

## HOOVER TOWER IS A PAPER PENIS

If the AZM decides that additional militant action is needed to obtain its demands, we want to suggest that the Hoover Institution be a focus of such action.

No mere library, the Hoover Institution makes no bones about its view of the world. In the late 1950's, Herbert Hoover solicited funds for the Institution by circulating a document one containing the following paragraph:

"The purpose of this Institution must be, by its research and publications, to demonstrate the evils of the doctrines of Karl Marx---whether communism, socialism, economic materialism, or atheism---thus to protect the American way of life from such ideologies, their conspiracies, and to reaffirm the validity of the American system."

Ever sensitive to the uses of the university, the Stanford Board of Trustees under David Packard's chairmanship incorporated Hoover's document into a resolution governing the Institution. Subsequent protests by faculty members embarrassed the Trustees into stating that Hoover's statement represented only his personal opinion, not Institution policy.

But, for all practical purposes, this 'personal opinion' is Institution policy because it is also the avowed personal opinion of Glenn Campbell, whom Hoover chose to head the Institution in 1960. Campbell makes spending decisions, chooses librarians and selects research fellows; he "runs the Institution with a strong hand" (Wall Street Journal, 6/2/67. see the Daily, 10/9-10/12/67 and 3/29/68 for additional documentation). The resolution governing Hoover guarantees that faculty committees will have no influence on what goes on there.

Campbell and his hand-chosen staff set the tone for the Institution. Anti-communism is their profession and they hope that it will continue, more than ever before, to be the American way of life. When they aren't studying, writing, conferencing, or worrying about communism, they are engaged in the nitty-gritty of the fight against it. For example: Alan Belmont, before joining Hoover as Campbell's executive assistant, spent 29 years with the FBI, the last 5 as chief of investigation. In 1964, Campbell co-ordinated Goldwater's braintrusters while Stefan Passony, head of Hoover's International Political Studies Program, was a major foreign policy advisor. Passony, who was an advisor to the intelligence staff of the U.S. air force, has received an award for exceptional civil service. His strategic analyses always lead to the conclusion that the U.S. needs more weapons. Richard V. Allen (until his recent White House appointment, a senior staff member) has co-authored high school textbooks expressing the evils of communism. He also authored a book for the Bar Association's Standing Committee on Education Against Communism dealing with the international communist threat. Another Hoover staffer, Bertram Wolfe, wrote the forward to this book. The Institution has helped to produce a 13 week television series on the "Red Myth" which Associate Director Swerakewsky hosted. According to the Wall Street Journal, links between Hoover and the CIA are "undisputed" (WSJ, 6/2/67) but they are difficult to pin down. While serving as curator of Hoover's East Asian Institute and lecturer in the poli sci dept., Dennis Paelin, a liberal by Hoover standards, was a paid consultant for the CIA whose staff he subsequently joined.

### Who Supports Hoover Institution?

Reliable and complete information has not yet been made public. Our favorite ex-Trustee, David Packard, was on the Institution's 61 man Advisory Board, and Chairman of the Stanford Trustee's special committee on Hoover. Along with Trustee Thomas Pike he headed a recent drive to increase the Institution's endowment by 50,000,000. Other present Trustees who have served on Hoover's Advisory Board include Fuller, Doyle, Symmonds, and Guggenheime. With the exception of Guggenheim all of them as well as Packard have also served on SRI's Board. Packard chaired the Stanford Trustee's meeting on Hoover and SRI simultaneously. At least five men not on the Stanford Board of Trustees have also served on both Hoover's Advisory Commission and the SRI Board. They are Wallace Sterling, John McCone (ex-CIA head), Robert Swain of American Cyanamid, Dudley Swim of Del Monte fruits and a recent Reagan appointee to the State College Board, and Paul Davies of Lehman Brothers Investment House. Two years ago Hoover Institution expanded its Advisory Board in order to increase financial support. Among the corporate heavies who joined the Board were the presidents of Lockheed, Signal Oil, and the Chairman of the board of Standard Oil of Indiana.

Up-front about its anti-communism, Hoover is uptight about who finances it. The available information is fragmentary. The Mellon family, one of the country's richest, has kicked in \$750,000 to help build the Institute a new

building. The Wall Street Journal reports contributions from Standard Oil of California, Gulf Oil, Monsanto, and Allen-Bradley, and quotes a spokesman of the last company: "One of our basic policies is to support anti-Communist and conservative organizations. The Institution falls right in with this policy."

### Why Does the Ruling Class Need Hoover Institution?

First, professional anti-communism creates lots of pressure for government handouts to corporations in the form of defense spending. People like Passony, always clamoring for more, more, more weapons, help. Along with Curtis LeMay and Thomas Power (ex-SAC commanders) Passony in 1967 co-authored a report that argued for the ABM.

Second, the ruling class understands that communism is the chief and ultimate threat to its wealth and power. Right now that threat is strongest in the Third World. The U.S. ruling class increasingly depends on the Third World for raw materials and markets--i.e., profits. For the ruling class, the "Free World" is that portion of the globe open to U.S. investment. Many "Free World" countries in Africa and Latin America have had nationalist revolutions. They remain undeveloped because their economies are controlled by outside investment to fit in with the needs of the world capitalist system. Only when nationalist revolutions become communist and insist on controlling their own resources are the necessary preconditions for economic development created, as the experience of China, Cuba, and North Vietnam shows. But the wars and counterinsurgency programs necessary to keep the Third World open to U.S. investment can't be sold to the American public for the sake of profit alone. Professional anti-communism helps the ruling class by arguing that communism cannot serve the needs of the people and is spread by power-crazed or just plain crazy outside agitators. Thus, communism must be fought for moral reasons.

Third, the anti-communist ideology helps the ruling class to preserve its power at home by convincing the people that their interests and needs are the same as those of the ruling class. How could the public tolerate the grotesque defense budget, the gap between the enormous potential for liberation created by technology and the reality of poisoned air, inadequate medical care, bad housing, and brutalized work if they didn't believe that it was necessary to use our resources to contain the communist threat?

Obviously not every member of the ruling class always and everywhere agrees with the professional anti-communists on means of fighting communism. For example, professional anti-communists emphasize military force, security alliances, and eternal vigilance in dealing with Soviet communism--they articulate the right-wing position. But many of the same corporations (Hewlett-Packard, Tenneco, Del Monte, IBM) and some of the same men (most notably Dudley Swin) who are represented on Hoover's board are now exploring the East European and Russian markets through SRI International--acting on the left-wing assumption that you can fight Soviet communism by bribing it. A corporation like Hewlett-Packard can help itself by supporting both sides of the force-versus-bribes debate. By doing so it defines the boundaries of discussion. The question of whether communism should be fought at all doesn't come up.

### What's this got to do with A3M?

Hoover's anti-communism supports CBW, counterinsurgency and classified and Vietnam war related research by providing the ideological justification for them. Focusing on the Hoover Institution, a world-wide symbol of anti-communism, focuses both the A3M and the community on the nature of a system that creates and nurtures such research. In the long run, such an education focus is one of the most severe ways of pressuring the trustees.

In the short run, taking Hoover Tower would pressure the Trustees just as the AEL sit-in did. We are attacking an accessible part of the system run by the Trustees and their friends that oppresses people here and in the Third World. AEL was part of the technological arm of that system; Hoover is part of the ideological arm. To stop counterinsurgency we have to fight on both fronts.

Steve Smith

WASH OUT THE BRAINWASHERS!

aspiring communist

LONG LIVE THE MEMORY OF AL SMITH!

STAND UP FOR AMERICA!!!