

**Chapter 1**

**Introduction**



2

C.L.R. James, 3 December 1987 London  
Photograph by Terisa Turner

## Dedicated to C.L.R. James

*born 4 January 1901 in Trinidad, died 31 May 1989 in London*

### The pursuit of happiness

C.L.R. James

C.L.R. James spoke as follows to a section of the public in the capital of Trinidad in 1960. People in this third world colony were in motion, trying to throw off British rule. Cuba had revolted months before. James had just returned from Ghana where the first African mass movement for independence had put Kwame Nkrumah, a protege of James', in power.

We chose this quote from C.L.R. James because it answers a basic question that many of us in the Spring 1989 uprising at UMass have been asking: what is the real meaning of life? James says that it is engaging in a process of movement towards understanding and controlling what makes your life. That brings happiness, he says. Second, this quote outlines James' type of Marxism which differs sharply from much of what is being passed off as Marxism at UMass and elsewhere in the U.S.A. James' method, summarized here, has been discussed by many participants in the anti-death research movement. This on-going study of James is taking place in the context of the 1989 *Celebration of the Life and Times of C.L.R. James*, co-ordinated by Terisa Turner. The theory, spirit and practice of Jamesian Marxism informed the takeover movement.

The final reason for choosing this quote is that James died at the end of the semester. His life and work have been very important to us, as is indicated by the dedications penned into a gift copy of an earlier book we produced. At the funeral events in June 1989 in Trinidad a committee for labor solidarity announced the creation on September 10, 1989 of a popular organization. This is a new labor-based political party, committed to peoples' control in places of work and in the community. In 1960 James was working for the establishment of just such an

3

organization in Trinidad. In the following statement, he explains how essential to our happiness, to the integration of our social personalities, is this new type of political movement, whether in Trinidad or the U.S.A.

### **The good life**

What is the good life? An individual life cannot be comfortable and easy or creative unless it is in harmony to some degree with the society in which it lives. The individual must have a sense of community with the state. That is where we began. And that today is impossible. We tend to think of the good life in terms of individual well-being, personal progress, health, love, family life, success, physical and spiritual fulfillment. The whole point is that far more than we are consciously aware of, these are matters of our relation to society.

I am not saying that the individual human being is consciously striving to adjust himself to society. Not at all. Since the days of Aristotle and even long before, the philosophers have understood that man seeks happiness and seeks to avoid misery; it is as simple as that. Only that is not at all an easy thing in a complicated world. The thing to understand is that progress is not simply the increased use of goods. That is utility - utilitarianism. That was the doctrine essentially of the men of the eighteenth century. But progress is the incorporation into the social and individual personality of the stage that society as a whole has reached, which means that a man must feel that he has at his disposal education, capacity and ability of handle the discoveries of his particular age. He need not have a great deal of money to be able to do that. He need not pile up a quantity of large houses with forty rooms, and a great deal of money and drinks. What a man needs is to eat and drink, and to eat and drink satisfactorily by modern standards is very little. That is not the problem. But he must be able to use, to handle, to have at his disposal the greatest discoveries, the latest discoveries which enhance and develop a man's social personality. An individual personality cannot live a satisfactory life if he is constantly aware of great new discoveries and inventions and possibilities around him from which he is excluded, worse still, that these are threatening him with destruction. The peasant of the Middle Ages did not have very much in comparison to what a modern farmer has; the artisan in his guild did

not have for his use what the modern workers has. But he understood and controlled what he was doing. We, the great majority, do not. Marxism demands a universal education of all men in the achievements of modern society. It can be done, easily, but only when the masses of men and women are in control of society. Today a minority has as its first concern the preservation of its rights and its privileges, i.e., the maintenance of the capital relation.

### **The modern social personality**

So you see the good life demands a feeling that you are moving, you and your children. You must have a sense of movement and of overcoming difficulties within your organism; and if you are doing that, it does not matter what your wages are as long as you have a certain elementary level of material welfare. You must have a sense of movement, the sense of activity, the sense of being able to use or on the way towards understanding and controlling what makes your life. I do not mean gadgets the way the Americans play with things; I mean things that really matter. This is your personality; this is your social personality; and when this is taking place, although in certain countries they may have two or three times the amount of goods and utilities that you have, yet you can have the good life. You go to a country like Ghana where the general level is even lower than what it is here, but you look at the people, you listen to them, you see what they are doing; you get a sense of movement and activity; they are going somewhere. They will have troubles of course; that does not matter. The Greeks had plenty of troubles.

An American woman told me once that she forgot herself and told an audience of white women in the United States - she was a Negro woman - speaking to them she said, "When I look at you all, I am sorry for you because although whites are oppressing us and giving us trouble, I am actively on the move; every morning I am doing something, but you all are just sitting down there watching." It is not the complete truth, but it is a great part of the truth. This is some idea of what I mean by what is the good life - the individual in relation to society. It is **not**, it never has been, merely a question of what the vulgarians call "raising the standard of living." Men are not pigs to be fattened.

*Let me sum up in terms which you should study and work at until they are an instinctive part of your outlook and method of thought:*

a) All development takes place as a result of *self-movement*, not organization or direction by external forces.

b) Self-movement springs from and is the overcoming of antagonisms within an organism, not the struggle against external foes.

c) It is not the world of nature that confronts man as an alien power to be overcome. It is the alien power that he has himself created.

Progress is not automatic. Hitler threw Europe back. To fight him it was necessary to fight the theory of race. But that theory can rise again. These reactionary concepts can become more acute than they have ever been in the past, not because they are ineradicable from human nature, but because of the fundamental disorder in modern society. You see what the Marxist solution is. Marxists envisage a total change in the basic structure of human relations. With that change these problems will not be solved overnight but we will be able to tackle them with confidence. Such are the difficulties, contradictions and antagonisms, and in the solution of them society moves forward and men and women feel they have a role in the development of their social surroundings, the individual can find a more or less satisfactory relation to the national to the world community. It is in this movement that we have the possibility of a good life. But if, on the other hand, reaction grows and the question of the freedom of women and the question of the equality of classes and the question of differences of race begin to be used, as they are bound to be used by reactionary elements in the defence of positions which are no longer defensible, society becomes sick unto death, the individual cannot find an easy relation either to the state or to his fellow men. Not only are we affected in war, in economics, and in politics. The turmoil the world is in reacts upon our most intimate consciousness in ways we are not aware of. And every succeeding day brings us nearer and ties us closer to the decisive forces and conflicts of the modern world., What has suddenly erupted in Cuba is going to place many of the things I am talking about before you, first for your discussion, and sooner or later for your decision. We were not able to choose the mess we have to live in, this collapse of a whole society, but we can choose our way out.

*This quote is excerpted from C.L.R. James' book **Modern Politics**. The book contains six lectures delivered between 8 and 25 August 1960 at the public library in Port of Spain, Trinidad. At the time C.L.R. James was editing **The Nation**, newspaper of the party headed by Eric Williams, which led the country to independence in 1962. C.L.R. James and Eric Williams had, at the time of these lectures, split over Williams' refusal to allow the democratic organization of a mass party in Trinidad. James details this experience in his book **Party Politics in the West Indies** (Trinidad: 1961). Because of the split, Williams suppressed **Modern Politics** and in 1965 put James under house arrest. James has been quoted as saying of the 1960 lectures, "**Modern Politics** means a lot to me personally. I did not prepare (the lectures) but faced a home audience, so to speak and just spoke as I felt and they responded."*

*Bibliographic information on **Modern Politics** is as follows: subtitled "A series of lectures on the subject given at the Trinidad Public Library, in its Adult Education Programme"), PNM Publishing CO., Port of Spain, 1960; new edition, with introduction by Martin Glaberman, Bewick/ed, Detroit, 1973, 176 pp.; extracts in **Radical America** James anthology, May 1970, pp. 3-11, "The Battle for Survival" in C.L.R. James, **At the Rendezvous of Victory, selected writings**, London: Allison & Busby, 1984, pp. 129-142. The quote in **Takeover!** is from the **Radical America** pamphlet, pp. 8-11.*



**C.L.R. James, March 1989 London**  
**Photograph by Terisa Turner**

## Introduction

### Terisa E. Turner and Timothy A. Belknap

In April and May of 1989 on the University of Massachusetts campus at Amherst six takeovers occurred. A few hundred of the approximately 40,000 students in the Five College area occupied university facilities to protest Department of Defence funding of research. We do not yet know whether this uprising has succeeded in stopping death research on our campuses, but we know that it has raised many fundamental issues. The uprising has educated thousands in basic social relations and in crucial moral principles.

The takeover! movement took place in an explosive national and international context. The Chinese student pro-democracy movement coincided with our actions. The pro-choice mobilization throughout the U.S.A. began before the UMass uprising and informed every initiative. President Bush has been confirmed in office in January 1989. This mobilization against militarization was among the first major challenges launched against his regime. We are not about to allow Bush, former head of the CIA, to invade third world countries or our inner cities to make the world safe for U.S. corporate profit-taking. We understand that putting our bodies on the line to stop death research is a potent method for changing the parameters of U.S. foreign policy. We join with the people of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in demanding control over our tax money and its expenditure. We join with ordinary people worldwide in refusing to further destroy the environment with nuclear bomb testing and biological warfare experiments.

The takeover! movement had deep roots in other mass mobilizations. Among these are the 1960s anti-war movement and the contemporary anti-nuke movement. Civil disobedience and non-violent resistance are methods of organization which have become highly sophisticated and we drew on these. The women's movement is probably the most highly developed in terms of technology use, media outreach, networking and effectiveness. Our takeover! drive drew crucially on the experience of the women's movement. It marked the tenth anniversary of women taking over the UMass student newspaper office (*The Collegian*) to end press coverage which tolerated violence against women. It coin-

cided with a powerful, new anti-porn movement in Western Massachusetts. Antecedents to our uprising include the historical 800,000 strong pro-choice march on Washington D.C. on 9 April 1989; and the CIA off the campus drive of 1986-1989.

The UMass occupations were part of a national wave of occupations reminiscent of the 1985 Free South Africa movement which swept the country and forced corporate divestment from apartheid South Africa. On several other campuses students took over buildings to protest receipt of funds for war research. Students in New York state occupied university buildings with such force and rapidity that New York governor Cuomo rescinded an order to increase tuition fees. Ten thousand students marched into Wall Street, the heart of global capitalism, in New York city just before the governor gave in to their demands. At the same time hundreds of homeless and militant people were protecting buildings in the Lower East Side of Manhattan from official destruction. New York city is largely controlled by the underworld and landlords. And these interests were driving the poor from city-owned buildings in order to tear them down and sell the land to property speculators. The homeless were starting to unite with angry students. Such an alliance is a powerful threat to the state. This is the background to the governor's capitulation to largely working class students on the tuition question. It is clear that the next decade will be marked by upheaval. Linkups among women, workers, the homeless, AIDS activists, students and the unemployed are already in evidence. Jesse Jackson's Rainbow Coalition is only the tip of the iceberg. There is a massive groundswell of citizen outrage and organization gathering force. The takeover! movement at UMass is organically linked to this revolution in the making for the 1990s.

**Takeover!** is organized into 15 chapters which treat the movement chronologically. During the second takeover (Memorial Hall on April 24th) the editors began to collect first hand accounts from participants. Throughout the uprising we requested people to give us their views, art, photographs and other materials for this desk top published book. We are among the editors of **Revolutionary Popular Culture**, another desk top published book which had been released in March 1989. Consequently many occupiers knew something of what to expect in the way of publication. **Takeover!** includes two chapters from **Revolutionary Popular Culture**: "Making Things at the University to Kill People:

Letter to Daniel", by Rachel Maiore and Joe Rubin, and "Love, politics and escape from the U.S. Air Force," by Ralph Reed.

Inevitably we were unable to publish many valuable contributions and documents. There was just not enough space or time. At least four other books are needed on the takeover movement: one consisting of media clippings and analysis, another of essays and analyses comparing the anti-DOD initiative with other uprisings, a third of organizational critiques and a forth devoted to the political theory of direct action practice at UMass. This call for more books underlines our conviction that the mobilization of students at UMass and elsewhere has fundamental significance for Marxist theory and for the world system. We are taking part in making the world of the next century in these actions and it is important for us to exercise critical consciousness in the process. Finally, we apologize for the many inevitable omissions and errors in this book. We welcome your responses.



Daniel Ortega and Ruth First  
Huge Wall Painting in NYC

## There I was a product of innocence

David Lipton

There I was  
a product of innocence  
protesting with nonviolence.

What did I want?  
I wanted to end the military superstructure.

There they were  
the products of malevolence  
fighting with violence.

What did they want?  
They wanted to keep the military superstructure.

What is going to happen?

We will win.

Shortened from the original in  
REVOLUTIONARY POPULAR CULTURE...

## Making Things to Kill People at the University: Letter to Daniel

Rachel Maiore and Joseph Rubin

Dear Daniel,

We are writing this letter because we hope by the time you get to college you can be part of a generation that works on the important problems that you have expressed concern about like hunger, A.I.D.S., homelessness, pollution and war. It seems like our school is doing more to create these problems than to solve them.

We'll get right to the point, Dan. You see, we are part of a group at school. We did some research and found out that U.Mass is receiving between 15-20 million dollars a year from the military. With this money the students and professors are working on a whole assortment of projects. None of them are very helpful and some could hurt a lot of people. Examples of some of the projects include developing tanks and bomberplanes that can be operated by remote control and computers, research on chemical and biological warfare (using chemicals and biological germs to kill people during a war), working on the Strategic Defense Initiative (S.D.I.), otherwise known as the Star Wars project.

Dan, we know you are a real bright kid and you know that even though twenty million dollars from the military at U.Mass is a lot of money, in the scale of our economy it is just a drop in the bucket. A couple of weeks ago while you were watching the news you commented that it was ridiculous to spend that much money on the Stealth Bomber when so many people are starving and that we should be developing much needed solar energy instead. You're comment was very perceptive and it is true of our whole society. We spend trillions of dollars making weapons, fighting and aiding wars, when so much is desperately needed and soon.

... People  
all over the world are protesting injustices. The group we are involved in is trying to do our small part by breaking our university's ties with the military cycle. We want to make U.Mass an example of a what education is supposed to be about.

A lot of people have told us that we should leave our school alone and instead deal with the people who make the big decisions. But we are not congresspeople and we don't live in Washington, we are students and we live in Northampton. We have to work to change things in our own local area and we're sure other people will get the idea and change things around them. Everything is part of a cycle of change. Just recently a U.S. representative filed a bill that would require factories to make plans for converting from military production to civilian production.

Some of the school officials have already accused us of "trying to bring the university down". In fact we are trying to bring it up. We think that our school, by doing all this research for the military, is bringing itself down. We believe it has started to hurt people and has the potential to hurt many more.

We decided that the best way to stop the research was to find out everything we could and then tell as many people as possible about it. First of all we had to find the public records that describe all the research and then we had to decipher them because they are very technical. We could have used you, because you are a lot better in science than we are. Because we didn't have you a few scientists helped us.

After we felt like we had enough information, we used a few different methods to tell people about it. Most of the papers I have included give some examples of the different methods we used. Here is a list of some of those methods:

1. In front of the student union building, where lots of people pass, we wrote in brightly colored erasable chalk about military funding on campus.



## Liberating Information

October 10, 1988

To Mr. Lee Beatty; Director of the Office of Grants and Contracts:

On behalf of our research group I am requesting a waiver of fees in our search of proposal files. Regulations require you to waive fees if the research is in the public interest. We believe this criteria easily applies to our research. The goal of our research is simple. To the best of our ability we will attempt to ascertain the content, goals and intended application of research grants which are funded by the military or have military applications. We look at this question from many different angles. In order to conduct this research it is essential that we carefully scrutinize the proposals of the principle investigators as well as other relevant documents that your office holds.

We intend to make the results of our research available to the public. Each year millions of tax dollars, a great deal of university resources and thousands of hours of faculty and student time is dedicated to the completion of these research grants. In light of this we believe it is essential and in the public interest to find out what this research entails.

Currently we are being charged six dollars per hour of office time used and twenty cents per page copied. At twenty cents a page it will cost us hundreds of dollars just to copy the nineteen proposals we have requested. We are only students and this expense makes the cost of research prohibitive. The Office of Grants and Contracts was set up in order to ensure a process of obtaining grants that was above board and in the public eye. This process is no longer above ground and in the public eye if one needs hundreds of dollars in order to find out basic and public information.

We greatly appreciate your office's time and cooperation up to this point. I hope this matter is due to lack of communication and can be solved quickly.

Sincerely,  
Joseph Rubin



UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS  
AT AMHERST

Hampshire House  
Amherst, MA 01003  
(413) 545-0021

Department of Legal Studies

Thursday 27 October 1988

Chancellor Joseph Duffey  
Whitmore Building  
CAMPUS

Dear Joe,


Lee Beatty's determination that the student research project on DOD grants to the University would not "benefit the public interest" and his consequent refusal to waive search fees (Memo from Beatty to Joseph Rubin, dated October 19, 1988) appear to be a misguided interpretation and application of the Freedom of Information Act.

I am sure you agree that the purposes and intent of FOIA are to promote citizen access to government decision-making and record-keeping processes. That this is not limited to cases of individuals seeking information on their own behalf or about themselves is made clear by the fee waiver exception couched in terms of a general public interest.

I am also sure you understand and agree that economic barriers to information access are as real as legal restrictions. The old saw about the free press being free to those who own the presses is relevant to FOIA as well. Beatty's insistence on collection of search fees undermines a central function of FOIA: democratic access to information needed for public discussion of government policies and practices.

Please consider this matter carefully. I have been told that you will shortly decide what to do about this request for research documents. I will be sorry if you do not act in such a way as to foster this inquiry rather than to impede it.

Regards,

  
Peter d'Errico

cc: Vice-Chancellor Paul Page  
OGC Director Lee Beatty

## An Overview of the TAKEOVER movement

1. Issued at Press Conference  
Wed. May 17, 1989

People for a Socially Responsible University

On April 19, after more than a year of investigation by a number of University of Massachusetts students into the Department of Defense funding and research at the University, students, feeling a moral commitment to stop the research for destruction, held a sit-in in a Microwave Remote Sensing Laboratory (MIRSL). This lab was carefully chosen because it received a particularly large amount of Department of Defense monies. Shortly after the sit-in began, the University police locked the lab, refusing to allow anyone to enter and refusing to allow the remaining students access to food, water, or the use of the bathroom. The students were informed that no arrests would be made. Several hours later, seven students were arrested on trespassing charges and threatened with academic disciplinary action. Two students were treated at the infirmary for injuries received during the arrests of these non-violent protestors.

Five days later, one-hundred students occupied Memorial Hall at the University. The protestors drew up a list of nine demands which were presented to the administration. The administration offered to meet with representatives of the protestors, but this offer was prefaced with the statement that students demands would not be considered by the university. The students agreed to meet as a group with the administrators in Memorial Hall, and this was refused.

In the late afternoon on April 25, university, local, and state police in riot gear were mobilized to Memorial Hall with a helicopter and dogs. Twenty-nine protestors were arrested for trespassing, and thirty-two students were arrested for non-violently blocking the bus that was attempting to remove the arrested students. The 61 student protestors were booked at the university stadium. Over forty of the students chose not to pay the \$15 processing fee and spent the night in the county jail.

2.

Concerned that the original demands had been too broad reaching, the group, People for a Socially Responsible University (PSRU), presented a revision of its demand. This was one: The Department of Defense funding and research be ended at the University of Massachusetts. Included was a list of suggestions towards the implementation of this demand.

On May 3, seventy-five students staged a sit-in in the office of the Vice Chancellor of Research. Though the protestors were locked into one hall, the University closed the entire building to students, including the Physical Science Library. Many in PSRU argued that this was a tactic intended to divide students. For more than fourteen hours, the University refused to permit any food that had been provided by supporters outside to be brought in.

Administrators presented a proposal to the students in the occupation and offered to meet with the students in the morning if they would go home. The proposal stated that the University would 1) make public information about research contracts publicly available, and 2) form a committee to review the University's research policy, but this committee would have no binding power, and students would not be represented. PSRU refused the proposal because it truly did not represent any progress. The students, once again, offered to meet with the administrators at their convenience the following day. An invitation was extended to Paul Tsongas, head of the state Board of Regence who was in town for a conference, to attend. This meeting was, also, refused.

At 4:00 a.m., the Head of Security woke-up the protestors and informed them that they would be arrested in half an hour with the largest police presence the campus had ever seen. They were told that in addition to criminal charges, all students would immediately be suspended, and they would be charged in excess of \$20,000 for the costs of their own arrests. In fact, no arrests came until after

3.

noon, more than eight hours later. At the time of the arrests, the faculty and students who had been brought in by the University to act as impartial observers offered to walk-out because of what they saw as gross violations of the students Constitutional rights. The protestors asked them to remain, and they agreed.

Thirty two students were arrested inside the Graduate Research Center (GRC). Three more were arrested outside, as riot-clad state police hit and shoved onlookers out of the way of the bus carrying the protestors to their bookings and arraignments at the university stadium. Nine students who were arrested in the GRC and had been arrested in previous protests have been placed on interim suspension. According to University policy, interim suspensions were intended to be used in cases in which a student posed an imminent threat to herself/himself, to others, or to the property of the University. Leaders of the Student Government Association and many faculty have objected strongly to the suspension of these students without due process. They have argued that these were clearly not the circumstances underwhich this policy was to be used.

On Monday, May 8, seven students began a hunger strike in support of FSRU. They stated that their hunger strike would not end until all disciplinary charges against students involved in the recent protests were dropped. Tuesday, during a forum sponsored by supportive faculty at Mahar Auditorium, six community people and two students were arrested after occupying Chancellor Joe Duffey's office in opposition to war research and the disciplinary actions. Following the forum, seventy students re-occupied Memorial Hall. At this time, in addition to the demand for the removal of military research, a second demand was added that all disciplinary actions against students be dropped.

Students in Memorial Hall were allowed free access to the building, but electricity and phones were turned-off during most of the day. Several of the hunger strikers went

4.

to Whitmore Administration building as liaisons for FSRU to extend an invitation to the Administration to meet with the group in Memorial Hall. A reply was delivered from the Chancellor by Bill Weitzer. It restated the proposal the students were offered in the GRC: public access to public information; and the formation of a research policy review board without binding power or student participation. The statement was prefaced with the agreement that the high level of military funding of the University was a concern to the Chancellor, as well.

At 5:30 a.m. on May 11 in a heavy rain, thirty-five protestors were arrested in Memorial Hall, and six more were arrested outside. The protestors were taken to the Northhampton National Guard Armory in Florence, MA. Many of the arrestees report that when they asked where they were, they were told by the police that they did not know. Outside, supporters and reporters discovered that the armory signs had been covered and that the street signs had been covered with a garbage bag. When several supporter were allowed inside where arraignments were taking place, they discovered that all signs and notices bearing the location of the the armory had been either covered with tape or turned over.

Thursday, one student who refused to give his name at his arraignment on charges of trespassing was taken to the Hampshire County Correctional Facility where he began a hunger strike. After releasing his name Monday, he is still being held and his bond has been set at \$10,000.

At a press conference called by the hunger strikers last Friday, the administration released a campus advisory first to the press. The students were asked to respond to the advisory on camera before the administration gave copies to the students. Later Friday afternoon, the hunger strikers met with Vice Chancellor Madson to negotiate the reinstatement of the suspended students. Following the meeting, the hunger strikers issued a statement to

Chancellor Duffey in an attempt to show their intentions of negotiating in good faith for the reinstatement of students. They received a response on Saturday which they understood promised the reversal of all disciplinary actions against protestors. A meeting was set with members of the Administration for Monday morning to begin the process of reinstating the students. The hunger strike was ended believing that the goals had been met.

Many of the hunger striking students discovered that their parents had received calls from Chancellor Duffey Friday night. He told the students' parents that their sons and daughters' safety against right-wing backlash could not be guaranteed.

When the students who had been involved in the hunger strike met with Vice Chancellor Jim Langly Monday morning, they were advised by him not to sign any agreement with the University Administration that stated that they would perform community service in retribution for their actions. Any statement of this kind could be used as an admission of guilt in the students' trials scheduled for the fall. The students then met with Dean of Students Jo-Anne Vanin who presented them with a contract which they were told they would have to sign to be reinstated. The contract stated that the students must perform community service and/or pay fines in retribution for their actions. The student maintained their innocence and refused.

A rally against Department of Defense funding and research at the University is planned for noon on Wednesday, May 17 at the Student Union steps. A second rally to support Tim Savegeau, the political prisoner being held on \$10,000 bond for trespassing charges, is scheduled for 2 p.m. in front of the County Court House in Northampton.

Civil suits are being prepared against the University of Massachusetts for its use of the interim suspensions. This case is being prepared by several lawyers, including lawyers from the Center for Constitutional Rights. This summer PSRU will be continuing its research into the military contracts at the University, and they will be working with experts on economic conversion to create a feasible plan for shifting to civilian funding sources.

A national conference on these issues is also being planned for the fall.

## Chapter 2

### Beginnings