

S.D.S./PITZER PROPOSAL

Jeff Blum

S.D.S. has so far been floundering. One main reason for this is lack of student support. There are three principal objections against S.D.S. raised by students in general:

- 1) S.D.S. is unreasonable. It presents demands and sets deadlines that do not allow for rational discussion or for the University to deal with problems in a manner befitting an academic community etc. etc.
- 2) S.D.S. is undemocratic. It does not believe in majority rule, but wishes to impose its will on the majority.
- 3) S.D.S. is too abstract. Its demands are fine if you have an acute identification with oppressed peasants in the third world, but most people don't. The problems are far away and complex; they do not relate to our concerns and desires here at Stanford.

Regardless of what we think about these objections, they provide the core of an ideological justification which assists most students in rejecting S.D.S. and radicalism. Dramatic refutation of these three objections would force many students to reevaluate at least some of their attitudes toward S.D.S., and would therefore enhance our position on campus.

In addition, we may suppose that there is a fourth reason why S.D.S. lacks support:

- 4) S.D.S. is either impotent or not serious. It has not done anything significant to date, therefore it does not merit the support of even those who are sympathetic with its political orientation.

The arrival of Kenneth Pitzer on campus enables us to engage in actions which contradict these four objections.

Proposed Course of Action:

At the beginning of winter quarter we state that we do not accept Pitzer as president; we consider him illegitimate for two main reasons:

- 1) his background and orientation (support with specific examples--RAND, A-bomb, Oppenheimer, own speeches, etc.)
- 2) he was chosen without even token consent from the Stanford Community.

We formulate an additional demand: that before Pitzer is inaugurated as president he must (1) come before the community-

at-large to discuss and respond to questions regarding his background, qualifications, plans for the future, Stanford's involvement in Southeast Asia, military research and other important issues and (2) the large public meetings will be followed by a community referendum on whether to accept or reject Pitzer as president.

The demand must be met by inauguration day. If there is no inauguration, then we can set a deadline around April 1. In either case, they have ample time with which to respond to and implement the demand.

The demand will be rejected.

(If it were accepted, a good precedent would be set even though Pitzer would probably be confirmed.)

The response to the demand's rejection is disruption of the inaugural ceremony and/or a large sit-in.

Advantages:

1) Something will be happening. People will be worried; issues will be discussed. We need specific events to mobilize people. The problem with waiting for Pitzer to make a mistake (judicial error, Napier) is that it probably will not happen and even if it did, it would be unlikely that we could tie in demands with significant political content.

2) Our important political demands about military research and Southeast Asia will be tied in with a local campus issue that anyone can understand and will therefore be given wider exposure and more concern.

3) We will be acting reasonably, giving them several months in which to discuss openly and rationally. We will be acting democratically. To reject the demand the University must take a position contrary to what most students believe in. Any significant area of agreement between S.D.S. and the student body helps encourage discussion, lessen antagonisms, and prepare the student body to receive future organizing.

We must begin to engage in actions to broaden the base of support while not losing sight of the important political questions. The current atmosphere of frustrated inactivity discourages even routine organizing work. We must do something.

The purpose of this paper is to encourage S.D.S. members to think about long-range, concrete, practical, alternatives (as opposed to saying "we're building a movement, heading toward a big strike sometime.") This paper presents one plan of action. Others

Blum-p.3

should present alternatives, and discussion should center around the different long-range, concrete proposals. If we never think more than seven days ahead, then our lack of results will reveal the fact. Time is neutral and nothing will happen unless we make it happen.