

BULLETIN

STUDENTS FOR A
DEMOCRATIC
SOCIETY

JANUARY 1965

Vol 3, No 4

CHASE MANHATTAN...
PARTNER IN APARTHEID

SIT-IN PLANNED

In a letter to the Chase Manhattan Bank signed by SDS President Paul Potter, SDS recently called on Chase Manhattan to "cease and desist" in its financial assistance to the racist government of the Union of South Africa. In the probable event that Chase Manhattan refuses to pull out of its multimillion dollar investments and loans, SDS has announced its intention to carry out a sit-in in the Chase Manhattan offices just off Wall Street in New York's financial district. The date set for this action will be Friday, March 19, two days before the fifth anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre.

(cont. p 14)

OVERVIEW OF THE

FSM

by ERIC LEVINE
Berkeley SDS

From the beginning, the politically interested, who constitute a minority on the Berkeley campus, as they do in any population, were deeply disturbed by the Administration action restricting political expression. Berkeley had a larger share than most campuses of politically active students, which helps explain why so many stu-

dents—over a thousand—were ready to devote the better part of their time sitting inside and outside Sproul Hall during the 32-hour demonstration, October 1 and 2.

SDS TO SPONSOR

VIETNAM MARCH

Perhaps the most far-reaching decision to come out of the December National Council meeting was the decision to sponsor a Student March on Washington to call for the end of American intervention in the

(cont. p 14)

Who were these students? A questionnaire returned by over 600 of the October 1-2 demonstrators showed that over 70% belong to no campus political organization. Half had never before participated in any demonstrations. Though only 15% were willing to risk arrest and expulsion at the beginning of the demonstration, 56% declared themselves so willing "if negotiations broke down and similar demonstrations were necessary."

At the height of the demonstrations, over 5,000 students gathered in Sproul Hall plaza; at least 3,500 were sympathetic to the aims of the Free Speech Movement.

When the Chancellor moved against four FSM leaders on
(cont. p 16)



The SDS National Council meeting attended by over 300 students

SDS NATIONAL COUNCIL

by C. CLARK KISSINGER, National Secretary

Traditionally the December meeting of the SDS National Council is the largest, most representative, and most important in terms of decision making. This year the December NC brought together 16 of the 17 National Officers, representatives from 37 chapters, and hundreds of observers—296 of whom bothered to register. The meeting, spread over (packed into) four days, was roughly structured along the lines of one day of speakers and panels, one day of workshops, and two days of plenary sessions.

The meeting began with welcoming remarks by Michael Harrington, author of The Other America, and a short address by SDS President Paul Potter. The main event of the first afternoon was a panel of speakers on "Breakthroughs in Student Action." This panel consisted of presentations by Prof. Staughton Lynd, Director of the Freedom Schools in Mississippi last summer; Mike Ansara, from Harvard SDS, speaking on the Noel Day campaign in Boston and the community action centers which grew out of that campaign; Jesse Allen, a resident of Newark, N.J., speaking on the Newark Community Union Project (the SDS community project in Newark); Eric Levine, President of Berkeley SDS, speaking on the Berkeley Free Speech Movement; and Peter Brandon, International Representative of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, speaking on the North Carolina Student-Labor Project.

CONTENTS

Free Speech Movement	1
South Africa	1
Vietnam March	1
National Council Meeting	2
MFDP	3
Chapter Scene	4
PREP: Conversion	5
ERAP Committee Meeting	6
Southern Student Organizing Committee	7
Political Education Project	8
Newark Arrest	9
Comments on the NC	9
PREP Defended	11

published monthly by:

Students for a Democratic Society
119 Fifth Ave, room 308, New York
editor: Helen Garvy

The evening session began with a panel of speakers on "The Organizational Directions of SDS." Here the speakers were David Smith, Tufts University; Jeff Shero, University of Texas; Steve Max, staff of SDS's Political Education Project; and Rich Rothstein from Chicago JOIN (the SDS project in Chicago). Following this panel, the National Council was formally convened and lengthy debate preceded the adoption of the agenda. This debate centered on how the next day's workshops should be structured, and was necessary because different viewpoints on what problems faced the organization led naturally to different viewpoints on how to talk about these problems. The final decision was to split the body into two workshops, one to deal with national student and campus programs, the second to deal with regional and local proposals for political and community organizing projects. These workshops could, in turn, break down into smaller groups.

Preceding the workshops on the second day was an address on Vietnam by journalist I.F. Stone, who reviewed the sordid history of America's intervention in Indo-China.

It is difficult to convey the essence of the two final days of plenary session. The seven typed pages of minutes consist mainly of procedural motions, reflecting the fact that such problems as were solved were talked out rather than voted out. But before discussing some of the unsolved or semi-solved problems, let me first quickly review the definite decisions of the NC: It was decided that the whole problem of who SDS

decided that the whole problem of how SDS should expand its community organization program could best be dealt with by the Executive Committee of SDS's Economic Research and Action Project (ERAP) augmented by interested members of the National Council. It was decided that SDS should sponsor a Student March on Washington to call for an end to American intervention in Vietnam, and that SDS would sponsor some form of direct action against the Chase Manhattan Bank around the anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre. A new program for the Political Education Project emphasizing the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party challenge was adopted. And the decision was made to unify the offices of SDS's various national projects with the National Office, the combined offices to be located somewhere other than New York City.

But perhaps the clearest way to miss the essence of this meeting is to simply list the formal deci-

(cont. p 15)

MFDP

by STEVE MAX, PEP Staff

The first round in the challenge to the seating of the Mississippi congressional delegation by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party is now over. On January 4th, 1965 a vote of 276 to 149 prevented the House of Representatives from debating a motion by House Majority Leader Albert to administer the oath of office to the Mississippians over the objection of Congressman Ryan of the New York Reform movement. Closing debate prevented Congressman Roosevelt (D - Calif.) from making a substitute motion which would have prevented seating until the matter had been considered by the House Administration Committee. Thus a vote for ending debate was a vote against the MFDP. The Albert motion to seat the Mississippi delegates then carried on a voice vote.

The next step in the fight to have the Mississippi elections declared void because of the disenfranchisement of the Negro population of that state will commence in about a week. The challengers, the MFDP, have forty days to use federal subpoena power to hold hearings and collect evidence in Mississippi. Following that, the challenged congressmen will have the same opportunity to use the subpoena power. Eventually the matter will go to the House Committee on Administration which will refer it to the sub-committee on Elections and Privileges.

Committee assignments for the 89th Congress are being made as of this writing and it is difficult to say how the sub-committee will shape up. In the 88th Congress, the committee was composed of five Southern Democrats and four Republicans who have a total combined ADA liberalism rating of 51. All the members of the sub-committee were returned to Congress this term. When the committees are re-organized for the 89th Congress, more Democrats will be added to the House Committee on Administration. Two liberal Congressmen, Gus Haekins (D - Calif.) and Reformer Jonathan Bingham of New York have already been added.

There are several possible paths that the challenge could take at this point:

- 1) The Sub-Committee could refuse to act, thus killing the challenge.
- 2) The whole Committee could receive a report from the Sub-Committee and then refuse to act.
- 3) The whole Committee could issue a report which would go to the Rules Committee, which could refuse to act.
- 4) The whole Committee could issue a report which could get to the floor of the House.

There are several strategies now under consideration by the MFDP in order to deal with the situation. The long-range goal is, of course, to have a full debate on the floor of Congress, and perhaps even to win. Thus pressure could be brought on Speaker McCormack to invoke the newly-passed 21 day rule to get the Challenge out of committee. This would require that a

member of Congress first make a motion to unseat the regular Mississippi delegation, and that the motion be referred to the Committee on Administration. (The statutory challenge now in process does not have standing in Congress unless a committee reports it out, but a motion made on the floor and then referred to a committee for action could be ordered out of committee again.)

A second method to bring the matter to the floor would be for a member of the House to make the above resolution and then gain 218 signatures on a discharge petition. If the MFDP could gain enough support for this petition, they could also sustain the challenge.

The Civil Rights Commission is due to hold hearings on voting in the beginning of February; and it is possible that, on the basis of the evidence turned up there, the MFDP will not wait until the statutory challenge runs its course some time in July, but will try to invoke the 21 day rule on the discharge petition.

In the meantime, there is still the question of what will happen when the lawyers go into Mississippi and demand the cooperation of federal and local officials in the use of the subpoena power. Chapters should be prepared to picket, demonstrate, send telegrams, etc. in the event that full cooperation is not given the lawyers, and there is little hope that it will be.

AVAILABLE FROM PEP:

- *The roll call on the MFDP vote in Congress
- *Information on the Challenge
- *Information on your congressman and your district

AVAILABLE SOON:

- *A detailed background paper on the MFDP and the Challenge
 - *A list of members of the Administration Committee and the Elections Sub-committee
- PEP, 119 Fifth Ave., room 309, New York

It is necessary to start contacting Congressmen now to urge them to support the challenge, to pressure Speaker McCormack if a 21 day rule is needed, and to sign a discharge petition if one is circulated. It is particularly important that pressure be brought on the members of the Committee on Administration.

The Challenge offers a superb opportunity to conduct an educational program on campus and in the community. It may be possible to reach those who in the past have been unmovable, since the Challenge is not a matter of one's feelings about civil rights, it is not a question of too fast or too slow, it is not a question of the South solving its problems by itself, it is not a question of Northern agitators, etc.; rather, it is a clear-cut case of Federal law being broken, of the Constitution being ignored and the compact which re-admitted Mississippi to the union being voided. It is a case of what is supposed to be the most sacred American institution--that of the ballot--being scrapped. This makes the challenge just the issue to raise with those who rose in indignation when civil rights workers "broke the law", "sat-in", "disregarded property rights", "trespassed", and "unlawfully and illegally assembled". Now that the "legal" shoe is on the other foot, let's take up the challenge and use this opportunity to the hilt.

THE CAMPUS SCENE

by HELEN GARVY, Assistant National Secretary

As the first item of business at its recent meeting, the SDS National Council voted to formally recognize the 22 new chapters that had been formed this fall, bringing the new total to 43 chapters.

A quick survey of the activities of these chapters gives an excellent idea of the kinds of programming they undertake and the range of possibilities open to chapters. Chapter activity can be divided into two main categories: education and action. But these categories are broad.

The most common form of education is the use of speakers and this is a part of the program of almost every chapter. Debates are an effective variation of this. Some chapters feel the need for more thorough internal education than can be obtained through a series of speakers. To fill this need, Swarthmore has held successful seminars in the past (for example, on the Negro freedom movement and on Marxism) and is again planning to hold several this semester on topics such as the labor movement, corporations, the political system, radical politics in the American novel. The Baltimore (Johns Hopkins/Goucher) chapter is thinking of holding a seminar on conversion, disarmament, revolution in underdeveloped countries, or socialism.

VOICE, the University of Michigan chapter has just succeeded in getting University credit for a loosely structured, SDS oriented seminar, begun on the initiative of VOICE members. An SDS friend on the faculty is officially responsible for the course but it will be planned and run by the participating students. Reading for the next meeting of the course includes the Port Huron Statement and the Triple Revolution.

Research is one area that has been neglected by chapters. Harvard has done some Jack Minnis type research (see "the Care and Feeding of Power Structures", available from SDS) on the University and the Piedmont chapter is beginning a study of the power structure of North Carolina, and Durham in particular.

Another means of education is through the press. This can mean anything from trying to get publicity for the activities and opinions of a chapter in the campus or local press, to publishing your own newsletter. Many SDS groups publish some sort of newsletter--some regularly, some not; some just for internal communication such as the Boston regional newsletter, a Queens chapter mailing, the Minnesota-Dakota regional mailings, some for wider distribution, such as the U of Michigan "Campus VOICE" and the New York at-large chapter's "Viewpoint" and the more specialized newsletter of the U of Michigan Student Employees Union and the "Conversion

Report" of the Boston PREP project which is produced primarily by students from MIT.

Another major educational device, although a much more complicated one, is the conference. Plans are underway now to hold a series of conferences in as many regions as possible this spring.

Actions such as petitions and leafleting can also be important educational tools. Many chapters have circulated petitions on the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, and several on the MFD and HUAC.

Almost all SDS chapters have some form of action program, whether on the campus or in the community. Action can be on any issue—civil rights, economic issues, peace, university reform, politics, civil liberties....

Chapters near ERAP community organization projects have generally worked closely with the project, although many problems exist in this relationship—primarily due to the high degree of commitment needed to be an effective community organizer.

Yet many chapters see some sort of a community action as desirable—because of its appeal to students and ability to involve them in something they care about, its value to the community, and its educational value to the student. Many chapters, inspired by ERAP, have begun to survey the areas they are located near to determine the conditions that exist and the issues around which organization can take place. These include Smith, Williams, Queens, Grinnell, NY at-large, Brown/Pembroke, Carleton, Cornell, Vassar, and Harpur. Some chapters, such as the University of Maryland and Southern Illinois University, already have projects of their own, affiliated with but not part of ERAP. The Duke and newly-organized Piedmont chapters are continuing their work with the North Carolina labor project doing union organizing in local plants. Southern Illinois University has also become interested in beginning something like this project and is investigating several unorganized plants in the area.

Many projects are involved in community action short of full-scale organizing projects. Bergen County (a high school chapter in New Jersey), the University of Texas, and Grinnell, for example, have tutorial projects.

Peace is another area for action by chapters. Several chapters—Harvard, Baltimore, and Swarthmore—will be taking a major share of the responsibility for planning the Vietnam March on Washington on April 17. Several chapters have already held speakers (Texas and the U of

(cont. p 17)

PREP on Conversion

by PAUL BOOTH

The December NC decided that PREP's conversion organizing should be dealt with as part of general community organizing strategy, and that priority should be given to organizing around conversion in present ERAP project areas. This seems fully justified in view of the hard facts of the seriousness of organizing work, and the shortage of skilled personnel to do that work.

There are two major implications of this consensus:

1. For the summer, in addition to the Boston Project, conversion work should be concentrated in either Baltimore, Chicago, or New Jersey, or two or three of those sites. (Inasmuch as a San Francisco project is now associated with ERAP, it would imply that effort to set up a conversion project in the Bay Area would also be appropriate.)

2. For those areas like Seattle, Brooklyn, Denver, and Long Island, for which conversion projects had been proposed (due to the heavy incidence of unemployment resulting from defense cutbacks), some kind of program around the

issue, and short of full-scale organizing commitment, has to be developed.

In order to follow up on the summer project angle, PREP will enter into discussions with the ERAP projects to find out the extent to which those projects feel conversion should be worked into their ongoing, year-round organizing program. A meeting of the PREP executive committee in early spring should make final decisions on where conversion project work will be done starting in the summer.

The more difficult task facing PREP is in evolving a conversion program. Part of that can be done around the nexus of an expanding Conversion Report, the Boston project's monthly newsletter, which is now prepared to go national and needs local correspondents. Secondly, the chapters in defense-impacted areas can work fruitfully on the issue through discussions with unionists, politicians, etc., through setting up research projects in conjunction with faculty, through holding of small-scale conferences on the area's economic problems, and through a number of other projects that must be dreamed up and experimented with.

S.D.S.

SDS is a movement of people, organized in chapters or independently, who study and participate in daily struggles for social change. Committed to change in many spheres of society, SDS members, in chapters and projects:

ORGANIZE THE DISPOSSESSED in community movements for economic gains. One hundred and fifty students devoted the summer of 1964 to full-time work on SDS projects in 10 Northern and Appalachian cities; 40 continue to work full-time. Movements of welfare mothers, the unemployed, tenants, residents of public housing projects, and others have been organized around their particular grievances.

PARTICIPATE IN ACTIVITY FOR PEACE through protest, research, education, and community organization. SDS organized protests and proposed peaceful solutions during Cuba and Vietnam crises, sponsors peace research among students, and is undertaking pilot efforts to organize defense workers for economic conversion.

WORK FOR CIVIL RIGHTS through direct action, publication, and support for the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee. SDS projects in Chester, Pa and Newark, NJ serve as models for Negro movements in the North due to their mass support.

INJECT CONTROVERSY INTO A STAGNANT EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. SDS participated in the mass demonstrations for free speech at Berkeley and organized national support, pioneered in the introduction of peace courses into college curricula, and initiated the union organization of student employees at the University of Michigan.

SUPPORT POLITICAL INSURGENTS in the fight for a government that would promote social justice. SDS produces studies of the political and electoral situation.

ERAP

committee meets

by RENNIE DAVIS

An augmented ERAP Committee, whose size ranged from 45-120 people, met for three days following the December National Council meeting to plan for the expansion of community projects. The discussion, however, ranged the full gamut of "field" problems and created some new ones out of its own dynamic. There is no easy or clear way to summarize the meeting except to say that there was complete consensus about the difficulty of explaining to people who didn't attend the post-NC gathering its significance to the ERAP staff. The meeting produced an incredible "socialization" of people and the most honest and searching confrontation of our organizing work we have had. Rather than attempt the task of summarizing the debates and questions of the three days, this report lists the decisions of the committee. Hopefully the issues raised by the meeting will not be lost but can be continued to be discussed in correspondence, in the Bulletin, and at future meetings.

1. New Projects: New projects were adopted in Boston; Cairo, Illinois; Cedar Heights, Maryland; Knoxville, Tennessee; New Brunswick, N.J.; San Francisco; and Texas. However, a distinction was drawn between projects for which the ERAP Committee assumes full responsibility and projects which participate in ERAP meetings and add to the community dialogue but are not dependent on ERAP for funds and staff. New projects for which ERAP assumes full responsibility are Boston (Dudley Street Action Center) and New Brunswick. Projects to be included in the "ERAP forum" are Cairo (Freedom House), Knoxville, Hazard, Cedar Heights, San Francisco (Freedom House), and Texas.

2. New Jersey Project: It was agreed that ERAP should emphasize regional organizational development in the state of New Jersey. This is not to mean that existing projects are to close down or that they are not to expand in order that new resources may be provided to New Jersey. It is to mean, however, that in publicity, new staff and finances New Jersey is to be emphasized. Projects are to determine for themselves what implications a New Jersey project has for their organizing plans. If any project decides to close down, it would be assumed that the staff released by such a move would go to New Jersey, if possible. If no such decision is made, all existing projects (Chicago, Cleveland, Newark, Philadelphia, Chester, and Baltimore) will be fully supported in their work by ERAP. The Philadelphia project, in the week following the ERAP meeting, decided to close.

3. Staff Allocation: No attempt was made to make staff allocation decisions in the meeting. It was agreed that New Brunswick and Boston particularly needed one new staff person and that every possible effort should be made to meet "minimal" staff needs in every project. The ERAP director is to consult with each project about staff needs and arrange for new staff members to travel to projects where decisions can be made.

4. Mid-West Concentration: There was considerable discussion of consolidation of projects in the mid-West, but no resolution was reached. It was felt that insufficient evidence existed for saying that either Chicago or Cleveland were "better" cities to work in. And it was equally unclear that ERAP could not potentially service both projects. It was agreed that no assumption should exist that either project should close but discussion of mid-West concentration or consolidation should continue, particularly among the staffs of the Chicago and Cleveland projects.

5. Appalachia: Several members of the staff argued strongly that ERAP should give serious consideration to organizing in Appalachia. It was agreed that financial help should be given to Bob Smiddie to work in Knoxville in order to determine how readily a viable organizing project could be established in that area. Some suggested that Rennie Davis and possibly others should consider Appalachia as an area in which to work. Most of the staff felt that work in Appalachia at this time was premature or out of the question for ERAP: that it would drain limited staff away from vitally important work in the North and that other organizations should develop a program in Appalachia.

6. Democracy: It was agreed that democracy is sometimes painful and that it comes slowly, but that for those who wait, it is beautiful.

For more information on ERAP write to:

Rennie Davis, Director
ECONOMIC RESEARCH AND
ACTION PROJECT
1100 E Washington St., Ann Arbor, Mich.

JOIN THE ERAP STAFF THIS SUMMER

Southern Student Organizing Committee

STUDENTS IN THE SOUTH

by ED HAMLETT

(Ed Hamlett is on the staff of SNCC, and now on loan to SSOC as a campus traveller.)

A new organization, the Southern Student Organizing Committee, has emerged in the South to work for "a new order, a new South, a place which embodies our ideals for all the world to emulate, not ridicule."

Why SSOC? Certainly a legitimate question. Suffice it to say that there is a need, that no other organization is meeting this need, and that those who formed SSOC feel that it must be met. Another group of students, these black, talked about needs in the spring of 1960. They discussed the problems of communication, coordination, and stimulation within their ranks and of the necessity of extending their concerns and goals for a new order to other students. Perhaps here much of the similarity between SNCC and SSOC ends. Those who organized SSOC emerged at a time when the sit-in movement was almost at an end. SNCC arose out of the sit-in movement, and by the time of the demise of the sit-ins, had largely moved on to other issues. The passage of the civil rights bill was imminent when SSOC got going. Most of the fifty students who gathered in Nashville in April of 1964 had been involved in direct action of one form or another; however, there were many others who were not there who had done absolutely nothing to relieve the sense of guilt which pervaded their consciences. It appeared that the civil rights bill might, in many cases, prevent their getting relief through direct action means. On the other hand, there were many more things to be done just in the area of civil rights, though these required a lot more work and thought than did the organizing of a picket line. And, there were, of course, many broader issues beyond civil rights, but, before we look at these, let's go back to 1960.

At the fall SNCC conference of 1960 there were, by actual count, twelve white southerners. They came out of curiosity, and some "never did anything," as we say. Very few forces were operating to stimulate their involvement. Not many were willing to participate in sit-ins or on picket lines. Some of the organizations which were trying to get white students involved in the South were as follows: Southern Project NSA, through its southern human relations seminar; some state human relations councils made attempts to set up college divisions; and the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF) which always had existed for the purpose of involving more whites.

In keeping with this central purpose, SCEF, in September of 1961 made a grant of \$5,000 to

SNCC to be used in working with white students. Bob Zellner, a minister's son from Alabama, was selected to work for SNCC on white campuses. A few other white students, some of whom had been associated with the NSA seminar, were active in and around SNCC and CORE. There was limited activity by these and others at the University of Texas, at Florida State and at the University of North Carolina and Duke, with smatterings of interest and action in Nashville, Louisville, and New Orleans.

Zellner, who was on the SDS National Council, was active in SNCC in many areas, but it was not until his second year on what became known as the white southern student project that he got to the campuses to any significant extent. One of his recruits for SNCC was Sam Shirah, another Alabama minister's son. When Bob went back to school in 1963, Sam took over. It is believed by many that the climate prior to 1963 in the South was such that few white southerners would dare to buck the system and face the social ostracism, the irate parents, and the racist school administrations; but the horrible events of that summer along with a certain amount of thawing in the upper and border South brought changes. Negroes now became the "tokens" on the picket lines in many areas.

Stimulated by the press and television coverage of atrocities, many students were ripe for organization. Local student leaders emerged on white campuses as Negroes had in 1960. Some of these in Nashville began talking among themselves. Why not set up an organization that would do the things that the coordinating committee of SNCC had done in 1960-61. They talked with Sam Shirah and others and SSOC was born. At the April SSOC meeting, the students from fifteen campuses in ten states who attended formulated a statement of purpose:

"We do hereby declare, as southern students from most of the Southern states, representing different economic, ethnic and religious backgrounds, growing from birthdays in the Depression years and the War years, that we will here take our stand in determination to build together a New South which brings democracy and justice for all its people."

And there were goals which had to do with these ideals--"full and equal opportunity for all...an end

(cont. p 18)

PEP

POLITICAL EDUCATION PROJECT

by JIM WILLIAMS, PEP Director

The debate and discussion around PEP at this NC was exciting and stimulating, even though there were a few rough spots. The PEP staff presented its campus program and presented a new community project based on coalition-oriented theories of organizing as mandated by the PEP committee. In a panel before the plenary session began, Steve Max outlined some of our ideas about the role of students as a minority political group, pointing out that the booming student population would give an enfranchised student body a hefty political leverage. A new paper, For A New Coalition, by Doug Ireland and Steve Max was distributed in the working papers. This dynamic new paper discusses specifically the needs and problems of the Negro-Labor-Liberal coalition. Another working paper prepared by PEP outlined a series of long- and short-range legislative demands.

The PEP campus program passed by the NC consists of:

1. Organizing SDS support of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.
2. Developing a major legislative issue to be decided upon by the PEP committee for a major campus program, e.g., 18 year-old vote, free college education, Clark Full-Employment bill, etc.
3. Continuing and expanding the PEP publishing program.
4. Distributing information and analyses on legislative developments.
5. Developing campus programs on other legislative issues, e.g., Nelson Abolition of the Draft bill, McGovern Economic Conversion for Peace bill, etc.

Oddly enough, there were a couple of extreme-leftist attacks upon the PEP program by some people who called PEP's legislative demands "coffin nails in the caskets of the poor" and who charged the PEP staff with being "agents of the Liberal Establishment on campus."

In view of PEP's strained financial situation, the NC voted to loan PEP \$500, as requested.

PEP's community project did not fair so well. PEP as mandated, had investigated a number of possibilities for a project. Cairo, Illinois was found to be the scene of a rapidly developing

insurgent political movement of poor Negroes and became the choice of the PEP staff to put forth at the NC. Southern Illinois University SDS students had been working since June in the Negro ghettos, doing organizing of people on relief and laying the groundwork for a precinct-level political reform movement in Alexander County. The proposed project fell into trouble when the NC first voted to consider Cairo separately from the rest of the PEP program. The next day, the NC voted to consider Cairo in a meeting of an "augmented" Economic Research and Action Project committee meeting. Although the Cairo project was thriving and had organized more poor than a majority of the other projects, it was turned down and its request for a grant of \$700 was refused.

The PEP staff was disappointed that the members of the committee did not support the Cairo project publicly to the extent that they supported it privately.

PEP activity in the coming period should be exciting. Much activity will be centered around the MFDP challenge and there will be many things happening in the new Congress which will be of importance to the left.

PEP mailings go to the SDS worklist (who should make sure that other people in the chapter see them). If you want to receive PEP mailings yourself, drop a note to PEP, Room 309, 119 Fifth Avenue, NYC 3. Donations will certainly be appreciated.

AMAZING FACTS ABOUT PEP

PEP can help you in mysterious ways.
PEP is your friend.
PEP can tell you how many Negroes there are in your Congressional District.
PEP can tell you the election returns in your district.
PEP can tell you about Right-wing participation in the election in your area.
PEP can answer questions about the poverty bill.
PEP can give you a guide to community political research.
PEP can give you new papers: The March on Frankfort, This is the War that Is, When the Southern Vote was Counted, Johnson With Eyes Open, and For a New Coalition.
PEP can tell you how your congressman voted on the MFDP challenge and the Rules changes.
PEP can give you a picture of Eugene V. Debs.
PEP can send you a catalogue of political and labor films.

Comments on the N.C.

by RENNIE DAVIS

It was at the December National Council meeting of last December that SDS undertook a commitment to a major organizing push in poor neighborhoods of the North. Since then, the face of the organization has been transformed. It is no longer that of an intellectual youth removed from the world, dissatisfied with the old formulas and answers but convinced
wers, but rather convinced that there are new solutions to be tested and worked out. The new face is much more complex, much more strained and uncertain. It is pointed many directions.

While SDS has retained its underlying concern for the student—for finding and developing student radicals and for organizing them to create a new form of political influence in the country—it has also stimulated organization among a significant adult constituency who share many of the SDS values. "We" are no longer simply "students looking uncomfortably to the world we are about to inherit." We are also people with large families, tied to a degrading job or welfare check,

dependent on the world that has been inherited and only beginning to understand the possibilities of changing it. In between the students and the organized poor, there is the full-time ERAP staff. In these seven months, they have brought to SDS sobering ideas about what it means to work in communities and what it means to create democracy.

At the December NC, the ERAP staff raised fundamental questions about how the organization should function and make decisions about the community projects. Questions were posed which seemingly had no answers—what does it mean to have community people "represented" on the NC? Does that mean that the NC is then the best body to make decisions about the community projects? Who "knows" whether a project should be closed down or expanded? Suppose SDS members shared a common ideology but that it meant different things to different people? What would that mean for decision-making? The questions put to the NC by the staff seemed to strip the Council of

(cont. p 10)

RENT STRIKE LEADER NEWARK RESIDENT ARRESTED

Ida Brown, a Newark resident who has been on a rent strike since July, was arrested on January 6 on trumped-up charges of assaulting her landlord, assaulting a police officer, and resisting arrest. Mrs Brown was released.

The Newark Community Union Project (the SDS project) had been supporting Mrs Brown's rent strike since July and rallied to her defense. An emergency meeting of the groups program co emergency meeting of the group's policy-making Policy Co

emergency meeting of the group's policy-making Program Committee held the night of January 6 decided to picket and sit-in at the Newark City Hall to protest the arrest. Those plans were suspended, however, when Judge DelMauro, who arraigned Mrs Brown, warned that if any direct or indirect threats were made against the landlord by Mrs Brown or anyone associated with her he would raise her bail so high that she couldn't get out.

The events that led to Mrs Brown's arrest began on December 30 when Ray Shustak, the landlord, forced Mrs Brown and her 5 children (the youngest with a fever of 103°) out of her apartment and padlocked the door, locking all the family's posses-

sions inside.

Early on January 6 a "health inspector" came to the apartment in which Mrs Brown was staying, upstairs from her own apartment, to "see if the place was overcrowded". The same "inspector" was overheard when he visited the building several days before to have said that he would have Mrs Brown either arrested or harmed on January 6. Shortly after the inspector's visit Shustak came to the back door of the apartment where Mrs Brown was staying but she refused to let him in. A while later Mrs Brown went downstairs to her apartment, from which a trucking firm, under orders from Shustak, had begun to remove her furniture, and took some of her belongings out. When she returned upstairs she found the apartment broken into and Shustak and several other men there. The men first arrested Mrs Brown and then pushed her to the floor, arguing about what to do with the children until she took them upstairs to a friend. The men then pushed Mrs Brown to the top of the stairs. A detective behind Mrs Brown pushed her forward and she fell into another detective who was standing in front of her, and the two of them fell down the stairs. The men dragged Mrs Brown the rest of the way to the police car and took her to jail where she was questioned for several hours before being released on \$1000 bail.

FROM FSM

Dear SDSer:

The fight for free speech at California continues. 800 students face demoralizing and expensive trials. They are charged on three counts including resisting arrest, which is a result of going limp upon being arrested. If a conviction is obtained on this charge, it could set a very unfortunate precedent for the entire civil rights movement.

We must not let the 800 stand alone nor be victimized by the power structure in order to crush the student movement. In order to provide for the defense of the 800, the Free Speech Defense Fund has been established. The Defense Fund is currently asking for the formation of campus-based support groups which will do the following:

- 1) Arrange meetings for discussion of issues involved at California and how they relate to your campus. A tape which will explain the basic issues will be ready soon. Also, FSM speakers will be available on a limited basis.
- 2) Mobilize political support on the campus and in the community for a fair trial.
- 3) Raise funds for defense.

Currently available from the SDS National Office are: An LP record with on-the-spot coverage of FSM events on one side and satirical songs written and recorded by FSM members on the other (@ \$3.95). A "45" EP record with more satirical songs (@ \$1.50). Silk screened posters (@ \$2.00). And Free Speech buttons (@ \$.25).

If you are interested in forming a support group on your campus, request more information from: Free Speech Defense Fund, attention Ed Rosenfeld, Box 448, Berkeley 1, California.

Fraternally yours,

STEVE WEISSMAN
FSM Steering Committee
and SDS staff

MARTIN ROYSHER
FSM Steering Committee
and SDS member

Comments on the N.C. ...

its capacity to make decisions on most of the issues before it, if for no other reason than the time allotted for the conference was eaten away by discussions about how to decide. At the end of the meeting, people recalled that Tom Hayden had asked earlier: suppose that the NC met for four days and at the end of that time it had decided nothing—would that mean that the meeting had been unsuccessful?

Of course there were different opinions about the meeting's success. Those who came because they wanted their particular problem solved or demands met were frustrated. Many were altogether ignored. Those who were coming to an SDS meeting for the first time found much of the discussion incomprehensible. Those who wanted to discuss honestly and searchingly their community work found the forum too large and most of the members inexperienced or unaccustomed to the same problems.

But a substantial number saw the meeting in larger terms—SDS has an organizational structure that is outmoded by its new size and range of problems; that is, the cause of our organizational crisis is good. SDS provides a forum for people in the movement whether they be on the campus or in the community to discuss their work and to share ideas and that forum may be becoming more important than the "organization". An important debate has begun that is far more serious to people than ever before as to how we should use SDS as an instrument for social change.

The issues raised by the NC meeting should continue to be discussed in the organization and should be carried with new clarity into the June convention. That is the only conclusion to be drawn at this time.

* * *

NOW AVAILABLE FROM THE SDS NATIONAL OFFICE

1. "The Berkeley Free Speech Controversy", a documentary history and an analysis by Eric Levine, Berkeley SDS. 15¢

2. "Thoughts on Berkeley" by Paul Goodman. Reprinted from the New York Review of Books. 10¢

3. "A Strategy for University Reform" by Paul Booth. 10¢

4. 2'x3' Free Speech Movement Poster. \$2

5. FSM LP record with songs and documentary. \$3.95

6. FSM "45" of satirical songs. \$1.50

7. Free Speech Buttons from Berkeley. 25¢

8. SDS's "A Free University in a Free Society" button. 10¢

(All profits on 4, 5, 6, & 7 go to the FSM Defense Fund.)

PREP DEFENDED

by TODD GITLIN

The following is an answer to the article by Steve Johnson that appeared in the last Bulletin.

Dear Steve,

You see three goals for a "fruitful program for PREP":

"(1) It would put top priority on the achievement of real disarmament, as the only international arrangement where the national security of each country is protected without the need for retaining armaments.

"(2) PREP would give top priority to the job of converting student attitudes on disarmament. 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) PREP 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."

For simplicity's sake I'll take these up one at a time.

(1) I think none of us in SDS are deluded into thinking that the test-ban and resulting partial detente have eradicated the danger of nuclear war; I think we would further agree that disarmament should be a primary aim of U.S. foreign policy. We see disarmament as urgent in its own right and also important for the freeing of funds for a good society at home. This is not simply a personal judgment; it is set out in some detail in The Port Huron Statement.

The disagreement would come in determining how disarmament can be achieved. You say that cold war coalitions "will retain their public support undiminished until we can convince the public that it is possible to have the national security protected without arms." You indicate that "the root assumption" blocking disarmament is "that national security must be protected with armaments." The implication is that attitudes toward arms in the undifferentiated "public" must be regeared before disarmament is possible. If that be the case, I fear disarmament is impossible; at the least, a long long time off. The only case I know of in which widespread change in public attitudes took place in a short period of

time and resulted in political change in recent America is the case of the prohibitionist movement, and there is even some uncertainty as to the significance of attitude change (as against strategic application of resources in lobbying, etc.) in that case. The approach of Weltanschauung change is that of "long twilight struggle." Moreover, it is not clear to me that attitude change need be as apocalyptic, as total as you indicate, to make disarmament possible. There is considerable evidence that the faits accomplis of Administrations have a good deal to do with the constellation of public opinion. To take one interesting example, national polls were taken before and after the American decision to intervene in the Greek civil war in 1947. Before the decision, a sample was asked, "Are you in favor of American involvement in the Greek war?" About two-thirds were opposed. After Truman began shipping arms to Greece, a similar sample was asked, "Are you in favor of President Truman's decision to support the royalists in Greece?" Two-thirds were in favor—a complete flip-flop. Similar results, though not such pat ones, have been obtained in polls on American attitudes toward Lend-Lease in 1940 and toward intervention in Korea in 1950. Administration policy is always influential, and it can be decisive. Much depends on the way it is promulgated and publicized.

True, Administration faits accomplis are influential with regard to public opinion on attitudes, not belief-systems. But one cannot pursue a strategy for converting belief-systems. In any event, public opinion on disarmament, the test ban, etc. is pacific and favorable. What remains is for government to take advantage of it by pursuing the indicated policy. Since the U.S. government (among others) has not heeded public opinion, one must conclude that public opinion, even belief systems, are not decisive in bringing about disarmament. Something more is required. I simply do not believe that the Administration is hamstrung by public opinion, in short.

To whatever extent it wants disarmament, the Administration is blocked by institutional interests and inertias. These include primarily the various tentacles of the military-industrial complex on one level; on another, the interests of NATO powers in perpetuating the myth of Soviet threat in Europe; on another, the arms race; on still another, widespread misconceptions of the role of a United States beleaguered by revolutions in underdeveloped countries. PREP program is founded on the notion that we can best apply our own limited resources in behalf of disarmament by organizing and educating around two levels of these institutional barriers: the areas of American involvement in the third world, and conversion.

PREP...

The Third World. I'm generally sympathetic to your remarks to the effect that there is more to the problems of the Third World than American interventionism pure and simple. I agree also that "as far as the countries of the Third World are concerned, the largest problem is to lift themselves up from deep poverty." But I cannot agree that "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." Insurgency amidst poverty, as in South Vietnam, would happen regardless of the larger Cold War. It is made more dangerous by the Cold War, but the most effective and compelling argument against American involvement in such situations may not be that involvement is bad because it is tied up with the Cold War, but rather that it is a bad (dangerous) self-defeating way to prosecute the Cold War. What is wrong with interventionism is not that it "sows the seeds for civil wars"; such civil wars may be to the advantage of the countries concerned, and in any case they cannot be avoided given the course of American interventionism--perhaps they cannot be avoided at all.

The fact remains that the economic interests of the have and have-not countries may not even coincide in the long run. Trade policies are at least as important as great power politics in stultifying development in the Third World. Whatever the complexities of the situation, U.S. policy, whichever way it turns, will be heavily responsible for the future of those countries. Thus, true, the issue is broader than American interventionism: it is the total role of America in the underdeveloped countries. In order to educate on this issue, we need to have a program for the American role; I could not agree more emphatically about that. Working on this is one of PREP's major functions in the coming year.

The connection of this function with the achievement of disarmament should be plain. As long as the United States sees itself as world policeman, disarmament is impossible; indeed, if American policy continues along present lines, we can fear the growth of an embattled garrison-state mentality that bodes ill for the prospects of domestic democracy. Thus education to these considerations is of direct importance for disarmament. And the recruitment of the hypothesized "buried academics" to do research and writing for PREP on lines professionally familiar to them promises to create new lines of attachment between "experts" and political activists, with important implications for any developing Left in America.

If I was emphatic in my derogation of "general education" to disarmament above, why do I want PREP to educate widely about American policy in the Third World? Changing specific attitudes

is qualitatively easier than re-orienting entire belief-systems. Second, I believe these attitude changes are more urgent, since public opinion is already generally favorable to disarmament--despite its attachment to the Cold War. Third, the unadorned facts themselves about U.S. involvement, actual and potential, speak a great deal about policy; opinion in this realm tends to flow directly from knowledge.

Conversion. Of course, a conversion organizing effort must spell out the dangers of the arms budget. But I think conversion projects also assume that any concrete demonstration that the economy can afford disarmament, by lessening direct-interest attachments to the arms economy, contributes noticeably to the tolerance of people for disarmament. The point is most powerfully made--as in North Bay, Ontario, last summer--when the two points are argued in tandem, but attitude-change is unlikely as long as interests are directly tied to the arms race.

I don't think anyone regards conversion as a sufficient condition for disarmament; only as a necessary condition, and one that we are in a position to help along. We need to continue fraternal support of peace groups that are arguing the superfluity of arms, but the fact of the matter is that no one else is organizing for conversion. The job falls to us.

Social processes have a way of working in chain reactions. Any demonstration that the defense budget is not sacred contributes heavily to the undermining of the power of the military-industrial combine--as heavily, that is, as we are allowed to contribute--for it allows defense allocations to be determined on their merits, and there our arguments are strong.

The draft. The draft was seen as a good issue for PREP because of its potential for "bringing the cold war home" to students, for illuminating the connections between the cold war and domestic life. Indications are that its potential was highly overstated, and correspondingly the issue is being downgraded in PREP priorities.

"A Neglected Issue--The Stall in Geneva." I have indicated that this is not an autonomous issue as are American involvements in the Third World and the sanctity of the military economy; it is rather (from the American point of view) a reflection of the institutional barriers to serious consideration of disarmament. That is why "there is no mention of the Geneva disarmament negotiations in the PREP program." (Which is not to say that PREP should not have an analysis of the current disarmament situation. We should, and I'd like you to write it.) True, "there is no suggestion that the stall in Geneva could be made an issue for students today." That is because it cannot be. And, as I think I've explained above, I would rather build constituency "from the ground up" on the issue of American interventionism and role than on the issue of stall in Geneva.

PREP...

You accuse PREP of having no strategy. We do not have a strategy sufficient in depth to satisfy anyone, although I think we are groping toward it. But how does "the stall in Geneva" become an issue capable of galvanizing large or strategic numbers of students (or anyone) to undertake activity designed to bring the world closer to disarmament? Isn't one lesson of the past several years that a peace movement cannot thrive on issues like test-bans and disarmament? Is disarmament thwarted because of public opinion? No. Saying that disarmament is important is one thing; forging a strategy that organizes people around it, gives them useful tasks along the way, maintains organization in the face of tokenism, is something else again. Everyone is for the Good, but not everything that's Good can be organized for in sustained, coherent, expandable ways.

(2) You ask why the budding detente destroyed the student peace proto-movement, and answer "that nobody was converting the members, nobody was convincing them that larger problems of the cold war also were issues, nobody was convincing them that there is an alternative to the cold war. Having basically accepted the cold war, they were easily satisfied by government initiatives and next-step tokenism." You insist that campus peace groups must be built on long-run concerns--specifically, ending the cold war--in order to survive changes in government policy.

But because you have no strategy for the attainment of disarmament, you have no way of structuring a campus peace group to insure strength and longevity. Saying "individual responsibility" is not enough; there still must be things to do, things whose direct importance or tangible immediacy are apparent. But you propose no such projects, and I find it hard to do so myself. Can you design projects for people that contribute perceptibly to disarmament, other than conversion organizing and Third World education? Can you design ones that produce tangible results, that identify enemies, that enhance group identity, beside conversion organizing, bank sit-ins, and other projects PREP is engaged in? If you could, there would be something more to talk about. It is precisely because people's motives are so fragile in peace activity that projects must be carefully designed. Peace groups on campus have collapsed for lack of such projects.

None of which is intended to deny that long-range perspective is crucial for any campus group, oriented to peace, university reform, or any other radical objective. Any campus campaign for a change in U.S. role in the Third World, against the draft, for campus conversion must at some point indicate and lead to the overarching context of ending the cold war and achieving disarmament. When and how this context is made

plain is a tactical consideration about which nothing general can be said. But in underscoring this point you have contributed a valuable reminder, to ERAP and SDS program generally as well as to PREP.

(3) Finally, there is the matter of what kind of groups we seek to set up on campus. For one thing, you assume that PREP should want to set up peace-only groups; but this is an assumption that seems to me contrary to the lessons of the past four years, contrary too to the lessons of Tocsin "(b. 1960, d. 1964)". The peace issue is not independent of other issues; moreover, it is more vulnerable to desensitizing influences than others. Regardless of organization structure, very few of the active peace groups of the early '60's have come through unscathed.

Even if it were PREP's object to set up peace groups of the traditional sort, however, I wonder to what extent the "membership-as-leadership" notion ever pervaded Tocsin to the extent you imply it did. Maybe you never heard the phrase because it wasn't operative. I doubt that it was ever far more than some semi-noticed rhetoric. All of which is a shame, but not one that a national organization can do much about.

Maybe the only thing I can conclude from all this is that you have not, it seems to me, come forward with a strategy to convert a set of issues into viable organizations. I'm not, on the other hand, convinced that we now have such a strategy, or even the resources to make one good. I would hope that you contribute to this groping. For if anything is true of any strategy, it is that in order even to be fairly tested it needs the plowing, the sowing, the watering that you talk about.

For more information on PREP write to:

Todd Gitlin and Paul Booth, Coordinators
PEACE RESEARCH AND
EDUCATION PROJECT
1100 E. Washington St., Ann Arbor, Mich.

Interested in conversion?
Subscribe to:

CONVERSION REPORT

Published monthly by:

Boston PREP
144a Mt Auburn St.
Cambridge, Mass

Price: \$2.50 per year

South Africa...

New York's financial district. The date for this action will be Friday, March 19, two days before the fifth anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre.

Traditionally, American protests against apartheid have been content with condemnation of the Verwoeld regime. They have left the impression that apartheid is a system "way off there over the ocean", rather than a system tied to hidden American and British interests, with U.S. financial institutions providing essential support for the social system that institutionalizes the brutality of Sharpeville. The SDS action against Chase Manhattan is directed at exposing those private and powerful financial interests whose operations typify "the higher immorality". And on the same day, SDS chapters will demonstrate at home and branch offices of other corporations that invest in South Africa.

The role of U.S. corporations and financial institutions in the South African economy is great, and has been particularly significant, perhaps decisive, in maintaining the South African regime since 1960. After the Sharpeville massacre of March, 1960, the subsequent declaration of independence of the Republic of South Africa, and South Africa's decision to go off the pound sterling, foreign capital began to flee the country. It looked for a while in 1961 as if the economy was on the verge of collapse. But the United States came to the rescue. The U.S. Government offered to help in the form of a new Atomic Energy Commission six-year contract for South African uranium, improving the Republic's trade balance. Equally significant, the eighty U.S. companies with investments in South Africa increased their investments in 1961 alone by \$23 million. And \$150,000,000 in dollar loans was extended to the South African government from U.S.-dominated

financial institutions (\$38 million, International Monetary Fund; \$28 million, World Bank and its affiliates), from U.S. lenders not publicly identified (\$70 million), and from two major U.S. banks: \$5 million from the First National City Bank of New York, and \$10 million from the Chase Manhattan Bank.

Since 1961 this pattern of U.S. bailing-out of the South African economy has continued unabated. Where there were in 1960 eighty U.S. corporations with investments in South Africa, there are now at least 160, including many corporate giants (General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Firestone, Goodyear, Armstrong, Eastman Kodak, Dow Chemical, Rexall, Pepsi-Cola, Olin-Mathieson, etc.). In 1963, eleven U.S. banks (Chase Manhattan, First National City, and nine others not publicly identified) extended \$40 million in revolving credit to the South African Treasury. Revolving credit amounts to a loan that is automatically re-lent after the principal is repaid—except for the (low) interest, "revolving credit" is tantamount to a grant.

In short, both U.S. banks and U.S. corporations have been influential in underwriting Apartheid in the past several years. Unfortunately, virtually no public attention has been drawn to these "private initiatives." The U.S. government has, if anything, encouraged these loans and investments.

On January 13 the Directors of the Chase Manhattan Bank raised the quarterly dividend from 47.5¢ to 50¢ a share. The "Chase", whose \$13 billion of assets make it the largest bank in New York, reported 1964 earnings of \$84.7 million, or \$4.04 a share, up 8.9% from \$77.8 million, or \$3.71 a share in 1963.

Vietnam...

Vietnamese civil war. The March, set for Saturday, April 17, will coincide with student Easter vacations and is expected to bring several thousand students to Washington.

The theme of the March will be the exposition of the underlying and basic questions of the war, such as who is fighting whom and why. And the extensive campus preparations and publications leading up to the March will emphasize the facts that the war is producing untold injury to Vietnam, that our participation in that war injures Americans at home by creating an atmosphere in which the government continually

lies to the public and decision making becomes farther removed from public control, and that the time has come for all of us to stand up and speak out.

SDS is actively soliciting endorsements of the March from all interested organizations and individuals. Negotiations are being carried on with the Washington Police toward the end of having the March directed at the Capital building, rather than Willard Filmore's grave or some other nondescript Washington landmark. Present plans call for the production of a March call, and the massive production of leaflets for campus distribution. Grants are being solicited to subsidize bus transportation to Washington.

* * *

NAT'L COUNCIL...

sions--the problems and hang-ups must also be sorted out. For it is in the growing pains of the organization that its essence is revealed.

To begin with, there was a trilogy of problems which I will call procedural. The first was simply the problem of size. There is no doubt that the size of the meeting (equal to that of our last National Convention) made it unwieldy. Is it really possible to discuss all the concerns of several hundred articulate and diverse people in four days? Is there, in fact, any point at all to a meeting of this size? The second problem was that of how sessions should be conducted. Some delegates, deeply influenced by their experiences in SNCC and in community work, felt that what we had to do was sit down and talk things out, regardless of how long that might take. The question was raised, "Suppose we rush through the debate and "decide" to do something by a vote of 36 to 33. Will we really have decided anything?" Or, "Suppose we leave here without voting on a single thing. Will the meeting then be said to have been a failure?" Opposed to this view were other delegates who saw the National Council as the executive committee of the organization which had a vast number of problems to be dealt with in only a few days, and this could only be accomplished by the body exercising self-discipline and by the use of formal procedures. But this dispute between the "fill-busterers" and the "formalists" was not resolved, and the meeting limped along under a combination of both. The third problem is that found in any membership organization with a large staff, namely, that the staff represents a more or less coherent body which discusses the problems daily, formulates the problems from its own point of view, and is able to speak about those problems in a more articulate and informed manner. In the case of our own organization, the staff of our community projects injected their own concerns into the meeting to the extent that many important campus issues, such as educational conferences and publications, were never really discussed by the whole body. And for their part, the chapter delegates (most of whom had never met one another before) did not present their concerns forcefully.

After the "procedural" problems, there were what we might loosely refer to as "political" problems. These problems centered mainly about the programs of ERAP and the Political Education Project (PEP). The ERAP staff came to this NC hoping to have a number of very thorny problems resolved. For example, is the ERAP program already spread too thin, and should we regroup and concentrate our staff and resources on two or three of the more successful projects? Should we adopt a state-wide concept of organization and attempt a project in the North like the SNCC Mississippi project? Which of the new projects asking to be affiliated with the ERAP program should be incorporated? At what point can or should the national organization

judge a community project to be a failure and close it down? But important as these questions were, discussion of them was subsumed by the larger question of whether the National Council was the proper body to make these decisions. After all, how can a body composed of campus delegates make intelligent decisions about a situation in which they are not intimately involved? And should they? There are no community representatives voting in the NC. Is this participatory democracy? It was for reasons such as these (and the press of time) which dictated the decision to transfer these questions to an "augmented" ERAP committee (which met for three days following the NC).

The Political Education Project, SDS's non-tax-exempt political action arm, presented another set of problems, for inherent in any political action project is the question of "whose politics?" The PEP staff presented to the NC 1) a proposal for a PEP community project in Cairo, Ill., and 2) a national program with emphasis on the development of campus programs around progressive legislation. The body decided to transfer consideration of the proposed community project to the augmented ERAP committee, where it was subsequently decided not to take the project on (i.e., not assume responsibility for staffing and financing it). And in place of the original national program, Rennie Davis (Director of ERAP) proposed an alternative program which would shift the emphasis to the MFDP challenge, community directed research, and one particular legislative proposal (to be selected by PEP). By a rather close vote, the body opted for the Davis proposal. But the debate and vote tended to reflect also the organization's still unresolved approach to electoral politics. And opinion in the organization still ranges from those who would like to see PEP abolished to those who feel the PEP program for a new coalition to be the only "objectively" radical program.

Finally there were two non-descript problems after the "procedural" and "political" ones. The first concerns SDS's relations with the rest of the American left. The debate over whether our March on Washington should have co-sponsors brought up the old question of how can we maintain our traditional position of openness to all sectors of the left, but avoid having the March destroyed or rendered ineffective by too close association with sectarian left-wing groups. The second was that of where the National Office should be located. Those favoring the mid-West stressed the need of making the office more accessible to the whole membership and getting away from New York, a center of "old left" activity, while those favoring New York stressed the fact that Gotham is indeed the organizational center of the country.

Imagine now all the foregoing problems being debated simultaneously and you have captured the essence of the National Council meeting.

FSM...

November 28 for actions allegedly committed on October 1 and 2, the active support for the FSM expanded greatly, especially among the graduate students. The Graduate Coordinating Committee and the departmental meetings of teaching assistants called for a strike Friday, December 4. Meanwhile, the FSM called for a sit-in in Sprout Hall. Over 800 students were willing to act as front-line troops in the dispute.

Approximately 15,000 students stayed out of classes from Thursday through Monday to protest the use of police on campus and the support the FSM cause.

It is hard to over-estimate the depth of the impact of the free speech controversy on the Berkeley campus. It seems clear that over half of the entire student body has played a role in support of the FSM at one time or another, from attending rallies, striking and signing petitions, to leafletting and other chores. A telephone survey of 5000 students randomly selected during the weekend following the arrests of the 800, showed 55% of the students pro-FSM and willing to strike.

Along with the impressive numbers who rallied to the FSM banner came evidence of deep commitment from a smaller circle of over a thousand students. Arranging meetings, writing and distributing leaflets, and manning telephones absorbed the attentions of an army of students, mostly independents; at crucial times, several sororities pitched in with needed womanpower.

Another indication of student support is the vast amount of money raised during rallies. These funds enabled the FSM to publicize its position in leaflets and newsletters, to rent loud speakers, and to hire meeting halls. Several hundred dollars were raised at various benefit performances. But the bulk of the money raised directly from among students, faculty, and University employees. At the October 1-2 demonstration, following the suspensions of the eight and the arrest of Jack Weinberg, over \$800 was collected. Money was also sent from other college campuses. In all, over \$2,000 was contributed by students.

Several factors contributed to the broad student support for the FSM. First, the free speech issue itself aroused sympathy; the Administration was unable to present a coherent justification for its regulations and the FSM position was a clear libertarian one which could be easily grasped. Press coverage, which tended to paint a picture of a small group of rebels challenging authority, muddled the issues in the public mind; but it only reinforced the commitment of students who attended rallies and saw for themselves the disparities between the press and Administration viewpoints and the actual course of events.

A major factor drawing student support was the repeated Administration response to the student protest: disciplining leaders. Nothing united the students more than the actions of the Administration--suspending the eight students, ordering arrests, and then after explicit and official faculty repudiation of this course, preferring new charges against leaders for acts allegedly committed two months earlier.

Given all these factors, however, the FSM would never have sustained and enlarged the base of its support were it not for the dedication of the leaders to keep the campus informed of FSM policy and to reach policy decisions by as democratic a procedure as possible.

A continuous stream of FSM literature outlined the demands and tactics planned. It was, furthermore, common knowledge, that the FSM was making frequent overtures to important administrators towards setting up talks on the issue, and that these attempts were not getting very far. Hardly a week passed without several informal meetings and telephone conversations with important members of the Administration--in each case initiated by members of the FSM. At one point, several "moderate" FSM members actually met with President Kerr and thought they had reached a compromise agreement, only to learn the following day that the President had changed his mind.

During several major rallies, the FSM's commitment to democratic procedure was evident. On these occasions, extensive discussion about options open to the FSM took place right at the rally and a voice vote decided the issue. For instance, on November 20, several thousand students assembled across the street from the Regents meeting, learned of the Regents' decision: the rules would be somewhat liberalized, but the Administration would still judge whether speech were "legal" and there would be further disciplinary action against the FSM. A segment of the leadership favored an immediate sit-in. The majority of the students agreed with the position of Mario Savio, that such a move was inappropriate at that time; and the meeting adjourned for the weekend.

Since the press has often minimized the student support for the FSM cause, it should be pointed out here that for a long while, faculty and administration also failed to see how extensive and intensive the student feelings were. A major turning point for the faculty came when hundreds of their brightest students were arrested on December 3-4, and when a majority of their teaching assistants (90% in the Humanities and Social Sciences) went on strike over the issue. At this writing, however, some members of the Administration continue to believe that the free speech controversy involves only a handful of "disruptive elements," and trust that the dispute will end if these people are eliminated from the school.

FSM...

The organization of the graduate students and their entrance into the policy-making of the Free Speech Movement marked a turning point in the course of the movement. The graduate students were among the most experienced and sophisticated members of the FSM and tended to raise the level of the discussions within the FSM. Furthermore, they were able to call on vast resources of intelligent and hard-working colleagues who had some leverage--the teaching assistants.

Until the free speech controversy, graduate students were unorganized. They were disfranchised from the Student Government (ASUC) in 1959. A few unsuccessful attempts were made during the following years to set up a Graduate Student Association but by the onset of the fall semester 1964, the organization no longer existed.

After the October 2 crisis, the graduate students set up the Graduate Coordinating Council consisting of two elected members from each department. Immediately, the GCC elected seven delegates to the FSM Executive Committee. As the dispute continued, graduates began to take the initiative. They felt deeply about the free speech issue, and especially feared the effect the restrictions on advocacy might have on the civil rights movement in the Bay Area. Graduate students were not convinced that FSM members practiced the right tactics, but they were persuaded of the justice of the FSM aims, and assumed they would have an important influence in FSM councils. This assumption was borne out.

The entry of the graduate students into the Executive Committee of the FSM paralleled an increasing amount of graduate participation in rallies and in the administrative running of the movement, especially in writing literature and handling informal faculty and Administration contacts. Though most graduate students tended to leave direct action to younger quarters, over 20% of the eight hundred students arrested December 3 in Sproul Hall were graduates. As FSM sympathies among graduate students grew, the tactic of a strike became feasible and the possibility was frequently discussed.

The fall 1964 semester of the University of California is generally regarded as the most exciting and dangerous era in its history. Like the loyalty oath controversy of the early fifties the danger came when outside pressures were transmitted by the administration into University policy. But the resistance to the inequities of the policies and the structures generating them has made a difference and has opened great perspectives for university reform in the California university system and elsewhere.

By any standard, save that of those who say that education does not exist outside a classroom

setting, the semester was the most educational in the history of the school. An ever increasing number in the University community were involved in a sophisticated level of dialogue created by a group of students whose main tactic was to continue to clarify the difference between conditions for educational excellence and the reality, and the unfolding of events in which the roles played by various participants became increasingly clear and the relationship between structures and patterns of interest and authority emerged for all to see. By the time of the arrests over 65% of the student body was actively supporting the Free Speech Movement as a result of this educational process.

The Free Speech Movement will continue to live its ideal of uncompromising dedication to principles of democratic participation and free expression both on and off the campus.

CHAPTERS...

Washington) or demonstrations (U of Illinois) on Vietnam. The MIT chapter and others in the Boston area are working with the Boston PREP project, organizing on the issue of conversion of the economy.

University reform, which was almost a dead issue on the campus a year ago, is now far from that. Most of the chapters are considering some action on university reform and for some chapters university reform will be the major activity. The Smith chapter is making plans for a sit-in in the library to protest early closing hours. Several chapters are directing their efforts at changing the student government. The University of Texas will be running a candidate for student body president, Carleton, Roosevelt, VOICE, and others have members on the student government. Harvard is fighting to change student government into a meaningful body.

The University of Illinois formed an Ad Hoc Committee for Student Expression to protest the lack of any student voice in administrative decisions. Duke has been working on issues of *in loco parentis* and curriculum reform. Queens is interested in working for reasonable library hours, free press, and general lessening of red-tape for extra-curricular activities. The University of Michigan has been concerned with economic issues relevant to students such as university wages and housing costs. The University of Washington has similar plans. Texas is concerned with free tuition, Carleton with press censorship and open-house issues. Pembroke hopes to re-establish an honor system. Vassar wants to change speaker regulations, Simmons wants curriculum changes, Harpur wants off-campus living... The Berkeley Free Speech Movement wants free speech—but more than that, it wants a university quite different from Clark Kerr's concept of the "multiversity"...

CHAPTERS...

This increase in university reform activity is certainly due in large part, if not almost entirely, to the FSM demonstrations at Berkeley and the campaigns in support of the FSM that were begun on many other campuses. Many chapters, in addition to calling for support for the FSM began to look at and talk about the conditions on their own campuses. And they found that Berkeley was not alone in its need for basic changes in the university. And they began to have hope that perhaps they could have an effect.

Although university reform is seen by some students in a narrow sense on minor reforms, to some it means major reforms in the university and its system of education.

There are many issues, even whole areas, that I haven't mentioned yet—political work of all sorts, civil liberties issues....The list is really endless. And the possibilities for chapter programs are also endless.

SSOC...

to personal poverty and deprivation...an end to public poverty...a democratic society where politics poses meaningful dialogue and choices about issues that affect men's lives, not manipulation by vested elites...an end to man's inhumanity to man...a world working toward the easing of tensions of the Cold War with positive emphasis on peace, disarmament, and world-wide understanding." Thus SSOC was to be multi-issue, rather than single-issue, oriented; however, it was realized that most students were there because of their interest in civil rights and equal opportunity for Negroes; it was also realized that much had to be done to arouse interest in the other goals, and that this would take a lot of time and work. Bearing this in mind, much emphasis was given to the desire that SSOC be virtually all-inclusive--that a student, whether he be moderate or radical, could have and would have, yes, even should have, a place in SSOC. All believed that the ability to grow and change is present in every individual; that a person will be respected for what and where he is; and that within and through SSOC he can grow and help others to grow. It was not expected that more than a few would take giant steps but that through increased awareness and involvement, all would grow. This means that stodgy old radicals can learn from groping young moderates (and of course the other way around). Utopian, you say--this desire to be all inclusive? Perhaps. But for years we've been dreaming in the South, and almost always about the wrong things.

So what have you done and what are you doing; you ask. We've placed a lot of emphasis on stimulation through communication. There were 125 students representing forty-three colleges in ten states at our November '64 conference. We talked about civil rights and liberties and academic freedom, and southern history and politics past and present. The varying degrees of awareness

of those present can be illustrated by two questions heard there: "Pardon me, but what is HUAC?" and "When can I come to your campus to talk about what I learned in Cuba this summer?"

Campus groups and individuals are involved in lots of things including: tutorials; university reform; public accommodations testing; picketing "private clubs"; research on urban renewal (Negro removal); meeting Negroes--and meeting whites (and if you don't know what that means, you have a lot to learn about the South); recruiting Negroes to go to previously all-white schools; trying to find someone who has some ideas on conversion; hunting for someone on the faculty who has some ideas (Casey Hayden, who went to the U of Texas, once said, "I was twenty-one before I ever met a full-fledged idea."); labor organizing; fighting gag laws; bitching about "double-jeopardy". While SSOC as an organization cannot take credit for a lot of these things, it has found three campus travellers who believe in its goals and program enough that they are going around telling others like themselves, "spreading the word" as it were. And this Christmas, about 45 people gave up part of their vacation to work in Mississippi.

As of now, SSOC is a predominantly white organization, but the staff has been mandated to work to bring about a truly "inter-racial, inter-collegiate" student organization in the South.

It is not anticipated at present that SSOC will sponsor a summer project, but that we will try to feed people into the programs of other organizations in the South, e.g., COFO, SNCC, and AFSC.

Plans for this spring include a large conference in Atlanta in Mid-March; possibly a spring-vacation Mississippi project; a joint SDS-SNCC-SSOC conference on University Reform in April; and an effort to organize the state of Tennessee around capital punishment. We shall also continue to publish The SSOC Newsletter.

Finally, I want to say something about a bit that everyone else has said something about. For a good century now, at least, there has been a lot of talk about "Southern tradition" and "the Southern way of life." In more recent years, they've written about "the mind of the South" and "the Southern mystique." Mainly this is all about Palegra, Incest, Murder, and Pucky-politeness. And the acronym for all this is PIMP. The pimp for a land and people which has prostituted itself for all the world to ridicule. Then do you ask why do we care, why do we work, when we appear so bitter? Because we, too, are responsible for this pimp and this prostitute. We have sired and suckled them, oftentimes without realizing it. And we who know them best must help them and ourselves and love them. Pimps and prostitutes have always been scapegoats for the morally superior. I wonder what would happen if the former got reformed?

Y'all tell us where the good guys are.