

ZEDEK

a quarterly.

The official journal of the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation, the only independent organization defending social activist professors rights have been violated.

whose basic constitutional and civil rights have been violated.
19329 Monte Vista, Detroit, Michigan 48221

Subscription Rates: \$ 6.00/yr. USA & Canada; elsewhere \$ 8.50/ yr.
Institutional Rates: \$ 12.00/yr. USA & Canada; elsewhere \$ 16.00/yr.

ZEDEK Volume II, Number 4 (November, 1982)

Page

138 Editorials: Politics & the Nuclear Freeze
A National Financial Exigency
Threatens All Activist Profs

140 SAPDF Seeking Supporters, Endorsers and
Sponsors, Registration Form

141 Some Comments on Two Tenure Struggles
California Higher Education under Governor
Ronald Reagan (1967-1975)

142 The Dilemma by John M. Mecartney

145 Cases of Academic Repression Reviewed in
Zedek (1980-1982)

* 146 Fighting Back with Social Action: An
Interview with Alex Efthim by Helen R.
Samberg

153 Feedback and Response
Highly Recommended Reading

154 Annual Index to Volume II
Key to Listings: Pages 71-94 re Feb., 1982
Pages 95-118 " May, 1982
Pages 119-137" Aug., 1982
Pages 138-156" Nov., 1982

156 Miscellaneous Advertising

Three Broadway Plays Explore People's Inhumanity to People

C.P. Taylor's GOOD shows how a decent college professor, living in a society very much like our own (economic depression, etc.), was converted into a Nazi involved in heinous crimes against people. See photo of Taylor and his comments about GOOD on front cover. A significant work every prof must see.

Also, THE CHORUS LINE, about rugged individualism in the dance world, and MASTER HAROLD AND THE BOYS, about the inhumanity of South Africa's apartheid system.

See details on page 156.



C.P. TAYLOR (Author) wrote more than 70 plays between the age of 30 and his untimely death at 53.

About *Good* he wrote, "The writing of the play is my response to a deeply felt and deeply experienced trauma in recent history, the Third Reich's war on the Jews, as well as an intellectual awareness, not at all deeply felt, of my role as a 'Peace Criminal' in the Peace 'Crimes' of the West against the Third World—my part in the Auschwitzes we are all perpetrating today.

"I put 'crimes' in quotes, because my concept of history—which will hopefully emerge from the play—is not quite simple enough to allow me to see either the anti-social activities of the Third Reich or of the West today, as simply criminal. If the problem were so simple, the solution might then be equally so.

"There seems to have been some pressure building up in me for a long time to write a play about the Final Solution, marking and responding to a great historical and personal trauma. Not as another Jew, wanting to add my wreath to those already piled high at the graves of the Six Million, but as my own gesture to revive their memory in our consciousness."

EditorialsPOLITICS AND THE NUCLEAR FREEZE

When one considers the amount of energy, commitment, coordination, and determination spent on the November, 1982 elections at every level, and then views the immediate poll results, there is a feeling of a job well-done.

Congress has elected 26 new people most of whom are against Reaganomics. The most vital and best (perhaps because it is so broad) organized coalition - The Nuclear Arms Freeze - demonstrated the value of good organizing around an issue by "passing" (that is, in states where the Nuclear Freeze issue was on the ballot, a majority of votes were for the freeze). In nine states people had the opportunity to vote on that vital issue. The victory parties of November 4th were wisely cautious rather than joyful. The freeze people and members of PSR (Physicians for Social Responsibility) have cautioned us that the victory was only one large step. Now we must organize!

Close on the heels of this victory was, of course, heavy evidence of the wisdom of this call for caution. Shortly after the freeze victory President Reagan announced to the world that the Anti-Nuclear War People are really dupes of a Moscow orchestrated Communist plot. As hackneyed and archaic as this may sound to many of us, Reagan glibly clichés and cajoles his way along, while possibly leading us to the destruction of the planet.

As more and more never-identified-with-Movements people, including former U.S. Generals who could not speak out while in uniform, are opposing the Strangelove Madness we are feeling and seeing daily, the more determined is the Administration to redesign and carry out a new "Polar Bear Expedition" against the USSR.* The most forcefully documented writing to come to our attention recently is a book entitled WITH ENOUGH SHOVELS by Robert Scheer, an author who is unidentified with Leftism (beyond his past association with RAMPARTS Magazine). On the basis of direct contacts with the highest government sources Scheer describes this as a current goal of the Reagan Administration. Nuclear Armament for Defense (and S.T. A.R.T.) is no longer at a deterrent level. Now, instead, there is a notion of a winnable World War III! All this to alter the economic and political structure of the Soviet Union. This is a post-World War I goal, a sixty-four year old hope, dormant through two cold wars, two detentes, an alliance in World War II, but never really dead in the minds of those identified with frontiersmends, bootstrap success, charity not dignity for the poor, who rob education and its equalitarian concepts to turn away poor and lower middle class students, who promote nepotistic elitism.

If the Freeze Movement fails it will be largely due to not being sufficiently political, that is, not spelling out what the connection is between freeze and don't freeze, allowing unlimited, unbridled cut-backs in education, housing, job resources, food and even bare

(continued on next page)

Editorials (continued)

minimal subsistence supports - all "for defense." The greatest threat is internal and until such is understood and acted upon, the victory of November 4th might best be seen as a one night stand.

 * The "Polar Bear Expedition" mentioned on page 138 refers to a contingent of Midwestern superpatriots who joined the U.S. and Allied Forces already working against the Bolsheviks during the Russian Civil War which followed the Russian Revolution of 1917. American intervention lasted from the late summer of 1918 until 1920. Although many American superpatriots then (and now), along with Winston Churchill would have liked to see the revolutionary "strangled at birth, the Bolsheviks won that civil war. It is interesting that most American textbooks today make very little mention of U.S. intervention in that civil war. However, here are a few good sources available in some libraries: Betty Miller Unterberger (Ed.), AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN THE RUSSIAN CIVIL WAR (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Co., 1969); William Appleman Williams, "American Intervention in Russia: 1917-1920" Part 2, STUDIES ON THE LEFT, IV (Winter, 1964), 39-57; E.M. Halliday, "Where Ignorant Armies Clashed by Night," in Oliver Jensen (Ed.), AMERICAN AND RUSSIA: A CENTURY AND A HALF OF DRAMATIC ENCOUNTERS (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1962), pp. 160-179.

A NATIONAL FINANCIAL EXIGENCY THREATENS ALL ACTIVIST PROFESSORS

The decreased enrollments in our colleges due to decreased public monies for grants, loans, and scholarships to students, changing interests from academic to vocationally oriented majors, and the increased cold war mentality ubiquitous in educational decisionmakers, has led colleges to use Procrustean methods of trimming their faculty. In the past few months, e.g., Wayne State, in spite of its strong, progressive faculty union, has notified 59 faculty members (all non-tenured) that their contracts will not be renewed for the 1983-84 academic year. The University of Louisville has lopped off 37 professors, 11 of whom are tenured. At the State University of N.Y., Brockport, in June, 52 professors, 37 of whom are tenured, will be dismissed. Since the University of Washington plans to phase out 24 degree programs in the next 3 years, 30 tenured professors there will have to look for jobs elsewhere. The picture goes on and on. It is grim indeed.

Even though the current national financial exigency is real for many colleges and universities, the manner in which it is used must be carefully watched. It is most alarming, e.g., that a significantly higher proportion of expendable tenured professors have been and are sociology professors, professors whose discipline often leads them to getting involved in social activist roles. Is academic due process observed here?

Depression rates of unemployment has led many students to avoid liberal arts majors and switch to more "practical" vocationally oriented programs. This is beginning to turn many colleges into training institutes and threatens the basic goals of higher education. This dramatic shift explains why the few colleges with increasing enrollments tend to be those with predominantly technical and business programs.

During this crisis, Thomas Jefferson's warning about education comes to mind: Training citizens only for jobs, instead of teaching them how to be learned and independent thinkers, might make a country vulnerable to tyranny. Free and open universities, available to all citizens who might benefit from them, represent one of the few relatively sure ways of guarantying a democratic society. Jefferson would have been most unhappy to see what has happened to his beloved dream for America.

SAPDF NOW SEEKING SUPPORTERS TO HELP FINANCE ITS STATED AIMS

The Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation, SAPDF, a non-profit foundation, established in 1980 to defend social activist professors whose constitutional and civil rights have been violated, is now seeking funds through a program of annual memberships. There are four basic memberships: Individual, Supporter, Sponsor, and Patron. There is also a special membership for Students, Seniors, and Additional Members of a Household. All four basic members receive the official journal ZEDEK plus all special publications (reports, monographs, etc.) as they appear. The special members receive ZEDEK only. The stated aims of SAPDF can be found on pages 1 and 2 of the November, 1980 issue of ZEDEK. A new expanded list of aims will be published in a forthcoming issue of ZEDEK. We will continue to seek individual and institutional subscriptions to ZEDEK but these subscriptions do not fully pay for the current production and distribution costs even though the SAPDF/ZEDEK staff, thus far, is primarily voluntary. To fulfill its many aims SAPDF needs the wide support of interested and concerned members. Please seriously consider becoming a member of the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation.

A Distinction Between Endorsers and Sponsors and Sponsor-Members

When SAPDF was first organized the term sponsor was used in the sense of endorser because SAPDF had no members, that is, any person or agency which endorsed the aims of SAPDF and lent his or her or its name to SAPDF was designated as a sponsor. Since SAPDF now has a membership category of Sponsor, the former use of the term sponsor is no longer in force. Henceforth, we shall properly call all former sponsors endorsers because they have endorsed the aims of SAPDF regardless of whether or not they contributed a particular amount of money in support of SAPDF. Thus, some of SAPDF's current endorsers include a wide variety of progressive, humanistic persons, e.g., Scott Nearing, Noam Chomsky, Benjamin Spock, Haxeert Aptheker, Zolton Ferency, Shirley Cereseto, Roy Larson, Father Victor Weissler, Sarah Silver, Rick Kunnes, Thomas Lough, Maryann Mahaffey, John Snider, Sarah Cooper, Ron Aronson, Betty Lanham, Alex Efthim, Murray Jackson, Bobbie Graff, Richard Weiss, and many others. While SAPDF needs many endorsers, SAPDF also needs many members who are also sponsors in this newest sense. If you are not already an endorser of SAPDF and wish to be an endorser as well as a member, please indicate that fact on the registration form below and sign your name and the date. Thank you.

REGISTRATION FORM ↓

Name: _____

Address: _____

Zip _____

<u>Membership</u>	_____ \$10 (Student, Senior, Additional Member of Household)	_____ \$150 (Sponsor)
	_____ \$20 (Individual)	_____ \$200 (Patron)
	_____ \$50 (Supporter)	_____ or more

Make all contributions payable to the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation or S.A.P.D.F.

Endorser Statement

I, _____, wish to become an endorser of the _____ (Print Name)

Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation.

Signed: _____ Date: _____ (complete signature)

**Note: An SAPDF return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

SOME COMMENTS ON TWO TENURE STRUGGLES

The numbers of due process denials, of firings after usually six years of teaching, represent a sensitive barometer of the academic freedom and repression climate today. In this issue of ZEDEK we present the account of two professors who were denied tenure. Both, while currently living in the same community (metropolitan Detroit area) are unknown to each other. But both have long histories of similar as well as quite different political and academic experiences. Both are socialist-oriented and actively practice their convictions and tendencies. Both have received seeming support and high praise for their teaching and projects from the college administrations under which they have served. Yet, when tenure approval would have seemed certain each was denied this. As in our previous cases presented, the alleged reasons for dismissal were fuzzy and biased. Due process was denied in both instances.

The cases of Professors John Mecartney and Alex Efthim are a study in contrast in their determined response/defense action while based on something even greater than their social perspectives. We have here two people who practiced what they preach and hold to philosophically.

Both address themselves to Professor Ron Aronson's description of his tenure struggle and ultimate victory at Wayne State University, Detroit (see August, 1982, ZEDEK), as one constructive way to go in a tenure struggle.

Please note that both Mecartney and Efthim were given their choice as to the format of their presentations, that is, in terms of doing a self-written account, or of being interviewed about their experiences. Mecartney decided to do a self-written account and Efthim requested an interview. We hope that the contrasting pieces and procedures will prove as stirring to you readers as they were to the interviewer and editors of ZEDEK.

We would be most pleased to receive your reactions to these cases, and information, materials, and outlines of other cases we have not, as yet, dealt with. Your suggestions are welcome.

---- H.R.S.

(See pages 142 ff.)

California Higher Education under Governor Ronald Reagan(1967-1975)

1. Fired University of California President Clark Kerr.
2. At the once free tuition state university system he proposed a tuition charge - a bonus for "good" families, a disaster for working class families.
3. Purged faculty who dared to dissent, e.g., Robert Mezey, et al.
4. Academic decisions made unilaterally and irrevocably at the top.

(See ZEDEK review of Seib's THE SLOW DEATH OF FRESNO STATE, November, 1980)

THE DILEMMAby John M. Mecartney

The sociologist Erving Goffman said that people tend to present themselves differently when in public than with family and friends. "Frontstage" folk try to show themselves in the best light. But "backstage" they admit their shortcomings and are more honest about their real selves. In this essay I will try to be "backstage" with ZEDEK readers.

My family raised me as a fundamentalist Protestant. I was liberated from this narrow religious orientation when I came to see the implications for a better society with the practice of a less orthodox, more humanistic Judeo-Christian set of ethics. I developed into a democratic socialist, a pacifist, an integrationist, and a feminist. During World War II I went to prison for two years as a non-registrant conscientious objector. Between college and seminary I was selected as national organizer for the youth section of the Socialist Party for two and one-half years. After serving Methodist churches for 13 years I went into teaching at church colleges where I felt I might more fully express my concern for justice and peace.

My first college teaching experience was a disillusionment. Not only did many of my students not appreciate my non-structured, more democratic type of teaching methods, they also seemed to show little social concern. The college and town were shocked when three professors and five students held a protest walk, complete with graphic picket signs, in front of the local post office. The signs asked that President Johnson stop the carnage and negotiate a settlement of the Vietnam War. A physician became enraged at me when I objected to his use of scare tactics in showing college students a medical film which mainly featured a bloody episiotomy which doctors often use during the birth of a baby. I felt that the Lamaze method film was more appropriate in preparing students for the birthing process. The school superintendent vowed to "get me" for objecting to the Gideons passing out their version of the BIBLE in the public schools. At the college there was little concern for the plight of the Blacks in the community. I was relieved when a pacifist whom I had met in prison told me of an opening at a college which was considered one of the traditional peace church colleges, namely, Bluffton College.

At Bluffton I was surrounded with controversy from the very beginning of my teaching sociology there. A student of mine was involved in organizing the first migrant workers union in Ohio. There was a strike in spite of the fact that they already had a contract. Growers retaliated in many different ways. Several benefactors of the college said they would not give money to the college as long as I was on the faculty. But, because the college supported my freedom to advocate migrant worker unionization, and the president of the college was essentially a decent liberal person, I remained on the faculty.

Another crisis came when some of the Black parents and children in a nearby town organized a boycott of the public junior high school to protest racism. So that students would not get behind in their lessons, there was a call for tutors. I volunteered and the press publicized my

Mecartney

(continued on next page)

DILEMMA-Mecartney(continued)

involvement. I was told by the college dean that I had wiped out in a short time all the good will toward the college that had been established with the community and that the college's students majoring in education would no longer be permitted to practice teach in the community's public schools. As it turned out, however, only one teacher would not accept Bluffton student teachers for awhile but other teachers did continue to accept them.

After three years at Bluffton College I had assumed that I had tenure because I had had enough teaching experience in the previous college to warrant it. On that assumption I turned down a teaching position at a North Dakota college which interested me very much. Thinking I had de facto tenure was, however, found to be a misconception.

Two years later I brought Michael Harrington to Bluffton to speak on socialism, capitalism, and communism. His speech was widely praised by students and faculty. Shortly after the Harrington visit, the old Socialist Party split, the local at the college was the first one to apply for a charter in the new Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee.

The liberal president of Bluffton took an appointment elsewhere. In his place a new president was appointed. The new president had religious views which were decidedly fundamentalist. He felt that the future of Bluffton was with the religiously conservative students and differed very much from my views of theology. When there were any openings on the faculty he hired fundamentalist professors only.

This new president inquired into the tenuring process and found that the previous president had done nothing about it. Instead of bringing everyone up for tenure who had been at the college for six years or more, he decided to decide tenure in stages. I came up for tenure in my eighth year, two years beyond the AAUP suggested limit.

Two people were denied tenure who were eligible for it, namely, an art professor and I. We both were shocked. The AAUP told me they could not take up cases like mine because there were many like it. They told me that they only work on the more flagrant violations of AAUP principles. The NEA was just going into college organizing and did offer some limited support. The art professor and I, however, felt that our best opportunity was to appeal to the board of trustees. One of our colleagues on the faculty circulated a petition among the tenured faculty members asking for our reinstatement with tenure. Few, unfortunately, had the courage to sign it.

My art professor colleague had a brother-in-law who was a lawyer. He hired him to help him seek redress and let it be known that if tenure were not granted there would be a suit against the college. This became the dilemma in my case. Should I take a similar stance or not? For the art professor the threat of a suit worked. He was reinstated. My tenure denial was upheld.

In the tenure review, the case of the president against me revolved around my student evaluations being lower than the average for the college. I pointed out possible reasons and noted that the literature indicated many variables affecting student evaluations. Unlike many other professors I always insisted that teacher evaluation forms be turned in after my grades were in and not beforehand. I felt that students would have been more objective in their evaluations under such circumstances. I also pointed out that some students did not appreciate professors who used the non-structured type of teaching approach. That is, some students strongly prefer straight lectures. Furthermore, my students often objected to having to read a good daily newspaper so that current events might be put to

(continued on next page)

DILEMMA-Mecartney(continued)

sociological analysis. Also, some students found it difficult to examine social problems from more than one perspective. I tried to help my students see social problems from conservative, liberal, and democratic socialist perspectives. Obviously, certain students were unable to appreciate my attempts in this direction.

When I was applying for tenure I gave the president taped copies of my classroom discussions. Though I felt the tapes were excellent, it may have been a mistake to have given them to him because he used them against me. The major criticism that he made to the board of trustees committee selected to review my case concerned the openness and non-structured nature of my classes. He told the committee that I had such little control over one of my classes that he could hear (on one tape) one student swear when making a comment. I felt, however, that when students were able to express themselves freely, including using vigorous language, there were very positive results.

When it was learned in the community and on campus that I was denied tenure by the president of the college, numerous students, alumni, and community people wrote to him and asked that he reverse his decision. The letters did not change his decision. One physician with whom I had worked in the 1972 McGovern campaign expressed himself vividly. He said that he had been a friend of the president but he could no longer make any contributions to the college if my tenure denial was left standing. He related how when he was working in the poorest county in Ohio I had brought my class into the community to observe his work there. As Ron Aronson reported in May, 1982 ZEDEK, mobilizing community support is good. Sometimes, unfortunately, it really does not affect a president's decision about the denial of tenure.

The big question was what to do when finally denied tenure. Put in a slightly different form:

To sue or not to sue. That was the dilemma.
Whether 'tis better to be denied tenure and silently steal
away into the night
Or to sue in court for reinstatement and perhaps to win.
But win or lose there's a rub:
Would one thereby damage the reputation of the college
and hinder enrollments so vitally needed for its
effective continuation?

I decided against suing. I was mainly concerned about the bad publicity such a case might bring to the college which needed increased enrollments. I felt that the college was a good one and had an excellent faculty. Could I ever forgive myself if I did something that seriously hurt the college and my many friends there? I also wondered if the president might be even more punitive in putting down my teaching and that the press, which was hostile to me might not exaggerate the case against me. The president had offered to give me a positive reference to other colleges if I left quietly. If I had sued the college he might have taken steps to see that I never taught again. He was a man capable of vindictiveness.

Some of my friends on the college faculty felt that that I did not get tenure because I did not threaten to sue. It was suggested that the art professor won his tenure because he did threaten to sue the college.

But I chose not to risk that road. Instead I looked for another sociology position for a whole school year without a nibble. Then, suddenly, there were seven offers. I chose one position where I told the presi-

(continued on next page)

DILEMMA-Mecartney(continued)

dent that I was a controversial person, that is, a person actively involved in such issues as civil rights, migrant worker organization, and democratic socialism. Her response was a positive one. She said: "I like controversial professors, professors involved with important social issues. Too many of our professors are not controversial. They are uninvolved." The position was at a fine college, Mercy College in Detroit.

Now I have been in Detroit six years. I have applied for tenure. I have assumed that the quality of my teaching would be the major criterion determining whether or not I would be granted tenure. In applying for tenure I was told that my teaching was excellent and that I had made a unique contribution to the college. But enrollments in sociology had declined and they would probably continue to decline with the deepening depression which Detroit finds itself in. Since Mercy College already has two tenured professors, it could not afford to tenure a third. So I am now looking again for a college which is interested in good teaching as well as justice and peace.

CASES OF ACADEMIC REPRESSION REVIEW IN ZEDEK (1980-1982)

<u>Professors</u>	<u>Issue Reviewed</u>
1. Ron Aronson	May, 1982
2. Maija Blaubergs	Feb., 1981
3. Alex Efthim	Nov., 1982
4. Pat Endress	Feb., 1981
5. R.M. Frumkin	Feb., 1982
6. Hans Kung	Feb., 1981
7. John Mecartney	Nov., 1982
8. Bertell Ollman	May-Aug., 1981
9. Melvin Rader	May-Aug., 1981
10. Bertrand Russell	Aug., 1982
11. Morris Schappes	Feb., 1982
12. F. Joseph Smith	Nov., 1980 & May-Aug., 1981
13. Charles Stastny	May-Aug., 1981
14. Scott Nearing	Feb., 1981

FIGHTING BACK WITH SOCIAL ACTION: AN INTERVIEW WITH ALEX EFTHIMby Helen R. Samberg

On October 6, 1976 Alex Efthim won back his job from which he had been fired in June of 1975 by the Provost, chief administrator of academic affairs at Wayne State University (W.S.U.), in a battle which began in the Spring of 1974. Professor Efthim and all who were active in this struggle feel that victory was the result of applying the principles indigenous to his course at WSU called "The Art and Science of Social Action."

Helen R. Samberg: Alex, I am interviewing you because you have been and continue to be one professor whose identity is with society's problems and this coupled with your own tenure struggle can be inspirational and educational, to say the least. Your experience will no doubt provide ZEDEK readers and SAPDF members with guidelines at a time when the ever-growing threat points to those who dare to stand up out of a commitment to academic and social freedom. Now, when did you come to Wayne State and from where? By "where" I mean both geographically and career-wise.

Efthim's Background

Alex Efthim: I came to the WSU Graduate School of Social Work in the fall of 1968. In part, my being hired was a result of graduate school students requesting that the school hire teachers of another discipline who were, like myself, social action oriented. Also, because the school's Community Social Work Department had only recently been decimated when its chairman and several faculty people had left for other schools. The wish was to fill vacancies with left-of-center people.

I have a Masters degree in political science from Columbia University. In undergrad work at the Washington University in St. Louis I had a triple major --- political science, sociology, and English. My career background, as you put it, consisted of being chairperson of the Machinists Non-Partisan Political League of Greater New York from 1952-1958 (the McCarthy period with all that this implies). I was political education director of the New York Hotel Trades Council for five years. This was followed by my involvement in the formation of the first anti-poverty organization in the early 1960s, namely, Mobilization for Youth (M.F.Y.). Led by the press, naturally, red-baiting reared its head. This developed into a six months struggle which we fought hard and won.

As to my teaching experience prior to coming to Wayne, I had been teaching among workers and community activists in the lower East Side of Manhattan. Here I conducted many workshops on the theme of how to win within social agencies, MFY and community struggles which inevitably meant interaction with social agencies, hospitals and other institutions. I hope the story of my tenure struggle will prove of value to others. My course at WSU entitled "The Art and Science of Social Action" was designed for anyone who has to fight back against injustice - whether a student

Alex Efthim

(continued on next page)

Fighting Back- Efthim(continued)

in a social work setting or a professor seeking tenure, community people fighting city hall, etc. My victory was a direct result of my application of the principle: practice what you preach.

Samberg: What was the School of Social Work climate like internally at the time of your appointment at WSU? The larger community viewed WSU as a liberal, cause-oriented faculty with rapport with the total university as well as the community. True or false? Please elaborate and/or correct this assessment.

WSU School of Social Work in 1968

Efthim: Yes, the school did have a reputation for a liberal tradition in its theory and practice. But the main liberal/progressive thrust came from the Community Social Work Department plus the advocacy role of Prof. David Wineman, who was not part of the Community Social Work sequence but noted for his role as an advocate.

Samberg: You were different - a new ingredient out of another discipline. We know there ^{is} a certain jealous possessiveness within disciplines. Did your department receive you with approval totally or was there a feeling of drawn lines? I mean, would it be accurate to suggest a cleavage of alliances faculty-wise? Also, where was the School's Dean in all of this?

Efthim: The Department recruited me enthusiastically, but after the honeymoon was over some really intense antipathy toward me and my teaching developed, particularly by some of the more vocal faculty members. Others in the Department were labor oriented and generally supported me as an outsider coming in. Since I was teaching "The Art and Science of Social Action" and similar subjects rather than so-called methods courses, this set me apart from most faculty in the Department. Had I been teaching traditional methods courses I would be highlighting more the advocacy role and innovative methods of social action and a close affinity with workers.

Samberg: Community Organization was, at the time of your Detroit debut, a natural social work concept for a university like WSU, located as it is in the very heart of a metropolitan area noted for more industrial workers, more residential integration, the birthplace of more socially-conscious organizations than most U.S. cities. Knowing a bit about your overall social and professional convictions and commitments, I would ask you to please give us a brief picture of your professorial life prior to your tenure struggle, that is, from 1968 to early in 1974.

Efthim's Professional Life, 1968-1974

Efthim: As most of us know, the appearance is often not the same as the reality, which takes time to unfold. Thus, the first month or so, following my joining the WSU faculty, I was treated as a kind of visiting dignitary. My Department did not discuss work load but invited me to visit their methods classes which were much different from my varied background. Many people sought my advice. Even the Dean spent a four hour lunch talking with me as to how he could best work with his faculty.

However, as time went by, a tension developed in the Department which I could not understand nor explain at that time. In spite of this tension I developed two main elective courses: "The Art and Science of Social Action" and "Community Control of Schools and Other Public Institutions." As a result of developing these courses, I was asked by the students to address a convention of all three of Michigan's schools of social work, which I did.

(continued on next page)

Fighting Back-Efthim(continued)

Meanwhile, a Department colleague had a "candid" cocktail party talk with the Provost about the quality of our faculty as related to its alleged involvement with student "unrest." The Provost singled me out sharply as a "labor organizing" person, wondering how I could even have been hired as a faculty member. (Privately the colleague describes this talk as a lurid red-baiting attack.)

The most significant part of this incident was that I did not learn of this for six years, and it was only revealed to me long after my tenure fight had begun. Looking back on this incident, I wondered whether anyone in my Department shared this damaging knowledge. If so, does this help to explain, in part, the tension developing over the years? Was this whole business threatening to anyone? We will never know for sure.

In spite of these tensions over the years, my interactions with staff people generally was most gratifying, warm, and reinforcing. As to my own teaching principles and practices, some professors outside of my Department funnelled their advisees into my elective courses. The associate Dean and other faculty leaders asked me to run a class on "The Art and Science of Social Action" for them. This I did until they had a radical response to the Kent State May 4, 1970 tragedy. Then they practiced their own social action.

Student response and interaction were and are, I would say, my greatest and most enduring reward. In both the School and its community base I had many supporters prior to and certainly during my tenure/promotion struggle. All in all, the first six years were certainly bumpy but challenging and frequently rewarding.

Samberg: Alex, I would like to describe what the scene appeared to be from the outside, somewhat, but not that remotely removed. My own interaction with you relative to WSU was in May/June, 1969. The circumstances were around the newly formed Local 1640, AFSCME (American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees), consisting of all workers in the 14 non-profit, private United Community Services/United Foundation agencies which, after long tiresome and frustrating negotiations, called a strike against the might Foundation (during which 1640 was dubbed "The Mouse that Roared"). These agencies were the sites for the practice work, three days per week, for the School of Social Work students. The seven-week strike was unique in itself, having at issue much more than dollars. The demands were political since our struggle was to fight the stranglehold policy-setting of UCS/UF and to ask for union representation on their Board, which we do have today. During the seven weeks not one internee from your School crossed a picket line and several students joined our pickets at struck agencies.

You and five other School of Social Work faculty used this action to demonstrate how professionals can best contribute through participation as well as to learn the true meaning of the rights and struggle relative to the concept "Your job is your property, "and all that this implies.

Certainly this experience was unique for the students who were aided and encouraged to write the administrators of the field agencies as to their support for those on strike. They were assigned off-agency credit work during the strike period. This whole experience proved to be consciousness-raising, union-educational, and a putting forth of an appropriate identity for future faculty people and agency professionals which the students would become. They had learned through seminars (to which agency administrators were invited) the full meaning of the strike

(continued on next page)

Fighting Back - Efthim (continued)

action from professional, administrative, and union perspectives.

I apologize if this seems like a long question/statement, but it is necessary since so much is unique and its content so germane to what makes an Alex Efthim and other socially advanced faculty people, and why they must struggle for the tenure so rightly earned and so regularly denied by Boards of Trustees and their beholden administrators.

Your presence and activity in our seven-week strike proved to be a tremendous force and your guidance in our almost nightly meetings around developing and enacting strategy was invaluable. You also helped us in the formation of the community support organization - People United for Community Service Workers. You and five other of your School faculty participated in our sit-ins at the United Foundation's headquarters. This added up to excellent television coverage and a special in-action educational experience for not only students but our agency professionals who were engaged in a strike for the first time. Added to this was the social action of standing up to a sacrosanct body. To the credit of all we must bear in mind that the strikers were of all ages and economic strata and none of these people ever tried to break through a picket line. Here is beautiful evidence how well the social and communal message was put across.

Certainly your participation in a strike of social work professionals and other support workers did not go unnoticed in your evaluation dossier by Provost Bohm.

It is so very important to point out that your case has a uniqueness and self-fulfillment of double dimension since your course "The Art and Science of Social Action", to which so many of us gladly contributed our little bits as resource people with "expertise", became the main base of your support in the tenure/promotion fight.

Before expanding on your support system internally, presidential, departmental, and others, please state:

1. What are WSU's criteria for granting tenure?
2. Are teaching effectiveness, publications, and university service, and/or other factors relevant here?
3. What were the stated reasons for denying tenure to Alex Efthim?

Efthim: Requirements for tenure were superior teaching, scholarly or professional achievements, and community service. In actual practice this meant being acceptable because you fit into the system even if you were a poor teacher, and especially if you were a part of the faculty organization committees, the Dean's committees, or the University-wide committee system. My teaching record was respected from the beginning; I had made sure to measure that respect with student and faculty evaluations of one kind or another. Regarding publishing, I published one set of proposals in the JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK entitled "Serve the U.S. Work Force!" This established me as a kind of pioneering intellectual leader in industrial social work. Meanwhile very few professors in the School of Social Work published; they simply had no time. "Creative professional achievement" had become an unofficial kind of measurement for our teachers (which the Central Administration later said only referred to teachers of art and music). The listing of my "Creative and Professional Achievements" and my "Community Service" was long. For example, after a massive coronary and open heart surgery in 1970, as a result of my hospital experience the Medical Committee for Human Rights and other groups used me to speak and consult widely

(continued on next page)

Fighting Back - Efthim (continued)

as an expert on patients' rights and struggles in hospitals and similar institutions.

While Provost Bohm passed over my teaching record, he declared my publishing as only "advocacy" and, therefore, not scholarly work. He pointed out that he felt that I lacked the qualities necessary to teach candidates for a doctoral degree program which he claimed the School of Social Work was planning to launch.

Helen, I must add, as we sit here seven years later, that the doctoral program which really had never been discussed by the School does not exist, and Henry V. Bohm is gone (having resigned while under fire shortly after my struggle had reached its peak).

Samberg: Now, please go on with the history of your case.

Efthim: In 1972 I was turned down for promotion by Provost Bohm. I was turned down again in 1973. In 1974 when I came up for tenure, as you can imagine, I was well-prepared for the imminent struggle. First, I had built up a strong faculty, student, and alumni support body. A unanimous resolution of 19 teachers present at a faculty organization meeting plus a similar unanimous resolution in my own Department expressed faculty support for my being granted tenure. The student support expressed itself in meetings and powerful support measures which will be reflected throughout my description of the struggle. The Alumni activities flowered in many directions after their official resolution of support appeared in their regularly mailed newsletter. Second, I had a plan of action based on my course on how to carry out a social action involving both institutional and community people. It was based on a model in my course "The Oversimplified Power Play." This called for first building your own group and then adding to it potential allies, while heading off potential enemies. It also called for organizing the vast mass of more or less inert neutrals. All this support is aimed at a target... to reach the ultimate holders of power, in this case, Pres. George Gullen and the WSU Board of Governors. The Tenure/Promotion Committee had voted the Admissions Director and me as their number one recommendations for tenure. The Dean, whom I had not seen as supportive, turned out to be quite supportive. He was apparently moved by the student evaluations, supportive resolutions by faculty, and other kinds of support, to write a personal evaluation of me almost as strong as those of the committee.

I had insisted on a united front of all candidates up for tenure. Relevant or not, I was denied tenure.

This denial did not deter my quest for justice in the workplace. I was practicing my basic life philosophy: no matter the discipline or situation, one always struggles with the same philosophy, drive, and general purposes. My support system now was: a large body of students, with majority and minority people, unanimous faculty organizations' resolutions, the Alumni Association resolution, and a newsletter to all agencies and alumni of the School of Social Work, all of which resulted in an amorphous, massive support system which required organizational coordination for specific actions. For example, small spontaneous student committees were formed for the June graduation reception two years in a row. The president of the student organization for each year made strong statements about what denial of my tenure would mean to the School of Social Work. The first student president had determined that the time to break the issue wide open was at this opportune moment, that is, at the graduation reception. As usual, parents, family,

(continued on next page)

Fighting Back - Efthim (continued)

friends, and some teachers made up the audience. Certainly, most of this audience were not unaware of the internal struggle around Alex Efthim. Also, President Gullen had just finished speaking favorably of the School and its relationship to the community. The audience expressed its support for the student president's remarks with prolonged applause. President Gullen responded by walking over to the student organization president and telling him that while the Efthim case was not up for his consideration at this point, that he would pay close attention to the case if and when it came before him.

As a result of careful organizing, the student committee passed around the hat at the graduation reception and got both petition signatures and addresses, and a substantial amount of money.

Samberg: What a graduation reception! This was late June, 1975, your fight was now into its second year. What was the status of your case and the strategies at that point?

Efthim: Two main elements of strategy were being pursued: 1. The social struggle which was reaching students, alumni, agencies, and community leaders through mass mailings requesting that all letters of support in response go to President Gullen. 2. A legal committee headed by Gabe Kaimowitz and David Wineman. Gabe Kaimowitz, a prominent civil liberties attorney, led a delegation to President Gullen. Present at the resulting meeting were Provost Bohm and other administrative leaders of the University. Kaimowitz informed them that the evidence of discrimination against me, including red-baiting, was so damaging to WSU that it would be wise for the Administration to grant tenure to me immediately, thereby sparing the University's reputation.

Provost Bohm, despite the opportunity to deny the charge of discrimination, avoided refuting the charge, thereby setting up a gap between himself and the rest of the top administrators. Kaimowitz, accustomed to leading social struggles from his lawyer position rather than working under a committee's direction, suggested bowing out and helped us to secure the services of Ernest Goodman - the Babe Ruth of labor/management cases involving political discrimination. Goodman accepted my case. Throughout the struggle, the AAUP, led by its president, Ernie Benjamin, strongly supported my case. My defense committee had to pay a significant portion of Goodman's fee because, although Goodman often worked for aggrieved individuals without a fee, this case involved his firm and an official trade union organization, the AAUP, thereby necessitating the fee relationship. Goodman's fee was higher than the union's own attorney's fee. I had arbitrarily (and perhaps unfairly) rejected the services of the union's attorney in favor of Goodman.

Samberg: What was happening activity-wise with your non-legal supporters?

Efthim: Coming off the last school term (June, 1975), the faculty organization and my department organization had, as stated before, unanimously supported me in resolutions. Any faculty persons working against me were inundated by this apparent unanimity of my colleagues. The inundations were by means of personal contacts made by faculty and other persons working in my behalf.

Naturally, part of my strategy was to defend the Admissions Director Iverson and myself. Since this was a defense of the School of Social Work support came rapidly from the NASW (Detroit Metro Chapter), the Alumni Association, and directors and other key people from various social agencies. It was not uncommon for President Gullen

(continued on next page)

Fighting Back - Efthim (continued)

to be suddenly joined at a luncheon or other social affairs and to be asked about the "Alex Efthim Affair." Following such occasions as these and a letter campaign, President Gullen, on August 1, 1975, wrote these remarks to concerned students: "Thank you very much for your recent letter regarding the course entitled 'The Art and Science of Social Action.' I share your view of the value of that course, and I have heard many other complimentary remarks from the Dean of the School of Social Work, members of the faculty, and former students (regarding it)." He also indicated that he hoped the course could be continued. He concluded: "P.S. The Professor Efthim case is not before me to settle as yet."

Throughout this struggle I had to play a laid-back role in how to conduct the fight. Of course, when a teacher graduates 1,000 students as practitioners of the art and science of social action, hopefully the effect will be quite pervasive, although sometimes unpredictable.

In August, 1975, a back-to-school party for old and new students, raised considerable money for much-needed legal fees.

Samberg: Now we are into the fall of 1975. What is the state of the case organizationally? What are students, faculty, and other supporters into?

Efthim: While interest was steady, naturally, a consistent committee was difficult to maintain. I decided that a full-time defense committee coordinator was necessary. For that reason I selected John Kretzschmar to take charge. John was one of the finest students I ever had. Eventually we were able to establish a full-time salary for him (actually a percentage of my own salary, which was my choice).

Kretzschmar coordinated the grievance activity with the union and the attorney Ernie Goodman and Ernie Benjamin (AAUP). Through letters, telephone, and personal contact, he also mobilized a steady series of activities, including the acceleration of the letter-writing campaign to President Gullen. The latter included letters from the former president of the Detroit City Council, the current president of the City Council, Congressman John Conyers, and other City Council and State Representatives, as well as leaders in the social work profession. Mayor Coleman Young made two personal phone calls to the Board of Governors in my behalf. The solicitation of letters, of course, was limited mainly to the Metropolitan Detroit Area to avoid any charge of "over-kill." The response was large and gratifying. A series of fund-raising activities proved helpful.

The grievance was developed and we were ready for arbitration. The very thorough research efforts of Kretzschmar relative to U.S. arbitrators and their decisions in labor/management issues proved fruitful. The arbitrators were examined with reference to their ideologies and their history of handling specific issues. On the basis of this research we decided on a pro-management arbitrator who was independent and had the ability to cut through phony arguments and get to the basic facts. S. Herbert Unterberger was that person. An added attraction with respect to this arbitrator was the fact that the WSU Administration knew and respected him.

In arbitration the evidence was overwhelmingly in our favor. Provost Bohm took the stand and failed to show that he did not have any prejudice toward me in spite of the testimony regarding his cocktail party statement against me. The arbitrator's decision was that due process had been denied me in my pursuit of tenure.

Now the ball was in the President Gullen's court. We did not stop fighting. Our entire constituency was informed in a mass mailing that the President had complete and unchecked power in this new situation.

Samberg: Alex, please don't keep us in suspense. What did Pres. Gullen do? How long after the arbitration finding?

(continued on next page)

Fighting Back - Efthim (continued)

Efthim: Our social struggle had proved its worth. We had forced President Gullen to appoint a nationwide committee of five scholars to judge my record as a professor, a scholar, and a teacher of social work practice.

The five scholars voted to reinstate me, and President Gullen sent us two letters, citing their quotations, and his congratulations on my victory.

Following reinstatement in October, 1976, came two nominations within three years, for Distinguished WSU Faculty Award, the first by the Alumni Association, the second by the Assistant Admissions Director and a group of social work students.

Samberg: Alex, your struggle was undoubtedly a painful and sometimes bitter experience. It must have taxed your physical and emotional being to go through this unfairly perpetrated denial of tenure battle. We appreciate your taking the time to share your experiences with us. Thank you. It has been most gratifying working with you.

Feedback and Response

It is that time of year again. We are entering our third year of existence. Our membership has grown some, though it has not reached its potential. Some have expressed their satisfaction through praise. Others have shown their appreciation by quietly soliciting new subscribers and SAPDF members. All this is encouraging. We are also most pleased with those who have helped us obtain university/college library subscriptions.

One member of SAPDF stated that ZEDEK editorializes too much on "non-academic" matters. The staff has considered this criticism seriously. We feel, however, that academic matters do not exist in a vacuum. For example, in an early issue of ZEDEK, David Riesman pointed out that the most important problem facing the nation and the world today is the control of nuclear weapons and the prevention of a nuclear war which might bring an end to life on earth. The wasting of resources on nuclear weapons instead of education and human services is something of deep concern to us.

Highly Recommended Reading

Robert Scheer, WITH ENOUGH SHOVELS: REAGAN, BUSH, AND NUCLEAR WAR
(New York: Random House, 1982) 285 pp. \$ 14.95

This is an excellent companion book to be read along with Jonathan Schell's THE FATE OF THE EARTH (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982) 244 pp. \$ 11.95.

ANNUAL INDEX TO VOLUME II

Key to Listings: Pages 71-94 refer to Number 1, February, 1982
 Pages 95-118 " to Number 2, May, 1982
 Pages 119-137 " to Number 3, August, 1982
 Pages 138-156 " to Number 4, November, 1982.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Pages</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Pages</u>
Academic Freedom Committee	103,104	Community Organization	141
Against Tenure	104	Community Control of Schools	147
Alfonso, Robert	89	Controversial Cartoon	87
AMERICA AND RUSSIA	139	Coogan, Alan	88
American Association of University Professors...97,102,108,109,133,142,151		DeBrizzi, John	122
American Civil Liberties Union	97,104,105	Debate	99
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME).....	148	DeLeon, David	122
American Federation of Teachers...	91	Democratic Agenda	114,115
AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN THE RUSSIAN CIVIL WAR.....	139	Democratic Socialism	113,115,116
American Medical Association.....	95	Democratic Socialists of America (DSA).....	113
American Personnel and Guidance Association.....	83	Detroit, City	106,145
Aptheker, Herbert.....	122	Detroit Police Department	77
American Sociological Association.	111	Dilemma	142
Aronson, Ronald....	134,141,145 and 108,	Discussion Memorandum on Academic Tenure.....	101
Art and Science of Social Action..	146, 147,148,149,152	Dissent	113
Arts and Science Faculty	103	Due Process	104,105,130, and 141
AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF NAHUM GOLDMANN...	120	Ebele, E.	102
Beecher, John	72	EDUCATION AND THE GOOD LIFE	127
Benkert	77	EDUCATION AND THE MODERN WORLD	127
Bierstedt, Robert	97,104	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).....	131
BILL OF RIGHTS	130	Efthim, Alex.....	141,145-153
Blaubergs, Maija	122,145	Ellis, Albert	83
Bluffton College	142	Endress, Pat	145
Bohm, Henry V.	150,151	Faculty of Arts & Sciences	103
Bucci, Nicholas	127,130,131	Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).....	78
Butler, Nicholas Butler Murray Medal	136	Feinberg Law	75
Caldicott, Helen	86,95	Financial Exigency, National	139
California Higher Education under Governor Ronald Reagan.....	141	First Amendment	129
Carter Report, American Council of Education.....	100	Fischer, Norman	116
Cases of Academic Freedom Reviewed in <u>Zedek</u>	145	Fliegler, Louis	82
Caute, David	78	Frank, Glenn	88,90
Central Washington University	132	Frank, J.	95
CIVIL LIBERTIES	97	Freedom of Information	77
Chandler, Alice	75	Freeze Now	95,122
City College of New York (CCNY)	136	Fresno State University.	141
Civil Rights	145	Frumkin, Robert	74,81,82-91,122
Cohen, Morris Raphael	126,129	Garrity, Donald L.	132
Collective Bargaining	101	GIDEON BIBLE	142
Comments on Tenured Professors	141	Goffman, Erving	142
Communist Party of California	113	Goldmann, Nahum	120
Communist Party of Michigan	114	Goodman, Ernest	151
		Graff, Arthur	72
		Gullen, George	151,152,153
		Halliday, E.M.	139
		Harrington, Michael	142,143

(continued on next page)

Annual Index to Volume II(continued)

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Pages</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Pages</u>
Harvard University..99,102,103,133		Mercy College	145
HEW(U.S.Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare).....	85	Methodist Church	142
Healy, Dorothy	113	METRO TIMES	107
Hearst Press	130	Metzger, Walter	97,104
Heisy, Ray	90	Michigan	147
Henry, Clement	122	Michigan U.S. Peace Council	106
Hibakusha	95,121	Mezey, Robert	141
Hiroshima, Survivor	106,107	Middle East	120
Hughes, Helen	83	Mistakes	100
Ho Chi Minh	123	Mobilization for Youth(MFY)	146
Iverson	151	MODERN DEMOCRACIES	119
Jacobs, James	78	National Association of Social Workers(NASW)	152
Jacques, Geoffrey	106	National Lawyers Guild(NLG)	151
James, William	133	Nearing, Scott	78
Japanese Peace Movement	107	New American Movement (NAM)	145
Jefferson, Thomas	139	New York Police	113,115
Jewish, leader	120	Nixon, Richard	82
Jewish Congress, World	120	Nuclear Freeze	138,139
JEWISH PARADOX	120	Nuclear War	80
Job Market	104	Nuclear Weapons Freeze	121
JOURNAL OF EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK.....	149	Nuss, Shirley	122,123
JOURNAL OF HUMAN RELATIONS	82	Office for Civil Rights(OCR)	85,88
June 12th Rally	95, 121	Ohio State University	82
Kaimowitz, Gabe	148	Olds, Glenn	82,88,90
Kay, Jean	127	Ollman, Bertell	76,145
Kallen, Horace	132	Oversimplified Power Play	150
Keller, Gordon	84	People United for Community Services(PUCS).....	149
KENT ACADEMIC POLICY BOOK	86	Physicians for Social Responsibility.....	90,95
KENT STATE COVERUP, Vols.I-II	89	Polar Bear Expedition	138,139
Kent State Massacre	84	Pre-War Budget	119
Kent State University	82,89,132,148	Rader, Melvin	145
Kerr, Clark	141	Rally, The	95
Kitner, Harold	81	Rapp, Herbert	74
Kito, Hijimi	106	Reagan, Ronald	95,121,141
Kretchmar, John	152	"Red Squad"	77
Küng, Hans	145	Russell, Bertrand	78,126-136,145
Lamaze Method	142	Russian Roulette	95
Lander, Byron	90	Rutgers University	119
LAST EMPIDEMIC	95	Ryan, Philip G.	104,105
Lincoln Brigade	79	SAPDF	91,94,95,111,137
Litwack, Lawrence	83	Safeguarding Academic Freedom	97
Local 1640	148	Sakata, Robert	89
Machinist Non-Partisan Political League.....	146	Saltzman, Glenn	86
Mahaffey, Maryanne	124	Samberg, Helen	78,82-91,141,146-153
Marching Hibakusha	96	Sandburg, Carl	81
Marxists	108	Sartre, Jean-Paul	111
McCarthy, Joseph	104	Schappes, Morris	74,145
McGrath, James	88,89	Scheer, Robert	139,153
Mecartney, John	141-145	Schindler, Clayton	82
		School of Social Work, WSU	147-48,150

(continued on next page)

Annual Index to Volume II (continued)

Subject	Pages
Seeger, Pete	79
Seib, Kenneth	141
Shank, Steven	113, 116
Shaw, Nancy Stoller	122
Smith, Frank	90
Smith, F. Joseph	88, 122, 145
Snooper Bowl	77
Snyder, John	89
Soble, Richard	78
Socialist International	114
Socialist Party	142
Spanish Civil War	77
Special Session on Disarmament II (SSD-II).....	121
START	122, 139
Stastny, Charles	122, 145
STUDIES ON THE LEFT	139
Steiner, George	125
Teaching	102
Tenure	97, 142, 143, 150
Tuchman, Barbara	76
United Auto Workers (UAW)	109
United Community Services (UCS)	148
United Foundation	148
United Nations SSD-II	106
United States Peace Council	106
University Committee on Governance	101
Untenured Faculty	102
Unterberger, Betty Miller	139
Upsala College	82
Vernoff, Edward	76
Vichy Regime	119
Victorious Tenure Struggle	108
Wayne State University	108, 109, 146
Williams, William Appleman	139
Wineman, David	151
WITH ENOUGH SHOVELS (R. Scheer)	138
World Jewish Congress	120
Youth Caucus	113
ZEDEK	141, 142, 144
Zionist	120

Miscellaneous Advertising

Dining

MEXICAN

CARAMBA—918 8th Avenue (between 54th & 55th St.) Mexican food at its best comes to Manhattan. Experience the flavor of old Mexico in this stunning contemporary restaurant. Lun. 11-4, Din. 5-12 Cl. Mon. 245-7910. Cr. Cds.

FONDA LA PALOMA—256 E. 49 — Known to all critics as the home of "Superior & Exciting Food." "Totally Mexican." "Thoroughly Charming spot." Rec. by all top notch papers & Mags. strolling Guitarists L.C.D.S. 421-5495.

PANCHO VILLA'S—2nd Ave. (cor. 78th), 650-1455. "N.Y. Times," C. Claiborne** 1967. — "Gourmet" 1967. Spec. in old Calif. style Mex. cooking. Cocktails/L./D. 7 days Other locales Larchmont, Huntington.

NIGHT CLUB

CAFE VERSAILLES—N.Y.'s most beautiful night club—presenting "Miller & Reich Productions" exciting French revue with a cast of 20. Shows nightly 9:30 & 11:30 no cov./D. Danc. til dawn. Lun., Cklt., Din., Val. Park, 150 E. 50. 753-3471.

RUSSIAN

TOVARISCH—"Outstanding" Mimi Sheraton N.Y. Times—Blini & Caviar, Smoked Fish, Herrings, Borscht, Rassolnik, Siberian Pelmeny, Chicken Kiev & Tabaka. Shashlyks, Kebobs, 38 W. 62 St. at Lincoln Center. Reservations 757-0168.

SEAFOOD

HARBOUR 48—303 W. 48 St. (off 8th) Fresh Sea Food & Bangkok Cuisine. Moderate Prices. Attractive Decor. Spec.: Harbor Seafd. Combo; Lobster Din.; Shrimps A La Francese. Full Bar. L. & D. T.—F. D. Sa. & Su. 586-4853. Cr. Cds.

KING CRAB—871 8th Ave. (cor. 52 St) Fresh Fish Daily—Moderate Prices—Lun. Entrees \$3.75-\$4.95 Din. a la carte \$4.95-\$8.95. Incl. Garlic Bread, Sal., Rice or Pot. Ckts. & Bar 7 days 12-12. 765-4393. K.C. Place 807 9th Ave. 246-4258.

LORD JIM'S—1674 B'way @ 52 St.—B'way's newest Rest., warm, comfortable ambiance just steps from where you are. Seafood—steaks—lobster. Op. 7 days. Lun.—Pre & after thea. Din. til midnight. 247-1374. Credit Cards.

SOUTHERN

JACK'S NEST—310 Third Ave. (Bet. 23 & 24 St.) C'mon down & enjoy down home southern cooking! Mouth watering Ribs, Fr. Chicken, Cand. Yams. Friendly people & much much more! Seating 'til 11:30 pm. dly., wkends. 2 am.

SPANISH

FUNDADOR — "The Spanish Pavillion" 146 W. 47th St. (OFF B'WAY.) CLASSIC CUISINE OF * SPAIN & MEXICO. LUNCH, DINNER, AFTER THEATRE. ALL CREDIT CARDS. RECOMMENDED BY GOURMET, CUE & AAA. 819-0012.

L—Luncheon C—Cocktail D—Dinner S—Supper

Entertainment

BEST MUSICAL
1976 TONY & PULITZER PRIZE WINNER
"THERE'S STILL EVERY REASON TO BELIEVE
THAT 'A CHORUS LINE' JUST MAY OUTLIVE
US ALL!"—Frank Rich, N.Y. Times, 1982

A CHORUS LINE
Tues. thru Thurs. Evgs. at 8 & Mats. Sat. 2: Sun 3 PM:
\$40, 35, 30. Fri. & Sat. Evgs. at 8: \$45, 40, 30. Wed.
Mats. at 2: \$35, 30, 25. Telecharge: (212) 239-6200.
(8 AM-Midnight • 7 Days a Week) Mail Orders: P.O. Box
998, N.Y. 10108. GROUPS: (212) 398-8383/591-7107.
Ticketron: 977-9020. Hol. Perfs. Dec. 26 at 7:30 PM;
Dec. 27 at 8 PM.
SHUBERT THEATRE, 225 W. 44th St., 239-6200.

AFTER "NICHOLAS NICKLEBY,"
THE ROYAL SHAKESPEARE COMPANY
COULDN'T GIVE YOU ANYTHING
LESS THAN ...

GOOD LIMITED ENGAGEMENT!

Evgs. Mon.-Sat. at 8 PM & Mats. Sat. at 2 PM: \$35, 30,
27.50. Wed. Mats. at 2 PM: \$30, 25, 22.50. Mail Orders
to: P.O. Box 998, N.Y., N.Y. 10108. GROUP SALES: (212)
239-6262. Telecharge: (212) 239-6200. 8 AM to Mid-
night 7 Days a week!

BOOTH THEA., 222 W. 45th St., N.Y. 10036

"THE BEST PLAY OF THE SEASON!"
—Frank Rich, N.Y. Times

JAMES EARL JONES
in

'MASTER HAROLD'
...and the boys

Written and directed by ATHOL FUGARD

Tues.-Sat. at 8, Mats. Wed. at 2, Sat. at 2, Sun. at 3.
Telecharge: (212) 239-6200. (8 AM to Midnight • 7 Days
a Week). Group Sales (212) 239-6262. Ticketron: (212)
977-9020. Mail Orders: P.O. Box 998, N.Y.C. 10108.
LYCEUM THEATRE, 149 West 45th St.