



IDEAS!



(Continued from previous page)

31. Social scientists try to pick the radicals' minds. The American Council of Education (ACE) survey, and the reaction. (Steve Weissman.)

32. The Stanford Trustees announced they would reform their membership. Remember? You don't remember? (Michael Sweeney.)

33. Do you realize what they're doing in psychological research at Stanford? (Bruce Campbell & Jeff Blum.)

34. A radical analysis of the undergraduate curriculum--course offerings and regulations as a consequence of the university's role in society. (Jeff Blum.)

35. Local high schools are almost ready to bust wide open. (Jeff Blum.)



36. Stanford-in-Washington program. David Packard, Richard Allen, Freeman & friends.

37. What goes on in the industrial park, anyway? Weapons development & procurement. (Mark Paul.)

38. Memories from the McCarthy era, as gleaned from ex-pinkos who got burned. (Mark Paul.)

39. When Stanford stops--going out into the cruel world. Interviews with recent graduates and drop-outs. The meaning of the degree, the work experience. (Debby Warren.)

40. The Stanford proletariat--the low-paid, non-union workers. Gardeners, secretaries, cooks. Where are they at? The hospital organizing effort. (Debby Warren & Barbara Hyland.)



41. Women's liberation movement at Stanford. (Barbara Hyland.)

42. People's Park people produced a 1-point liberation program. What does it mean? What's happening with it? (Penny Hill.)

43. The DYT controversy. Stanford professors played a big role. Archetypical liberal action.

44. How the San Francisco Chronicle and the SF State faculty are working together to oust Hayakawa. (Writer needed, Sweeney has clippings file.)

45. What to do about virginity. An open-ended discussion.

46. Who is admitted to Stanford and why. (Pat McMahon.)

47. Stanford tuition is \$725 a quarter. A list of all the things that \$725 would buy.

48. The Thrilling Saga of Neological Sciences. An academic satire. (Michael Sweeney.)

49. A blank page so readers can be creative.

50. The District Attorney comes to the Farm. The administration's plan for a prosecutor for campus judiciary.

51. Woman's role in art. (Susan Hudgens.)

52. The United Front Against Facism. (Bruce Pollock.)

53. All art is alienation--and what that means. (Susan Hudgens.)

54. Narc of the Week--photo and description. A public service feature.



55. Run Stanford for a Day. Chaparral sponsors a one-day takeover of all administrative offices, including Board of Trustees, and publicizes what the People's Representatives enact.

56. Is the draft breaking down? Increasing refusals, court backlogs, attacks on draft board files. (D. McGuire)

57. Today's horoscope. (Penny Hill.)

58. The white lower middle class. A visit to DeAnza Junior College, the training ground of the cops, beauticians and technicians. Where are they at?

This list includes only the ideas that have been mentioned to date--and most of the ideas were formed after an intense political controversy, hence the obvious bias. If you have any comments or information on any of these story ideas, please communicate them to the prospective author or to Mike Sweeney. Send him your new story ideas too.

STANFORD Chaparral

INTERIM BUREAUCRACY

Coordinators

General: Michael Sweeney, 2031
Wellesley St., 328-8459

Arts & Entertainment: Susan
Hudgens, 4095 Alpine Rd.,
851-7693

Photography--John Shoch, 969
Lawrence, 321-1967

Production--Penny Hill, 2272
Princeton St., 327-8304

Business--Michael Benefiel, 1699
Springer Road, MV, 968-8457

These people
said they
were inter-
ested in
ing on Chaparral
in some way.

Anderson, Gail
Atkins, Rich
Bauer, Ann
Benefiel, Michael
Bernstein, Paul
Black, Bill
Blum, Jeff
Bonner, Randy
Campbell, Bruce
Cassidy, Frank
Coburn, Tim
Davidson, Karen
Denton, Ann
Dolinger, Peter
Filene, Ron
Fonvielle, Lloyd
Freeman, Crissy
Goetz, Lori
Haight, Tim
Hargrove, Kip
Harte, Cris
Hill, Penny
Hudgens, Susan
Hyland, Barbara
Johnston, Marian
Jones, David
Kane, Jeff
Levinthal, David
Liese, Hank
Mahoney, Marta
Matthews, Jenny
McCarthy, Todd
McCarten, Hugh
McGuire, Diarmuid
McMahon, Patrick
Moriarty, Penny
Morton, Michael
Ownes, Rob
Passett, Mimi
Paul, Mark
Pollock, Bruce
Rustin, Terry
Shoch, John
Sibbett, Dave
Snell, Dan
Stevens, Dave
Stresser, Judy
Sweeney, Michael
Tom, Gene
Trounstein, Phil
Von Schlegell, Vic
Warren, Barbara
Warren, Deborah
Weinstein, Michael
Ward, Ricki
Oswald, Nancy

THAN
NEVER TO HAVE LIVED AT
ALL.

REFLECTIONS

Arts + Entertainment ← coming attractions!!

Incredibly, the Stanford community has no publication with an adequate section on arts and entertainment. The Arena, with a movie review and rock column, did better than the Daily.

Well, it happens that the Arena's movie reviewer and rock columnist have both come over to Chaparral--Susan Hudgens and Bruce Borgeson. Other people have expressed an interest in rock and straight music reviews, theatre, books, and movies. We should be able to run at least one review in each area in every issue.

All the reviews could be put in a distinct section along with an Entertainment Schedule (think of a better name) listing everything that's happening for the next two weeks. Movie, theatre, record and restaurant advertising can be concentrated in this section.

To give the whole thing a lot of class, we can start the section with feature articles on the arts. Cultural revolution, after all.

Anyone interested in an aspect of the arts and entertainment section should communicate same to Susan Hudgens.

I KNOW the Fish: The Party Line

Too few people really understand our purpose in putting out Chaparral. Some even fear that it will be entirely radical politics--and having these fears, may try to undermine our attempts. We may not be able to relieve them of their fears, for some people like to be afraid of something all the time, but we can clear up the rumors that are being spread.

The House Organ now presents a series of standard questions (ones that have been posed to some of us already) with a set of standard replies. This is our "party line." And we don't even have to lie.

Q: So you're going to make Chaparral an underground newspaper for radical politics?

A: No, Chaparral will continue to be a magazine, with all kinds of feature articles--not just politics. Anyone can join the staff.

Q: Can you do that? Chaparral is a humor magazine.

A: Wrong. Back in 1967 the Chaparral staff announced that the humor magazine was dead and henceforward, Chaparral would be a general magazine. We're continuing that.

Q: Isn't Chaparral supposed to be a monthly?

A: It can be anything we want. Back in 1899 when it started it came out bi-weekly. Publications have to change. Sequoia started as a weekly newspaper. Now it's a literary quarterly. The predecessor to the Daily was a monthly magazine.

Q: How about all that money you owe the ASSU? Isn't it \$16,000?

Point of Interest

With high-quality photo-offset printing, we will be able to use graphics profusely. Any line drawing can be pasted onto our page proof.

For an idea of what can be done with graphics in a tabloid, look at "The New York Review of Books."

We can do caricatures, either standing alone or tied-in with an article. Drawings and photos can be interchangeable as illustrations for articles.

We need artists who like to do this kind of thing. If you know any, tell them about Chaparral.

We can also get outside cartoonists. We can subscribe to Feiffer and R. Cobb, if we want to spend our money on that.

A: True. Chaparral has built up that deficit since 1962. It will be paid off from the Hammer and Coffin Fund.

Q: You can't fool me. You're starting a brand-new publication. It isn't Chaparral at all. I think the Chaparral offices and the Fund should be made available to anyone else who wants to start a publication, too.

A: We are not starting a new publication. We are continuing Chaparral, in its finest tradition. Just ask last year's editors. Besides, any use of the offices or fund by any publication besides Chaparral would be illegal. So go fuck yourself, you fascist pig.

Palabras de Organización

"In my opinion, an organization chart is a thing that is practically impossible to comprehend; it is a straight jacket, by which the reality of social life is forced into imaginary molds, it is the brainchild of sterile imaginations which cannot create anything in reality." --Fidel Castro

Getting it ON With Photography

CHAPARRAL has a big, beautiful darkroom. Somebody ripped off a lot of the equipment, so we can use anything people can donate.

John Shoch will be organizing our photography and darkroom.

CHAPARRAL should use photography more creatively than any publication Stanford has ever seen. Perhaps it is endemic to the Daily, Arena and Stanford Observer that their photography is as pedestrian as their prose. We can break out of that.

The Daily seems to think that a photo essay is a collection of pretty pictures on the same page. Chaparral can also do photo essays. Fort Ord, anyone?

Our page size will be 14" x 11". There is no reason why some photos can't be that big, too.

Do you remember the poster of Malcolm X, black dots on red paper, that looked like it was a blown-up, grainy press photo? White on black. Naked bodies.

Resurrected photos from old archives.

(This is an article from the Peninsula Observer, January 20-27, 1969. It may have some relevance for our own organization.)

Editors edit, don't dictate

By Judy Wasserman

(Editor's note: This is the first of a series of articles by Observer staff members describing their views of the recent changes in the Observer.)

You may have noticed a change in the Observer staff box several weeks ago. Now we no longer distinguish between editors, managers, and other staff members. We decided to drop that distinction, reflecting, we hope, an actual change in the structure of our organization and the relationships among the staff members.

Two things are happening. One involves the formal decision-making process of the newspaper; the other involves personal relations among the staff. The first is much easier to describe.

Until the middle of last fall, responsibility for the Observer, financial and otherwise, was in the hands of a few people known as editors. As the staff size increased, the editors decided they didn't have to carry that much responsibility, although giving it up also meant giving up a certain amount of power. Production-line staffers began to resent their underling status, and fell left out of policy making. About the same time, it became clear that there was no established decision-making procedure on the paper at all; decisions seemed to be made by whomever answered the phone or was in the office when questions came up. Finally, huge hassles began to arise--some over trivia, some over major policy--usually just before the paper was about to go to bed. They would be settled by force of personality or sheer endurance, and would carry over into the meetings that followed.

When we couldn't stand it any more (staffers weren't coming in because they couldn't endure the hostile atmosphere in the office), we spent an evening establishing a democratic structure that we hoped would be reasonably consistent with a humane, yet efficient, way of running the paper.

First, we set aside a time for personal confrontations, separate from the Sunday night business meetings, leaving us time to conduct some business instead of fighting on Sundays. Group therapy or confrontation had been suggested earlier by one staffer who had a good experience in a therapy group, but we'd been both timid and unconvinced of the need for it. This plan works

so well that we now get enough business done on Sundays so we can spend alternate weeks in serious political discussion.

Then we agreed that all policy and financial decisions would be made by the entire staff at business meetings, even if important decisions had to be delayed, if stories had to be pulled at the last minute, or if people got angry. Procedural decisions--commas, layout, captions, etc.--were left to final arbitration by whoever was doing that job, insoluble difficulties to be decided by the editor-of-the-week.

The position of editor-of-the-week would be rotated among five people, and every business meeting would have a new chairman.

Anyone calling the office to ask for the boss gets to talk to whoever answers the phone. There is no required length-of-time-in-service for the editor-of-the-week. However, the job does carry a lot of responsibility, so a prospective member of the editorial pool must be approved by the staff at a meeting. We also made a job called office manager, to be filled by someone who doesn't mind spending a lot of time at the office, so that the editors wouldn't have to handle minor business matters and could concentrate on writing, assigning, and editing stories. But we have already lost two office managers.

New people are being trained for all the other jobs on the paper as well, so that no one is indispensable. This not only helps eliminate the power-play problem, but allows a guy to take a vacation without shutting down the paper.

So what have we now? Ideally, a non-hierarchical staff of equals, in which editors edit but don't dictate, in which policy is made by the group (we even have a rule that says we can't vote to have someone do something he doesn't want to do), in which procedural decisions may be made by fiat but are subject to criticism later. We decided it was OK to make--even publish--a mistake.

In truth, what we have is a bunch of people trying to get to that point. Setting aside a time for personal confrontations was a recognition of that fact. One of the first things we discovered was that we hardly knew each other, that we had worked together for several months (in some cases

more than a year) and rarely saw each other outside the office, and that one of our primary goals was to become friends, and, hopefully to build a community of trust and interdependence.

It would be nice if the paper ran more smoothly as a result, and to some extent it has. The staff is now large enough, and operations are well enough defined, for us to publish weekly instead of biweekly. Before, no one wanted to spend every weekend hassling. People are beginning to see that criticism of their sentence structure of their drawings or their layout is not necessarily a personal attack. We're also learning to be able to tell when it is.

We are becoming closer personally; we're learning each other's sensitive spots and when it's appropriate to avoid them. We're also learning that a friendly touch on a sensitive place doesn't hurt as much as we thought it might. We felt close enough to want to have Thanksgiving dinner together, although enough people were still on their own trips to show that we weren't quite a family yet.

We still have problems. Some people speak loudly and are too easily heard, others have good ideas and are too shy to speak up. Some of us aren't totally committed--that is, we do other things besides work for the Observer. Should these people carry the same weight as the full-timers? Formally, we've agreed they should. Actually, there's still occasional friction.

What is all this in terms of the movement, or the revolution? Partly, we found that the inherent alienation and suspiciousness of the left had seeped into us and kept us separate, even from our comrades. We used the newspaper to help us communicate (at what a safe distance!) with the world, now we're learning to speak to each other. More important, we're beginning to look at what the revolution would mean



Support your
underground
newspaper

to us as people, and to see that some of the goals can be lived now. We can integrate our work (the paper) and the people we work with into our lives only if we see our comrades-at-work as a total people, not job-role-fillers, and make them our friends and family. The psychological barriers built by alienation between people are as real as the physical barriers built by the police, and both must be torn down in this revolution.

If I am not for myself, who am I?

If I am not for others, what am I?

If not now, when?

--Maimonides

SPECIAL FEATURES

A chance phone conversation resulted in this idea for a Chaparral feature: "Narc of the Week"--a photo of undercover agent, plus other descriptions that will help the people avoid and/OR stomp him.

Let's collect ideas like this for Chaparral--anything, far out or close in. Write them down. Bring them up. In the last analysis, ideas is all we got.

God Save Us From The BUREAUCRACY

IF YOU ARE DEDICATED TO THE PRINCIPLE THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL, THEN BE ON HAND JULY 25 TO HELP (IN BROTHERHOOD AND EQUALITY) CLEAN UP THE CHAPARRAL OFFICE. YOU WILL ALSO BE AROUND THE CHAPPIE OFFICE THAT EVENING TO HELP IN THE DECISION-MAKING MEETING. REMEMBER: WORK THROUGH TOIL SESSION STARTS AT 2:00 P.M. AND THE DECISION-MAKING MEETING STARTS AT 7:30 P.M.

stanford CHAPARRAL

Storke Student Publications Building Stanford University, California 94305 DA 1-2300, Ext. 4638

Volume 70 1969-70

WHAT'S INSIDE THE STANFORD CHAPARRAL?

Everything that has meaning for the University community. Feature journalism, humor, politics, personal close-ups, and a large and lively arts & entertainment section. Photography and graphics throughout. Our theme: "cultural revolution."

WHAT DOES IT LOOK LIKE?

For many years Chaparral was a slick magazine, appearing monthly. Starting September 25, the magazine is tabloid size (14" x 11"), coming out on alternate Thursdays, for a total of 19 issues during the school year. The greater frequency of publication will give better service to our readers--and to our advertisers.

WHO READS IT?

Everybody at Stanford. Free copies are distributed on campus for all students, faculty and staff. Guaranteed minimum circulation: 10,000. Mail subscriptions are offered at \$2.50 per year.

WHY ADVERTISE IN CHAPARRAL?

Only Chaparral gives adequate coverage of the Stanford market of more than 23,000 people. That includes 14,000 students and student wives, 3,000 faculty and their families, 6,000 full-time staff, and many others who participate in the intellectual life of the University. Chaparral is written for all of them. Stanford is an affluent market--the students come from families with a median income of \$16,700. It's also a market full of people who are new to the area--3,700 new students each fall, and 1,900 new University employees each year. These new residents want to know where they can shop. Chaparral advertising helps them find out.

HOW MUCH DOES IT COST TO ADVERTISE IN CHAPARRAL?

A full-page ad in every issue of Chaparral costs only 1¢ per reader--\$109.50 per insertion. For any size of ad, our rates are a bargain. Every thick issue of Chaparral stays in the reader's hands for days or weeks. So does your ad.