

January 1969  
Gini Masley

We all want to be revolutionaries. We all want to end the racist/militarist/imperialist/materialist system. But most of us are perceptive enough (or cynical enough) to realize that our situation is far from being revolutionary, or for that matter pre-revolutionary (much closer, in fact, to pre-fascist). What most of us fail to realize, however, is that our objective situation need not determine our subjective status as revolutionaries. There are two revolutions to be fought -- the political and the personal. We radicals who decry the system of capitalist imperialism which relegates humanity to a state of servitude should not ignore the fact that the institutions we attack have indelibly left their mark on our lives and personalities. Recognizing the source of our frustrations and hang-ups, it is very easy for us to wage war on those institutions. We can say that we are lonely, unhappy, insecure because we have grown up in a system in which relationships are functional, in which communication is replaced by advertising propaganda, in which human values are measured on cash registers, in which the moral code is the dictate of the status quo. Capitalism, the educational establishment which serves it, and the imperialist penetration of other countries which perpetuates it--all of this must be torn down and replaced by socialism and then we will all be free to develop our creativity, to enjoy a community of friends, to find real meaning and value in our lives. Right? Not likely.

Too many radicals fall into the trap of thinking that a better world will automatically appear after the revolution, forgetting that a better world must be created. They scoff at those members of the radical community who devote themselves to creating a new lifestyle as an alternative to the conventional institutional structure of society. The criticisms of the "artsy-craftsy" or "kunchie-facie" faction are valid in one sense. There is a danger in creating an alternative without trying to change the present social structure; the institutions which they find oppressive still remain in force, inflicting death and servitude throughout the world. And examples such as the Knight-Tisbury indicate that co-existence of two conflicting societies is hardly possible. However, the counter-criticism is equally valid: that many radicals use political dissent as a means of escaping from the necessary confrontation with themselves and their problems.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from the preceding observations (and I'm unclever enough to draw ~~KNIGHT~~ it) is that the two revolutions must become one, that the two factions should form a united front to fight for political and personal liberation. And SRS in particular must come to terms with the second revolution, for full quarter has shown that the organization is not likely to grow (and more likely to fall apart) if members persist in fighting political battles in a vacuum.

SRS should be a community. It should be a community united in radical action and also a community which can satisfy the needs of the members and help them in their personal development. And when SRS begins to function as a community, when it serves that is can serve the needs of the individual (which in turn will create a more unified body for effective political action) its image and drawing power in the larger community (ie. Stanford) will be greatly enhanced. As membership grows, the strength of collective action also grows. Thus, both aspects of the revolution are reinforced and both become simultaneously more realizable.

#### SRS PROBLEMS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE

I'd like to suggest a few of the principle problems within SRS which I have observed and raise some possible means for generating a stronger organization. The problems seem to be primarily in the functioning of the organization as a group. Meetings, for instance, have degenerated into hostile reporters which subject the entire membership to the personal disagreements of a few. As a consequence, decisions have been made out of desperation, more for the purpose of getting the damned meeting over than for well thought out strategic reasons. The size of the meetings has

frustrated, an indication of decreasing student support of SDS. As a solution to the problem of long and frustrating meetings, I would propose the retention of the temporary elective system if it proves viable, so that all divergent views can be discussed in small groups which will then present concrete proposals at the general meeting. But there is a further need for communication of ideas among individual members. The following proposals are designed to serve the goal which I see as essential to the effective functioning of SDS, i.e. the development of a true sense of community within the organization.

1/ Communal living. A long-term plan should be instituted whereby houses in a specified locale (to be determined by the membership) be rented so they become available and thus SDS members or radical non-members move in communally. Hopefully the end result would be a sort of "ethnic" residential community with easy access from house to house. With these expanded facilities there would be the possibility of a broader range of group functions -- parties, barbecues, picket-sign making, bread-baking, poster painting, practice of street tactics, guerrilla theater, maintenance of a good radical library, etc. It is also important, however, that SDS also stay on campus to spread radicalism in the dorms. For the on-campus members the residential community could serve as a "drop-in" community center. Transportation for pedestrian members would be easier to arrange since the houses would all be located in the same area and there would be many cars traveling to and from.

2. Campus Community Center. It is also important that SDS maintain and strengthen its ties on the campus. SDS should have a place to meet during the school day and in the evenings, where people can drop in between classes to nap, work, sing songs, etc. Some suggestions are the coffee house, a specified area of Tressider, or the lounge in the Women's Githouse. A basement room in Shattuck or an area in one of the dorms is less favorable because of the distance from the supplies in the ASSU office and the campus center. Attempts should be made to find a permanent on-campus office or center, but for the time being the location is less important than the fact that a specific spot be determined, announced, and used. SDS members would then have a chance to talk more, get together more often, and keep in touch with what is going on in the organization. Hopefully, too, more members would become involved in planning and activities rather than silent voting at meetings. Also, interested non-members would have a chance to drop in and talk to members about SDS, policies, the apocalypse, etc.

3. New and More Creative Projects. Too many of us are trapped by our middle or ruling class backgrounds into believing that teaching must be verbal or written, that to convince someone you must argue logically and with precision. We forget about the effective teaching of Bob Dylan and the Mime Troupe. We fail to recognize or use the entire scope of the media of communication. We also forget that learning does not have to be analytical, that we can learn through action, through writing songs, painting pictures, creating skits -- and have fun doing it. SDS members can work together on things other than planning demonstrations and traditional confrontations. We can attempt to educate the community by presenting skits in dorms, singing songs in the coffee house, displaying radical art around campus (e.g. sculptures shrines to the military-industrial complex), roaming the buildings and streets with prominent and colorful signs (e.g. "The Alley of the Electronic War," "The Viet Cong Cafe," etc.), showing more films, and presenting more inspired programs and rallies. The range of possibilities is tremendous--we cannot limit ourselves to the obvious, the conventional, the uncreative "raps." The fact that for most of us lecturing and arguing logically is what we do best is a clear indication that we really need to work on the second revolution.

4. Improved relations with non-radicals and the uncommitted. We need closer contact with other groups and individuals on campus if we can ever expect to gain massive support for our programs.

SDS members should attempt to attend meetings of groups such as UCM, RSU, Students United for New Democratic Politics (political tolerance will hopefully emerge as we develop a sense of community, mutually supportive, and can cease to be so defensive about our political position), or at least maintain contact with other organizations to insure the possibility of coalition support of SDS policy and action and to offer our support of their programs. Bechers should also reach out to individuals at Stanford, students and especially faculty, and welcome them if they choose to participate. SDS cannot function as a closed and cold enclave. As internal relations improve and as SDS demonstrates that it can satisfy the felt needs of the members for community, for action toward radical change, and for creative development and good times, the organization will have a broader range of appeal. And if we political radicals no longer bad-mouth the artsy-craftsy radicals, if we show that we can work to create an alternative life-style while at the same time involving ourselves in politics, we can perhaps begin to remove the barrier of artificial factionalism within the movement. Our membership and, thus, our strength will grow.