

# THE NEWSPAPER

Published by the students of Montreat-Anderson College  
Monday, 9 November 1970

## THOUGHTS ON THE REVOLUTION

This issue contains two particularly interesting and significant documents. They represent as well as anything else the points of view characteristic of the two major factions of what has come to be known as "the movement" in the United States. They also give us some idea of the misapprehensions under which both camps labor.

The first is part one of an interview with Mr. Gerald Lefcourt, chief legal spokesman of the Black Panther Party on the East Coast. Mr. Lefcourt, as you will no doubt notice, is a Marxist, and a rather rigid one. The essence of his position is (1) inasmuch as we live under a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, all channels within the framework of political society are closed to radical change and, therefore, revolution is the only way out; and, (2) any oppressed group--specifically, the Black Panther Party--is justified in using any means to resist and end their oppression.

The second is an analysis of the Weathermen by Mr. I.M. Terhune, a writer for NEW UNIVERSITY at the University of California, Irvine. Mr. Terhune's bias is clearly revolutionary, although not necessarily Marxist. While he endorses selective terrorism as a tactic, he opposes for political and ethical reasons the strategic use to which it has been put by the Weathermen.

There seem to be at least four serious flaws in one or both of these positions. The first is

## STAFF

Frank Austin, Editor-in-Chief  
Richard Lance, Cultural Editor  
Gene Hines, Montreat Editor  
Al Seitner, National/International Editor  
Patricia Butler, Business Manager  
Janet Stone, Faculty Advisor

The opinions presented here represent only the views of the contributors, and are not necessarily the views of the College or the Student Government Association.

Mr. Lefcourt's belief that a noble cause justifies any means used for its realization. It is to Mr. Terhune's credit that he neatly deflates this idea in the last paragraph of his analysis.

It is not to his credit, however, that in doing so he throws around such phrases as "revolution for the people," "personal liberation," and "revolution of life" without adequate definition. One wonders how a revolutionary organization can possibly attract and hold the committed and well-informed members it must have to be successful if those members do not know the meaning of their own aims.

Third, both authors assume the United States to be in a "pre-revolutionary" situation. This is hogwash. Although, by a wildly optimistic estimate, there may be 500,00 committed revolutionaries in this country, they have no chance of success in the foreseeable future. They would lose in guerrilla warfare; guerrillas must have the support of a large segment of the people to exist, and