

BULLETIN

NOV-DEC 1964 Vol. 3 No. 3

STUDENTS FOR A
DEMOCRATIC
SOCIETY

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT 119 FIFTH AVE., ROOM 302, NEW YORK CITY 10003

THE ELECTIONS— AND AFTER

By Jeremy Brecher

DECEMBER N.C. ISSUES RAISED

By C. Clark Kissinger

The December meeting of the SDS National Council has been set for December 28-31 in New York City. Like lemmings returning to the sea, it is true again this year that most of our chapters will be able to get delegates to New York during the Christmas vacation. Coming as it does six months after the National Convention, the December NC has traditionally been the most important NC of the year. Last December's NC drew over 100 people (including Bobby Dylan), and we expect many more this year.

It was at last December's NC that the crucial debates took place which led to last Spring's series of inter-collegiate conferences on poverty and the summer ERAP projects. This December, one year later, we are in a position to evaluate (cont. p. 40)

I am writing the morning after the morning after the elections, when the returns are in but not yet fully analyzed. Two things at this point are evident however: there is going to be a very large Democratic congressional majority, and the only opposition the Republican party is going to present over the next few months will be not to the Administration but to itself. These conditions give the Left an opportunity for the first time in many years to be a choice not an echo.
(cont. p. 36)

INSIDE . . .

University Reform	2
Political Education Project	3
Tom Hayden Arrested	3
FREP:	
FREP Program	4
Critique	5
The Unemployed	6
Chapter Reports	8
Letters	31
Literature List	41

UNIVERSITY REFORM

THE PERENNIAL ISSUE

By Shelley Blum

(The following are notes for a speech given at Duke University.)

Anybody can attack the university in a number of places but often the university shrugs off the charges as of the same level of importance as a march of army ants on New York City. Part of the reason for this is that the university is not structured to respond to student thought, but a large factor is that the student's blasts are often aimed at effects and not causes. If it is true that the hospital gives students inferior service, it is probably due to the overall university stance that relegates the mere student to a very passive role. The student is here by the grace of god and the administration. The faculty is here to waste time with the students because the administration doesn't want to deal with them. I would suggest that this attitude rubs off on the clerks, etc. who actually deal with the students, who waste the time they could otherwise use in doing valuable work. Similarly, the library problems the students attack, with all their massive editorial sarcasm, are not root problems. That the inane library hours have existed for years is due in large measure to the fact that students have no role in the university. Surely an effective student government would have the power to amend library hours and have a say in library procedures as well as participating in the decisions that affect students. Students can take the easy way out and attack immediate problems but it gets little in the way of results. I submit that

the first necessity is a fundamental criticism of the university. The second is a search for methods of implementation of our vision.

Those of you who have read "Student Social Action" by Tom Hayden will recognize my blueprint for an ideal university. I don't intend to repeat his examples or his arguments in developing an outline for Duke, but I do draw heavily on both.

I feel that the university should be made more democratic. This means that the largest group, the student body, should be able to participate in the decisions that affect their lives. The situation that now obtains is the playground theory of student government. Let them practice now so that when they go out into the big world they will be able to conduct themselves properly. In translation: don't let them have any decisions to make that mean anything. The result is immense apathy, student government types, and bigger and better beach weekends. The student governments are not willing to even ask for more power. The Duke student government recommendation for the revision of chartering procedures does not call for this power to be put in student hands but for the deans to carefully examine the new group's constitution before it comes to the student government so they will have an easier time of it. It is very clear that the choice one makes in coming to Duke, as opposed to getting a job, is one between being a student and being an adult. In coming to Duke one is forced to surrender his rights and privileges under

(cont. p. 38)

PEP: POST-ELECTION PLANS

By Steve Max and Jim Williams

The Organizers of the Political Education Project have argued in the past that the major political conflict in the country was between the Administration and the Right Wing (Republicans and Dixicrats). This is probably no longer true. The fight seems to be shifting back into the Democratic Party but it is no longer the old Dixicrat Republican vs. Truman-Kennedy-Johnson battle that it once was. The Dixicrats have retained their crucial committee chairmanships, but the reactionary alliance has had its voting strength broken in the Senate and possibly in the House as well.

It would now appear that the major conflict will be that between Johnson Democrats and more Liberal Democrats. Indeed this fight will be slow to develop since the liberals probably will spin away from Johnson quietly and behind the scenes. Needless to say, generation of popular pressure and organization of the unorganized can only help the process of building a liberal coalition within the Democratic Party.

Branches of SDS are already at work organizing on the community level. The Political Education Project will approach the matter from the opposite end. While (cont. p. 36)

HAYDEN ARRESTED

Tom Hayden was arrested and faces charges of threatening to kill and assault and battery. The story:

The Newark project won a rent strike Oct. 7 and the landlady agreed to make repairs and lower the rent and signed a notarized statement to that effect. On Wednesday, Oct. 14, Tom was leafleting and the landlady (Mrs. Hayes) approached him on the street. They argued about her harrassment of the tenant. Tom pulled out the notarized statement and she grabbed for it, hitting him with her free hand. Mrs. Hayes managed to get the statement and stopped hitting Tom. Tom then went to report the incident to the police and was told he couldn't make a complaint for 30 minutes. He then went back to the scene of the incident and found the landlady and a police car. Tom was booked for assault and battery and was

taken to the police station where he again tried to make a complaint but his request was refused. Tom was then thrown in jail.

Meanwhile the neighborhood rallied to Tom's defense and began making phone calls to the police station urging his release. Neighborhood people also pressured South Ward Councilman Lee Bernstein, a political opponent of the Newark project, to intervene in Tom's behalf. About 11 p.m., 5½ hours after Tom's arrest, a group of neighborhood people and Councilman Bernstein went to the police station and Tom was released in his lawyer's custody. Tom was arraigned Friday, Oct. 16 on charges of threatening to kill and assault and battery. The case now goes to the Grand Jury. (The Newark project is discussing action but has not yet decided on what would be the best course to follow.)

PREP: PROGRAM

by Paul Booth and Todd Gitlin

The original PREP perspective for 1964-65 program has not really had a chance to prove itself, but this report will contain some preliminary judgments. It is not yet clear how extensive the program of the various chapters and sympathetic peace groups will be, but the limited response to PREP program suggestions already offers meat for some reconsiderations.

The most important reconsideration involves the relative emphasis afforded the draft and third world segments of the program. PREP would be better off if it had three full-time people in Ann Arbor, but unfortunately that is not the case. And it would appear that interest in the draft issue is quite limited. More important, we have on hand the basic materials for programming on the draft, but they are lacking for programming on the Third World.

Furthermore, we have maintained from the start that great care would have to be allotted to insure that any draft movements we instigated quickly made links to the related issues. The joint action of Johnson and Goldwater appears to have bought off a great deal of the latent interest in anti-draft activity.

Until the meeting of PREP's Executive Committee on November 6, no decision can be made shifting the burden of staff energies. In the meantime, in the absence of demands of campus groups on the PREP center for assistance in anti-draft work, Todd Gitlin is using the "spared time" to start to put together material on the Third World and to put out New Era.

As for the conversion program, it is moving along quite well. The Boston project is well on its feet, and Jim Morey--the new Director--has an office at 114 Mt. Auburn St. in Cambridge, and has already made fruitful contacts with labor

leaders at the Watertown Arsenal (the current focus of efforts). Equally important news: several of the local SDS chapters have made strong commitments to working with BPREP.

The major goal of the conversion program is now to stir up interest on the campuses in replicating the Boston effort in other defense-impacted areas. The most practicable idea would seem to be to work toward the establishment of perhaps half a dozen summer projects. The most prominent possibilities for such projects would seem to be in the Western states, precisely where SDS' base is weakest. San Diego, Los Angeles, Denver, and Seattle, are all reeling under the impact of defense spending reductions, and there is clearly more to come between now and the summer. But summer projects are not worth considering unless preliminary research and contacting work is done, and we suffer from a lack of people on the spot. This need is less evident in the case of impacted areas east of the Mississippi --New Jersey, Philadelphia, Baltimore County, Rhode Island, Boston area, Brooklyn.

The second most important need is for a conference on how students can play a key role in the process of converting from an arms economy to a national war on poverty, a conference emphasizing community organizing, preparing for summer projects, relating the Boston experience and parallel experiences of other groups on Long Island, in Camden, and Schenectady. A site for this has not been found.

A possible new arena for PREP program has been generated by the Cleveland cluster, who have located a number of Cleveland high school students with strong peace and other left concerns. We are going to be exploring the pros-

(cont. p. 27)

AND CRITIQUE

By Steven H. Johnson

In SDS we play the "good guy-bad guy" game by setting radicals against liberals, radicalism against next-step tokenism. Extending the characterization, fruitfulness can be set against sterility. If you impatiently picket a vacant lot with a sign reading "Damn this vacant lot for being sterile," your approach is also sterile. If you have patience and faith, if you plow the lot, seed it, water it, weed it, and harvest it, your approach is fruitful. For peaceniks (which is what this article is all about), if we impatiently picket the Pentagon saying "Damn this vacant lot for being sterile," our approach is sterile. For peaceniks, it is acting without being radical, without rising above next-step tokenism. This type of approach is also exemplified by FREP's "Toward an Effective Peace Program on Campus," a program which is neither radical nor peacemaking, and not fruitful.

I believe a fruitful program is possible for FREP. It would be conceived in terms of goals and methods so three goals would be paramount. (1) It would put top priority on the achievement of real disarmament as the only international arrangement whereby the national security of each country is protected without the need for retaining armaments. (2) FREP would give top priority to the job of converting student attitudes. Almost all students today accept the cold war, being blind to any alternative. Converting them means teaching them to see that disarmament is the practical alternative, which they can work for. (3) FREP would give top priority to organizing dynamic student groups, in

which being a member requires being a leader and recruiting and training others to become leaders. Within this goal-oriented context, FREP would then raise those specific issues with which it is now concerned almost exclusively.

As currently outlined, the FREP program falls very short of setting such a context. It says there's been a recent shift in peace issues, from nuclear testing to economic conversion, the draft, and American interventionism. It observes that the peace movement has declined; FREP's diagnosis is that the peace movement so far has failed to organize new constituencies around these new issues. Its present program is one for organizing around these new issues. Booth and Gitlin have hopes that this organizing activity will be successful, and create a renewed peace movement. But their FREP program contains very serious built-in limits. Even if their program is fully successful on all fronts, it will have made only a tokenist approach to the international problems of war and peace.

The Limits of FREP: (1) International Relations

On foreign policy questions, American citizens ask certain questions that we are required to have answers for. They want to know how the national security is to be protected. They want to know what leadership there is for them to rely upon except the President, the State Department, the Defense Department. They want to be shown where the alternative policies are, and where the alternative leadership is, that could handle this country's foreign policy problems any better (can't p. 27)

THE UNEMPLOYED

The following is a correspondence between Dick Flacks and Rennie Davis on programs for organizing the unemployed. Rennie Davis is director of the Economic Research and Action Project and Dick Flacks is an assistant professor at the University of Chicago who worked on the Chicago ERAP project (JOIN) last summer.

Dear Rennie:

I think most of us are agreed that the central problem in organizing the unemployed is the development of a continuing program of activity for JOIN (Jobs Or Income Now) groups--a program whose relevance is obvious to the participants, which can potentially recruit new members and which can have some political significance. Some people are already despairing that such a program can be developed given the nature of the unemployment problem and the kinds of people who are recruited to JOIN. The time for such despair has not yet arrived, in my view. I think we may be confronted by a chance for a breakthrough. I refer, specifically, to a new bill introduced by Senator Clark on October 1 and supported by Senators Nelson and Morse. This bill, summarized by I. F. Stone's Weekly of 10-17-64, represents an attempt to revive the spirit of the Full Employment Bill of 1946. The heart of it appears to be the writing into law of the responsibility of the Federal Government to maintain unemployment levels below 4 per cent until 1968 and below 3 per cent thereafter. The bill would require the Administration to submit Full Employment Budgets to Congress with fiscal and monetary provisions aimed at maintaining unemployment at the stated levels. It should be evident that: (a) this goes beyond merely ad hoc public works and tax cut measures; (b) this institutionalizes the notion of national planning to ensure full employ-

ment, with the responsibility for approving such plans resting with Congress rather than Federal bureaucracies. The bill, according to Stone, goes beyond the measures proposed by Clark's subcommittee, and as far as I can tell is one of the more radical economic measures to be recently proposed by left-liberals. According to Stone, this bill could become the focus for left opposition to the Administration within the Congress. It definitely does deviate from the Administration emphasis on private enterprise, education and token appropriations as the means to fight unemployment. And it clearly asserts that existing national policies are a cause of unemployment.

For these reasons, I think this legislation may be worthy of support. But more than this, it offers the opportunity for continuous, relevant programs for JOIN groups. Such a program could be built around delegations to Congressmen and Senators, community education focused on support for this Clark bill, visits to newspapers and to other "opinion leaders" urging the support for this legislation, etc. More than this, it may provide the occasion for a genuine alliance between unemployed organizations and labor unions--with unemployed groups urging labor unions to help back the legislation and labor unions at last seeing the need for grass-roots organization of the unemployed in order to build support for the legislation. Finally, along this line, it seems to me that this would be a good basis for national ERAP fund-raising and joint pro-gramming with the labor movement.

The ideas embodied in the Clark proposal are fairly complex, but if they can be gotten across to people, it seems to me that the possibility for national debate and grass roots organization of the issue of jobs, automation and national planning will be there.

I would like to see some discussion of this proposal in the Newsletter and in the next ERAP meeting. In the meantime, I will try to obtain copies of the Clark Bill and supporting materials; I would urge others interested in the issue to do the same.

Dick Flacks

Dear Dick:

Your proposal that JOIN projects develop a campaign for the Clark legislation doesn't, it seems to me, resolve the more fundamental organizing problems faced by the Chicago, Cleveland and Baltimore staffs. We built the JOIN projects on two critical notions: (1) that the economy increasingly would fail to provide jobs--due to job-eliminating technological advances in production; upward population trends; foreign competition; and a steady weakening of post-war consumer demands; and (2) that a program for full employment was a "radical" program--because it tied the issues together and required fundamental political and economic change for its implementation. (To demand full employment was also to demand major narrowing of income gaps, redistribution of power in the society, and public programs which could meet the enormous social needs in schools, housing, etc.)

There is no question that unemployment, particularly among the structurally unemployed with whom we work in Cleveland, Chicago and to a lesser extent in Baltimore, is acute. The

boom period we are in, however, does raise new questions for our earlier analysis. The resiliency of the American economy seems greater than we expected. Unemployment is lessening. And there is little indication that we can build a movement of unemployed, at least among whites, in our JOIN projects during the current period.

However, the even more critical and immediate problem faced by JOIN in my opinion is inadequate program rather than shortages of constituents. While the lines around the unemployment compensation offices have been substantially reduced, we continue to find many people who have little hope for a steady job in their lifetime. These people are potentially radical and could become involved in a social movement. Our failure has been to provide them with the kinds of experiences which would commit them to a program for basic economic change and full participation in a movement for that program.

Thus far, our activity has centered around petition campaigns, rallies, apple selling, leafleting, signing unemployed up for membership in JOIN (mostly in Baltimore), and small group discussions. All of these activities are important to building an organization, but are not conducive to serious political education. There are few lessons that can be drawn from them and there is no sense of victory (or loss) following the activity which is likely to directly challenge the unemployed to accept new responsibility for developing a program and an organization.

Your proposal comes close to the kinds of programs needed in JOIN, except in one respect--it has no tactic which would demand a response from established powers. There is nothing in it that cannot be ignored. The project, it seems to me, does not readily lend itself to such tactics, because the principal target is distant Washington.

(cont. p. 34)

CHAPTER REPORTS

SDS is growing on the campus this year in many ways. There are more chapters now (31) than ever before, in more states (19, from Mass to California and Washington, and from Minnesota to Texas), and with more members. More important than figures is the fact that chapters which last year simply existed are now active--both on the campus and in the community--in action and education in fields such as civil rights, peace, university reform, community organization, and foreign policy.

Out of this activity comes many problems and many ideas, all of which should be shared. The chapter reports that follow touch on some problems and also show the diversity of the chapters and their programs. Of special interest are: education programs, both internal (See SPAC and Chicago) and external, relations with student government, the campus in general, the administration, other groups on the campus, the faculty (SPAC), ERAP-PREP projects, the labor movement (Duke); ideas for speakers and debates; university reform experiences and ideas (VOICE, Texas, article by Shelley Blum on p. 2); problems of leadership, use of resources, types of political activity (Harvard, Reed, NY area, Texas) and ideas for research (Duke). Also to be noted are the student employees union at Michigan, the North Carolina labor project, and the University of Texas solution to financial problems--beer parties.

BERKELEY

By Mike Bancroft (FSM report compiled by the NO)

Nothing dramatically new has happened on the Berkeley campus in the aftermath of the free speech demonstrations. A committee was originally set up by the administration in an undemocratic manner to negotiate a final settlement. That unilaterally and undemocratically established committee was reconstituted October 15. There will now be 6 representatives from each group: faculty, administration, and students; and 4 of the 6 student representatives will be chosen by the Free Speech Movement. The committee will hold hearings for no longer than 3 weeks, after which it will make recommendations. The FSM was optimistic about having their demands met. But the optimism did not last long and has now changed to pessimism. Students and faculty appear to be in basic agreement that there should be freedom of speech on the

Berkeley campus but the administration has still not accepted this position. And recommendations of the committee must have the concurrence of all three groups involved. The eight suspended students will be tried by the Academic Senate (faculty) and will be defended by the ACLU, which marks a return to due process. There has also been a good deal of red-baiting. One San Francisco paper showed a picture of a student demonstrator with a book on Marxism (used in a course). A printed newsletter is now available from Berkeley--the Free Speech Movement Newsletter. Write FSM, Box 809, Berkeley 1, Calif.

The response by SDS chapters to the call for student protest in support of the Berkeley students was very good, although we still don't have complete reports.

Many chapters sent telegrams and petitions--some had demonstrations, stressing local grievances at their university in addition to the Berkeley situation.

CHAPTERS . . .

SDS activity in Berkeley is not confined to the free speech controversy. Some members are working with the Welfare Rights Organization (WRO) which is an interracial group of residents of Alameda County who are attempting to secure the rights of welfare recipients in Alameda County and at present is well on the way to making the Alameda County Welfare Department abide by state welfare law. This is quite an accomplishment, considering that Alameda County (which contains Oakland and Berkeley) is ruled by a "non-partisan" clique of businessmen and incumbent politicians, the foremost member of which is William Knowland.

One tactic the Welfare Dept. has used is a blanket referral of unemployed men to farm labor and immediate suspension of Aid to Dependent Children, without waiting to see if full time employment has been achieved and without adequate screening for physical ability. For inexperienced workers, farm labor pays \$3-\$4 a day minus travel expenses, with the man leaving at 4:30 a.m. and getting back at 8:00 p.m.

The WRO has helped push through and win over a hundred appeals. However, these take 4-6 months, without money. The WRO felt that there had been enough stalling and presented the Welfare Department with an ultimatum on settling six specific cases. They refused and a sit-in at the Dept. building was begun on Friday, September 4. They decided not to make any arrests, but rather lock the doors and let us out any time we wanted, but no one and nothing was to be allowed in. At that time there were 20 people inside. That evening, 200 sympathetic demonstrators came over after picketing the Oakland Tribune, and 17 of them snuck in with bedding and three shopping bags of food. The group was composed half of WRO people includ-

ing two pregnant welfare recipients and half students, mostly from CORE. We sat-in for 88 hours until the building was opened on Tuesday morning. The fact that we refused to be starved out gave the WRO more publicity than arrests would have. In negotiations on Tuesday, the County Welfare Department gave in on four of the cases.

The sit-in also accomplished getting the ear of the State Department of Social Welfare, which has great power over the counties. We met with the head of the State Department, who agreed the County Department wasn't acting within the regulations, and that he would take our complaints into consideration in making new regulations. Furthermore, the appeal procedure has been speeded up and there has been direct intervention in cases we bring to the state's attention.

The WRO now faces the problem of growing in the welfare community, which is difficult to reach. It consists of a few hard-working middle class whites and the rest present or former welfare recipients, mostly Negro or Mexican, with few organizational skills. Berkeley SDS is helping to provide the volunteer manpower to fulfill the WRO's day-to-day purposes. Recently, Berkeley SDS recruited students to help with the casework at the WRO office, interviewing people and helping them through the hostile bureaucratic maze of the Welfare Dept. A training session was held to acquaint these volunteers with the problems and regulations involved.

An effective technique of fighting the atrocities committed in Alameda County has been bringing them to the attention of the well-meaning state officials. SDS will help by interviewing people who come to the WRO and presenting their cases to the state officials. The state may hold hearings about the welfare situation in Alameda County. For this, we would try to get a massive turnout, which would require block canvassing to

CHAPTERS . . .

explain the WRO and people's interest in coming to and speaking out at the hearings. SDS is also very active in the WRO's publicity committee.

BOSTON UNIV.

By Dave Felder

During orientation week the BUSDS distributed over 2,000 leaflets publicizing Noel Day's speaking at BU. Noel Day was introduced as an SDS member and among the topics he discussed was SDS which he said is sometimes considered irrelevant but which proves to be relevant over the course of time. Seventy people joined the BUSDS as a result of this meeting.

The Students for a Democratic Society is now well-known on campus. We sponsored jointly with the Young Democrats a Citizens for Johnson-Humphery organization at B.U. and also set up an Anti-Goldwater Committee.

The BUSDS anti-Goldwater committee passed out 1,000 flyers publicizing the anti-Goldwater Vigil at Fenway Park. About forty members of the BUSDS conducted a separate Vigil at the entrance an hour before Boston Committee on Political Extremism (CAPE) arrived. Our SDS line grew to 140 people and we then joined onto the CAPE line as they passed us. It was quite impressive.

The BUSDS has enjoyed excellent publicity from the BU News--in fact, the publicity has been too good. They said that the entire CAPE Vigil of 2500 people was an SDS affair.

Members of the BUSDS have been working for Noel Day and Raymond T. McNally-- a FAX (Political Action for Peace) candidate running as Democrat in the town of Brookline. Many of our mem-

bers are in the civil rights co-ordinating committee at BU and we will be joining with them to publicize James Farmer's talk at M.I.T.

For the future we will have a discussion group. On November 18 we hope to have Professor Howard Zinn speaking on "The Civil Rights Movement." On December 3, we will discuss university reform, elect new officers, and plan our post election program in more detail.

CARLETON

By George Brosi

At Carleton the most active student group is Action Party which has existed as a liberal-radical political party (in the tradition of VOICE, SLATE and SPAC) since early 1961. Although Action Party is not affiliated with SDS, we expect to have a chapter of SDS by the time of the December National Council. So far this year our activities have been centered on campus programing, making the curriculum relevant, and spreading "the word."

Nine hundred of our 1300 students have signed up for an Action sponsored "sacrifice meal" for the benefit of SNCC which will be held on October 30.

Our most time-consuming job has been running candidates for the Carleton Student Association Senate. The campaign resulted in a major effort to sell the idea of discussing "off-campus" issues and to encourage working with other student governments to pressure college and University administrations (including our own) to allow student control over social policy and student participation in all major college decisions.

In response to the idea of Phil Raup of the University of Minnesota SDS, already about half a dozen Action Party members

CHAPTERS . . .

have expressed a desire to work together in a state-wide, interdisciplinary, student-faculty effort to study Minnesota's poverty problems and draft effective legislation which we hope will be introduced in the state legislature. Because we are seeking academic credit for this work, it will have implications for curriculum reform as well as a realistic "war on poverty" and a co-ordinated state-wide student movement.

Action Party has depended heavily this year on a fantastic group of sophs, three of whom were senate candidates. Meanwhile upperclassmen in the group have concentrated on spreading "the word." Larry Seigle has spoken about his summer trip to Cuba. The three Mississippi Summer Project Alumnae have talked to numerous campus groups and to many organizations in nearby communities. Our ERAP alumnus, George Brosi (who worked in the Ann Arbor Office), has been building potential SDS chapters at St. Olaf's, St. Teresa's, St. Mary's, Winona State, Macalester, and Augsburg, and is preparing for future visits to other "nearby" campuses. The very first Carleton student convocation on the 27th featured Pan Parker, George Brosi, and Bob Traer discussing curriculum reform from the perspective of students who spent the summer on social action projects.

Clearly we have been weak on programing and allocated tremendous energy to proselitizing and integrating curricular experience with extra-curricular action. This is the first year that these areas have received our attention, so this emphasis is probably healthy. However, we have some really good original ideas for programing which you will hear about when we implement them.

CHICAGO

By Lee Webb

We are off to a great start. In the city of Chicago, there is a great vacuum of left activity and thinking. Although many of the old left adult and student organizations are active, they are not on the wave length of the new political developments and possibilities in the city.

The University of Chicago chapter of SDS is small but all are experienced members from other SDS chapters, and committed people, and there is a tremendous possibility for growth. Their initial program will be oriented around JOIN, that is helping out with staff, fund raising, research, etc. Not only will there be an attempt to get kids interested in going off campus to get involved in organizing the unemployed, but also will such methods as leafleting large Soc. Sci. lectures, hoping to get numbers of kids involved by writing relevant term papers on issues that JOIN is interested in.

At Roosevelt the Committee for Student Action (CSA--the radical student group on campus) at this writing is campaigning for the student government, hoping to come up with an absolute majority of the student government seats. The Roosevelt Torch gave excellent coverage, based on SDS reports, to the Berkeley demonstrations and protest, and the Roosevelt Student Government passed a resolution protesting the stand of Clark Kerr, President of University of California.

Also, CSA was very active in setting up the anti-Goldwater demonstration that SDS people held on October 16 in front of the Conrad Hilton (where Barry was speaking). The demonstration, initially planned by Chicago SANE, was picked up by Chicago SDS, and with minimal effort got about 125 people out. About 3000 leaflets were

CHAPTERS...

distributed, and people from over 10 campuses showed up. We got good radio and television coverage, but poor press coverage. I had a number of radio interviews, as did other of the participants; and we were on all the nightly television news shows, and in all publicity that we got, SDS was mentioned explicitly. An excellent beginning for SDS student activity on the Chicago area.

As there are a large number of SDS members and prospective members not attached to a university, we felt it important to set up an at-large SDS chapter. The main group of people who will be in it are JOIN staff members, staff from the Young Christian Students, American Friends Service Committee, Turn Towards Peace, Packinghouse Workers, and I am certain there are going to be more. The meeting is being held as I write the report, so a definite account of their program is difficult to predict. However, earlier sentiment was that the chapter's program be primarily educational for its members. As many of them are active in other organizations full time, there is certainly a need for substantive intellectual discussion and evaluation. The model is similar to the famous Robb Burlage discussion group in Boston. Someone in that chapter had suggested that the meetings be open to the public and be called a Chicago New Left Forum.

A week from tonight will be the first meeting of the Chicago New Left Study Group. There is certainly a definite need for more ideological discussion about America, its future, its movements. The first meeting will be primarily a discussion of what this New Left Study Group should study and discuss. Read the next Bulletin to find out what they decided. Also, at the meeting Bob Ross will lead a discussion of The Distribution of Power

and Wealth in America.

Further on the regional level. We are planning on making extensive use of conferences. An organizing committee for conferences is meeting this Friday evening. At present it looks as if we will have a major SDS conference on STUDENTS AND THE OTHER AMERICA some time in the middle of January. It will be for the entire Midwest region. Also, there is considerable sentiment for a local Chicago conference or day-long seminar on community organizing.

CORNELL

By Arlene Eisen

Enthusiastic social and political concern sort of fluctuates at Cornell. About every two years a new group is formed, launches an ambitious program and eventually dissipates. I hope that the new SDS chapter here will break this tradition.

We have outlined a program tentatively for this year. There will be a series of seminars conducted by socialist oriented professors. One is entitled, "Can the two party system possibly accommodate itself to significant social change?" The second will be concerned with a study of foreign affairs based on a regional analysis from which we will try to construct some policy abstracts. These seminars and possibly several forums, debates and lectures will serve the educational function.

We have already circulated and sent petitions off to Berkeley, sold "Part of the way with IBJ" buttons and sponsored several speakers.

We may also try some community organization on Ithaca housing in the ghetto. But this will require a great deal of planning and effort since Ithacans are rather burdened by a history of abortive

CHAPTERS . . .

student attempts at do-goodism. We'll probably also take up some campus campaigns on liberalization of women's regulations, etc.

GRINNELL

By Marion Meyer

So far, our activities have been primarily in the area of voter registration in Grinnell and Des Moines. We are also in the process of investigating the pay scale for the maids and janitors here. This Saturday we are going into Des Moines to investigate reports that there is a section of town with a population of 5000 which has neither electricity nor indoor plumbing. We are working closely with the Young Democrats group here at Grinnell College, and with the United Christian Campus Fellowship at Drake in our voter registration drive. We have been in touch with Des Moines CORE and AFSC. We are attempting to work with (and actually get on the road) an all Iowa Colleges Human Rights and Peace Congress. Last year one was begun which met here and flopped miserably. This year we hope to keep in better touch with one another and coordinate efforts to bring speakers such as Jesse Gray and Mike Harrington, and performers such as Guy Carawan and Dick Gregory. Next week we are beginning our faculty discussion dinners (invite interested faculty and 8 students--all that can fit at a table--to dinner to discuss relevant matters). Next week it is an Economics professor and we are discussing the Triple Revolution.

Come to the
SDS NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING
Dec. 28-31 New York

HARVARD

By John Mendeloff

A chapter now exists here, but not all the people in it know why. Following various pre-season planning sessions and the leafletting of the university registration, an organizational meeting attracted about 90 people.

At the meeting they were told about SDS, ERAP, FREP, and the tentative chapter program. Unfortunately, questions about SDS's ideology elicited very confusing answers from the people running the meeting; the supposed consensus of the planning sessions proved shaky at best.

Before the school year had begun, SDS groups had worked with the Massachusetts Freedom Movement to bring out 1200 people, mostly students, to a silent vigil around Fenway Park and Barry Goldwater. Much less successful have been the efforts to set the Noel Day campaign spinning to November 3 with enough force to make post-electoral action a natural rather than an artificial consequence. No more than 100 Harvard students have worked in the Day campaign; for most of these, the commitment never moved very far from the heart to the head. Noel's speech on campus was greeted by a standing ovation from the 400 students who filled Emerson D to hear him; 75 work-cards were filled out by people who hadn't signed anything before; 50 were contacted; 15 or 20 eventually did some work. We in Boston will have a good deal to say about the Day campaign, but will let it wait until after the election.

In the meantime, 2 days after our organizational meeting, about 25 people gathered to discuss the prospects for community organization work in Cambridge. 15 of them had previously surveyed for a

CHAPTERS . . .

campaign-supported action center in Dorchester; the 75 minute ride to and from the center forced the revival of some members' plans for working in Cambridge. Half of the people at that meeting had not been active on the Harvard political scene before; that night they listened to a very exciting discussion of what community organization was and how we should go about it. This meeting was followed by 3 more and by surveying in Cambridge, all of which led us to the decision that we really shouldn't work in Cambridge after all.

Community organization is not impossible in Cambridge; organization around misery is; an organization already exists in the Negro community; in many lower-middle class areas where ethnic ties are strong and yards well-kept, we have been told that we should work in the west part of the city with the parents who let their children roam around Harvard Square all evening; only discomfited groups like the Portuguese-speaking population seem insecure in the neighborhood. Nonetheless, issues like urban renewal, the seemingly irresistible expansion of Harvard and MIT, and the neighborhood-ravishing inner-belt highway are major concerns to the inhabitants of eastern Cambridge. We may still work on these issues in the future, but, for now, we decided that work at the Dudley Street action center in an integrated area of Boston would be more profitable.

Financed, at the moment, by the Day campaign and provided with a paid staff of one, the center sits on what the Italian gang calls the last white corner in the area; they also say they aim to keep it that way. In the last 10 years the influx of Negroes and flight of more affluent whites to the suburbs has transformed a stable middle-

class district into a lower-middle class mixture in flux. Negroes compose perhaps a quarter of its population now. The 1960 census presents the statistics as follows: average income \$4800; unemployment (male) 7.2%; average educational level of those over 25 years old-10 years; 65% of the housing deteriorating or delapidated. The houses are old, but the owner occupied 2 family dwellings are still nice. Other streets, mostly Negro, look like an expanse of badly tended teeth: empty, rotten, burned out shells and large vacant lots with ugly holes dominate the bleak landscape. Having the city tear down the burned-out houses and help the residents to turn the de facto junkyards into playgrounds has appealed to everyone in the neighborhood; on one block a rent strike seems feasible; on another a resident Italian cop told us to get the hell out of the neighborhood. We are really still only surveying and researching, although block meetings are being tentatively proposed. Like all community organization, this is an experiment.

Back on campus, 2 seminars, one on the 1964 election and the other on the MFDP and independent political action (with Harold Zim) attracted 25 and 35 people respectively. They should grow (I think we are building a base for them), but their ultimate success depends upon our ability to structure them into a more meaningful educational experience; considerable work should go into them and something concrete should emerge, a paper perhaps or a plan of action in a certain field.

In the inter-campus sphere, plans for an anti-Goldwater march and rally on the Boston Commons originated here and has spread quickly; speakers will be Mark De Wolfe Howe, James Breden of the Mass. Freedom Movement, Joseph Salerno, Int'l V.P. of Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and Richard Cotten, President of the Harvard Crimson. Aimed primarily at students, the march should

CHAPTERS...

bring together a few thousand.

The simple question is how to create the most effective chapter. On a large, fragmented campus mere communication can become a major obstacle to organization. So far, the organization has concentrated on bringing a fairly small group of people into fairly close contact with SDS. Some people think that on a large campus, radical control of the S.G. would provide the platform we need to stir the campus; others, considering the scorn which its impotency invites, feel that infiltration would make us something of a joke. The debate will continue and should become more relevant.

LOUISVILLE

By Bruce Westbrook

This is sort of an informal report between business meetings as to what has been happening here. About 250 people signed our mailing list at registration, and about 35 signed the "work against Goldwater list." This latter list we sent to COPE, which will type it up and send us copies, thus saving us some clerical work.

On Thursday, Sept. 24, we had a night meeting at which we showed the film "The Extremists" which AFL-CIO furnished. Since our communications on campus remains as of now, chronically inefficient, we weren't able to reach everyone who might have wanted to come. It appears that mail, expensive though it is, is the only efficient way to contact large numbers of people on campus. We're still working on the money angle. The "Extremists" pamphlet has caused a minor stir on campus.

Future plans right now: Distributing literature when Gene Snyder speaks on campus tomorrow. Big seminar under auspices of History Club.

We have made up a leaflet from "Goldwater A-Z" using his more militant statements. It's entitled "Barry and the Bomb." Literature we've received has been appreciated.

The Michael Harrington meeting was a very good success. He spoke to a capacity crowd of 200-plus, this despite the fact that the meeting was at 11 A.M. while many classes were being held. The audience was overwhelmingly sympathetic and impressed by him. Many graduate students and faculty members attended.

Three members picketed and leafleted in front of Goldwater headquarters downtown during lunch hour. In less than a half hour 450 copies of "Barry and the Bomb" were distributed. This disturbed the Goldwater people very much, and they came out and started distributing their own literature along side us, crying out "Goldwater Against Communism!" Incidentally, the Goldwater headquarters has been having several daily showings of "Operation Abolition" to show "U.S. Communists at work." Also we are working with Carol Stevens of the SDS at-large chapter in establishing a day-care center for the local Tobacco Workers Union.

A note on the political atmosphere: The IBJ people seem to have a slight edge here, but it's amazing the number of people openly advocating invasion now of Red China. At the State Fair the Goldwater people had 3 booths plus a Birch booth passing out some of the same stuff. The YD's have started to move, they're a bit shy of us since we passed out ADA lit at registration.

CHAPTERS...

U. OF MICHIGAN

The following are two excerpts from the VOICE newsletter, "The Campus Voice."

STUDENT

EMPLOYEES' UNION

On Wednesday night, October 7, 1964, the University of Michigan Student Employees' Union (UMSEU) was given official recognition by the Student Government Council. It is the aim of this Union to work for better student wages and working conditions.

The main short range objective of the Union shall be to raise the minimum wage at the University to \$1.25 and from there, raise the wage in all of Ann Arbor, to this minimum. The long range goal, however, shall be to raise wages to an adequate level and to improve working conditions.

It is likely that the Union will bargain with the University for higher wages, finding that the University will not yield to the Union's full demands. Wages will probably be raised by an insignificant amount to attract people to vacant jobs, and the Union will find that some form of strong action will be necessary. This may be in the form of a slow down, selective walk off, or a work boycott. Of course the action taken by the Union will be limited by what the working members are willing to try against the University. If they are highly dissatisfied, a long, or more probably, a short strike may take place. The Union, however, will try to solve all problems through negotiation. It is predictable, however, that the need for one or more of the above actions will be necessary before the Union demands will be met.

The fight for University Reform (i.e., student participation in decision making

at the University) is a part of the same struggle which the Employees' Union is waging against the University. Both struggles are against the University's attempt to arbitrarily determine what the student must accept while he is at Michigan. As Kenneth Winter put it, in a recent Daily editorial dealing with Student Government, the University's terms are "that the student must agree to a 'package deal', he must accept all the regulations, policies, procedures and standards of evaluation the University chooses to impose or get nothing at all. The individual has essentially no power to change the bargain item by item." The Union is attempting to strike out at this University policy. If it can break the acceptance of this policy by the students, then the path is open for students to bargain with the University in terms of student participation in determination of curriculum, general administration, and self-government.

STUDENT ACTION LEAGUE

By Richard Horevitz

The most exciting event to hit this campus in years has been the formation of the Student Action League (SAL) out of the VOICE campus committee. In the week since Barry Bluestone and I spoke at the VOICE speaker rally on the Diag in support of the Berkeley students and to demand university reform at the University of Michigan, the University has begun to perceive and react to the potential in student action. For the first time in years, students have stood up for the rights which are slowly being withdrawn from them.

There has been a profound yet subtle change occurring in the atmosphere of the university, and now this change has begun to arouse the student body. This change has been the decline of the university as a concerned, educational environment.

CHAPTERS . . .

This situation has arisen either through an explicit decision by university administrators or by default, the result of no decision. At any rate, the university has allowed itself to become merely an institution that provides the physical equipment for student education--and that inadequately--and not a rich, nourishing society. This statement has grave implications. In effect, the administration is giving higher priority to the running of its corporate institution than to the process of education. It means the administrators believe education consists of "book learning" and not through living and participating in the cultural environment of an academic society.

The phenomenon of the bureaucratization of American universities has been sufficiently discussed, and so I will address myself to the problem of philosophy. Lack of space prevents me from great elaboration on the subject, but I think it is important to outline the problems that face us.

Tuesday, October 13, 25 student leaders met with President Hatcher to discuss the grievances articulated at the speaker rally. At this meeting, President Hatcher made it clear to us that the problems of the university are no concern of the students. He said that the university is like the family. One doesn't make demands on his parents. Students, he implies, are like children, who can have no say in the direction of their lives. Since only trained administrators know what is good for their "children", students should adhere to the narrow roles into which they are being directed. He is saying it is too bad that good teachers are leaving, that there is not enough study space, that dorms and classrooms are overcrowded, that our political rights are abused. But it is not for

us to demand change; we must wait. After all, we do not understand the "complexities of the situation." Even more important, he is saying that there is no role in the educative process for students, other than the role of an "intellectual receptacle."

If this is true, then we must look upon our years in the university as years in a sterilized "Skinner box", where education becomes merely a response to a negative paternalism. I do not believe education is "fact-gathering". I believe it is living in a society that promotes the values of culture, that responds to the needs of its members, that gives us a share in the making of decisions. The University of Michigan is not such a society; perhaps no American university is. But we are being thrust in just the opposite direction. Our education is being dehumanized, and we have progressively less control over it.

This concept of the university as such a society is, I believe, the philosophic core of SAL and of SDS's philosophy of education. This is what we are fighting for, and is a step beyond the immediate alleviation of our grievances about the physical plant of the university.

MIT

From Boston Area Coordinating Committee minutes

SDS activity at MIT is presently merged with that of the Scientists and Engineers for Johnson and Humphrey. After the election they will begin organizing a Scientists and Engineers for a Democratic Society, affiliated with SDS. They hope to bring a series of speakers on arms control and disarmament. The Scientists and Engineers sponsored a rally and panel discussion at Cambridge Latin High concerned with disarmament and extremism.

CHAPTERS...

NEW YORK AREA

By Robert Jaffe (CCNY)

New York City students have started a campaign in order to preserve the 117 year tradition of free tuition for the City Universities. This effort involves a non-partisan political campaign to inform voters in certain districts that their assemblyman voted against this ideal. All the assemblymen we are fighting have voted against discharge of a bill which would guarantee free tuition. This means that by reducing state aid, the Governor could force the City to impose tuition charges and relieve Albany of financial difficulties brought about through poor fiscal policies.

On Saturday, October 17, over 200 students met at the Baruch School (CCNY), to begin the drive in two Manhattan districts. After a speech by Joel Cooper, coordinator of the campaign, block captains took their groups out for the start of the door-to-door campaign. The students went to housing projects, shopping centers and street corners, talking to people and distributing literature. There were also sound trucks patrolling the areas.

On successive Saturdays there were rallies at Brooklyn and Queens Colleges. During the week small groups of students (10-40 daily), were sent out in a more concentrated effort in the same areas.

It is difficult to tell now what the effect of our campaign will be. We are hoping to defeat at least two or three assemblymen this year and put enough pressure on the others to possibly affect their opinions. This is a strictly non-partisan student drive which could be effected in other

areas with a similar problem.

NYU

By John Roberts (NYU)

There are two levels of involvement of SDS people at NYU Uptown. The first is in the chapter itself and also as part of the Heights Freedom Movement of which the SDS chapter is sort of a caucus. SDS qua SDS has done very little yet there are rumblings. For one, we will be announcing ourselves to the campus in a few days via a letter to the editor refuting his do-nothing attitude. We will also be bringing a large contingent to the SDS NO open house and hope that our chapter membership will at least double (from 5 to 10) in the next few days.

The rate of growth of the Heights Freedom Movement on the other hand has been phenomenal. The first thing to be noted is that the total enrollment of our campus (geographically separate from most of NYU) is 2,500. Our mailing list is now about 250. Of this number from 80-100 are active on a week-to-week basis: 17 tutoring in Harlem, 30-50 tutoring in local churches and in our own project, 10 in a committee which acts as liaison with SNCC, and from 2-5 people in an arts (film) committee, bi-weekly bulletin, fraternity investigation group, anti-attendance regulation committee, and general administration.

Within a week of our first general meeting we had our first action project which was a voter registration drive in the South Bronx. About 23 people took part in this. After that we settled down to committees and tutoring. There has been a lack of creative thinking where action projects are concerned and although there is work being done on a more permanent working arrangement between us and some groups in the S. Bronx,

CHAPTERS . . .

it will probably not gell for a couple of months. In the meantime we have no other thing to fill in. We feel that a project is necessary to serve as a starting education into some of the workings of society so as to broaden perspectives. The tutoring that we do usually does not do this for it often involves practically all the tutor's free time and can be a limiting experience. There is the possibility that our own tutoring project may turn to more general issues, but the other tutoring programs are not structured this way.

One area of particular neglect has been the campus. In our zeal to get whatever projects we have gotten going there has been no attempt to reach those not sympathetic already or on the borderline and apathetic. The campus is well aware of our activity--there is hardly a day that there is not a newspaper article announcing or reporting one of our events. Yet few people really know our concerns or program who are not already involved. Due to a grant we have received from the Sociology Department we will be having a film program, but we have as yet devoted no time organizing a lecture series, seminar group, or literature table. I think very often we spend too much time getting people to go off campus when at least a good portion of our work ought to be on campus.

There are two areas of campus work in which we are involved. The first is around a fraternity issue. There is one frat on campus that has made an issue of flying a confederate flag. We have become involved in making an issue of this. So far it has been a matter of negotiation of sorts, but by the time this is printed there will probably have been pickets, resolutions, and words from the administration.

The issue itself is not that important but we hope to make a broad attack on some of the fraternities on campus which we are pretty sure are restrictive and think that this is a start.

The other area of campus involvement is an attempt to change attendance regulations which limit the amount of cuts. So far this has been a very quiet underground affair that has much interest but steadily declining activity. It may be brought up in regard to our students who will be in Mississippi for a week to work on the Freedom Ballot and will become quickly over-cut, but I don't think an issue will be made of it.

We hope to work some of the bugs out of our program and develop some idea of what we are heading toward at a retreat to be held in two weeks. Logistical problems will limit the number of people to officers mainly and we hope to have an intensive set of discussions. We have not begun work on planning for it yet and fear that it will flop if we don't do some soon. One thing is clear already, not everyone is in agreement about ideology and program. This is not necessarily bad. What it does do is raise the question of whether or not to become more homogenous in outlook and perhaps lose some members or to remain non-committal and umbrella-ish. I think that it is this basic question that accounts for the fact that the Heights Freedom Movement has not become an SDS chapter. Among those who know SDS there are some who would not join and I suspect that there are many others who will feel the same when they are introduced to SDS. One thing which would help, again, would be a more intensive education program both internally and on campus, but no one has taken the time to organize something like that yet.

We would like to throw out one question for discussion: what does a group such as ours do when the faculty and adminis-

CHAPTERS . . .

tration are far friendlier than the student government who, by all rights, should be our closest allies?

NORTH CAROLINA

By Shelley Blum (DUKE)

I am going to attempt to describe the North Carolina Student-Labor Committee project as I see it. The theory behind the project is a total campus program to involve all kinds of students in the process of making labor unions a political force. Perhaps this can better be seen as building the second leg of the liberal coalition, a left looking labor organization. The basic thought behind the problem is that unions have a list of somewhat class conscious people which can serve as a skeletal precinct organization. Both labor and the civil rights groups can cooperate to turn the rascals out since both stand to gain from the creation of jobs, the which only a liberal congress can do.

Peter Brandon, organizer of the project, has a four-point program to: organize unions, politicize unions, do basic N.D. research in politics and economics, and publish a labor newspaper. Here is how they seem to be working out in practice, as opposed to the theory behind them.

The poultry industry is a very large one in N.C. and one with 1900 working conditions. Pete's union (Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO, of which he is an international rep.) has jurisdiction over the food industry. It has some food processing plants and some retail (A&P type) outlets organized in the state. There are several ripe targets available including: strengthening a Raleigh processing plant, organizing a

1,000 man bargaining unit in Durham in a poultry plant, beginning in virgin territory in Chatham County by organizing two poultry plants in the two major cities in the county. Now, there are two students from UNC attached to the Raleigh locals. Contacts have been made in Chatham County by UNC students. A workshop will be held to train North Carolina College, UNC and Duke students to work in Durham. These are all politically sensitive areas and one with great potential for the creation of liberal climates. The Raleigh case is one of a local that is willing to go into politics on a large scale, and is a large bargaining unit. The students attached to it are to bring speakers, liven union meeting, strengthen the steward system; all of which can be done by the use of outside perspective.

Other general points begin with the fact that the food industry is one which extends into every county in the state. The union is one with a good left tradition, stemming from the packing houses in Chicago and the fur and leather workers. The industry is in general integrated although many shops are not. It is not one of the traditional southern industries (lumber, furniture, textiles) with a paternalist union hating tradition. All in all it looks like it can be taken.

The other two points of the proposal deal with the less exciting but rather important functions of research and propaganda. There is a great dearth of political information about N.C. We don't know who is who in the various counties, nor do we know what their voting history is. Some of this is easy to collect and some quite impossible. Similarly, economic data is scarce. We hope to interest research minded people to do this kind of work for their term papers, etc. It is an old pitch but we have the new wrinkle of being able to call on union information sources in Washington and local workers for pertinence

information. Further, the students in UNC plan to put out a newspaper which will go to the members of local 525 of the Butcher Workmen..., the North Carolina local. It probably will provide the first trustworthy news of the union, and of the world for that matter, that has ever been printed in N.C. Its first issue should come out shortly after October 25 when the newly organized A&P unit in Raleigh signs its first contract.

If I end on a rather flat note, it is because I am not attempting to forecast as fact what I would like to happen. The program is being tried and it has every hope of expansion. It also was started only months ago and we just don't know what is going to happen. In closing, I can only say that we are going to meet a lot of people with a big stake in liberal legislation and a renovation of society. It is pretty easy to imagine how to cybernate the retail and processing ends of the food business. If we had to go out and canvass the streets to find these people, it would take years. Looking at it from this point of view, we can't lose. And if we win, North Carolina might have some maverick congressmen attracting national attention in another few years.

REED

By Jeremy Brecher

As in past years, we face a situation here at Reed where "the potential we have helped create is too large to be captured completely by a still relatively small self-conscious radical community." As a result, we have faced the problem here of the special role of SDS among a multitude of miscellaneous activities.

of members has been focused in the program of other organizations:

- Students for Racial Equality, our excellent civil rights group which sent 14 students to Mississippi last summer, has established a freedom school for Negro high school kids in Portland, teaching Negro history, accounts of the civil rights movement, Negro literature in America, etc. The program has been set up with the cooperation of teachers in the Negro district high school and Negro organizations. So far the program is off to a small but excellent start. I will try to get a full report of how the program was organized, what problems were faced, etc. for the next Bulletin.

- S.R.E. is also engaged in extensive fund-raising, both on campus and in the adult community, for SNCC. A good part of the student body makes regular small weekly contributions to a fund designed to match the money raised by the movement in two towns in Mississippi.

- A tutorial for high school students and illiterate adults is continuing this year to involve over a hundred students. Headed by an SDS member, it is now being run by an independent group which grew out of S.R.E., and cooperates with other tutorial programs being run at Portland State College and Lewis and Clark.

- S.R.E., in cooperation with the League of Women Voters and other organizations ran a massive voter registration drive in Albina, the Negro section of Portland. According to the Urban League, 90% of Portland Negroes eligible to vote are registered.

- Over 100 students demonstrated against Goldwater on his visit to Portland, with signs and a leaflet which pointed out vote by vote his opposition to the test ban treaty, medicare, civil rights bill, etc.

CHAPTERS . . .

- Focus, a long-defunct campus organization, briefly reserected itself to demonstrate as "ultra-leftwingers for Goldwater." They apparently persuaded one little-old-lady-in-tennis-shoes that if Marxist-Leninists could support Goldwater, maybe she shouldn't.

- The Reed Young Democrats have regularly supplied dozens of students to do precinct work and voter registration with the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party itself has done little or nothing in the campaign.

- An ad hoc group sponsored a demonstration on campus in support of students at Berkeley in which about 100 students participated.

- About 60 students demonstrated for protection for civil rights workers in Mississippi, sponsored by S.R.E.

Aside from being actively involved in all of the above activities, SDS has developed some, although not nearly enough program for itself:

- A group of us picketed with the local U.A.W. during the General Motors strike. We were received very warmly, and were impressed by the degree of sophistication with regards to strike strategy, politics, etc. on the part of the rank and file guys we talked to.

- We did a certain amount of precinct work in a working-class white neighborhood in which there is absolutely no Democratic Party structure. Our objective was to organize anti-Goldwater committees of those who were interested in working against him. Even with the little work we did, we found a few people who were interested in working in some such committee, and who might have been potential members for some sort of continuing community-based political organization. Unfortunately,

we have not been able to follow through on the project as a result of other time demands.

Our major need right now is for an issue which will capture the imagination of students, and which will allow us to move into the community on a basis of real effectiveness. So far we have not found one. However, two new developments should put us in a much better position to utilize whatever programs we do develop. First, we now have excellent contacts within the state's "liberal establishment" which should prove useful in raising funds and in getting things done. Second, as a result of Mike Harrington's trip to Portland, we now have excellent contacts at the two other major campuses in Portland, Lewis and Clark and Portland State College, where we may soon develop SDS groups, and which will in any case make any kind of city-wide action much more effective.

SIMMONS

By Jenny Green

SDS considers the involvement of college students in the social and political issues of the day important to the progress of our society. In accordance with this concern, Simmons SDS proposes to work on several levels.

A primary objective is bringing awareness to the campus of the major problems confronting our society. This will be done by publicizing issues as well as presenting educational programs. The representative of minority platforms in the Simmons mock election and the presentation of student speakers who worked in Mississippi this past summer are examples of SDS educational projects.

SDS plans also to sponsor study groups, discussions and seminars. Participating students will meet with professors or

CHAPTERS...

specialists from Boston to discuss specific problems and to attempt to devise programs to meet these dilemmas.

Specific projects, requiring immediate student action will be supported by SDS. SDS members, for example, worked for Noel Day, independent candidate for Congress in Boston.

Simmons is also working with the Boston FREP project, headed by Dr. James Morey, PhD of Harvard University, which intends to deal with the problems of converting the Watertown Arsenal and the Chelsea Naval Shipyard into businesses functional in a peace time economy. FREP plans to sponsor polls in various areas to gather information regarding the effects of conversion.

SWARTHMORE

By Nick Egleson

SPAC, which is the Swarthmore associate of SDS, continues to be active in a wide range of areas.

ERAP PROJECTS: Approximately twelve people are working extensively in the Chester ERAP project. They spend most of their time organizing blocks. Teams are working in the Negro wards, one team in a lower class white section. Five others are working with Bryn Mawr, and Haverford students on the Philadelphia project. Organizing a tenants council, 6 block organizations, and a high school JOIN group among other activities.

PEACE: Twenty-five people attended the first meeting of a peace group. The group is not formally connected to SDS or SPAC, but it has many of the concerns we consider highly important. Several reports on possible projects for the group are currently being written.

The projects include:

1) Attempts to form a peace constituency at a nearby Vertol plant, which is busily producing helicopters, many of them to be used in the dirty little war.

2) Pressing for the conversion of the Philadelphia Naval Yard. The yard employs approximately 12,000 men. Rumors suggest it will close sometime after the election. The city, it is also rumored, is looking for a way out of its clearly untenable position that the yard must remain open in naval service. It is open to suggestions on Conversion.

3) Organizing the area's many university and graduate school students who are eligible for the draft.

4) Some form of activity oriented toward the US position on South Africa. Philadelphia is the largest foreign goods port on the eastern seaboard, and carries on extensive trade with the U of SA.

RESEARCH: This newly formed committee is now thoroughly researching the War on Poverty and the Urban Renewal programs in the city of Chester. The committee is also working with the Economics and Political Science Departments so that term paper topics will fill the research needs of the Chester and Philadelphia projects.

FACULTY: Efforts are underway to involve faculty members and residents in the academic community in the SDS program and debate. To date the three possibilities for faculty participation are: 1) Help in special projects. Faculty members with specific fields of interest can help students on research or work jointly with them. 2) Faculty members, perhaps in regular meetings, can take part in the key theoretical debates confronting SDS. The first step will be acquaintance with the basic documents (ANE, etc.) 3) Fund Raising. Enough said. Several professors have expressed a keen

CHAPTERS...

interest but many of them feel they don't have time to participate to a degree which would be worthwhile, either for them or the organization. We need suggestions on what faculty members can do.

SEMINARS: SPAC is sponsoring two discussion groups. The periodical seminar meets one hour a week during an unused class hour. Each week the discussion focuses on a number of recent articles on a topic chosen at the previous meeting. Recent topics and articles include:

The civil rights movement: Current issues of Studies on the Left and Dissent.

Worker control: The New Left Review, Nos. 25 and 10; Yugoslav review; Bell, End of Ideology-the chapter on Work.

The second weekly meeting is meant to parallel the college's economics 1-2 course, which, although supposedly a study of economic indicators and analytic tools, concentrates on a description and a eulogy of economics in the USA. Alternate title: Capitalism 1-2.

OTHER CAMPUSES: In cooperation with Haverford students who have worked on ERAP projects, activity in Philadelphia project and around the issue of peace is being encouraged. A news sheet, the Two Penny Press, edited at Haverford, is being distributed on both campuses. It is hoped that the sheet will eventually reach many campuses in the area.

A group of students at the U of Penn is setting up a community project in an area of Philadelphia known as Mantua. The University is reportedly interested in acquiring large sections of the area for the expansion of its campus. The project will probably work around the

issue of housing. We have helped with advice on survey techniques and survey forms.

In addition, we are supplying food and clothing for the Chester and Philadelphia projects. SPAC is helping friends of SNCC collect a voluntary poll tax on election day.

PROBLEMS: The change from large summer staff to small permanent staff in the Chester and Philadelphia projects led in both cases to some confusion about strategy and long range goals. Activity slowed during this period. In consequence weekly SPAC meetings deteriorated, because tactical and strategic discussions of Chester activity had been the main substance for the discussion. The problem has disappeared to some extent in recent weeks, and the meetings have improved.

The existence of strong 'old leadership' also had its adverse effects, particularly at the start of the semester. The tendency toward cliqueishness and away from spreading responsibility to more and more people has at least in part been countered.

A third problem has arisen from the wide dispersment of resources obvious from the foregoing summary. Last year meetings were more than long enough. Now that there are 2 main issues (Chester and Philadelphia) and in some ways three (Peace) the problem of coherent meetings is confounded.

Another major problem is the theoretical debate on how to react to the forces of co-optation, such as the War on Poverty program for Chester.

U OF TEXAS

By Gary Thiber

Since its inception only last spring the

CHAPTERS...

University of Texas chapter of SDS has been rapidly gaining momentum. We are now pretty well known about campus and are by far the most active student political group. The trend appears to be one which will continue.

One of the main drawing cards at registration was a cultural-tutorial program among students at the local Negro high school (an excellent Southern case of de facto segregation). A good bit of excitement is felt about this program and its possibilities. It should prove to be one of the highlights of the year.

We have had several programs this fall. At the first, Robert Pardun and Judy Schiffer (both local SDS members) and Bob Stone discussed their experiences in the C.O.F.O. summer project in Mississippi. Pertinent in light of the recent demands of the United Auto Workers was the talk given by Donald Petesch, faculty member and former assemblyline worker, on the dehumanization of workers in modern mass production industries where man is merely an appendage of a machine rather than the opposite. The most recent program was a debate on Vietnam with the right-wing Young Americans for Freedom. In the future we are going to challenge the Young Democrats to debate.

The SDS beer party has become something of a tradition around campus. Offering "all the beer you can drink for a dollar" has consistently made profits when the brew is purchased by the keg. In addition to filling the coffers, the parties tend to breed comradeship among the members and offer an excellent environment for converting new people to the cause.

The situation in Mississippi, and specifically McComb, has been the cause

of much action lately. SNCC was requesting former volunteers to conduct some sort of local action which would bring pressure to bear on the administration to initiate federal action in Southwest Mississippi and protect Negroes from further acts of terrorism. Since President Johnson was at his ranch about fifty miles from here at the time, a small group of students picketed him on the road near his house. The Secret Service would not allow anyone to get out of a car directly in front of the house. This action gained a small news release on the national wire services and a sizeable article in the local press. In response to the SNCC request, SDS published a report on McComb and sponsored a petition on campus which was signed by 1200 students demanding that federal marshalls with powers of arrest be sent to McComb. Copies were mailed to Lyndon Johnson and acting Attorney General Katzenbach.

Last year U.T.'s progressive regents wiped away the last vestiges of segregation--housing and athletics--and proudly proclaimed the university as the first fully-integrated major Southern institution. However, scandal was unearthed recently when SDS member Rick Robbins was strolling through the basement of the Student Health Center and stopped to ponder two rest-rooms standing side-by-side labeled, "Men Employees." In answer to his query a nurse blandly informed him that one was white and the other colored "because this is the South." Struck by the crusading spirit, Rick launched an attack with a visit to the chancellor and a letter to the student newspaper. Promptly dubbed Restroom Investigator extraordinary, Rick has also discovered a White Only rest-room in the supposedly integrated state capitol. A suggested slogan for this minor mopping-up campaign has been, "Let my people go."

Several SDS members are presently in-

CHAPTERS . . .

volved in the Ralph Yarborough campaign. Ralph is the only liberal southern senator extant and is now running neck and neck with his reactionary Republican opponent, George Bush. The senator is also the prime support of the Democratic Coalition, a liberal sub-group of the Democratic Party which hopes to gain control of the state party. We're holding our breath at present.

As for the future, various plans are being thrashed around. Definitely on the agenda is opposition to the proposed tuition increase. All students will oppose this, but SDS will also put forth a positive program--abolition of all tuition. While arguing for this, we also will expose the regressive tax policies presently followed by the state.

TUFTS

By Dave Smith

The fundamental nature of the radical-left movement at Tufts has yet to be clearly defined. Last year our activity was centered around three single issues, and the activity (on paper) was in the hands of several front groups.

It is my feeling that these activities were valuable then as an initial movement but that this year, as a core group that will grow and gain more influence, we must now become a structured consistantly active group.

Just how this can be done has yet to be determined. The situation poses several questions that we must deal with immediately.

1. Do we see ourselves as primarily a campus group organized to function as an educative and reforming element within the student body, or do we find

our role by working within the already structured extra-campus groups in the Boston area? In either case what precisely are our relationships to be with the Boston civil rights groups, especially NSM?

2. What do we do about SPAN? Does it become simply a front for SDS? Do we drop it entirely? Do we use it as a student political party and run candidates in the Spring elections?

3. Do we legitimize SDS on campus by applying for a charter?

4. Does SDS have a role it should play in the tutorial program either in the recruitment of tutors or working in the office?

5. To date the student movement at Tufts has been primarily in the field of civil rights. Do we continue to stay in this area or do we become multi-issued and start working on the areas of peace, economic reform, etc.?

PROGRAM SUGGESTIONS

There are several areas which deserve our immediate attention:

Noel Day's campaign. He needs people, wants SDS help. What can we do for him?

The Boston PREP project. Is there a role for part-time people in it this year? What types of research need to be done that we might be able to provide through papers for Ec., Sociology and Government courses?

The election. What is our role? Is on-campus anti-Goldwater activity important or do we belong in the community? Where do we stand on Johnson? Should we work with local COFE or the Democratic party or on our own? Does this issue provide us with an opportunity for taking on YAF?

Conscience activity. Can we use the

CHAPTERS...

national end-the-draft campaign as an initial forum for peace work here? What do we need from PREP, TTP, etc.

Campus education project. Can we at this time make a dent in the student body? Speakers, films, riots, etc? Would a full scale conference on poverty, the backlash be of use?

PREP PROGRAM...

pects for a peace-and-related-issues high school conference, and would appreciate information about similar possibilities for high school conferences elsewhere.

PREP suffers most from the sparsity of communication between campus people and Ann Arbor. We need your help to bring off the grand scheme outlined in Toward an Effective Peace Program on Campus. This is a short report precisely because people are not yet sharing that responsibility. Our confidence is not shaken, but our patience is getting slim. We want to get out and put our strategy to the real test of national action.

Please send comments, critiques, requests for speakers, etc. to us at 1100 E. Washington, Ann Arbor, Mich., 48104.

PREP CRITIQUE...

These are valid demands. We should take a closer look at the constructive thinking that has already been done to formulate the possible shape of a disarmed world. "Quis Custodiet: Controlling the Police in a Disarmed World" by Arthur Waskow, available from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; "A Demilitarized World (and how

to get there)" by Walter Millis, available from the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; "World Peace Through World Law" by Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn; are among the most recent or representative works. These studies try to show that America's national security can be protected without America retaining its armaments.

Now it is true that a disarmament agreement is not possible today. The Great Powers will still be building arms to protect their security as you read this paper. But it is important to understand the process of change to be used in converting the armed world of today into the disarmed world of the day after tomorrow. The process of international political change will require the work of mediators or creative middlemen who are independent from the political prejudices of the Great Powers. Their task is to find the thin strands of potential agreement among the great powers, and weave these strands together until they have a net of agreement strong enough to support an international police force, an international disarmament inspectorate, and international laws against violation of borders and against rearmament. Their task is to quiet the hot flames of political disagreement that keep tensions high in the Third World, in Vietnam, in the Straits of Formosa, in Germany. This difficult and sensitive job is going to be accomplished, not by disbelievers, but only by those who appreciate change and the processes of change. It will be accomplished only by those who can conceptualize a disarmed world coming into existence the day after tomorrow, and can use their conceptualization persuasively to lead nations together into agreement.

The disarmament agreement that will actually be achieved should be kept publicly distinct from the contrasting (and somewhat phony) disarmament treatie

PREP CRITIQUE

now being talked about by the United States and the Soviet Union. Lyndon Johnson talks a peace line, but his administration will be prevented by many of its basic political assumptions from ever actually leading the way on disarmament. Johnson might like to lead us to disarmament, for the greater glory of both the human race and the Democratic Party, but he won't be able to. There is American intransigence in Geneva as much as there is Soviet intransigence. But the fact that disarmament is not possible in today's world situation does not mean that there is not an opportunity for initiating the processes of change that will take us to disarmament. To fail to see and pick up this opportunity would be one of history's most negligent acts.

Yet SDS's approach to the questions of international relations does miss this opportunity and is negligent. The SDS position at present is represented by two documents, "America and the New Era" and "New Possibilities for Peace." Both of these papers do one job excellently. They identify the competing cold war coalitions in America, and succinctly summarize their different approaches to cold war foreign policy. ANE and "New Possibilities for Peace" also review the links between the political and economic interests of these coalitions, and how these interests are served by the cold war rhetoric and policies they espouse. Thus noble rhetoric about "America defending the Free World" is used to conceal baser motives.

However, while ANE and "New Possibilities for Peace" describe political coalitions in terms of their competition, these coalitions are actually united on an important set of underlying assumptions. They all assume that the national security must be protected. They assume that the Soviet Union and China must

always be seen as definite threats. And they all assume that the United States must retain the option to use military force. The political differences between coalitions are differences over how best to protect the national security of the United States. As far as they can see into the future, disarmament is not a realistic likelihood. No matter how heavily SDS attacks them, they will retain their public support undiminished until we can convince the public that it is possible to have the national security protected without arms. Until the public is convinced of this, furthermore, it is not likely to accept compromise settlements for current cold war conflict.

For the problems of international politics that exist today, disarmament actually is the only radical and peaceful answer. But SDS's analysis cannot deal with actual disarmament, because it has not yet begun to handle the root assumptions, that the national security must be protected with armaments. Simply failing to touch the root assumption is bad enough. But worse, there is a tendency to suggest it isn't even necessary to talk about it. For example, when such people as Donna Allen of Women's Strike for Peace, and Lee Webb or Dick Flacks of SDS prescribe a program of intensified political agitation to satisfy America's domestic needs, they have the temerity to suggest this agitation will force the United States to withdraw from the cold war. Donna Allen even says domestic agitation will bring about disarmament.

Much praise can be given to PREP's treatment of American interventionism, economic
(cont. p. 29)

now that the election is over -- read

JOHNSON WITH EYES OPEN
use literature order form-- p. 43

NEXT BULLETIN DEADLINE --- December 28

conversion, and the draft. Yet on each of these three issues, PREP program shares the same failure to deal with the cold war's root assumption, and the same failure to give the radical answer.

B. American Interventionism

PREP's approximate premise is that where the economic and military policies of the United States support conservatism and block needed social revolution, or where they help widen the gap between the haves and the have-nots, these policies may be classified as American interventionism, and opposed as such.

Of course, as far as the countries of the Third World are concerned, the largest problem is to lift themselves up from poverty. Social revolution is frequently a part of this process. Outside assistance frequently is also. For all of them, the aching need is faster economic development.

The major outside drag on their economic progress is not something simple, like American interventionism. It is bigger than that; it is the process of cold war between West and East, as it is being fought out in many Third World countries. An example: for Vietnam, the cold war outside has fed the civil war inside with arms, cash, and political encouragement. There have been two armed camps fighting each other in that country for the last twenty years. The devastation, the cost in lost lives and lost chance for progress, is incalculable. The same process of cold war, of military assistance, arms sales, and gun-running, is sowing the seeds for civil wars in many other countries. The results will be equally bloody, damaging, and tragic. Projecting ten years into the future these trends, plus the growing gap between population growth and food production, we get a glimpse of the 1970's in which many countries will be torn by revol-

utionary civil wars, and wracked by extensive famines.

American interventionism is not the sole culprit working against progress for the Third World; moreover, even a successful campaign of opposition against American interventionism would not be a sufficient answer to the needs of the underdeveloped countries. This is because those who argue for real revolutions to overthrow feudal oligarchies (and therefore oppose American intervention) are not in possession of the whole truth. There are many Americans who see another part of the truth, that the West's great wealth (its aid policies, tariff and quota practiced, educational resources) can be used much more potently than it has been until now to speed economic progress in underdeveloped countries. The different brands of American, Russian, and Chinese interventionism all produce corrupting effects on the Third World. Those neutrals who are politically and economically astute would like to have the cold war brought to an end, and would like to draw on the resources of both West and East so that they might weave a healthier future for their countries.

These are the wider dimensions SDS should be dealing with. PREP's desire to deal only with the domestic American components of complicated international problems has given us an approach that is too simplistic and limited.

(cont. p. 30)

come to the

DECEMBER NATIONAL COUNCIL MEETING

December 28-31

New York City

NEXT BULLETIN DEADLINE -- December 28

PREP CRITIQUE . . .

B. Economic Conversion.

Saying that "the defense budget provides neither job security nor international security," PREP advocates that SDS begin organizing new constituencies in communities where defense budget cuts have endangered job security. Question: what would provide job security, if not the defense budget? PREP's answer--the McGovern bill, which would establish a National Economic Conversion Commission to plan economic alternatives. Question: what would provide international security, if not the defense budget? PREP's answer--silence. "Toward an Effective Peace Program on Campus" does allude to the problem of international security with rhetorical gimmicks here and there, but nowhere with hard reasoning or real answers. SDS organizing around economic conversion problems can continue comfortably within the cold war framework of detente, and indeed it should. But the program as now set out could just as easily be handled by ERAP as by PREP.

C. The Draft.

During the earlier cold war periods of Dulles brinkmanship and Stalinism, it was almost impossible to attack the draft. Now that Kennedy and Khrushchev have rationalized and stabilized the cold war, and now that the baby boom promises to swamp military recruiters, it is much easier to attack the draft in public. Thus are we given a "new issue." But like PREP's other two issues, it is not one that deals directly with the problems of international peacemaking. It is only a domestic component of the larger cold war mechanisms that the world is bound up in.

D. A Neglected Issue - The Stall in Geneva.

In "Toward an Effective Peace Program on Campus" Todd Gitlin and Paul Booth suggest that discussion of peace and disarmament issues has gained new legitimacy

in America today. If you remember, it was not until 1962 that both the United States and the Soviet Union had put forward so-called comprehensive plans for general and complete disarmament and had begun to discuss them in Geneva. For the last two years, their discussion of disarmament has ostensibly been more earnest, if not yet more realistic. The day-to-day proceedings of these negotiations in detailed summary form are a part of the UN library and certainly available to any peace researcher from something that calls itself a peace research and education project.

Yet unfortunately there is no mention of the Geneva disarmament negotiations in the PREP program. There is no suggestion that the stall in Geneva could be made an issue for students today. There is no suggestion of building a new student constituency on this issue, although when it comes to American interventionism, PREP expresses itself as being willing to build a new constituency "from the ground up." It does not seem to me that this failure to mention Geneva reflects simply PREP's judgment of which constituencies are either easier or more important to build. It represents SDS's basic failure of analysis, basic failure to conceptualize disarmament, and inability to see the processes of change whereby today's world might be converted to a disarmed world.

Conclusion.

When History tells us about the conflicts which divide nations, and about the militaristic traditions which guide them, it is not telling us that it is impossible to achieve disarmament. It is only measuring for us the magnitude of the challenge we face. When current history tells us most students don't understand disarmament, and that most students accept President Johnson's guidance on foreign policy, it is not telling us that student

(cont. p. 33)

LETTERS

FROM VERNON GRIZZARD

There are two big issues that we at Swarthmore have recently been thinking about a lot: urban renewal and the War on Poverty. Most of our thinking is the result of our experiences on the RAP summer projects in Chester, Philadelphia, and Newark, and subsequent developments in those cities and others where there are ERAP projects.

Our questions about urban renewal stem from the remarkable similarity of programs for different cities. In all three cities where we have had experience, as well as in Chicago and New York, certain characteristics emerge: 1) the axe falls heavily on Negroes, with no relocation almost a certainty, in spite of Johnson-Poverty rhetoric; 2) what relocation is provided for is often by private investment, rather than public housing projects; 3) there is often a plan for renovating the downtown business area, which may have nothing to do with better city planning; 4) the city university often has a big stake in urban renewal, buying up areas in the center city area for expansion.

There are currently two views on urban renewal. One says that it is a good idea, and would basically benefit all the people in a city, but through misinformation and mismanagement (typical of big government without people's participation) the programs are consistently bungled. The other view is that urban renewal is a conspiracy and a swindle, benefitting primarily the financial and commercial interests of a city, and often the industrial interests, though the industrial interests are more likely to have a firm foothold in the local economy already. Urban renewal is the most significant outlet for financial capital in the country, thus supplanting imperialism in the Leninist model of national economy.

Which of the above views is more true is not known yet, and more information about urban renewal plans and who is behind them is, in our view, a very

pressing need. The economic and political implications of urban renewal cannot be minimized. "Negro removal" changes the political base within a city, and changes the economic base away from the drain on social services which many center city areas have become, back to a revenue base. Two students here (Nick Egleson and Larry Gordon) have received permission to do a year-long joint paper on the economics of urban renewal. They would welcome any source material suggestions people have, as well as people doing more work on this problem.

The other issue we are talking about a lot is that of the relationship which should and will exist between community grass-roots movements and the War on Poverty. No doubt Poverty people would like for community groups to identify very closely with the government, but our fundamental bias about where change will come from leads us to fear cooption. A neighborhood center has already been opened in Chester, so this is no abstract debate. Should a block organization near the community center become the community group which the Poverty people want to help run each of their centers? If so, how important is it that the block group maintain a separate identity from the Poverty people, feeling that "they" have given us something, and it's good, but seeking to maintain a fundamental we-they attitude? What will happen to people who assume positions of responsibility within the poverty program (helping to man a community center)? Will they be lost to the government, and begin to apologize for, rather than protest the inadequacies of a given program?

Should a community group fight for Poverty money itself, and seek to get involved in the administration of funds? This is a possibility in Philly, while most of the above questions pertain to Chester. In even more general terms: should we encourage people to work in the government program as VISTA's? If not (and I think my concern is evident) how effectively can we differentiate ourselves (cont. p. 32)

LETTERS . . .

from the government when we speak to the thousands of students who don't have even a passing impression of SDS? These are questions which those of us who will spend our summers organizing in northern cities, and are considering working for a few (or many) years after school will have to face as the government seeks to organize many of the same groups we are working with.

Vernon Grizzard

FROM TODD GITLIN

It's hard for me to speak with anything approaching Delphic wisdom about the shape and direction of the organization. I personally feel distinctly remote from what seem to be the mainsprings of organizational growth--the chapters and campus members. Thus I'll keep this letter short and leave it to others to strike responsive chords, if any.

I've been watching with dismay the difficulty VOICE (the U of Michigan SDS chapter) has had in establishing a membership educational program. Maybe we expect too much, but that is only consonant with our ideology. All the well-known factors of busy-ness, natural laziness, dislike of "formal" occasions, etc., have militated against the success of on-campus education programs. So has our lack of printed materials. Even if we succeed in getting our literature printed, there are limits to its effectiveness: students, bless them, don't like to read. We need, instead--or rather in addition--to conceive of devices to instill educational experiences into the membership of chapters and the campus at large. (Maybe the line between those two is more blurred than we've liked to think.) Last September's NC was reluctant to pay what I think would have been proper attention to so-called "structural"

means of rectifying the situation--institutes on ideology and the world (proposed previously by Jeremy Brecher of Reed and Rich Horevitz of the U of Michigan). Discussion of these proposals was mandated, and thus the imperative swept under the transcontinental rug. Certainly, then, the December NC should set sufficient time aside (prefaced by committee meetings) for discussion of educational institutes.

Another difficulty we are aware of in Ann Arbor is the time-honored one of being broke. Not since I've been in SDS has a National Council had a serious discussion of fund-raising; at Philadelphia in September, the subject was naturally squeezed into the tail-end of the agenda, and no real discussion was possible. If we like, we can continue to consider fund-raising a subject too undignified or "technical" to concern ourselves (I speak here of the NC) with, and we can run the attached risk of going under, which seems to be a real risk. On the other hand, there is virtue in the argument that fund-raising is a matter sufficiently technical to warrant extensive preparation before formal debate. Thus: I think the November ERAP-PREP-FEP meeting should also leave time for a committee on fund-raising to meet, and a committee should likewise meet during the December NC to bring up proposals during the last day. Committees, to be sure, can be surrogates for action, here as in Student Government. But there are ideas in the air--some discussed in Cleveland in July, some at Philadelphia--and I think the major problem is to implement them: entailing a discussion of staff allocation, ERAP project time, etc. Any better ideas?

Todd Gitlin

Come to the December NC in New York

FROM PAUL BOOTH

Speaking simply as a member of the organization, I feel the lack of an action program in the Third World area. Although PREP can't yet claim to have found a suitable site for a major conference on America's Role in the Underdeveloped World, I feel that additional time to the Third World area should be divided between preparing for a major conference and evolving a national action program. Tentatively, I would recommend that it be anti-Apartheid action, differing from those planned by the National Student Association and the Consultative Committee on South Africa by its clear focus at U.S. Big Business interests in the Union of South Africa. For example, research could easily uncover the names of the major corporations involved in South Africa, their Directors and those addresses, the banks which back American investment there, the law firms for the investing corporations, and a long list of addresses of individuals and offices which locate our fellow-citizens who underwrite apartheid. Demonstrations directed at these companies and individuals, and perhaps direct action against the banks, would be a dramatic undertaking and would make just the point that we are trying to make about where in the U.S. the crucial decisions are made. And, because of the general attention to the anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre, we could really cash in on some public attention.

Paul Booth

PREP CRITIQUE . . .

attitudes cannot be converted. Nor have we the right to conclude that the recent decline of the peace movement means it is impossible in the bland climate of detente for PREP to build the kind of dynamic peace group with a membership

that will thrive. I think we are being told that a long-range program, based soundly on a clear idea of our goals and methods, has a good chance of succeeding, but that more limited programs are likely to fail.

PREP's "Toward an Effective Peace Program on Campus" is guilty of succumbing to the liberal illusion that work for next-step gains is the most important place to put our energies. PREP's most obvious guiding value right now is nothing more than political agitation, and the creation of dissonance, because PREP wants to unsettle something called the cold war consensus in America. But as Steve Max once wrote, we ought to have an idea of where we want to go and how we want to get there. This means PREP should rise above agitation for agitation's sake. It should think in terms of goals and methods (or in the equivalent terms of policy, strategy, and tactics). PREP, operating now without goals or without policy, doesn't have sound criteria by which it can select possible strategies and tactics.

If PREP's program is not improved, if we in SDS stay blind to the opportunity for international political change that is before us, and if we fail to initiate a radical and peace-making campaign for disarmament, history will not absolve us.

SPORTS

ERAP TRAPPED

At the Cleveland Executive Committee meetings, PREP and FEP combined to defeat ERAP in a regulation length, full-court basketball game, 42-38. Starring for the FEPREPPERS was a Swarthmore-Harvard squad composed of Booth, Grizzard, Gordon, Gitlin, and Rothstein. The ERAPISTS were made up of Rennie "Chicken" Davis, Bundy, Magidoff, McEldowney, and Fein.

PAY YOUR DUES ----- NCW !

UNEMPLOYED . . .

What are the essentials for a short-term program for JOIN? I think a program is needed which will have the possibility of a significant limited victory; which will involve people in tasks which can readily be seen as critical to victory; which will force some group or individual to grant or deny victory; which will involve people in experiences which develop a new understanding of the society which denies them opportunities and rights; and which will open possibilities for more insurgent activity in the future. Among organized tenants, a rent strike can be an example of a program which meets these criteria.

There is only one example of such a program which has grown out of JOIN, and that one had major problems. The Chicago effort to combat hiring practices and other corruption in day-labor agencies potentially combined the experiences needed for a good short-term political program for the unemployed. Reform in the spot labor groups was feasible and the people involved faced real power which they could learn about and combat through organization and action.

The difficulties which were encountered however, suggested the need for several experienced organizers who could work from the "inside." We also realized that any strike of the men would be extremely vulnerable to strike-breakers, particularly from the winos who are pleased with an occasional \$7 a day. Finally, we saw that it would be enormously difficult to pressure the city to take over the hiring agency (the critical demand) while, at the same time, conduct an effective strike at the hiring site. Our one experience in Chicago, remember, in calling a meeting of people to oppose a spot labor group produced two

JOIN members, two private detectives, and an official of the hiring agency.

The Cleveland U-JOIN has recently undertaken a less ambitious project related to reform of day hiring agencies. It involves its membership in letter writing to state representatives, publicity work and pressure on the AFL-CIO to organize the men who are exploited by the agency. It doesn't, however, lend itself to the kinds of experiences I have suggested as critical to building a radical movement.

I don't have any easy answers to the problems which I think JOIN faces in each of the three cities (Philadelphia, by the way, has pretty nearly dropped its U-JOIN for block work on community problems and organizing in a housing project.) We need to find programs comparable to a rent strike for unemployed. JOIN needs to decide how to organize for limited goals which actually matter in a man's life, but which are more political and educational than the goal of self-help.

I can offer a few examples of the type of programming I would like to see tried in JOIN, though I think (hope) better ones can be created.

One notion that I have is to implement our idea (in a modest way) of building pressure for programs which would fill unmet social needs in a community and thereby put people to useful work. Pressures could be created by a number of tactics: (1) a street could be blocked off and repaired by JOIN members. After the repairs were made, JOIN would hold a demonstration at city hall to present the bill to the mayor; (2) JOIN could fix up an apartment where it had previously been active in developing organization. Tenants would then hold rent to pay for materials and labor; (3) an abandoned house (always a good issue) which had been condemned by the city could be torn down by JOIN for a recreational

area. JOIN would protest with whatever methods possible if the city tried to interfere with the "community decision."

Activity such as this is highly visible, but difficult to organize. Such a program, I think, would raise important questions about private property, the responsibility of the city to provide jobs, and the right of people to shape conditions in their immediate lives.

Another type of programming might center on the Administration's War on Poverty. JOIN could build community support for a program developed and run by community people and oppose any city effort which failed to include the interests of the community or was based on private gain. Parts of the adopted legislation commit the government rhetorically to worthwhile programs. For example, the bill provides loans to build cooperative enterprises and to construct low-rent housing units (Title IV). It also has money for labor and materials to beautify neighborhoods (Title I) and funds for anti-poverty agencies (i.e., JOIN) who hire indigenous leaders onto their staffs (Title III). I could see the possibility of utilizing the rhetoric of the poverty program to write our own program and then put pressure on the local poverty corporation to accept it. Were we working in an area where the government was planning an anti-poverty drive, such pressures could prove extremely embarrassing and effective against the local administrators and could provide important radicalizing experiences for the JOIN and active community people.

A third type of programming for JOIN could be developed around the welfare and social service system. In Cleve-

land, welfare mothers have shown that recipients of these programs can be mobilized against inhuman and inefficient administrative practices and will press for more comprehensive coverage. There is no question but that a meaningful confrontation between the individual who has been made wholly dependent on a service system and the system itself can be created through organization. During the summer, Chicago JOIN had a grievance committee established to get better service out of the unemployment compensation office. The shortcoming of this committee, it seemed to me, was that it was run by the staff members and didn't train JOIN members to take responsibility for anyone who had a complaint about the unemployment compensation office. The JOIN grievance committee should be re-established and the notion of JOIN groups which are active in the community for an improved and more humane welfare system should be experimented with concretely.

These suggestions represent a new conception for JOIN projects. I think that our experience increasingly shows that JOIN must recruit beyond the ranks of the unemployed and there is experience to suggest that initially the organization is likely to be more viable in a community than a city-wide context. Certainly, the types of programs I'm thinking of would require an expanded constituency and a community organization.

However, I do not see JOIN abandoning its basic concern for full employment. JOIN committees should take up legislation which seeks to re-establish the notion of government responsibility for job creation--the basis of the 1946 Employment Act. (Though the Clark bill should not give support to a 4% unemployment rate. Even English Parliament gets aroused if unemployment creeps up to 3 per cent). Also, JOIN recruitment should concentrate on the unemployed. And its major educational programs and activity should be

(cont. p. 36)

UNEMPLOYED...

geared to the problems of joblessness. JOIN must not, however, limit itself to the narrow conception of program thus far developed.

Rennie Davis

PEP...

ERAP handles community organization, it will be the function of PEP to keep the organization informed on the activities of the Liberals in Washington and on legislative matters that relate to our interests (such as the Clark Full Employment Bill). PEP will keep tabs on the legislative work of the AFL-CIO and will find ways in which students can tie into some of the drives that Labor will be undertaking in this area.

PEP will work on the local level too, with an eye to the primary elections two years hence and local elections next year. It will gather information and assist students who are interested in working in such campaigns as relate to the concerns of the organization as a whole. PEP will come to the December NC with proposals for two or three political projects, probably in the border states.

In the coming month PEP staff should be doing two things. One is finding new sources of funds for the PEP program; the other is to collect and publish a series of papers on the experiences of students in various aspects of the campaign, hopefully including material on the Freedom Democratic Clubs in Ill. and the Day campaign in Mass.

By the time Congress reconvenes, PEP should have an idea of some of the major anti-Poverty legislation that will be offered and will then attempt to have some specific pieces of legislation evaluated by professionals in economics, city planning, etc. This information

will be made available to the membership of SDS along with suggestions for the support of worthwhile legislation.

In the early Spring PEP will start to look at city and county primaries and general elections, in order to locate areas where students might work during the summer, either as part of projects which PEP could organize, or as part of ERAP projects.

PEP will publish (if funds are available) a newsletter on its activities and will, as soon as the reference material from this election is published, continue to offer a consulting service which gives birdseye views of the political history and economic situation in specific congressional districts and smaller political unit.

PEP intends to cooperate with the Coalition for a New Congress in doing detailed survey work on the Congressional District level, an activity in which students can participate.

ELECTIONS...

Two major structural gains are possible in the new Congress. If sufficient pressure is applied by the civil rights movement and its allies, the actual changes made in Southern political life can be registered in the power configuration of Congress by the breaking of Dixiecrat power. If opposition from the Right is sufficiently feeble and pressure from the left sufficiently strong and well-aimed, it may be possible to build a grouping of liberal congressmen to the left of the Administration and shift the focus of political conflict from the Administration vs. the Right to the Administration vs. the Left.

Such gains will not be possible, however, unless major social movements bring their pressure to bear effectively and strategically. Both lobbying and educa-

ELECTIONS . . .

tional programs must be carried on systematically, with more imaginative techniques like those used in the Civil Rights Bill fight of last year employed when necessary. It will also require hard political fighting of the kind used in the fight to strengthen the Administration's Civil Rights Bill in committee last year. For this, real political muscle is required.

Such pressures must start now, before the Congress opens, if decisions of strategy for the coming session are to be affected by it. At a number of points SDS people and groups can play a strategic role.

(1) So far the Full Employment Bill, submitted by Sen. Clark at the end of the last session of Congress, has received little attention in liberal, labor, and civil rights circles, primarily because it has been ignored by the press. I. F. Stone has suggested that the bill, which provides for national economic planning for full employment, can become the center for Left opposition to the Administration. We must now begin to lay the foundations for local coalitions of labor, civil rights, liberals, and the constituency of the poor behind the bill. SDS people throughout the country should approach whatever contacts they have in the labor movement, the liberal community, and the various civil rights groups in their area, give them copies of the bill, and do whatever possible to lay the groundwork for later political action around it. In addition, all Senators and Congressmen should be written for information and their stands on the bill. Many of them probably know nothing about it as yet; a few letters of inquiry at this point would make them do their homework.

(2) The decision of liberal Congressmen

to try to drum Southerners who supported Goldwater out of the Democratic Party must be given some political support. Many Congressmen have a feeling that nobody "back home" watches what they do in intra-party matters in Washington. The civil rights movement and its allies should make it very clear to them that somebody back home is watching them.

(3) A third area of focus should be the related issues of conversion and military budget cuts. Perhaps the best strategy here would be to attack the military budget in the same way Wayne Morse went after the foreign aid bill last session-- with a well-sharpened razor blade.

(Morse went into the Senate with over 200 amendments designed to cut \$100,000 here and half-a-million there, and succeeded in putting together a coalition of anti-interventionist liberals and budget-cutting conservatives which actually cut most of the military expenditures out of the foreign aid bill.) Johnson will probably come into Congress with slight reductions in the military budget; he should be forced to justify every penny spent; in fact, Congress should go on a budget-cutting spree, with some good healthy competition to save the tax-payer's dollar.

(4) Finally, it is important to create an anti-interventionist bloc in Congress. With the national discrediting of the trigger-happy Right, it should be possible to put great pressures on the Administration to institute a real good-neighbor policy throughout the world. While it is doubtful that Johnson would or could completely reverse the policy of making America an international cop, strong congressional pressures of the kind Morse and Greuning have presented on Viet Nam, but coming with much wider congressional support, will force the Administration to think twice every time it considers hanging its clothes on that hickory limb and going for a skinny dip.

(cont. p. 41)

UNIVERSITY REFORM...

the constitution and to submit to a totalitarian regime. There is no reason why there could not be democracy at this school. This is an outline of the sort of basic analysis that should be done in order to underlie our stands in this area. We should fight the idea that the brightest people in our society need the most supervision, that they are not competent to function without deans to supervise their activities. We must fight the idea that going to a university is a privilege and not a necessity in our culture. Once again we must firmly state that a democratic university is possible.

What actually do we want to change at Duke? Can we actually hope to do anything? After we produce a fundamental analysis of the type of place we would like to be at, we can offer several areas in which students could begin to make their presence felt, the object being co-government of the school, along with the faculty. These are the areas with which we should concern ourselves: curriculum reform, free speech and action, money grubbing, in loco parentis, and grievance procedures.

I would state as an ideal that students should share in the formation of curriculum requirements. To a great extent, the faculty is the natural leader in this area, in that they should be responsible for the professional competence of the graduate. This is clearly seen in the case of the engineering school where the student depends on his having the right courses to get a job. But there is usually little curriculum reform to keep up with the passing of years. Ideally, each year, there should be a battle in each course; the students challenging and

evaluating ideas and determining their relevance to the new age. In practice there is no controversy since the courses are academic in the worst sense, they have little meaning to the student and little relevance to the world outside the university. We should examine the whole Duke curriculum and offer amendments from the students' point of view. I can suggest better freshmen courses, and more free choice--also less research and more teaching. The aim should be a functioning student-faculty committee on curriculum reform.

I think that at the university a student should not be denied the rights of free speech and action. There is an undercover tendency to limit the rights of free speech when the speaker begins to criticize the university, in other words, when he begins to be significant. We don't have the problem they have at Chapel Hill, a speaker ban law, but there is very little controversy on this campus. I would suggest that unless you are prepared to appeal to the faculty for support that you not criticize faculty housing leases and that you be careful in your choice of speakers. We are working for the right of students to hold and disseminate all kinds of political and social views, on and off campus, and the university's support and encouragement of this right.

I would suggest that some parts of the university are run as money machines and that this situation is based on a false premise. The university is short of funds, and students are treated as monetary assets, figures in a ledger and not individuals. Somehow these two things are linked together. A university should not be run like American Tobacco, and a robber baron should not be a university's patron saint. If anything this attitude intensifies the fund raising problem since they will never get adequate funds from the alumni they added and subtracted as students. Our goal should be student participation

in the Duke University stores and in the cafeteria. The policy should be to give students the best cut they can and the logic here says that they should be non profit making. The University should get its money somewhere else.

It is true that most of my points could be subsumed in a ferocious blast against in loco parentis. Most families are not run democratically, and neither are universities. The attitude that determines the fact that students are excluded from decisions is the one that says that our parents delivered us over to the university for care and supervision and that we are not capable. Neither was the less than 20 shilling freeholder capable of voting. But in particular, girls should be able to decide on hours, to leave school for weekends without special permission, to drink if they want--Why go on? They should be able to conduct their lives as any girl of 19, working in a cotton mill, conducts hers. Paternalism is debilitating and you can't learn to build sky scrapers from playing with mud pies. There should be a student-faculty committee to regulate student affairs, with an eye to building self-reliance on the part of students.

Lastly, there should be a defined grievance procedure. We should have an unbiased source of appeal and advice. What do you do if a professor disagrees with your politics and lowers your grade? What can a generation of students do about an unfair or incapable professor? Further, how does a student make himself heard if he has criticism of his dorm, his walks, his food--you name it. Democracy would mean that students would share in reviewing plans for dorms, for example, and be able to fulfill a historic role of the student as innovator. Is it out of the question that students in a university dorm

have apartments? That coed dorms be established? The principle is that where students are concerned, students should be able to make their opinions known and to have them have weight, directly.

What I have sketched should demand a little work, the work of students: thinking, analysis, reason. We should derive a mature criticism of the university and perhaps append a student bill of rights. This is a firm basis for action in detail. Individual gripes, the kind you and I have plenty of, should be systematically organized under major headings of wrongs. My system is one, but it could easily be replaced. With a criticism and a list of grievances we should be able to find allies in the faculty. They are as much concerned as we. They want to have closer contact with students, they want reality in courses as much as we do. I don't think they want sleepy conformity and acceptance of the past as the guide for the future. Maybe I speak as an idealistic future college instructor; I hope not.

A coalition is possible on the campus as well as in the community. In both places the coalition could produce democratic reforms and in both places it is made up of the excluded groups in society with many things in common. Perhaps in a new university, students might not have to leave school to find themselves, might not be driven into apathy by concentration on trivia, might be able to serve the society in their traditional role of critic. Perhaps then the university might not produce ticky tacky props for the status quo. Perhaps then the society itself might be changed.

SDS

needs staff

Use application Blank enclosed with this Bulletin.

DECEMBER N.C. . . .

our community action program and ask where it is that we go from here. During the year sharp practical and theoretical questions have arisen out of the experience itself. For example, still unresolved are basic questions of approach such as city-wide membership organization vs. block and community organization, organization around critical national economic problems (e.g., unemployment) vs. neighborhood for family issues (e.g., playgrounds, building codes), and electoral political action vs. direct or economic action. And there is the problem of fitting the community action program into the overall program of the organization, and the question of allocation of organizational resources.

The creation of the Political Education Project as the separate political action arm of the organization has also created a whole new set of debates. To what extent should SDS members involve themselves in Democratic reform activities? How do we see emerging community unions as functioning in American politics? Is coalition politics feasible without an independent base of power? And to what extent has the basic program of SDS become a political program?

There will probably also be some re-evaluation of the Peace Research and Education Project. For example, there are now second thoughts about the viability of the draft as a campus issue. On the other hand, there will probably be discussion of expanding HREP's community action program on the issue of reconverting the defense economy.

The December NC is also the principal meeting for evaluating the campus program. This is true both because of the large chapter representation and because we are in the midst of the school year.

Again the issue of a more directed and coordinated campus program will come up--and along with it the related discussion of allocating more of the organization's staff and money to the campus program and campus organizing. Of particular importance will be the reports of the chapters and suggestions from the chapter delegates on how the national organization might better serve their needs and interests. For example, there have been suggestions for an SDS leadership training institute, for increased regional organization, for more campus travelers and speakers, for a unified student campaign on the campus to raise basic economic questions, for a student march on Washington for full-employment, etc. The question keeps recurring: does SDS have a campus program? If so, what is it? And how does it serve to build the organization and the movement?

Another question is the literature program. Should SDS publish an expensive, slick paper journal? How do we communicate our program to the student? How do we communicate our program to the liberal and labor community? Is SDS devoting enough of its time to critical analysis and publication? If so, what new papers do we have to show for it? What new promotional material is needed?

Finally, there are administrative questions. With the real and perceivable shift of SDS's base off of the East coast and across the country to form a truly national organization, the question of moving the National Office out of New York City has been raised. There is also the related question of unifying the ERAP and HREP offices with National Office, so that the organization does not become schizoid at the top. Always open to review are structures of the national projects and the allocation of financial resources.

Now is the time for chapters to begin

DECEMBER N.C.

thinking about these problems, and others which will arise between now and December. It should be born in mind that the National Council is "the major policy-making and program body of the organization." The chapter delegates constitute the vast majority of the National Council, there being only 17 at-large members. Every chapter should be represented. Before schools let out for Christmas vacation, it is imperative that each chapter elect its delegates and alternates, and notification of their election be sent to the National Office. Chapters with 25 or less members get one delegate, larger chapters get two.

It should finally be remembered that the NC is open to all interested students, and all SDS members are encouraged to attend. Notification of time, place, and agenda will be mailed to the chapters in early December. At-large members can get this information by writing or phoning the National Office.

P.S. December NC's traditionally end on New Year's Eve. And you know what that means.

ELECTIONS . . .

Let me add a few longer-range thoughts on national political strategy.

- As Telford Taylor points out in Grand Inquest, it is one of the tragedies of the McCarthy era that American liberals have come to look upon the congressional investigation as something highly distasteful, merely because it has been abused by the heresy hunters. Congressional investigation can be one of the most effective means of national political education. It has been a basic tool of nearly all American progressive movements. One of the best possible developments of the

next Congress could be wide-spread investigations of some of those "undebated issues" of American society, such as anti-labor practices and union-busting by management (like the famous LaFollette labor-spy hearings which laid the basis for the Wagner Act); civil rights violations and police brutality and illegality North and South; the political power and practices of the great corporations, especially those concerned with the military (like the Nye Committee "merchants of death" investigations); poverty in America, with large chunks of testimony by the poor; urban renewal and what it has become, etc.

- Another tragedy of recent years is that the Left has let the Right monopolize the issues of corruption and bureaucratization. It is indeed curious--and something to be ashamed of--that the investigation of the subversion of American government by private and corporate interests should be left to such conservatives as Senator Williams. Congressional liberals must go on the offensive, both against corporate and military influence in the Executive and equally against their fantastic power in Congress. This must be combined with an investigation and attack on the corruption of the federal bureaucracy, which as everyone knows is controlled by the interests it is supposed to regulate. Further, we need to develop concrete ways of attacking those aspects of governmental bureaucracy which do in fact interfere with the lives of ordinary people. We will never be able to appeal to those who support Goldwaterism because it protects them from legitimate social control, but we must not allow the Right to monopolize the Jeffersonian concept of men competent to direct their own lives.

- Over the next few months we need to develop a program of social legislation which goes well beyond the Administra-

ELECTIONS . . .

tion's limited medicare, poverty, and civil rights proposals. Bills for a complete revision of the now-inadequate social security program, the massive reconstruction of our urban centers by publicly-responsible agencies (not "urban renewal" by downtown business interests), a "B.I. Bill of Rights for veterans of the war on poverty," the great extension of free public education to break the monopoly of the affluent on nursery schools and college education, revision of anti-union parts of the Taft-Hartley Act, re-establishment of the progressivity of the income tax, etc. should be introduced into this Congress. Congressmen with whom we have contact should be given proposals for such bills and asked to submit them. Interest groups should be organized behind them. Political struggles in which Congressmen and the Administration are forced to debate issues and take public stands may be the fruit of the 1964 elections; if there is adequate power exerted for it, we may see for the first time in our lifetime real national debate over the issues confronting the country.

Clearly a group of young radicals like SDS is not the primary agency through which such change will be effected. But because of our insight into the nature of the problems we face, and because our commitment transcends the immediate political situation, we can play a strategic role as midwife to the potential change.

Send all letters for publication to Bulletin Editor, Helen Garvy, SDS National Office.

REGIONAL ORGANIZERS

SDS this fall found it necessary to establish a system of regional organizers around the country who could service chapters in the area, organize new chapters, and plan regional activities. The following are the regional organizers:

New England--Dave Smith, 94 Boston Ave, Somerville, Mass.

Pennsylvania--Vernon Grizzard, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.

Maryland, Wash. D.C.--Peter Davidowicz, 3220 St Paul St, Baltimore, Md.

South--Archie, Allen, c/o SSCC, Box 6403, Nashville, Tenn.

Texas, Oklahoma--Jeff Shero, 506 W 12 St, Austin, Texas.

Ohio, Indiana--Ken McEldowney, 2908 Jay Ave, Cleveland, Ohio.

Michigan--Dick Magidoff, 808 Mary St, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Illinois, Wisconsin--Bob Ross and Lee Webb, 1521 E 54 St, Chicago, Illinois.

Minnesota, Dakotas--George Brosi, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.

Oregon, Washington--Jeremy Brecher, Reed College, Portland, Oregon.

READING RECOMMENDATIONS:

Studies on the Left, Quarterly, \$3.50/year, (P.O. Box 33, Planetarium Station, NY 24, NY) Last issue was excellent.

Conversion Report, Monthly, \$2.50/year. Published by Boston FREP project (144a Mt Auburn St, Cambridge, Mass.)

Freedm North, eight times/year, \$2.00, Published by NSM (514 W 126 St, NY, NY)

Peace News, Special ten introductory issues for \$1.00 from AFSC (160 N 15 St, Philadelphia 2, Pa).