

1. Discussion of problems of contact between academic and non academic which quickly resolves again into the question of the type of organization or movement envisioned.
2. There were two general lines which the discussion took.
  - A. A process of working from the top down, i.e., using established people to help promote a type of Convention which would be a vehicle for bringing the opposites together in Madison.
  - B. A process of emphasizing organization and working from the bottom up, i.e., of immediately bringing in people in the Madison community who have no obvious vested in the present situation, and who are we hope, discontented enough to work in the group.

This new and broader based group would then we suggest work out the problems which our different backgrounds entail. This would not be easy nor rapidly accomplished but until we see what will happen we can only theorize!

This final approach would not exclude a convention--the difference lies more in degree than in type. Time in the growth if possible of a broader group will be essential.

In the course of the discussion, several problems of contact were noted with few real answers due to lack of experience.

- A. The difference in mobility -- the university group will change rapidly while non-academic Madison would remain relatively static (this is a reason for the university apathy where Madison is concerned). This might, it was suggested, emphasize the importance of continuing organization
- B. Large difference in property owning and tax paying--vested interest here tend to isolate the group from one or more areas at any given time due to the issue being pushed!
- C. More intangible difference in out-of-Madison voter registration.
- D. The fact of where the academic community lives--the unique position of the sixth and seventh wards was sighted by both Mr. Hart and Mr. McBurney. The latter made the comment that very possibly students could stay a live-in by moving out of these wards and into real Madison (note: in this sense faculty is a more real part of Madison than students).
- E. Lack of interest in smaller specific issues
- F. More obvious difference in education, but more specifically, of ability to articulate ideas!

6. Finally, it was suggested that at the beginning especially the burden of proof of intention, lies with the academic community. Due not only to past relations but also due to our acceptance of the initiative!
7. This last point suggests a problem in tactics, at the point of first contact which is not small! The suggestion was made that a one-on-one situation would be best during the initial meeting. Further that an informal atmosphere off-campus and invitation by word of mouth to either personal acquaintances and/or neighbors would be most fruitful. This raises a question of how large this meeting should be.
  - A. It should probably be in private homes or apartments, thus no more than about 20.
  - B. If larger, it should begin in small sections separately.
  - C. In every case the person being introduced to the group should be briefed on what it is he is coming to, emphasizing its useful nature before attending.
8. One weakness of this type of approach appears to be slowness of growth. This would be especially true when the mobility of the academic community is considered.