

20c **S.D.S.**



INSCAPE

INSCAPE (a word created by Gerard Manley-Hopkins)

Inscape is insight into that individually-distinctive form which constitutes the rich and revealing 'one-ness' of Man, Society, and Nature

Inscape refers to the individuality of the essence of any man whilst illuminating the pattern that is Man, that is Society, and that is Nature

Inscape illuminates the nature of the individual as the building-stone of the 'one-ness' that is society

Edited by: Judith Cameron
Diana Crunden

EDITORIAL

An essential aspect of the S.D.S. magazine will be the discussion of the role of S.D.S. in the University and society for 1969 and the future. As such it will provide a vital link for communications between members during the vacation.

A further important aspect of the magazine will be the discussion of issues with which S.D.S. finds itself concerned. This can be achieved through the inclusion of articles not readily available to everyone, but, more importantly, through the contributions of members themselves.

This first edition is purely experimental and any suggestions or constructive criticisms will be welcomed.

- - - - -

CONTENTS

Principles of a Democratic Society	Page 1
Report of an S.D.S. meeting	Page 2
Pangu Pati Newsheet 3. (New Guinea)	Page 4
"Up The Revolution" - Chris O'Connell, Sydney S.D.S.	Page 6
A Framework for Our Generation - Harry van Moorst	Page 8
S.D.S. Racial Action Committee (R.A.C.)	Page 11
Reform or Revolution - Carl Davidson (U.S.A.)	Page 12
S.D.S. Constitution	Page 16
Coming Events	Page 17

THE PRINCIPLES OF A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

S.D.S., while recognizing that no single objective can be safely isolated from the social context of the overall objective and that action must be related to the establishment of a chain reaction of related social change, and while rejecting absolutely any theories of elitism, believes that the principles upon which a democratic society would be based are:

1. An economic and social system which is not only a specific system of relations between things and institutions but a system of human relations.
2. The supreme value in all social and economic arrangements is men and the goal of society is to offer the conditions for the full development of man's potentialities by ensuring the full development of each individual is the condition for the full development of all.
3. Every man is an end in himself and must never be made into a means to another man's ends.
4. It is committed to the unity of mankind and the solidarity of all men, fighting any kind of worship of state, nation or class.
5. It is radically opposed to war and violence and considers attempts to solve political and social problems by force and violence immoral and inhuman when non-violent means of restoring the conflict are available.
6. It holds that each member of society feels responsible for his fellow citizens, not as members of a particular community but as citizens of the world.
7. It stands for freedom from fear, want, oppression and violence and also for freedom to participate actively, responsibly in all decisions concerning the citizen and freedom to develop the individual's human potential to the fullest degree.
8. It believes in the introduction of a maximum of decentralization compatible with a minimum of centralization necessary for the co-ordinated functioning of society.
9. It recognizes that social change is a continuing process in which the desire for a better, more human society provides for an unending pressure to accomplish something which does not yet exist and may never exist and a refusal to necessarily accept the status quo.

(Tentatively accepted at the first meeting of S.D.S.
August, 1968)

REPORT OF THE S.D.S. MEETING 23/11/68:

The meeting opened with a report on the progress of the Gurindji Truck Appeal. Up-to-date approximately \$3000 has been raised; \$1,200 of this was raised in the Abschol-S.D.S. down-town collection. Secondary students have also helped, and the appeal has been co-sponsored by Students In Dissent and Secondary Students for Democratic Action. So far Secondary Students have raised about \$170. The Trade Unions have donated about \$350.

The desirability of joint research with the Trade Unions (especially the Meat Workers' Union) into Vestys and their control over the granting of Land Rights was discussed. It was seen as a good opportunity to work in co-operation with the Unions and a research committee was set up.

The second item to be discussed was conscription. There was some controversy about the function of S.D.S. with regard to such controversial issues as conscription. Two main points were stressed - firstly that no member should ever be bound by a policy decision of S.D.S.; secondly that S.D.S. should not make policy statements on controversial issues because this would turn away many prospective members - such policy statements should be left to sub-committees. It was pointed out that this concept of S.D.S. would turn it into a 'wishy-washy', undefined, and hence unattractive organization, and that furthermore this was pragmatism at the expense of idealism. It was countered that S.D.S. would be attractive because of this very concept, which allowed most people to be members, and would be defined by its activity and its ideals of full participation, self-actualization, and democracy.

A temporary solution was found when the S.D.S. Anti Conscription Committee was set up, comprising most of those present at the meeting.

The Anti Conscription Committee (A.C.C.) adopted the policy of condemning conscription as being a denial of the right of each individual to determine his own future. At the same time the committee agreed to support amendments to the National Service Act as a step towards the eventual repeal of the Act. It was decided to elect two people to represent S.D.S. at the Trade Union Conference on Conscription (Nov. 25th.). The two representatives were Augustine Zycher and Chris Majewski.

A.C.C. further agreed to call a conference on December 28th. for all draft resisters and potential draft resisters - this conference to be partly an S.D.S. conference because S.D.S. from Sydney and Adelaide, and perhaps other capitals, would be coming to Melbourne.

David Hollinsworth from Sydney S.D.S. gave a report of their activities with special emphasis on the Guerilla Theatre. Guerilla Theatre is similar in spirit to the mock ballot held by Melbourne S.D.S. earlier this year. The aim is to present a scene to the public which either satirizes or dramatizes certain actions of the Establishment. Before anyone can intervene the 'actors' depart for some other venue to repeat the performance. This activity, plus student/mass media football matches for Biaffra, 'Freedom Rides', 'Sit-Ins', etc., have proved quite successful in Sydney and have made Sydney S.D.S. the most influential student organization on (and off) Sydney Campus. The meeting agreed that it would be valuable to organize a Guerilla Theatre in Melbourne.

The meeting agreed on the desirability of re-establishing the S.D.S discussion meetings and it was decided to have discussion sessions every Saturday at 57 Palmerston St., starting at 11:00 am.

The Free University was discussed briefly and a number of people volunteered to help organize it. It was decided to hold a meeting at a time to be announced later.

The meeting then discussed the City Council By-Law which prevents the dissemination of written information in the City. There was general consensus about the undesirable nature of this by-law and the necessity to have it repealed. However, it was pointed out that S.D.S. would not have the resources to mount a campaign against this by-law if it was to run campaigns on conscription and Land Rights next year; though most likely the handing out of information would automatically be a part of any campaign on conscription or Land Rights. It was generally agreed that in principle at least fines incurred through disseminating information should not be paid. Discussion ensued about the principle that this by-law should be completely ignored and about the best way of doing this without showing disrespect for those individuals whose job it is to enforce this law, and without showing disrespect for the 'Just Law'.

It was agreed that this could best be done by not volunteering our names to the Traffic Officer, politely explaining that we legally need not do so and that we do not recognise the law he is basing his case on. The Traffic Officer would then be forced to call a Policeman. The same should then be told to him - this would mean he would have to arrest us before we are legally obliged to give our names. It was noted that the above should first be verified by a solicitor before it is acted upon.

The meeting then adjourned to the nearest pub to recuperate.

- - - - -

The next S.D.S. meeting will be at the National Conference December 29th.

- - - - -

We need more finance for this magazine - if you know anyone who may be interested in subscribing to it please ask them to send their dollar.

This is a reprint of Pangu Newsheet No. 3
The Pangu Pati is a political party of Papua New Guinea with the
stated aim of working for internal self government leading to full
self government.

WHY PANGU HAS BEEN FORMED

We have sent out our Platform. A Platform is a list of things Pangu will try to do. But you need background news to know what's behind all this.

In the "Home Rule" submission to the Select Committee it said, "The time has come to put some responsibility into the hands of the Papuans and New Guineans in the House of Assembly. We must begin now and learn about government by 'doing it'". But the Minister and the Administration don't like this. They are now getting very hard. They want to keep all the power and control in their hands. This kind of power is called Executive authority and decision making. Not a single Papuan or New Guinean has ever been given this kind of power. We in PANGU say this is not a good thing. We cannot go on being like children or we will never be ready for self-government. We say the Australian government should begin to fulfill what they promised in 1963 and this should begin in 1968. But the Australian Government says no.

The Australian Government has promised many things but some of these are not being carried out. The present Minister, Mr. Barnes, seems to be going back on former policies and refuses to give us new responsibility. How can we go forward and grow if Australians control everything, decide everything and are masters of everything. Take this example:

In 1963 Mr. Hasluck said Under Secretaries will become Ministers. A minister would be a man appointed by the House of Assembly and put in charge of a Department. All the ministers would sit in a Cabinet which is called an Executive. This means they have full control of government and decide what to do. They would also be responsible to the House of Assembly because the House of Assembly is responsible to the people. This is ministerial government. This is what Mr. Hasluck foretold. This is the root of Home Rule. This is what we have asked for.

But this has not happened. And this will not happen in 1968 either if the Australian Government follows the Select Committee's report. The House of Assembly has passed the report so it seems almost certain that Federal Government will put this Report into the Papua New Guinea Act.

Remember these promises by Mr. Hasluck are supposed to be part of Australian policy and plan for Papua New Guinea. But they are not carrying this out. And instead of coming straight out into the open and saying, "We are not going to do this yet", or instead of saying, "We don't think the time is right" or "We have given up what Mr. Hasluck promised to you", they are pretending to do something that looks good but means nothing at all. They propose (plan) to appoint "Ministers" which will not be ministers at all. They propose to set up an "Executive" which will not be a true Executive, only an advisory body like the old Administrator's Council. They are using names like "Minister" and "Executive" which have a clear meaning in Australia, but in this country they will mean something quite different. PANGU says this is not honest. This is not good.

We say this is dishonest because people will think we are going to have true "Ministers" and a true "Executive". It is not good to mislead people like this. When the House of Assembly wakes up and understands that the Australian Government is fooling them with empty words they will get very angry. Then there will be a breakdown of trust and confidence in Australians and this is very bad. We say to the Australian Government stop using the "double standard". That means one standard for Australians and another standard for Papuans and New Guineans. We see this in the Public Service. This is supposed to be one Public Service but there is one salary standard for Australian Public Servants and another lower standard for Local Officers. Again look at citizenship - Papuans are supposed to have Australian citizenship. For an Australian his citizenship is a very important thing, but for a Papuan it means nothing at all. It is only second class citizenship. This is not good.

Now it seems they want to introduce the "double standard" in government. That is why we in PANGU say we do not want second class "Ministers" or a second class "Executive". Far better not to use these names at all. What is the truth behind this double talk. It means that the Papua New Guinea Administration controlled by Canberra, is still a colonial-type of government. These so-called "Ministers" will some day be called "puppet" ministers. Because, in the end, they must obey the Administrator. So we will be no nearer to learning about self government. We know these words "puppet" ministers and "colonial" government have a bad sound. But the Administration can only blame themselves because they are making the same mistake they made when they appointed Under Secretaries and made elected members a part of an Australian Administration. They have turned down the wishes of many people. They are misleading the House of Assembly by using names which, in Australia, have a different meaning. This is what Mr. Henderson pointed out in the House of Assembly. At least he was honest. This is going to cause much confusion and misunderstanding. So we say there must be an end to this heavy-handed domination (bossing) of our elected members by the Minister.

- - - - -

Prayer session, Radio 2UW, Tues. Dec.3rd.

"...and let us give a prayer for World peace - and for all those fighting overseas."

FILMS:

Films will be shown at 57 Palmerston St., throughout the vacation. They will be shown at fairly regular intervals of about once/week. Films are presently being negotiated from Embassies and Film Centres. Phone 345734.

The following is an extract from MARCHONS, the Sydney S.D.S. newsletter.

"UP" THE REVOLUTION!

There are three signs of immaturity among Australian left-wing youths. The first is their penchant for singing "THE RED FLAG" at the drop of a hat, which usually means at the pub. You can see them, self-righteously emphasizing the "traitors sneer", hypocritically slurping over the dungeons, the blood, the spirit of self-sacrifice to the point of braving death. And you might ask how many of these "revolutionaries", in their more sober moments, shriek out their pacifism at front lawn meetings. Or you might ask how many of them are prepared to carry their ideal of self-sacrifice to the extent of refusing to register for National Service: not many, statistics show. And you man end up by sneering at them, which immediately classifies you as a "traitor".

The second sign is the constant, half-flippant, half-serious, but always unreasoned reference to the "revolution". Our good left-wingers - Trotskyites, anarchists, syndicalists, Moscow-liners, ideologues of all varieties - are committed to the "revolution", and please believe them, because otherwise they might have to try and prove it to you, and then you might discover that they are too busy drinking their half-baked apologies for an "ideology" to produce a "revolution". You might even discover that they do not know how to load, aim, fire and clean an SLR. You might find that they do not know the first principles of first aid, just in case there are real bullets in the "revolution". You might find in fact, that the left-wing youth, particularly the university student, does not know how to fight, how to accept discipline, how to "cause" a "revolution". You might find at the last, that all he can do is talk - about the "revolution", of course, always the "revolution".

The third sign of left-wing immaturity is the idealizing of Che Guevara. Che tried to do something, and therein lies his attraction, despite the fact that he got done. Because Che exported "revolution" he must be praised: that is the be all and end all for young Australian "revolutionaries" who haven't the guts even to make public donations to aid the revolutionaries in Vietnam - a typical example of their hypocrisy and cowardice.

Che was an adventurist who flopped and was killed in the manner he would have killed his opponents. What must be condemned is the acceptance by so many left-wingers of the belief that "revolution" can be exported. To be justified and to be successful, revolution must occur when the objective and subjective conditions are ripe, are favourable. Otherwise, the "liberating revolutionaries" are merely putting themselves in the place of their "oppressive opponents". Che did not attempt to ripen these conditions: he just waltzed in, shot up a few border guards, and expected to be taken seriously. He deserved to fail, and he did fail; just as the NLF will not fail because it did not put the cart before the horse.

SDS is seeking a revolution in values and attitudes, which in many cases probably approach those of the democratic socialist. It does not seek armed revolution in Australia, and regards all talk of such a "revolution" here as a ludicrous fantasy, and as such the property of the left-wing. S.D.S. is seeking to alter and influence the values of students at Sydney University in the belief that this is a necessary precondition to, and concomitant of, social change and structural reform.

S.D.S. has no intention of compromising its principles with the Trotskyite Labour Club, which no longer exists on campus, anyway, except to provide pocket money for its members from bookstall sales. What on earth is the point of making the attempt when a member of that club, at the first Czechoslovakia demonstration outside the Cenotaph carried a placard: "Leon Trotsky, We Need You Now"? What possible advantage is there to be gained by S.D.S. becoming associated with emotional "revolutionaries" who insist on parading their banners with Che Guevara's image printed on them at all public functions, no matter how "unrevolutionary". S.D.S. has its objectives, Che Guevara had his, and, thank God, the twain don't meet.

On the other hand, S.D.S. is confronted with the big talkers who disappear when the neck has to be placed on the line. These are the establishment Left. S.D.S. is easily distinguished from these "armchair revolutionaries" who have not yet, despite their criticism of the activists, produced a blueprint for "revolution" not any outline of what to put in place of the "capitalist system" they denounce, in fact, they have displayed a contemptible lassitude when it comes even to criticising that nasty "capitalist system". An article a year will do."

The points of departure are two: S.D.S. seeks a qualitative change in each individual; the armchair revolutionaries are concerned with structural change. Secondly, S.D.S. is an action group which seeks its change by getting students involved in activities so as to preach by example; our big talkers find the attractions of ideological refinement so great that they leave the implementation of their ideas up to their fairy-godmothers.

S.D.S. prefers to work with the ordinary student, the "sneering traitor" of "Red Flag" fame, than with the establishment lefties who watched their "revolution" on the television when police attacked students at Martin Place. The Alf then put his neck on the line, unsupported, in one case deserted by the armchair revolutionaries.

WE NEED HELP:

1. to produce the S.D.S. magazine
2. for Community Projects
3. to build our bookshop/coffee lounge
4. to research into: - aborigines
- New Guinea
- "Peace Talks"
- education

Contact S.D.S., 57 Palmerston St., Carlton, 3053. Ph. 345734.

A FRAMEWORK FOR OUR GENERATION

The new generation, of which we are a part, has inherited a world filled with machines and bombs, and the coldness of individuals turned to statistics. With 2/3rds of the world living in poverty and the world's population increasing at a rate that makes famine, disease, and widespread unrest and dissatisfaction a certainty in the next 20 years, our 'leaders' still insist on a policy of anarchy between nations and still maintain the selfish attitude of 'first come first served'.

We look at our inheritance and find it the home for apathy and human degradation. People are no longer individuals, free to develop and diversify, they are the cogs of a social machine which demands obedience and conformity. Politics, based as it is on obtaining a majority by persuasion, has, in conjunction with the all-encompassing oil-slick of the mass-media, produced conformity as its major output. Politics appeals to, and reinforces, only those attitudes, drives and desires people have in common. Individuals are forced to fit in with THE SYSTEM. Whether the system is capitalism or communism as we know it, doesn't matter - the fact is that we are looking at a world that places more value on a system than on the individual, more value on the law than on the person it is supposed to protect. The System passes laws to make itself comfortable, it even allows dissent if it can remain comfortable, but at best many of these laws are supported by a majority at the expense of the minority and at worst they are a dictatorship of a minority over the majority.

We see that Man has been degraded. Yet when we speak Man does not listen, does not care. This apathy causes the situation in which he finds himself, and his perception of that situation causes his apathy. The Man on the Street knows he cannot really do anything - ask him to do something and he admits he really has no say in Government policy. He has never been given the opportunity to make decisions; he is forced to re-sell his power to the politicians every three years at election time. The System doesn't need him for anything more than that; the Democracy can be guided along quite well without his "interference": He has long since learnt to rationalise his position. He no longer tries to have a say - Politics stinks anyway, and the Government does alright by me.

But it doesn't do alright by others. It doesn't help the millions in other countries who are starving to death, it doesn't help the suppressed minority groups in our country. Why should it, minority groups by definition don't have many votes. Ask the Man in the Street and he answers he doesn't know what he can do for those poor people; THE SYSTEM doesn't even bother.

Then Man takes the final step of degradation. He forces upon others the values of his own System, values often mere rationalizations for inadequacies in his own position. It may be valid to say that "I would rather be Dead than Red". But it is immoral to act according to the notion that "He would rather be Dead than Red". This imposition of so-called values upon other people is an integrated function of the social system we have inherited.

The new generation has to cope with this inheritance. But our inheritance, along with ourselves, cannot survive on this foundation of de-personalised systems, where the human being is no longer an individual, encompassing an undefined potential, but a mere statistic. Radical changes are called for.

However, though we may be legally of age, our inheritance is not our own - it is still the property of the last two generations. They are the ones who have created today's situation and they are the ones who have a vested interest in maintaining it as is - we cannot look to them for change. It is left to us.

We are the young radicals; we shall work for radical changes in our society. We, as students in and of our society, must rise above the complacency to which it is so easy for people in our position to succumb. We must look beyond the University and beyond our professional aims to our responsibility as agents for social change. As students we are in a position enabling us to see and analyse the society in which we live. This position assigns to us a social responsibility which cannot be fulfilled simply by taking up our profession when we have our University degree: it is a responsibility which demands our continued activity in an ever-expanding movement to instill in our society a full respect for the individual, his beliefs and actions in such a way that he is free to govern and direct his life in all its aspects.

This movement must aim at changing basic social attitudes, not at superficial changes like a change of Government or an alternative political system. We must develop methods whereby we can induce people to realise the importance and value of the individual. People must be made aware that democracy should ultimately be aimed at giving each single person the maximum control over the whole spectrum of his life. Only then will they act to remove the artificial, legalistic structures that are imprisoning and limiting their whole being. And this will only be possible if we can show people that they have the power to change their society and the power to demolish the unnecessary structures and govern their own lives.

=====

Keeping the above in mind, I would like to suggest a possible framework for S.D.S. activity next year. S.D.S. should not, however, tie itself down to any one framework - continual discussion and evaluation is vital.

The work of S.D.S. should take place both on and off campus. On campus we should attempt to introduce the maximum possible participation in the life and functioning of the University. Within S.D.S. we should organize so as to avoid elitism and to encourage activism. Our committee meetings are open to all persons active enough to attend, thus ensuring that anyone who wishes to have a say in what S.D.S. does may do so. Policy should be decided by reaching an agreement, not by voting. Voting splits a meeting into two - the majority may be happy with the solution but the minority are left on a limb, being a

part of the organization yet disagreeing with some of its policies. This same principle can apply when we discuss S.D.S. activity. No member should ever be bound by the decisions or actions of any other member or group of members, but neither should he be limited by them. Any activity which fits in with the ideals of S.D.S. may be undertaken by any individual who has the initiative to do so. Sub-committees have been set up which should act as individual bodies within the broad principles of S.D.S. They should not have to refer their actions to popular consent - all those who do consent to their activity should participate if possible, those who disagree will obviously not participate. Only if a sub-committee contravenes any of the S.D.S. principles should they be responsible to a general meeting.

S.D.S. on campus should take a close look at the University administration, and should endeavor to create as much student participation in the running of the University, from the distribution of finance to the planning of courses, as possible.

But we should also work off-campus. We should venture into the community to show people that they can run their own lives. Perhaps next year S.D.S. will become involved with the High-Rise flats so that these communities can see the possibility of running their own lives and their own community. Perhaps we will venture into the migrant sectors of Melbourne to help create an awareness of the problem facing our community.

Next year we will probably organize campaigns to highlight some of our social problems. These campaigns must take into account three important things. Firstly, it should always be pointed out that these problems are all merely symptoms of a more general cause - most of our major problems are interrelated and cannot be separated from this general cause. Secondly, campaigns should involve as many people as possible. The concept of "education through action" appears to be a valid one. Thirdly, these campaigns should be run according to the principles of S.D.S. They should always take full account of the individual and should always attribute to him the dignity and freedom all human beings deserve. This means we should not demean or degrade our adversary but rather show him in his full light and make him explain his actions. It is only by leaving your adversary with self-respect and dignity that you will change his attitude - this is what shame does, which abuse can never achieve.

This also means, of course, that we must employ non-violent means of action. Violence involves more than just a degradation of the individual, it is a denial of his right to act and think as an individual - violence strengthens rather than changes attitudes; it detracts from the issue at stake and pushes the principles into the background.

Finally, it should be noted that S.D.S. is an experiment in "revolution". Radical changes in society are necessary if the individual is to survive. There are several alternatives open to us. We can use methods of revolution that have been tried before, in situations where they were more applicable than here, and yet were still not a great success. These "violent overthrow" methods of revolution do not even appear applicable in a society like Australia. Or we could attempt to change society through the existing channels such as joining the

ALP. But the political parties are all intrinsically elitist and very similar to one another in their basic outlook on society. Furthermore, using the existing means is to use political power instead of social power and is to change parties or systems instead of attitudes - hence it will always be a "bandaid" solution. A third alternative would be to attempt the S.D.S. experiment. We can try to change attitudes; and we can enable people to run their own lives; and hence ignore and devalue the structures and systems that can in actuality only imprison those with legalistic attitudes.

Unlike most other organizations we are not out to implant an ideology. Hence we are not tied to the dogmatism that always accompanies it. We can be flexible and mobile in thought and action. We do not pretend to have a blue-print of the society we want; we are not so egotistical as to say what is best nor so naive as to assume that people would do what is best for them even if they knew what it was. Even if we had a blue-print we still should not use it because we must allow society to develop its own alternative to THE SYSTEM.

Harry van Moorst

S.D.S. RACIAL ACTION COMMITTEE (R.A.C.)

S.D.S. needs a committee to investigate instances of racial discrimination in Australia, in accordance with S.D.S.'s policy of taking action to protect the right of individuals to participate to the fullest extent in the governing of their lives.

Research is planned into the political and administrative set-up in New Guinea; in particular the extent to which the Australian Government is encouraging progress towards self-government, and the effects of the recent events in West Irian.

The R.A.C. will also take action on Aboriginal affairs. At present attention is being directed towards investigating Vestey's, the political and economic power they wield in Australia, and the extent of their business interests. The Meat Workers' Union are joining with us on this research.

We need lots of people for this, so for anyone who is interested, the first meeting will be held at C.D.A., 57 Palmerston St., on Saturday 14th. of December, starting at 4.00 pm.

Stephanie Richardson.

REFORM OR REVOLUTION: WHAT KIND OF DEMANDS?

Fighting for reforms and making a revolution should not be seen as mutually exclusive positions. The question should be: what kind of reforms move us toward a radical transformation of both the university and the society in general? First of all, we should avoid the kinds of reforms which leave the basic rationale of the system unchallenged. For instance, a bad reform to work for would be getting a better grading system, because the underlying rationale - the need for grades at all - remains unchallenged.

Secondly, we should avoid certain kinds of reform that divide students from each other. For instance, trying to win certain privileges for upper class-men but not for freshmen or sophomores. Or trying to establish non-graded courses for students above a certain grad-point average. In the course of campus political activity, the administration will try a whole range of "divide and rule" tactics such as fostering the "Greek-Independent Split", sexual double standards intellectual vs. "jocks", responsible vs. irresponsible leaders, red-baiting and "non-student" vs. students. We need to avoid falling into these traps ahead of time, as well as fighting them when used against us.

Finally, we should avoid all of the "co-management" kinds of reforms. These usually come in the form of giving certain "responsible" student leaders a voice or influence in certain decision-making processes, rather than abolishing or winning effective control over those parts of the governing apparatus. One way to counter administration suggestions for setting up "tripartite" committees (1/3 student, 1/3 faculty, 1/3 administration, each with an equal number of votes) is to say, OK, but once a month the committee must hold an all-university plenary session - one man, one vote. The thought of being outvoted 1000 to 1 will cause administrators to scrap that co-optive measure in a hurry.

We have learned the hard way that the reformist path is full of pitfalls. What then, are the kinds of reformist measures that do make sense? First of all, there are the civil libertarian issues. We must always fight, dramatically and quickly, for free speech and the right to organize, advocate and mount political action - of all sorts. However, even here, we should avoid getting bogged down in "legalitarianism". We cannot count on this society's legal apparatus to guarantee our civil liberties; and, we should not organize around civil libertarian issues as if it could. Rather, when our legal rights are violated, we should move as quickly as possible, without losing our base, to expand the campus libertarian moral indignation into a multi-issue political insurgency, exposing the repressive character of the administration and the corporate state in general.

The second kind of partial reform worth fighting for and possibly winning is the abolition of on-campus repressive mechanisms, i.e., student courts, disciplinary tribunals, deans of men and women, campus police, and the use of civil police on campus. While it is true that "abolition" is a negative reform, and while we will be criticized for not offering "constructive" criticisms, we

should reply that the only constructive way to deal with an inherently destructive apparatus is to destroy it. We must curtail the ability of administrators to repress our need to refuse their way of life- the regimentation and bureaucratization of existence.

When our universities are already major agencies for social change in the direction of 1984, our initial demands must, almost of necessity, be negative demands. In this sense, the first task of a student power movement will be the organization of a holding action - a resistance. Along these lines, one potentially effective tactic for resisting the university's disciplinary apparatus would be the formation of a Student Defense League. The purpose of the group would be to make its services available to any student who must appear before campus authorities for infractions of repressive (or just plain stupid) rules and regulations. The defense group would then attend the student's hearings en masse. However, for some cases, it might be wise to include law students or local radical lawyers in the group for the purpose of making legal counter-attacks. A student defense group would have three major goals: 1) saving as many students as possible from punishment, 2) desanctifying and rendering dis-functional the administration's repressive apparatus, and 3) using 1) and 2) as tactics in reaching other students for building a movement to abolish the apparatus as a whole.

When engaging in this kind of activity, it is important to be clear in our rhetoric as to what we are about. We are not trying to liberalize the existing order, but trying to win our liberation from it. We must refuse the administrations' rhetoric or "responsibility". To their one-dimensional way of thinking, the concept of responsibility has been reduced to its opposite namely, be nice, don't rock the boat, do things according to our criteria of what is permissible. In actuality their whole system is geared toward the inculcation of the values of a planned irresponsibility. We should refuse their definitions, their terms, and even refuse to engage in their semantic hassles. We only need to define for ourselves and other students our notions of what it means to be free, constructive, and responsible. Too many campus movements have been co-opted for weeks or even permanently by falling into the administrations' rhetorical bags.

Besides the abolition of repressive disciplinary mechanisms within the university, there are other negative reforms that radicals should work for. Getting the military off the campus, abolishing the grade system, and abolishing universal compulsory courses (i.e., physical education) would fit into this category. However, an important question for the student movement is whether or not positive radical reforms can be won within the university short of making a revolution in the society as a whole. Furthermore, would the achievement of these kinds of partial reforms have the cumulative effect of weakening certain aspects of corporate capitalism, and, in their small way, make that broader revolution more likely?

At present, my feeling is that these kinds of anti-capitalist positive reforms are almost as hard to conceive intellectually as they are to win. To be sure, there has been a wealth of positive educational reforms suggested by people like Paul Goodman. But they are anti-capitalist as well? For example, we have been able to organize several good free universities. Many of the brightest and most sensitive students on American campuses, disgusted with the present state of education, left the campus and organized these counter-institutions. Some of their experiments were successful in an immediate internal sense. A few of these organizers were initially convinced that the sheer moral force of their work in these free institutions would cause the existing educational structure to tremble and finally collapse like a house of IBM cards. But what happened? What effect did the free universities have on the established educational order? At best, they had no effect. But it is more likely that they had the effect of strengthening the existing system. How? First of all, the best of our people left the campus, enabling the existing university to function more smoothly, since the "troublemakers" were gone. Secondly, they gave liberal administrators the rhetoric, the analysis, and sometimes the manpower to co-opt their programs and establish elitist forms of "experimental" colleges inside of, although quarantined from, the existing educational system. This is not to say that free universities should not be organized, both on and off the campus. They can be valuable and useful. But they should not be seen as a primary aspect of a strategy for change.

What then is open to us in the area of positive anti-capitalist reforms? For the most part, it will be difficult to determine whether or not a reform has the effect of being anti-capitalist until it has been achieved. Since it is both difficult and undesirable to attempt to predict the future, questions both difficult and undesirable to attempt to predict the future, questions of this sort are often best answered in practice. Nevertheless, it would seem that the kind of reforms we are looking for are most likely to be found within a strategy of what I would call "encroaching control". There are aspects of the university's administrative, academic, financial-physical, and social apparatus that are potentially, if not actually, useful and productive. While we should try to abolish the repressive mechanisms of the university; our strategy should be to gain control, piece by piece, of its positive aspects.

What would that control look like? To begin, all aspects of the non-academic life of the campus should either be completely under the control of the students as individuals or embodied in the institutional forms they establish for their collective government. For example, an independent union of students should have the final say on the form and content of all-university political, social and cultural events. Naturally, individual students and student organizations would be completely free in organizing events of their own.

Secondly, only the students and the teaching faculty, individually and through their organizations, should control the academic affairs of the university. One example of a worthwhile reform in this area would be enabling all history majors and history professors to meet jointly at the beginning of each semester and shape the form, content, and direction of their departmental curriculum. Another partial reform in this area would be enabling an independent

union of students to hire additional professors of their choice and establish additional accredited courses of their choice independently of the faculty or administration.

Finally, we should remember that control should be sought for some specific purpose. One reason we want this kind of power is to enable us to meet the self-determined needs of students and teachers. But another objective that we should see as radicals is to put as much of the university's resources as possible into the hands of the underclass and the working class. We should use the student press to publicize and support local strikes. We should use campus facilities for meeting the educational needs of insurgent organizations of the poor, and of rank and file workers. Or we could mobilize the universities' research facilities for serving projects established and controlled by the poor and worker, rather than projects established and controlled by the government, management, and labor bureaucrats. The conservative nature of American trade unions makes activity of this sort very difficult, although not impossible. But we should always be careful to make a distinction between the American working class itself and the labor bureaucrats.

This extract was taken from Carl Davidson's booklet, "The Multiversity: long-range strategies for student power movements"

- - - - -

FREE UNIVERSITY

The "Free U" is largely a concept generated by the increasing schism between knowledge and life, between abstraction and experience. This schism becomes more and more obvious as one observes the University turning into an exam-orientated technical college. Being exam-orientated it excludes life for the sake of cold facts and excludes understanding for the sake of memorizing; being a technical college it is aimed at producing competent technicians in many fields capable of expertly utilizing nature and manipulating society to advance THE SYSTEM.

The "Free U" hopes to partly overcome this situation by existing as a synthesis between knowledge, abstraction, and experience. Its existence will depend on the participation of those few people prepared to move out of the system and prepared to remove this schism which makes knowledge and university life a cold, calculated, bread-and-butter encounter.

The "Free U" will be extensively discussed and planned at a meeting of all those interested to be held at 57 Palmerston St., Carlton on Thurs. 12th. of Dec. at 7:30 pm. ALL WELCOME.

S.D.S. CONSTITUTION

NAME: The name of the association shall be "Students for a Democratic Society" (Vic)

- OBJECTIVES:
- (i) the identification, analysis, and interpretation of specific unmet needs among individuals and groups of individuals;
 - (ii) striving for the restructuring of our current society towards a democratic society by providing opportunities for the community to take action on its own behalf;
 - (iii) the building of institutions outside the established order with the aims of making these the genuine institutions of society;
 - (iv) the application of specific knowledge, experience and inventiveness to these problems.

MEMBERSHIP: Membership shall be by registration in the association's membership book open to all members of the Union, staff, graduates and any other person as approved by the secretariat.

- MEETINGS:
- (a) The formal monthly General Meetings of members shall be the governing body of the association and it shall have the power to make and alter policy.
 - (b) General Meetings shall be held at least monthly. At least seven (7) days notice of any monthly General Meeting shall be prominently advertised by posters on selected notice boards.
 - (c) A quorum at any General Meeting shall be fifteen (15) members.
 - (d) A Special General Meeting of the association may be called for at any time by a signed petition of fifteen (15) members.
 - (e) The Annual General Meeting of the association shall be its first General Meeting during the second term of the academic year.

SECRETARIAT:

- (a) Subject to the decisions of the monthly General Meeting the management of the association shall be vested in the Secretariat which shall consist of the President, Secretary, Treasurer to be elected by the Annual General Meeting, and the current Chairman, and such other members as are currently convening action on behalf of the association.
- (b) A quorum shall consist of three members. All members of the committee are to be informed of the meeting.
- (c) The signatures of any two of the President, Treasurer and Secretary shall suffice to operate the association's accounts.
- (d) The President shall normally preside over all meetings of the Secretariat.
- (e) The monthly General Meeting shall appoint a Chairman who shall have the rights and powers of the Chairman until the next monthly General Meeting.

FINANCE:

- (a) All receipts issued by the association shall be on the official receipts of the association.
- (b) All disbursements of the association other than payments from petty cash, shall be in the form of cheques.
- (c) The financial year shall commence on January 1st.
- (d) As soon as possible in each year, but not later than April 30th, the Secretariat shall prepare a financial statement for the year's activities.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION

The constitution may be amended only by a majority of the members at a monthly General Meeting, provided that the proposed amendment has been tabled at the previous monthly General Meeting.

- - - - -

COMING EVENTS:

- Dec. 11th., 10.00am - City Court, court cases of a number of S.D.S. members for handing out leaflets protesting against the imprisonment of John Zarb.
- Dec. 12th., 7.30 pm - 57 Palmerston St., Carlton. Meeting to organize the Free University - All Welcome.
- Dec. 13th., - "Walk Against Want" - organized by C.A.A. to raise money for underfed nations - a worthwhile project, so come and walk if you have time.
- Dec. 20th. 4.30 pm. - Protest demonstration for Wilfred Burchett, denied access to his homeland for "un-Australian" activities, such as saying nasty things about Australia's Vietnam policy. Outside the Immigration Dept. Cnr. La Trobe and Spring Streets, Melbourne.
- Dec. 28th. - Conference for all draft resisters and potential draft resisters. Will have direct effects on the mounting anti-conscription campaign for 1969. This will overlap with the S.D.S. conference.
- Dec. 29th. - S.D.S. National Conference. S.D.S. members from Sydney, Adelaide, Brisbane, and possibly Hobart will attend. Important for the contacts made with other states and for the clarification and co-ordination of next year's activities. All S.D.S. members are urged to attend. (more info. next edition).

For further information about any of the above phone 345734.