

Winter, 1969

On January 14th, the issues were suddenly brought back into public consciousness when about 50 students, mostly S.D.S.^{members}, broke up a Board of Trustees meeting at the Faculty Club. S.D.S. had demanded that ~~the~~ three trustees, Rodger Lewis (President of General Dynamics Corporation), William Hewlett (President of Hewlett-Packard Corporation), and Tom Jones (President of Northrop Corporation) either resign from the Board or from their positions in defense related industries. They also demanded: 1) that S.R.I. cease all C.B.W. research; 2) that all faculty who were members of D.O.D. boards resign from them; 3) that the S.R.I. counterinsurgency office in Thailand be closed; and 4) that the development of "people sniffers" at S.R.I. be stopped.

S.D.S. tried to force open the trustees' meeting to discuss the demands. The trustees refused to let the demonstrators in, but one of them entered the Faculty Club through the back and let the others in. They forced themselves past Administrators and demanded that the Trustees open the meeting. There was some shoving and name calling and finally the Trustees left.³³

The Daily's editorial on January 15th asked the University Community to overlook S.D.S.'s tactics and think about the real issues behind them:

S.D.S. maintains that the United States' political involvement in Southeast Asia is immoral...they believe that Stanford Trustees and powerful men of their ilk are responsible for this involvement, for the war...and for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of human beings.

S.D.S. is right.

The radical students wanted to talk to the Trustees yesterday...not surprisingly, the captains of industry refused to hear them.

...the liberals know as well as everyone else that the Trustees will probably never listen, and if they do, it will just be a way of sapping their opposition.

...It is not constructive to carp at the style of the activists.

...And despite any shortcomings, ^{in tactics} they are the only ones who are putting themselves on the line to oppose evils that many others quietly accept.

We ask for the University Community to ~~to~~ share the frustrations of S.D.S. rather than taking their frustrations out against it.³⁴

*Was done
what you mean
12. wait
"accept"
"understand"
"tolerate?"*

But the University community had not yet reached the point where it could overlook S.D.S.'s tactics. The Daily was accused by many of "whitewashing"³⁵ the entire episode, not only in its editorial, but in its news coverage, and S.D.S. was accused of using "Nazi like tactics".³⁶ The majority of the student body thought that the S.D.S. had gone too far, that they should have shown respect for the trustees, and that their "violent" tactics were inexcusable. L.A.S.S.U. condemned the tactics, objecting both "philosophically and tactically..."³⁷

S.D.S. used the uproar created by the disruption as a means to educate the community. On January 20th, they held a teach-in about the demands, explaining the class interests of the Trustees, and claiming that the Trustees used the University to serve their class interests. Harry Cleaver, one of the students in Weissman's summer research group, and also a member of the President's Committee on S.R.I., spoke about the war research at S.R.I.³⁸ Students showed an increased interest in the demands and the teach-in, largely as a result of the disruption.

*Do you
accept
this?
at
least of
lying the
facts of
the
disruption!*

A defence of the disruption, written by Cary Dictor of S.D.S., claims that "...since we strive to eliminate wars, killing, violence, exploitation, and oppression, as long as our methods contain less of these things than [that] which we want to do away with, they are preferable and justifiable. So if 200 Vietnamese are destroyed by the United States Government in a day, we have a veritable Carte Blanch to brutalize and destroy anything of less value than 200 lives during that day..."³⁹ A letter written to The Daily by Georgia Kelly of S.D.S. states that, "The American Government and Corporations can more appropriately be compared to Nazis."⁴⁰

Subsequent events played into the hands of the radicals. In January a panel discussion about the recent S.E.S. proposals was held. S.D.S. used the opportunity for a teach-in on imperialism, and Stanford's involvement in the war.

On January 27th, The Daily announced that S.R.I. had accepted a new top secret, counter-insurgency contract with Thailand in December despite Hayes' request. S.R.I. Vice President Brunsvold defended the contract saying, "This is an extension of our work-- not a new contract. We don't know what they do with our results, at least not here. Those that feel about our work should take their complaints to the Department of Defense."⁴¹

On Wednesday January 29th, S.D.S. held a rally in the Old Union courtyard, to which they invited President Pitzer to explain why he had not met their demands, and invited Prof. William Rambo, the director of A.E.L., S.R.I. V.P. Brunsvold, and Trustee William Hewlett to answer questions. Only Rambo accepted the invitation. Pitzer made a statement to S.D.S. saying that "it is... unacceptable to me to consider, as the S.D.S. has proposed, that we interfere with individual freedom of choice of trustees or faculty."⁴²

The S.D.S. rally was disrupted by militant Young Republicans and Young Americans for Freedom, led by Harvey Hukari. The right-wing protestors carried signs denouncing S.D.S.'s "facist" [sic] tactics, and continuously shouted down S.D.S. speakers. At the rally, Hukari declared that S.D.S. did not speak for the majority of the students. Fred Cohen of S.D.S. replied, "Of course S.D.S. doesn't speak for the majority of Stanford Students. Why should the majority of Stanford Students decide for the Vietnamese people? The Vietnamese people have the right to make their own decisions."⁴³

After the rally, S.D.S. held a mill-in at A.E.L. to disrupt the research there. The conservatives blocked the doorways, not letting the S.D.S. members through, but about 50 of them managed to get in a back door. After the mill-in, S.D.S. moved to the S.R.I. facilities on Hanover Street in Palo Alto, but were unable to get past the locked doors and security guards.

The militant action of the right wing caused a student backlash. After

having denounced S.D.S. tactics for so long, the Y.R.'s and the Y.A.F. members were considered hypocrites for using similar tactics. The student body was generally disgusted with both sides, but was probably more sympathetic to S.D.S. who at least had a coherent analysis.

On February 11th, the Judicial Council commenced the hearings concerning the disruption of the January Trustees meeting, and found 29 students in violation of Glaser's policy on campus disruptions. The second half of the hearings ⁵ ~~were~~ devoted to the motivation behind the disruption, and the defendants used this session as a teach-in. They divided their defense into five parts: 1) Wealth and Power: the existence of a ruling class with control over the University; 2) the University and Local Affairs; 3) the University as a Channeling Institute in Society, stressing its connections with industries; 4) Stanford in Southeast Asia; S.R.I. and A.E.I.; and 5) Confrontation and the Fundamental Standard. ⁴⁴

At the hearing on Friday, February 4th, the students blamed the trustees for the confrontation, saying that it was their failure to listen to the student demands that produced the disruption. James Johnson, (S.D.S.) a defendant, stated that, "The people who should be on trial are those God-damned mother-fucking Trustees...they're the criminals." James Schoch, (S.D.S.) another defendant, declared, "The differences between us and the Trustees are not ones of communication, but definate political, ideological, and non-negotiable differences...We've been charged by the Trustees that we threatened violence, yet they're making decisions that further the violence of the Vietnam War. If we had played by their rules, we would have napalmed them." ⁴⁵

50 Alan Cristelow, a defendant and a member of S.D.S., said, "Violence results from the insistence of the dominant powers that the heirarchical distance between them and us is going to be maintained...when confrontation is suppressed,

then it becomes violent." ⁴⁶

Doron Weinberg, the informal defense counselor, gave the final and most powerful speech:

The law is supposed to judge both students and Trustees impartially...but that's not true. The law is no more a value free than anything else in this society and the law is, in fact, a tool of the Trustees...The fact that you, (the council), have to uphold the law as it exists means that...you have already put yourselves on the side of the Trustees and against the students... If that's the law, then yes, ~~we~~ broke it, but join ⁴⁷ us, break it with us, because that's where justice is.

The defendants were found guilty of violating the disruption policy. Twenty-six of them were fined fifty dollars each, and ^{given} suspended suspensions and one year probation. Stephen Smith was fined \$300 for breaking into the meeting and letting the others in, and for taking a copy of the agenda for the meeting; Fred Cohen was fined \$200 for threatening a University official and several trustees; and Jim Johnson was fined \$100 for kicking and beating on the doors and windows of the trustees' room with his heavy boots and a stick. The fines were to be paid to the Martin Luther King Fund to aid Stanford's minority group program.

The Council stated in its report that "...the University administration and the Board of Trustees failed to make clear to the defendants what proper channels, if any, existed for communication between students on one hand and the administration and the Board on the other," and that this failure "was a contributing factor of the disruption."⁴⁸

S.D.S. had alienated what little support it had through its disruption of the trustees' meeting and its "disrespectful" attitude during the first S.J.C. hearing. Normally, liberal support contributed little to the radical movement, but at this point, any action taken by S.D.S. alone would have been almost completely hopeless. With most of its leaders on probation, any action could

result in their immediate suspension. In an editorial, The Daily said that S.D.S. had to get liberal support and find better tactics.⁴⁹ S.D.S. responded to the situation by doing so.

On March 4th, an article in The Daily announced a new "S.R.I. Coalition," composed of both liberals and radicals, who urged that S.R.I. be brought under tighter controls by the University, and that S.R.I. end CBW and counter-insurgency research. A petition expressing this position was circulated, and signed by Yale Braunstein(LASSU), Robert McAfee Brown(Prof. of religion), David W. Jones (chairman of the Committee for New Democratic Politics), Philip Taubman(editor of The Daily), and twenty others.⁵⁰

On March 5th the S.J.C. defendants announced that "In light of the SJC's failure to examine corporate violence by the trustees, we have decided not to pay to the University the punitive \$1900 fine..." and that they would raise as much money as possible and give it to the Black Panther party. They also wrote a letter to the trustees, inviting them to an open meeting on campus the following Tuesday, when the trustees had a scheduled on-campus meeting. The letter was also signed by Yale Braunstein and Vic von Schlegall, ASSU Vice President. President Pitzer asked the student members of the new University Advisory Committee (Michael Sweeney, Patrick Shea, Roulette Smith, Al Spector, and Denis Hayes) to consider the problem. The students changed the invitation from an open meeting to an open forum on Tuesday, March 11th.⁵¹

The trustees accepted the proposal, which proved to be a fatal mistake.

They sent as representatives Mrs. Allan Charles, Charles Ducommun (a director of Lockheed Aircraft Corp.), ^{Judge} Benjamin Duniway, ^{wife of an attorney} W.P. Fuller, III, and William Hewlett (President of Hewlett-Packard Corp., a director of FMC Corp., and a director of the Chrysler Corp.). The students were represented on the panel by Jeanne Friedman(S.D.S.), Bill Klinge(S.D.S.), David Pugh(S.D.S.), Mike Kuhl(YR's), Pat Shea(University Advisory Committee, and presently ASSU President), Michael Weinstein(LASSU), and Paul Rupert(Resistance). Doron Weinberg was the

no one did - but some illusions did
serious mistake
Your metaphor could be better

identical
now
clearly

moderator.

Paul Rupert opened with a statement condemning the trustees' use of power to further their own interests, and finished his speech by asking Ducommun, "will you lay down your weapons?"

Ducommun said no. The meeting continued with various accusations against the trustees. A speaker from the floor asked Hewlett if FMC was making lethal nerve gas, and Hewlett said no. Then Rupert interrupted and quoted two sources stating the opposite. Hewlett replied, "...I happened to check with the president of FMC, whom I consider superior to your sources, and he says that they are not making nerve gas at the present time." *How marvelous you should have this.*

The speaker from the floor asked, "Have they ever made nerve gas?"

Hewlett answered, "The answer is yes. They were asked by the government to build a plant, which they built and operated at the request of the government and they turned that plant over to the government about six months ago."⁵²

As the meeting went on, the trustees began to lose their power over the students. The meeting proved to be the turning point in the anti-imperialist movement at Stanford. As Paul Rupert writes in the Peninsula Observer:

The successful meeting was a decisive point in the long struggle against the trustees and their political and military involvements. It grew out of the research of the early Vietnam years, a time that saw the campus plastered with posters accusing the trustees of war crimes. The meeting was also possible because of dorm discussions and newspaper articles, numerous demands, and the SDS 'opening' of January 14... The meeting saw a steady erosion of their [the trustees'] position, a transfer of the crowd's identification from them to us. It may have been the beginning of the transfer of some of their power as well.

I wonder?

The helpful too have gone on subtly for quite awhile - One can question its direction or force of it.

The open forum of March 11th began a shaky liberal-radical coalition, that lasted through the A.E.L. sit-in. The alliance was necessary to both groups-- the liberals lacked leadership, a coherent ideology, and effective tactics, while the radicals lacked the ^{means - most support} ~~power~~ to accomplish any of their goals. The coalition gave to both groups what they needed. It was cemented not by a sudden change in liberal ideology, but rather by a feeling of complete frustration on their part caused by the lack of positive response from the trustees. The liberals did not lose their faith in the future of American society, they only lost their faith in a small group of men who, according to the radicals, rule American society. But the liberals did wake up to the fact that there is more than a communication gap between themselves and the trustees, that there is at least a contradictory world-view if not a genuine conflict of interests.

For the radicals, the meeting was the most effective educational tool that had ever fallen into their hands. It brought them into contact with the student body, something they had been hopelessly trying for all year. It meant that they had to tone down their tactics and rhetoric for a while, but it also meant that they were no longer working in a ^{political} vacuum. Their "cries" about the ruling class finally hit home: the power of the trustees had come into conflict with the "will" of the students for the first time. S.D.S. had avoided the student power issue carefully, believing that the student body was not sufficiently politically educated to use power properly, but the trustees forum gave the liberals both the education and the sense of conflict and power that S.D.S. had failed to give them during the year.

The demands of the April 3rd Movement were a reflection of this change. CBW research was the main issue now, and no longer imperialism. A liberal-moral issue had replaced the radical-political issue that S.D.S. had been trying to organize around. Although the Movement failed to achieve its goals, the

best - large #s of the "will of students" is from heads of the students.

This
needs
more
analysis

?
be careful
not you
the tone
don't
confuse
the
analysis!

and
like
national
and
coral
ground!

demands showed S.D.S. what type of issue would arouse the liberals. The liberals, incensed by their moral goals and the perceived immorality of the trustees, were finally willing to challenge the trustees' right to make decisions for them: the actual issue beneath the demands was a struggle for power. To succeed next year S.D.S. will have to organize around this issue; the legitimacy of the trustees, and their right to rule in an undemocratic fashion. The ^{behavior was} trustees ~~were~~ the catalyst that brought the liberals and radicals together for a short time during April, and if S.D.S. operates effectively, they can use the trustees as a focal point for next year's movement, and again form a coalition with the liberals. (By the way, my position has changed from the opportunism suggested here)

D.H.

Doug,

It's a good paper - and you've kept a sense of analysis in sight - First - watch your paragraphing - it's too jagged at times and hampers the flow of narrative Second - be ^{consciously} more critical of your sources - see my remark on p. 4 for examples

The definition of radical & liberal - whose footnote I've left out should be in the body of the paper. It would help!

You keep ~~the~~ ^{the} attention of the reader on Stanford - that is proper but I think the movement reflects the frustration felt from within outside - in DC, Ucla, Harv, St. John & Berkeley

Notes

1. The Coalition demanded closer ties between the University and S.R.I., with guidelines to ensure "socially acceptable research" at S.R.I. and Stanford. There were further demands for cessation of all classified research, all chemical and biological warfare research, all counter-insurgency research, and all research in support of the war in Vietnam Laos and Thailand. The final demand was for an open meeting of the Board of Trustees during the week of April 21st. The trustees responded with only a moratorium on new CBW contracts, and a promise of closed hearings with selected witnesses. (Cleaver-Bauer Minority Report of the President's S.R.I. committee, "SRI Supplement," Stanford Daily, April 5, 1969, p.13.)

2. Stanford Daily, April 21, 1969, p.1.

3. An unsigned, untitled leaflet, apparently published by the April 3rd Movement. *But how reliable with no notion of its source?*

4. Stanford Daily, Oct. 11, 1968, p.1.

5. The distinction between liberals and radicals can be made in terms of party membership and ideology (including both objectives and tactics).

The majority of the radicals associate with either S.D.S. or the Resistance.

Their goals include democratic, decentralized socialism (S.D.S.) and an end to the draft and the war in Vietnam (S.D.S. and the Resistance). They generally do not consider illegality a sufficient reason for refraining from using potentially effective tactics, since they regard the legal system as a tool of the ruling class used for political suppression.

The liberals are less organized, with some of them belonging to reform groups such as the Committee for New Democratic Politics. Many of their goals are outwardly similar to those of the radicals: they want

where
is this
to be the
text

This
document
has 2
pages
the
body of
the MSS!

This
part
is not
up order!

to end the war and stop CBW, but their motivation is usually more humanitarian than political. They reject the radical analysis of imperialism, and see the war in Vietnam as an isolated exception rather than the logical outcome of corporate capitalism. They reject the radicals' tactics because they are "violent" and illegal, and believe that disagreements should be resolved through increased communication("rational dialogue") rather than by force and confrontation.

The distinctions between the two groups became unclear at A.E.L. because the liberals were using what appeared to be radical tactics. However, many of the liberals participating in the sit-in viewed it as a symbolic demonstration and not coercion, and their general ideology remained the same. Few of them joined S.D.S. even after the sit-in.

6: Peninsula Observer, Through March 3, 1969, pp.9,12.

7. Cleaver-Bauer Report, p.12.

8. Letter from the steering committee of S.C.P.V., May, 1966.

9. Stanford Daily, May1, 1967.

> 10. Leonard Siegel, interview, May, 1969. *How does he prove this?*

11. The response from S.R.I. to the growing student dissatisfaction appears to be purposefully deceitful. Homer Meaders, the public relations man at S.R.I., stated that "No chemical or biological warfare weapons are being developed here at S.R.I."(Stanford Daily, April 14, 1967.) Although his statement was probably technically true, a statement from S.R.I. to the S.R.I. Committee set up by Acting President Glaser in October, 1968, clarifies the situation: "The Institute has conducted and is conducting research for agencies of the Government which have a preparedness mission in the field of chemical and biological warfare."(S.R.I. Committee Majority Report, "SRI Supplement," Stanford Daily, April 5, 1969, p.2.

12. Midpeninsula Observer, Aug. 8-22, 1967; Feb. 19-March 4, 1968; and April 8-22, 1968. (The name of the paper was later changed to the Peninsula

Observer.)

13. Stanford Daily, Sept. 23, 1968, pp.1,4.
14. Ibid., Sept. 24, 1968, p.1.
15. Ibid., Oct. 7, 1968, p.1.
16. Ibid., Oct. 9, 1968, p.1.
17. Ibid., Oct. 11, 1968, p.1.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid., Oct. 14, 1968, p.1.
21. Ibid., Oct. 16, 1968, p.1.
22. Ibid., Oct. 15, 1968, p.1.
23. Ibid., Oct. 18, 1968, p.1.
24. Ibid., Oct. 21, 1968, p.3.
25. S.R.I. and A.E.L. employees continually make a distinction between "basic" and "applied" research, even if both are being funded by the D.O.D. and will eventually be used in the same weapon. S.D.S. rejects this distinction, and this example illustrates the reason why. (see above, p.10.)
26. Stanford Daily, Oct. 22, 1968, p.1.
27. Ibid., Oct. 17, 1968, p.6.
28. Ibid.
29. The Goods on AEL, April 3rd Movement, Stanford, Calif., April, 1969.
30. Stanford Daily, Nov. 6, 1968, p.2.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid., Nov. 26, 1968, p.1.
33. Ibid., Jan. 15, 1969, p.1.
34. Ibid., p.2.
35. Ibid., Jan. 22, 1969, p.3.
36. Ibid., Jan. 17, 1969, p.4.

37. Ibid., p.1.
38. Ibid., Jan. 21, 1969, p.1.
39. Ibid., p.2.
40. Ibid..
41. Ibid., Jan. 27, 1969, p.1.
42. Ibid., Jan. 29, 1969, p.1.
43. Ibid., Jan. 30, 1969, p.1.
44. Ibid., Feb. 20, 1969, p.1.
45. Ibid., Feb. 24, 1969, p.1.
46. Ibid., Feb. 25, 1969, p.1.
47. Ibid., p.4.
48. Ibid., March 3, 1969, pp.1,5.
49. Ibid., p.2.
50. Ibid., March 4, 1969, p.1.
51. Ibid., March 6, 1969, pp. 1-2
52. Peninsula Observer, Through March 31, 1969, pp.9-10.
53. Ibid., pp.9,12.