This paper is in no way intended to represent the views of San Diego State College.

Berkeley's Chancellor Heyns made a classic mistake last weekend. He rejected a student compromise offer that might have led to fruitful negotiations.

The lid is going to blow off the Berkeley campus. The explosion will involve more than just "a minority of dissident students." It is going to involve the whole university, students--nearly all of them--Heyns and the administration, the faculty, and probably the governor and the California legislature.

The students feel they have lost everything they gained in the FSM and are still losing ground. They are pissed-off that cops were called onto the campus to settle a political dispute. They are also pissed-off about obvious administration duplicity in the affair and they are prepared to stop the university in order to change the situation.

The FSM has a sense of quixotic idealism about it. That atmosphere doesn't exist this time. Mario Savio said Friday night that it is just not the same.

Prof. John Searle, who has been a long-time negotiator between the students and the administration said, "This time they're meaner." He was talking about both the administration and the students.

My Berkeley trip this weekend is not just a series of vivid impressions: a bumpy FAA Electra trip--white caps on San Francisco Bay--thinking there must be quite a wind down there and damn near blowing off the little stairs goodly when I left the plane.

The campus Berkeley, with students standing in the night rain outside the Student Union, arguing quietly about the events of the last two days--nobody taking quite the same stand on any issue.

Watching the dismay as reports came out of AFF and Faculty Senate meetings. Neither of these groups took a definite stand on the strike or the strikers demands. Both were divided on the issue of non-students on the campus, who and how.

Arguments have not reached the point where decisions are being made on how to bring non-students on the campus. The argument is just about whether they should be there. Nobody seems to be talking about the same kind of non-student.

A meeting of the Strike Committee, supposedly sort of closed, but involving about 75 people, long arguments about the bulky size and who should talk and so on, lots of concern about lack of sleep--not much had in the last 48 hours by many of the people there.

More concern about alienating great numbers of students who were participants, not leaders, and leaders not having enough time to join the picket lines and talk to the rank and file.

Thinking how different the impression gotten from students was from what was available in the press and on the radio in San Diego. Even the L.A. Times told less than the whole story and left out important facts. The UPI story carried in the Union might as well have been written about a fictional event for all the relevance it had to the events at Berkeley.

Listening to students tell about cops charging unprompted into the crowd of demonstrators and beating the hell out of four of them, including a chick. And promises of safe sausage given by the administration and ignored by the cops.

This is the issue probably most responsible for the unity so far--the students and faculty don't like the idea of cops being brought on campus.

The Strike Committee was insisting that Mario Savio be included in the negotiations, but dropped this as a gesture toward compromise. They asked that Savio be allowed was an observer, but Heyns flatly refused.

The Strike Committee and other students interested in the strike were afraid of the weather, the weekend, and the upcoming finals might put a damper on whatever force they had mustered so far.

Heyns intransigence has guaranteed the continuation of the strike and probably with renewed vigor.

"PEOPLE ARE REALLY PISSED!"

A major controversy is rapidly developing on campus because of the increase in parking fees. This change over from 10 to 25 cents has caused more student arousal than any other issue in the past year. The Daily House Organ has printed a blasting editorial which can be summed up in one word:follow-up. Students are discussing junior high school type pranks to disrupt the gates' operation. The SDS chapter is talking about organizing people around "things which effect their lives."

While it is an act of bad faith and dishonesty not to let students know what is being planned, the sudden announcement concerning parking fees should have been anticipated. The California college system, from junior college through the university, is set up as a paternal institution to control and direct the activities of students. Student desires are rarely considered except in rare instances when they organize, such as the FSM or the current controversy at Berkeley.

For some reason students at SDSU are just discovering that they are being administered to by an arbitrary and powerful bureaucracy. But in discovering this, the students have tipped their hand. They have shown not only how unconcerned they are with intellectual growth but also their inability to distinguish real issues and responsibilities. If the students are at all concerned about their intellectual and intellectual growth, they should be organizing and demanding a role in decisions regarding curriculums, excellent teachers being denied tenure, faculty members who are aloof and too busy for students, and the largeness of their classes.

Students have failed to recognize that they are least important than professors doing research or playing golf, the order and facility of parking lots, business after tax profits, and securing of a population for a petty and corrupted military junta in South East Asia. The real issues of administration and education lie not with President love, but with the Chancellor's office and the public's misconception of education.

If students are really concerned about their education, it is doubtful they would organize "to do something about" parking gates. They would instead start developing dialogue and interest on campus to decide what they want out of their education.
I think the "good old-fashioned mystery woman" Fred Bailey is looking for will never be found because she never existed. She was just one more illusion that couldn't last. The presently lamented lack of "mystery" and "romance" is merely a longing for confusion: a jumble of misconceptions and fears. Whimperings for the "girl that married dear old Dad are cries for the frigid mess that bore his children and who he just had to cheat on every now and then for the "other kind of woman." Come down to earth and knock off the Puritanical yearning for Victorian virginia. You wouldn't want one if you had one.

Mrs. Bailey makes two large errors. First, he defines "masculine" behavior and then he proceeds to greedily hoard all activity coming under his classification. If you appropriate certain behavior as yours exclusively, then label it and repel all "intruders," you're being pretty conservative, whether you realize it or not. Who says it's your orgasms, your drinking, your smoking and your voting? You sound like John Wayne: "How dare you dames look for suffrage, drive cars and even cases like us big shots? Why you females even butt into our politics and now and then you even have an idea! That's not bad enough, but you bitches get awfully "pubby," read books and even want to enjoy life! You Niggers are all alike, always trying to agitate and make trouble for the real men. You should know your place.

Come off it Fred. Don't beat the disappearance of the thing who had sex and babies with the lights out. You bet she had a distant quality." She was untouchable! Don't wrong her "used passing." Kiss her goodbye. Don't you realize that Victorian man "de-emphasized consumption of love" because he considered it "lusty," "lower nature" and "dirt"? These people you praise were so frustrated they started the pornogrophy industry! Speaking of "I love a mystery" fans, for a minute I thought E. Richard Barnes wrote your article. As E. Richard can tell you, there are no such people whose heads are at the thought of exploiting second-class citizens like "Jews, Negroes and women, we have ready-made groups sympathetic to such ideas."

There are some women who are caught between two centuries, demanding both the old and the new "rights." But you don't allow for individuality when you lumpingly say modern women (singular) has no charm. Which women? You should try to take advantage, not of some fictitious female Image, but of what many 20th century women have to offer. You want to bury the wrong body. Believe me, your obituary for some "fascinating complex thing that is woman" was badly premature. It is the two-headed grandmother who needs to be laid to rest. The real woman is very much alive.

--Helen McNamara

Greek Department: A well-known Greek presently serving on the AS Council described why he is in Student Government: "What I am doing now is making myself marketable.

--Ron Reusus

Anyone wishing to make comments or contributions to the TEASPOON, please leave them in the Tuthill box in the Bailey Aztec Office.