

in the educational sphere, the opportunity to relate to off-campus political groups—to involve a large minority in a multitude of social issues. Indeed, the combined number of students doing such things as investigating prison conditions and responding to prisoners' legal and educational needs, organizing support for the United Farm Workers Union in its battle with the Teamsters and growers, studying and experimenting with curricula for free schools, working for McGovern as a step toward pushing the country to the Left, and setting up a counseling center on alternative, socially relevant vocations, is probably larger than the number who sat-in during 1969 and 1970.

There is, to be sure, less opportunity for casual participation, as by attending a mass rally, than there was in the apocalyptic days. There's even some breathing space for such conservative side phenomena as a mini-revival of fraternities and the flowering of the Jesus movement. But the reigning ideology is liberal. Campus resocialization carries a large minority of privileged white students to Left-liberal or radical positions, either through direct involvement in issues or by a less tangible cultural osmosis. The forms of political action do challenge the system, although they are less violent than those of an earlier period.

And Stanford may not be untypical of the current situation on America's "elite" campuses, from which the movement of the 1960s sprang. It is, if anything, more "bourgeois" and "suburban" than Harvard, Columbia, Berkeley and Cornell. According to the university's placement counselors, most Stanford students are sorely tempted to spend their lives, in whatever capacity, amid the enticing and distracting lushness of Palo Alto, Los Altos Hills and Portola Valley.

On examination, the notion of a return to the 1950s seems illusory. At the end of that decade Stanford had twenty-six fraternities and an overwhelming preference for Richard Nixon as the next President of the United States. By the mid-1960s, things had changed somewhat. David Harris returned from Mississippi summer, became student union president by appealing to students in the dorms rather than those in the fraternities, and started the Resistance. In 1969-71 several hundred among Stanford's 11,000 students were willing, at appropriate moments, to become involved in high-risk, forceful action against the university's military research and ROTC programs. Several thousand others rallied to support these demands and heard far-reaching criticisms of American society. A majority of these voted, in special referenda, for the demilitarization of the university, American withdrawal from Southeast Asia, the Panther demand for liberation of all political prisoners, and the reinstatement of radical Prof. H. Bruce Franklin who was fired in a *cause célèbre* of academic freedom for such alleged incidents as encouraging students to shut down a Computation Center where a war-related program was being run off. (See "The Discontents of Stanford" by Sherman B. Chickering, *The Nation*, March, 13, 1972.)

This year only fourteen fraternities remain; 80 per cent of student voters went for George McGovern; the newly installed student government is every bit as activist and

Left-leaning as its recent predecessors, although the *Stanford Daily* has acquired a less militant (but liberal) staff. The number of students enrolled in Stanford Workshops on Political and Social Issues (SWOPSI), a sort of counter-curriculum for credit which resulted from Movement agitation, has doubled in the past year. Student leaders of varying political persuasions characterize the present phase as one of "high consciousness and low mobilization." Faculty members with whom I spoke tended to agree. Asst. Prof. Ward Watt, who teaches introductory biology, observed that his students are more persevering and "less distracted by mass excitation" than three years ago, but adds, "They are quite interested in social problems. I've never found as much interest in the connections between science and these other questions. I don't think there are indications that they're moving down and turning in." John Mollenkopf, an assistant professor of political science, has noted that his classes are "shot through with a large number of people who were permanently changed by anti-war stuff, the Movement, who talk of intellectual issues but are sometimes confused about current directions." In the Law School, Prof. Anthony Amsterdam believes that the "marked change" in law student activism that resulted from the 1960s has persisted in this less noisy era. He detects "no decrease in social consciousness" in the last two or three years. The dean of undergraduate admissions, Fred Hargadon, flatly states that "a large majority of candidates accepted are socially conscious and concerned with issues." Although Hargadon is skeptical as to the depth of their commitment and regards the rapid succession of issues as a symptom of "media other-direction," he has become accustomed to application essays on Vietnam, racism and ecology, rather than "My Experiences Fishing with Maine Lobstermen."

Why, then, has the largest mass mobilization this year been a quiet rally of 800 in January, following Nixon's decision to bomb for peace in North Vietnam? According to Dan Brenner, a junior who is opinions editor of the *Daily*, "Students today are less prone to go out on the Embarcadero and get arrested because they feel it is not an effective technique." Brent Appel, a former student union co-president who is in his fifth year at Stanford, explains, "The issue is what I can do. Demonstrations are not seen as viable—all has been heard before, it's not novel now, the average Middle American won't be reached. People are looking for new tactics." Past mobilizations also created an ideological momentum which was bound to undermine the logic of the initial tactics. Bob Saunders, another fifth-year student who is also an alternative vocations counselor, thinks: "People's expectations got to be higher than their tactics, which couldn't themselves change society. Even if you got the Defense Department off campus [which largely occurred], the capitalist structure and imperialism survived." Bruce Franklin, now laboring off campus as a member of the Central Committee of Venceremos, a Marxist-Leninist organization, speaks of the "apparent paradox" of "a low level of militant activity and high consciousness": "Because people have a high level of consciousness they don't see what they can do about [oppression]."

Another important factor in the subsidence of large

eruptions has been the removal of draft pressures. In the context of Vietnam, conscription was more than a personal threat; it was, in Appel's phrase, "a symbol of government coercion at your back door." Radical organizers today have not found a similar cross-cutting incentive for campus mobilization. Finally, the labor market and graduate school gluts have undoubtedly taken some toll of activism even at a prestige school like Stanford.

But while the shift away from mass mobilization has left some of the more casual former participants feeling frustrated, powerless, and occasionally cynical, that has not been the general reaction of those who were more deeply touched. There is widespread agreement with Appel's judgment that "the number of people who really commit a substantial part of their lives to social change is increasing." Furthermore, as *Daily* columnist Bill Evers points out, "The new New Left is more organized, less hedonistic and politically crazy. Achievement orientation has come back more and there's a more sensible time horizon." Leslie Rabine, a graduate student who has been active organizing women's groups remarks, "At the point

where the Movement was generally at its height there was a lot of reliance on spontaneity. Now there's better organization, more solid ties. It's much more serious and long range." In organizing students, the new New Left has emphasized both consciousness raising and meaningful action. And it has made good use of the post-1960s educational revolution: greater openness of the campus to outside social change groups and the incorporation of a significant number of student-initiated, action-oriented courses. Here follow some examples of current activity.

Student government co-president Kevin O'Grady, a first-year medical student, headed the local McGovern campaign which involved more than 400 people. With other McGovern workers and veterans of the Movement he formed SCOPE (Stanford Committee on Political Education) which recently presented a four-day conference focusing on domestic repression. The most prominent of eight Left-liberal and radical speakers was Daniel Ellsberg, who attracted 1,600 spectators. Ten years ago major universities did not countenance public appearances by individuals under indictment.

Through SWOPSI, a group of students is researching

Speak Out

Because this is the season of commencements, The Nation here reprints an edited version of what is perhaps the finest commencement address ever delivered in America. John Jay Chapman gave it, in the spring of 1900, to the graduating class of Hobart College. The full text of this address is to be found in The Collected Works of John Jay Chapman (Volume VI), published in 1970 by M & S Press, Weston, Mass.

You believe that the abuses under the Russian Government are inscrutably different from and worse than our own; whereas both sets of atrocities are identical in principle, and are more alike in fact, in taste and smell and substance than your prejudice is willing to admit.

Life is not a boarding school where a bad boy can be dismissed for the benefit of the rest. He remains. He must be dealt with. He is as much here as we are ourselves.

The voice of humanity is stifled by corruption; and corruption is only an evil because it stifles men.

Try to raise a voice that shall be heard from here to Albany and watch what it is that comes forward to shut off the sound. It is not a German sergeant, nor a Russian officer of the precinct. It is a note from a friend of your father's, offering you a place in his office.

This is your warning from the secret police. Why, if any of you young gentlemen have a mind to make himself heard a mile off, you must make a bonfire of your reputations and a close enemy of most men who wish you well.

I have seen ten years of young men who rush out into the world with their messages, and when they find how deaf the world is, they think they must save their strength and wait. They believe that after a while they will be able to get up on some little eminence from which they can make themselves heard. "In a few years," reasons one of them, "I shall have gained a standing, and then, I will use my power for good." Next year comes and with it a strange discovery. The man has lost his horizon of

thought. His ambition has evaporated; he has nothing to say.

Social and business prominence look like advantages, and so they are if you want money. But if you want moral influence you may bless God you have not got them.

They are the payment with which the world subsidizes men to keep quiet, and there is no subtlety or cunning by which you can get them without paying in silence.

This is the great law of humanity, that has existed since history began, and will last while man lasts—evil, selfishness and silence are one thing.

When I was asked to make this address I wondered what I had to say to you boys who are graduating. And I think I have one thing to say: If you wish to be useful, never take a course that will silence you. Refuse to learn anything that you cannot proclaim. Refuse to accept anything that implies collusion, whether it be a clerkship or a curacy, a legal fee or a post in a university.

Retain the power of speech, no matter what other power you lose. If you can take this course, and insofar as you take it, you will bless this country. Insofar as you depart from this course you become dampers, mutes and hooded executioners.

As for your own private character it will be preserved by such a course. Crime you cannot commit, for crime gags you. Collusion with any abuse gags you.

As a practical matter a mere failure to speak out upon occasions where no opinion is asked or expected of you, and when the utterance of an uncalled-for suspicion is odious, will often hold you to a concurrence in palpable iniquity. It will bind and gag you and lay you dumb and in shackles like the veriest serf in Russia.

I give you this one rule of conduct. Do what you will, but speak out always.

Be shunned, be hated, be ridiculed, be scared, be in doubt, but don't be gagged.

The time of trial is always. Now is the appointed time.