

Summary of Meeting on Structure - Feb. 12

The meeting began with a discussion as to whether or not to have a structure and an executive committee (or some inter- group), and after deciding--by vote--that SNCC should have an executive committee, later moved on to discuss the function of such a committee and its composition.

Courtland thought that the executive committee should be able to decide anything that the coordinating committee can decide, between c.c. meetings--with some limitations.

Limitations on the executive committee were discussed; Jesse Morris felt, for example, that it should not make decisions involving more than \$1000. Some felt that the executive committee should make no policy decisions; it was pointed out that all decisions involve policy, the choosing between alternatives. Jack Minnis emphasized that to a great extent the formation of policy should be separate from the implementation of policy--one should be done by the c.c., and between meetings, by the executive committee, and the actual carrying out of decisions should be performed by the administrative staff and by various committees. One of the functions of the executive committee would be to supervise the implementation of policy by such groups.

Five functions of an executive committee were outlined, which met with fairly general agreement:

1. to supervise the implementation of decisions taken by the coordinating committee (and by themselves);
2. to determine emergency policy between c.c. meetings;
3. to supervise the administration;
4. to assist, through systematic planning, education and distribution of information, the c.c. to increase its effectiveness in dealing with problems confronting us;
5. to hold itself accountable to the c.c.

There was also general agreement on the kinds of decisions which an executive committee should not be empowered to make:

1. decisions which would affect the basic goals and purpose of SNCC;

* No ^{broad (more)} basic policy changes by Exec Comm.

Structure Meeting - 2

2. decisions which would initiate broad changes in programs (although this would not rule out approving experimental programs in individual projects)

3. similar decisions involving basic political decisions (for example, whether or not openly to oppose HUAC).

It was again emphasized that all decisions of the executive committee be subject to review by the c.c., for example by means of an executive committee report to be distributed at each c.c. meeting. The above list of limitations met with general acceptance.

Finally, the composition of the executive committee was discussed. Three proposals were put forth. Because of the lateness of the hour, it was decided not to take a vote, but to present all three proposals.

1. Frank Smith proposed that the executive committee be composed of two representatives from each of five standing committees (he later amended this to 6 committees, to include one on Northern problems). The 5 committees would represent program areas, and would be: freedom schools, community centers, political action, federal programs, and a catch-all committee he called "community action" which would include the campus travellers, research, communications, etc. These representatives, elected by each committee (perhaps on a rotating basis), plus the executive secretary and the chairman, plus 5 members elected at large.

There were objections to his plan, based mostly on the fact that allocation of resources--which is probably what the executive committee will concern itself with to a great extent--generally goes to a project, and not to a program.

The two other proposals were for:

- 2. an executive committee of 15-20 members, all elected at large;
- 3. a committee of 15-20 members, elected partly at large and partly on a geographical basis (for example, the state project directors, the Northern staff).

During the course of the discussion there was some mention of the function of an executive secretary and a chairman. The matter of their retention and their

(more)