We often talk about decades—the Twenties, the Thirties, the Forties, Fifties, Sixties, and now (almost) the Seventies. The Movement has been quite obtuse in this regard. It has persisted in separating politics and culture—to its own detriment. "Cultural revolution," as Abbie Hoffman points out, "requires people to change the way they live and act..." If we are to create a socialist politics, we must begin to live our vision of society in our day-to-day lives. Our politics will grow out of the tension between our lives and those of our rulers.

II. Elitism. RYM and other Movement groups continue to prate about the "vanguard" party and pre-party organizational forms that will "concretely serve the people." Now, I will grant that in Afroamerica those concepts, especially as applied by the Black Panthers, make much sense. It is too mechanical an application of Maoist theory. Why should the world's "most privileged workers" (RMY's term) need a vanguard to "serve" them? Does not the whole concept seem absurd in an advanced capitalist society where conditions exist for a decentralized and very liberated political life? Why try to organize in such an incredibly elitist fashion?
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out the differentials in material living conditions between blacks and whites. The third, he contends, is a straw man.

Unfortunately, that man is not made of straw. The concept of repudiating white-skin privilege has had great impact upon the white student movement precisely because it does appeal to the guilt and shame of middle class students interested in fighting racism. Take, for instance, the emotional statement of one New York RVM leader: "When I repudiated privilege, it strengthened me and gave me real contact with the masses"—a confession of guilt in a politicized form, thinly disguised—"or, as Falstaff put it, "bleeding heart white liberalism."

More importantly, however, the concept of privilege is racist, that is, it accepts the definition of racism in terms propounded by the ruling class. It is our rulers who propagate the notions of privileges for whites vis-à-vis blacks. There is an enormous body of evidence indicating that white racism is a useful tool in subordinating all elements of the working classes. To organize against racism one must talk, not of repudiation, but of gaining strength through independence and opposition to the ruling class. To define racism and white supremacy in terms of privilege is to accept the hegemony of Establishment ideology.

IV. The agency of social change. There was not much discussion of this crucial question at the RYM conference. Mostly there were banal calls to join/support "the struggles of the most oppressed people" and "the struggles of the most oppressed people" relate to the means of production—a vital concern for a serious Marxist—was not discussed at the conference, not even any mention of reference to it in the theoretical papers circulated by RYM. The emphasis on the struggles of the most oppressed conjures up Marx's lumpenproletariat and SDS's old ERAP producers which sought to build an interracial movement of blue- and white-collar workers, the white-collar workers. How applicable is it? What kinds of trends of the political economy seem to be eroding the importance of that group to the nation's productive apparatus. While the various factions of SDS call for organization of blue-collar workers, the trends of the political economy seem to be eroding the importance of that group to the nation's productive apparatus. In fact, in a few years the number of blue-collar workers may begin to decline absolutely. What does that mean for traditional Marxist concepts? A few New Leftists, following the theory of Andre Gorz, have begun to elaborate a theory of a new working class of highly skilled workers may begin to decline absolutely. What does that mean for traditional Marxist concepts? A few New Leftists, following the theory of Andre Gorz, have begun to elaborate a theory of a new working class of highly skilled blue-collar workers. How applicable is it? What kinds of relations are there between that new working class and hip-culture?

The disintegration of most of the organizational forms of the Movement gives us a challenge for the Seventies. Can we meet it? In spite of all my criticism, I remain optimistic. Black and hip culture appear to have the strength and vitality to sustain us for the long haul.