

Erosion Of Smooth Society

By Fred Cohen

I see a garden blooming
undisturbed
where are the buds are even in
their rows
in an ordered garden, sweet with
unity
that is my dream; my Smooth
society."

MACBIRD, ACT II, SCENE 2

Following the April 3rd
Movement's evacuation of AEL,
uncertainty began to develop
within the movement and in
the broader Stanford community.
For some reason our "polite"
sit-in had failed to prick the
conscience of the Trustees. Most
people were not sure why we had
failed or what we should do next.
Last Wednesday this uncertainty
manifested itself in a tension filled
meeting which later decided to
evacuate Encina. Doubts about our
actions escalated as the glass doors
shattered.

At that point everyone knew
that the gentility of the AEL
occupation would not be repeated
and that the character of the
Movement would never be the
same. But we were not the only
ones to change; Thursday morning
Leonard Schiff didn't have to
plead with us to leave. One
hundred and fifty riot police
made his presence gratuitous. The
administration's new position
extended far beyond the lines of
our new legal aids. This became
apparent when we received neatly
typed injunctions compliments of
McCutchen, Doyle, Brown and
Enersen.

These developments bring out
new aspects of the struggle to
control research and they force
everyone to take a long second
look at the situation. Our
escalation and the
administration's response can only
be understood in light of the
position of the Trustees. The
failure of our moral outrage to
move them stems from the central
conflict between the demands of
the movement and the interests of
the Trustees. This schism goes
much deeper than Arthur
Stewart's desire for military
protection of Union Oil's
investments in Peru and Thailand.
It is a conflict of opposing
ideologies and value systems.
Their positions have been shaped
by occupying seats at the acme of
the corporate hierarchy and eating
too many meals at exclusive clubs.
All of them, liberals and
conservatives, firmly believe in the
national security state and the
global hegemony of the American
multinational corporations.

Thus Bill Hewlett can say that
he feels providing hardware for
the U.S. in Vietnam is "hardly
political." He may question the
expediency of the war, but his
ideology can never question the
foundations of American foreign
policy. While we call for open
meetings, they prefer the comfort
of a locked conference room.

Thus John Gardner feels that
an open meeting is a "silly idea."
The thrust of our demands attacks
the political ideology of the
Trustees and our belief in open
decisions confronts their own
elitist decision making process. As
many people learned last August
in Chicago, such splits are rarely
healed by a display of moral
outrage.

Packard's Statements

David Packard's statements in
the Saturday Chronicle helps to
focus these broader conflicts on
the issue of SRI. When asked if
SRI would be brought under
tighter control Packard replied:
"It won't be. It would be
disastrous if it were."

He is right, but the question is
disastrous for whom. Dave means
the Trustees and the defense
department. Students seem to be
thinking of different people when
they made their decision
concerning SRI. Leaders in the
corporate world are not as slow to
see this conflict of interests as
many of us. The May 3rd issue of
Business Week states that
"...from Harvard to Stanford,
He (the businessman), his
business, and even his principles
are coming under fire."

The whole section on campus
protest centers on the antagonistic
relationship between student
demands and the interests of the
business community. Featured is a
statement by Stanford Trustee
Gardiner Symonds which notes "a
growing impatience" among his
colleagues toward the
administration's inability to come
to grips with the problems. Surely
Gardy felt that the 150 cops was a
fine use of domestic
counter-insurgency. However, he
must have felt even better about
the injunctions being handled by

his fellow board members Doyle
and Brown.

Insurgent Move

Most people in the April 3rd
Movement saw themselves as part
of a counter-counterinsurgency
movement. The recent actions of
the University make it clear that
in fighting against
counterinsurgency we have
become an insurgent movement.
This is due to the challenge we
present to the Bay Area branch of
the American ruling class. These
men, from John Gardner to Dean
Watkins, perceive us as a threat
and are willing to fight to protect
their interests.

If we are going to stop the
research we must come to grips
with both the ideological conflict
and the Trustee's willingness to
defend their interests. Only if we
are aware of these factors can we
begin to think of how to win our
demands.

(Fred Cohen is a junior
philosophy and a member of
SDS-Ed.)