TO GUESS WHO WAS COMING TO DINNER

September 16, three days after Attica, the faculty was informed that Governor Nelson Rockefeller had been invited to be the "keynote speaker" at Edgar Draper's inauguration as President of Manhattan Community College.

We wish to congratulate the administration for having the courage to make such an announcement at such a time to a predominantly third world and white working-class college.

Apparently, however, either the administration or the Governor had second thoughts (thoughts of self-preservation?) for the Good Governor isn't coming to dinner after all.

But in case he wants to know what he's missing, here's the menu-with-prices for his information and for yours—since the total cost of $9,500 of Draper's Big Blast comes out of your pockets, that is, out of the BMCC Association's student-dominat body which "manages" student funds. The following menu simply includes hors d'oeuvres for all, and excludes a VIP dinner at the Top of the Met at $7.25 per person. This is a multiple choice menu:

Cold Hors d'oeuvres:
- Cherry Tomatoes Stuffed With Roquefort Cheese
- Eggs a la Russe
- Pineapple and Prosciutto
- Patsy MC Chef
at $3.50 per person

Hot and Cold Hors d'oeuvres:
- all of the above, plus
- Tidbits of administration
- Miniature Quiche Lorraine
- Pigs in Blankets
- Shrimp Puffs
- Veal and Mushroom Patties
at $4.50 per person

Finger (you should pardon the expression) Sandwiches:
- Roast Sirloin of Beef
- Turkey
- Imported Salami
- Creamed Cheese and Watercress
- Egg Salad
- Tuna Salad
at $2.25 per person

Fruit Punch with Fresh Fruit
at $1.00 per person

As a student, staff or faculty member you have probably been thinking about one or two little items that all that money might have been used for during the Board of Higher Education's Year of the Rock-Bottom Budget. Since you don't establish priorities around here, you'll just have to accept the administration's decision that the time and energy of some two dozen school officials is best spent on the nine separate committees in charge of organizing Draper's Party, and that $9,500 of student fees is better spent on Pigs-in-the-Blanket than on anything you need.

Several hundred people are expected to attend. A few selected students (and a few more pressed into unpaid service as ushers, hat check girls, etc.) One staff member. (None was invited, but when one staff person suggested that it was rather impolite to treat the staff like nonexistent persons, that one person was invited.) The Faculty, The BMCC Association budget provides about $10 a head for hats and tassels and hoods and for the function of the faculty is to fill up the seats of Alice Tully Hall in Lincoln Center, and to serve as an impressive-looking procession while Draper marches up the aisle to marry the Borough of Manhattan Community College. That leaves about 300 spaces. Start with the members of the Board of Higher Education, the Presidents of other CUNY and SUNY units—and then start on the list of politicians because, after all, who is worth trying to impress?

The inauguration makes blatantly clear the administration's total disregard for the needs of students, staff, and faculty, a disregard so total that Rockefeller could be mocked as the "keynote" speaker three days after the massacre at Attica.

SPEND THAT MONEY CONTEST
Easy! Simple! Anyone can win!

If you can think of a better way to spend $9,500 of student fees, send your ideas to: The Tiger Paper c/o Bill Friedheim A331 October 25, 1971

THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE THIRD WORLD COALITION

Most student governments are laughable. A handful of undergraduates play politician under the approving eyes of an administration that holds all the real power. Attention to anything more serious than booztrides and blooddrives is discouraged. As a result, most students ignore campus elections as irrelevant. Manhattan Community College was no exception—until three years ago.

In the spring of 1969, Third World students, frustrated in their attempts to negotiate with the administration, seized the B Building. They were demanding a program of Black and Puerto Rican Studies, the hiring of more Third World faculty, and an overall increase in responsiveness to the needs of Third World students.

This display of power forced concessions. Third World Coalition, which grew out of the building takeover, decided to run a slate in the fall student government elections in order to have the legal authority to police the agreements arrived at with the administration.

More students voted than in any election in school history. Third World Coalition won every office by a four-to-one majority.

But agreements with the administration proved to be almost worthless. Week after week, Third World Coalition—now representing the entire student body—met only with evasion, footdragging, and assertions by the administration that they were powerless to act until the Board of Higher Ed, or the City, or the State, or God in Heaven agreed.

Nevertheless, in some ways the situation turned out to be educational. Third World Coalition concluded that:

1. Students in fact were powerless. They had only token representation and no control. All power rested in the hands of the President.

2. They could not deal with their basic problems alone. They had to forge alliances with the community and with working people both inside and outside the college if their needs were to be taken seriously.

3. Nationalism could only be the first step on the road to liberation. The administration was skilled in the age-old technique of pitting white against black against Latin.

Building on these lessons, TWC developed a program calling for basic changes not only at Manhattan Community College.

The refusal of TWC to be bamboozled, and its willingness to expose the racism and totali­

tarianism of the administration, led to a series of confrontations in 1969-70. These confrontations culminated in a hard-fought but successful month-long strike ending the school year.

From that time to this, the administration has sought by every means possible, including use of police, the courts, and the jail, to oust Third World Coalition from office.

An especially favored tactic has been the manipulation of student government elections:

1. The administration has set higher academic standards for student government membership than for participation in any other college activity.

2. The administration itself has tried to recruit candidates to run against TWC.

3. The administration has allowed opposition candidates available to the headline while denying similar privileges to TWC.

4. The administration has made publicity materials available to the opposition while denying them to TWC.

5. The administration has removed TWC campaign posters claiming that they had not been approved by the Office of Student Activi­
ties, while they permitted the distribution of slanderous statements by the opposition which were not only unapproved but

Continued on Page 2
THE TIMES QUOTES DEAN PITTMAN

The following excerpt is reprinted from a New York Times article, "Dispute on Drugs Dividing College," which appeared on Sunday, May 30, 1971.

Last spring the Puerto Rican faculty, concerned about the widespread use of drugs at M.C.C., called a series of press conferences. The administration responded with a press conference of its own. According to the Times, "Administrators of Manhattan Community College maintained . . . that students were exaggerating the problem of drug usage on campus and students asserted that administrators were failing to own up to it."

The Times goes on to report:
Sample Pittman, associate dean of students, said of the students agitating for administrative action on drugs, "They're all Maoists, Communists and militant socialists, bent on destroying the American system."

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO PROMETHEUS?

The administration has prevented the publication of the student newspaper, Prometheus. The staff of the newspaper had elected an editorial board, but it has been unable to function since school authorities have denied it funds as well as access to the Prometheus office on West 50th Street.

The administration has justified its decision by claiming that only a student government has the authority to appoint the editorial board and staff. It argues that since there is no student government, it follows that there cannot be a student newspaper.

The administration's decision has no legal basis. The by-laws stipulate that under certain conditions and with cause, a student government can—as it did last year—take over publication of the college newspaper. Student government does not, however, have the power to appoint or replace an editorial board and staff whenever it chooses to do so. It must first hold a hearing before a board of faculty and students to determine that the newspaper is not being run in the best interest of the student body.

The by-laws do not permit an administration to discontinue publication of a student newspaper in anticipation of an election of a new student government which might or might not decide to convene a board to consider charges against the newspaper. That's like saying, I think John Doe might possibly commit a crime next year so why don't we find him guilty before the fact and hang him on the nearest tree.

All of this, of course, raises questions about the administration's motives. When it delays student government elections and then stops the publication of the student newspaper, then we can only conclude that it is trying to silence the voices of those who disagree with it.

If you want to gain knowledge you must participate in the practice of changing reality. If you want to know the taste of a pear you must change the pear by eating it yourself. . . . All genuine knowledge originates in direct experience.

—Mao Tse-tung, July, 1937

DEANS AT WORK

VERSUS VERSES

Dear Dean Pittman's long been thinking What a swell place this would be If all the students were transported Right into the penitentiary.

Old Dean James played merry old games, And merry old games played he: He called for his deans And he called for his files And he called for the Infirmary.

Now the nurse had worked seven years or more For a clean, well-functioning place; But while she was out experience. Now James has his files And the nurse has the bone she was thrown.

Draper has a little lamb, His job is highly hack: "We'll see," says he, And then shafts you When you have turned your back.

Lester, Lester, quite contrary, Where did you learn your trade? "Where a man becomes a real man, boy, For my mind is Army-made."

DEAN PITTMAN SEARCHING FOR THE "HARD CORE" (Yearbook, 1971)

THE BMCC ASSOCIATION

The BMCC Association is charged with responsibility for appropriating approximately 300,000 dollars collected annually in student fees. The Association consists of eleven students selected by the Student Government Association (but there is no student government, so there are no student representatives) and eleven faculty and administrators. Of the latter, two are elected by the faculty and the other nine mostly deans—sit automatically because of the office they hold. The President is the chairman who holds an absolute veto over any and all decisions.

The Association approves the annual budget and elects a six-man Board of Directors who make all important day-to-day decisions on who spends how much for what. The President is the seventh member of this Board and again possesses absolute veto power.

The election of the Board by the Association is peculiar: students on the association get to vote only for the three student members of the Board, Faculty and administrators vote for their three members. The President sits automatically.

Such an arrangement virtually guarantees that on every critical issue the vote will show three students on one side, three faculty-administrators on the other, and the President "reluctantly" voting to break the tie in guess-whose favor.

In a nutshell: The President and the deans control the expenditure of money from student fees, which is supposed to be spent on student activities, but which is more and more frequently spent on items like the President's inauguration.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE THIRD WORLD

Continued from Page 1

6. The administration has cooperated with the Immigration and Naturalization Service in attempts to institute deportation proceedings against the current student government President on the grounds that he is an "undesirable alien."

7. The administration "misplaced" the correct lists of eligible voters in last Fall's election. Approximately one out of every two students trying to vote was told that he would not be permitted to cast a ballot.

8. The administration scheduled last Spring's election to take place two days after classes ended.

9. The administration is the only one in all of City University to deny the legality of an election when less than 30% of the student body votes. And yet it has done everything in its power to make sure that the total vote is less than 30%.

Despite this harassment, Third World Coalition has won every office in every election since the Fall of 1969. But the key is the 30% Rule. Last Spring's election was decided invalid because the administration made it impossible to vote. Will the same thing happen again?

October 25, 1971
DRAPER READS  
STATE OF THE COLLEGE MESSAGE TO ASSEMBLED THRONG  

Control is essential to any administrator's job. A college president is no exception to this rule. At the first faculty meeting of the school year on Wednesday, September 1, the president's control of the school was the only matter that seemed to concern him. While the meeting proceeded, for its essential purpose was to discipline the faculty in advance of any serious trouble similar to that of last Spring's semester.

A number of events over the past six months had brought into question the president's authority and resulted in bad publicity for the school.

In May, the Puerto Rican faculty threatened to resign en masse, citing as one of their grievances the administration's unwillingness to deal with a campus drug problem of disastrous proportions. Several days later, when the New York Times picked up the story and ran it on page one, the administration found itself in a rather surprising position. The school continued to receive a bad press when in July newspapers carried accounts of the suicide of a student on a college sponsored trip to Africa.

Even though classes were over and many instructors had left, 102 faculty signed a petition in June asking the Board of Higher Education to investigate the almost daily and seemingly arbitrary arrests of students which together with violations of parliamentary processes of the college's legislative and undemocratic practices had created an atmosphere of fear and intimidation at the school.

Evidently Draper had gotten a very clear message from his superiors at the Board of Higher Education and in the chancellor's office—get your house in order.

Of course if you cannot get your house in order, the next best thing is to make it look like it's in order. So at the beginning of the meeting, Draper announced the appointment of a new public relations officer, who upon introduction to the faculty, saw how his successor would be able to mend fences between the administration and the faculty.

The administration is ready to make cynical use of the economic crisis, "faculty accountability that student evaluations to keep the staff in line. Because of the fiscal crisis, faculty are more vulnerable. As instructors they must increase the individual "productivity" to hold their jobs. At the moment, increased "productivity" simply means larger classes and more of them. However, the president hinted that the college might also devise quantitative measures to gauge teaching effectiveness. The question, of course, is who will determine the criteria? And how, we may ask, do these existing evaluations enter into the equation? Dean Eric James let it slip that he plans to channel these evaluations to the administration's sphere only. The president's message from his superiors at the Board of Higher Education necessitates that the Board of Higher Education appropriates $50,000 to house him in presidential splendor.

In May, the Puerto Rican faculty, certain students, 102 petition-wielding faculty, the young man who committed suicide, and assorted bad guys had conspired to victimize "your" president. All of these people according to the president, had brought shame upon the school and the administration.

The Puerto Rican faculty, the New York Times, and certain faculty had dramatized a serious drug problem where supposedly none existed, since the college had mysteriously determined that there were only fifteen needle-scared, hard-core, card-carrying addicts at the college. The 102 faculty (bad children) had not come to big daddy president with their problems, but rather had gone to the Board of Higher Education. In fact they had come to him many times only to realize that Big Daddy WAS the problem.

The young man who committed suicide, Draper says, was right on the school in an awkward position where he had to explain away what happened.

Outrageous as these attributions are, they are not really funny. They are the views of bureaucrats whose only priority is control, and maintaining the public image that will preserve it.

The administration is ready to make cynical use of the economic crisis, "faculty accountability that student evaluations to keep the staff in line. Because of the fiscal crisis, faculty are more vulnerable. As instructors they must increase the individual "productivity" to hold their jobs. At the moment, increased "productivity"

TASK FORCES OR TASK FFFCES?

Last spring, as directed by the Board of Higher Education, Dean James established the Task Force on Academic Governance. At first many committee members expected to be able to do some real work toward improving the college. Subsequently, many of them, especially those on the more crucial committees, have become disillusioned—for good reason: most of the task force committees are a farce.

The administration is guilty of:

1. Continuing attempts to keep important task force committees under its control. (All committee members were appointed by the administration to begin with; a number of volunteers were refused.)
2. Rendering the work of the committees ineffective if committee conclusions do not coincide with what the administration wants.
3. Discouraging student participation on the committees. (Many student members have graduated. No new students have been chosen to replace them.)
4. Attempting to use the committees to rubber stamp policies handed down from above, and disregarding the work of the committees if they refuse to do so. The administration has turned most of the task force committees into purposeless bull sessions, full of sound and fury,signifying nothing.

The Administration in order to keep tighter control has been watering down the committee at will. At its most recent meeting two more deans and two more department chairmen appeared for the first time. They had just been appointed by Dean James in an apparent attempt to stack the committee in the administration's favor.

Proposals presented by faculty members of the committee have not been given any serious consideration. Instead, the committee chairman insists time after time on debating the question of "a bicameral vs. unicameral legislative body," as a diversionary tactic to keep the committee from exercising its real business.

There is only one student on the committee on.
THE STORY OF THE CHILDREN'S CENTER

One student demand which emerged from the Spring 1970 strike at Manhattan Community College was for a child care center. A year later, after a prolonged struggle, the center was born. It is open this semester at 1595 Broadway (on the second floor) and provides free child care for the children of M.C.C.'s day students.

The center is an example of the positive accomplishments that result from people getting together and staying together to fight for services essential to them. During the strike a Child Care Committee was formed, made up of representatives from the M.C.C. Women's Liberation Club and the Third World Coalition, along with parents and a few faculty men and women. They put in months of hard work and endured many fruitless meetings with administrators before the center became a reality.

When the administration at last acquiesced to the idea of a children's center, under pressure from the committee, a few of them started talking a good line. At one meeting President Draper said: "The administration is here to service you. Just tell us what you want us to do." The Child Care Committee responded immediately with requests they had presented in vain for weeks—lists of items to be requisitioned, a request for contracts for the codirectors, and requirements for space. Many more weeks were wasted, however, because despite what the President said, Dean Weinberger dragged his heels. He was unavailable for days on end, made appointments he failed to keep, and was rude and discouraging to members of the committee. The center could not open in February of '71 as planned. It was not operating on a full scale until Summer Session. Some of the requisitions ordered last winter have only just come in. What has been at last accomplished has happened because of the perseverance and determination of the Child Care Committee; not through any benevolence on the part of male administrators.

Progress and Problems

The free Children's Center is a start toward ending discrimination against women who wish to attend Manhattan Community College, in particular working-class Black, Puerto Rican, and white women who cannot afford costly day care facilities or baby sitters.

In an interview Dorothy Randall and Susan Cammer, the co-directors, said that mothers called up all week before this fall's registration. If it wasn't for the Center they said, they would not be able to go to college. "All the time the mothers thank god the Children's Center is here." Thirty children are using the center now, 90% of them Black and Puerto Rican.

But this is just the beginning. The directors were asked what problems still existed and presented a long list. No work-study students were assigned until the Center had been opened for two weeks; for two weeks Dorothy and Susan had to manage by themselves, without even being able to take an hour off for lunch. They are worried that the results of the BMCC Association meeting to find out how much it will be. The Children's Center handled eighty children during Summer Session. In September part of that space was taken away. Until more space is provided and more work-study students are assigned, there can be no program for the children of evening students. To have a proper program for evening students' children, they also need another full-time trained person. The male administrators the Children's Center has to deal with are either pleasant but ineffectual or downright unco-operative as is the case with Dean Weinberger, who told the directors that he personally held up the requisitions all summer because he didn't have time to make one phone call.

What the Center Needs

The directors need a copy machine, preferably a mimeograph machine. If anyone has one, please get in touch with Dorothy Randall or Susan Cammer.

They would like more parent involvement in the Children's Center. If any mothers or fathers are interested, please speak to Dorothy or Susan.

The Center is in great need of hot water, which only the college can provide. So far it has refused to.

The Directors would like to get an estimate of how many parents might use the Center next semester. If you are interested, please fill out the following, and take it to 1595 Broadway and 48th, second floor—or mail it to the Center. (The Center can take only toilet-trained children.)

I would like to use the Children's Center next semester (Spring, 1971).

Name:

Address:

Phone Number:

Name of child (children):

Age(s): Day : Evening

The Center used to be a beauty parlor. These left over pipes must be fixed.
The Secretaries: M.C.C.'S INVISIBLE PEOPLE

Without them, BMCC absolutely could not function. They're as necessary to the daily activities of the school as are students and faculty, and a lot more important to us (and a lot harder working) than most administrators.

They're as necessary to the daily faculty, and a lot more important to us (and a lot harder working) than most administrators.

Consider for a moment just a few of the frustrations and humiliations endured by college secretaries:

- In some departments, one or two secretaries do all the work for as many as fifty or sixty faculty members.
- Transfers of secretaries from one department or building to another are at the whim of administrators, and though grievance machinery does exist, past examples of retaliation make people afraid to use it.
- Once in the D, E, and M buildings, there is no such thing as a corner where secretaries can relax during lunch or breaks.
- A secretary clocks in at 8 a.m., clocks out at lunch, in again after lunch and out again at night.
- Secretaries address all faculty and administrators as "Doctor" or "Sir" or "Professor," while most of them address her by her first name, even if they're twenty years younger than she is. Once, when a union official called the school and asked for Mrs. Smith, the man for whom she had worked for two years said there was no one there by that name. His secretary was Jane, and he didn't even know her last name. (We are of course not recommending formality of address, but equality of address.)

Salary Squeeze

All of these indignities help to break workers' spirits, keep them from understanding the immense importance of the work they do, and from feeling good about themselves as people. Above all, they help keep the secretary in her place when new contract time rolls around.

Wage control is odious for all workers, but the wage squeeze is especially hard on secretaries whose new contract will be negotiated this June under the pressure of Nixon's 'a-worker-today policy.'

There are two ways in which secretaries' salaries are limited: first, the low scale itself; then, the complex ways of preventing promotion. These are CUNY secretaries' salaries negotiated during the last contract three years ago:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretarial Position</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Secretary A</td>
<td>$5,800</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after July 1, 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after July 1, 1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Test, No Raise

Regardless of past experience, each secretary is hired as a College Secretary A at the minimum salary. Each secretary is raised to the next minimum salary plus about $200. Someone who has worked for Manhattan since 1969 is now earning about $400 more than a newly hired person. Try to raise one or two kids in New York City--no less make it on that salary! Furthermore, we have no cafeteria here in our mid-town locations where anyone can get reasonably-priced lunches. There is not so much as a refrigerator where a secretary can keep yogurt. It should be noted that on May 29, 1970, the faculty voted to supplement workers' demands for abolishing the time clock, vacation days with pay on school holidays, time off for staff meetings, and the establishment of a non-profit cafeteria. (But the faculty clearly has no more power than the staff in this school, and we are all still waiting for implementation of what was agreed upon.)

To be promoted from an "A" to a "B" is no promotion at all, since "A"s are already doing as much work and have as much responsibility as any human being could handle--but it's the only way you can get a real raise.

The Time Clock

Was it really precisely the same test? The answers were published in THE CHIEF, the Civil Employees Weekly, on June 2, 1971. Every one of the hundred questions asked of the secretaries was the same as those asked of supervisory personnel.

The tests will have to be regraded on a curve to achieve the 45% required by contract (we hope). But this leaves even those who finally pass feeling inadequate and undervalued. Many feel that they're not really entitled to the raise because they didn't really pass the test--even though they know in their heads that the test was unfair. And promotions (raises) based only on such absurd criteria cannot help but create low morale among workers.

Learn To Be a Zombie

The tests questions themselves (designed, of course, for supervisors and not for secretaries) are revealing. They give us much insight into the authoritarian nature of work relationships. They show us how, on every count, thinking, initiative, in fact any constructive effort on the part of the person being supervised (typist, stenographer, clerk) is discouraged by a system of rote answers superiors are supposed to memorize and spit back at their "subordinates." Here is just one example (though the test provides dozens):

An employee's performance has fallen below established standards of quantity and quality. The threat of monetary or other disciplinary action is a device for improving this employee's performance would probably be acceptable and most effective:

(A) only if applied as soon as the performance fell below standard.
(B) only after more constructive techniques have failed.
(C) at any time provided the employee understands the punishment will be carried out.
(D) at no time.

One secretary, who understood her position as an adult human being (as well as an adult covered by a union contract), answered (D), She was marked wrong; (B) was the "correct" answer.

Students are coming to understand that they too will be workers when they graduate. Faculty members, as workers, are beginning to see that the same administrations (school, City and State) which seek to demoralize and immobilize secretaries have the power to stuff their classrooms and raise their teaching loads. Staff members are increasingly aware of how they are manipulated into accepting low self-esteem and similarly low salaries. Students, faculty and staff are coming to know that they must support one another individually and en masse if any of them is to survive.
THE WAGE PRICE FREEZE:
A Cold Shoulder for the Poor and the Middle Class

Bit by bit, the truth comes out. What we might have guessed would happen is happening: When the country gets into an economic crisis, it's ordinary people who feel it worst, and when the government comes up with a solution to the crisis, it's ordinary people who are expected to make the sacrifices. The rich are solicitously cared for. They suffer least and profit most.

Last spring, when the government was running short what happened?
- Welfare cuts
- Education cuts
- Health care cuts
- Employment cuts

Right here at Manhattan:
- Landlords got over a million dollars in rent from the college
- The President got his $40,000 a year plus $50,000 to buy him a home and pay for maids and a chauffeur

But at the same time:
- Work-study was virtually eliminated
- Loans were cut
- Child-care funds were cut
- Staff who worked over the summer on orientation were denied their pay

Now, of course, there is a national plan for dealing with the crisis—a wage and price freeze.

So far, the results are fascinating:
- Layoffs of government employees
- Abandonment of welfare reform
- Higher prices for imported goods
- Overcrowded classes and heavier workloads for teachers
- Reduced aid for students
- Reduction in school lunch programs

But at the same time:
- No limits on corporate profits, on stock dividends, on interest charged by the banks.
- Tax bonuses for corporations
- Loopholes that permit price increases (e.g., Aluminum)
- No effective limits on the incomes of executives

And it turns out that the oil companies were tipped off to the freeze in advance so that they had time to raise gasoline prices before it took effect (WINS, 9/30/71, quoting Congressional testimony). Clearly not the sufferings of ordinary people, but the needs of giant corporations prompted government action. How else would you explain that the freeze follows right on the heels of the disaster which controlled but privately owned economy in the fifties and forties.

The whole thing is a pathetic and improvised hoax. But Nixon's New Economic Policy has deadly implications.

First, productivity—what a person can produce in an hour of work—is always going up. If your wages are frozen, who gets the benefit of the increase in your productivity? Not you. Not the consumer either. Prices are frozen as well as wages. The businessman gets it all. In other words, without wage increases and price reductions, massive amounts of income are taken from ordinary citizens and given to the wealthy.

Second, tax concessions to business have the same result. A larger share of public expenses has to be carried by ordinary people.

Third, import quotas and surcharges make foreign goods more expensive and permit domestic producers to maintain current high prices.

Fourth, currency changes that make American goods cheaper for foreigners to buy seem likely to lead to retaliation by foreign governments.

But isn't it true that if the rich get enough favors, if they make greater profits, they then invest more, produce more, and hence create jobs? If the rich get richer won't something trickle down through their fingers to you and me?

Not really. There already exists 27% more plant and machinery than the corporations can profitably use. It now lies idle. Why should they invest in more?

And anyway, government layoffs and decreased budgets will cancel any benefits that might arise from new investments. If you create more jobs in one sector of the economy only to eliminate them in others, you're back where you started. Third World people are likely to benefit in the worst shape since most of the cuts will occur in those areas which most directly affect them: health, welfare, education and government employment.

As for those measures designed to reduce foreign competition, remember two can play that game. Other countries will not take restrictions against the sale of their goods lying down. We will end up selling even less abroad than we do right now. And there will be fewer jobs in those industries that depend significantly on overseas sales.

The whole thing is an pathetic and improvised hoax. But Nixon's New Economic Policy has deadly implications.

First, it robs the poor and the middle class of the minimum wage in advance so that they have time to raise gasoline prices before it took effect (WINS, 9/30/71, quoting Congressional testimony). Clearly not the suffering of ordinary people, but the needs of giant corporations prompted government action. How else would you explain that the freeze follows right on the heels of the disaster which controlled but privately owned economy in the fifties and forties. It will mean more, not less, militarism more, not less exploitation of the Third World.
REMEMBER ATTICA!

Rockefeller: Racist, Murderer, Enemy of the People
It's a Family Tradition

The Attica prison rebellion, according to Nelson Rockefeller, is "another symptom of the deep-seated illness of our society." His prescription for sick America is standard among our rich physicians: apply rhetoric liberally to affected areas; patch with white band-aids; isolate stubborn cases; purge with bullets during severe outbreaks.

If that treatment sounds dangerous to you, it's no wonder. For when the disease proceeds to be the doctor, the patient is surely going to be killed instead of cured.

The governor's consultants in this deadly charade, the "impartial" state and federal investigating committees, won't come much slower than Rockefeller himself to naming the real sickness. They'll admit the justice of the 28 demands accepted by Commissioner Oswald before Rockefeller ordered the attack on the prison; acknowledge the existence of racism inside and outside the penal system; recommend the thousand, the million time, "real social and economic change." A couple of the committees may actually go so far as to condemn Rockefeller for using "excessive" or "unnecessary" force. And then the bundle of papers produced as epitaph for a mistake. It was, first of all, the legal outcome of legalized, institutional racism in the U.S. No amount of whitewash can cover up the blood-link between the massacre at Attica, the murders of George Jackson and Fred Hampton, the shootings at Orangeburg, Jackson State, and Augusta, the killings and brutalities by police in the black and Puerto Rican ghettos of the North. The fact that at Attica the power was also in the hands of State and federal armies of company gunmen to put down strikes, but also drew on federal, state and local troops, lent them by government to preserve "law and order." From 1880 to 1904 in Colorado alone, where the Rockefeller family owned huge mining interests, troops were ordered out against strikers on ten separate occasions, at a cost of over a million dollars to state taxpayers, and despite the existence of state laws which guaranteed workers the rights which the owners refused to concede.

The Rockefeller and the other company owners fought the strikes furiously for long-term as well as short-term reasons; more than anything else, they wanted to prevent mass-organization among working people. Even when the courage and endurance of strikers forced owners to grant more pay, shorter hours, and better working conditions, the owners resisted to the bitter end the recognition of the unions themselves (and as is clear from the struggles of Cesar Chavez and the California farmworkers in the 1960's and numerous cases in the relatively unorganized South today).

In the early part of this century Nelson Rockefeller's father, John D. Jr., was among those who tried to destroy the unions wholesale, and, failing that, tried to preserve the so-called open shop, where the employers had the option of hiring non-union labor. Combined with intimidation and blacklistimg of union members and activists, the "open shop" was intended to keep the workers divided and thus maintain the power of the owners. John D. Jr. never spoke publicly in these terms; Gould-style candor was no longer possible, for working people had made gains in spite of the owners' all-out war against them. Rather, as during the 1913-14 strikes in the coalfields of southern Colorado (owned largely by Rockefelller interests), John D. Jr. claimed that the owners merely obeyed the option of hiring non-union labor. That is the great principle at stake. It is a national issue.

In April 1914, in the name of this great principle—which amounted to the working poor's "right" to be exploited as the owners pleased—the famous Ludlow Massacre occurred. State militia and shop in order to protect the right of "American workers under the Constitution, to work for whom they please. That is the great principle at stake. It is a national issue.

From the 1870's to the 1930's, on the railroads and in the mines and factories and sweatshops, American workers had literally to pay with blood to win a living wage, protection against wage cuts, an eight-hour day, safe working conditions. Against the concerted power of big business, they sought to form unions, recognizing solidarity and the power to strike as their chief resources against the Rockefellers, Morgans, Fricks and Goulds who overworked and underpaid them and tried to keep them ignorant and at war with each other instead of with their exploiters.

The Rockefeller's innovation was to use their own private armies of company gunmen to put down strikes, but also drew on federal, state and local troops, lent them by government to preserve "law and order." From 1880 to 1904 in Colorado alone, where the Rockefeller family-owned huge mining interests, troops were ordered out against strikers on ten separate occasions, at a cost of over a million dollars to state taxpayers, and despite the existence of state laws which guaranteed workers the rights which the owners refused to concede.

Rights would be won through "law and order," and by 1920 the non-union movement had consolidated. The first law to protect labor in the federal government (the Clayton Act of 1914) was followed in 1932 by the Wagner Act. But for Rockefeller the job wasn't done. If you want to know more about "the other America," read Boyer and Mosbacher's Labor's Untold Story, Josephson's The Robber Barons, and Haywood's The Autobiography of Big Bill Haywood for a start.

Like grandfather, like father, like son. Nelson's Masacre at Attica, it would seem, follows an old family and class tradition. Although the social forces now contesting...
ESSAY ON BLACK CULTURE

FROM GEORGE JACKSON'S LETTERS

These prisons have always borne a certain resemblance to concentration camps. Buchenwald, places for the bad niggers, Mexicans, and poor whites. But the last ten years have brought us face-to-face with the persecution of blacks for crimes that can clearly be traced to political-economic causes. There are still some blacks here who are, in a sense, criminals—but not many. Believe me, my friend, with the time and incentive that these barracks provide, you can read, study, and think, you will find no class or category more aware, more embittered, desperate, or dedicated to revolution. The most dedicated, the best of our kind—you'll find them in the Folsom, Kansas, and Soledad. They live like there was no tomorrow. And for most of them there isn't. Somehow along came this life. Life, the installment plan, three years of prison, three months on parole, then back to the same cell. Parole officers have sent brothers back to the jail for selling newspapers (the Black Panther). Their official reason is "Failure to Maintain Gainful Employment," etc.

We're something like 40 to 42 percent of the prison population. Perhaps more, since I'm relying on material published by the media. The leadership in the black prison population now definitely identifies with Huey, Bobby, Angela, Eldridge, and artifacitism. They are the pressing of blacks, which can be estimated by reading the obituary columns of the nation's dailies, Fred Hampton, etc., but not failed to register on the black inmates. The holds are fast being broken. Men who read Lenin, Fanan, and Who Are They? They mass, "they rage," they dig graves.

If the economic crisis deepens, and if the American people refuse to accept Nixon's solutions favoring the corporations at the expense of the public, we may see a resurgence of social struggle on many fronts and possibly the creation of alliances between white and Black revolutionary groups. To prevent the Rockefellers will haul out every familiar weapon in their arsenal—some piecemeal reforms and the eradication of serfdom of men against women for jobs and services charges of communism, anarchy, revolution, and violence. The camp is a prison of militant leaders State violence. More and more of us will find we have something in common with the Attica inmates.

NELSON ROCKEFELLER'S irrelevant mask is slipping. Our would-be healer, icon of Standard Oil and Chase Manhattan, adviser to presidents of blacks, which can be estimated by reading the obituary columns of the nation's dailies, Fred Hampton, etc., but not failed to register on the black inmates. The holds are fast being broken. Men who read Lenin, Fanan, and Who Are They? They mass, "they rage," they dig graves.

The soul of black folk we talk about in the abstract becomes a dynamic political concept only as it interacts with the actual situations. Black liberation becomes a positive part of the decolonization process only as it helps lead us out of powerless participation in our own oppression. More preciously, black spirituality in itself is only a part of the culture of resistance we have been building since our captivity in this land began: the defensive part. Black spirituality aims to establish the validity of black people's existence by reversing the equation of black with evil and white with divinity. Its assumptions turn the West's "divine right" to rule the world. Its elaboration marks the first stage in the black national liberation struggle. Black spirituaity has resolved to fight ethically to battle for self-reliance and eventual liberation. It gives us room to pursue national liberation strategies within a global context of exploitation. The next pages will be a discussion of the substance of black spirituality in the U.S. and the activity it has produced.

To Be Continued in the Next Issue
Notes on Madhatter Community College

by Alice

—Who has any more words left to express what a disaster registration was? You would have thought it was a crazy plot against students dreamed up by madmen and idiots. We’re still suffering the consequences of overcrowded classes and impossible programs.

—Dean Weinberger has more office space than a department of over sixty people.

—What brought on the moving mania this August while everyone was on vacation? Teachers, nurses, statisticians, and secretaries returned to find their belongings flung hither and yon, some of them lost for ever. Meanwhile the Deans and the President on the second floor have more space than ever. Take a look sometime.

—Two full-time Assistant Professors were brought in on English department lines this fall without so much as a telephone consultation with the department’s P. and B. Committee.

—Whatever happened to plans for the Black Studies Department and the Puerto Rican Studies Department voted for by the faculty in 1969?

—Students and teachers have to travel from the downtown buildings to the L. and M. Buildings and back. It costs money and is more than a nuisance—people just can’t get to their classes in time. The college should provide transportation or at least reimburse the students.

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Several departments are now using observation and evaluation forms devised by the central administration of the City University to assess the performance of their teachers.

The forms represent an attempt by the college to quantitatively measure the effectiveness of teachers, rating them from unsatisfactory to superior according to several dozen criteria, all of which are supposedly given equal weight. Conceivably, a teacher could compensate for his total ignorance of a subject by superior scores for "punctuality," "student discipline," "use of visual aids" and "speaking ability."

The proposed evaluation form ranks the instructional staff in areas such as "personal appearance," "manners," "adaptability," "willingness to accept direction," and "relationship with administrators," among others.

It is rumored that to date only two superior ratings have been given, one to a blackboard in the "M" building and the other to a computer in the "A" building.

How To Bust Unions

On An Austerity Budget

The Legislative Conference (one of the two unions representing faculty) has informed us that the Board of Higher Education has paid $65,000 in legal fees since last Spring for arbitration and court appeals to fight grievances filed by the Conference and the United P. and B. Committee of College Teachers. The figures do not include the cost of arbitration which the Board must share with the unions. Since we do not have ready access to the financial records of the Board, we cannot vouch for the complete accuracy of the figures. What we do know, however, is that the Board, by hiring outside lawyers instead of using its own legal staff or that of the Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, is spending a small fortune to combat the unions.

The University has much more money to draw upon than the unions to pay for the costs of court and arbitration procedures. And the Board seems bent on taking as many cases as possible to arbitration, and when things do not go their way, to the courts. It does not seem terribly concerned about losing these cases, as it frequently does, or spending the taxpayer’s money. Rather, its policy appears calculated to bust the unions by forcing them to spend their relatively limited funds on legal costs. If there is a moral to this story, it is that the University pleads poverty as a matter of convenience. While it has no money to give its employees and students, it has plenty to keep them in line.

A Run Down on Legislative Conference Grievances Pending

1. The Edith Robbins–David Cahn Case. These two M.C.C. teachers were unanimously recommended for tenure by their departmental P. and B. Committees and by the school-wide P. and B. Committee last year, but were fired by President Draper. Their case is now at arbitration.

2. Salary Inequities Resulting from Promotion: 10 Assistant Professors appointed in 1969 (Siegel, Picard, Bria, Garnett, Miller, Spector, Allison, Christodoulou, Friedheim, Kaspar) suffered a loss of pay because of their promotions. The L.C. hopes to win it back for them.

3. Pay for Summer Session '71. The L.C. is asking that Professors Matt Lanna and Bob DiRivetta receive for their work during summer session the salary promised them by the Dean of students. In addition to these, the Legislative Conference is involved in a series of individual grievances concerning—among other issues—faculty facilities, secret files, and class size.
is being used to bring underprivileged youngsters into their university, and to build more buildings. It can be educationally sound if it is projected in the right direction. Of course there are people who abuse this. I admit there are many schools, many administrators who put too much emphasis on making money, and not enough emphasis on the academic aspects. And what happens to the young man when he leaves the school.

Tiger: Do you think that since athletes are bringing money into some of the bigger universities that have high-powered athletic programs, they should be allowed to have a salary, the business aspects of this should be more above board; that there should be less hypocrisy about it?

Howie: Well, the best way I can answer that is, I think that every student attending school, from elementary school on up, should be paid a salary for going to school. Then we wouldn’t have so many dropouts. An athlete is performing in school, and he’s given a scholarship which, I think, is a moral and a financial aspect. And his books, and tuition, then that’s an adequate amount of pay as it is. But I’m thinking beyond the athlete. I’m thinking that everybody who goes to school should be given some type of financial aid. Unfortunately it’s only limited to colleges. I’m thinking about thousands of young people who drop out of school within New York City alone who are not given money. I think you want to consider an athlete because he’s bringing the school money, I don’t know. That depends on what you emphasize. Extra money in his pocket? I think my first ambition should be going to school. If he’s going to play sports, I think he should be a scholar first. I think my first ambition—just because he’s playing sports—might be to become a professional, hoping that he’ll find a contract. Think the position as a teacher at a university. It’s through sports that I got my teaching experience in New York City. It’s through sports that I’m here, right now. So as far as I’m concerned, sports have helped me a great deal.

Tiger: How did you get into coaching?

Howie: Well, strange as it may seem, I was a major in history when I went to college. In fact, my degree is in history. During my senior year in college, I was approached by a principal of a high school in the area of Richmond, Virginia, who asked me to consider a coaching position. I didn’t hesitate to say that I would consider it, but it would be on a volunteer basis, I wanted me to major in physical education for my Master’s. I consented that I would go ahead and work on my Master’s in physical education. While in the process of starting my Master’s in the field of physical education at NYU, I found out that I didn’t have a job. But since I started the Master’s program, I did not stop. As a result, the college from which I graduated gave me a head coaching job. That’s how I got started in coaching.

Tiger: What do you think is the difference between high school coaching and college coaching? You’ve done both.

Howie: Well, the difference would be, one, on the high school level, I consider the most complicated level of coaching, you take a young man in his embryonic stage. A boy doesn’t really know what he’s doing. You’re putting the polish on the shoe in high school and in college you’re taking the rag and shining the shoe. In other words, we are there. All you have to do is the product in college. High school is a little more complicated because you are dealing with younger players. You’re not dealing with a very limited amount of basketball knowledge. They may have basketball ability, but they lack the knowledge of the game. So it’s a challenge. Basically, you are teaching. I think that a lot of people don’t understand that when you are a coach in college, you are actually teaching youngsters. Some youngsters don’t know how to shoot properly. Some youngsters don’t know how to set up properly. A lot of things take for granted, I can do in high school, he can’t. On the college level, it is a lot more complicated because you are dealing with a more complicated group. And how do they know what you want. Eighty percent of success in college is how you go about recruiting the talent. You see what you want. You see them in action. You say that this particular young man is a motivator, a recruiter, or what? I think that it depends upon the philosophy of the university at that time. If they desire that they have to win, then college coaching becomes very complicated.

Tiger: How would you describe the function of a coach? For example, is he a teacher, a motivator, a recruiter or what?

Howie: A coach is all of those categories. He is even a father and a mother sometimes. I think that the philosophy of a coach should be first that he’s always teaching. I think that I mentioned before that many coaches in high school and we have the situation with black athletes, because coaching does not belong in this gymnasia. Many coaches feel that all they have to do is to tell a kid to do a certain amount of sit-ups, run around a certain amount in the gymnasia. Many coaches feel that all they have to do is to tell a kid to do a certain amount of sit-ups, run around a certain amount in the gymnasia. It’s the only thing that they are interested in. The only thing these teachers call by that name. It’s the only thing that they have to do. They don’t care if you have talent or not. But it is not as difficult to coach. The only thing is that it depends upon the philosophy of the university at that time. If they desire that they have to win, then college coaching becomes very complicated.
sides basketball, besides the sport itself, the coach has a definite interest in his social affairs. What is a young man thinking about when he is leaving the gymnasium? Is he happy? Is he dissatisfied? Is he hungry? Does he have problems in the neighborhood? These are things that coaches have to take into consideration. It will always be that a youngster who has a problem. He is human everywhere else he is not going to be able to compete. He should compete as a teacher, he’s a motivator, he’s a father, he’s a mother. He falls into every one of those categories as a matter of fact.

Tiger: What are the common personal problems that intrude upon the athletic scene? Howie: My problems as far as coaching is concerned would be minimized if I had a dormitory where I could make sure that the youngsters that you provide, get the proper rest, and studying properly. My experience at Boy’s High and my experience here is that the players have problems financially. They have home problems. They have social problems. And these all come back to me as a coach. An example is a youngster not having enough food at home because he comes from conditions that are deplorable. Without exaggeration, they are deplorable. Many of these are problems even an adult cannot handle. These are some of the problems that we encounter.

Tiger: To what extent do you think that racism is a problem in organized sports? Howie: It becomes a problem when one is not treated the same as others. If for example, I am competing for a position and there is a quota system—that is only a certain number of blacks can be accepted—then this is racism and we are not being treated as equals. If you look around and you ask any professional baseball out of all the black stars who have come up in the last fifteen years—Ernie Banks, Willie Mays, Roberto Clemente and Hank Aaron—we still don’t have a black manager. If you ask yourself out of all the quarterbacks in the problem, why don’t we have a black quarterback; if you ask of all the quarterbacks in the college ranks, why you don’t have a black quarterback, you must conclude that there is racism. They can play. They can perform. Yet the requirement for their performance is that it must be above the average. It has to be just being good. It has to be superior. In every sense of the word, they have proven this, but they are not good enough to lead, only follow. This is a problem of racism. I see it within the coaching ranks. Within the college ranks, how many black coaches? And you find predominately black athletes on all of the teams. The majority of the teams are made up of black athletes. In New York City, in 1960, when I first became a high school coach, I was the first black high school coach in the city. And this is in the sixties! All these years they didn’t have a black high school coach. I can’t understand this. It only leads me to believe that this is part of racism.

Tiger: To what extent are drugs a problem in organized sports? Howie: A college without any has to definitely accept that drugs are a part of sports. It is happening. Athletes are taking drugs. Athletes are involved with it. A perfect example is the article that appeared recently as recently as Sunday [Oct. 17 in the magazine section] stating that our best Olympic runners and performers are using drugs. They can play. They can perform. Yet the requirement for their performance is that it must be above the average. It has to be just being good. It has to be superior. In every sense of the word, they have proven this, but they are not good enough to lead, only follow. This is a problem of racism. I see it within the coaching ranks. Within the college ranks, how many black coaches? And you find predominately black athletes on all of the teams. The majority of the teams are made up of black athletes. In New York City, in 1960, when I first became a high school coach, I was the first black high school coach in the city. And this is in the sixties! All these years they didn’t have a black high school coach. I can’t understand this. It only leads me to believe that this is part of racism.

Tiger: How do you handle the drug problem with the teams that you coach? Howie: First of all, to be honest with you, I was as naive as many people who feel that it can’t exist among athletes. I was naive about the fact that a youngster could not take drugs and perform to the maximum so I never looked for it. And then when I was made aware of it with certain experiences at Boy’s High and past experiences with it here at Manhattan Community College, I made great strides in trying to alleviate the problem, by first having these youngsters checked out not by just an ordinary doctor, but by a doctor who has been exposed to this type of thing, who knows what to look for and many doctors don’t know what to look for, they don’t see it everyday. The second move was to bring in people to speak to them—former athletes who were addicted at one time, who came up through the Synanon program; and also to bring in a law enforcement narcotic agent who would tell them what are the pitfalls of being caught with things like this, or being a part of things like this. I teach them about first—and I have—accept that it could happen here, it could happen anywhere and so before it happens I want to deal with it. And the one way to deal with it is to let the youngsters know that I am aware of certain things and that I am going to do everything humanly possible to see that it doesn’t happen.

Tiger: To what extent do you think that players on a team have the capability to make vital decisions affecting it? For example, do you approve of the policy of the high school football coach in California who every week allows his team to elect the starting lineup? Howie: They tell me that a healthy mind is a mind that can make decisions. I am in full accordance with youngsters sitting down with the coach and helping to decide what kind of defense, what kind of offense and what we should look for and what we shouldn’t look for, because this is what I call team effort. I am totally against the coach being a dictator, totally against a coach living in the days of the eighteenth and nineteenth century; that I am God almighty and that whatever I say you do. I am strictly against anything of the sort where the youngster does not have the chance to use his own mind and his own intellectual capacity. He must be able to think and to create. He must be able to accept his decisions and to be able to accept the form of narcotics or narcotics stimulant to perform. It’s here. The question is how do we handle it. But most important of all is this. Do we accept the fact that it is here. I think that many people do not want to recognize this. People try to show that the players are athletes and that it presents a very poor image of sports. We are not saying that all athletes are addicted to drugs. We are saying a certain number of them are involved in using drugs. The thing is, how do we stop it? This problem comes about because drugs are very much a part of the game. Any game that is dependent in the field of sports. It is hurting us. It is hurting the youngsters. It is hurting the coaches and I think it is hurting the environment, in itself, and it has to be dealt with.

Tiger: How do you handle the drug problem don’t want my youngsters to feel as though they are robots, that they are mechanical men and that they have to move like mechanical men. This is not teaching anything. I like to run and shoot, because these youngsters can run and shoot. Set plays—only when they are necessary. I don’t like to make basketball complicated. This is the fault of many coaches—that we make it a little too complicated. There is no fun when you are a computerized basketball player.

Tiger: To what extent do you think defense is in today’s college game? Howie: It will vary. But as far as I am concerned, I go along with the old school that your defense is your offense. Example—when you are on defense, if you can create a lull, create a bad pass, create an offensive mistake, it automatically turns the ball over to you. And there is no way to score a basket like this. This is the philosophy of basketball. This is the philosophy of basketball. This is the philosophy of basketball. This is the philosophy of basketball.

Tiger: Why important do you think defense is in today’s college game? Howie: It will vary. But as far as I am concerned, I go along with the old school that your defense is your offense. Example—when you are on defense, if you can create a lull, create a bad pass, create an offensive mistake, it automatically turns the ball over to you. And there is no way to score a basket like this. This is the philosophy of basketball. This is the philosophy of basketball. This is the philosophy of basketball.

Tiger: What is the prospect for the team this year? Howie: Building character! I don’t think that we can repeat the distance that we covered last year to go all the way to the nationals. We have some young fellows. We have four seniors. All of the forwards, guards, backs are freshmen. The tallest player we have is six foot six and from that point on I think that everybody is under six feet. So I always say that when this happens that I am going to build character. Forget about winning this year. We’ll teach them how to lose.