

good morning tea spoon

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 now just a series of vivid impressions: a bumpy PSA Electra trip--white caps on San Francisco Bay--thinking there must be quite a wind down there and damn near getting blown off the little stair goodie when I left the plane.

The campus in 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 AFT 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 what to do 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 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 unprovoked into the crowd of demonstrators and beating the hell out of four of them, including a chick. And promises of safe passage 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 as 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 thought of 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 we can be assured will not be followed-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 surprise no one. 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 education and intellectual growth, they should be organizing and demanding a role in decisions regarding curriculum, 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 less important than profs 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 realistically and sincerely 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.

Today is another December 7th. Twenty-five years ago in Pearl Harbor a number of heroic acts were performed; however, no truly American hero was generated there. No. The heroes of World War II had to wait for creation until legends could be developed that would somehow weave the protagonists into the myth system of our people. Subsequently we generated our Eisenhower of Europe, MacArthur of the Pacific, McAuliff of Bastogne, G.I. Joe of God Knows Where, and Rosie the Riveter of the Tool "Crib".

Why are we not generating heroes today in Viet Nam? Certainly there are acts of heroism being performed. Where then are the heroes? Could it possibly, just possibly, be that the only hero to arise from this sorry mess will be the one who finally gets us out of it? I submit that such is the case. Viet Nam is not within the true schema of America, and the sooner over with and forgotten the better. It is much more likely that heroes of America today are not being produced in Viet Nam at all, but in the streets and on the campuses here at home.

The history books of 21st Century U.S. will most likely devote a great deal more attention to King of Montgomery, Meredith of Miss, Carmichael of SNCC, and Savio of Cal, than to leaders of the Viet Nam war. In fact, Savio may ultimately rank with the very greatest of our democratic leaders. The legends are building up around him, and he is adding significantly to the central myths of democracy. The same is true for the negro leaders. The chief difference, and maybe an important one, between the negro revolt and the student revolt is that the former is in completion of an historic sequence, while the latter is the beginning of a whole new face in our democratic imagery.

No! The real heroes of mid-20th century America are not among the General Westmorelands and Admiral What's-his-faces and their men, but among the Mario Savios and Stokely Carmichaels. All the manipulative administrators, federal, state, and local, governmental or academic be damned.

Elegie on the Atomik Deth of All the Professors in the United Status Quo

They ar ded now, past away
Safe from nuklear fission
Saf from the human condition
Saf from unclear vision
Safe from eny attrition
In a permanent position.

They wer men ov talent
Powerful with the pen
Too bad the ink ran dry
and ther buks burned,
when

They will be remembered:
We kood never forget
The understanding silence
Which all our questions met

Remember them with this epitaph
Az the Lights inherit the erth
'For them, the printing press
Was the principal agent of birth'.

--Anon

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 virgins. You wouldn't want one if you had one.

Mr. 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 is 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 cuss like us big shots? Why you femmes even butt into our politics and now and then you even have an idea! That's not bad enough, but you babes get awfully "pushy", 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 wail the disappearance of the thing who had her sex and babies with the lights out. You bet she had a "distant quality". She was untouchable! Don't mourn her "sad passing". Kiss her goodbye. Don't you realize that Victorian man "de-emphasized consummation of love" because he considered it "lust", "lower nature" and "dirt"? These people you praise were so frustrated they started the pornography 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, for anybody whose heart thumps 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 woman (singular) has no charm. Which woman? 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 sadly premature. It is the two-headed grandmother who needs to be laid to rest. The real woman is very much alive.

--Helen McKenna

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 Ramus

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