New Historical Society*, a collected volume of essays produced by Historical Society members, Peter Novick viewed the American historical profession as presented by the contributors as one ‘in which tolerance, mutual respect, and co-operation have given way to the tyranny of ‘politically correct’ ideologues who shamelessly bend the past to suit their politics.[[693]](#footnote-693)

Noting that many of the contributors were in their sixties and seventies, Novick suggested that the book was an ‘exaggerated response’ to the shift of the professional ethos from one of ‘ironic detachment’ to ‘passionate commitment’, in a profession which had in recent decades, ‘lurched sharply to the left.’[[694]](#footnote-694) Genovese’s claim that professional climate resembled the McCarthyism of the 1960s, with post-modernists taking the place of Communists, was personified in the use of a ‘stick figure called ‘postmodern historian:’ a crazed nihilist who ‘campaigns against efforts to identify clear historical facts of any kind; teaches that there is ‘no way to establish any kind of truth or even accuracy; seeks to liberate us all from the coercive ideas of truth and reality.’[[695]](#footnote-695) In reality, there was little evidence for ‘McCarthyism redux.’[[696]](#footnote-696) As late as 2010, Genovese could be found addressing a Republican Party CPAC, warning of a decline of academic freedom, a ‘breath-taking collapse’ in academic standards’, and the transformation of the humanities into ‘ideological soapboxes.’[[697]](#footnote-697) Though now identifying as a conservative, Genovese continued to advocate for academic freedom. Like Sklar, who fell out with his colleagues at Bucknell University over their withdrawal of the American History survey course, Genovese railed against ‘the ‘progressive forces’ who had abolished required survey courses in Western Civilization and American History.[[698]](#footnote-698)

Viewing their interpretation of American history as a synthesis of the way things were, rather than the way that they wanted them to be, the work of the *Studies* editors was designed to act as a ‘useable past’ to inform their radicalism. Taking a leadership role within the academic New Left, the editors had used their work to shape a critique of contemporary American society. At the same time, however, they worked to defend their profession against those who wished to make political statements. Viewing ‘New Left history’ as a problematic term, they too took issue with presentism as a scholarly tool, whilst viewing their own work as objective. Supporting contemporaries who denied tenure or dismissed from their teaching positions for supposed ‘radicalism’, the pages of *Studies* were offered as a sanctuary. And in their own way, they sought to produce scholarship that would challenge the academic status quo.

**Part Two: The Radicalism of Disclosure**

## Chapter Five: Corporate Liberalism

For as long as corporations have existed, historians have attempted to explain the circumstances which gave rise to dominance, and the role played by capitalists in the development of the American economy. Scholarship has fallen into a number of distinct waves. The Progressive historians, particularly Charles Beard and Carl Becker - it is suggested, business leaders as antagonists, who opposed efforts to regulate business during the Progressive Era and later the Great Depression.[[699]](#footnote-699) In the 1950s, this analysis gave way to the Consensus School, coinciding with, perhaps, a raising pressure amongst the profession to interpret the past in a way that was sympathetic to American interests. Speaking as President of the American Historical Association (AHA) in December 1950, Samuel Eliot Morison praised the spate of ‘liberty documents’ released in the previous half-decade, symbolising a change of attitude towards the past: ‘a friendly, almost affectionate attitude’ compared to the cynical, hateful attitude of the 1920s.[[700]](#footnote-700) With direct reference to Beard, whose conflict-centric interpretation of the American Constitution as being a persistent block to social justice, Morison warned of the pitfalls of falling prisoner to ones frame of reference; via a selective rendering of sources, one could sacrifice a responsibility to historical objectivity in order to attempt to influence the future.[[701]](#footnote-701)

Among those works that now represent the ‘classics’ of the ‘Consensus School’ are Arthur Schlesinger Jnr’s *The Vital Center* (1949), Louis Hartz’s *The Liberal Tradition in American* (1955), and Daniel Boorstin’s *The Genius of American Politics* (1953), with Richard Hofstadter’s *The* *Age of Reform* (1955) often included, in spite of the authors protestations that he merely sought to rebalanced the tendency to over emphasise conflict in the American past.[[702]](#footnote-702) Consensus, it was later proposed, has had the dominant tendency in post war historical writing; a defence of freedom as the thread that held American history together, and a sense of uniqueness in its shared experience.[[703]](#footnote-703) ‘We have received our values as a gift from the past’, wrote Boorstin, ‘...equipped...at birth with a perfect and complete political theory, and adequate to all our future needs.’[[704]](#footnote-704) Rejecting political theory, the American experience, he claimed, was historically homogeneous; those values remained the guiding principle of ‘The American Way of Life.’[[705]](#footnote-705) Commensurate with this re-evaluation of philosophical values was a re-evaluation of the role of business and businessmen in American society. In most popular depictions to that point they had been portrayed as ‘robber barons:’ now, in the 1950s, they were elevated to hero status.[[706]](#footnote-706) Allan Nevins hailed the changing climate; businessmen would finally be allowed to stand forth ‘in their true proportions as builders of an indispensable might’, and academics would have to alter their preconceptions.[[707]](#footnote-707)[[708]](#footnote-708)

As has previously been indicated, scholars of American history have broadly suggested that it was within the pages of *Studies on the Left* that co-ordinated opposition to the Consensus School took form, the term having first been used byJohn Higham in his *Commentary* article ‘The Cult of the American Consensus’, earlier in the same year *Studies* was first published*.*[[709]](#footnote-709)Consensus school history,Higham claimed,had described‘a placid, unexciting past’ as part of ‘a massive grading operation to smooth over America’s social convulsions.’[[710]](#footnote-710) In response to this history, the *Studies* editors, including Martin Sklar, James Weinstein, Stephen Scheinberg and David Eakins, and associate Ronald Radosh, adopted an alternate view of the American past which viewed the post-Progressive era as a high-tide for liberalism – an age in which prosperity was supported by a policy consensus defined by Martin Sklar as Corporate Liberalism; broadly encompassing an acceptance of certain regulations by business, and a support for an expansionary foreign policy that secured new market and investment opportunities for American companies.[[711]](#footnote-711) Their efforts were part of a wider reconsideration of the role played by businessmen in American society, particularly in regards to policy formation – which encompassed works by Ellis Hawley, Robert Wiebe, Samuel P. Hays, and Gabriel Kolko, and other scholars whose work was considered part of the ‘Organisational Synthesis’.[[712]](#footnote-712)

A means to describe the reconfiguration of liberalism towards a pro-corporate and pro-expansionary configuration of liberalism in the Progressive Era, Corporate Liberalism was predicated upon the notion that corporate elites, in co-operation with union and government officials, had successfully utilised the state in order to stabilise capitalism and diffuse radical and socialist discontent. Such analysis found a willing audience within the student movement, providing them with an ‘useable past’ and a common enemy to direct their dissent towards, though the idea that their existed a breed of Corporate Liberals who manipulated the state in order to dampened dissent also appeared to them decidedly bleak, and perhaps contradictory to their belief in the power of campaigners to influence policy, and the capacity of government to instigate social transformation as an independent actor.[[713]](#footnote-713) Contemporary scholars however whose frame of reference reflects decades of anti-regulatory and ‘neo-liberal’ pro-business policy cannot help but ‘be impressed by the undeniable power of business leaders in contemporary politics.’[[714]](#footnote-714)

Long after Corporate Liberalism entered historical lexicon, Martin Sklar expanded and clarified the research he had begun in the mid-1950s. His PhD thesis, published as *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890-1916* appeared in 1988, long after the scholarly debates of the 1960s were concluded. Key to Sklar’s understanding in that earlier period was his belief that historians had too frequently created an ‘academic’ conception of liberalism which bore little relation to the political liberalism which existed and operated in the ‘hurly-burly’ of the political economy.[[715]](#footnote-715) Existing studies of the Progressive Era, he felt, had created their own idealised interpretation, which ‘imbibed’ liberalism with certain characteristics and deprived it of others, based on the ideological views of the author.[[716]](#footnote-716) Thirty years later, Sklar criticised such binary assignations, all too common in scholarship of the era, of capitalists and business with ‘the interests’ and conservatism, and the working and middle-class reform movements, the ‘farmers, workers, small proprietors, and other vessels of virtue’ with liberalism and ‘Social (Good) reform.[[717]](#footnote-717) This was a dichotomy, according to Sklar, which failed too many empirical tests to be valid, ‘however fervently’ historians and activists wished it to be so.[[718]](#footnote-718) Given that the Progressive Era had been so full of reform, for example, how could historian Gabriel Kolko have designated it as a period that witnessed ‘The Triumph of Conservatism?[[719]](#footnote-719) Ultimately, Corporate Liberalism, Sklar concluded, was best understood not as a policy program envisioned by corporate capitalists, nor a personality type, but as a distinct periodisation of capitalism, which had competed its ascendency to prominence over a laissez-faire following the resolution of the ‘Anti-Trust Question’ in 1912.[[720]](#footnote-720)

The implication of Sklar’s analysis continues to rankle with historians who seek to chart and understand historical alternatives to corporate capitalism as a prelude to assessing the contemporary prospects for economic and social transformation in the United States. At the heart of any analysis of Corporate Liberalism lays the question of whether history should seek to explain how society functions through objective analysis of society and systems, or whether a truer representation can be found through sectoral inquiries of individuals who are designated as displaying certain characteristics; whether they are in ascendency or decline, or whether they display virtue or iniquity. An accurate understanding of Corporate Liberalism is therefore vital to understanding the role of *Studies on the Left* in terms of its scholarly contribution, its influence on the broader New Left, and its long-term impact on the historical profession. Should historical scholarship be based on the search for lost alternatives to the status quo, a ‘usable past’, to provide the basis for political or social points, or should it seek to explain contemporary conditions ‘evolving (or devolving) *from* the past?’[[721]](#footnote-721) Can a balance be struck, in the sense that failed alternatives might have influenced what in fact triumphed, and by their mere existence placed the outcome beyond the hands of predestination?

Presently, we shall examine the development of Corporate Liberalism from Martin Sklar’s perspective, followed by an analysis of the same theory as interpreted by the wider *Studies* board. The reason for this division is the fact that much of the implications of Sklar’s thesis, as interpreted by the other *Studies* editors, are distinct to the formers eventual conclusions as described in his thesis, and later *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890-1916.* As used by the movement, and interpreted by those scholars who assessed the theory in the 1970s and 1980s, Corporate Liberalism achieved the status of capitalist conspiracy, rather than the broad *weltenschauung* – or worldview – Sklar had envisioned as far back as the early 1960s.

Martin Sklar and Corporate Liberalism

‘Woodrow Wilson and the Political Economy of Modern United States Liberalism’, first published in the third issue of *Studies on the Left,* began its life as an extract from a larger 250-page manuscript which Martin Sklar had written on anti-trust reform in the Progressive Era. [[722]](#footnote-722) Introduced in a Merle Curti graduate seminar, Sklar refined the paper for possible publication through 1957-1959. He was influenced in his research by his undergraduate advisor Robert A. Lively, his graduate advisor Howard K. Beale, and Thomas LeDuc, a visiting scholar to Madison in the mid-1950s. In a 1955 Review Article, Lively had coined the term ‘The American System’ to describe the patterns of public support for business development and government partnership in enterprise, suggesting that the work of Louis Hartz, and Oscar and Mary Handlin among others, had demonstrated that the activities of state and local governments in the Antebellum Era were of crucial importance in the stimulation of American enterprise, and the emergence ‘of a sturdy tradition of public responsibility for economic growth.’[[723]](#footnote-723) It was in the mixed railroad corporation, the ‘parent to big business in the United States’ that the character of business-government relationships was first defined. Sklar later described Lively as having introduced him to ‘perspectives way ahead of the curve…erroneously thought of as having originated with “New Left” revisionism.’[[724]](#footnote-724)

Contained within Sklar’s paper was a rebuttal of the existing consensus of Wilson, which claimed that he had sought to restrain private power in order to restore competition to the economy, and had practiced a conservative foreign policy, a conclusion which Sklar felt represented the ‘greatest source of historical misconception’ about the man.[[725]](#footnote-725) Concluding that Wilson had accepted the ‘irrefutable fact’ that individual entrepreneur and small-producers had been eclipsed by the developing corporations as the predominate form of enterprise in the United States, and that they were a natural and beneficial occurrence, Sklar suggested that Wilson had attempted to reform the legal, social, and regulatory structures of the nation in order to perpetuate, in the [Edmund] Burkian sense, the natural evolution of the American social system – its traditions and customs…[and] structures….whilst protecting individual liberty and property rights.’[[726]](#footnote-726) Seeking a compromise between a declining individualistic, entrepreneurial form of competition, and an ascendant ‘reasonable’ inter-corporate competition; between the prevention of unfair competition and the allowance of reasonable combination and inter-corporate arrangements consistent with the public interest and general welfare, Wilson’s anti-trust reform sought a balance between jurisprudence and state regulation.[[727]](#footnote-727)

Influenced by the Frederick Jackson Turner’s Frontier Thesis, Wilson believed that the future prosperity of the nation rested on the development of foreign markets for American products, and a ‘necessary’ expansionary foreign policy, to export the American ethos.[[728]](#footnote-728) Such a policy would be guided by the imperatives of the ‘Open Door’, formulated by Senator John Hay and practiced by Wilson and the ‘Dollar Diplomats’, which emphasised the ‘natural international division of labor between the industrialised and agrarian nations…mutually beneficial…free trade.’[[729]](#footnote-729) Forming the economic, political, and legal stratagem of politicians, capitalists and intellectuals to entrench the corporate economy in popular consciousness as the dominant mode of business in the United States, Corporate Liberalism represented a broad world view encompassing socio-political and economic relations in the same vein as European and English social democracy, but was incomparable to the imperial exploitation of the British colonial model.[[730]](#footnote-730)

Describing his initial findings in 1957, Sklar concluded that the foundations of American imperialism therefore, in the foreign banking and investment machinery; the co-operative ‘export monopolism’ of banks, railroads, industry, and shipping, tariff rationalisation, and the coordination of State and Commerce Department activities with businessmen in foreign markets, had therefore been laid by ‘Make-the-World-Safe-For-Democracy Wilson.’[[731]](#footnote-731) In the 1950s however, this dream, shared by American internationalists ‘from Wilson to Hoover to New Dealers to Truman-Acheson-Kennan-Dulles’ could potentially be shattered by communism and nationalism, Anti-Americanism and agrarian resentment in other countries to ‘Dollar’ and ‘Good Neighbour’ diplomacy.[[732]](#footnote-732) The ‘bourgeoisie-liberal-mind’, in the post-war era appeared unable to understand how the Open Door, ‘reified’ by liberals as merely the ‘free trade’ exchange of goods, could be interpreted as containing injustice or exploitation.[[733]](#footnote-733) Though the consequences of the Open Door policy had been unmasked as being essentially the same as English and European colonialism, with the resources of ‘colonies’ becoming ‘supplementary’ to those of the United States, existing scholarship on Wilson had neglected to analyse Wilson’s world view as a whole. Decisions based on socio-economic principles had been privileged, and were assessed as moral, and those based on the economic imperative of capitalism, assessed as ‘sordid [and] immoral.’[[734]](#footnote-734)

The impact of Sklar’s interpretation of Wilson was considerable, not only among Wilson scholars, but also among those who sought new definitions of liberalism.[[735]](#footnote-735) Though the article was reprinted on several occasions in anthologies, only one extended analysis of Sklar’s interpretation of Wilson appeared. In a 1977 article, Alan L. Seltzer belatedly critiqued the article as being economically determinist in its assertions that corporate capitalism was inevitable, and its adoption of ‘ruling class’ or ‘power elite models’ in explaining the motivations of the Progressive Era polity. Rather than being a Burkian acceptance of capitalism as a ‘natural growth’, Wilson’s anti-trust action, Seltzer clarified, represented a ‘vigorous but unsuccessful effort to restructure the economy along lines opposed by the then dominant corporate interests.’[[736]](#footnote-736) At his best, Seltzer noted, when demonstrating the influence that big business played in drafting the Webb-Pomerene Act, Sklar was guilty of misunderstanding the moral imperatives of Wilson as demonstrated by the fact that Wilson had supported the Act because, he noted, small businessmen also favoured it as a means of diminishing the foreign trade advantages of giant corporations.[[737]](#footnote-737)

On the Madison campus, William Appleman Williams took an interest in Sklar’s conclusions. On study leave from the University of Oregon to undertake research at the Wisconsin Historical Society, Williams was invited by Thomas LeDuc to sit in on his graduate seminars, where he met Sklar, who was also writing an article on the early years of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) and its focus on foreign markets for *Science and Society*.[[738]](#footnote-738) Sklar proposed that capitalists within NAM had arrived independently at a decision to support foreign market expansion. ‘Deeply concerned’ with the crisis of overproduction, these businessmen, some large, but many associated with the small firms that later campaigned against unionism and the New Deal, had sought out foreign markets and ‘new spheres of influence’.[[739]](#footnote-739) These were early signs, Sklar believed, that large sectors of the population in the Progressive Era shared a belief in foreign expansion at the expense of economic isolation.

Though he never taught Sklar, Williams was impressed by his work, and the two struck up a friendship that led, if not to a collaboration, to a shared understanding of the Open Door as a central component of the American worldview. ‘Our encounters’, Sklar later recalled, were largely ‘ex-cathedra…sometimes in the drugstore near the UW Bookstore, where he would sit at the lunch counter with a soft drink.[[740]](#footnote-740) I’d go in for a newspaper in the late afternoon, [and] if I saw him we’d sit and talk…and at times then walk and talk.’[[741]](#footnote-741) Having served as an editor of *American Socialist*, Williams was pre-disposed to the view that large corporations had wielded ‘extensive’ influence in domestic affairs as an ‘*imperium in imperio’*,working in competition to and in collaboration with the government to place the corporate conception of the world at the centre of American foreign policy.[[742]](#footnote-742) In time, Sklar provided him with drafts of his Wilson essay, the underlying documents that supported its arguments, as well as his materials on NAM, and in turn, Williams shared them with his own students. He also incorporated them into his own research, eventually published as *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. ‘All of the stuff in *Tragedy* about foreign markets and the Spanish-American war, including the Open Door Notes…and Wilson’s pro-capitalism in foreign policy’, Sklar later recalled, had come from this research.[[743]](#footnote-743) Williams found time to acknowledge Sklar in both *Tragedy* and a separate article for *The William and Mary Quarterly*, for his ‘perceptive analyses’ of John Hay’s Open Door notes.[[744]](#footnote-744) ‘I’m breaking into print by hook or crook…there I am in black and white’, he boasted.[[745]](#footnote-745)

The intellectual transfer worked the other way. Sklar recalled that it was in LeDuc’s sessions that the and others first learned from Williams ‘his emphasis on ideas, world-views, and their interrelatedness with modes of production and interests’, and this began a pre-occupation with historical periodisation which extended into Sklar’s later life.[[746]](#footnote-746) Influenced too was Sklar’s friend Carl Parrini, who edited a series of documents provided by Williams for the first issue of *Studies.* Suggesting that the expansionist philosophy had penetrated far into the inland States areas considered by historians to be ‘isolationist’, the records of the ‘Moroccan Conference on the Open Door’ suggested and that the United States had actively worked to prevent the formation of spheres of influence among imperial nations, in order to assure an ‘Open Door’ defined as equal access to markets, and an equality of opportunity in matters of trade.[[747]](#footnote-747) Parrini’s own interpretation of the Open Door disagreed with that of Williams, in that he believed that it hadn’t just been for the benefit of the United States, but also for the countries that benefitted from capital investment.[[748]](#footnote-748) Both Williams and Sklar would come to suggest that corporate capitalism, as an economic system or world view, had developed across a far broader constituency than business elites.

William Appleman Williams and the Open Door

As a student at the University of Wisconsin in the late 1940s, William Appleman Williams had been exposed, like the *Studies* editors, to the ‘radical’ traditions of the History Department, as well as the Germanic influences within the social sciences. Sharing an affinity for Charles Beard and Hans Gerth, Williams also consumed the works of Adorno, Horkheimer and George Lukacs of the Frankfurt School, and their key inspiration Max Weber.[[749]](#footnote-749) Through Wilhelm Dithey, he learned the concept of weltanschauung, crudely translated as ‘world-view’ constituting a ‘spiritual expression of the inner principle or essence of a period or process…a synthetic outlook of the world that is practical and strategic.’[[750]](#footnote-750) Drawn towards foreign relations as a ‘promising arena’ of study due to its focus on policy and periodisation, Williams sought to conceptualise the world ‘as entertained by’ American foreign policy makers, an effort that produced *Russian Relations, 1781-1947,* and *American Foreign Relations, 1750-1955* by the time he moved to Madison in the autumn of 1958.[[751]](#footnote-751) Across three books published during his time in Wisconsin demonstrate the influence of the Open Door on Williams’s conception of the American past.

Published in early 1959, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* defined the sixty-year period since the dawn of the Progressive Era as one marked by the growing preponderance of American influence on the world stage. This, Williams declared, was not the product of ‘naïve fumbling’, but an outcome consciously driven by policymakers who had sought to ensure the future prosperity of the United States through the development of new and ever-expanding markets for investment abroad, as an alternative to domestic reforms that might imperil the emerging corporate system.[[752]](#footnote-752) The ‘Tragedy; of pursuing Open Door policies was not that it policy implications had been inherently evil, but that American ideas and ideals had become subverted by Cold War and anti-Communist ideology; a singular focus on communism had caused successive administrations to discount the realities of Western discrimination of other races, and to overlook poverty.[[753]](#footnote-753) This had resulted in a moral and ideological failure, for an over-reliance on foreign interventionism as a means to secure open access to foreign markets had led the nation to take actions that contravened the spirit of its liberal inheritance.[[754]](#footnote-754)

Published two years later, *The Contours of American History* served as an ambitious survey of the three weltanshauungen Williams identified as having characterised the history of the United States, each emerging from and then eclipsing its predecessor; ‘The Age of Mercantilism, 1740-1828’, the ‘Age of Laissez Nous Fair, 1819-1896’, and ‘The Age of Corporation Capitalism, 1882-1860’.[[755]](#footnote-755) In the ‘Mercantilist’ era, a concern for state and national responsibility for ‘social property’ had motivated federal funding for infrastructure projects deemed in the public interest, until it had been eclipsed by a ‘Laissez Faire’ era, in which concern for private initiatives that maximised personal liberty and opportunity at the expense of ‘statist’ initiatives became preponderant. The development of corporate capitalism from the 1890s onwards in turn made laissez-faire increasingly untenable as an ideology, as various sectors of society attempted to resolve the dichotomy of incorporating the new economic and social reality into a social system – a community – that respected property rights.[[756]](#footnote-756)

Having abandoned the mercantilist tradition of ‘mutual and interrelated duties, obligations and responsibilities’, however, the United States had entered the corporate era ill-equipped to manage the social upheavals of industrialisation, having equipped itself only with a ‘bundle of rights’ and an ‘anti-intellectual’ tradition of the frontier experience.[[757]](#footnote-757) It was left to corporate leaders to exert preponderate influence over national decisions, and though reformers and the ‘class-conscious gentry’ had moderated the more glaring weaknesses, ‘*only when their frontiers of expansion were closed by foreign opponents or severe economic crisis*’, did reformers and capitalists join together to change the system.[[758]](#footnote-758) Only three times – during the First World War, the Great Depression, and the period between 1949 and 1956 – had the frontier been limited, latterly by the radical challenge of anti-imperialism, socialism and communism ‘armed with nuclear weapons’, and on each occasion, Williams concluded, the United States had returned to economic expansion, ‘the gate of escape.’[[759]](#footnote-759)

The *Studies* editors placed huge value in the conclusions reached by *Contours.* It took weeks, Lloyd Gardner recalled, to ‘work out what had happened’ after he was treated to a ‘preview screening’ of the work, a chapter of which appeared in the second issue of *Studies.*[[760]](#footnote-760) A ‘contribution of fundamental significance to American historiography…and to current efforts of radicals to re-examine and re-evaluate the history and present state of United States social development’, the editors invited John Higham to review the work, after he had defended it from criticism elsewhere for its content.[[761]](#footnote-761) *Contours* was, he declared, an ‘Olympian declaration of a historian concerned about failures and evasions in American experience.’[[762]](#footnote-762) In abandoning the notion of class conflict in favour of shifting networks of group alliances, Williams was in his offbeat way joining the Consensus academics in presenting America as an essentially homogenous culture, characterised best by his favourable view of Herbert Hoover.’[[763]](#footnote-763) ‘What sort of radicalism is this? That praises men whom our conservatives are also rehabilitating?’[[764]](#footnote-764) The editors agreed. ‘Williams…gave us a new group of American ‘heroes’ …’ Stephen Scheinberg explained to James Weinstein. ‘Each of them traced a most important conception through intellectual generations – the concept of community or corporate concept…In common parlance they might be termed ‘responsible conservatives’ or Tory-radicals, if a more esoteric term is required.’[[765]](#footnote-765) Williams’s seminars he later added, flowed with ‘the ideas’ associated with the Corporate Liberal interpretation.[[766]](#footnote-766)

Taking as its basis an offhand made in *Contours* that the Progressive Era conservatives had been overly narrow in their definition of what a businessperson was, *Roots of American Empire*, published in 1969, demonstrated how a clamour for foreign markets had existed across a broad inter-class coalition, including agrarian reformers, which developed over the course of the 19th century.[[767]](#footnote-767) Though their opposition had failed to produce any major changes in policy direction away from the ascendency of corporate capitalism, Williams noted, historians had overlooked the fact that agricultural businessmen had accepted and relied on Adam Smith’s interpretation of political economy , and were responsive to the ideas of the free market. Fearing that they would become caught in a ‘neo-colonial’ relationship with ‘metropolitan interests’ they, like Smith, advocated government action to check monopoly power and improve infrastructure, in order to guarantee and secure the free marketplace, and negate the inherent structural economic advantages the metropolis enjoyed over the periphery.[[768]](#footnote-768)

The most effective way of accomplishing this was through the ‘safety valve’ of economic expansion, and it was this emphasis on the enlargement of foreign markets that guided the Populist agenda in the 1890s, as opposed to the orthodox colonialism practiced by the British Empire.[[769]](#footnote-769) This legacy had been eclipsed because many metropolitan observers had falsely dismissed the agrarian farmers as being irrational or ignorant of the true workings of the economic system, with the implication that they should consider economic upheaval as an ‘inevitable part of the industrialisation process in a free market.[[770]](#footnote-770) The agricultural majority had created a marketplace conception of the world based on freedom and equal opportunity, codified in an internationalist and imperial foreign policy based on reinforcing this world-view.[[771]](#footnote-771) Gradually winning over the metropolitan minority towards this expansionist weltanschauung, they adopted the imperial outlook as businessmen, but ultimately failed to win metropolitan capitalists over to their broader conception of market freedom, with the consequence of creating an ‘overpowering imperial consensus’.[[772]](#footnote-772)

Sklar later identified Williams as the first scholar to establish the concept of corporate capitalism as an essential periodisation of United States history. Though earlier intellectuals had theorised about corporate capitalism and chronicled its rise, it was Williams who had first periodised the contemporary epoch from 1882 to the 1960s as the ‘Age of Corporate Capitalism’.[[773]](#footnote-773) It was this periodisation which proved influential to the work of the *Studies* editors. ‘We had this group of people’, James Weinstein later recalled, ‘who developed these ideas and were constantly doing their own research.’[[774]](#footnote-774) In order to grasp the key divergences between their research and Sklar’s it is useful, for the purposes of this discussion, to classify the work of the other editors as being the search for an understanding of the ‘Corporate Ideal’; an imposition of corporate structures on society. When Sklar later clarified his views on Corporate Liberalism in the late 1980s he declared, like Williams, that it was a system not merely ‘bestowed on society’ by an elite, but as a periodisation of capitalism in which an ever shifting set of alliances between capitalists and ‘ever-widening sectors of the smaller bourgeoisie’ defined the parameters of the corporate state.[[775]](#footnote-775)

The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism

Having completed most of his research on anti-trust by the early 1960s, Sklar set his manuscript aside while focusing on other projects and teaching obligations. Having spent time during the late 1970s writing editorials for James Weinstein’s Chicago based newspaper, *In These Times*, Sklar returned to university in 1982, earning his PhD under Eugene Genovese at Rutgers*.*[[776]](#footnote-776)Published in 1988 as *The* *Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890–1916*, the thesisanalysed the ‘[anti]-trust question’ as a ‘political clearinghouse’ through which the various social and economic movements of the era transacted the reconstruction of American capitalism from its laissez-faire ‘proprietary phase’ to its ‘corporate-administered’ phase.[[777]](#footnote-777) Though relatively peaceful, this ‘transaction’, had emerged as the outcome of a set of political contention which had encompassed twenty-five years of debate, the rise of populist and socialist parties, and the temporary splitting of both parties.[[778]](#footnote-778) The outcome redefined the relationship between the state and society in social and economic affairs and the law, ultimately resolving the questions of how corporations would be regulated in a society that still valued small enterprise.[[779]](#footnote-779)

A far from simple transaction, Sklar described Corporate Liberalism as emerging as an expression of the cross-class realignment towards a corporate outlook of society, existing in three distinct variants: the statist leaning, ‘New Nationalism’ of Theodore Roosevelt; the ‘minimalist-regulatory Corporate Liberalism’ of William Howard Taft; and the regulatory imbued ‘New Freedom’ of Woodrow Wilson.[[780]](#footnote-780) These three visions gained support from a shifting network of sectors of capitalists and the smaller bourgeoisie, including farmers, among which pro-statist ‘proclivities’ succumbed to the much stronger anti-statist tradition within American political culture, and workers, who were attracted by the stability of the corporate system.[[781]](#footnote-781) Each was consistent with the American liberal belief that society reigned supreme over the state; law serving a freely developing society, with government guaranteeing a free society, administered by free markets, and regulating natural monopolies.[[782]](#footnote-782) Common to this era, Sklar stated, was a consensus that a public utility might be commanded by the state either by direct ownership or by regulation as an instrument of public policy, but that this would not extend to the general economy, instead safeguarding the marketplace from monopoly power by turning it into a public asset.[[783]](#footnote-783)

Analysing each of the Presidents in turn – Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson – Sklar highlighted the considerable differences in their approaches to the ‘trust problem’. Roosevelt’s strategy, developed through the Bureau of Corporations, sought to legitimise the corporate economy, whilst ensuring that it acted in the public interest, recommending a licensing or registration scheme administered by a federal agency, whereby the President could issue licenses for incorporation, restrict reasonable restraint of trade, and outlaw business practices that threatened smaller enterprises and consumers.[[784]](#footnote-784) The underlying assumption was that only a truly competitive market could be ‘left alone’ by government, and that monopolisation could cause damage to the market system.[[785]](#footnote-785) Federal corporate licensing policies were included in Roosevelt’s 1912 platform, as well as a new law empowering the federal government to approve or deny any corporate merger, and these powers, Sklar believed, would have legalised the corporate reorganisation of the economy under state command.[[786]](#footnote-786)

Wilson and Taft were opposed to the statist solutions proposed by Roosevelt; their opposition based on the belief that such policies had the potential to make the corporate economy subservient to state direction, and would lead to private capital being withdrawn, leading to greater state control over large units of the economy, creating a ‘public-service’ capitalism in which capitalists were transformed into ‘public servants.’[[787]](#footnote-787) The 1911 Rule of Reason decisions against Standard Oil, proved crucial in shaping the sequence of events away from this conception and towards that of Wilson. Following these decisions, Taft came to view the anti-trust ‘question’ as being largely settled, and broke with Roosevelt over the idea of corporate licensing.[[788]](#footnote-788) Enforcement of the Sherman Act, he felt, was the only effective solution to the problem and, as President, he oversaw a series of high profile cases against corporations, which Roosevelt and corporate leaders saw as being damaging to industry.[[789]](#footnote-789) Even Wilson’s platform, which proposed market regulation, with clear distinctions made between public utilities and the corporate sector, might result in the state wielding too much power through strong regulatory agencies.[[790]](#footnote-790)

What ultimately came to pass under Wilson, Sklar believed, produced the foundations for contemporary institutions, social relations, and political divisions in the United States, with debates vacillating between state-command and societal supremacy over the state and the market.[[791]](#footnote-791) The reform legislation of 1913-1916 represented the ascendency of Corporate Liberalism as the dominant tendency in American society, and ‘removed from politics’, the place of corporations in American society.[[792]](#footnote-792) Corporations would now be regulated by judicial process, providing the freedom for rapid development, growth and change without undue state interference; it was the ‘new frontier’ of American expansion, in the same manner that ‘The West’ had previously been perceived.[[793]](#footnote-793) Supporting this system was an Open Door foreign policy, exporting the corporate model to the world.[[794]](#footnote-794)

In response to critics who believed Corporate Liberalism was an economically deterministic theory, Sklar stressed the fact that at every step, the movement towards Corporate Liberalism had fought with, and accommodated the small-producer tradition, the organised labour movement, and the socialist movements.[[795]](#footnote-795) Reconciling these interests, Corporate Liberalism was an evolving mix of capitalism, socialism, and populism, representing an alternative to the politics of the left or the right, corresponding with the prevalent anti-statism of all the major classes and strata of a developed and highly education society; a strong and diversified capitalist class, a functionally heterogeneous working class, a growing sector of professionals and technicians, and a business minded farming community.[[796]](#footnote-796)

An Instrumentalist Reconstruction

Though some reviewers found *Corporate Reconstruction* to be verbose and overlong, the response to its conclusions was largely positive.[[797]](#footnote-797) The triumph of Corporate Liberalism, a la Sklar’, Kim McQuaid summarised, ‘was not foreordained; nor was it foisted by big businessmen on a passive political order. Ideas, social relationships, and social movements mattered too. Now it appears, economic and other changes in society are reciprocally related. Each influences the other and is influenced by the other.’[[798]](#footnote-798) Some quarters believed that Sklar had focused too tightly on the economic and social ‘winners’ of the dawning of the corporate age, with the contributions made by those outside the ranks of corporate capitalists, professional politicians, and government bureaucrats barely reckoning in his analysis. The thoughts and motives of ‘intellectuals... professionals and reformers, workers and trade-union leader’s populists and socialists’, were discussed, but only as appendages to the actions of their political leaders Wilson, Taft, and Roosevelt.[[799]](#footnote-799) Essentially a ‘ruling class’ analysis of the Progressive Era, Ellis Hawley suggested that Sklar had not provided enough space to an analysis of the activities of the reforming middle class.[[800]](#footnote-800)

A more comprehensive critique was provided by Gerald Berk, who praised Sklar for having enriched scholarship with a sophisticated analysis of the transformatory ‘grammar’ by which capitalists and public officials had defined their interests. In his conception of Progressive Era reform, however, Corporate Liberalism proved to be an economically deterministic theory of history; one that dismissed any alternatives to the eventual legislative balance sheet of the Progressive Era as being doomed to statically reproduce the crises of the previous fifty years. Alternatives to mass production, consolidation and administrative hierarchies had existed, Berk stated, and had offered more than the static reproduction of the old order; the anti-monopolists, green-backers, and populists had drawn from an ‘old order’ of producer republicanism, yet articulated a ‘genuine alternative’ to corporate liberal divisions of labour, citizenship and economic organisation. The Farmers Alliance, for example, had come to greenbackism through a commitment to the co-operative movement, in opposition to the New York money market.[[801]](#footnote-801)

On the issue of anti-trust, Berk did concede to Sklar that he was ‘perhaps right’ that after 1912, ‘even if [Louis] Brandeis’ and other corporate sceptics had articulated alternatives to corporate capitalism, the political conditions did not exist to bring them into being. Brandeis had continued to wage a public campaign for an altered antitrust policy based on balanced co-operation and competition, in order to support a flourishing and innovative smallholder economy, and to outlaw destructive competition. Yet there remained an untenable contradiction to suggest, as Sklar had, that history was contingent: ‘market form and policy’ had emerged ‘from the many struggles over property entitlements’, whose outcome, in turn, had been determined by ‘education, coalition building, cunning, and compromise’, and not by economic fiat. Greenbackers, populists and anti-monopolists remained were tied to a passing epoch of capitalism that had inevitably moved in stages, but only if you viewed it from the present.[[802]](#footnote-802)

Sklar was pained to point out that ‘[h]istory is lived forward but it is written in retrospect.’ [[803]](#footnote-803) If the outcome of a historical inquiry was already known, the purpose of its analysis was therefore to ‘reach back in the past to discover how and why the outcome, or the present, came to be…to know *what* it is all about, *what* it means, *how* and *where* it is tending.’[[804]](#footnote-804) Were historians to ‘start from the present’ and assess the past from the perspective of present-day sentiment and ‘patterns of thought’, or was it more appropriate to understand the present as ‘evolving…or devolving’ from the past.’[[805]](#footnote-805) His purpose had not been to analyse opposition to the corporate reconstruction of capitalism, but to analyse the ‘settling’ of the anti-trust question as the event by which the United States had been set on the course to which it had arrived in the present, and how those tendencies could continue to interplay in the future. *Reconstruction of American Capitalism* raised important question about the character of United States capitalism; the reconciliation of class analysis and pluralism; the characterisation of the American political tradition as shaped by conflict or consensus; and the relationship between economic change, social movements, intellectual innovation and political power. Sklar had demonstrated that it was incorrect to focus on either conflict or consensus, or to give class priority ‘over all other possibilities’, as this distorted historical reality and limited future political choices. Capitalists had to be treated as a social movement rather than the personification of ‘interests’, who were not omnipotent but often struggled to legitimise the corporate form of capitalism, and voices from the older ‘proprietary’ sector of society with dignity rather than ‘pathetic figures’ from the past.[[806]](#footnote-806)

Viewed from the present, Sklar perceived the United States as being a Corporate Liberal society and had identified the key moments which had assisted the corporate weltanschauung in achieving its hegemonic position. It is hard to reconcile these conclusions to Corporate Liberalism as envisaged by his *Studies* colleagues, which ultimately rested on the belief that there was a consensus between the ruling economic units of the American economy; a ‘Corporate Ideal’.[[807]](#footnote-807) Such an understanding Sklar stated, had not existed beyond a belief that corporations were a progressive and beneficent mode of capitalist enterprise, replacing individual enterprise as the dominant form of property relations in the American economy.[[808]](#footnote-808) The various analyses of the Progressive Era as an ‘Age of Reform, ‘Businessmen and Reform’, Response to Industrialism’, The Search for Order’, ‘Political Capitalism’ and ‘Organisational Society’ were ‘valid’ inasmuch as they contained valid propositions and research, but they did not amount to a distinct periodisation of American history.[[809]](#footnote-809)

Likewise, the stereotype of ‘capitalists’ being ‘robber barons’ and captains of industry was an outdated and simplistic conception of class relations. ‘Businessmen’ had always been involved in reform or societal change, and like other ‘interests’ in society, had struggled to reconcile their interests to the challenges of the emerging corporate era. Like farmers and workers, capitalists constituted a social movement, imbued with its own goals, values, and principles, who sought to protect and extend their way of life, based on a definitive mode of property ownership and exploitation of labour, and had participated in trade and civic associations, reform clubs, the media, in order to win support to their cause.[[810]](#footnote-810) That there appeared something ‘unusual’ about capitalist interests being associated with or divided over reforms, or that if capitalists were in favour it became less than reform, was not one that had much empirical weight.[[811]](#footnote-811)

Neither was the development of corporate capitalism part of an overall ‘Response’ to Industrialism. American society had not ‘Responded’ to industrialism, but had consciously participated in it as an evolving process, as a response to their own republican values, ‘to nature, the market, and the opportunities and insecurities of capitalism.’[[812]](#footnote-812) Corporate Liberalism was therefore not simply an imposition bestowed on society by an elite sector of the capitalist class.[[813]](#footnote-813) Though groups had opposed this outcome, the corporate ‘revolution’, Sklar noted, had been relatively peaceful and fluid, even ‘reintegrative’ in its ability to subsume the interests and development of small producers, proprietary capitalists, the professions, and the working and emerging middle classes in a manner which maintained the American traditions of private property and liberty.[[814]](#footnote-814) To smaller capitalists it could offer coexistence with large-scale capital and market and price stability, as well as the opportunity to merge with stronger firms, and the opportunity for employment and advancement based on merit rather than patronage or nepotism. To labour it could offer greater employment stability and wages, as well as pensions and other inducements, and to small enterprise, it could provide protection from trade unionism.[[815]](#footnote-815)

There was therefore, no natural ‘type’ of capitalism; small-producer, competitive capitalism, and corporate capitalism, were simply competing types of capitalism, and ultimately, if any one of the three had eventually ‘triumphed’, none would have resulted from ‘objective’ circumstances. Even within the capitalist class, there existed, just as within the farming and working class, segmentation between competing interests and visions for the ideal form of capitalism, each possessing their own views on the ideal the role of government, and their own interpretation of the law and social policy. In advocating the corporate outcome in a society, which valued small enterprise and a dispersed economy, capitalists sought to adapt popular thinking to what they saw as a natural evolution of society.[[816]](#footnote-816)

**Part Two: The Radicalism of Disclosure**

## Chapter Six: The Corporate Ideal

Inspired by his work on the Progressive Era, Martin Sklar’s fellow *Studies on the Left* editors, James Weinstein, David Eakins, Stephen Scheinberg, and Ronald Radosh used his research as the basis of their own efforts to comprehend the reality of the corporate economy in the United States, and to forge a ‘useable past’ for the New Left. Under their ward, Corporate Liberalism became the guiding characteristic of American capitalism since the Progressive Era, encapsulated in a ‘Corporate Ideal’ shared between business, labor and government. Guided by the interventions of an ‘enlightened’ group of capitalists who sought to bring a degree of class harmony to American society, this Ideal, based on collaboration with union leaders and politicians, was responsible for much of the social and economic reforms of the 20th Century, most evident within the ranks of the National Civic Federation, whose members sought a ‘Third Way’ between business ‘anarchists’ and the socialist ‘radicals.’[[817]](#footnote-817)

The *Studies* editors were not alone in focusing their attentions on business involvement in Progressive Era policy. Taking special care to pay tribute to Sklar and William Appleman Williams in the introduction to *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State*, James Weinstein also acknowledged the influence of Gabriel Kolko, a fellow graduate of history from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, whose *The Triumph of Conservatism: A Reinterpretation of American History, 1900-1916*, concluded similarly that Progressive Era reforms passed under the aegis and control of business elites in what was a *triumph* of conservative policy making against more radical alternatives.[[818]](#footnote-818) The implications of this analysis worried the editors greatly; like the work of C. Wright Mills and Herbert Marcuse, it questioned the agency of dissent to overcome oppression, and repeatedly concluded with pleas for a socialist revival as a catalyst for overcoming the contradictions of ‘Corporate’ or Cold War Liberalism.

Whilst the Corporate Liberalism thesis was influential amongst activists, it was never truly accepted by fellow scholars. As the 1970s dawned, both activists and historians concluded that the conclusions of the *Studies* editors had been too pessimistic to be a useful guide for action. Gabriel Kolko questioned whether the business community was capable of acting in the rational manner that was implicit in the analysis produced by the editors. A generation of New Left historians seeking to adopt the approaches of Jesse Lemisch – history from the bottom-up’ – balked at the ‘totalitarian’ implications of the corporate liberal thesis; that dissent could co-opted into the liberal mainstream in a way that made social change impossible. They were followed by a generation of Neo-Marxist social scientists who questioned their implication that Government had no agency no independent agency to make decisions in favour of the people and against the forces of corporate capitalism – that it was an instrument of capitalist forces. This critique largely sidestepped the intent of Martin Sklar’s original essay on Woodrow Wilson, though when his own work on Corporate Liberalism emerged in the late 1980s; it too was dismissed in some quarters as being instrumentalist, due to its failure to adequately consider those movements which had opposed the corporate reconstruction of American capitalism. This had not been Sklar’s intent, yet as we shall see, the theory of Corporate Liberalism has never quite managed to escape this characterisation.

*Studies on the Left* and the Corporate Ideal

After moving to Madison in 1960 to take up graduate study in the University History Department, James Weinstein threw himself into the task of researching the legacy of the American Socialist Party. Absorbing Martin Sklar’s and William Appleman Williams’s analysis of the Progressive Era, he concluded that the basic character of American domestic and foreign policy in the 20th Century had blunted efforts by reformers to transform American society, or help it transcend free marked orthodoxy. ‘You say America is not yet dominated by corporations’, he wrote to journalist Andrew Hacker. ‘If by domination one means the position of basic policy making, one can go back as far as the years from 1902-1914 and find that the largest corporations controlled the basic decisions in most areas of American life.’[[819]](#footnote-819) Dominated by giant corporations and their institutional supporters in the military, political machines, and trade unions, the United States had failed to solve the problem of poverty, commensurate with a decline in the ability of average Americans to participate meaningfully in politics or social policy decisions.[[820]](#footnote-820)

Persuaded by this interpretation of American society, Weinstein and his fellow *Studies* editor David Eakins worked for a time on *The Triumph of Corporate Ideology*, a project that would explore the ‘nakedly self-interested approach’ of the ‘Kennedy phenomenon’ as part of a larger analysis of the dominant ‘moderate conservative, or ‘corporate liberal order.’[[821]](#footnote-821) As the consensus around a particular interpretation of liberalism had tightened, the original value of the term and its true application, they believed, had been corrupted.[[822]](#footnote-822) The successful ‘enveloping’ of the few remaining ‘meaningful movements’ outside of the corporate consensus during the 1930s Popular Front with the New Deal had rendered meaningless any description of the United States that was not predicated on the domination of large corporations.[[823]](#footnote-823) The project did not come to fruition, but others did. The first to appear was James Weinstein’s *The Decline of Socialism in America*, *1912-1925*, an analysis of the American Socialist Party and its decline in the late 1910s.[[824]](#footnote-824) After discovering that the Socialist Party vote in the 1917 elections had reached 35%, he spent each morning in the Wisconsin Historical Society examining the socialist newspaper *Appeal to Reason*.[[825]](#footnote-825) Having completed the manuscript in 1962, he eventually persuaded the Monthly Press to publish the manuscript in 1967, but only after he promised to pay for the printing costs.[[826]](#footnote-826)

The following year, Weinstein published *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State,* *1900-1918*.Inspired by Sklar and Williams, *The Corporate Ideal* proposed that the Corporate Liberal order had been formulated, developed, and finalised under the ‘aegis and supervision’ of the ‘more sophisticated’ leaders of the larger corporations in the United States, who had come to understand, as Theodore Roosevelt had told them, that social reform could act as a form of social control.[[827]](#footnote-827) Research for the book was a big undertaking.

I spent more than six months just at the archives of the library in New York City, the New York City Library, and going through the papers of the National Civic Federation and the different characters who were there, the businessmen. George Perkins, who would be called the CEO these days, but I don’t think they called him that, he ran the United States Steel Company, which was the biggest company in America at that time, so I went through all of his personal papers, and I went through personal papers of all the ones acknowledged in *Corporate Ideal*.[[828]](#footnote-828)

Drawing together middle-class reformers and ‘thoughtful men of all classes’ into a vanguard for the building of a good community, Weinstein remarked, the NCF, with the co-operation of moderate trade unionists, attempted to negate irresponsible business practices in order to find a third way between radicalism and socialism and ‘anarchists’ in business.[[829]](#footnote-829) Though social movements had played a significant role in formulating and pushing for reform, few reforms had been enacted, he concluded, without the ‘tacit approval, if not guidance’ of businessmen, who promised concessions as a means of reduce social turmoil, increase discipline among the workers, and stabilise society. For better or the worse,the price to pay had been the erosion of politics, heralding an era of corporate oligarchy in which day to day power laid more and more in the hands of ‘administrators and experts’ constricted by the need to win the approval of corporate leaders than serve the needs of workers, farmers and small businessmen.[[830]](#footnote-830) The commensurate collapse of the Socialist Party and other revolutionary parties in the United States meant that there existed no serious alternative vision for American society. Corporate Liberals in the New Deal, the New Frontier, and the Great Society, had demonstrated that when faced with immediate threats, the establishment could make the necessary adjustments to restore at least a facade of social harmony.[[831]](#footnote-831)

Given Weinstein’s socialist background, and his new-found belief that Populist and Socialist ideas had been co-opted by Corporate Liberals as a means of social control, it is not surprising that he considered the Progressive Era to be a period of conservatism. In reaching this conclusion, he was influenced, like his fellow editors, by Gabriel Kolko, a contemporary of the *Studies* editors in the 1950s whose PhD thesis was published as *The Triumph of Conservatism* in 1963.[[832]](#footnote-832) Kolko concluded that the reforms of the Progressive Era had been not been generated by a popular insurgency, but through the triumph of the ‘Political Capitalism’ practiced by the executives of the larger corporations.[[833]](#footnote-833) Their efforts to utilise political outlets to attain conditions of stability, predictability and security to attain rationalisation, worked to ‘internecine competition and erratic fluctuations in the economy’ ensuring the ability to plan ‘future economic action based on calculable expectations:’ and ensure reasonable financial returns.[[834]](#footnote-834)

The result ‘was a conservative triumph in the sense that there was an effort to preserve the basic social and economic relations essential to a capitalist society, an effort that was frequently consciously as well as functionally conservative.’[[835]](#footnote-835) ‘Business control over politics’ rather than political regulation, had defined the Progressive Era and met the potential threats to American society; agrarian discontent, violence and strikes, a Populist movement, the rise of a Socialist Party, and a seriously divided labour movement. Although some forms of progressive rhetoric had attacked businessmen, ‘at no point’ had any major political tendency transcended generalisations and translated their ideas into a concrete alternative program to combat business supremacy over the control of wealth in any significant manner. It was businessmen therefore, who had defined ‘the limits of political intervention’ and specified ‘the form and thrust’, of political reforms.[[836]](#footnote-836)

The editors of *Studies* praised *The Triumph of Conservatism*, highlighting the success with which it described the ‘underlying nature’ of liberalism as a precursor to understanding the 20th century.[[837]](#footnote-837) If read widely alongside *Williams’ Contours of American History*, James Weinstein suggested to Martin Sklar, it would ‘change 20th century historiography, providing those who hoped to effect humanist social change with a ‘powerful intellectual tool.[[838]](#footnote-838) Yet the book also had its flaws. Weinstein believed Kolko had overplayed the hegemony of Eastern business and financial elites and their ‘narrow motives’, ignoring the complexity of the different social forces that were in a constant state of tension and flux; both the complexity of the business leaders motives, and the real moves for social change, from the Socialists, neo-populists, and other non-big business reform groups.[[839]](#footnote-839) ‘Kolko does not take into account’, he wrote, ‘the extent to which reform was motivated by a desire *to head off more radical action* at the hands of the Socialist Party or the neo-Populist progressives’. The combination of these forces, if such a situation had come to pass, or if the Socialist Party had not split, could have led to a more severe package of reform.[[840]](#footnote-840)

Aside from James Weinstein, work completed by Stephen Scheinberg, Ronald Radosh and David Eakins rounded out a comprehensive analysis collectively made by the *Studies* editors of the development of Corporate Liberalism in the 20th century. Scheinberg’s *The Development of Corporation Labour Policy, 1900-1940*, an analysis of corporate welfare work in the pre-WW2 era, is perhaps the best of these contributions. Scheinberg lamented that the analysis of liberalism had been largely confined to the political and intellectual fields, eclipsing the role played by businesses in ‘adapting’ to new economic circumstances rather than become prisoners of strict orthodoxy economic orthodoxies.[[841]](#footnote-841) Though motivated in part by a desire to stave off organised unionism, Scheinberg identified inchoate desires among sectors of business reformers to work with of ‘moderate’ unions, which recognised the rights of the corporation, as a means to transcend sectional and interest group considerations and support for corporations within the unions.[[842]](#footnote-842) Unlike Kolko, who had focused on the areas in which executives had sought to impinge upon the political process in order to shape legislation, Scheinberg found the major source of their activity not in politics, but within corporations themselves.[[843]](#footnote-843) Efforts to improve employee welfare in the form of better sanitation, recreation facilities, industrial education, employee housing, provident funds and stock purchase plans, were part of an attempt to reduce alienation and improve ‘the non-mechanical aspect of factory life.[[844]](#footnote-844)

As important as it was to acknowledge that progressive views on labour relations among businessmen only ever constituted a minority of the corporate community, Scheinberg stressed that however small, their influence was significant. During WW1, employers and unions were brought together on the War Labor Board, and in the interwar years, the ‘Special Conference Committee’ of business leaders serving as an informal network to develop a unified front towards a moderate policy in relation to labour, ultimately eased the path of acceptance towards the Wagner Act.[[845]](#footnote-845) Designed to harmonise the emerging trusts and labour movement, while suppressing radicalism, Theodore Roosevelt’s labour policy disciplined ‘pugnacious’ employers, whilst thwarting trade union incursion into politics.[[846]](#footnote-846) Herbert Hoover was a ‘radical innovator’ whose focus on labour efficiency rather than supply and demand led him to advocate for increased pay and promotions, rather than lower unit costs.[[847]](#footnote-847) He also supported collective bargaining and unemployment and sickness protection.’[[848]](#footnote-848) At the heart of his and world-view, one he shared with Samuel Gompers, was a belief in the corporation as the primary social forces in American life, and the commensurate need to devise a system for its governance that was equitable and workable for all.[[849]](#footnote-849)

Examining the ‘new unionism’ of Samuel Gompers of the American Federation of Labour, and Sidney Hillman of the Congress of Industrial Organisations, Ronald Radosh noted that their acceptance that the growth of corporations was a natural and inevitable occurrence that the unions could not defeat led them to ‘join with owners and managers’ in a Corporate Liberal consensus supporting a corporate ideology based on imperialism.[[850]](#footnote-850) The AFL had gradually moved from anti-revolutionary policies under Gompers to support for anti-communist regimes in the Cold War, working to curb social revolution in South America, whilst accepting the general belief that social progress coincided with the growth of an informal American ‘empire.’[[851]](#footnote-851) Hillman and the CIO advocated an end to labour militancy, and support for State Department policy, allowing the preponderance of cold war diplomacy.[[852]](#footnote-852) Labour had accepted the corporate political economy in exchange for a share in the decision-making process.[[853]](#footnote-853)

By the mid-1950s, only radicals and right-wingers, Radosh later remarked, were questioning the co-operation between labour and government in foreign policy, the merged AFL-CIO playing the role of the ‘labour front’ for the American-style corporate state, working to bolster labour support for the system.[[854]](#footnote-854) The absence of a truly radical trade union movement had allowed corporate liberals, working through bodies such as the American Association for Labour Legislation (AALL), to influence the development of comprehensive social security, old age pension coverage, and further growth of conservative trade unions conservative unions as a prop to the existing order. Public works had persuaded liberals and radicals to overlook the conservative origins and effects of the New Deal, an understanding of which was crucial if radicals were to ‘resist’ policies which extended the welfare state and continue to work towards a socialist community in the United States.’[[855]](#footnote-855)

In contrast to Weinstein, Scheinberg, and Radosh, David Eakins focused explicitly on post-war developments. Exploring the formation of a coalition of corporate liberals in business, government officials, and academics in the ‘handful’ of research organisations, Eakins sought to understand how organisations such as The Brookings Institution, the Committee for Economic Development, and the Twentieth Century Fund had participated in the making of national policy making process. [[856]](#footnote-856) Though each of them was a private organisation, their objectivity and detachment, Eakins noted, had become widely accepted, based on their desire to sustain and stabilise American capitalism, and influence policy changes advantageous to the corporate economy.[[857]](#footnote-857) Motivated out of a fear of a post-war depression as a consequence of job shortages and an excess of productive capacity, Corporate Liberal businessmen ‘generally agreed’ that the government should continue to play a role in helping to sustain full production and employment, but stop short of internal planning or an extended New Deal. Yet disagreement over the role of the government in the economy stimulated the growth of policy research groups as a means of demanding government support for ‘new approaches for economic expansion abroad.[[858]](#footnote-858) ‘Under the circumstances, David Eakins proposed that the radicals return to the alternative so dreaded by Corporate Liberal policy makers, the co-operative commonwealth.’[[859]](#footnote-859)

The combined efforts of the editors met with contrasting opinions. In his 1965 critique of the emerging New Left historiography, Irwin Unger noted that while Martin Sklar had not gone as far as Gabriel Kolko in determining that Progressive Era reform was ‘a sham’, it was difficult to identify in his work ‘anything of the humanitarianism, the self-criticism and the social imagination’ that had characterised earlier examinations of reform.[[860]](#footnote-860) Reviews of Weinstein’s book reflected this opinion, questioning the degree to which businessmen worked to ameliorate conflict between employers and unions. Samuel P. Hays felt that Weinstein’s arguments that business leaders had provided the impetus for workingman’s compensation were persuasive, but that they overlooked the possibility that they had been driven by the ‘logic’ of rationalisation in compensation outcomes to better control the economy, rather than to ameliorate conflict. More interested in the specifics of decision making and the ‘instruments of manipulation and control’ rather than ‘class conscious’ in an overt sense, buy…often within a self-image of the ‘public interest’ most New Left writing on the period, he found, was overly concerned with gross terms of classes and power, rather than the dynamics of rationalisation in large-scale systems.[[861]](#footnote-861)

Robert Wiebe went further, suggesting that Corporate Liberalism had reconstructed the earlier ‘Consensus School’ interpretation, compressing and paralysing history into an ‘elementary catechism of social oppression and moral failure’, that rendered it without nuance, and useless as a tool for guiding social change.[[862]](#footnote-862) ‘One can grant the oppression and failure, one can even grant the death of American liberalism without packaging the past into a tidy lesson to note, file, and forget.’[[863]](#footnote-863) Likewise, Morton Keller chastised Weinstein for exaggerating his supporting evidence, particularly in the suggestion that the establishment of city managers in many American cities demonstrated that ‘the end result was to place city government firmly in the hands of the business class’, ignored the fact that none of the nation’s largest cities had adopted the structure.[[864]](#footnote-864) ‘Radical history ‘should open ourselves to ways of looking at the world that has not occurred to us before. It should be liberating and humanising’, he claimed, yet, in resting such a notion as American public policy wholly on the aspirations of a ‘coterie’ of corporate spokesmen, Weinstein had succeeded in doing the opposite: ‘If I may be permitted an appropriate paraphrase’, Keller argued in a nod to Herbert Marcuse, Weinstein had written ‘one-dimensional history.’[[865]](#footnote-865) Even fellow editor Eugene Genovese, who commended Weinstein’s ‘fortitude’ in wading through archives in an effort to ‘put flesh on the bones of the corporate-capitalism–liberalism thesis, found his uncovering of such a high degree of consensus in American society and the pro-capitalism of progressive movements had a combined ‘flattening’ hard to take.[[866]](#footnote-866)

If the editors had expressed a desire to reject the ‘Consensus School’, of 1950s scholarship, as Unger had inferred, their work did not represent a wholesale rejection of its claim, suggesting instead that a consensus had worked against the suppression of radical alternatives through the co-optation of legislation. In this regard, Corporate Liberalism offered a different route to the ‘liberal tradition;’ a consensus forged out of incorporation rather than ideological agreement. Given the sceptical reviews the scholarship of Samuel P. Hays in *The Response to Industrialism* and Robert Wiebe in *The Search for Order* and *Businessmen and Reform*, associated with the ‘Organisational Synthesis’, was latterly identified by Peter Novick and others as ‘meshing’ with that of the *Studies* editors, in its focus on the Progressive Era development of capitalist organising principles.[[867]](#footnote-867) Hays indicated, for example, that industrial leaders sought to dominate party political activity to render it subservient to their wishes. The senate became representatives of the different economic groups ‘rather than of the state… Party leaders functioned now as servants of the new business politicians rather than as masters.’[[868]](#footnote-868) More sceptical, Wiebe understood businessmen to have been as disconnected as any other segment of society but were elevated to the status of social innovator due to their economic success.’[[869]](#footnote-869) They stood apart from other reformers because of their narrow public philosophy, represented ‘the hard side of progressivism. ‘[[870]](#footnote-870) Often leading reform, sometimes opposing, and sometimes merely adjusting along with other class segments, businessmen had been important actors in the Progressive Era.

Corporate Liberalism and the New Left

In the first history of SDS written by Kirkpatrick Sale in the early 1970s, Corporate Liberalism was credited as being one of a number of concepts, along with local ‘participatory democracy…local organising, the new working class, revolutionary consciousness, and imperialism’, which had widened the spectrum of left-wing politics in America.[[871]](#footnote-871) Alongside Herbert Marcuse’s One Dimensional Man, which also questioned the capabilities of movements to enact progressive in a capitalist society in which a process of ‘oppressive desublimation’ remove the energies otherwise available for a social critique.

First introduced by SDS in their 1963 manifesto America and the New Era, Corporate Liberalism was defined as the language and culture of the ‘New Frontiersmen’ whose rhetoric had captured the liberal political base of the Democratic Party and its supporters, who were afraid of irrelevancy outside it.’[[872]](#footnote-872) Written by Dick Flacks, with help from Paul Booth, Alan Haber, and Studies editor Tom Hayden, the authors were proud of the document: it was ‘the ‘only time I felt I had a synthesis’ Flacks recalled in the late 1980s. ‘It seemed to me that heightening grass-roots protest could entail fundamental policy changes…the people who are running the society are the corporate liberals. They want to stabilize, not repress. The real threat to the left is not the right wing, but a strengthened liberal centre.’[[873]](#footnote-873) His conception of Corporate Liberalism, he later clarified, was more of a ‘Liberal Corporatism’ the point had been not to attack labour leaders such as Walter Reuther, but rather ‘to attack the idea that Walter Reuther’s role lay in meeting with General Motors and John Kennedy to hash out appropriate solutions for society – that’s corporatism.’[[874]](#footnote-874) Its liberalism was based in the belief that it involved representatives of groups traditionally favouring liberal reform and democracy, such as unions. ‘Liberal corporatism tends to the co-optation of dissent and reform rather than their suppression.’[[875]](#footnote-875) The differences between co-optation and suppression would become a key point of contention for critics of Corporate Liberalism

The term reached a wider audience in the speeches and literature of the New Left. At the 1965 March on Washington, SDS President Paul Potter stated the need to “name the system” that had sought to justify American involvement in Vietnam, disenfranchised impoverished Southern communities, and created ‘faceless and terrible’ bureaucracies. “We must name that system… describe it, analyse it, understand it, and change it.”[[876]](#footnote-876) Later that year, on a similar march in the capital, his successor Carl Oglesby suggested that the men who engineered the war in Vietnam were not “moral monsters” but “honourable…liberals” but corporate liberals, who rationalised their ‘rapacity and policy of counter-revolution’ with virulent anti-communism. Corporate liberalism, he claimed, performed a church like role, justifying its burdens and protecting itself from change. Humanists faced a crisis: allow their dreams to be used and become grudging apologists for the corporate state, or try to change it, “in the name of simple human decency and democracy and the vision…If that sounds anti-American to some I say: don’t blame me for that! Blame those who mouthed my liberal values and broke my American heart.”[[877]](#footnote-877) The speech was well received. ‘‘I was something like a rock star’, Oglesby wrote in his memoir. ‘SANE and SDS, the old liberals and the new radicals, were going to fight against the war together, and not waste energy.’[[878]](#footnote-878) Paul Potter was more sceptical. ‘Corporate capitalism, or imperialism, or Oglesby’s corporate liberalism… was not the name I was looking for in 1965...I wanted ambiguity…I was disappointed in Oglesby’s speech not because I disagreed with it…but because it sacrificed the ambiguity which I felt was such an important part of our movement for a term – corporate liberalism – that didn’t particularly stir me.’[[879]](#footnote-879)

Despite his objections, Corporate Liberalism appeared frequently in SDS publications such as New Left Notes. The SDS activists who disrupted the 1967 National Student Association’s congress in Washington denounced the organisation as a front for corporate liberalism over its links with the CIA. Carl Davidson’s SDS tract on the multiversity system drew links between the cold war ‘multiversity’ – weaned on government grants, and the Corporate Liberal state.[[880]](#footnote-880) The same year, Columbia University SDS, referred to as the ‘Praxis Axis’ group, published the ‘Port Authority Statement’, which highlighted their belief that corporate liberalism was the underlying political framework of American capitalism, the driving force which had shaped the War on Poverty into a program to stave off social instability rather than to eliminate poverty.[[881]](#footnote-881) Corporate Liberal society, they felt only permitted an examination and acceptance of the assumptions of the system, rather than its potential for change and liberation, with critical thought, in intellectual scholarship, leisure time and consumption, co-opted into a ‘bland acceptance of everything.’[[882]](#footnote-882) ‘We are fulfilled in a way that is totally repressive, whether socially or sexually’, the group wrote. ‘Excitement is a Ford Mustang; passion is a cool hair groomer; love of nature is a Marlboro filter-tip; history is a Saturday Evening Post article about Everett Dirksen and Joe Namath; politics is the art of Lyndon Johnson; and societal identification is…a colour television set. And society is always there.’[[883]](#footnote-883) Representing one of the more conservative factions of SDS, the Praxis Axis hoped to maintain the focus of the organisation on education rather than aggressive and confrontational protest.[[884]](#footnote-884)

The theory continued to play a significant role in the work of Carl Oglesby. In his 1967 book Containment and Change, Oglesby offered a comprehensive critique of American foreign policy, which David Barber has suggested popularised the significance of the ‘Open Door’ theory of William Appleman Williams within ‘the broader New Left.’[[885]](#footnote-885) The legacy of American foreign policy, Oglesby stated, had been to generate resistance and create revolutions in the Third World, which the United States saw as ‘an unprotected gold mine... Why should it want to surrender its privileged position there, all in the name of some fuzzy humanitarian ideal? Alternatively, why should it rejoice to see the emergence of local capitalists who may some say get strong enough to give it some competition?’[[886]](#footnote-886) A conquering of ‘the wilderness’ was simply an updating of America’s ‘frontier’ ideology, now called ‘modernisation’ or ‘developing the underdeveloped’.[[887]](#footnote-887) The splits within the Democratic Party Corporate Liberals in the lead up to the 1968 election had caused the formation of two distinct ‘ruling-class voices’, one which demanded an increase in military effort in Vietnam, and another which wanted to walk away and focus on other things.

At the heart of this split, Oglesby suggested in his later work, The Yankee and Cowboy War, was a regional difference between the East Coast Wall Street elites and major corporation leaders, and the new wealth of the Southern states, born out of the emerging defence and oil industries. ‘The Yankee mind, of global scope, is at home in the great world’, he stated.[[888]](#footnote-888) ‘The Yankee believes that the basis of a good world order is the health of America’s alliances...The Cowboy...substitutes for the Yankee’s Atlantic-orientated culture a new system...orientated to an expanding wilderness Frontier.[[889]](#footnote-889) Challenging the Eastern Corporate Liberals, these ‘corporate conservatives’, Oglesby believed, had provided the impetus behind the efforts of Nixon administration to roll back many of the Great Society programs.[[890]](#footnote-890)

The theory, also adopted by Kirkpatrick Sale, was discussed widely within radical circles, and it is interesting to speculate whether the supposed drift of the United States away from Corporate Liberalism towards Neo-Liberalism was a response to the splitting on the corporate class into different factions.[[891]](#footnote-891)

\* \* \*

At the end of the decade, in an overview of the 1960s movements, ex-Studies editor Staughton Lynd claimed that Herbert Marcuse’s One Dimensional Man had been the single most comprehensive scholarly statement supporting the New Left’s analysis of Corporate Liberalism.[[892]](#footnote-892) Published in 1964, One Dimensional Man, it has been argued, elevated Herbert Marcuse to ‘guru’ status within the New Left.[[893]](#footnote-893) In the book, Marcuse stressed the degree to which the lives of the American people were characterised by servitude ‘to irrational and impersonal forces’ designed to maximise their productivity at the expense of a fulfilling existence.[[894]](#footnote-894) Through the successful expansion of mass production and distribution, Marcuse claimed, industrial society had perfected new and highly effective forms of totalitarian social control. The most prominent of these, ‘commodity fetishism’, manipulated ‘the deepest and innermost human needs’ and obliterated the effectiveness of radical critiques to the capitalist system, redefining dissenting ideas political opposition through a process of welfare expansion and rising standards of living.[[895]](#footnote-895) Renouncing liberal reformism or piecemeal change, Marcuse claimed, was the only non-integrated ‘outsiders’ could act as a truly revolutionary force, through ‘The Great Refusal, a rebellion that would not bow to the ‘coercive consumerism and conformism’ of capitalist society.[[896]](#footnote-896)

The idea that Corporate Liberalism had neutered the impact of radical critiques of capitalism had not escaped the Studies editors. In February 1961, a full three years before One Dimensional Man was published, Eleanor Hakim, had mused over the capacity of the new student movements to be truly radical in a corporate society, asking Martin Sklar whether corporate liberal society was strengthening its existence and ‘forestalling its decline’ by incorporating the ‘tiny titbits of solutions’ proposed by the left. ‘Is…radical protest today, the vanguard of liberal program tomorrow?’ she mused. ‘How then does a radical keep from getting swallowed up?’[[897]](#footnote-897) The process by which corporate liberalism had achieved dominance, she suggested elsewhere, was much more subtle than the ‘bludgeoning technique of fascism’, for it neutralised and made impotent those protest movement radicals which challenged it, and maintained the illusion of democratic tolerance, rendering fascism superfluous.[[898]](#footnote-898)

The most forthright invocation of Marcuse’s ideas in Studies however, came from the younger editors such as Norman Fruchter, Tom Hayden, Ronald Aronson, and associate Paul Breines. In the form of the movement activist, Fruchter and Hayden identified a ‘New Man’, immune to manipulation due to status of his rebellion against the state; their version of Marcuse’s ‘Great Refusal.’[[899]](#footnote-899) Elsewhere, Fruchter and Robert Kramer mused whether the advances in industrial technology were aiding the process by which radicalism was diverted into manageable dissent, and whether the increasing rate by which society was enforcing disaffiliation - from victims of youth culture, addicts, to pacifists – would eventually produce a class that was too numerous and diverse to effectively assimilate.[[900]](#footnote-900) Aronson, a student of Marcuse, praised him for introducing a new perspective which had helped young radicals ‘make sense’ of their lives, and enable them to define themselves in opposition to liberal mainstream.’[[901]](#footnote-901) ‘You introduced us to a perspective, which was new and revolutionary’, he addressed Marcuse in the late 1960s, ‘which made sense of our lives and helped us to find our way as radicals…Capitalist society became clear as one form of class society: the central question became one of domination.’[[902]](#footnote-902) Like Marcuse then, it appeared to the New Left that corporate liberalism made radical social change appear a less likely prospect.

Despite its popularity of One-Dimensional Man, Studies editors voiced their dissatisfaction with the despair evident in the work akin to the despair some historians had identified in the editors’ work. They struggled to review the book.[[903]](#footnote-903) Martin Sklar complained of the book’s popularity on the New Left, stating his preference Marcuse’s earlier Reason and Revolution, which insisted on the real possibility of liberation as well as the obstacles in its way.[[904]](#footnote-904) Likewise, James Weinstein later argued against Frankfurt School-type theses of total control, writing that ‘the very fact that you can perceive the cultural hegemony of capitalism and commit yourself to struggling against it is proof that it is neither omnipotent nor omnipresent.’[[905]](#footnote-905) Hayden later dismissed the influence of Marcuse as being ‘too pessimistic’ or ‘too theoretical’ to have had much of an influence over the student movement.

By the end of the 1960s, the New Left itself had begun to critique Corporate Liberalism.[[906]](#footnote-906) In the page of Radical America, a new generation of left scholars began to critique the theory of Corporate Liberalism for being too pessimistic in its depictions of capitalist hegemony, believing that its conclusions to be a ‘new extreme in historical interpretation.’[[907]](#footnote-907) The revival of political opposition among the most oppressed and the most incorporated required analysis; it suggested a different sense of how history was made’, a process ‘not simply’ determined ‘by elites, from the top down, but in the interaction of social groups holding power in different forms.[[908]](#footnote-908) The appetite of the American historical profession for ‘New Left’ historical perspectives as a ‘useful corrective’ to the extremes of consensus history had looked towards Corporate Liberalism as a theory that removed the need to take the historians or the political movement seriously.[[909]](#footnote-909) ‘The new radical historians have made more important contributions than their critics like to admit’, stated the editors. Studies, with its ‘rigorous and unconventional thought and its refusal to respect the tidy boundary lines of the different academic disciplines…represented an in-between generation of radical intellectuals who sought…to ferret out the materials for a new theory.’[[910]](#footnote-910)

For all their accomplishments however, the works of Martin Sklar, David Eakins, James Weinstein, Stephen Scheinberg and Ronald Radosh, had been limited to corporate, political and labour elites and neglected to discern how successful the corporate ideological hegemony had been imposed. Aside from The Corporate Ideal, the editors felt, the editors reflected too much of the pessimism symbolised by Herbert Marcuse, their despair over the possibilities for radical social change reflected the success of the corporate hegemony. The worry was that their works would be seized upon by radicals ‘as a new dogma, with slight regard for the methodological and political differences among the historians, ‘often publicly and polemically aired.’[[911]](#footnote-911) Alternately, they may become viewed as ‘extreme’ with the pendulum of scholarship swinging back the other way in the same way that Beardian history had been treated as ‘the left end of a one-dimensional spectrum.’[[912]](#footnote-912) Studies had been the first step in the process of applying radical social analysis and the experience of contemporary radical movements to the study of the past.[[913]](#footnote-913)

The efforts of the Radical America editors to educate movement radicals, recalled Buhle in later years, were disillusioning. Where Studies had emerged from a period when corporate hegemony had been so manifest and overwhelming that the editors saw their primary task ‘as the depiction of the successful manipulation of the whole system’, Radical America grew out of the resurgence of the Left, whose sense of history leaned more sharply toward the rebellions of the past. [[914]](#footnote-914) Hoping to educate SDS members to their mistakes, he found that chapter activists were indifferent to history, too caught up in the day-to day activities of their locality, from whence they drew their pragmatic lessons.[[915]](#footnote-915) Those who considered themselves intellectuals were interested in Herbert Marcuse, and in the Old Left tradition, liable ‘to argue about Russia, China and Cuba’ without even considering the United States.[[916]](#footnote-916) Not that there appeared to be any real lessons to be drawn from the history as it had been written. ‘We wanted to look at history’, Buhle recalled, ‘especially working-class history, later Black History and women’s history – as something more live, more vital, of more immediate importance in political and even personal life than could be suggested in…other academic journals.[[917]](#footnote-917) With the New Left having turned away from Corporate Liberal analysis in favour of social history, it appeared that former had lost its traction as a theory for understanding the past, but more importantly, assessing the prospects for radical activity in the future. In the 1970s, this trend extended into the social scientists, as a new generation of academics attempted to ‘Bring the State Back In’ to historical writing as a powerful and autonomous actor.

Corporate Liberalism and its Critics

Theoretical critiques of Corporate Liberalism from the social sciences began in earnest within the circle of editors loosely connected to *Socialist Revolution*, James Weinstein’s successor journal to *Studies on the Left.* Focusing particularly on the implications of Ronald Radosh’s analysis of New Deal reform in *New History of Leviathan*, James O’Connor, Erik Olin Wright, Fred Block, and Theda Skocpol – members of the ‘Kapitalistate’ collective – concluded that corporate liberalism had been too ‘instrumentalist’ in its assessment, similarly to C. Wright Mills, that the state was an ‘instrument’ of the capitalist class. – merely a committee for ‘managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.’[[918]](#footnote-918) AS *Socialist Revolution* contributor William Domhoff recalled,‘Whereas the original corporate-liberal Marxists’ had been concerned why their years of effort within the movement working towards socialism and revolution had produced only liberal reforms, neo-Marxists hoped to cheer on the activists of the 1970s ‘by emphasising that reforms were possible, significant, and the products of working-class demands.’[[919]](#footnote-919) Simply, Corporate Liberalism was ‘too elitist, manipulative, and pessimistic’ a theory to be of use to the movement.[[920]](#footnote-920)

Corporate Liberalism, according to a *Kapitalistate*, was a ‘sophisticated version’ of instrumental theory, which stressed the ‘ability of progressive fractions of capital to pre-emptively determine the limits of reform through corporate financed, controlled and staffed policy research and policy formation groups which originated model legislation and set the ideological boundaries within which partisan battles’ had been contained.[[921]](#footnote-921) Cut adrift from the context of capitalist development both in the 19th century and beyond the First World War, the theory neglected to account for the historical development of capitalism as a ‘transient social formation.’[[922]](#footnote-922) *The Corporate Ideal* implied that prior to the corporate capitalism had diverged from a ‘happier, more democratic’ prior age in which a more equal power relationship existed between the people and the corporate elites.[[923]](#footnote-923) Conversely, the term ‘Triumph of Conservatism’, emptied both liberalism and conservatism of their historical meanings, and implied that conservatism equated to ‘coordinated’ attempts of the capitalist elites to use government in the interests of the capitalist economy.[[924]](#footnote-924) Who was to say whether a certain reform measure was a ‘genuine reform’; if it was progressive, conservative or radical?[[925]](#footnote-925) Lacking a theoretical conceptualisation of the role of the state in society, both James Weinstein and Gabriel Kolko had ignored the capacity of the state to intervene against specific capitalist interests, given the various contradictions of capitalism – the conflict between labour and capital, the competition between individual capitalists, and uneven growth across nations.[[926]](#footnote-926)

For the Kapitalistate group, these problems made Corporate Liberalism a poor tool with which to critique contemporary society or guide activists. Seen through the lens of Corporate Liberalism, corporate interventions appeared as ‘spontaneous efforts at rationalisation or efforts to channel reform into less threatening direction, rather than result of demands from below, combined with the efforts of the powerful to shape and control the process of change.’ [[927]](#footnote-927) It could neither explain the mid-1970s discussions about government-business planning that went nowhere or the social spending cutbacks made by Nixon, which the theory would have declared impossible. ‘Past and present rationalisations’, of capitalist society were the result of complex interactions among social classes and the state, and could not be reduced to a single dimension.[[928]](#footnote-928) An analysis of the passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) and the Wagner Act for example, Theda Skocpol, proved how Corporate Liberalism could only be substantiated if major facts about the passage of these policies was ignored. There had been little unity within the corporate sector in the New Deal years, demonstrated in the failure of the NIRA to bring economic recovery through business-government co-operation.[[929]](#footnote-929) Little evidence existed to suggest that capitalist plans had led to the New Deal. ‘Was there at work during the 1930s, a self-conscious disciplined capitalist class, or vanguard of major capitalists that put forward functional strategies for recovery and stabilisation and had the political power to implement them successfully?’ she asked.[[930]](#footnote-930) ‘Were most corporate leaders (especially of big, strategic businesses) prepared to make concessions to labour? Did business opposition to the New Deal come primarily from small business? These questions, she felt, went to the heart of the Corporate Liberal claims, and the theory could not explain the New Deal.[[931]](#footnote-931)

These criticisms of Corporate Liberalism were strengthened in the mid-1970s by Gabriel Kolko who sought to clarify the conclusions he had made in *The Triumph of Conservatism.* Without abandoning the essence of his argument, he sought to clarify his feeling that capitalist elites were both irrational and illiberal, the clear majority being hostile to even the most ideologically and politically conservative union movements, in fact had preferred conflict to collaboration. Competition between capitalists, he felt, had made collaboration near impossible, and when they did agree to utilise the state for their needs, the process was impeded by a lack of social knowledge.[[932]](#footnote-932) Acknowledging that the state often acted as an autonomous force to stabilise capitalism, Kolko denied that capitalist ‘skill’ was responsible for the political failure of socialism and working-class politics in the United States. Rather, the weakness of the left had allowed capitalists ‘vast amounts of ‘social time and social space’ to bungle towards solutions. The unions had failed to create a movement, which could challenge capitalism, and in place of working class consciousness there was violence, psychosis and alcoholism.[[933]](#footnote-933) The concept of ‘capitalist rationality’, had caught on among Corporate Liberal historians because American capitalism in the 1960s had appeared so permanent, ‘obvious’ and un-shifting, and the prospects for a socialist ‘revival’ so remote, that it must have been a state of affairs brought about by deliberate design.[[934]](#footnote-934) In focusing on the strengths and achievements rather than the deficiencies of American capitalism, the New Left had precluded themselves from a full understanding of the ‘real and potential’ limits of a system and its structure, and the potentialities for its breakdown.[[935]](#footnote-935)

The same had been true of the efforts of the Organisational School. ‘Organisational’ and ‘integrationist’ theories such as those presented by Samuel P. Hays and Robert Wiebe had united conservatives and radicals around a belief in the existence of individuals who had achieved mastery over an impersonal and bureaucratic system of political and economic decision making, creating efficient and rational systems, a belief that was false. Corporate Liberal scholars had gone further, suggesting that the Progressive Era had contained a coherent, planned out effort to make society ‘more rational and efficient.[[936]](#footnote-936) The idea that American capitalism contained within it a higher rationality however, remained ‘pure ideology. ‘The self-confidence and capacity for mastery which pessimistic critical theorists and capitalist apologists alike attribute to it are merely illusion and false consciousness…In the view of the radical pessimists, of whom Marcuse is the best known but by no means the first…the society is condemned while its permanence is asserted. They do not consider the way intelligence operates but look only at the final social outcome of integration - of which technically precise, efficient, and socially neutral information is implicitly considered the first step.’ To analyse the basis of the failures, he felt, required a conception of the limits of integration, and the more complex problems of the structure of US capitalism.[[937]](#footnote-937)

Kolko’s re-imaging was not received well from either the Kapitalistate neo-Marxists, or the former *Studies* editors. Though Fred Block praised Kolko for his analysis of capitalist rationality, he lamented his failure to propose a unifying theory of the state and a lack of discussion of non-elite actors and their relationship to power.[[938]](#footnote-938) In a rare book review, Martin Sklar noted that although Kolko had set out to develop a synthesis of American history based upon three factors; the ‘structural context’ of the capitalist-political economy; the world-view of ‘men of power’; and the contingency emerging from ‘human frailty’ the reader, it was unclear which was the ‘Main Current’ of the American history; Structure, world-view, or chance? Kolko had describing a society out of control, yet which was following a predetermined direction and purpose of which capitalism was the most significant aspect, with capitalists at once sharing a consensus that the corporate structure needed to be preserved, yet mocking their lack of ‘social knowledge’ and ignorance.[[939]](#footnote-939) John Braeman was more accusatory, accusing Kolko of masking a political tract as historical analysis in his assessment that the United States was an ‘irreparably sick society.’ Though successful in delineating the tactics used by government to prevent the emergence of class-consciousness in the working class, these strengths were hidden behind a ‘deep pessimism about the likelihood, or even possibility, of any meaningful change’ and a feeling that the United States was locked into enduring, permanent crises at home and abroad. [[940]](#footnote-940)

Through the late 1970s and 1980s, Corporate Liberalism, continued to be marginalised.[[941]](#footnote-941) Herbert Gutman, in stating the need for a new national synthesis in place of the increasingly narrow studies categorised as ‘New History’, rejected the corporate liberal thesis, believing that it simply projected back into the past the political pessimism of the 1950s and early 1960s, and the disillusionment with the New Deal and the Old Left’s uncritical relationship to Roosevelt.[[942]](#footnote-942) In assessing the impact of Corporate Liberalism in his study of the American historical profession, Peter Novick highlighted the degree to which the work of James Weinstein and Gabriel Kolko echoed Alan Brinkley’s assessment that scholars in the organisational field had laid claim to a ‘value neutral interpretation of history’ which placed no ideological stand on the processes they described.[[943]](#footnote-943) There was, he stated, in their description of the modern world, ‘an unmistakable aura of inevitability, a sense that, in its broad outlines, what has happened is what had to happen’, and that protest movements, ‘in the organisational view’, became irrelevant, ‘clinging to a vision of society doomed to obsolescence by the relentless march of history.’[[944]](#footnote-944) Even the more nuanced approach presented by Ellis Hawley, who argued that corporate liberalism represented a co-operative pluralism, active in the political centre, which had embraced laissez faire and welfare statism, found little support.[[945]](#footnote-945)

In most of the criticism of corporate liberalism, the voice of Martin Sklar appeared absent. This is particularly evident in G. William Domhoff’s analysis of the theory and its critics in his 1990 book *The Power Elite and the State: How Policy is Made in America,* which attributed the development of the theory to William Appleman Williams, James Weinstein, David Eakins and Ronald Radosh, without even mentioning Sklar. Having clarified his earlier views, in 1988 Sklar published *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890–1916*, which clarified his conception of Corporate Liberalism, which in form and content, profoundly departed from the pessimistic outlooks of Kolko in *Main Currents*, and James Weinstein, who continued to battle against Reaganism and neo-conservatism at *In These Times*.

The American Century

The late 1980s were a time of transition for Progressive Era historiography. Whilst it still had defenders in public life and popular culture, a mounting number of contemporary historical accounts had begun to undermine the reputation of the Progressive Era as being a period of positive reform. ‘In a cynical age, and given the leftist politics prevalent in the academy, it is easy to see that progressives did not address many of the age’s fundamental issues of social justice. Indeed, they clearly made many of them worse’, Robert D. Johnston wrote in 2002, describing a wave of scholarship that was ‘unrelenting’ in detailing the crimes of Progressivism.[[946]](#footnote-946) In the 1950s, in the work of Richard Hofstadter, Samuel P. Hays, and Louis Hartz, had portrayed the ‘moralistic rhetoric of the middle-class reformers of the Progressive Era as largely harmless to the status quo. The New Left had then, Johnston stated, in the form of Sklar’s Wilson article had ‘matter of factly’ detailed the reality that ‘corporate growth’ and the Open Door had constituted the reality of liberalism at the turn of the 20th century.’[[947]](#footnote-947) James Weinstein and the *Studies* editors had emphasised the co-optation of working-class reforms by the corporate elite.

It was Sklar’s *The Reconstruction of American Capitalism*, along with James Kloppenberg’s *Uncertain Victory*, and Theda Skocpol’s *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers*, which had broken this trend, demonstrating that Progressive activism had ‘paid handsome dividends.’[[948]](#footnote-948) Christopher Lasch’s *The True and Only Heaven* had revived the middle-class as a source of ‘petit-bourgeois populism’, which protested liberal progressive in the early 20th century, and supported the ‘egalitarian small propertied ideal and the values of ‘responsibility, loyalty, the dignity of labor, and participatory democracy’ in opposition to economic centralisation.[[949]](#footnote-949) Daniel Rogers, in *Atlantic Crossings,* praised the ‘cosmopolitan left-liberal thinkers’ who reconstructed *laissez-faire* capitalism and created a ‘social politics and Elizabeth Sanders celebrated ‘the peasants with pitchforks’ who fought for a populist agenda. What now attracted scholars to look again at the Progressive movement? ‘Beyond specific political prescriptions’ Johnston declared, ‘the progressive impulse’ might aid the Americans to re-democratise their society and their lives.[[950]](#footnote-950)

Was Johnston’s conclusion a call for a new ‘useable history? This was arguably the aim of Elizabeth Sanders, whose *Farmers, Workers, and the American State, 1877-1917*, published in 1999, rallied against the Corporate Liberal scholars for having relegated agrarian populism to ‘the dustbin’ of failed crusades’, and ignored the legislative victories of the farmer and worker movements, who had worked to forge and design the modern American state. [[951]](#footnote-951) Attempting to ‘set the record straight’, she demonstrated an account of the origins of the twentieth century state different to that offered by those offered by ‘business-dominance’ accounts, and those of intellectual historians such as Richard Hofstadter.[[952]](#footnote-952) The dynamic stimulus for Populist and Progressive Era state expansion was the periphery agrarians’ drive to establish ‘public control’ over capitalism. It was the periphery, Sanders claimed, who in tapping into a political economy that was innately hostile to industrial and finance capital, had generated the reform agenda and mobilised the support that saw it pass the legislature.[[953]](#footnote-953)

Hoping to restrain corporations and prevent excess concentration of economic power in a reformed decentralised market, and unable to rely on a union movement that was sceptical of populism, it was from within the agrarian movements from which reform was derived. *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism*, stripped populists of their agency, placing them at the mercy of ‘an inevitable, corporate-led reconstruction of state-society relationships on (big) capitalist terms…labor is inconsequential, and farmers are a major nuisance in the unfolding of a grand capitalist design, the implementation of which takes place largely through presidential action.’[[954]](#footnote-954) Agrarian radicals however, had succeeded, putting laws ‘on the books’, their successes setting the tone for government expansion and regulatory surges right up to the 1970s. The populist vision of the agrarian movement was the ‘gold standard’ of social movements; ‘underdogs’ who propagated a vision of an alternative society and experimented with new ways to aid the credit-starved farmer: build an alternative cooperative economy; endorsing major-party candidates; finally, fusing with the national Democratic Party.[[955]](#footnote-955)

A further example was offered by Charles Postel who in *The Populist Vision* set outto demonstrate that in a time of technological transformation, incorporation and globalisation, the populist movement had campaigned for economic and political reforms that would adopt ‘the model of large-scale enterprise to their own needs of association and marketing’.[[956]](#footnote-956) Postel’s approach contrasted with previous treatments of the Populists, which had mocked the movement for supposed social backwardness, unreasoned radicalism and intolerance of progress.[[957]](#footnote-957) Though their movement had been too diffuse to produce a ‘Populist Social Blueprint’ Postel longingly speculated as to what the ‘sum of Populist strivings’, their ‘cooperative commonwealth’ of public and private, cooperative and corporate, municipal and nationalised property relations, might have looked like if allowed to come to fruition. Populists, he claimed, wanted to reshape government as an agency of the majority, checking concentrations of wealth and redistributing it widely across the nation.[[958]](#footnote-958) Their victory would not have constituted a revolution, but perhaps, as Postel suggested, have ‘placed American institutions on paths akin to those of Canada or even Denmark - significant changes but hardly the overthrow of existing conditions.’ [[959]](#footnote-959) Having ‘mobilised millions of ordinary men and women in an effort to steer the political and economic institutions of an increasingly modern technologically sophisticated and globally connected society’, the significance of the Populists had laid ‘in the act of trying.’[[960]](#footnote-960)

The potential for such works by Sanders and Postel to provide a ‘useable past’ for readers looking for inspiration for their activism is understandable. As the *Studies* editors found in its encounters with the Socialist Scholars Conference and the Free University in the 1960s however, the search for such a history can be problematic. ‘It seems to me…on both the left and right’, Martin Sklar later wrote, that a proportion of people who studied history did so in order to ‘bring back in’ a past, a determination less to understand history ‘than to resuscitate, perpetuate, and repeat’ various movements, often out of a disdain, or disaffection, for contemporary society.[[961]](#footnote-961) This raises interesting questions about the utility and purpose of history. Should historical analysis of societal development always consider the motivations and actions of those who offered alternatives to an outcome, and perhaps continued to have influence, even if their alternatives were not ultimately taken up? Alternatively, should history actually account for events as they unfolded in the ‘hurly-burly’ of the political economy.[[962]](#footnote-962) Corporate Liberalism, for Sklar, was not an ideology, or a sector of society, but a characterisation of the capitalist epoch in which Americans lived.

If there had been no opposition to the growth of corporations, if capitalism had developed unimpeded by reform, how might have politicians and political parties developed differently? As it stands, what did transpire was the development of a Corporate Liberal society. In his final posthumous work, *Creating the American Century: The Ideas and Legacies of America’s Twentieth-Century Foreign Policy Founders*, Sklar returned to the policy of the Open Door, and the foreign policy makers who had advocated the development of an ‘Open Door World’, which replaced the cycle of rising and falling empires ‘with a cumulative process of global human development.’[[963]](#footnote-963) Maintaining the central role played by the election of 1912, Sklar defined the differences between Roosevelt representing the Left-Statism tendency of modern corporate liberalism, against the non-statist regulatory Corporate Liberalism of Wilson, and the property-rights liberalism, a ‘Neo-Conservatism’ of Taft.[[964]](#footnote-964) Whilst different in character, each characterised, Sklar believed, a long-term glacial tilt to the left. Unlike Roosevelt, who hoped to guide socialism, Taft rejected a dialogue with socialism, choosing to fight it at the ballot box. In this manner, Sklar believed, Taft effectively drew the distinctions between what would become left and right in modern American politics; on the left, those who would align and enter dialogue with socialism; and on the right, and those who would not.[[965]](#footnote-965) Acting as the bridge between Roosevelt’s incipient Corporate Liberalism and Wilson’s anti-statist, regulatory Corporate Liberalism, and the interplay between these three strands, Sklar believed, would recur repeatedly in the remaining years of the twentieth century in American politics, ‘whether square-dealing or new-dealing on the equalitarian left.’[[966]](#footnote-966) For Sklar at least, Corporate Liberalism defined political discourse in the United States. In the third section of this thesis, the Cold War era implications of this weltanschauung will be analysed.

# **Part Three: Up from Irrelevance**

## Chapter Seven: After the Election: *Studies on the Left* and the Great Society

In the autumn of 1962, the editors of *Studies on the Left* published ‘The Ultra-Right and Cold War Liberalism’, an editorial which attempted to reconcile the implications of their Corporate Liberal thesis with contemporary political economy. Believing that dissent had been co-opted by the Corporate Liberal elite in order to maintain free-market status quo, they concluded that the chief threat facing democracy in the United States was not the ‘Ultra’ or ‘Radical Right’ represented by Barry Goldwater and the recently formed John Birch Society, but Corporate Liberalism. Enjoying a hegemonic position in society, the corporate elites, with support from the unions and the government, had made concessions to the labouring and middle classes, and supported an expansionary foreign policy which ‘contained’ communism and worked to export American values and secure new markets for American products abroad.

With this consensus in place, the Corporate Liberals had little use for the radical right, which urged a more strident stance against communism. That was not to say that the Radical Right were not a threat; rather the editors believed that it was from the ‘headwaters’ of the Corporate Liberal consensus that the ‘ideological stream’ of contemporary right-wing politics drew its strength; ‘its’ existence was ‘a concomitant of the waging of the Cold War’, and in particular, its failure to achieve a decisive victory.[[967]](#footnote-967) If the United States continued along this interventionist path, the editors warned, the Right would continue to draw strength from those areas of society who clamoured for more extreme ‘solutions’ to ‘resolve’ the ‘conflict’.[[968]](#footnote-968) The growing restrictions on civil liberties tied to the ‘national interest’ required radicals to refocus their efforts away from the ‘Ultra-Right’ and to the destruction of ‘the still;’ the liberalism of the New Frontier and the Great Society.[[969]](#footnote-969)

An intellectual ‘declaration of war’ on liberalism, the ‘Ultra-Right’ editorial keyed into a growing scepticism among left-wing activists of the ability of liberalism to affect meaningful social change.[[970]](#footnote-970) Earlier in the same year, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) issued the *Port Huron Statement*, a document which challenged the ‘peace credentials’ of liberals, and warned that whilst it was possible for liberals and socialists to come together and develop a unifying thesis, the New Left might ultimately be forced to run candidates against liberals in order to protest the nation.[[971]](#footnote-971) Not so easily however, were the *Studies* editors able to reconcile their unease towards a political ideology that they saw as responsible for the inherent iniquity of corporate capitalism. Opposing Johnson’s ‘Great Society’ as a Corporate Liberal tactic to co-opt dissent into a client state, rather than a transformatory program, in the years following 1962, would aim to assist radicals in advocating an alternative program that would support the interests and sensibilities of those who were ‘done violence’ by the liberal state, placing ‘man and his social needs’ at its centre.[[972]](#footnote-972)

Development of such a program began with a diagnosis of why the socio-political principles of the Great Society program were misplaced. Using their own work, and that of William Appleman Williams, they critiqued the emerging ‘Client State’ at the heart of President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society Program, a consequence of its focus on ameliorating and managing social issues rather than aiming for solutions which changed the position of deprived individuals in society. In common with community activists who participated in the SDS-ERAP projects, they rejected the ‘paternalism, bureaucratic indifference, and sheer inadequacy’ of the welfare state. Social democrats, the felt, were no longer able to offer substantive alternatives to Corporate, or Cold War liberalism.[[973]](#footnote-973) It was within the pages of *Studies* that the New Left forged its analysis of the ills of liberal politics in the 1960s and began to debate alternatives. As we will find in the final chapters of this thesis, the fight to define how these alternatives were likely to be achieved grew to consume the editorial board in the later years of the journal’s existence.

Containment and the New Frontier

The roots of the *Studies* critique of liberalism lie in a rejection of George Kennan’s ‘Containment Thesis, which had grounded the essential strategy adopted by the United States in fighting the Cold War since the late 1940s. Kennan, a Foreign Service officer, warned in a 1947 edition of *Foreign Affairs*, that the United States had to confront the Soviet Union with an ‘adroit and vigilant application of counterforce’ to hold back their expansionist tendencies, and ultimately either force it to moderate its ideology, or hasten its demise.[[974]](#footnote-974) One of the few intellectuals to contest the Containment Thesis’ alongside Carl Marzani and I.F Stone, William Appleman Williams had long suspected that it was a prescription for participations in unending wars as a means for the United States to make the world over again in its own image.[[975]](#footnote-975) The *Studies* editors agreed. Williams was a ‘lonely voices of reason’, a review of his *Tragedy of American Diplomacy* explained in the first issue, who had cautioned an acquiescent public ‘to reconsider its course’: that Americans could only save their liberty through a program of colossal arms spending and military alliances.[[976]](#footnote-976) While a cessation of the arms trade and a negotiated settlement had been described as the road towards subjugation and enslavement, more likely, Frederick L. Schuman suggested, it would lead to the collapse of the ‘War Economy’, and a descent into a’ miasma of depression’, so dependent was the economy on foreign expansion.[[977]](#footnote-977) As long as the United States attempted to quash nations that challenged American interests, however, liberals, radicals and socialists had a duty to serve as ‘critical solvents’, encouraging a more enlightened view of the long-run interests of the nation that could gradually ease the nation towards a better diplomacy.[[978]](#footnote-978)

As the 1950s ended, Williams’, the *Studies* editors, and even George Kennan began to feel that the consequences of containment had reached crisis point. Such was the growth of nationalistic sentiment under the eye of Kennan’s replacement John Foster Dulles that the stated aim of a strengthening of the ‘Western Alliance’ against communism was now making enemies of nations who simply wished to pursue socialistic policies. No longer ‘the fair-headed boy of the dominant corporate interests’, Kennan was now on the outside, unable to influence the corporate interests and policy makers who determined policy within the State Department and the National Security Council.’[[979]](#footnote-979) Despite his move to ‘co-existence’, Martin Sklar noted, Kennan and Dulles both remained committed to the same underlying philosophy: to secure the ‘American Century’ through massive foreign investment and the building of an integrated world economy dominated by the United States.[[980]](#footnote-980) As we saw, this philosophy, Williams and Sklar felt, had dominated American society since the mid-Nineteenth Century. Now in the 1950s, Progressives and socialists had to tip the scales towards Kennan, and ‘irreverently’ past him to something that abandoned ‘Open Door’ imperialism and monopolistic corporate capitalism.[[981]](#footnote-981)

The election of John F. Kennedy represented a further hardening of the Cold War consensus, in which moderate liberal voices were increasingly marginalised at the Cabinet level. ‘The New Frontier’, Martin Sklar declared, signalled the creation of a new ‘muscular’, tough minded’ and ‘realistic’ Corporate Liberalism which completely absorbed the ‘abstract... faith’ of political liberalism, as personified by Adlai Stevenson, Stan Bowles and Wayne Morse.[[982]](#footnote-982) The ‘un-rooted’ liberalism of that latter grouping, imbibed with ‘transcendent principles’, had appeared ‘bumbling and inconsistent’.[[983]](#footnote-983) Judged as actors in society who defended the existing social-economic system, rather than simply men of principle, by the consistency of the spoken work, political liberals had failed to compete with Corporate Liberal ideology, which dealt explicitly with a system that could be simply defined as ‘the requirements of business.’[[984]](#footnote-984) The consequence for the left was that political liberals, in an effort to remain relevant, now spoke of ‘realism’ in overcoming a ‘ruthless foe’ that was not restrained by the liberal heritage of the United States and Western Civilisation.[[985]](#footnote-985) Living in the shadow of this ‘disembodied projection of a dimming self-image’, the American left in the 1960s had devolved to simply an ‘embodiment of the liberal projection’, no longer acting as an effective critic to the system.[[986]](#footnote-986) It would be the responsibility of radicals like the *Studies* editors to reinvigorate the left by forging a distinctive American approach to socialism.

Nowhere were the consequences of the corporate liberal ascendency under Kennedy more damaging than in the response of the United States to the Cuban Revolution. As part of a successful chain of anti-colonial insurgencies, the Cuban experience, *Studies* editors argued, was one of the most important and least understood social developments in recent history, and therefore needed to be defended. Cuba’s punishment for rejecting the ‘hemispheric hegemony’ of the United States had manifested itself in the reaction of the State Department, whose systemic economic harassment and threats of military intervention threatened to ‘divert the energies’ of the revolution.[[987]](#footnote-987) Such behaviour, the editors argued, strengthened ‘the jingoists and racists’ in the United States by obscuring and distorting the true nature of the revolution. ‘Only the alternatives of intensified cold war, or a shooting war, are presented’, they continued, with ‘accommodation and adjustment’ not even discussed.[[988]](#footnote-988) Those who raised the possibility of such a policy were accused of being ‘soft on Castro’ and therefore ‘soft on Communism’ and ‘appeasement.’[[989]](#footnote-989) The retreat to the Cold War ‘devil theory’ made it impossible for the United States to understand and deal with the changes in the developing world, which meant the nation further isolated itself as a haven of reactionary ideologues, who distorted and swept away the lone voices who advocated a more rational re-evaluation of America’s position in the world.[[990]](#footnote-990) As one of those voices, the *Studies* editors echoed Mill’s appeal to the American people to realise the ‘total’ inadequacy of their Cold War policy dogma of ‘Expand or Die.’[[991]](#footnote-991)

In spite of the deleterious effects of these foreign policies, there existed, the editors felt, no real understanding of the implications of Cold War policy on the American psyche. ‘*Exposure’* of the American system, Warren Susman suggested, ‘was *essential’,* so that Americans could see the *reality* of their decision-making, their society, or actual economic state.[[992]](#footnote-992) Liberalism, the great hope for empiricism, had once delivered this promise, but now left America ‘blinder than we were in the Middle Ages’, with the promise of reason and scientific approaches to policy making having led to a ‘technological nightmare’ and a refusal to re-examine any of the nation’s pre-propositions. ‘Let us face what now exists’, Susman explained. ‘A corporate state in serious economic trouble. Politically... a dictatorship, but a dictatorship clearly and distinctly. Thus “in time of crisis” we surrender everything into the hands of the state – our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honour – everything. We have no control at all.’[[993]](#footnote-993) How could radicals develop a meaningful political and social theory to restore liberalism to its proper place; the promise that the state could be made to serve the interests of man, he wondered.

While the editors shared Susman’s scepticism, they still dared to hope that change could occur through compromises brokered between the more enlightened elements of the corporate elite. ‘[William Appleman] Williams, you may remember’, Stephen Scheinberg remarked to James Weinstein, ‘had his hopes (and still may) for the development of a responsible corporate elite in the U.S.’[[994]](#footnote-994) Were there men in the ruling elite prepared to break with the current program of continued expansion and a worldwide American empire? Could left intellectuals do anything to encourage the more responsible elements in the ruling group to take a stand?[[995]](#footnote-995) In order to address those questions, David Eakins and Saul Landau felt a more activist response was required. Through the early months of 1963, they worked to develop the San Francisco Opposition, a grouping of ‘disgusted, alienated’, radicals and socialists based on education, culture and political action, which included the creation of the San Francisco New School which offered courses in American History and the Growth of Empire, and Politics and the Cold War.[[996]](#footnote-996) ‘We declare opposition’, Landau wrote to James Weinstein ‘to the entire presidential election farce: NO we say until meaningful alternatives to Cold War suicide are offered, domestically and in foreign policy... Rocky [Nelson Rockefeller] v. JFK is like Filmore v. Franklin Pierce, Cold War A v. Cold War B.[[997]](#footnote-997) Among their suggested activities included getting southern blacks to take seats on the Southern Delegation benches at the Democratic National Convention.[[998]](#footnote-998)

Both Martin Sklar and James Weinstein, by that time having moved from Madison to New York, dismissed Landau and Eakins strategy as a gimmick that would serve to ‘extend and deepen the mindlessness of US politics.’[[999]](#footnote-999) Liberal Democrats, Sklar believed, would milk the sit-in ‘for all it was worth;’ if the movement insisted that they were not liberals, but Socialists, they would be ejected from the room as ‘undemocratic disruptors of someone else’s convention.’[[1000]](#footnote-1000) Rather than feed the illusion that the Democratic Party represented the ‘forces of liberalism’ socialists had to build its own platform and movement on which to wage the ‘class struggle’, holding its own meetings and conventions, and ‘upholding the democratic right of assembly against disruptionists.’[[1001]](#footnote-1001) It had to ‘build respect for, and put substance into democracy, not contribute to its disintegration.[[1002]](#footnote-1002) James Weinstein agreed. Part of the problem of engaging with the Democratic Party, he explained in a *Studies* article, was that it was liberals, and not the radical right, who were producing anti-communism, with McCarthy having merely perfected the art of witch-hunting and red baiting as previously pioneered by the liberals.[[1003]](#footnote-1003) By making, the United States ‘*appear* less democratic’ Americans had handed the Soviets ‘another weapon in their ceaseless struggle to undermine the posture of American democracy and the uncommitted nations of the world.’ Such was the ‘moral degeneration engendered by the Cold War.’ [[1004]](#footnote-1004)

The Bay of Pigs invasion proved to the editors that the aura of idealism and intellectual integrity which had swept Kennedy into office had been a chimera: a new delivery system for old anti-communist rhetoric, which had strengthened the ‘Cold warriors’ and the McCarthyites at home.[[1005]](#footnote-1005) In April 1961, *Studies* editors and Socialist Club members were signatories to a petition sent to the Madison *Capitol Times* condemning the unlawful ‘counter-revolutionary’ invasion.[[1006]](#footnote-1006) Those who had followed Adlai Stevenson and Stan Bowles in believing Kennedy might tread a new path of economic equality among nations, they felt, had been let down: Americans now had to ‘stop’ and ponder’ the morality of their leaders.[[1007]](#footnote-1007) Had they not supported dictators such as Trujillo, Somoza, Chiang Kai-Shek, Verwoerd and Franco, all of which made their denunciations of Castro hypocritical? Had the United States not placed pressure on Britain, Japan and Canada to suspend trade with Cuba?[[1008]](#footnote-1008) The invasion, Eleanor Hakim believed, had been presented to the American people as a mission to preserve American interests, including a stepping up of civil defence and enlargement of the draft as a way to lower unemployment.[[1009]](#footnote-1009) ‘It means madness-logic such as... might=right and right=might; entrench firmly and wave a big bomb…Now is the time for all good Americans to sacrifice themselves for the New Frontier since the U.S. is the Sherriff of the world’, she joked. ‘What is perhaps even more depressing is the reaction of my peers...there is nothing we can do really, except make some small protest!’[[1010]](#footnote-1010) National security, it seemed, was now being used to scare off non-Establishment dissent; the consequence of the corporate liberal consensus engendering totalitarian tendencies within American society.

The Radical Right and Fascism

The *Studies* editors’ sense of ‘moral degeneration’ in American society was one that was broadly felt among left wing intellectuals. The ease with which the public had embraced ‘loyalty oaths’ and congressional ‘inquisitions’ reverberated widely in contemporary culture, as intellectuals and writers speculated on the possibility that this soft totalitarianism would degenerate into fascist demagoguery.[[1011]](#footnote-1011) Martin Sklar, who warned in 1958 that the spreading of ‘containment psychology’ to the domestic arena under the auspices of John Foster Dulles held within it the potential for the growth of totalitarianism, was characteristic of the editors in sensing a rightward shift towards support for a curtailment of ‘fringe’ liberties under the pretence of national defence. In pledging to support ‘austerity’ and ‘self-sacrifice’ policies proposed by Dulles, President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, liberals and labor ‘statesmen’ had advocated that workers accept increased unemployment to stabilise wages, a weakening of the union movement through ‘right-to-work’ laws, and reductions in welfare spending and farm price support, so that arms spending could be increased without raising corporate taxes. Without an anti-imperialist and internally expansionary political alternative to these policies, Sklar warned, the United States could witness the rise of ‘Sunshine Fascism’: fascism formed out of prosperity rather than depression.[[1012]](#footnote-1012)

The growing influence of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) backed John Birch Society, and the William F. Buckley faction of the Republication Party, caused further alarm among the editors. It was those working politicians and their allies who had pledged their loyalty to these groups, the editors believed, which gave the far right its political potency, which manifested itself in proposals for more stringent measures to defeat the Communist ‘devil’, adherence to the mythology of private enterprise, and support for archaic social views. Viewing any compromise against ‘godless communism’ to be a surrender to the Soviet Union and world socialism, their desire for a ‘test of strength’, was at the heart of their appeal to the fringe elements of business and the military, which only increased the likelihood of war.[[1013]](#footnote-1013) The subsequent capture of the Republican Party by that faction ahead of the 1964 election was ‘difficult to deal with’.[[1014]](#footnote-1014) Finding that support was strongest among those sectors of society who demonstrated a ‘hampered resentful individualism’, and sensed a shrinking American power globally, the editors noted how conservatives perceived that an expansion of federal power and the domination of the corporate economy would reduce levels of freedom and private initiative. Its supporters had included ‘small businessmen, minor corporation executives, the stockholders and managers of major oil companies, representatives of new Western Banks... the small town and rural gentry, the rock-ribbed Republican rich, and lower-class entrepreneurs, the grocery-store owners or salesmen’, all of whom saw in the radical right the last major effort to preserve the ‘disappearing... powerless fragments of American society.’[[1015]](#footnote-1015)

Frightened by these developments, the editors and contributors to *Studies* located at least one wellspring for the popularity of far-right politics in the same alienation that they too had felt in the post-war era. Larry D. Spence suggested that the popularity of the radical right arose from overwhelming feelings of ‘smallness’ in relation to the monolithic giants of the corporate economy, elite government and massive militarism. Pitted against the ‘ten-foot-high figures of supervisors and customers on the job; social and economic superiors during leisure activities and the demanding spouse and children in the home’, middle class entrepreneurs, professionals, and white or blue-collar workers sought out conspiracies and evil forces to blame their failure, resorting to personal mythologies which promoted the delusionary sense of ‘personal majesty and self-reliance.’[[1016]](#footnote-1016) All of this provided evidence of an ego severely damaged by the ‘smothering grasp of a rigid society.’[[1017]](#footnote-1017) The consequence was not simply a ‘hopeless’ regression to *laissez faire*, but a level of infantile responses to social conditions fuelled by the millions of people alienated by everyday society. Worshipping the very monoliths that crushed dissent, those prone to support the radical right resented genuine rebels, viewed weakness with contempt, and eagerly anticipated any attempt to help stamp out those who tried in vain to reconstruct the system.’[[1018]](#footnote-1018) This was apparent in the extremist wing of the Republican Party, which had criticised the University intelligentsia for producing Communists, and was winning the minds of the ‘disaffected masses of static Cold War capitalism.’[[1019]](#footnote-1019) Seeing themselves as victims of deprivations, the middle classes sought out an ‘evil cause for their misfortune in the ‘subverters or outside enemies’ of the mythological framework of free enterprise. The confines of the American system, Spence felt, were acting as an echo chamber for the forms of uncertainty which bred support for the fascist agenda.[[1020]](#footnote-1020)

While the editors believed that the New Right was a threat, they believed that it still reflected the view of an isolated minority. The Corporate Liberal consensus however, might not endure in perpetuity: corporations might yet move their allegiance towards the ultra-right given the right economic and political conditions. The Ultra-Right – the old middle class obsessed anti-communists – held within it the potential to destroy the labour-liberal coalition on which the Cold War was based, if not the political system itself. Indeed, under circumstances might re-introduce conflict and reinvigorate socialism. ‘Every election in recent years has demonstrated that the ultra-right has little independent strength’, he explained. ‘On its own it is no threat to those who now hold power.’[[1021]](#footnote-1021) Fascism had only come about in those countries which had two conditions present: a breakdown in operation of the prevailing legal and constitutional system, and a threat to capitalism from the left. The United States had neither but did have a liberal administration that could move both left and right, at present, they appeared to have seen an ‘advantage in moving left – that is in espousing a program against poverty, supporting ‘disarmament’ condemning segregation as morally wrong.’ [[1022]](#footnote-1022) Even if the radical right was able to install a new man, or a small group of men into positions of power, though they would gain influence over policy, Weinstein assured Staughton Lynd, ‘in most circumstances – times of great crisis or instability aside – they would be unable to change the basic direction of policy.’[[1023]](#footnote-1023) Why therefore, would the liberal elite give up the consensus under which labour, liberals, trade unions and farm organisations gave their support? If liberals were so absorbed in the ‘meaningless’ politics of reform, ‘why would the ‘Establishment’ turn to fascism when liberalism had served it so well?’ he asked [[1024]](#footnote-1024)

For all the notoriety of the John Birch Society’s proclamations against ‘socialism’ and communist conspirators, the *Studies* editors concluded that it was the liberals, who held the hegemonic social position, who were the primary generators of anti-democratic trends in American society.[[1025]](#footnote-1025) Sensing that all the meaningful radical neo-Populist movements since the Progressive era had merely recast their internalised understanding of the American liberal heritage into left-wing parlance, they concluded that it was their responsibility to ‘salvage the left from the terrain of liberalism’, and develop an alternative social structure to the domination by the large corporations.[[1026]](#footnote-1026) ‘If Liberalism’s current corporate fixation marks its ideological ending’, Martin Sklar warned, ‘the critique and shedding of Liberalism marks the Left’s renewed ideological and political beginning.’[[1027]](#footnote-1027) Only by discarding the Cold War assumptions could the ideological ground be cut from under the feet of the McCarthyists and Birchists whose program relied on the failure of the liberal establishment.[[1028]](#footnote-1028) As indicated in the record $19 million dollars raised by the Barry Goldwater Presidential campaign, the radical right, far from being the preserve of small-town *petit-bourgeois* America, had been able to attract a broader coalition encompassing the ‘new men of power’, and financial interests such as the Mellons and the DuPonts’, and had forced the spectrum of party politics and the content of campaign rhetoric further right. The continued belligerence of the right for a more ‘adventurist’ foreign policy could push more establishment liberals to adopt these policies in the instance of military setbacks.[[1029]](#footnote-1029) ‘Supporting the liberals, as opposed to developing a genuine opposition from the left, only helped to push society further to the right, and closer towards an attempted coup from “frustrated” ultra-rightists.’[[1030]](#footnote-1030)

The editors’ analysis provoked a ‘most welcome stimulant’ to its readership on both sides of the debate. Emile Capouya claimed that its extremism was already strongly positioned in both major parties, and the policies of Goldwater and his ‘moderate’ Republican opponent Rockefeller could only be distinguished from one another ‘in strong sunlight.’[[1031]](#footnote-1031) Much of what the liberal state was doing, he felt, was compatible with the goals of the ultra-right, even though some of their ‘pipe-dreams’ would be abandoned in the event of them taking ‘official’ office.[[1032]](#footnote-1032) Others were more sceptical, questioning the motives of identifying ‘a new devil’ to replace the ultra-right, or in making meaningless distinctions between corporate liberals and traditional liberals.[[1033]](#footnote-1033) Though the liberals had often been willing to move right, editor James O’Connor claimed, the right had often shoved them there. Events in the 1950s had confirmed this analysis: civil liberties had moved to the right, blackballing had been legitimised, politically motivated sackings had become tolerated by unions, and cold war opponents had been purged from networks. It was important therefore, to continue strengthening the liberal consensus, for it was from the labour and civil rights movement that many of the most progressive liberal policies still emerged. The civil rights reforms, for example, had only recently appeared ‘the wildest of dreams.’[[1034]](#footnote-1034) Supporting liberals who were doing the right things for the wrong reasons was necessary because the left did not have enough independent power.[[1035]](#footnote-1035)

Fellow editor Michael Lebowitz was equally nonplussed by the creation of a liberal ‘devil.’ American democracy could survive by drifting to the right or the left, but what would characterise the nation if the centre did not hold? Corporate liberals were the ‘rational caretakers of our system’, who oversaw the rationalisation of the new economic order. ‘I was groping at a way of explaining why the masses give their loyalty to liberalism... Well, why do they? Or don’t they? Or is it that they’re being deceived by the masterminds?’[[1036]](#footnote-1036) he asked Martin Sklar. An analysis of the right, he suggested, had to focus upon the ‘temper of the people’, the passive agents of the system and the aggressive underlying population and its likely reaction to the maladies of the system in an irrational, limited and short-term manner. Contemporary right-wingers and liberals shared and competed for the support of those afflicted by government policy and economic uncertainty.[[1037]](#footnote-1037) ‘I do not care whether it comes with coloured shirts and it bothers me that if it does not come with a black shirt, I am not allowed to call it fascism’, he lamented. Fascism did not require a parliamentary breakdown to flourish. ‘Explain the ultra-right; explain intolerance, prejudice, and race-war, anti-communism... America has had fascistic-type responses in its history and that increasing discontent her can easily take this form again – in fact, why not, the furrows are already begun.’ The editors, he warned, had to understand the appeal of fascism to individuals and human nature, how it deadened normal human responses and externalised evil.[[1038]](#footnote-1038)

The rising popularity of reactionaries such as George Wallace in the immediate post-Kennedy years did little to assuage the collective fears of the editors. Describing the strong performance of George Wallace in the Wisconsin Primary for the 1964 presidential election, Lebowitz expressed concern over the growth in popularity of pro-segregation politics across the nation. The Wallace bid, he suggested, had been no accident; it was the first ‘official’ movement made by Birch Society members in the state, and demonstrated the infectious nature of their paranoid view of American society. ‘Wisconsin is a little frightening these days… His [Wallace’s] electors are Birch people... [The] Wallace campaign is pushed as ‘the only way to express disapproval of the civil rights bill’ even has me believing there are hidden powers in the bill (I’m for it)’[[1039]](#footnote-1039) ‘The lessons’, of the Kennedy assassination, Staughton Lynd warned, suggested that fascism was a real and present danger. ‘There have been moments’, he wrote, ‘the U-2 crisis, for instance – when I felt, not just helpless, but suffocated and threatened by an atmosphere which was one great lie.’[[1040]](#footnote-1040) The conduct of the Oswald case, Lynd believed, was an indicator that the ‘coming period is fascism’, where violence would be used for political purposes, manifesting in assassination, the breaking up of meetings, and the persecution of Jews.[[1041]](#footnote-1041)

James Weinstein was more sceptical. Though the ‘non-investigation’ of the Kennedy assassination had included fascistic overtones, it had more accurately represented the primacy of the self-preservation tactics of the police, FBI, and CIA. Did it mean that the assassination was the work of men with a fascist mentality and purpose, carried out in the belief that Johnson, as President, would be significantly less liberal than Kennedy?[[1042]](#footnote-1042) This was based on the false premise that the Johnson Administration would change course: in reality it was just as committed to the preservation of the Cold War consensus of the large corporations, and organised labour as Kennedy. Or was it the failure of the media to honestly examine and publish the evidence and the Bureau’s harassment of witnesses? ‘Here Lynd was on firmer ground. ‘There are, indeed, many similarities between American society today and that of Germany in the years before and during Nazi rule, and the systematic manipulation of public opinion by the government and the commercial press is one of them.’[[1043]](#footnote-1043) As had been revealed by Hannah Arendt in *Eichmann in Jerusalem,* men would carry out orders simply to win favour in the eyes of superiors, and in this sense, Weinstein stated, he was the prototype of those Americans who help plan and execute the ‘defence’ of the ‘free world’ in Vietnam and Cuba.[[1044]](#footnote-1044) Lynd however, emphasised the complacency of both liberals and radicals in assuming that the current *stable* state could go on indefinitely. The weakening of the United States’ global position in a changing world and the restlessness of those Americans caught up in the civil rights movement might easily undermine the concepts of the ‘affluent society’ as the ‘permanent war economy.’ [[1045]](#footnote-1045) The only solution, he felt, was socialism, and the independent Left which both he and Weinstein desired. In working to protect liberalism against the far-right, radicals had to be careful not to shore up liberalism to the degree that they abdicated a critique of the Cold War liberal state.[[1046]](#footnote-1046)

The 1964 election, the editors felt, represented the watershed moment for this informal coalition. In supporting ‘the less offensive’ cold warrior Lyndon Johnson to shore up liberalism against Barry Goldwater, they explained, radicals had abdicated the opportunity to attack the structure of the Cold War state. Consequently, disarmament and ‘peace initiatives had disappeared from the rhetoric of the administration, replaced by a re-emphasis on America’s dependence of military policies in ‘have not’ countries.[[1047]](#footnote-1047) A further stimulation of revolutionary movements in ex-colonial territories and the under-developed world, demonstrated that the ‘have-nots’ would continue to define themselves in opposition to American neo-colonialism.[[1048]](#footnote-1048) The reliance of the United States on foreign markets for commodity and capital surpluses in countries it could easily manipulate meant that it could not extricate itself easily from the situation, nor could it withdraw its commitments to parties in nations who were holding the line against socialist and anti-imperialist attacks.[[1049]](#footnote-1049) The strength that the far right could draw from this was based on keeping the American people as far removed from reality as possible. Forced to hide the true nature of the political and economic manifestations of American capitalism in the world, setbacks were ‘made to appear as victories’, while the administration insisted that they were defending freedom and civilisation; that each ‘imperial outpost’ was a vital component in the defence of American values, and the struggle of war was a moral one that the nation could not abandon. Such a line, the editors felt, could only ward off right-wing pressure so long as major defeats could be avoided. Defeat in Vietnam might generate a ‘sweeping jingoistic’ response that could only be overcome if the liberals took a sharp drift to the right.[[1050]](#footnote-1050)

Reflecting the inadequacy of efforts to enact domestic reform in preference to foreign policy adventurism, the editors would subsequently offer a characteristically downbeat assessment for the prospects for radicalism under Johnson. Though they had anticipated a leftward turn, they attributed this to the ‘looser principles’ of a man whose ambition seemed ‘simply to be President’, and they anticipated a shift towards a less dogged pursuit of ‘victory’ in the Cold War and towards more pragmatic policy making. ‘On Civil Rights’, James Weinstein explained, ‘he could hardly do less and remain leader of the free world.’[[1051]](#footnote-1051) Kennedy had been ‘about as bad as was possible’, having committed to a reinvasion of Cuba when ‘only the missiles and the imminence of World War III stopped him.’[[1052]](#footnote-1052) In the wake of his subsequent overwhelming victory over Goldwater, offering a comprehensive critique of his marquee Great Society program. Isolated in their fight against ‘the gigantic Johnson combine’, they admitted that the left was now a shadow within the Johnson administration. ‘What can we expect from Johnson’s administration’ they asked. ‘What kind of leadership, what programs, what administrative style?’ The editors required answers, so that they could cease the endless debates about the ‘role’ of the left and begin building their new movements to combat liberalism and the right.[[1053]](#footnote-1053)

*Studies on the Left* and the Great Society

Soon after his landslide victory against Goldwater, Lyndon Johnson announced his intention to make the United States not only a ‘rich…and the powerful society’ but a ‘Great Society.’ [[1054]](#footnote-1054) Considered by many to be the ‘apex’ of American liberalism, the subsequent upswell of reform activity in civil rights, poverty, and education took form in a number of newly formed agencies designed to target social problems ranging from poverty, the arts, public broadcasting, mass transit and natural resources.[[1055]](#footnote-1055) Its impact on life was considerable, yet among the *Studies on the Left* editors of *Studies,* there existed a substantial degree of scepticism towards its programs as an inaccessible and alienating bureaucracy. The ‘old liberals’ and ‘old left’, they claimed, had done much to promote the bureaucratic regimentation of American society, and the new liberals had only sought to extend it.[[1056]](#footnote-1056) While new programs did provide the poor with useful services, their chief effect had been to reinforce the powerlessness of the poor by reducing them to the status of clients, perpetual dependence on the dole becoming a ‘permanent feature’ of life.[[1057]](#footnote-1057) Further expansion and rationalisation of these programs, would only extend the degree to which they worked as a tools of manipulation and control.[[1058]](#footnote-1058) With this in mind, the editors produced an extensive critique of Johnson’s agenda, the editors spent the later years of *Studies* publication working towards alternative proposals to a program they felt spawned ‘passive clients’ rather than an active citizenry.[[1059]](#footnote-1059)

Chief among the failures of Johnson’s program was the inertia of civil rights reform. Like other critics of the Civil Rights act, the editors belittled its evasion of segregation, subtle discrimination, and poverty alleviation.[[1060]](#footnote-1060) The conventional judgement was that enforcement and economic equalisation was the most desirable outcome, yet presidential authority appeared to be manifesting itself as a symbolic effort towards a ‘unified gradualism’, at a pace so slow that the structure of racism was barely being dented.[[1061]](#footnote-1061) The treatment of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP) at the Democratic National Convention in August 1964, the editors claimed, was a demonstrable example of Johnson’s need to create ‘an enduring image’ of competence and unity within his party. The treatment of the MFDP demonstrated that there was ‘no room for insurgent local groups’ whose views conflicted with the imperatives of the national party and threatened the ‘image’ of party unity at election time. Disunity, the moderates warned, would force a split that would lead to disadvantaged people in the South receiving no ‘economic or social amelioration’ under a hostile Republican administration.[[1062]](#footnote-1062) The subsequent public disorders in Harlem, Brooklyn, Rochester and Jersey City, the editors felt, demonstrated the failure of this strategy. What was needed was a civil rights strategy that joined with the armies of the white poor, slum dwellers, the under-educated and new unemployed, who together could fight for meaningful public programs of social services, urban renewal and new public works that could produce and high-quality jobs.[[1063]](#footnote-1063)

It was unfortunate therefore that many of the new bodies appointed to investigate and implement these services were failing to deliver. The Office of Economic Opportunity set up as part of Johnson’s ‘War on Poverty’, had become mired in corruption, mismanagement, and embezzlement scandals.[[1064]](#footnote-1064) Led by Sargent Shriver, and based in the Executive Office of the President, the OEO had the authority to co-ordinate and direct federal resources in the national anti-poverty effort. It accepted the failure of previous programs to reach the ‘unreachable’ or ‘hard-core’ poor’, yet the tactic of replacing them with a new focus on ‘community action’, had merely co-opted ‘indigenous’ leaders into a Corporate Liberal consensus with financial inducements, ‘anti-poverty boards’, ‘co-ordinated anti-poverty campaigns’, and ‘anti-poverty corporations’.[[1065]](#footnote-1065) Promising a new focus on ‘community action’, it’s agencies had largely operated on the assumption that the bureaucratic models which had previously excluded and alienated the poor ‘would now be successful in organising them.’[[1066]](#footnote-1066) Where programs had broken with elite ‘forms’ of mobilisation, such as the Community Action Program (CAP) there had been limited success in stimulating new methods such as tutorials and rent strikes. Uptake however, was limited; lower class people morally alienated from the dominant values of American social and political life, Stanley Aronowitz noted, did not respond to carefully controlled protest tactics, being distrustful of official power or schemes which did not have a sense of independent control.’ [[1067]](#footnote-1067) Focusing on individual uplift, the movements, Aronowitz stated, appeared ‘a substitute for, not a supplement to the real war against the persistence of poverty and unemployment’, a ‘stopgap’ geared towards satisfying public demands for action. Conditions remained relatively the same, yet more appeared to be happening.[[1068]](#footnote-1068)

A similar fate had befallen the Urban Renewal Program. First expanded by President Kennedy’s Omnibus Housing Act, urban renewal policies to eradicate slum neighbourhoods had been a feature of American life since 1949. Instead of replacing these neighbourhoods with affordable housing for the disadvantaged, local authorities collected the federal subsidy for having purchased the land and demolishing the buildings, improved the land at public expense, and then sold it to private developers at a profit. The consequence was that existing slum housing was then subdivided to increase the needed capacity for individuals whose houses had been demolished. Appropriations grew throughout the 1960s following the creation of the Department of Housing and Development, as did anger at the number of people displaced.[[1069]](#footnote-1069) In outlining the strategy for urban renewal, the Department had called for ‘democratic participation’, but in practice ‘local political and corporate power’ had abused federal funds with a ruthless disregard for poor people’s rights, housing and life conditions.’[[1070]](#footnote-1070) What had supposed to help the poor had only caused to strengthen corrupt local political machines, providing a ‘grab-bag’ of payoffs for insurance companies, mortgage associations, and local banks, and ‘mammoth’ development companies which earned huge profits to third parties and contractors.[[1071]](#footnote-1071)

In other areas, such as education reform, a lack of funding had crippled reform efforts.[[1072]](#footnote-1072) The passing of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Act and the Head Start Program had signalled an expansion of earlier programmes enacted under President Kennedy which aimed at equalising education opportunities for the disadvantaged, especially in deprived areas. Successful school boycotts led by civil rights campaigners and radicals concerned at the level of public education had prompted a more comprehensive program, aimed at upgrading the quality of low-income education, injecting additional resources into low-income neighbourhoods, and establishing pre-schools, to equip the low-income child with the skills to function in a middle-class school. Experiments with pre-schooling in low-income areas, curricula revision, and new teacher-training methods, funded by the federal grants and foundations like the Great Cities Educational Foundation, had attempted to reverse failure rates and halt the general alienation of the ‘dispossessed.’[[1073]](#footnote-1073) Existing federal aid however, had been channelled to material improvements, with only a massive further infusion of funding able to produce equality among all students and improve attainment levels. ‘It will exhort children to stay in school, and finance intensive publicity drives insisting the value of education, the need for a college, if not a high school degree’, the editors claimed. ‘But the present responses to public mal-education should continue: a rising dropout rate partnered to a rising rate of college admissions and an increasing failure and dismissal rate in those same colleges.’[[1074]](#footnote-1074) No infusion however, was likely, and instead the government would continue to tinker, seeking maximum visibility for its experimental programs and peripheral improvements.

The failure of the education programs came despite the administration’s drive to increase college attendance and reduce unemployment. The central program of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Job Corps had been designed to provide vocational training and employment for 200,000 young people aged 16 to 21, giving them direction and purpose. Yet many programs quickly encountered problems. Whereas the Corps New Deal predecessor, the Civilian Conservation Corps, educated participants in practical skills such as carpentry, Job Corps classes frequently focused on socialisation skills such as etiquette, public speaking and basic literacy skills.[[1075]](#footnote-1075) Vocational training, Ruth Prywes explained in a *Studies* article on Manpower and Retraining in Philadelphia, had exposed the inadequacy of the agencies used in training and placing individuals, assessing the needs and attitudes of industry in contrast to the needs of the unemployed, and the inability to plan for future economic needs both locally and nationally. Targeting the ‘hard core’ or ‘the unskilled, unemployed, those without high school education, had turned into a mammoth task, requiring remedial reading, writing and arithmetic teaching, and none of the agencies were able to provide adequate counselling, leading to high dropout rates.[[1076]](#footnote-1076)

Aside from education, much of the motivation for the jobs training teaching had been the fear of an oncoming crisis of automation. In March 1964, an open memorandum signed by activists and intellectuals was sent to President Johnson, warning that machines would soon usher in ‘a system of almost unlimited productive capacity’ that would continually reduce the number of manual labourers required to run the economy, increasing unemployment. With this in mind, Prywes wrote, the Great Society programs, it seemed, offered the ‘thinnest of plasters.[[1077]](#footnote-1077) An ideological response to automated job-related losses, the poverty program was premised, she explained, on the belief that since jobs existed that could not be filled in the face of unemployment, the problem could addressed simply by offering ‘inexpensive training programs’, built on the ‘spurious’ assumption that; that jobs existed, and the problem was to fit people to them.[[1078]](#footnote-1078) In reality, these fragmented programs, managed by agencies of insufficient standard, were training people for jobs that did not exist, and were not addressing the root issues of unemployment. ‘Jobs training cannot solve the larger problems of unemployment’, Prywes explained. Any meaningful job training program, had to offer ‘extensive’ opportunities to individuals of all degrees of ‘aspiration and ability’, promoting a general rise in the level of education and job skills.[[1079]](#footnote-1079)

There were, the editors felt, other methods to combat automation. James O’Connor in particular proposed the creation of organisation of community unions for the unemployed.[[1080]](#footnote-1080) Predicting that the future social base for working-class organisations in deindustrialised towns and urban slums would shift from the workplace to the community, it made sense, O’Connor claimed, to organise the poor along community lines in their local community, fighting for issues such as improving housing, welfare and better public services. Criticising CAP style organisations for failing to fill the political vacuum in depressed regions, he noted that in isolated areas, prototype ‘community unions’ were developing to organise against the outdated labour unions, and the liberal ‘reformers and planners’ who staffed the bureaucratic projects without any real understanding of their working environment. The governments ‘phony war’ on poverty, O’Connor believed, had radical potential given the advancing rate of technological change in the United States and the inability of the capitalist system to distribute wealth in an equitable way, but had manifested itself as a ‘patent political trick for election year.’[[1081]](#footnote-1081) In a stagnant economy, unions had become ‘inherently conservative’ and ‘politically irrelevant’ acting more as pressure groups rather than tools for securing political power, and the significant number of people committing to community work, he felt, provided an opportunity for politicisation and the development of a radical perspective.[[1082]](#footnote-1082)

The broad criticisms of the Great Society made by the editors were not universally appreciated. Though their critique of labour dissatisfaction and automation was perceptive, Eli Zaretsky admitted, much of it was an ‘essentially old-hat attack’ of the Johnson administration, ‘a lot of clichés rolled together… [into] an *omnium gatherum* of criticism of Johnson’s policies.’[[1083]](#footnote-1083) Herbert Gans emphasised that however undesirable the present war on poverty and urban renewal program, the money to improve conditions in the slums of any city had to come ‘from Washington and from the local City Hall.’[[1084]](#footnote-1084) Being a radical was a frustrating task, he reminded the editors, and the need to keep the faith created strong demands for emotional gratification and ideological certainty, which led to the temptation to attack anyone who threatened the cohesiveness of the movement and the ideological security of its members.

James Weinstein suggested that Gans’ mindset was a syndrome of characteristically liberal attitudes: the belief that things were getting better, that events suggesting the contrary must be a mistake and an exception, and a belief that the remedy was to do ‘just a little more’ of the same. Single issue movements existing on the edge of the existing system, would only bolster and strengthen those in power, their ability to co-opt, absorb, and divert separate demands ‘virtually endless’, and therefore, an oppositional movement to liberalism was required.’[[1085]](#footnote-1085) Bolstering the Democratic Party and liberalism would only lead to a continuance of the same programs led by the same community, labour and religious leaders.[[1086]](#footnote-1086) Tom Hayden and Staughton Lynd agreed. Radicals had to seek out allies outside the Democratic establishment, among the restless poor, students and other independent middle-class insurgents, and those clients who had suffered psychological and structural torment at the hands of welfare reformers.[[1087]](#footnote-1087)

Beyond Protest

As the Great Society creaked under the weight of increased expenditures in Vietnam, and President Johnson’s growing unpopularity, the Studies editors noted that new coalitions between radicals and the reform wing of the Democratic Party were being formed. Far from welcome however, they dismissed these alliances as new forms of the Old Left strategy to transform the Democratic Party into a progressive or ‘anti-monopoly’ party.[[1088]](#footnote-1088) Whereas previous attempts at coalitionism had sought to obscure its grievances with the national leadership of the Democratic Party, the New Coalitionism openly did so.

Sharing an opposition to the war in Vietnam, a resistance to anti-Communism, and sensitivity to moral and social issues, this new liberalism rejected formal ties to the labour leaders of the AFL-CIO and developed closer ties with civil rights groups and Freedom Now.[[1089]](#footnote-1089) Focusing on reform, they rejected the tired rhetoric of the Great Society and focused on grassroots organisations in opposition to Lyndon Johnson. In denouncing Johnson, the editors believed, an outlet for radical sentiments, which the old coalitionism had compelled to repress, had now opened. ‘That those sentiments seemed to be shared by many of Johnson’s liberal opponents gave the impression that the New Coalitionism reflected, ‘at long last’, the imposition of a left program on the liberals.[[1090]](#footnote-1090)

The editors viewed such efforts be a chimera.[[1091]](#footnote-1091) Though the New Coalitionism was highly critical of many aspects of the Great Society programs and aspired to make life better for the mass of ‘clients’, it did not attack the fundamental assumptions on which the system was based.[[1092]](#footnote-1092) On both foreign and domestic policy, they remained firmly fixed within the ‘ideological and political framework of corporate rule’ offering benign interventionism abroad and compassionate totalitarianism at home. Unwilling to countenance immediate and unilateral withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, their candidates had instead favoured the ‘realistic’ demand for a negotiated settlement, a close relation to the Administration’s own ‘unconditional negotiations’ propaganda. Without challenging the principle of interventionism – and the anti-Communist ideology, which underlined the liberal agenda – the New Coalitionists made the building of an effective opposition to American neo-colonialism impossible.[[1093]](#footnote-1093) The New Coalitionism represented merely the shift of the corporate liberal consensus from one sector of the elite to the other. No matter how radical a candidate might be, the elites would ultimately betray them in the same way as their predecessors and would be ‘forced to console themselves by implementing bits and pieces of their program within the general framework imposed by the harsh demands of the military-industrial complex.’[[1094]](#footnote-1094)

In this regard, the editors of Studies were perhaps guilty of the same scepticism that had ‘plagued’ their academic work, avoiding the ‘inconvenient’ fact that liberalism ‘was no monolith’, in their search for a radical alternative to liberalism.[[1095]](#footnote-1095) Such was their disbelief that the Democratic Party would ever honestly engage with a socialist program, that they felt that the only way to build a genuine movement was to do so from a stance of ‘leftist isolationism.’[[1096]](#footnote-1096) Scarred by their belief that the Popular Front strategy adopted by the Communist Party in the 1930s had led to the co-optation of radicals as ‘merely the left face’ of the Corporate Liberal order, the editors sought to ‘expose’ the liberalism of the Johnson and Kennedy administrations as a means of promoting independent political action, and to promote new methods, such as community unions, to pressure the system to change.[[1097]](#footnote-1097)

Part Three: Up from Irrelevance

## Chapter Eight: With the Movements

‘I actually had no sense that something momentous had occurred’, *Studies on the Left* editor Michael Lebowitz recalled of the Port Huron Conference.[[1098]](#footnote-1098) ‘I felt I had contributed in making the statement more radical and had introduced what I saw as a promising group to *Studies.* The conference was as…an exercise in camaraderie and increasing student radical identification.’[[1099]](#footnote-1099) As one of around 70 students who gathered at a United Auto Workers retreat in Port Huron, Michigan (now Lakeport State Park) in June 1962 for the first national conference of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) however, Lebowitz, in a small way, made history. Taking as many copies of the journal with him as possible (having joined the *Studies* board in late 1961), one found its way into the hands of SDS leader Tom Hayden, who Lebowitz had met earlier that summer when he visited Madison as a Congress Delegate of the National Student Association. ‘I remember Tom sitting at the table with the issue before one of the plenaries and exclaiming “Can you believe this is from the United States?!”[[1100]](#footnote-1100)

Invited to co-chair the economics panel, Lebowitz made a number interventions in restructuring the points made in the economics section of the *Port Huron Statement*, and witnessed first-hand, the famous clash between Hayden, and Michael Harrington, one of the four League for Industrial Democracy elders (SDS had begun its life as the student wing of that organisation) who attacked the group for not being sufficiently anti-communist.[[1101]](#footnote-1101) Though the *Statement* went on to gain legendary status as the statement of the 1960s generation, at the time, its significance could barely be understood. There, ‘as everywhere’, the spirit of the conference had been influenced by the presence of those activists who had experience organising for the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), who ‘led us in singing freedom songs from the struggle.’[[1102]](#footnote-1102)

Lebowitz’s success at the conference was a sign of the increasingly profile of the journal among the movements. The following year, SDS met at Camp Gulliver, near Pine Hill, New York, with *Studies* editors James Weinstein and Stanley Aronowitz leading discussions, and their critique of Corporate Liberalism forming a central thread of *America and the New Era*, the follow-up manifesto to *Port Huron*.[[1103]](#footnote-1103) More specific in identifying the evils which plagued modern society, it identified the cause of the contemporary malaise in society as the closing of the ‘open frontier’ in face of ‘national social revolutions’ that were undercutting American influence in the Third World by blocking off access to markets.[[1104]](#footnote-1104) Through a new insurgency’ of grass-roots democratic action, SDS hoped to place pressure on the liberal elite to abandon this style of politics in favour of protest movements and popular mobilisation, refocusing their resources away from maintaining an international hegemony and military superiority towards ‘meeting the desperate needs’ of the American people.[[1105]](#footnote-1105)

Repulsed by the Democratic Party, it was from the pages of *Studies* that many SDS members forged their critique of Corporate Liberal efforts to ‘channel and contain’ the civil rights struggle, and developed ‘participatory democracy’ as a potential practical solution.[[1106]](#footnote-1106) Delivering uneven results, the editors, it was argued, were ultimately unable to ‘adequately explain’ how the journal was supposed to be used by activists.[[1107]](#footnote-1107) Was it to build the useable past for a new movement? Or was it to provide practical guidance in how to build a movement or to strengthen a community organising project? Movement historians have noted the impact that James O’Connor’s Community Unions thesis had on the development of the SDS Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP), and more broadly, Corporate Liberalism shaped the opposition of the movement towards liberalism and the Great Society.

Within the board however, efforts to influence the movements further were hamstrung by clashes over disagreements about the preferred strategy for the future. The younger editors felt that the New Left should adopt ‘participatory democracy’ as their guiding principle, while the older editors felt that the only strategy that could bring change was to move to political socialism.[[1108]](#footnote-1108) Some argued it should spring from the grassroots, with a structure developing ad-hoc and spontaneously, while others called for something more regimented, along traditional party lines. The duality between grass roots and bureaucratic organising would continue to feature on the left for many decades after *Studies* ceased publication. The desire to forge an independent political movement with its own distinct strategy ultimately found its voice in the successor journal *Socialist Revolution*.[[1109]](#footnote-1109) In spite of their differences however, the board was united in its desire to forge an independent political movement.

An American New Left

The editors of *Studies on the Left* initially expressed caution over whether the renewed activism of the sit-in and anti-HUAC movements of 1960 could be considered a New Left. On the eve of the journal’s move to New York, Eleanor Hakim characterised the editors’ views when she stated that the ‘New Left’ had yet to digest the heritage of the past, or sufficiently develop a methodology to make sense of ‘the past, present and future.’[[1110]](#footnote-1110) Having emerged out of the crisis within the Communist movement following the Hungarian Revolution and Khrushchev’s revelations about Stalinist era atrocities, the movements were driven forward by the Civil Rights movement and the anti-HUAC protests in 1960, the Freedom Rides of 1961, and the Freedom Summer of 1964. The early development of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) had focused developing radical activity as an educative process, with issues studied in a broad analytic context, and direct action used as the pretext for ‘a deeper appraisal of social problems.’[[1111]](#footnote-1111) Its inaugural conference ‘Student Radicalism: 1960’ drew 250 activists from eight campus chapters, with the aim of broadening the nascent movement from ‘single issue campaigning towards the broader issues of manpower…and resources…poverty, healthcare, wasted agricultural resources, [and] meaningless work.’[[1112]](#footnote-1112) With this early intellectually minded focus, it is not surprising that *Studies* grew in prominence as a potential outlet for work of this kind.

This was cemented when *Studies* published C. Wright Mills ‘Letter to the New Left’, a landmark source, which had previously appeared in the British *New Left Review.* Mills, whose writing ranked among the most influential of the critical analyses of American society to emerge in the 1950s, had been influential in the editors thinking, not at least, perhaps, because Mills too had been a Madison graduate, who had worked closely with Hans Gerth. Like the editors, Mills had been critical of the ‘Old Futilitarians’, the New York intellectuals who had refuted radicalism and reconciled themselves towards liberalism. Their guilt at their involvement, and previous commitment to socialism, had prompted them to embrace the ‘American Celebration.’[[1113]](#footnote-1113) In opposition to this attitude, Mills had purposefully sought out a movement to address, had deliberately held onto his values, because although they might be unrealisable in the near future, times could change, and ‘what was in one decade…utopian’ might in the next be ‘implementable.’[[1114]](#footnote-1114) With words such as these, it is not hard to understand why the editors were drawn to Mills. Here was an apparently authentic radical; an intellectual who was also a talented motorbike mechanic with an aptitude for physical work and home cooking – Mills had built two of his own houses, baked his own bread, and took long rides down the highway on his motorbike.[[1115]](#footnote-1115)

Sceptical of his peers, Mills felt that labour unions had eschewed radicalism and the forming of an independent political movement in favour of a union with the Democratic Party, and other anti-communist groupings such as the Americas for Democratic Action (ADA), to secure better contracts for their employees.[[1116]](#footnote-1116) White-collar workers too, had begun to work for salaries rather than owning property and the means of their production, undertaking work, which lacked meaning or purpose. As William Appleman Williams had proposed in *The Great Evasion*, Mills had envisioned a return to 19th century ‘democratic public’, in place of the contemporary mass public indifference to politics, caused by the bureaucratisation and centralisation of political power, at the expense of the voluntary associations where the public had once shared ideas.[[1117]](#footnote-1117) White-collar workers were now no more likely than labour to form a radical vanguard, in fact they now acted as a conservative force in society.[[1118]](#footnote-1118) Further hampering the path to radical change was the Cold War, which had ‘flattened’ political discourse, stifled public thinking, and hindered civil liberties.[[1119]](#footnote-1119)

Excited by the protests of students against the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings in San Francisco in early 1960, just as he had been energised by similar protests in England, Mill’s scattered evocation of a young intelligentsia rising up in protest cited the Aldermaston march in England, the sit-ins in North Carolina, and a number of other movements across Europe as being the harbinger of a New Left, in which students, not the working class, w the prominent role.[[1120]](#footnote-1120) The *Studies* editors remained sceptical. Though they had been characterised as a theoretical organ for the New Left, they did not yet believe that a significant or identifiable movement had emerged that could be characterised as the New Left. Thus, they could only be considered New Leftists in the sense that they were ‘striving’ to free themselves from the dogmas, myths, and ‘fratricidal warfare’ of the Old Left. Concerned with the effective and meaningful use of their disciplines to help change society, they did not feel that they themselves could transform society, only that they could produce a body of analysis and social theory that could aid those activists who chose to take on the responsibility.[[1121]](#footnote-1121)

Though Mills had previously rejected their overtures to be listed as an associate editor, he now appeared heartened by the advances made by the movement, and had made overtures, and the editors felt compelled to publish the Letter. ‘One of the things we are trying to do is build a New Left’, Martin Sklar wrote to Eleanor Hakim. ‘Mills wants to do so. Mills wants SoL (sic) as the possible organ of a developing New Left. So let’s associate damn it.’[[1122]](#footnote-1122) After a protracted discussion, because the article was a reprint, it finally appeared later in the year. ‘This is an article that left Americans should be reading and discussing’, Sklar insisted.[[1123]](#footnote-1123)

Mills was not the only prominent thinker who *Studies* identified as having influenced the New Left. A 1961 article contributed by Emile Capouya ran the gauntlet over post-war social criticism, including David Riesman, Daniel Bell, Paul Goodman, Erich Fromm, C Wright Mills and others who had articulated public discontents to a broad readership.[[1124]](#footnote-1124) As autonomous men reduced themselves to the status of ‘socialised and insipid ciphers’, ‘mutually accommodating, ‘vaguely benevolent, and anxious to please’, these ‘prophets, Capouya, had attempted to quantify.[[1125]](#footnote-1125) Daniel Bell had described the intellectual and moral bankruptcy of socialism, which had failed to deliver liberty, equality, or fraternity, and had discredited alternatives to corporate capitalism. Erich Fromm described the mass insanity of the paranoid cold war, and C Wright Mills highlighted the idea that a high degree of organisation and integration had implied the isolation and powerlessness of the average citizen, whilst highlighting the influence of the power elite. Speaking for their ‘beaten fellows’, these men came across as beaten men, in as much as they proposed that nothing could be done to materially change the situations.[[1126]](#footnote-1126)

Defending Mills from accusations that he had ‘uttered a kind of *Protocols of Zion*’ which presented the history of American capitalism as a conspiracy, Capouya emphasised that Mills had not been out to prove the existence of power, but to find out which organs of society were most concerned with “producing or inducing it and with directing its application.’[[1127]](#footnote-1127) What he, and the *Studies* editors wanted, was an ideology, which gave democracy ‘another whirl’, which tried to insure that society was run under universal values, instead of those, which had failed society.[[1128]](#footnote-1128)

The death of Mills in 1962 affected the editors greatly. His insights, wrote Hans Gerth, had begun to make sense of the opaque and puzzling nature of industrial society. Mills was a ‘herculean’, a masculine figure whom loved ‘tough minded’ writers and writers of in Hemingway tradition whose words made sense of a world that seemed adrift.[[1129]](#footnote-1129) Mills had ‘died a revolutionary’; Saul Landau wrote in *Root and Branch*, much criticized and misunderstood. Liberals disliked his innuendos about the United States being dominated by undemocratic elites, and conservatives dismissed as a Communist. Encountering *White Collar* for the first time as an undergraduate – ‘ready for debate, knowing all the answers’ – Mills had provided a devastating commentary on society in the United States. ‘He decided’, said Landau ‘that Marx was basically wrong. ‘It [was] obvious’ that the proletariat didn’t make history, ‘no matter how much you want[ed] to stretch historical facts’; it was obvious that elites had made and still made world history.’[[1130]](#footnote-1130)...Now in all the overdeveloped societies, with the intricate control of the mass media, it’s up to the intellectuals who have a conscience to do what must be done.[[1131]](#footnote-1131)

The impulse to move away from the search for a ‘substitute proletariat’ and the ‘labour metaphysic’, was one shared within the *America and the New Era* as a desire for the New Left. This was not to mean that SDS members sought to move away from intellectual concepts. At the 1962 Conference, Paul Potter, insisted that intellectuals could act as agents for social change. The New Left and its associated social movements represented the first alternative home for intellectuals who hoped for something other than ‘service to the Establishment or isolation from society.’[[1132]](#footnote-1132) It was towards these same ends that the *Studies* editors had worked since 1959.[[1133]](#footnote-1133) Among those still associated with the Old Left, there was alarm. Reviewing *Studies* for the *Marxist-Leninist Quarterly*, Paul Saba praised the editors of declaring that radicals had to take the lead in exposing Cold War liberalism and its efforts to engage young intellectuals. Highlighting the growing radicalism within the universities however, he warned the editors of the dangers of discounting the potential of the working class, and that young radicals would have to break out of the ‘walled-in’ campuses if they were serious in believing that a revolution could occur without them.[[1134]](#footnote-1134)

With the Movements

Over the next three years, *Studies* increasingly orientated itself to examining contemporary applications of radicalism, a move that did not come without its critics. Madison editor Helen Kramer warned that be the adoption of an editorial line as the ‘leader of the New Left’ would be a ‘serious error’, restricting the scope and freshness of the discussion in the journal.[[1135]](#footnote-1135) Michael Lebowitz was equally worried: ‘*Studies* appears… to have succumbed to a tendency to give up its previous desire to maintain close ties to the campus and new radical scholarship’, he complained.[[1136]](#footnote-1136) Who and what the journal now stood for was not immediately discernible. Whereas previously *Studies* had occupied the unique status as a serious journal targeted towards graduate students, he believed, it appeared to have surrendered its ‘individuality’ to the movement.[[1137]](#footnote-1137)

Despite these warnings, James Weinstein, now in control of the journal, pressed on, developing a plan to shift *Studies* toward a bi-monthly schedule, with issues focusing on developments in the movements, with an intention to convert to a monthly if the new format proved popular.[[1138]](#footnote-1138) ‘Since the movements have blossomed we have been reorienting the journal toward a more active and immediate concern with existing practice’, he explained to one potential donor. ‘In addition to continuing our interest in history, sociology, and political science, our purpose is to provide critical information and analysis about the movements.’[[1139]](#footnote-1139) Spurring him forward was the development of the SDS led Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP), which became synonymous with community organisation projects in slums across nine major American cities.[[1140]](#footnote-1140) Conceived by Tom Hayden and Carl Whitman, ERAP proposed that the New Left activists should work in disadvantaged communities as community organisers, demanding decent housing, jobs and income, and providing an opening for the mass democratic participation that could challenge the liberal state. The first ERAP project was formed in Chicago in September 1963 as an attempt to organise the white unemployed. Based next to an unemployment compensation centre, the campaigners entitled their program Jobs or Income Now (JOIN). Followed by a similar project in Baltimore, the JOIN projects were originally premised upon the belief that only movements that attacked the fundamental issues of the economic structure of American society could succeed in forging lasting change. Other volunteers in Newark and Cleveland, influenced by James O’Connor’s articles on Community Unions, planed their activities around issues that the community saw as being relevant to them, becoming known as Garbage Removal or Income Now (GROIN) projects.[[1141]](#footnote-1141)

Aiding the establishment of ERAP was Stanley Aronowitz, a trade unionist who had known James Weinstein from his days as a high school organiser in the late 1940s.[[1142]](#footnote-1142) He was one of several new additions made to the *Studies* editorial board through 1964 and into 1965; others included Norman Fruchter and Tom Hayden, both of whom had first-hand experience of the ERAP project in Newark. Through connections made within the National Committee for Full Employment, an organisation which Aronowitz had formed with economist Roy Brown, Aronowitz supported ERAP organisers form projects in northern cities such as Cleveland, Baltimore and Newark. Instrumental helping the Newark project, where he had held the position of vice-chair within the Clinton Hill Neighbourhood Council, he worked to preserve the ‘interracial character of the community by improving community life and…its amenities.’[[1143]](#footnote-1143) He also helped to form the Committee for Miners (CFP) offering financial and legal assistance to miners who were on strike in Hazard, Kentucky.[[1144]](#footnote-1144) Echoing the conclusions reached by *Studies* editor James O’Connor, Aronowitz proposed the development of community unions, emphasising in his speeches for the NCFE the importance of filling the void left by the unions within communities by organising the poor within cities.[[1145]](#footnote-1145)

Following a series of themed issues in 1964 focusing on the arts, the northern ghetto, and Latin America, ‘With the Movements’ debuted in the first issue of 1965, combining reports and analysis of the various movements and campaigns, written by movement figures such as Staughton Lynd, Noel Day, Sumner Rosen, Dick Flacks, Mike Miller, and members of the SNCC.[[1146]](#footnote-1146) The decision brought about the resignation of Martin Sklar from the editorial board; Sklar cited the blurring distinction between the journal and the movement. ‘At all times in Wisconsin, we never thought of *Studies* as ‘the movement’ or as an expression of the movement, or as a tool for organising the movement’, he later explained, ‘because we did not want to fall into the illusion that a magazine is a movement or into the complacency of rationalising attachment to a magazine as a substitution or evasion of the work of building a movement.’[[1147]](#footnote-1147) The rationale for introducing the section, Weinsten believed, was a belief that many SDS leaders were eager to have *Studies* play a more actively critical role within the movement, combining the theory with a more political focus.[[1148]](#footnote-1148) ‘The journal has always reflected this duality... Now… the balance is shifting rather heavily toward the movements’, he wrote to Sklar, requesting his theoretical insight ‘(if not physical) presence.’[[1149]](#footnote-1149) Leaders in the movement, he stated, had suggested that the editors make *Studies* available to its membership, either through subscription or direct distribution through the chapters and in the projects.[[1150]](#footnote-1150) The issue ‘cut to the heart of the role of the journal’, and raised the question of whether it had the right and responsibility to interpret and critique the movements, Stanley Aronowitz recalled, with Tom Hayden insistent that as intellectuals, the editors had to ‘confine themselves’ to providing publicity for the movements and emphasise their centrality to contemporary political discourse.[[1151]](#footnote-1151)

Across three issues, the emerging consensus assessed that the projects were successful at demanding lower rent, housing repairs and day-care centres, higher welfare payments, and highlighting the broader ruthlessness and indifference of local officials and undemocratic bureaucracies. Lacking in the Projects, however, was the knowledge and impetus to transfer that action to an attack upon the structural roots of the system, making a confrontation with the original sources of poverty and power in communities impossible. With specific reference to his own experiences of working with the New Brunswick ERAP, Ron Aronson noted that this was partly because organisers who desired to ‘change the system’ were working with a constituency who largely interacted with indirect or secondary arms of the state. [[1152]](#footnote-1152) ‘Landlords, corrupt government officials, low-paying employers at service jobs, racist police – all derive from and support [the] basic social economic system…imperialist monopoly capitalism’, he explained, and political activity which failed to question its legitimacy could not change the system. This explained why even in New Brunswick, the most successful organising projects only appeared to be making marginal demands; unlike the direct tactics of the strike, picketing, sitting-in, and damaging the image of a city or a state could win concessions, but did not offer control over the levers that ran the system. [[1153]](#footnote-1153) These built in limits meant that a movement of the poor would continue to drift unless it could make a connection with another movement that did expose and attack the roots of the system.[[1154]](#footnote-1154)

The solution to this problem, Norman Fruchter suggested, was to create alternative organisations that were responsive to the need of residents, and free from bureaucratic constraints. [[1155]](#footnote-1155) Individual freedom could only be gained through direct control, a strategy at odds with the totemic demands (planning for public rather than private ends, extension of public ownership and control, a national health service) of the Old Left. ‘Left wingers whose original generating ideals have atrophied or petrified into slogans or programmatic solutions’, he wrote, ‘find themselves as alienated from SNCC as from all the ‘quality of life’ responses to the decay of the majority society which have been variously labelled Bohemian, Beat, Hip, or simply non-political.’[[1156]](#footnote-1156) Questions remained however, as to the form of the new politics that would emerge from the movements.[[1157]](#footnote-1157) Victor Rabinowitz accused Fruchter of misrepresenting the issues; a counter-community lacked the power to overcome the evils of the ‘separate but equal’ doctrine, and only political action, a program and an organisation could effectively challenge this system.[[1158]](#footnote-1158)

 ‘Need we recite again, those social reforms which left-wingers fought for in the past, which now succeed in damaging those they are intended to serve? Public welfare? Federal housing? Urban renewal? Radicals are not useful until they confront American institutions, Fruchter replied. ‘I use totemic to style those orthodox left-wing solutions to real problems and real needs which have become empty phrases.’[[1159]](#footnote-1159)

In a separate and unpublished reply, SNCC staffer Mike Miller accused both Fruchter and Rabinowitz of producing ‘renderings’ that bore a frightening lack of resemblance to the ‘day-to-day realities’ of the movement.[[1160]](#footnote-1160) The goal of SNCC was not to forge new assumptions about ‘identity, personality, work, meaning and aspirations’, as Fruchter suggested, but to break ‘into society and get a share of its resources.’[[1161]](#footnote-1161) In reducing SNCC to its policy statements, Rabinowitz had overlooked the core purpose of the organisation, which was to service the staff and field without controlling all activity at the local level, and misunderstood that SNCC neither eschewed political power nor the ‘totemic demands’ of the Old Left.[[1162]](#footnote-1162) The potential of the South, he felt, could only be ‘opened up’ by those who had experience oppression, and it was their demands for participation, local control in decision making, leadership from below rather than from above that distinguished SNCC what had come before.[[1163]](#footnote-1163)

The other substantial block on the development of the projects was, the editors and contributors suggested, the lack of any political program that might potentially guide the development of the projects into fully fledged movements. Reporters found a uniform lack of leadership from within the communities they were serving, partly because of the organisers and participants own desire to avoid top down structures and leaders and promote democratic participation. Jesse Allen, one of the volunteers ‘discovered’ by Tom Hayden in Newark, remarked that NCUP operated a system of ‘rotating chairmen’ who served four-week terms before being replaced, because organisations had so frequently been ‘sold out’ by the leaders.[[1164]](#footnote-1164) Similarly, the San Francisco’ Freedom House, which sought to help deprived communities overcome their poverty and alienation, struggled to build a sustainable grassroots organisation due to the fear among its members of infiltration from the ‘liberal establishment’ and left-wing ideologues who would impose ‘their own particular version of the truth.’[[1165]](#footnote-1165)

In movements with a specific aim, such as the New York Rent Strike Movement, which staged strikes in 1963-64 to force landlords to make repairs to low-quality housing, activists had failed in their objectives of creating a tenants’ movement, because, Stanley Aronowitz noted, beyond winning repairs, there was no ‘perspective of building a movement, and without leaders, different tactics prevented the building of a unified movement.’[[1166]](#footnote-1166) In New Brunswick, community action projects avoided associating with social welfare agencies and the government anti-poverty program, which enabled people to become politically knowledgeable without being manipulated. But that was a difficult task if there was no ideological framework to guide them, which made the strategy, William Miller argued, misguided. ‘They incorrectly assumed that community organising could be fruitful before the articulation of an ideology and program’, he stated. ‘Without goals to aim towards, many necessary issues were made with little more than guesswork.’ What was the ultimate aim of community organising, if not to reverse the drift towards totalitarianism and alienation?’[[1167]](#footnote-1167) *Studies on the Left*, Miller proposed, had an important role to play as a forum for the ‘purposes and possibilities’ of community organising, to ensure that it was not prematurely rejected as a worthwhile means of building a movement.[[1168]](#footnote-1168)

In promoting the ‘With the Movements’ section, the editors of the journal had attempted to fulfil this task and had some degree of support for the strategy. While the link up of individual projects to a national movement had not yet happened, Norman Fruchter and Robert Kramer noted, activists had ‘pushed the possibilities of opposition into new constituencies and new dimensions’ of resistance.[[1169]](#footnote-1169) The future growth of organisations like NCUP depended on persuading liberals that they were a legitimate native response to problems rather than ‘disruptive…trouble makers and agitators.’[[1170]](#footnote-1170) As NCUP and others further integrated into the neighbourhood, gaining a sense of place and minimal financial security, a greater understanding of their ability to serve as foundations for a permanent radical movement would emerge. ‘They represent one among many attempts to push opposition movement for change as far as it can go…Working in particularly vulnerable sectors of society, their limits and their dead-ends are the present limits of a movement for fundamental change in society’, Fruchter and Kramer explained.[[1171]](#footnote-1171) ‘Members of the projects see themselves as rejecting the existing society, as creating centres of opposition that intersect with it, but are finally ‘outside’ its control.’[[1172]](#footnote-1172) Fruchter would subsequently form Blue Van Films with Robert Machover and Robert Kramer to chart the effects of the NCUP in Newark in two documentaries, *We Got to Live Here* (1965) and *Troublemakers* (1966).[[1173]](#footnote-1173)

Reviewing the ‘With the Movements’ segment’s overall impact, James Weinstein remarked that while the contributions gave ‘an interesting picture of the consciousness of those involved’ they nonetheless fell short of the ‘overall analysis.’[[1174]](#footnote-1174) One solution, he proposed, was the hiring of a full time ‘editor reporter’ who would travel the country: ‘we have been at the mercy of those directly involved for material’ he wrote to a prospective funder.[[1175]](#footnote-1175) With an editor, ‘our own man on the spot…we could do a great deal more...Lots of people in the movement care what the editors of SOL think. Especially in SDS, NSM, and even SNCC.’[[1176]](#footnote-1176) Editor Michael Lebowitz disliked the strategy, believing that the ‘single travelling observer format’ might produce a single line on events ‘based on poorly thought-out’ recounting of experiences, whereas the current format left room for conflicting interpretations.[[1177]](#footnote-1177) Associate Paul Breines, felt that though the journal moved away from its original theoretical approach and towards political journalism, the sense was that *Studies* was still too abstract and non-practical. Participation, constituency, organising the poor had acted as surrogates for new thoughts, and the journal had to take responsibility for having encouraged a strategy that merely aimed to avoid co-optation, rather than build a new ideology. ‘My own feeling…is that its task is to the recruitment of students and intellectuals who become (maybe) the agents of transforming the social consciousness’, he explained.[[1178]](#footnote-1178)

Readers and associates also expressed their opinions. Robin Cook believed that *Studies* should stick to analysis rather than opinion. ‘We already have *The Nation*, *Dissent*, *Liberation*, *Commentary*, *Ramparts*. With the Movements is fine, but now there is more information in your book reviews than in the rest of the magazine.’[[1179]](#footnote-1179) Weinstein agreed: the movements’ initial usefulness was wearing thin, and they were fast approaching a point of crisis. Writing of his experience of the SDS projects in Newark and Chicago, he highlighted the formlessness of their activities. ‘In Chicago’, he wrote, ‘30 people are wandering around aimlessly’, he commented, ‘lacking the education to… go beyond the simplest (first) stages of organisation.’ Typical of the group was a ‘history is bunk’ resistance to learning about the past, promoted by elitist project leaders. It seemed that the mystique of participatory democracy, far from allowing the program and strategy to emerge ‘from the people’ was prone to degenerating to the level in which its members looked towards leaders who would act as ‘their kings’, who kept their true intentions obscured from honest discussion.[[1180]](#footnote-1180) Interviewing five members of the Chicago project – Casey Hayden, Chicago Seven member Rennie Davis, Richard Rothstein, and Judy Bernstein – the *Studies*’ editorsencountered activists who themselves questioned the tactics of the movement.[[1181]](#footnote-1181) Admitting scepticism, Bernstein admitted that she remained ‘unconvinced’ that students who became radical after working a project could act as a significant force in the country.’[[1182]](#footnote-1182)

The lack of clarity of direction within the movements, SDS, caused concern within sections of its leadership. Prior to his replacement as ERAP Director in the Autumn of 1964, Al Haber echoed the feelings of the *Studies* editors when he questioned the value of students romantically ‘subsisting in a slum’ rather than developing an individual’s talents in a professional field and undertaking the ‘intellectual job’ of forming a radical perspective.[[1183]](#footnote-1183) In a heated letter, Haber criticised the substance of ERAP’s commitment to community work as being free of any radical direction and lacking both clarity of goals and sufficient differentiation from liberalism. He proposed that it diverted from SDS’s role as a student organisation and provided the base for ‘an unfortunate anti-intellectualism’, based upon middle-class alienation at their privileged backgrounds. The ‘into the ghetto’ enthusiasm, Haber later wrote, had become linked with an ‘anti-intellectualism’, a ‘disparagement of research and study’, and the movement to urge students to leave the university and become ‘morally superior’ by giving their bodies to the movement. ‘In the world’ has come to mean ‘in the slum.’ The ‘cult of the ghetto’, he felt, had diverted SDS from the primary and most difficult task of educating radicals.’[[1184]](#footnote-1184)

Abandoned after three issues, ostensibly because of failure of the journal to raise funds for a reporter, ‘With the Movements’ remains an interesting documentation of movement activity in the mid-1960s. Subsequent to the decision to suspend it, the journal once again entered a period of uncertainty, as editors quarrelled over its future direction, and that of the movement they wished to influence. What was needed, Martin Sklar and James Weinstein felt, was theoretical clarity about the potential of the movement to adopt revolutionary politics.[[1185]](#footnote-1185) American life could only be transformed through ‘the recreation of a popular movement for socialism’ in the United States, and this meant strengthening the weak body of socialist intellectual thought that aimed to replace the centralising conceptions of socialism, which had been co-opted by corporations to establish the bureaucratic state. The anti-war movement, they admitted, had ‘encouraged a constituency for a politics of opposition’, yet it existed as a movement primarily of protest, and with no alternative vision for society apart from their disgust, the New Left was showing signs of ‘unwittingly repeating the mindless march into the popular front policies of the 1930s.’ At issue was whether the New Left, unlike the left of the 1930s, might develop its own ideas, its own revolutionary vision of a reorganised America, or whether it would succumb to the tactics of protest as an ineffectual and unthinking response to social conditions.[[1186]](#footnote-1186)

Teach-In Movements

It was in the spirit of education and new ideas that the editors took an interest in the action of students who participated in the Free Speech Movement and the Teach-in Movement, particularly the Berkeley Free Speech Movement. Beginning as a protest against the California-Berkeley University administration’s banning of literature and activities that ‘advocated or opposed off-campus political issues’, the incident quickly escalated into a student strike, and an occupation of the central administration building.[[1187]](#footnote-1187) *Studies* quickly moved to include analysis of these movements in its pages. Larry Spence, a graduate student at Berkeley, described the ‘multiversity’ as a conservative construct to turn out appropriate workers for the ‘cybernated production system’, and challenged his fellow students to create a new program that moved away from ideas of planning, and centralisation, apathy at the bottom and ‘bureaucratic egotism’ at the top.[[1188]](#footnote-1188) Civil disobedience and non-violent demonstration, he felt, could bring bureaucratic processes to a halt, jolting individuals from their ‘conformist slumbers’ to challenge the ‘ignorance of little minds operating from an ant hill of power’ by demanding a university democracy in which teachers and students rightfully ruled and administrators emptied the trash.[[1189]](#footnote-1189) Michael Nagler agreed. The Berkeley demonstrations were a ‘scale model revolutionary movement’ that was threatening the structure of a community ‘long paralysed by prestige and the desolate inhumanity of the multiversity.’ The ‘vast majority’ of the campus community, he reported, had been shaken out of its ‘thoughtless apathy’, and faculty and students together were breaking down the ‘tragic alienation’ in American society. The aim moving forward was focus on the ‘much more present danger’ of the university administration itself.[[1190]](#footnote-1190)

Out of this prolonged activity emerged the Teach-In movement, the first of which was organised by faculty professors at the University of Michigan as a means of gaining support from students for their ‘work moratorium’ protest the Vietnam War. Following a backlash from the university administration and the state government, which had escalated to the national media, the professors decided to invite faculty and activists from around the country to address students from 8pm March 24th until 8 am March 25th, 1965. Declared by Carl Oglesby, President of SDS, as a ‘stroke of genius’, the format was copied at Columbia, Berkeley, and Madison, and fifty other campuses around the country. [[1191]](#footnote-1191) The Teach Ins excited the editors; to not cover them, Michael Lebowitz argued, would ‘betray much of the early arguments of the constituency of the journal’, meaning those graduate students who hoped to shift academia towards and engagement with contemporary and vital issues and away from the archival monograph.[[1192]](#footnote-1192) Martin Sklar also expressed his interest, suggesting a special issue of *Studies* that would analyse of the role of the academic community as ‘an important ideological force’ in American society.[[1193]](#footnote-1193)

In the following issue, *Studies* associate editors James Gilbert contrasted the strengths of the Madison Teach-in, with the drab National Teach-in held in Washington DC. The Wisconsin faculty had greeted the opportunity to speak out on controversial subjects such as Vietnam with relish - going as far to organise a joint ‘Faculty-Student Committee to End the War in Vietnam.[[1194]](#footnote-1194) Merging education with protest, the event had challenged the detachment of the university from the political community, and the ‘persistent soul-searching about the meaning of education and the role of the university…triggered by the rise of the mass university and the race to publish.[[1195]](#footnote-1195)‘ In contrast, the National teach-in had been co-opted in the name of balance: ‘the price of respectability.’[[1196]](#footnote-1196) With students acting as observers rather than participants, the event had been stripped the event of its protest element. The professors had become ‘experts’, removed from the anonymous audience that could not actively participate. The lack of a representation from the administration sent a clear message that intellectual exchange could be ‘left to the intellectuals, while officials attended to the more important business of making policy.’ There were now two forms of ‘teach-ins’, Gilbert concurred. ‘One respectable…and another a forum for protest…one embraces the concept that we must suspend judgment…while the experts bicker…the other assumes that faculty and students have the right to commit themselves and protest.’[[1197]](#footnote-1197) Later, Ronald Radosh concluded that the the teach-ins had reminded the American public that ‘teachers, like politicians’ were communicators, who having been muzzled by their institutions, sought new channels in order to express their opinions. Together, he felt, teachers and students were building a movement.[[1198]](#footnote-1198)

As an extension to these events, the *Studies* editors became figures in the emerging Free University of New York (FUNY). Instigated by Sharon and Allen Krebs and James Mellan in the spring of 1966, FUNY was the first ‘alternative educational institution’ of the New Left, its instructors made up of local radical intellectuals and political movement organisers, who were brought together by their shared view that standard universities and colleges had ‘gone beyond the point of intellectual bankruptcy.’[[1199]](#footnote-1199) Their ranks included a number of the *Studies* editors. Stanley Aronowitz taught modules on community and political organising, and American radicalism’, including lectures on ‘Marx, Mills, Marcuse, and American pluralists.’[[1200]](#footnote-1200) Staughton Lynd charted the course of American radical tradition before Eugene Debs in ‘The American Radical Tradition before 1900’, with the aim of contextualising the new radicalism in the sixties with that of earlier generations. James Weinstein led with an examination and evaluation of the socialist movement in the United States, including the rise of Debs and the Socialist Party, and in collaboration with Martin Sklar, offered ‘Problems of Social Revolution in Advanced Industrial Society: The Case of the United States’ in the winter session of 1966. Martin Sklar taught about corporate capitalism in the United States from 1896-1929 in the fall of 1965, and from 1929 to the present in the winter of 1966. Norman Fruchter’s course on film criticism inspired the creation of the New Left film directors’ group Newsreel at the Free University.[[1201]](#footnote-1201)

In spite of their close involvement, the editors were not enamoured by the ‘low – very low’ standard of discussion’, in their courses.[[1202]](#footnote-1202) ‘The other night we approved a course by a mystic who said he did his studying with the masters in a previous existence (Buddha, I believe was his instructor)’, James Weinstein described to *Studies* editor Alan Cheuse. ‘Then the members grilled some fellow who wants to teach a course on fascism for two hours. He knows it all backwards…but he may be pro-fascist, so the PL simples…were opposed. When asked why the mystic was okay, but not the fascist, Taus (sic) replying that no one takes mystics seriously anyway. That is, it’s okay to have the Free U loaded with incompetents as long as they’re irrelevant.’ [[1203]](#footnote-1203)

This experience was one that was true of the broader movement: anti-intellectualism, James Weinstein felt, was a genuine problem on the New Left, and at least some of it had crept into the journal, even if *Studies* was one of the ‘main victims’ rather than a proponent.[[1204]](#footnote-1204) Writing to Jesse Lemisch about the latter’s desire to attend the first New University Conference, organised by Richard Flacks, he asked: ‘Are you going to going to be able to educate yourselves, [and] develop your ideas by having to argue step one over and over again with essentially hostile (non) intellects?’[[1205]](#footnote-1205) Lemisch recounted similar anti-intellectualism among students who had chosen to ‘liberate’ his university class on election day, and then criticise him for proposing to cancel the class due to his worry that he wouldn’t be able to conceal his own opinions. ‘True to your analysis… they had nothing’, he wrote Weinstein, ‘they commenced to assault me for having been unwilling to give a class to political discussion…They are really very authoritarian.’[[1206]](#footnote-1206) The movement, Lemisch agreed, was in serious trouble. Paul Breines likewise, felt that inability of SDS leaders to learn from the demonstrations was due to their ‘horrendously’ anti-intellectual streak; ‘The New Left… refuses to examine or study and goes on acting on the basis of the traditional pre-digested assumptions’, he wrote to James Weinstein. ‘For example, the efforts of most of the anti-war activity are carried out in a recurring pattern: the last demonstration didn’t stop the President from bombing… Conclusion? Let’s have a bigger and better and more imaginative demonstration.’[[1207]](#footnote-1207)

There was some sense of hope within the SDS Radical Education Program (REP), formed in 1966 by Al Haber as a long-distance study group between SDS members focused on the collective exploration of topics relevant to building a new radicalism.[[1208]](#footnote-1208) REP was at least partly influenced by *Studies;* Norman Fruchter served on the advisory committee for a time, and the Project reprinted and circulated articles by Editors Ronald Aronson and Robert Wolfe, and contributor Gabriel Kolko.[[1209]](#footnote-1209) The organisation however, they felt, was not perfect. Though James Weinstein praised the REP, he believed that the New Left was based on the false premise and that once the hypocrisy of the liberal rhetoric had been exposed, the corporate establishment would move to repair its shattered image by making real concessions and real reforms. [[1210]](#footnote-1210)

“A Lot of Thunder but a Brief Reign”

As the 1960s ended, the wider *Studies* community attempted to assess the overall contribution of the New Left. Having lost sight of its own ‘peculiar’ democratic traditions, they concluded, its attempts at ‘exposing’ the system without offering anything in its place had degenerated into an ‘all-consuming’ nihilism, which had resurrected the sectarian dogmas of the bureaucratic Old Left.[[1211]](#footnote-1211) The very survival of the SDS vision of ‘participatory democracy’ now depended on the adoption of more durable forms of organisation. Following the closure of *Studies* in 1967, James Weinstein, Eugene Genovese and other *Studies* alumni began to work closely on a ‘project for democratic renewal’, an attempt to ‘reshape’ the New Left into a ‘redemptive movement’ for reinvigorated citizenship.[[1212]](#footnote-1212)

The first step in forging this new democratic movement was a disavowal of SDS. Having witnessed ex-*Studies* editor and SDS leader Tom Hayden ‘babbling’ about bringing down the university in the aftermath of the Columbia University Revolt of 1968, Christopher Lasch typified the view that intellectuals could not engage with the student movement until it dissociated itself from the leadership of SDS and other practitioners of ‘obscurantist anti-intellectualism.[[1213]](#footnote-1213) ‘We must oppose neo-Stalinism on the New Left’, he wrote to James Weinstein. ‘That means attacks on SDS.’[[1214]](#footnote-1214) Though he felt that SDS was in a bad way, and questioned whether the politics of the group had anything to offer the *Studies* group and their efforts to move towards more partly-led movements, Weinstein hoped that it was not beyond redemption.[[1215]](#footnote-1215) ‘You say that the issue is confrontationalism and that we must oppose the SDS crazies’, he responded. ‘But… we are faced with a situation where the confrontationists have the initiative for the moment among our main constituency… That means that we cannot make blanket attacks on SDS… particularly before we offer a set of alternatives.[[1216]](#footnote-1216)

Through 1968 and 1969 the editors nonetheless continued to try and influence the direction of the SDS. In 1968, Martin Sklar moved to the University of Rochester, and became influential in the Rochester SDS chapter, as it moved to oppose both its Revolutionary Youth Movement (RYM) and Worker Student Alliance (WSA) factions.[[1217]](#footnote-1217) The RYM, inspired by the Black Panthers, hoped to reshape the movement towards support of the black liberation movement and armed struggle, which it now saw as the truest expression of working-class radicalism in the United States. The WSA on the other hand was a caucus of the Progressive Labor Party (PL) whose Old Left orientation subordinated race issues in favour of class, and cast Black Nationalism as a reactionary, bourgeois construct. Sklar saw the RYM as having turned to sectarian ‘Third Worldism’ - ‘White Skin Privilege’ - wretched-oppressed-victim - ethnic-race-based politics’, as he later referred. ‘I regarded them as moving to fascism… that is, moving to glorification of, and alliance with, irrationalism, nationalist/ ethnic/ racist identities, and socio-economic backwardness.’[[1218]](#footnote-1218) At the SDS State Convention at Niagara in February 1969, Sklar issued an anti-PL statement, already passed by the Rochester SDS, in the hope that it would help turn SDS back towards a coherent socialist platform.[[1219]](#footnote-1219) Writing to Michael Lebowitz with the suggestion that he introduce the resolution at the Wisconsin SDS chapter, Sklar described the impact of his motion as having exposed the PL faction, with its ‘phoney ultra-leftist phrasemaking’, as ‘functionalist ideologues.’[[1220]](#footnote-1220) ‘Their enemies (in addition to the traditional ones) are the “student chauvinists” (who are attempting to control universities, etc), the Old New Leftists (whose emphasis upon democracy and criticisms of current things plays into the hands of the pigs and is in reality “anti-communism”, pig professors and the like.’ Attempting to peel away chapters one by one, persuading them to take control of their own decisions and resources, Sklar hoped that old SDS members, ‘dragged along unhappily by the confrontation creators’, would be emboldened to take back control of the movement.[[1221]](#footnote-1221)

Through 1968, the WSA and the RYM had fought for control of SDS, whilst activists of various factions fanned discontent on campuses.[[1222]](#footnote-1222) Increasingly ambivalent in his attitude towards activists, Eugene Genovese wrote to James Weinstein, suggesting that ‘the nihilists’ were going to fail in their effort ‘to burn the campuses’ and that it was up to their group to offer a constructive alternative theory and strategy. ‘When they are smashed, we shall pick up the best while the worst (who are not dead or in jail) will move onto acid or worse. The day of reckoning for New Left imbecility is about to arrive and we must prepare to take different ground.’[[1223]](#footnote-1223) Genovese dedicated his 1968 book *In Red and Black* to those who were restoring sanity to the ‘remains of the miscalled and abortive “New Left” and those who had fought its “nihilistic perversions.”‘[[1224]](#footnote-1224) The sole aim of the New Left, he claimed, was to overthrow the ‘economic determinism’ of the Old Left, which had prompted them to glorify ‘the lower classes’ and to read the through the lens of current political demands.[[1225]](#footnote-1225)

A further split then occurred between the RYM, led by Bernadine Dohrn, and the new RYM II, a Maoist influenced group led by Mike Klonsky, who claimed that ‘skin privilege’ was ‘irrelevant’, and rejected armed struggle in favour of building a new revolutionary vanguard party. Months later, the RYM faction won control of the SDS National Office, and soon after, at the 1969 National Conference, the organisation split. Each delegate was given the convention issue of the SDS newspaper *New Left Notes*, published by the National Office, which contained a RYM manifesto, ‘You don’t need a Weatherman to know which way the wind blows.’[[1226]](#footnote-1226) Once it became clear that the Worker Student Alliance (WSA) faction was the largest contingent with a majority of the delegates, the convention quickly fell into disarray, as the RYM and allied groups moved to expel Progressive Labor (PL) members and the WSA faction.[[1227]](#footnote-1227) Dohrn led a breakaway meeting from which WSA members were barred. By the next day, there were two SDS organizations, which RYM termed ‘SDS-RYM’ and ‘SDS-WSA. ‘I knew…it was coming’, James Weinstein, who attended the conference, later recalled. ‘We knew that PL was coming in strong, and they would have taken over.’ Though believing them to be a ‘bunch of nuts’ he nonetheless went along.’[[1228]](#footnote-1228) Writing to Paul Buhle, he expressed relief: PL had to go.[[1229]](#footnote-1229)

Having launched *Socialist Revolution* in order to escape the sectarianism of SDS and the anti-war movement, James Weinstein clarified his thoughts on the fragmentation of SDS. The organisation’s reliance on black nationalism and ‘archaic’ Marxism as a guide had led them to neglect the development of a necessary ‘overarching theory’, instead relying on surrogates such as community organising, and the peace movement, before eventually turning towards ‘anti-theory’, which meant the avoidance of developing theory and a regression to the Old Left Sectarian Marxism they had once rejected. [[1230]](#footnote-1230) PL had moved into that void, using political issues ‘as bludgeons rather than opportunities for political development and education.’[[1231]](#footnote-1231) RYM conversely, had developed a long-term strategy for revolution, yet it was one based on entirely false premises. Promoting African Americans as the ‘vanguard of the revolution’, and believing that white Americans were incapable of forming a socialist movement due to their ‘white skin privilege’, they had admitted that ‘the ruling class holds its power by ideological hegemony.’[[1232]](#footnote-1232) Whilst this may have been so, Weinstein claimed, such a practice needed a theory that could place it in the correct context.[[1233]](#footnote-1233) The resulting failure to do this, and the break-up of SDS into little ‘absurd caricatures of different parts’ of the Old Left, meant that movement was unable to produce a shared politics.[[1234]](#footnote-1234)

The fundamental weakness of the New Left, and latterly the feminist, gay and lesbian liberation movements, Weinstein later clarified, was its ‘unwitting replication’ of the worst faults of the Old Left. ‘Few New Leftists thought much about a different form of society’, he explained in 2003. ‘Many may have had vague ideas about being revolutionaries, but they operated simply as militant interest groups. In the New Left, as in the old, style, rhetoric and the degree of commitment and self-sacrifice also became the badge of radicalism.”[[1235]](#footnote-1235) Rather than creating a positive vision for American society, and then winning power, the New Left and its successors had created a negative politics, based on opposition rather than proposition. They had been against the Vietnam war, racial discrimination, and latterly against sexism and heterosexism. But when asked what they were for, and what ‘positive changes they would make in society’, they had no answers, no interest in running for office, or ‘for taking responsibility for the nation’s welfare. ‘Like the Popular Frontists… they simply lobbied those in power to make changes for them’, Weinstein concluded. Those in power, who had responsibility for enacting policy, were left undisturbed.[[1236]](#footnote-1236)

From ghetto organising based around ‘poor blacks’, then the peace movement, and then a return to the Old Left’s industrial working class, the New Left had failed in its search for a vanguard, and had finally ‘replicated the old [Left] – in its worst and absurd aspects.’[[1237]](#footnote-1237)

Though it was recognised for having produced ‘brilliant analysis’, overall, it was believed that *Studies* had left ‘a very bad odour’ amongst activists. It had appeared ‘arrogant, condescending, sectarian and dogmatic…a paradox of brilliant analysis by people who will have great difficulty getting people to listen to that analysis, in part because they have been and continue to be unwilling to listen to anyone but themselves.’[[1238]](#footnote-1238) Having hoped to use their journal as a means of educating activists, the editors’ disillusionment, similar to that of Al Haber, was born out of a worry that the movement might submit to the pitfalls of the past. In her history of ERAP Jennifer Frost concluded that James Weinstein had been largely correct in his view that the movement projects were a ‘failure by any reasonable criteria’, but that this was common for most efforts at neighbourhood organising. ERAP activists had come unstuck, she noted, when faced with reality of the slow progress of organising, unable to reconcile their achievements with what they envisioned. Where they succeeded the most was in providing a formative experience for young participants for personal growth and development, and a strategy of promoting flexibility and creativity in addressing issues, most evident, Frost notes, in women’s’ organising. By doing ‘just what needed to be done’ women contributed to an expansion of the definition of politics and social movements ‘that continued on past ERAP’s demise.’[[1239]](#footnote-1239)

A concern to demonstrate that activism did not fade from relevance following the collapse of SDS has prompted academics to also look toward the 1970s and 1980s; Michael Foley has sought to ‘demolish the myth’ that Americans retreated from activism after the 1960s. whileSimon Hall has demonstrated that 1970s movements from across the political spectrum continued to use tactics such as marches and sit-ins.[[1240]](#footnote-1240) Meg Jacobs and Julian Zelizer have, that scholarship such as this might be motivated by an urge to demonstrate that liberal activism persisted in a more Conservative age, with less regard given for the actual influence it had on the wider public. The story of protest in the 20th century, it seemed, had been ‘modest victories’ and ‘partial accomplishments’.[[1241]](#footnote-1241)

Part Three: Up from Irrelevance

## Chapter Nine: Radical and Independent Politics

In March 1966, James Weinstein and Martin Sklar reviewed the development of the New Left in the three years since *Studies on the Left* had moved to Madison from New York. At that time of their departure, they had questioned whether the student movement identified by C. Wright Mills could be characterised as a New Left. Three years on, Weinstein admitted, ‘a great deal’ of confusion remained as to what or who the New Left was, though it had generated a new ideological framework based around ‘participatory democracy.’[[1242]](#footnote-1242) This framework however, was fast reaching a state of crisis, due to a lack of theoretical clarity regarding its political aims.[[1243]](#footnote-1243) The movement had rejected theory in favour of ‘the glamour and sense of immediacy’ of a summer spent as an activist between graduation and full-time employment.[[1244]](#footnote-1244) There seemed little impetus to commit to the ‘lifetime job’ of building a revolutionary party that could bring form to the inchoate desires of a more equitable society.[[1245]](#footnote-1245) ‘The electoral arena must be entered’, they claimed, ‘and electoral politics developed in such a way as to build growing, solidly-based constituencies…to make socialists…and organise within a developing movement.’[[1246]](#footnote-1246) Without theory, they warned, the prospects for ideological change in the United States were bleak and so radical intellectuals had start the process of building the theoretical basis for this movement, and imparting that to activists.

Of the issues discussed in the pages of *Studies* and among its editors, the most hotly contested was that of outcomes; specifically, how their scholarshipshould be used. Having hoped to guide the movements towards engaging in a more intellectual consideration of their activities, the older editors in particular, identified an anti-intellectual current among its activists, reflected in its unwillingness to move beyond protest and into political activism. Only through education and theoretical study could meaningful societal change be achieved. This was poorly received by the younger activist editors; too reminiscent of the Old Left and its support for bureaucratic structures. ‘Every meeting’ of the editorial board’, editor Stanley Aronowitz explained in later years, reflected these splits in ideology, between political solutions and ‘participatory democracy’.[[1247]](#footnote-1247) The older editors were ‘barely able to disguise their contempt’ for what they saw as the mindlessness of the counter culture and civil rights movements in which the younger editors had placed so much faith.[[1248]](#footnote-1248) Reaching an impasse, it was James Weinstein who ultimately prevailed: the ‘With the Movements’ section was abandoned, and *Studies* reverted to a more overtly scholarly approach – reminiscent of its Madison incarnation – though this time with an emphasis towards directly encouraging the building of a political movement, inspired by James Weinstein’s studies of the Eugene Debs Socialist Party.

This led in interesting directions. In 1966, Weinstein ran for Congress as a candidate of the Committee for Independent Political Action, assisted by Aronowitz and other members of the board. After a similar split over tactics among a new generation of editors, Weinstein ceased publication of the journal in the summer of 1967, and moved to San Francisco, where he reunited with former editors David Eakins, Saul Landau, and Martin Sklar. He set about forming *Socialist Revolution*, a successor journal devoted to forming the intellectual basis of a radical socialist party, and formed a community of scholars that would guide its intellectual development. Some have argued that *Studies* ultimately failed to create the intellectual community they felt was necessary to develop social and political change; an intellectual vanguard that could build a ‘counter hegemony’ to the Corporate Liberal state. [[1249]](#footnote-1249)

Black Nationalism

Sceptical of their own ability to act as a vanguard, another manifestation of radicalism encountered by the editors out of the civil rights movement was the growth in calls for black nationalism. In early 1962, *Studies* received an unsolicited manuscript from the independent writer Harold Cruse, whose had previously been published in *Crisis*, and *Presence Africaine*. Like C Wright Mills, Cruse had concluded that industrial workers were no longer the main generators of social change, but believed that it was the colonised people – including America's ethnic minorities – who had the potential to inherit their position. Western Marxists, Cruse believed, had not come to terms with the growing conservatism of white industrial workers, and that intellectuals did not appreciate the implications of the idea of colonised nations as a revolutionary force, with Cuba being an example of their myopia.[[1250]](#footnote-1250) Puzzled by the article, the editors nonetheless agreed that it was important and should be published. ‘There was only one problem’, Martin Sklar recalled in the 1990s. ‘It's length, which I think was 100 pages more or less, and we had to get it down to about 30+ typescript pages.’[[1251]](#footnote-1251) The editors recall a process that was full of doubts, both about the arguments the piece made, its attacks on the Communist Party, and the possibility that Cruse might not accept such a drastic edit, boiled down with ‘much use of pencil, pad, scissors, and scotch tape – not to mention pots and pots of coffee during editing sessions and bottles and bottles of beer after such sessions!’[[1252]](#footnote-1252) An unsigned review of the article however, reveals that at least one editor considered its prose as being replete with ‘the circular verbiage (rhymes with garbage) of nationalism.’[[1253]](#footnote-1253)

The article, suggested that rather than labour, it was to the colonial world that now held the revolutionary initiative, and as ethnic minorities in American society were unequal in any economic, social, cultural or political sense, they existed as a colony within a nation, a fact that was obscured by the wealth and prosperity of American life. In building a radical New Left movement had to adequately incorporated Black American issues, whilst allowing black movements that were indigenous to their communities to be self-directing, rather than stifled by the ‘revolutionary paternalism’ of bourgeois left wing movements. ‘The revolutionary initiative has passed to the colonial world… and in the United States is passing to the Negro’’ Cruse argued in ‘Revolutionary Nationalism and the Afro-American’ but American intellectuals had failed to develop theories that would be of value to their movements, preferring to compartmentalise them, and that had led to the failure to develop theories that would be of value to them. Highlighting the plethora of Black separatist and national organisations, the rejection of non-violence and passive resistance, and the espousal of socialism highlighted the distinct forms that opposition could take, and prompted the question whether integration was possible, or whether basic changes in social and economic relations were necessary to harmonise relations between whites and blacks. It wasn't sufficient for radical intellectuals to accept or reject any of its forms according to his preconceptions.[[1254]](#footnote-1254) In spite of this attitude, there was much that Cruse and the editors had in common, for both wished that the movements would undertake the intellectual education they needed to inform their radicalism in more constructive ways. ‘He submitted his article to *Studies* as an effort’, Eleanor Hakim explained to one reader ‘to influence the young people in some of the nationalist grouping. They seem to be fighting with one another and splitting up in the most unfruitful manner.’

He feels that they are too involved in playing the romantic super-imposed rule of American Negro Fidelista...He told them: You want to be revolutionaries? Well then, think about why there are riots in Harlem every summer and every time there’s a recession. Go into Harlem and live among the exploited masses there and help them to gain some material and economic freedom. Organise them so that they could make demands to get better housing, jobs, standards of livings...They prefer to pose as revolutionaries rather than to try to develop any real working approach to the problem.[[1255]](#footnote-1255)

The article attracted a series of responses from readers, such as Richard Greenleaf, who accused Cruse and *Studies* of promoting pro-segregations in proposing self-directing movements, for suggesting that their existed a nation within a nation, and that national moments were always bourgeois in character. Responding, Cruse dismissed Greenleaf's interpretation of Black-Labour unity as a relic of the Old Left. A new Afro-American political line would be developed independently of Marxist groups, and it would be nationalistic in character. The debate brought Cruse's name to wider attention. Don Freeman, a leader of Central State University SDS group Challenge, urged members to study the essays message of black oppression and its calls for a movement. More prominently, the essay prompted Malcolm X to visit Madison, where an unprecedented meeting took place in Martin Sklar’s' house, the first time he had consented to a political meeting in a white persons’ place of residence. ‘He did so’, Sklar recalled, ‘because he knew of *Studies*, especially the issue with Cruse and [Robert F.] Williams pieces, and that he carried Studies in the bookstore of his Harlem mosque. Michael Lebowitz was assigned to lead a government informer away from the meeting. ‘There was a grad student in history who was clearly assigned to the Socialist Club and made an occasional militant intervention there. He was very anxious to know where the meeting was and had a [probably] naive undergrad approach me several times to enquire. I passed that on and volunteered to be a decoy; I said there was no such thing and that I was heading off to a bookstore. They decided to accompany me (presumably thinking that I'd not miss the meeting); there were a few local black militants there at the meeting.’[[1256]](#footnote-1256) Harold Cruse would go on to greater fame with his 1967 book, *Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, believing that intellectuals could be at the vanguard of efforts to transform America's democratic culture.

Socialism and the Radical Centre

At the heart of the splits between the *Studies* editors were disagreements about the organisational form of the movement. What lessons should the movement draw from its activism, how should they be applied, and who would co-ordinate these activities? While both factions agreed that the movement required a ‘radical center’ that would act as a catalyst for movement activity and energy, opinions differed over where this centre might be located.[[1257]](#footnote-1257) The older editors, including James Weinstein, Stanley Aronowitz, Eugene Genovese, and Martin Sklar, believed that *Studies* could guide the New Left towards the formation of a socialist party that reflected the traditions of American radicalism. The failure of community organising projects to coalesce into a political force meant that activists had to come together into a mass movement of the urban poor, students, and rural African American communities, to form a ‘centre’ for the discussion of the necessary theories and strategy for social change.[[1258]](#footnote-1258) Such a centre was not to be built on the bureaucratic structures of the Old Left, but on the structure of the pre-1917 Socialist Party, which enjoyed countrywide support before the 1917 Espionage Act decimated its leadership.

Weinstein had long advocated for a Socialist Party model. Writing in 1960 for *Studies*, he noted how most people, historians included, had tended to think of American socialism as narrow, isolated, and split into numerous sects, based on their experiences and relationships of the movement since the 1920s. This ‘ideological fog’ had prevented historians from recognising that before the Russian Revolution, the American Socialist Party had provided a potent and relevant indigenous anti-capitalist radicalism.[[1259]](#footnote-1259) Writing to Staughton Lynd, Weinstein insisted that radicals had to ‘exhume the old Socialist Party’ he wrote ‘with its great diversity, decentralisation, democratic structure, parallel organisations and acceptance of multi-tendencies as a general model’, and investigate the reasons for their historical failure and present irrelevance.[[1260]](#footnote-1260) The New Left movements, he later admitted, paled in comparison to the possibilities that the Socialist Party had held within its political agenda.[[1261]](#footnote-1261) It had been in this spirit that the editors had rejected the idea that the New Deal and Great Society reforms had been *radical*. A radical reform program would not manage the people ‘through a process of concessions, adjustments to demands, and extension of the consensus to absorb new dissident or critical movements’, but would start with the ‘with the material and cultural needs of the American people’.[[1262]](#footnote-1262) ‘Leaving liberalism to the liberals’ they felt, was the first step to creating a socialist alternative.[[1263]](#footnote-1263) In order to act as anything more than gadflies, or marginal advisors to those who held power advocating a more socialist direction, radicals had to constitute themselves as an independent constituency with a unified vision of what a future society should be.[[1264]](#footnote-1264)

In opposition, movement figures Tom Hayden and Norman Fruchter, and historian Staughton Lynd, felt that such a focus on political organisations would stifle the movements because of their dogged adherence to overly-bureaucratic conceptions of organising characteristic of the Old Left.[[1265]](#footnote-1265) Politics, they felt, was as a ‘form of domination’ even more ‘oppressive than economic exploitation’, and within the movements, ‘participatory democracy’ had promised a non-bureaucratic, and non-hierarchical alternative of organising, from which a more egalitarian political movement might emerge.’[[1266]](#footnote-1266) The movements and their ‘bursts of activity’ were still in their development phase, and these activities should not ne misread as strength and organisation, or a sign that they were ready for the bureaucratic blueprints of the party structure. ‘Behind the sit-ins, teach-ins…wildcat strikes and other protests’ they wrote, ‘is the persistent reality of human inertia…which act[s] as a conservative force.[[1267]](#footnote-1267) Rather than an overly administrative ‘radical centre’, they urged a focus on the motivations of ‘free individuals to think and work as radicals and build a movement where ‘everybody’ was in a position of power.[[1268]](#footnote-1268)

Torn between different approaches, relationships between the editors deteriorated. Though the editors agreed that the journal had to be open to a wide range of opinions if it hoped to maintain its position as the ‘significant intellectual organ’ of the movement, James Weinstein became increasingly weary of Tom Hayden’s ‘failure’ to participate in theoretical discussion, and his reticence to promote socialist policies within the movements.[[1269]](#footnote-1269) The situation, Weinstein implored to Martin Sklar, was becoming desperate. The board was in flux, splitting into three distinct positions. Eugene Genovese advocated the formation of a theoretical and political journal directed towards an explicit socialist party with a political line. Hayden and Fruchter favoured a ‘Moses variety of Mississippi anarchy that rejected any concept of mass or overarching movement; Weinstein and Stanley Aronowitz favoured the formation of a loose radical centre that could coordinate activity, develop political programs, and train and educate recruits on the movements.[[1270]](#footnote-1270) Ultimately, the differences proved intractable. Hayden resigned from the board, with Fruchter and Staughton Lynd following in solidarity. Explaining his decision, Lynd remonstrated that *Studies* had failed to ‘enlist’ Hayden, the foremost student leader of his time.[[1271]](#footnote-1271) In response, Weinstein suggested that Hayden had used his status as an editor merely to maintain his radical image, and that he was not committed to building the new socialist perspective that he thought was necessary. ‘As largely an intellectual process’ the new movement would not emerge from the ‘consciousness’ of the movement activists as they stormed ‘the barricades.’[[1272]](#footnote-1272)

In a deliberate attempt to move towards the ‘prerequisite educative and proprietary work’ needed to build a new Socialist Party, Weinstein recruited academics Ron Aronson, Robert Wolfe, John Cammett and labour organiser Shin’ya Ono to the board.[[1273]](#footnote-1273) Only by returning once again towards being a ‘serious intellectual journal’, he explained to Michael Lebowitz, could that work begin.[[1274]](#footnote-1274) Outlining the new strategy, the editors took aim at intellectuals who had compartmentalised their intellectual and academic work from their politics, and had retreated to the ‘socialist ivory tower.’[[1275]](#footnote-1275) Intellectuals had to be at the vanguard of dismissing bureaucratic liberalism in favour of a post-industrial and decentralised socialism. If this was not done, they warned, then the left ‘might as well retire from the scene…and enjoy the sweet life’ and leave activists to be absorbed by the ‘sophisticated moulders of the liberal consensus.’[[1276]](#footnote-1276) Those who limited their concept of politics to demonstrating on a picket line, or helping to ‘seize an intersection during lunch hour’ were as mindless activists as the non-intellectuals were.[[1277]](#footnote-1277) ‘There could be a Kierkegaard or a Nietzsche in some Manhattan loft, or a Kant ‘puttering away’ in the library of a small Midwestern university; or a Marx, perusing the archives at the New York Public Library’, one contributor exclaimed to Weinstein. However, they would go unnoticed until the New Left moved beyond its frenetic activism and was given life by a radical, revolutionary and true’ theory for change.[[1278]](#footnote-1278)

Independent Politics

Inspired by the successes of Debs and the Socialist Party in securing representation in legislatures across the nation in the early 20th century, as early as 1964 James Weinstein considered standing in the Democratic Primary for the 19th Congressional District of New York against William F. Haddad and incumbent Democrat Leonard Farbstein in 1966. Early that year he joined with the National Campaign for Independent Political Action (CIPA), a coalition of ‘peace’, civil rights and student protest movements from across the nation, and soon after was involved in the formation of the West Side Committee for Independent Action.[[1279]](#footnote-1279) Joining with Stanley Aronowitz, the pair constructed a ‘very full and careful program’ including policies on schools, housing, medical care, foreign policy, [and] poverty, and worked to attract experienced activists, with Democratic Party experience, who had concluded that the Party was ‘impotent and irrelevant’ in fermenting social change.[[1280]](#footnote-1280) Activities included an educational and lecture training program for welfare recipients, a study circle based on Baran and Sweezy’s *Monopoly Capital*, and a community organising project in an eight-block area around West 79-85 Street at Columbus and Broadway, the site of a Great Society urban renewal program.[[1281]](#footnote-1281) When the renewal project was cancelled due to lack of federal funds however, momentum for the campaign dissipated.[[1282]](#footnote-1282) ‘We probably could have sustained the organisation effort’, Aronowitz explained, ‘but would it have been radical activity?’[[1283]](#footnote-1283) Weinstein accepted that some form of ‘mindless activism’ had been almost inevitable; that it was all too easy for organising to fall into the quicksand of organising ‘for the sake of organising.’[[1284]](#footnote-1284) The solution of course, he explained, was to create a framework with which meaningful organising work could take place.[[1285]](#footnote-1285)

After an attempt to draft Eugene Genovese as the CIPA candidate failed, Weinstein put himself forward.[[1286]](#footnote-1286) Aiming to attract 5,000 votes, educate 200 activists to collect enough donations to create a sustainable organisation, and start a district wide newspaper, Weinstein hoped to win ‘a majority of socialists’ rather than voters.[[1287]](#footnote-1287) He called for the end to the war in Vietnam, the abolition of American bases abroad, an end to intervention in Guatemala and the Dominican Republic, and a reduction in the arms budget, the elimination of income taxes for low earners, abolition of excise taxes, a dramatic increase in corporation and real estate taxes, an improvement in public school education, the democratisation of housing, the elimination of fares for mass transit, and the support for the black power movement. Writing in *19*, the campaign newspaper, he announced his intention to build a new politics in opposition to Corporate Liberalism. ‘The corporations claim that what is good for them is good for America, ‘[w]e disagree’…’The clear majority of the American people have no real interest in the continuation of the domestic and foreign policies and programs that have been imposed on them by a political machinery they do not control.’[[1288]](#footnote-1288) Neither major party could solve these problems because of their commitment to the business system, hence the investment of public money had into areas profitable to the corporations. The Cold War was just rhetoric, a shield for the defence of corporate interests. Socialists had to build a popular socialist movement, he explained in *Village Voice*, rather than spend their limited energise labouring for partial victories within the reform wing of the Democrats, which only caused to bolster the existing system.[[1289]](#footnote-1289)

The response to the launch of the campaign was varied, attracting notable left-wing figures such as Paul Sweezy, Victor Rabinowitz and Leo Huberman.[[1290]](#footnote-1290) Younger activists from Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) appeared less persuaded. CIPA was claiming a monopoly on the proper course of action for a radical movement, explained SDS leader Paul Booth: ‘everybody else is wrong’, he complained to *Studies* editor Dale Lewis.[[1291]](#footnote-1291) On Election Day, Weinstein polled 3.5% of the votes, 3800 votes in total, spending less than $4,000 dollars, and delivering 50,000 brochures and 50,000 Withdraw from Vietnam leaflets.[[1292]](#footnote-1292) Weinstein considered the campaign a success – Vietnam had been the biggest issue on the doorstep – but viewed CIPA as a poorly developed organisation, due to the lack of development and political experience of its campaigners.[[1293]](#footnote-1293) ‘Jimmy was very effective at meetings, both large and small, when there was an opportunity to discuss matters on an intellectual level’, a CIPA internal report concluded. ‘On the other hand, he did not get out on the streets at all and avoided street-corner speaking altogether. Further, his physical absence…had an adverse effect on the moral of the campaign workers.’[[1294]](#footnote-1294) Jim O’Conner attempted to reassure Weinstein. ‘Maybe this is inevitable – this inability to develop people politically in the relatively old-fashioned, standard way. Chances of success are so very slim…that it is a rare bird who will come out early in the morning when the worms are few and far between.’ [[1295]](#footnote-1295) It appeared easy to create critics, and to ferment critical thinking in the classroom, but transforming the critical mind into a socialist mind appeared a far harder prospect.[[1296]](#footnote-1296)

CIPA continued into the next year, its leaders convinced that the task of the socialist left in America was to build an independent movement. However, where they originally hoped that activity would ‘spontaneously’, give rise to a programme, they now realised that developing a though campaigning against sources of injustice, exploitation, and repression, were important, the chief aim should be to develop a concrete, clearly articulated socialist alternative.’[[1297]](#footnote-1297) A year later however, and the organisation had petered out. It had been the ‘talk of the town’, Murray Rothbard wrote to Martin Sklar. ‘Now it is admittedly a fiasco.’[[1298]](#footnote-1298) Radical political movements had to propose clear anti-corporate state alternatives to liberal reform, but the organising of the poor by middle class Jews had long proven ineffectual.[[1299]](#footnote-1299) The *Studies* editors sought their own evaluation of the spate of independent political campaigns that November in a special edition of *Studies.* Independent politics, James Weinstein, explained, was the ‘coming thing’ Weinstein wrote, ‘and we can exert some influence to move it in a socialist direction by an…analysis and critique of the various developments. We are planning articles on CIPA, NCNP, Scheer, Frost, Adams, Newark, Lowndes, Aptheker, and others.’[[1300]](#footnote-1300) *Studies* was well placed to analyse the movement and guide it in a positive intellectual direction.

The War of Position

In the wake of the Weinstein election defeat, the editors held several ‘private’ meetings to decide the future direction of the journal. It was at this point that the work of Antonio Gramsci, particularly his understanding of hegemony, began to become increasing influential. Introduced to his work by *Studies* editor John Cammett, one of the first academics to introduce Gramsci to English speaking Americans, the latter’s formulation that capitalism played a hegemonic role in society meshed with the editor’s theory of Corporate Liberalism.[[1301]](#footnote-1301) These meetings culminated in a gathering at the 1966 Socialist Scholars Conference to discuss the practical and theoretical problems that needed to be overcome to achieve a Socialist Party.[[1302]](#footnote-1302) A new strategy was needed, editor Robert Wolfe claimed soon after, which looked beyond the New Politics coalition with the Democrats, and protests tactics as the means of dramatizing the failure of Corporate Liberalism, and towards a radical political movement engaged in a program of political action and ‘serious’ theoretical work. If this did not occur, echoed James Weinstein, the restlessness and eagerness of students might soon devolve into despair if intellectuals could not work out an attractive vision for the poor, workers, and intellectuals dissatisfied with the universities. What was needed was a movement to define socialism in the United States, with *Studies* at its centre.[[1303]](#footnote-1303)

As John Cammett explained at the 1967 Conference, Gramsci’s understanding of hegemony derived from the distinction between ‘political society’, consisting of public institutions and ‘organs of coercion’ such as the police, the courts, and the bureaucracy; and ‘civil society’ made up of the church, schools, and political parties.[[1304]](#footnote-1304) Out of these institutions emerged the ‘dominant’ order of society, a concept of reality which diffuses through society, informing behaviour, morality, and intellectual thought, which is accepted by society. The more homogenous and self-conscious a social class, the more susceptible it was to being consumed by a particular world-view; and in the United States, the capitalist worldview, or weltenschauung, Cammett noted, had been particularly pervasive.[[1305]](#footnote-1305) If the working class hoped to develop counter-hegemony to Corporate Liberal capitalism, it would have to establish itself as claims to hegemonic status in the ‘political, cultural and “ethical” fields, by forming a distinct class-consciousness with a comprehensive world-view and political platform.[[1306]](#footnote-1306) Through a political party – the instrument of education and civilisation – movement (and their leaders) would develop a ‘program’; a set of new ‘relations of forces’ emerging spontaneously as a result of the lessons of the struggle, rather than being ‘imposed’, by which society could be transformed.[[1307]](#footnote-1307) ‘Precisely because the American socialist movement is one of the most backward and feeble in the world’, Cammett quoted fellow editor John Cowley; it had the ‘advantage of the borrower’ the opportunity to take the best of Gramsci and leave the past traumas of the European socialist movement behind. Gramsci’s work was the inspiration, for it could provide the ‘participatory democracy’ of the New Left with the theoretical understanding to reconcile undertaking its activities under the aegis of a socialist party within the American political arena.[[1308]](#footnote-1308)

The *Studies* editors agreed. The fact that he remained ‘untranslated, unread, and undiscussed’ in the United States, Eugene Genovese explained, was demonstrative of the ‘intellectual bankruptcy’ of the American left, although his ideas were relatable to both the current problems.[[1309]](#footnote-1309) Genovese praised Gramsci for having purged socialism of the ‘fatalism and mechanical determinism’ of Marxist theory.[[1310]](#footnote-1310) Though it now understood this, in order to develop further the New Left had to embrace Gramsci by building a Socialist Party that could act as the catalyst for developing a counter-hegemony to Corporate Liberalism in a way that ‘counter communities’, such as Free Universities couldn’t, as they abdicated responsibility for changing society. Socialists, he felt, could forge a middle path between institutional activity, and dropping out, working openly in the battleground of civil society, with a radical centre coordinating political action and providing ideological clarity. James Weinstein agreed. Having read Cammett’s book, he found a great degree of crossover with the work of Martin Sklar, who had called for a ‘comprehensive alternative world view’, that could achieve ‘ideological hegemony’ among the swathes of the population who existed outside of the Corporate Liberal elite.[[1311]](#footnote-1311) ‘We are his and he is ours, there’s no dispute on that’, he exclaimed to Christopher Lasch.[[1312]](#footnote-1312)

It was the search for the theory that would underwrite this Gramscian approach that would ultimately be *Studies* undoing. Behind the scenes, tensions once again emerged regarding what the journal should propose. The newer editors including, Ron Aronson, Robert Wolfe, Shin-ya Ono, and John Cowley, believed that the journal should incorporate articles on literate criticism, art, jazz, and the sexual revolution, whilst theory would ‘emerge from action’; a ‘Neo-Lynd-Fruchter-Hayden bloc’, James Weinstein explained.[[1313]](#footnote-1313) Compounding matter was the fact that Weinstein, undergoing personal issues, had withdrawn from active participation in the journal for a prolonged period, leading to a sense of drift.[[1314]](#footnote-1314) The journal, Michael Lebowitz complained, appeared ‘to mean less and less’ at a time when it should have been growing and exerting influence; it had played a ‘historic role’ but was now a bad example, with a paucity of ideas, poor promotion, and ‘an insensitivity…to political trends’, exacerbated by thedepartures of Eleanor Hakim, Tom Hayden, and Jim O’Connor.[[1315]](#footnote-1315) *Studies* he claimed, had failed to get ‘on top of what was happening’ in SDS, and having abandoned editorials, had tried to operate as a ‘timeless journal’, which was unbefitting of the journals ambition to influence change.[[1316]](#footnote-1316)

Admitting that the political differences on the board were damaging the ability of the journal to select manuscripts, Weinstein felt that clarity was required if *Studies* were to be transformed into the explicit organ of a pre-party organisation.[[1317]](#footnote-1317) The options were, as he saw them, to restructure the board, with the political differences remaining, or to form a new journal with a full time editor, a ‘skeletal organisation of intellectuals’ modelled on the Fabian Party, taking positions on current events such as the economy from a socialist perspective, and bringing in SDS members into the fold.[[1318]](#footnote-1318) ‘It would…act as a sophisticated party organ’, he wrote. *Studies*, he decided,was not capable of being that organ.[[1319]](#footnote-1319) The time was right, he felt, for a new party, and that required a journal that would provide ‘a clear and coherent articulation of the ideas of American socialism’, a new vision for new society.[[1320]](#footnote-1320) Michael Lebowitz disagreed. If the editors knew what articles they wanted in the magazine, why didn’t they just go out and get them from sympathetic writers. Why did a new journal have to be formed?[[1321]](#footnote-1321) ‘We can no longer maintain *Studies* for the reason you suggest’, Eugene Genovese replied. ‘We cannot attract the talent…without an organisational focus: we cannot have a real organisation without attracting talent.’ *Studies* had nothing left to say. A new journal might act as a ‘pre-party’ organ, he added, ‘a non-Fabian, Fabian Society’ for a new party.[[1322]](#footnote-1322)

Having set his aim on founding a new journal, in August 1967 Weinstein distributed a letter announcing that *Studies on the Left* would cease publication. Citing dissatisfaction with the character of the journal and its future direction, he stated that the journal had decided to ‘retire gracefully.’[[1323]](#footnote-1323) The board would split into two groups, both of which aimed to publish new journals by the end of the year. One group would seek a movement-orientated journal, and the other hoped to organise a party.[[1324]](#footnote-1324) A little over a month later, Weinstein moved to San Francisco.[[1325]](#footnote-1325) Addressing ‘the gloomy fact of *Studies* final end’, the journal he felt, had escaped the fate of existing after it had ceased to be useful.[[1326]](#footnote-1326) *Studies* had helped shape the conditions for a future radicalism, yet without a consensus on its board, a separate organisation was needed that would involve itself in ‘real politics. The journal had aroused scant popular consciousness within the New Left, but its exposure of Corporate Liberalism had started the process of converting socialist thought towards the idea of building a post-industrial socialism; a ‘revolutionary political organization.’[[1327]](#footnote-1327) Advocating a ‘general political stance, it would include theoretical and research articles, as well as discussions of local study groups.[[1328]](#footnote-1328)

With the promise that a journal from the other editorial faction might be forthcoming, Michael Lebowitz contacted Robert Wolfe, seeking clarification over the nature of the *Studies* split.[[1329]](#footnote-1329) Though troubled by Weinstein’s description of his ‘organ’, he admitted that he had always favoured the idea of *Studies* being a serious theoretical magazine, rather than one that reviewed the movements.[[1330]](#footnote-1330) In response Wolfe outlined the formation of a loose coalition of the left, including SDS, SNCC and the black community, and the JOIN Community Union movement, the raft resistance projects, and socialist intellectuals, with theoretical magazine distilling the ‘general guidelines’ for a movement from the practical experiences of movement participants.[[1331]](#footnote-1331)

Endless proclamations and discussions of theory, the drafting and reworking of manifesto statements, and the grandiose expectations of ideological leadership were in some cases necessary, though tended to attract the type of person who liked to substitute action and theoretical study with ideology as a means of asserting dominance within an organisation. This could be counteracted through a combination of individual and collective theoretical and practical work, a task that a Party of academics would find hard to do.

When Lebowitz expressed scepticism towards Weinstein’s proposal for a new socialist, Wolfe attempted to assuage his fears.[[1332]](#footnote-1332) The new emphasis allowed ‘a party orientated around the struggle for structural reforms ‘control at all levels’ and the creation of a broadly based socialist culture – ideas, values, styles of life, technical capacities…a reformist agenda.’[[1333]](#footnote-1333) The issue was what control meant, and where was the struggle going to take place. Could a struggle for control achieve real gains of any kind without a simultaneous struggle for political power?’ Wolfe asked.[[1334]](#footnote-1334)

 From Jim’s standpoint, this is no drawback: he conceives of socialism as a kind of Platonic category which good fortune has put in this head. Having received the Word, his task is to put it in as many others heads as possible; his party’s task, as I understand it, will be to conduct electoral campaigns and other “educational” activities until such time as the word has entered enough heads (51%) as to become flesh. If one disagrees with this line – as you do – then one must face up to the implications of that disagreement.[[1335]](#footnote-1335)

To organise a new party, therefore, would only reinforce the misunderstanding and distrust between activists and socialist intellectuals, until intellectuals had practical advice to provide. ‘Who would be attracted to such a party at the present time?’ he asked. Awareness of Gramsci was limited almost wholly to university intellectuals, who had little or experience of off-campus political work. Aside from campus political work on a limited scale, ‘the most that could be expected of the intellectual classes’ was for them to establish journals.[[1336]](#footnote-1336)

*Socialist Revolution* and the JWMSP

Once in San Francisco, James Weinstein immediately began to lay the groundwork for a ‘successor to *Studies*’, as well as a new Socialist Party.[[1337]](#footnote-1337) He gathered figures from the *Studies* circle to develop the ‘Pre-Party Papers’ a manifesto for the new party. Meeting over Mother’s Day Weekend 1968 in Chicago, at the home of Jesse Lemisch and Naomi Weisstein, the occasion proved a denouement of the *Studies* journey since 1959: the struggle between intellectualism and activism.[[1338]](#footnote-1338) In the run up to the meeting, Michael Lebowitz’s voiced concern that those invited to the meeting were predominantly intellectuals rather than movement activists. Rather than ‘get off on the wrong front’, he suggested, it was better to reschedule rather that have an ‘unrepresentative meeting.’[[1339]](#footnote-1339) The Pre-Party Papers, he declared, said ‘too much’ about why other groups and organisations had been wrong and too little about why the approach of the proposed organisation was superior. A successful party had to proceed from a ‘coherent, relevant and articulate framework, but as it currently stood, the document was a ‘no-proposal to create a no-party based on a no-theory.’[[1340]](#footnote-1340) There seemed to be no real difference, he noted, between the pre-party Weinstein envisioned, and the loose coalition proposed by the *Studies* editors Weinstein had left behind.[[1341]](#footnote-1341) If the group was unable to engage with the movement, to help them devise the strategy and articulate it, Michael Lebowitz wrote of the atmosphere of the meeting, ‘Weinstein will win by default - and we end up with a continuation of this movement – action/intellectuals-theory split.’[[1342]](#footnote-1342)

Other dissenters expressed concerns over the timing of such a development, and the likelihood of success. Martin Sklar expressed his disappointment that the draft had only been circulated to those of an ‘academic background and orientation’.[[1343]](#footnote-1343) Former editor James O’Connor, who contributed the first long-form manifesto piece to *Socialist Revolution*, expressed doubts that it was possible to develop a mass party in the United States, due to the ‘peculiar’ nature of American individualism, which rendered most citizens emotionally disturbed and ‘unfit’ for meaningfully active participation in the proposed movement. America people lived, worked and consumed whilst remaining separated ‘in their own minds’ from their primary economic role, and were unaware of their own alienation, exploitation and their needs. ‘It seems to me that the basic problem is to make people aware of their lack of consciousness’, he stated. It seems to me that a statement calling for a party must include an analysis and projection of the character of the US class structure.’[[1344]](#footnote-1344) David Horowitz dissented on the assumption that the organisation was projecting itself as a Fabian Society, unconcerned with seizing power, while John Ehrenreich believed that the organisation would appear elitist ‘and would disastrously abandon the movement to another round of hippiesm.’[[1345]](#footnote-1345)

A setback was encountered when Martin Sklar, who was tasked with redrafting Weinstein’s first draft - an outline of contemporary society as a prelude to post-industrial socialism, and the intermediate program for a political party – was unable to deliver. He ‘disappeared’, Michael Lebowitz explained to Robert Wolfe.[[1346]](#footnote-1346) As the meeting got underway, a split emerged between the Chicago SDS members invited, and the academics.’[[1347]](#footnote-1347) Subsequent accounts of the meeting have described the role of Eugene Genovese in the meeting, who, smoking a cigar, was already talking in terms of party discipline. ‘I must say that the prospect of having Gene Genovese as my commissar turns me off’, James Weinstein wrote to Christopher Lasch, who had joined the group after reading the document for the first time in May 1968.[[1348]](#footnote-1348) The next year, the group split, over the increasingly harsh language used by Christopher Lasch and Genovese in regards to the activities of SDS.[[1349]](#footnote-1349)

Work however, continued towards the launch of *Socialist Revolution*. The failure of *Studies*, James Weinstein explained to Ronald Radosh, was that it had been no longer appropriate for a journal to exist independently of an explicit goal. We were not, after all, forced to suspend publication of *Studies*; we chose to stop precisely because it was a disembodied journal, it represented no organised political movement and at least half the board was unwilling to take the initiative and begin forming such a movement.’[[1350]](#footnote-1350) The journal would be the main national activity, with an editorial section that would articulate ‘a general political stance to the events of the next few years’.[[1351]](#footnote-1351) Hoping to constitute a network of ‘loosely affiliated’ study groups across the country, would draw the groups together, rather than have an organisation existing merely to sustain a journal.[[1352]](#footnote-1352) Suggested names included *Socialist Agenda*, *American Socialist*, and *Thought and Action*, *Pre-Party Papers,* until finally Weinstein settled on Martin Sklar’s suggestion of *Socialist Revolution.*[[1353]](#footnote-1353)

Though he had gifted the journal its name and felt that anther ‘socialist theoretical and scholarly journal’ was necessary, Sklar was sceptical as to whether it could succeed, and warned Weinstein to leave the organising to others. ‘If you get involved in that, kiss goodbye to organising a movement’, he warned. It was more important to set up the movement first, with the theoretical journal emerging once it was the right time.’[[1354]](#footnote-1354) Two years later, Sklar remained steadfast on this point. ‘A journal, I guess, you can start anytime you like...But…I’m convinced that your people are not seriously concerned about developing a political movement capable of becoming a popular and revolutionary socialist movement.’[[1355]](#footnote-1355) Much like *Studies, Socialist Revolution* appeared more concerned about establishing their ‘intellectual presence in public life.’[[1356]](#footnote-1356) Picking up where *Studies* left off, the first *Socialist Revolution* editorial outlined the importance of building a socialist consciousness, encompassing a redefinition of ‘abundance and the good life’ and a left-wing political reform program of decentralisation, to replace the increasingly unstable liberal welfare state that could not contain class conflict indefinitely.[[1357]](#footnote-1357) It was perhaps apt then, when Eli Zaretsky wrote that *Socialist Revolution* was ‘indeed the son of *Studies*.’[[1358]](#footnote-1358)

Seeking to commemorate that journal, Weinstein and David Eakins began the process of compiling a *Studies* reader for general publication. Summing up the legacy of the journal, the pair explained that *Studies* had come a long way in its seven years of publication, yet its end marked the completion of only the first stage of the intellectual and political development of the New Left. The movement, they claimed, was one that was ‘increasingly finding expression as a turn toward revolutionary socialism.’[[1359]](#footnote-1359) Characterising the various shifts in the journal’s character, Weinstein noted how *Studies* had from its inception ridden between the audiences of amorphous ‘radicals’ and those who were self-consciously socialist. While some had worshipped spontaneity, others had been theoretically minded, some merely confused, yet the journal successfully grappled with the question of socialist intellectuals. Where it had come lacking, though it had long promised to articulate what it intended, was the ‘central need’ to develop a theory that intellectuals and ‘radicals’ could work toward. ‘Unfortunately’, he lamented, most of the editors had not been to clear on that either.[[1360]](#footnote-1360)

A New American Movement

Though his own ideas for a party seemed to have faltered by the end of the 1960s, Weinstein was involved in the formation of the New American Movement (NAM), a successor organisation to SDS. One of the earlier organisers, NAM reunited Weinstein with Staughton Lynd, and the two set about building an organisation that would embody ‘both the communitarian and the tradition radical politics.’[[1361]](#footnote-1361) Weinstein believed that NAM had the potential to be a hold action, proving organisational continuity until the next period of growth on the left. ‘We can’t create that new movement’, he explained, ‘but we can be better prepared for it than SDS was?’[[1362]](#footnote-1362) Martin Sklar, who formed a NAM chapter in DeKalb, was also optimistic; the movement appeared ‘alive and kicking’ and more mature ‘by a very educational ten years, but understood Weinstein’s worries about the groups within NAM who were sceptical or hostile to socialism.’[[1363]](#footnote-1363) In order for NAM to avoid the problems of the New Left, there had to be room to support socialist candidates and NAM members regardless of their party banner. Refusing to ‘box themselves’ into supporting the Democratic Party; It would keep open the option of working to strengthening socialist politics through independent campaigns’, until such time that the ‘capitalist policy making party’ transformed into a socialist party, or withdrew under the pressure from a socialist party.[[1364]](#footnote-1364)

As the 1970s wore on however, Weinstein became increasing disenchanted. In 1973 he moved to England for a year to teach history at the University of Warwick, and on his return, shifted his focus to starting a socialist newspaper.[[1365]](#footnote-1365) Formulating the idea for *In These Times*, Weinstein looked to emulate the early twentieth century newspaper socialist newspaper *Appeal to Reason*, which at its height had counted 750,000 subscribers.[[1366]](#footnote-1366) At this time, his commitment to independent politics appeared steadfast. In his 1975 book *Ambiguous Legacy*, a history of the left in American politics, he concluded with a call for a new Socialist Party orientated towards contesting for state power, and incorporating labour, the student movement that would make ‘the need for socialism the major political issue of the 1970s and 1980s.[[1367]](#footnote-1367) His own efforts in the electoral arena however, remained unsuccessful. During his San Francisco years, he supported a socialist in the race for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, who in the final count trailed ‘Jesus Christ Satan’ in the vote tally.[[1368]](#footnote-1368) As Eleanor Hakim, his ex-editorial colleague at *Studies* remarked in 1976, Weinstein had relocated the ground for his ever hoped-for American socialist revolution in Chicago: ‘New York and San Francisco having failed.’[[1369]](#footnote-1369)

One could argue, therefore, that the editors of *Studies on the Left* ultimately failed in their quest to create a new radical movement in the United States. Its efforts to encourage the New Left to evolve into a more intellectually curious and politically engaged movement collapsed, as did its efforts to build a party. *Socialist Revolution* ultimately changed its names to *Socialist Review*, as the likelihood of a revolution retreated ever further. In the next decade, the rise of the Ronald Reagan and the New Right was fuelled by ‘a working class constituency of Reagan Democrats’ who joined with traditional Christian families in accusing the left of eroding communities and working class families.[[1370]](#footnote-1370) The merger of the New American Movement (NAM) with Michael Harrington’s Democratic Socialist Organising Committee (DSOC) to form the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) was indicative, scholars have claimed, of the response to the Reagan ‘onslaught’, against the Welfare State.[[1371]](#footnote-1371) However, some NAM members had opposed the ‘shift to the centre’ and opposed Harrington’s ‘Fabian-like strategy of ‘permeating the Democratic Party’ others felt it necessary to support more mainstream social democracy to protect the gains that had been made since the 1930s.[[1372]](#footnote-1372)

The choice of cover of the first issue of *In These Times* - self-styled socialist Democrat Congressman Ron Dellums – gave an early indication of Weinstein’s shift towards support for working within the Democratic Party.[[1373]](#footnote-1373) In 1983, he gave vocal support to Harold Washington, the Democratic Party candidate for Mayor of Chicago, who presented a rare example of the socialist left, successful assembling a coalition of ‘labour, blacks, women and others’ that was effective ‘in electing our own people.’[[1374]](#footnote-1374) By 2000, Weinstein was asking the left to ‘confront reality and think serious about how to make successful interventions into the political system.[[1375]](#footnote-1375)

In his final work, *The Long Detour,* published in 2003, he denounced Ralph Nader for having run a ‘transitory’ and ‘individualistic campaign’ for the Presidency in 2000, which had led his followers into a blind alley and alienated many on the left for dividing the potential constituency. In future, the most effective way for insurgents to bring about change was by working within the ‘big tent’ of the Democratic Party.[[1376]](#footnote-1376) The love affair between the left and the idea of having its own political party, he now stated, had been a serious impediment to the creation of an effective movement. ‘Jesse Jackson, Harold Washington, and the Christian Coalition validate different aspects of the advantage of working within the existing institutional parameters of the American political system’, he explained. ‘And it is these examples – rather than eleventh-hour third-party campaigns that end up as little more than moralistic exercises in futility-that point the way to a strategy that might allow a left to become a recognised force in the nation’s political life.’[[1377]](#footnote-1377) The building of Gramscian inspired socialist counter hegemony, first trailed in *Studies on the Left*, it seemed, would now continue, but inside of the Democratic Party.

# **Conclusion: For a New America**

*Obviously (to me), Studies is one of the few intellectual links between the Old and New Lefts. It grew out of a rejection of the politics and positivism of the old. It was the place in which many of the core ideas of the new were articulated and developed.*

* Paul Buhle[[1378]](#footnote-1378)

Introducing his ‘thesis’ on the role of little magazines– remaining outside the mainstream, articulating the demands and alternatives that were ‘just left of the possible – David Marcus wrote in 2015 of the various reasons why a group of intellectual might decide to go into publication together. Though the contemporary academic market is more restricted than it was when *Studies on the Left* was formed in 1958, the motivating factors appear the same. ‘Here is what we…have’, Marcus itemised. ‘Young talent, lots of ideas, a sense of political commitment, and a lot of well-written articles. We also have the clumsiness of larger magazines, which can often serve as fodder for our own purposes…We can make the case for those alternatives that many politicians and magazines believe implausible.’[[1379]](#footnote-1379)

Everyone always quotes Irving Howe’s line, “When intellectuals can do nothing else, they start a magazine.” But they almost never seem to include what he said afterward: “starting a magazine is also doing something: at the very least it is thinking in common. And thinking in common can have unforeseen results.[[1380]](#footnote-1380)

The present enquiry has explored the various ways in which *Studies on the Left* attempted to give a voice to radical graduate students and young academics, and how their ideas influenced the New Left movement. We have tested the limits of their ability to combine their intellectual work as an editorial board, with the realities of activism and explored the limits of intellectuals to influence movements.

*Studies on the Left* was an ambitious project. In a time when, as now, the intellectual centre of the nation was perceived to be New York, the ability for a group of Midwestern graduate students to produce a journal and for it to achieve a national profile was a considerable achievement. Though it often struggled to match up to the reputation it had been given as the premier New Left journal, the editors struggling to reconcile their commitment to activism with their academic training, the journal achieved success as a platform for radical ideas and perspectives in academia and the movement beyond. At its peak, it enjoyed a circulation of around 10,000.[[1381]](#footnote-1381) Reflecting on the changing landscape of academia in the early 1980s, Eleanor Hakim expressed disappointment in the conservative attitude of the little journals of the day, in their focus on ‘short-signed mass-market and instant-history perspectives in recent years.’ [[1382]](#footnote-1382) Writing to *Dissent* editor Irving Howe, she claimed that these emerging trends, ‘did not bode well for the renewal of an intelligentsia in this society, ‘especially since it has been the intelligentsia’s role, traditionally, to function as a pivot in disseminating consciousness about that which is significant but not well known.’[[1383]](#footnote-1383) This had been *Studies* role, and though she had split with the journal, she remained proud of the contribution it had made.[[1384]](#footnote-1384) It is the nature of this contribution, which I have attempted to bring to life.

A Journal of Research, Social Theory, and Review

In assessing the impact of *Studies on the Left*, I have considered the following. In Part 1, I charted the early years of the journal in Madison. In those years,the editorssought to reject the alienation of the 1950s, developing a new intellectual community with a political commitment to radical scholarship. They succeeded in creating a space where young radicals could express themselves, and its early issues struck a chord with those ill at ease with the state of academia and of the nation. Though Eleanor Hakim’s vision for a ‘An Intellectual Community Committed to the Radicalism of Disclosure’ was ultimately unrealised, *Studies on the Left* was a trailblazer of the intellectual New Left.

Whether the lionisation of Madison as a centre for radicalism, and the journal as a product of that milieu is debatable – Martin Sklar is perhaps correct in suggesting that the journal has been party mythologised – it is hard to deny that an intellectual community *did* exist around *Studies*, and that possibilities for growth had existed. Caught up in the tumultuous events of the early 1960s, however, the journal was pulled in a number of directions – should it be accessible to the movement activists? Or should it be *hard forme* intellectual? Should it stick to politics and history, or should it broaden itself to cultural topics? These debates meant that the editors often struggled to give the journal a consistent direction. Vacillating between these tendencies, between intellectualism and activism, *Studies* was able to present a varied selection of path-breaking perspectives, but at key points, it struggled to define itself in the face of competition and criticism from rival student journals such as *New University Thought* and *Root and Branch,* but also from dissenting editors.[[1385]](#footnote-1385)

Analysing the intellectual contribution made by the editors, Part 2 charted the impact the *Studies* editors had in influencing the renewal of the historical profession in the 1960s. Martin Sklar, James Weinstein, David Eakins, Stephen Scheinberg and Ronald Radosh contributed a body of scholarship which served as a historical account of the development of the corporate economy in the United States, as well as an analytical concept – Corporate Liberalism – which explained the complex structural relationship between elites in American society. Rejecting the tenets of the historical profession, they used the journal, and organisations such as the Socialist Scholars Conference and the Free University of New York as platforms to widen the dissemination of their work, and to provide movement activists with a ‘useable past’ for their activism which was based (for them) in historical truth. Though the editors achieved recognition for their archival prowess, their conclusions were criticised for their pessimistic tone, which indicated that capitalism was immune to social change, making the prospects of a radical movement to achieve lasting and irrevocable social change remote. Similarly to Herbert Marcuse, the editors did believe that a movement that was consciously aware of capitalistic hegemony could create a new counter-hegemony to replace Corporate Liberalism. Later, Martin Sklar took Corporate Liberalism beyond the status of policy consensus to the level of weltenschauung.

Having identified Corporate Liberalism as a suitable analytical framework for their critique of Cold War society, the editors came to see how the New Frontier and Great Society programs, rather than seeking to build a new economic system, was an effort to channel dissent into compliance through ameliorative reforms, which left the capitalist system intact. President Kennedy and President Johnson had created welfare clients rather than enabling them to escape poverty and had failed to adequately address the inequality between societal groups. Corporate Liberalism had delivered prosperity at home, and had secured access to wealth and investment abroad, yet it had also generated unsustainable levels of poverty and racism, and third world liberation movements threatened American’s sphere of influence abroad. It was from these follies from which the Republican New Right was deriving much of its strength.

In Part 3 we learned of *Studies* efforts to influence the student movement. As participants in the earliest stirrings of New Left activism on American campuses in the late 1950s, the *Studies* editors were eager to offer their perspective on how the movement should develop. As the 1960s wore on, however, the relationship between *Studies* and the movements soured considerably, as the original vision of the New Left as a non-sectarian political movement was corrupted by political inertia and the failure of SDS to avoid sectarianism. Community organising had likewise failed to instigate social change, the lesson being, for the editors, that it was necessary for a rational, educated, independent, and cross-sectional radical constituency to create a new consensus around socialism. It was on this matter however, that the editors of *Studies* split. Movement orientated editors, including Staughton Lynd, Norman Fruchter and Tom Hayden, who advocates of participatory democracy, and believed that the movement was not ready to coalesce around the bureaucratic structures of a political party.

Having decided to move from New York to the west coast – San Francisco – James Weinstein shuttered *Studies on the Left* in the summer of 1967 with the intention of replacing it with a journal more clearly focused around party politics and strategy. He formed a study group of prominent New Left intellectuals to kick-start the development of a party, which began with promise; however, it ultimately split due to differences within the group over how to manage the existing movements, and the impracticalities of marrying theory with action. A new journal, *Socialist Revolution*, did appear however, as did a successor organisation to Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) the New American Movement (NAM), formed in 1971 with Weinstein’s assistance. By the early 1980s, the verve for independent political action had subsided, as radicals turned their attention back to the Democratic Party, which was being squeezed by the ascendant New Right coalition formed by the Republican president Ronald Reagan. Moving to Chicago to set up the newspaper *In These Times* in 1976, Weinstein remained optimistic to the possibility that socialism could once again become a force in American society, despite his own modest achievements as an editor and publisher. ‘Despite all signs to the contrary’, he claimed in the early 2000s, ‘the future of socialism is in America.[[1386]](#footnote-1386)”

Looking back on the New Left in the early 2000s, Weinstein identified its fundamental weakness – which it then passed on to the liberation movements of the 1970s and 1980s – being a question of identity. The New Left had acted too often as militant interest groups, and rarely thought about a different form of society. As in the Old Left, rhetoric, commitment and self-sacrifice became the badge of radicalism, rather than an engagement with ideas. Thus, it developed a negative politics, in which few could suggest what positive changes they would make in society, ceding instead to the leadership of their organisations, who felt that their job was to pressure the authorities to implement their demands. ‘That, of course, was something that public officials liked to do’, Weinstein noted. ‘It left them in place. It did not threaten their power, and it allowed them to make adjustments in social policy without altering the underlying principles on which their policies were made.’[[1387]](#footnote-1387) An active member of the DSA in the 1970s, Weinstein was a leader of a group who thought the organisation had to be more electorally focused, challenging the Democratic establishment by running socialist candidates in party primaries.[[1388]](#footnote-1388)

The fracturing of the movements and the political disappointments of the early 1970s, historians Howard Brick and Christopher Phelps have noted, prompted a gradual shift in attitudes among radicals. The first issue of James Weinstein’s *In These Times*, for example placed the self-styled socialist Democrat Congressman Ron Dellums on its cover, which ‘gave indication’ of a the start of a shift towards working within the Democratic Party.[[1389]](#footnote-1389) In the next decade, the rise of the Ronald Reagan and the New Right was fuelled by ‘a working class constituency of Reagan Democrats’ who joined with traditional Christian families in accusing the left of eroding communities and working class families.[[1390]](#footnote-1390) The merger of the New American Movement (NAM), which Weinstein had helped to found in 1971 with former SDS members, with Michael Harrington’s Democratic Socialist Organising Committee (DSOC) to form the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA), Brick and Phelps, was indicative of the response to the Reagan ‘onslaught’, against the welfare state. However, some NAM members had opposed the ‘shift to the center’ and opposed Harrington’s ‘Fabian-like strategy’ of ‘permeating the Democratic Party’ others felt it necessary to support more mainstream social democracy in order to protect the gains that had been made since the 1930s.

One of the first acts of the DSA was to reform the Socialist Scholars Conference, which *Studies on the Left* had played a key role in organising in the mid-to-late 60s, with *In These Times* and *Dissent,* providing the left and right voices within the reconstituted ‘milieu.’ Representing *Dissent*, Irving Howe believed that the Popular Front strategy of the 1930s had ultimately been the correct course of action, for it subordinated socialism in favour of liberal alliances.[[1391]](#footnote-1391) For different reasons, Weinstein and *In These Times* also shifted towards supporting working within the Democratic Party. As early as 1983 Weinstein voiced support for Harold Washington, the successful left candidate for the Democratic Party in the Chicago Mayor election that year, presenting a rare example of the socialist left, successful assembling a coalition of ‘labor, blacks, women and others’ that was effective ‘in electing our own people.’[[1392]](#footnote-1392) By the end of the century, Weinstein had decided that it was time for the left to ‘confront reality and to grow up politically’ and think serious about how to make successful interventions into the political system.’[[1393]](#footnote-1393) He denounced Ralph Nader for having run a ‘transitory’ and ‘individualistic campaign’ that led his followers into a blind alley in 2000 and alienated many on the left for dividing the potential constituency.[[1394]](#footnote-1394) The love affair between the left and the idea of having its own political party, Weinstein admitted, had been a serious impediment to the creation of an effective movement.

Aided by William Appleman Williams’ seminal work in *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*, the *Studies* editors recast American foreign policy as one that was expansionary and focused on perpetuating prosperity at home. These conclusions are ones that have been reappraised by a new generation of historians seeking to understand the motivations of American foreign policy since the 1990s. In *American Empire*, Andrew Bacevich acknowledged that the evolution of United States foreign policy since the 1960s had ‘vindicated Williams analysis of American statecraft.’[[1395]](#footnote-1395) In his afterward to the 50th anniversary edition of *Tragedy*, he remarked that Williams ‘true genius’ had been to identify an American *weltanschauung* built on the assumption that American values are universal. In the 20th century, Williams believed, those who drove United States foreign policy had come to see the American economy as being dependent on external expansion. Working within these limits, American policy makers, driven by a belief in ‘American exceptionalism and American beneficence’, had externalised evil, demonising foreign adversaries as being ‘beyond redemption’, which had prompted a ‘steady, if unacknowledged drift towards militarisation.’[[1396]](#footnote-1396)

What Williams had outlined in the late 1950s, Bacevich believed, still carried currency in the 21st century, the difference being that whereas the original Open Door strategy had enriched the United states and enhanced its power, the modern incarnation was squandering that wealth, ‘while exacerbating American problems with debt and dependence.’[[1397]](#footnote-1397) In an atmosphere of rising tensions between the United States and Russia and a potential trade war between the United States and China, Bacevich has recently repeated a William-esque call for ‘non-violent approaches to reducing threats to America’s security and well-being: ‘instead of more expensive weapons, try more creative diplomacy.’[[1398]](#footnote-1398) Yet that approach would entail actually formulating a strategy. This is what Nixon did in the 1970s with his opening to China, and Reagan did the following decade when he found common ground with Gorbachev.’[[1399]](#footnote-1399) He did not foresee a shift in policy to be a likely prospect.[[1400]](#footnote-1400)

For a New America

Many of the issues that the editors of *Studies on the Left* grappled with remain potent and relevant today. In the same way the editors of *Studies* worked to build ‘An Intellectual Community Committed to the Radicalism of Disclosure’, young intellectuals today are working to build similar communities in the wake of the Great Recession of 2008. In the spring of 2017, the New York Institute for the Humanities hosted a roundtable event on the topic of ‘new public intellectuals’ with guests from three prominent independent journals: Nikil Saval, the co-editor of *n+1*; Sarah Leonard, the senior editor at *The Nation*; and Jon Baskin, co-editor of *The Point*. Each represented, as Evan Goldstein pointed out for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, a facet of the ‘renaissance in cultural journalism.’[[1401]](#footnote-1401) Lamenting the passing of the ‘near-mythic minds’ of the New York intellectuals of the 1930s and 1940s’, these non-academics, Goldstein claimed, had formed little magazines before the 1960s, when ‘careerism and specialisation’ first began to create a gulf between intellectuals and the public.[[1402]](#footnote-1402) The 60s generation, Russell Jacoby argued that the 1960s generation had been absorbed into the universities as they became pre-occupied by the demands of a university career.[[1403]](#footnote-1403)

Much like the *Studies* editors in the early 1960s, the deterioration of academic life, Goldstein suggested, had prompted graduate students to seek outlets for the scholarship outside of the established career path of peer reviewed journals. The optimism of the sit-ins of the 1960s, which so energised *Studies*, isreplicated in the Occupy Wall Street movement, which Goldstein claims, was one of the most hopeful and significant experiences of their lifetimes - the ‘first time that things seemed up for grabs politically and intellectually.’[[1404]](#footnote-1404) The new generation of independent journals are radically left wing, and similarly focused in targeting liberalism as the main enemy, rather than the insurgent Tea Party Republicans; neo-liberalism rather than Corporate Liberalism is now the enemy. Aided by the growth of the internet, these new journals had new battles to fight in appearing relevant and maintaining the ‘critical ethos of the little magazine’ online, when ‘prestige’ was so often dictated by hits and links.’[[1405]](#footnote-1405)

Similarly, within the universities, intellectuals have recently begun to issue challenges to the core tenets of the academic faith: objectivity and presentism. In the 1960s, the *Studies* editors challenged the academic orthodoxies of their day, challenging the nature of objectivity to create a new form of politically and socially engaged academic scholarship. In the Spring of 2015, a collective of twenty-two affiliates launched the V21 Manifesto, outlining their dissatisfaction with the current state of the field of Victorian Studies. Their ‘Ten Theses’ bears a remarkable resemblance to the calls made by the early *Studies* editorials, which accused academics of falling prey to a *positivist historicism* which resisted theoretical innovation. Such an approach, the V21 group has claimed, produces work that is ‘intellectually lazy’ and aims to do little more than ‘exhaustively describe, preserve and display the past.’[[1406]](#footnote-1406) Just as the *Studies* editors and their circle lamented ‘abstract intellectualism’ and challenged young scholars to go beyond the ‘pigeonhole monograph and...dry-as-dust style’, the V21 Collective have challenged scholars to reject the fetishisation of archival study and the reconstruction ‘of the past *wie es eigentlich gewesen*: an endless accumulation of mere information.’[[1407]](#footnote-1407)

The V21 manifesto received varying and lively responses from academics, some of whom were unsettled by the suggestion that resistance to theory was ‘pervasive’ in their field, and that their work was ‘at its worst...bland antiquarianism.’[[1408]](#footnote-1408) Where some of the editors and readers of *Studies* may have balked is at the suggestion that a post-historicist approach might lead to a ‘new openness to *presentism*: an awareness that our interest in the period is motivated by certain features of our own moment.’[[1409]](#footnote-1409) Whilst presentism was not ‘a sin’ and not all of its forms are equal.[[1410]](#footnote-1410) ‘In finance, resource mining, globalization, imperialism, liberalism, and many other vectors, we are Victorian, inhabiting, advancing, and resisting the world they made’ they state, and ‘V21 is not an end in itself but a means for sustaining a collective of Victorianists who aspire toward a more argumentative, porous, and ambitious field.’[[1411]](#footnote-1411) More broadly, the debate regarding presentism and objectivity in scholarship continues without resolution.

The *Studies* editors own challenge to the tenets of Cold War society produced Corporate Liberalism, both in Martin Sklar’s and James Weinstein’s iteration. In recent years, academics have attempted to periodise Corporate Liberalism as a worldview which has largely been superseded by Neoliberalism. Amos A. Tevelow has proposed that beginning in the 1970s, Corporate Liberalism was gradually superseded by an insurgent neo-liberalism; the multiple fronts of ‘political assassinations, the Vietnam War and economic decline’, eroding faith in reformist social science and active government. In response, think tanks began to shift towards a developing a new policy regime to unite the elites. Philanthropists and business leaders began to shift investment away from Corporate Liberal think organisations such as the Brookings Institute (BI) and the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) towards anti-government non-profits such as the Heritage Foundation and the Progressive Policy Institute. As a result, the corporate liberal consensus was gradually reconfigured around a new set of antithetical policy initiatives known as neo-liberalism, which focused less on state intervention and more around the primacy of private property, ‘free market’ solutions to economic and social problems. The PPI was later crucial in helping Bill Clinton to develop a politics, Tevelow has suggested, ‘that capitulated to neoliberalism while keeping a semblance of the Corporate Liberal compromise alive.’[[1412]](#footnote-1412) To a degree this shift could also been prompted by the continuing shift by the Democrats away from their New Deal reformism and towards an overt Corporate Liberalism, a shift which markedly accelerated from the late 1980s onwards by Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) who offered their own vision of a *reformed* Democratic Party that could effectively challenge the Reagan-led Republican Party. In 1990, the political scientist Edward Greenberg proposed that with the capture of the party by the New Right, the corporate liberal wing, favouring a more activist state, would most likely return to a revitalised Democratic Party less influenced by traditional liberals and more by a centrist ‘neo-liberal’ focus on economic growth rather than public spending on inequality and social justice issues.[[1413]](#footnote-1413)

Since the 1980s, successive administrations have attempted to reduce the size of the Federal Government itself, and the ambition and reach of its social programs. Welfare provision, for example, is frequently outsourced to the private sector. Reporting on a 2013 strike of the Legal Services Staff Association, representing the Legal Services Corporation (LSS) of New York, who provide legal aid to the unemployed, the working poor, and disabled, *In These Times* described the irony of the conflict. Congress had created the LSS in 1974 in order to integrate the grievances of disadvantaged and the working poor into the judicial system, following the riots of the 1960s and early 1970s. Even Judge Lewis F. Powell, the author of the Powell Memo, ‘now infamous as the charter document of neoliberalism’, had praised the organization.[[1414]](#footnote-1414) ‘The broad ruling class consensus behind the creation of Legal Services reflected the reigning ideology of Corporate Liberalism’, the newspaper reported. ‘Four decades later, most Democrats and Republicans are united around a new ideology of shredding the New Deal social safety net through sequestration and other forms of austerity, while waging a war of attrition against the labor movement.’[[1415]](#footnote-1415) The entrance into the ‘Age of Occupy’ James Livingston has described, has prompted a reassessment of the meaning of Corporate Liberalism in line with Martin Sklar’s own intellectual development on the understanding of the relationship between capitalism and socialism.[[1416]](#footnote-1416) It is also this critique corporatism and oligarchy that *In These Times* ally Senator Bernie Sanders has made his political career.[[1417]](#footnote-1417)

Since the 2016 Presidential Election, there has been an increased interest in Corporate Liberalism, as writers and intellectuals have attempted to understand why Hilary Clinton and the Democratic Party was rejected at the polls. The result of the election, Russell Rickford of Cornell has claimed, exposed the bankruptcy of Corporate Liberalism as practiced by Obama and the Clintons. Buying off dissent through mild social democratic reform had only served as a means to maintain ‘a perilously financialised economy, and an obscene empire of incarceration.’[[1418]](#footnote-1418) Others have begun to recognise similarities between the corporate liberal critique as used by the New Left and the modern critique of neo-liberalism. Writing for *New York Magazine*, Jonathan Chait has noted that the current identification of neo-liberalism as the source of all the ills of progressive politics is ‘almost exactly’ the same as the identification of ‘Corporate Liberalism’ in the 1960s.[[1419]](#footnote-1419) Recently, in celebrating the thirtieth anniversary of the publication of Donald Trump’s *The Art of the Deal*, Steven Watts has suggested that the book is a 1980s incarnation of the ‘success ideology born out the move towards consumer capitalism and Corporate Liberalism of the early 20th century.[[1420]](#footnote-1420)

In the wake of Donald Trump’s election, Andrew Hartman noted that a renewed critique of liberalism as practiced under Bill Clinton and Barack Obama was indicative not of a revival of the 1960s New Left, ‘who raised hell in their efforts to end the Vietnam War and change American culture’, but an invocation of the Old Left’s opposition to the New Deal ‘reform’ and its search for ‘a genuine alternative to capitalism’, or at the very least ‘industrial democracy.’[[1421]](#footnote-1421) John Judis, who worked with James Weinstein on both *Socialist Revolution* and *In These Times* claimed that the revival of the DSA was an effort to realign contemporary liberalism back towards the economics of the average American, and away from ‘the economic priorities of those segments of Wall Street and Silicon Valley.’[[1422]](#footnote-1422) As others had noted, the Obama Presidency had been marked by the further distancing of the Democratic Party away from progressive liberalism and towards Corporate Liberalism and beyond.[[1423]](#footnote-1423) In the 1960s, SDS leaders stated that members should name corporate liberals as the enemy; in the mid-1990s, DSA stated that the collapse of the political economy of Corporate Liberalism had hastened the “atrophy” of the “progressive politics” that constituted the New Deal and the Great Society: “strong trade unions, social movements…Democratic political machines.[[1424]](#footnote-1424) As recently as 2016, speakers at the ‘Socialist Caucus’ of the Democratic National Convention reminded attendees that ‘liberals are not our friends’, urging them to make the election ‘a referendum on Corporate Liberalism.’[[1425]](#footnote-1425)

New Horizons

A generation previously, the *Studies* editors grappled with these same issues, and had concluded that liberal solutions to the problems that faced American society were inadequate. Though united in their opposition to Corporate Liberalism and the dangers it engendered, when it came to outlining their own solutions they began to split over the tactics. The editors most closely associated with the New Left placed their faith in community organising, participatory democracy, and an avoidance of top-down organised political structures, while the older editors focused on the potential for building a radical socialist movement that would engage with electoral politics and coalition building. With the latter accusing the New Left of ‘anti-intellectualism’, *Studies* for a time offered two programs for action: protest, community organising, and participatory democracy on the one hand, and socialism, electoral politics and coalition building on the other. The debate regarding the efficacy of the two competing ideas would consume the editors for much of the final years of *Studies* existence and leaked out into the broader movement for decades more.[[1426]](#footnote-1426)

In recent years, their collective belief in counter-hegemonic institutions has been revisited in the wake of a renewed sense of frustration at the pace of social reform, and the exponential acceleration of technological change in society. Academics seeking to explain the perceived impotence of movements to effect social change have focused on the term ‘folk politics’ to describe the predominate forms of left-wing campaigning activity: horizontal, local and consensual forms of political action that reject hegemony. Defined by Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams in their work *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work* as the ‘locus of the small scale, the authentic, the traditional and the natural’, folk politics, focused on non-hierarchal structures, protests, and single issue campaigns, in their estimation, has debilitated the left, rendering it unable to create lasting change or to expand beyond its core activist supporters. Echoing the *Studies*’editors’ conclusions, they have advocated for a counter-hegemonic politics that would mobilise campaigners towards confronting the big issues that face society within the political arena.[[1427]](#footnote-1427)

There are signs that some of these ideas are beginning to take root within the left-wing movements. Following the 2016 election, activists enthused by the Bernie Sanders campaign flocked to the DSA, which experienced an exponential increase in membership. Its endorsed candidates have been elected to office around the country. Disillusioned by the Reagan revolution, the Corporate Liberalism of the Clinton era and the wider neo-liberal project, they have also worked in communities, providing support to pro-immigration groups, and setting up communal food projects. Politics and community organising have appeared to have merged.[[1428]](#footnote-1428) Between November 2016 and January 2018, DSA increased in size from 8,000 to 31,000, and its number of office holders from 20 to 35.[[1429]](#footnote-1429) These numbers are still relatively small compared to the peak membership of SDS of around 100,000, but after so many decades of conservative insurgency, activist have cause to be hopeful that their views are again reaching an audience.[[1430]](#footnote-1430) Their immediate goals include a drive to organise and strengthen left wing movements, to help workers build politically committed unions, to fight on the ideological front, and to build a ‘rainbow’ coalition.[[1431]](#footnote-1431)

The role of intellectuals in building this coalition, like the role of *Studies* in building the New Left, is far from certain. In the last decade, *Jacobin, The Los Angeles Review of Books, The New Inquiry, n+1, The Point,* and *Public Books* have all appeared, older publication such as *Dissent* have been rejuvenated, and dormant magazines such as *The Baffler* have been reconstituted. The historian James Livingston has suggested that these times are a moment of ‘intellectual ferment…everyone knows we have to do something radical.’[[1432]](#footnote-1432) It has been argued that in the United States, the stereotype of the apathetic hipster has given way to “a new kind of well-educated, middle twenty-something who rails against the prison-industrial complex, who talks about wages for housework, who throws around words like “imperialism” and “exploitation” with a growing sense of comfort.’ The revival of left-wing intellectual thinking ‘on a level unseen since the 1960s’ was manifesting itself, Max Strasser notes, in the form of the magazine or journals with avowedly socialist perspectives. ‘It was the anti-Stalinist left, much of it based in New York, much of it centred around magazines, that helped to lay the groundwork for the New Left of the 1960s’, he argued, But ‘what happens next remains entirely unclear.’[[1433]](#footnote-1433)

Just like the *Studies* editors in the 1950s, the new generation of young editors look upon the political structure as being paralysed and disconnected from the concerns of most people. Many of them had graduated in the wake of the 2008 financial crash, entering a labour market with student debt, and at a time when automation was once again emerging as a subject of human concern.[[1434]](#footnote-1434) They have however, all of the conveniences that the *Studies* editors did not – computers, the internet, mobile phones – making the achievements of the latter all the more impressive. Today its radical inheritors pursue the same dream of creating a new radical movement for social change in the United States. Each of them owes some small amount of debt to *Studies* *on the Left* and its legacy.
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