

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE...

When in the course of human relationships, it becomes apparent that such relationships are basically dominant ← submissive or in more promounced forms sadistic (-) masochistic, it then becomes necessary for the person cast in the submissive role to dissolve the personal bonds which have connected these persons and to initiate a relationship based on a separate and equal status. Recognizing that dominant submissive relationships often appear desirable to both members involved, the first because it satisfies his passion for power, for control over another being; the second because he is afraid of freedom, afraid of facing the uncertainty and responsibility involved, and finds security in submission to the decisions and wishes of another; recognizing that to a certain degree, this phenomenon is present in nearly all relationships, we nevertheless maintain that the most healthy and productive type of human relationship rises out of equality rather than dominance submission regardless of the age or social position of individuals involved. We believe this to be a position given much lip service in our society, but one which is rarely encouraged and commonly discouraged in practice.

There exist within every society certain types of individuals who seem to have a psychological need which can be filled only by the controlling of other lives. (We call them leaders and if they are spectacular they become heroes.) In their struggle for power and a sense of importance, they invariably exploit and use other individuals. The tragedy is that they wield sufficient persuasive power to convince the victims of their guidance that it is in these individuals' interest to support a continuance of the dominant (submissive relationship, in fact that they cannot function without such relationships, and that society itself would collapse if such relationships were dissolved. The dominant figures have the power (which they often disguise as paternalistic guidance or advice) to shape the lives of the submissive and program into their thought the belief that they are inferior and incapable of making their own decisions. Consequently the weak relinquish their personal sovereignty to the wishes and whims of a strong and wise authority who can decide what is best for them. Instead of being strengthened by having to stand on their own, they are led into a role of dependence on the authority, further weakening them as individuals which is exactly what the authority desires, for without this dependence he finds it very difficult to exercise effective control over them. It is a very subtle means of control, much cheaper and easier to manage than control based upon coercive force. Invariably, the authority makes use of his control over these persons to further the cause he considers worthy. The dominant () submissive relationship is the basis for the authoritarian system.

In an authoritarian system, decisions are made by the man at the top of the social pyramid and those who find themselves situated on lower levels of this pyramid must abide by his rulings (often these decisions are immortalized and raised above situational convenience or above the level of simple human whim or desire by incorporating them into a legal system). The weight of decision- (CONTINUED)

The Pine Needle is an independent newspaper printed in North Manchester, Indiana. Editors: Jerry Eller, John Flory, Barbara Smith. Cover: Kevin Miller. Illustrations: Jim Albright.

BETRAVALETHE REVOLUTION

The following is a quote from John Wilson, thru Liberation News Service.

"But the left is too puritanic; it's too pure. And you cannot be pure in a capitalist society. You have to be as ruthless as your enemy is and until we learn to be as ruthless as our enemies we will not be able to move in this society as one, with the will and the hope in the people to fight to destroy this society....

The whole problem is to decide what institutions you want to maintain, how you move to control those institutions and how you move to give people what they want. I think that one of the most important concepts is that anything you can't control you must destroy. And we must begin to destroy this society basically because we cannot control it."

These words are the language of nihilism, they are words which lead to the betrayal of the cause of the revolutionary. They are words which become a cause in themselves, lighting flames of excitement and zeal. But turn back, turn back from nihilism before it's too late,

rushing headlong towards apocalypse and suddenly smell the stench decaying flesh, burnt skin, blood boiled, brains scorched don't believe the tales of the phoenix, the miracle bird of ressurection

glittering, rising out of ashes, out of destruction the new heaven and the new earth and the New Jerusalem reborn. There is a bird that rises

clumsily flapping, flopping, soaring. Maybe this is the Legendary phoenix or the angel Gabriel

but most know him, evil smelling picker of bones, as Vulture. The desire to destroy that which has hurt him is an attempt to seek psychic relief. But the aim of the revolutionary should not be the search for personal psychic relief, but rather the attempt to challenge and change existing societal systems. For it is only to death that nihilism leads. Disgust for a society must be tempered by a compassion for the persons trapped in the systems of that society. The nihilist is a seeker or revenge, rather than revolutionary change.

Betrayal of the revolution comes initially from a dedication to revolution as an end in itself. Individuals can become so caught up in the emotional romanticism of a cause or the means of realizing a cause, that they forget the reasons for their actions. They support revolution because they are revolutionaries. They support change not so much because they see the need for such change in society, but more because they have identified themselves as the bringers of change, the makers of revolution. In order to fit the role into which they have cast themselves, they must seek out revolution, for a revolutionary cannot continue to think of himself in those terms if he is not partaking in the revolution. In this context revolution becomes a personal justification, a series of acts contrived to fulfill personal needs, psychological needs. Plans are made to occupy an administration building not as a result of grievances suffered but as a result of a need to realize or solidify one's identity. The motives of many present student revolutionaries becomes suspect. There is certainly not a lack of real grievances, certainly not an absence of need for change, but the motivation and mood of student rebels may lead to a miscarriage or betrayal of a needed change in American society.

The obsession for the acquisition of power or control is also a betrayer of revolution. For the enemy is not just the present manipulative power structure, but any such power structure whether it is leftist, rightist or centrist (as the present one seems to be.) The revolution is betrayed when the old power structure is replaced by a new equally manipulative one. (The classic betrayal being that of the Russian Revolution where the tyranny of Lenin and the Bolshevics is substituted for the tyranny of the Czar.) Thus the goal of revolution should not be change in the power structure, but abolition of that power structure. It should not be a political revolution but instead an anti-political revolution. Politics is the studied use of power, whether persuasive or coercive. Power is the manipulation of persons, whether by consent or without that consent. The goal of revolution should be that of freeing men to shape their own lives rather than testing up new controlling agencies which will shape them in different patterns according to different ideologies. There always exists the danger that the overthrow of a tyrannical system wedded to hard line dogma will be replaced by a new system justified by different dogma.

--John Flory

ROGRESS-FUTILITY?

The question of whether a society based on violence can change peacefully is a very real dilumna that faces America today. Our country was founded by violence, expanded by violence, and perpetuated by violence. With violence as American as apple pie, is there a viable option for change in America today?

In the early sixties the civil rights movement was totally non-violent, almost pacifistic. Why did it gradually change to assume the militant and aggressive nature it does today? Simply; people understand violence, and only violence. Without the threat of violence, nothing ever changed. Violence arose out of frustration of ineffective non-violence. I am convinced that if changes had occurred in the early sixties with the non-violent approach, the violent approach would not have been tried.

I hoped that America would learn a lesson from the civil rights movement, because at this moment a similar non-violent method is being employed by Americans who are against the war in Vietnam. People can no longer say that these are only a handfull of weird, communist-inspired hippies, who are against the war. The anti-war movement is now quite extensive and at present, non-violent in action.

Can non-violence bring change in America? Government officials throughout the land praised the orderliness of recent peace marches in cities throughout the country. I was in Chicago, where 25,000 people peacefully expressed their concerns. It is now up to the government to hear the will of the people and to work to achieve peace. If nothing happens, don't think that the anti-war movement is going to remain peaceful.

Has America learned a lesson, or will it still remain unyielding until seriously threatened? I myself, have serious doubts whether the peace march in Chicago was a sign of progress rather than an exercise in futility.

--Jerry Eller

