

THE ARENA

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

MAY 16, 1969

VOL. V, NO. 7

The Board of Trustees and SRI

by Harvey H. Hukari, Jr.,

The Board of Trustees' decision to sever the University's connections with the Stanford Research Institute has produced the predictably outraged response from campus liberals and radicals who somehow felt that they had the right to determine the collective future of 3,000 SRI employees. In essence, the Board's action on Tuesday was a direct rebuff to the efforts of the militant April 3 Movement to bring SRI under closer control by Stanford and restrict the type of research SRI could engage in. While the decision to sever was in consonance with the conclusions reached by the infamous Scott report and with the sentiments of the people who work at SRI, it was not an easy one for the Board to make. The Trustees had to balance the political antagonisms of a significant number of faculty and students against the fiscal realities of running a major educational institution.

Since the decision to cut ties with SRI does not conform with the SDS goal of crippling U.S. foreign policy or destroying American business, it was not greeted with much enthusiasm by the radical community. Thus far, the radical movement has demonstrated a remarkable capacity for institutionalizing their frustration. For months the April 3 Movement has promoted campus hysteria by publishing a huge volume of literature containing enumerable distortions and misrepresentations about the nature of the research work that goes on at SRI. They have held demonstrations and rallies, broken into buildings, roughed up fellow students, stolen valuable files and destroyed property in the name of humanity only to find that the Trustees were not impressed by their behavior. Now, the fairy tale has ended.

FALSE ISSUES

In reality, SRI is as much a symbolic cause as it is a practical one. Time and again, SDS has tried to arouse student passions over the issue of Chemical Biological Warfare research being done at SRI. The fact that only a minimal amount of work related to CBW was being performed (2 projects, both unclassified, worth around \$50,000) did not deter radicals from screaming about the "filthy research going on at



The A3M prepares for a peaceful march on SRI.

SRI". The A3M capitalized on student ignorance over the alleged "counter-insurgency" research taking place at the Hanover facility of SRI by labeling everything that SRI did in Southeast Asia as being counter-insurgency. Yet, even members of A3M themselves were confused about exactly what SRI was doing to "oppress" other people.

At an A3M meeting last week, a speaker condemned SRI for its work with the Oakland Police Department and referred to it as counter-insurgency. When one student asked the chairman of the meeting just exactly what SRI was doing in Oakland he was told to consult someone who had studied the problem. In fact, SRI has virtually nothing to do with the Oakland Police or "oppressing" the ghetto population. Last year, some SRI researchers who were working on a nation wide study financed by the Small Business Administration conferred with representatives of the Oakland Police on how best to prevent looting, burglary and vandalism in small businesses. That was all. The major research that SRI did pertaining to Oakland was a massive study for the city government which recommended that minority groups in the city be brought into the decision making process in order to

promote the growth and economic health of the area.

More important to the radicals is the symbolic value of SRI. Not even the most militant member of the Red Guard would deny that most of the research which SRI does falls into the category of being socially acceptable. This would include their agricultural studies and work relating to cancer cures. What the radicals are more concerned with is that SRI is an institution which represents the interests of the American military and of American business. SRI's work in SE Asia is relatively small in comparison with the other projects that they have contracted but to SDS it provides the rationale for conducting their campaign of harassment and disruption. To strike a blow at SRI is to strike a blow at the system itself. The A3M is not concerned with whether or not the University receives any benefit from SRI, the important question is to control it and that's where they have failed miserably. The Trustees haven't capitulated to Radical intimidation and it's doubtful that the employees at SRI will either. To confirm a report published two weeks ago in the *ARENA*, the April 3 Movement is dying. *La guerre est finie.*

ROTC VS THE WITCHHUNTERS

by LEO

It is a turbulent period in the history of Stanford, as it is throughout American education, and during periods of turbulence the rights of minorities are often sacrificed to the whims of the tyrannical majority, or even to the whims of a belligerent and powerful minority.

This is just what is happening to ROTC. As political involvement sweeps the campus, and the labels "liberal" and "radical" come into vogue, the "Establishment" inevitably comes under fire.

This newfound expression of concern for politics in our generation is healthy, and to a certain extent the questioning of the Establishment is healthy. However, such questioning ceases to be healthy as soon as it encroaches on students' rights, and the recent attacks on SRI, ROTC, and AEL are evidence that the movement has gone too far.

The axis of radicals and far left liberals which has attacked these institutions has done so because it is an essentially negative movement devoted not to reform but to disruption. As such, it desperately needs a villain. Built on hates and frustrations rather than hope and love, it refers vaguely to "morality" and "pressing social issues", but devotes its whole-hearted

energies to reviling the Establishment.

It is interesting to note that the Axis rejects completely the idea that businessmen, through the Urban Coalition, or President Nixon, through men like Romney and Moynihan, could have valid ideas for attacking urban problems is inconceivable to the axis. On the contrary, there must be a villain, and the villain must be the Establishment. It is inconceivable that the villain is circumstance, and that the Establishment is quite well aware of the problem, and is moving, through existing machinery, to attack these problems.

NEEDS A VILLAIN

No, the axis needs a villain. It needs witches to persecute. The well-intentioned liberals who hang onto the axis are motivated not so much by hate as by simple-mindedness: "love conquers all", "re-orient national priorities", "world communism is dead", etc., etc. They find the simple-mindedness of the radical leaders much to their liking.

How to navigate the University through this chaotic period is not easy, and demands the leadership of an unusual type of person. Whether President Pitzer can offer such leadership is yet to be seen. To carry the University community through its adolescence to poli-

tical maturity, Pitzer must restrain students and faculty just beginning to flex their political muscles from encroaching on others' rights to study (and receive credit for) their interests, so long as academic standards are maintained.

To bend completely to every political demand masquerading as a moral imperative would be folly. In a matter of a few years, we could see Stanford overrun by militant faculty and their radical allies among students, and an atmosphere such as what pervades Reed, SF State before Hayakawa, or Pitzer College in Claremont (named after President Pitzer's father) could become dominant here. No sensible faculty member concerned with maintaining high academic standards and an environment conducive to serious research would want such an atmosphere, and the overwhelming majority of students currently at Stanford would not want the utter chaos of these campuses either.

EARLY TARGET

One of the early targets of witch-hunters has been ROTC. ROTC is a program which poses about the same threat to academic independence as a program of training for the Olympics. As anyone who has

Continued on page 4.

Sentence Resolved

by Spectator

Last week in this space, the Academic Council was urged to meet in special session for the purpose of reviewing the Academic Senate's April 24 resolution barring "secret" research at Stanford.

Procedurally, it was noted, the Council has reason to suspect that the smaller, more "activist" Senate is not representative of the full faculty's diversity, deliberation and caution.

Moreover, the April 24 resolution specifically amends the Council's own position on University research, adopted September 29, 1967 pursuant to the report and recommendations of its Committee on Research Policy.

Close comparison of the 1967 position with the text of the Senate resolution suggests that the Council's concern should be substantive as well as procedural. The April 24 statement, for example, claims to have resolved a dilemma the Council committee (hereafter CRP) found irreconcilable.

The CRP report cites two principles flowing from the "basic objective of the university":

"(F)irst, that the scholar must be free to select his area of inquiry . . .

"(S)econd, that he must be free to disseminate his findings without constraint from within or without the university community."

Looking at "a world where nationalistic strife constitutes a major element of the environment", and perceiving the "inescapable reality" of public control (e.g. classification) in certain areas of research, the CRP concluded that "a university cannot achieve full realization of these fundamental principles." Its 1967 report continued:

"The choice then is to accept certain limitations on dissemination, subordinating one basic principle of the university, or to deny to many scholars in the university the opportunity to carry on effective investigation in their chosen fields of inquiry, thus subordinating a different principle.

"As a practical matter, the second choice will, in some proportion of cases, have the consequence of driving a group of scholars from the university to institutions which have struck the balance differently.

"We believe that here, as is often true when important principles contend, the wisest choice is not uniformly to subordinate either principle to the other. A more particularistic approach is possible."

Contrast with this spare and judicious language, if you will, the fulsome moralizing of Point One of the Senate resolution:

"Resolved: That the principle of openness in research — the principle of freedom of access by all interested persons to the underlying data, to the processes, and to the final results of research — is one of overriding importance."

Yes, RESOLVED. Just like that. No more agonizing over freedom of choice. No more need for a case-by-case approach, because sentence is pronounced before trial.

Continued on page 3.

THE ARENA

TAURUS: Bill Randolph; GEMINI: Harvey H Hukari, Jr., Susan Hudgens, Mark Venezia; CANCER Leon Eymil; LEO: Mike Hirsch; VIRGO: Anne Castle, Bruce Borgerson; LIBRA: Craig Ostfeld; SAGITTARIUS: Spectator; CAPRICORN: Doug Hamilton; AQUARIUS: Bob Tvedt, Leo; SCORPIO Rich Grey, Jack Stevens; PISCES: Mike Cobb, Joe Frawley, Rich Nelson; ARIES: Martin Taylor, John Rogers.

THE ARENA is published weekly at Stanford University. All correspondence should be directed to Box 3678, Stanford, California, 94305. All contributions are considered: letters to the editor, short features articles and any graphic work. Letters and articles should be typed and double-spaced. Write on.



Culprit Identified



The Culprit

To the Editor:

In reply to your request for the identification of the man who "attempted to prevent an ARENA photographer from taking pictures of the A3M break-in at Encina Hall . . .", I know him. He is a very "close" friend of mine named David Long. I am resorting to such vulgar deeds as reporting my "close" friend only out of moral conscience and a deep concern that no ARENA photographer ever be inhibited from objective reporting of the news.

Love,
David C. Long

P.S. I'm enclosing a better picture, for I find your photography atrocious.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The ARENA wishes to thank all those individuals who aided in the positive identification of Mr. Long. The matter of Mr. Long's attempted interference with our photographer will be forwarded to the Stanford Judicial Council. It should be noted that Mr. Long's letter arrived at the Arena with six cents postage due.

To the Editor:

In 1906 Dr. David Starr Jordan, President of Stanford, dismissed an eminent scholarly professor whose leftist activities were deemed to be contrary to the ideals upon which Stanford was founded. This expulsion of Dr. Goebles was upheld by a nine man committee of the faculty. No dissenting vote. The "firing" of Dr. Goebels was most important to the Stanford Daily, of which I was then editor, and I wrote a strong editorial commending Dr. Jordan's action and the San Francisco papers in column long articles printed news that the Stanford Student Body as well as the faculty supported Dr. Jordan. A united Stanford.

How different today. For seven years I have complained to the Stanford administration and the Trustees about the harm the Stanford Daily in its leftist's ideas was doing to Stanford. No action. Yes, the Daily was far different in the old days when we were loyal to Stanford and received no financial assistance. Now I understand that they get from the University or Student Funds \$30,000.00 a year to support a leftist paper which has and still is injuring Stanford. Formerly the Editor was elected by and represented the Student Body. Now it is a self-perpetuating leftist clique.

Once the position of trustee was one of great honor and prestige. Once a student at Stanford was stamped as a promising individual intellectually and also as a loyal citizen who believed in his Country. Not so today. The public is getting more and more antagonistic to Stanford every day. Do not be surprised at financial difficulties to come. The Ford Foundation points out a very dangerous financial future for Stanford Law School. The general public is asking why should Stanford put up with a hard core of Stanford Professors who seem to run everything. Push this

Continued on page 3.

WHEN THE MUSIC'S OVER

Airplane Zooms Out of Hangar

by Bruce Borgerson

The Jefferson Airplane had been grounded for a couple of months before their recent Winterland appearance, waiting for Grace Slick to recover from an operation for throat nodules — an ailment common to opera singers, among others. But Grace seemed to have recovered fully, and the rest of the group had no trouble getting it together despite their vacation. In fact they were tighter and more powerful than ever before, and I must admit that they were a few hundred feet above me at some points. The Airplane creates an electric tension built on a foundation of mind-shattering volume, which contrasts with the easy-rolling approach of the Grateful Dead. Listening to the Airplane requires full concentration, a complete giving over of your mind to what they are doing. But if you can stay with them, it's a beautiful high.

The Airplane opened with "3/5 of a Mile in 10 Seconds", which is also the first cut on their "live" LP, *Bless Its Pointed Little Head*. Since this song also appears on *Surrealistic Pillow*, it serves as a good measure of how far the group has come in two years. The difference is obvious in the first thirty seconds of Spencer Dryden's drumming. On *Pillow*, he sticks to a basic, pounding beat a la "Satisfaction", accented only by on-beat cymbal crashes. But the new, improved, "live" Dryden opens with a very fast tempo on the hi-hat, then brings in a synchopated bass-drum beat, then adding quick, shifting accents on the snare,

finally building into riffle fills that further increase the rhythmical complexity. Behind all this technical jargon is the key to the "new" Airplane — the manipulation of musical tension. On top of Dryden's rhythms, the incredible team of Jorma Kaukonen (guitar) and Jack Casady (bass) weave a pattern of electric tension that rivals the best of the Clapton-Bruce duo. In front of this swelling wave, Marty Balin and Grace Slick turn to each other, watching and waiting. The wave of music crests and they start moving with it, adding their penetrating yet delicate contrapuntal harmonies. Paul Kantner is beside them, reinforcing and accenting with rhythm guitar and vocal harmony. The wave breaks and roars across you, and there is nothing to do but relax and let it take you where it will.

Like the Dead, the structure of the Airplane's music is visible in their position and movement on the stage. Dryden, Kaukonen and Casady cluster together drift away, face each other, and do their thing while Dryden drops back to hold the bottom. Marty and Grace face each other in a similar manner, watching each other's eyes as if to increase telepathic communication. When Kantner shares the lead vocal, Grace turns to him and the focus of tension shifts. This complexity is reflected in the quality of their music, and establishes the Airplane as the only native San Francisco group — with the possible exception of Quicksilver — that has been able to continually evolve new styles without the framework of their music

threatening to collapse around them.

The Kaukonen-Casady team, aware of their affinity, moonlighted some gigs at the Matrix during Grace's recovery. RCA liked the idea and signed them to do a couple of albums as a duo, although they still plan to stick with the whole group as long as it lasts.

So if you haven't bought *Pointed Head* because 2/3 of the songs appear on their first two LP's, you're missing a unique experience. But please don't try to listen to it while cramming for a Psych 1 final. You've either got to get in the Airplane and fly with it, or stay back on the ground. There's no going halfway. Have a nice trip.

Here, There and Everywhere

Tom Donahue's wedding in the Airplane's mansion was the occasion for a gathering of the tribe which included most of the big names on the S.F. rock scene. After the formalities, many guests went tripping through the Park with the help of whatever was in the Jell-O (if you believe a man named Pigg.) . . . Coming soon to your local dealer (of records): Buddy Miles' *Electric Church*, *David's Album* by Mrs. Harris, and the long-awaited album by The Charlatans, the San Francisco originals minus Dan Hicks (now with his Hot Licks) and Micheal Ferguson (now with Tongue and Groove) . . . At the Fillmore F,S,Su: Santana, Youngbloods, Allmen Joy.

Ultimate Morality

by Anne Castle

I did not boycott my classes this week. This is not because I couldn't bear the thought of missing calculus, or because I adore my Civ. T.A. It is because I can no longer be sympathetic with the April 3rd Movement or contribute to the achievement of its goals.

My decision is not based on the fact that I question the validity of the movement, although I do to some degree. It is not because I feel the radical element on campus is using the movement as its own political tool, which extends beyond April 3rd, beyond Stanford, beyond the United States, in fact. It is not because I think that anything my elders do is correct, although I do feel they deserve much more respect than they are getting, if not as elders, as human beings. But above all these factors, I unquestionably refuse to condone the arbitrary actions of a group which has placed itself in a position of moral superiority.

Before I had really analyzed the movement as a whole, I might have been open to consider a student boycott out of general concern for the issues. Although opposed to the demands and the way they were being forced down the trustees' throats, I felt I could somehow sympathize with those who felt strongly enough to be a part of the April 3rd Movement. I admitted that it was quite possible that intelligent, concerned members of the community who were of good will could hold a view which did not coincide with my own. But it didn't take long to find that the respect which I granted them was not being returned. My reasons for opposing the movement were not granted any validity because the movement had a monopoly on something they placed above reason and above logic...morality. They had placed themselves on a different plane, a plane which was ideal and uncompromising, for, after all, how can you compromise with (supposed) morality? Such an extremist position places the movement beyond reason, beyond rationality, and places the problem of S.R.I. beyond solution.

This approach has been all too obvious in various confrontations with the Trustees themselves. After being denied any measure of self-respect by direct personal attacks, not on their political views, but on their moral integrity, they are asked to be responsive,

open-minded, and compliant. To be considered politically incorrect is one thing, but to be branded as immoral is hardly conducive to dialogue. It only brings about rigid defensiveness and that administrative paranoia which is a desperate attempt to establish oneself on that level which is so unjustly filled by the A3M people.

To be demanded to admit personal immorality is unquestionably abhorrent to any self-respecting human being. Thus the movement asks for degrading confessions from the trustees for which they have no right to ask. By doing so, they degrade their goals with boorish, unthinking emotionalism. It seems ironic that many of these people are those who would scorn the emotionalism of the Star-Spangled Banner or the flag salute as manifestations of American nationalistic stupidity.

Admittedly, emotionalism in politics is unavoidable, logical or not. This will be true as long as politicians are human beings and not machines. But to let a presumptuous, condescending moral stand rob an issue of any hope for fair and just solution is to support ignorance and anarchy.

Letter...

Continued from page 2.

public too far and you will see steps taken to put that part of Stanford not used for education on the tax rolls. People are beginning to write Congress not to give Stanford money if they (Stanford) interfere with Government projects. Trouble lies ahead.

And still the *Daily* gets \$30,000.00 a year! Ask yourself why.

Louis R. Weinmann '06
"Dewey" Weinmann

	JEWELER
ARTHUR F. GLEIM CERTIFIED GEMOLOGIST American Gem Society	322 UNIVERSITY - DA 3-1331 408 CALIFORNIA - DA 3-6822 119 STANFORD SHOPPING CTR. DA 5-3633

Spectator (cont.)

Continued from page 2.

With certain exceptions, of course. Some of these arise from the Senate's attempt to define the word "secret", intended partly as a replacement for "classified". A succeeding column will examine the ingenuity with which Senate draftsmen have created semantic mazes, at the center of which are . . . (gasp) LOOPHOLES!

Suffice it for now to ask what happened to the Council's "general rule" known as (d) in the CRP report, to wit:

"The University should enter no contract and accept no grant that involves the collection of social or behavioral data in a foreign country and requires the security clearance of any person involved in the project."

This section, let it be recalled, was an early reaction to widely publicized academic involvement in such prospectively counterinsurgent operations as the Defense Department's CAMELOT.

So why did the Senate drop (d)? Because it was superfluous, under the general secrecy ban? But what about the loopholes, all that stuff on "peripheral", "intellectually significant", "rights of the individual to privacy"?

My God! You don't suppose the Senate really is in favor of counterinsurgency, do you?

Now wouldn't it be worth a Council meeting to find out?

(to be continued)

Dutch Goose



3567 Alameda De Las Pulgas
Menlo Park 854-3245

ROTC...

Continued from page 1

taken ROTC can testify, the program needs reforms, but what professor at Stanford would be so brash as to claim that his course could not be improved?

As to the specific arguments against ROTC, none holds weight. It is charged that the Professor of Military Science owes his loyalty to an outside authority. But most professors at Stanford, if questioned, would admit that they feel greater loyalty towards their profession than towards their University. The increasing tempo with which professors shift from University to University and from consulting position to consulting position is evidence enough of where their primary loyalties lie.

Leftists often charge that the military stresses disciplined rather than creative thinking. But don't professors refer to their fields as "disciplines", and don't they vie with one another to claim that theirs is the most rigorous discipline? It is a truism that a grad student or young prof must prove his ability to handle the canons and traditions of his field before he is accepted at higher levels. Certainly, some ROTC courses are cookbook courses, but then so are basic language courses or many basic courses in the medical school. Maybe we don't like discipline, but it is a fact of life, and depriving ROTC of academic credit is not going to remove memorizations and low-creativity courses from the Stanford curricula.

PMS LOOKS GOOD

Nor is the charge that PMSs lack adequate academic background accurate. Many of the officers have or are working on masters' degrees, and all have substantial experience in their field. Compared with the TA or assistant prof, who usually does not have his Ph.D., and who has substantially less experience in his field than PMSs, the PMS looks pretty good.

Far from being a threat to the liberal values of our society, ROTC is one of their greatest supporters. For ROTC, one of the best checks against the military machine is a high civilian component in the military. If you don't believe this, ask any enlisted man who has served in Vietnam whether he would rather have a competent ROTC lieutenant or an OCS or West Point lieutenant as his superior. And in Congress one will find that the congressmen best able to understand and control the military are those with military service in their backgrounds.

It may seem appealing to deny the military access to liberal arts students, but it is just this kind of student — the liberal arts student with innate skepticism about martial values — who should be left in the military as a humanizing influence. The liberals who would cripple ROTC at Stanford, Harvard and other leading universities are simply insuring that the military will be turned over entirely to professionals and gung-ho OCS officers. It is a rather short-sighted tactic.

As stated earlier, Stanford is going through a critical period of growth. If we ride the waves of change and do not panic, it will be to our enduring credit. But if we lose our heads, and capitulate indiscriminately to every demand on which the tag "moral obligation" has been stuck, we can tumble very quickly from being a great University, where controversy thrives, to being a one-dimensional University, given over to the propagation of a single political line.

The Leftist Axis complains that the University is part of an economic machine, and yet what the Leftists want of the University is that it be part of a political machine churning out obedient little radicals. That the radical core of the Leftist axis will continue to aim at destroying the University as a center of independent inquiry is inevitable. The tragedy, and fortunately it is a remedial tragedy, is that hordes of liberals flock to the banner of a political crusade which feeds on imaginary ogres and witches. Whether the Pied Pipers of the SDS succeed in leading away the liberal children of Stanford will in large part be determined by President Pitzer's decisions on matters such as ROTC. Such are the trials of a helmsman.

AUTHOR'S NOTE: The author wishes to apologize for any embarrassment caused by his statement in last week's *ARENA* that the faculty gives "credit for a film seminar which the instructor himself admits doesn't deserve it". This statement sprang from a misunderstanding between the author and the instructor and does not correctly reflect the instructor's thinking.

THE CINEMATIC EYE

Troubled Greetings

Greetings is a potpourri of everything *Life* magazine says is troubling and obsessing the youth of this country. In Brian de Palma and Charles Hirsch's \$40,000 two-week production, the viewer is hit with the issues of the draft; the Kennedy assassination; Lyndon Baines Johnson drooling and blabbering on the tube; a sound track by the Children of Paradise; computer dating WITH the Bronx Secretary, the Mystic, etc.; an under ground skin flick called *The Delivery Boy* and the Bored Housewife . . . oh, and lots of boobs, rearends, and dirty words thrown in with the hip vernacular.

The young hero — in the role of the uncertain young man in the big city of New York, like *You're A Big Boy Now* — meets up with his pals who teach him devious means of avoiding the draft. They give him instructions on how to walk, talk, and dress like a fag, and then on how to play the super-patriot, ready to not only kill Vietnamese, but every Negro, Mexican, or homosexual in the Army (his psychiatrist comments that he may be a bit "overzealous").

De Palma also directed the film, and some of the situation comedy scenes are a scream, particularly the sequence concerning the Kennedy assassination when one of the young men measures where the bullets, according to the Warren Commission report, entered and left the President's body, using his girlfriend's body for his model (not unlike the hilarious stamp scene in *Closely Watched Trains*, which played with *Greetings*).

One of the worst scenes is the parody on the television newsman plodding through the middle of a Vietnamese jungle with a camera crew and an American soldier for a guide.

If all this incessant commentary on America isn't enough to placate the viewer for an hour and a half, then there's the technique, which — unless you've been locked for the past ten, fifteen years — you've seen

done before and you've seen done better. The old trick of breaking a scene and turning to the camera to make a personal comment, first instituted in movies by W.C. Fields and Groucho Marx and later brought back successfully by Tony Richardson in *Tom Jones*, simply doesn't work out in *Greetings*. The problem is that the breaks are usually ill-timed and furthermore the lines are not sufficiently funny to warrant the special effect. Another flaw is the use of titles, which may have been necessary at times for easy scene transition, but somehow came off as trite, maybe because the scenes they introduced were trite (example: *Computer Date No. One*, *The Bronx Secretary*). Some of the camera work was good, particularly in compositional detail, but hardly note-worthy or spectacular.

Perhaps the most enjoyable feature of the film, and certainly the main ingredient that kept the viewer from lapsing into boredom — in spite of the hackneyed content and message of the movie — was the acting. All three young men did a fine job of making themselves believable, interesting, and funny.

In fact, it is the exuberant, youthful spirit of the film (both de Palma and Hirsch are under thirty) that sets it apart from other films like *The Graduate*, *You're A Big Boy Now*, *Wild in the Streets*, and *The First Time* (a real Hollywood bomb) — which also deals with draft-age youth. But if *Greetings* has spirit, it lacks flesh (figuratively speaking) — plot or thematic development is grossly lacking and the quick scene shifts lack coordination. A professional film, *Greetings* is not; but if de Palma can go beyond superficial satire and can smooth out his technical skills, he may well be able to produce a fine film.

Special Note: *Greetings* has finally left the Los Altos International Theater, and has been replaced by Truffaut's latest film to come to this country, *Stolen Kisses* — by far the best prospect for movie fans to see now in this area.

by Susan Hudgens

ESCALATION

Taken from *Violence and the Universities* by Professor Albert W. Levi, Washington University.

No university seriously interested in its own survival and mindful of its educational responsibility for the disciplining of lawlessness dare refuse its obligation to punish those who engage in the tactics of disruption, especially those whose very political philosophies commit them to acts of violence rather than the legitimate protest which seeks for adjudication through responsible democratic processes.

The escalation of outrage received in silence is a danger too enormous to risk, as we of the last generation have experienced it in the days of Nazi insolence before the invasion of Poland, when the provocations were continuous and no resistance was forthcoming. David Low, the great British cartoonist, caricatured this infamous patience in a cartoon of Neville Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, saying to the German Chancellor: "Sir, you have starved my ancient mother, kidnapped my wife, raped my daughter, burned down the Houses of Parliament and sunk the British Navy, but beware, Herr Hitler, someday you will go too far."

I can see before me now the image of the tender-minded and perhaps conscience-stricken section of the Columbia faculty saying to Mark Rudd and his associates, and this time not hyperbolically, but in literal truth: "You have seized five university buildings, barring students and professors from holding classes without their vote or consent, you have broken into the offices of the President of the University, opening, ransacking, photographing, and making public his confidential files, you have held a college dean prisoner in his own office for over 26 hours, calling him to his face names unprintable in the public press, you have burned the offices of three professors who have been unsympathetic to your strike, including the research notes of one of them which were the fruit of ten years of patient research, but beware, SDS, one day you will go too far!"

TUNE-UPS—General Motors Corp. factory trained mech. 6 cyl. \$8 + parts. 8 cyl. \$11 + parts. American cars. Rich Scollay 326-7316.

GOING ON AN

INTERVIEW TRIP?

BOOK AND CHARGE YOUR TRAVEL WITH

SEQUOIA TRAVEL

TRESIDDER UNION
STANFORD, CALIF.
323-9401

*Please call for information regarding necessary documents.

MARK IV
DISTRIBUTORS

AUTO AIR CONDITIONING
SALES & SERVICE

Peninsula Carburetor & Electric Service

BILL FORCUM

2904 ASH AT PEPPER STREET
SO. PALO ALTO • CALIFORNIA
TELEPHONE 321-5248

Home Federal Savings and Loan Association of San Diego

Highest Dividend Rate in the Nation
on Insured Savings

P.O. Box 2070 San Diego, California 92112