

DECLASSIFIED

BY THE AUTHORITY OF THE PEOPLE

Volume 1, Number 11

April 24, 1969, BEHOLD: A Thursday



"As to research in support of national security, we feel that we have a nationwide morals committee of voters who elect representatives to decide what is and what is not needed for the common good." --

Charles A. Anderson/President, Stanford Research Institute / April 22, 1969



Today's Trustee:

Eleventh in a Series

William Lister Rogers, M.D.

We haven't been able to find much on Dr. Rogers—except that he's a rich doctor who lives in San Francisco.

If anybody knows anything more about William Lister Rogers, will you please stop by the DECLASSIFIED office (Old Union Clubhouse—third floor)? Or else call us at: Stanford (321-2300) extension 3114? We don't even care if it's good news!

A POLL IS BORN

Wednesday morning DECLASSIFIED talked with Prof. Nathan Maccoby, head of the 4-man committee which drew up the referendum questionnaire. Other members of that committee were G. Ray Funkhouser, research assistant for the Institute of Communication Research; John Meyer, assistant professor of sociology; and Mark Edwards, history graduate student.

Maccoby told us that after his committee drafted the questionnaire, a "supervisory" committee, under the leadership of sociology professor Sanford Dornbusch, took the questionnaire to different constituencies to see that all points were covered.

DECLASSIFIED wanted to know which staff members were selected to participate in the poll, but Prof. Maccoby had no specific information about the staff poll. "My charge from President Pitzer," he said, "was to poll the students and faculty." He also said, "There may be a separate polling of senior staff members," and he had heard something about it Tuesday. A senior staff member, according to Maccoby, is any employee who is eligible to build a house at Stanford. (Does this not include Kenneth Pitzer, et. al?)

The different colored ballots (white for students, green for faculty) were used for the purposes of tabulation—in other words, separate tallies. The responses will be transferred from the ballots to IBM cards which will be computer-counted. The IBM cards for the faculty even have a green stripe to further insure the separation of responses. The results of the poll, furthermore, will be presented separately.

Sell? Sell!

3

Phoney Poll!

This week students, faculty, and selected staff received a referendum ballot which poses questions concerning the future of the Stanford Research Institute. Although we in the April Third Movement expect widespread support for our positions, and we ourselves are participating in the referendum, we do not accept the legitimacy of the poll. The questionnaire does not represent the views of all those affected by the Trustee's eventual decision, nor does it adequately phrase the questions to which the community must address itself.

In making our decisions we can not forget that we at Stanford are an elite. Most of us come from upper-middle class backgrounds and the others of us are here because of our potential for assimilation into the upper strata of American society. It is this society which is an upper class in the world. It follows, then, that we Stanford people stand to lose--materially, not spiritually--from a redirection of U.S. foreign policy. There are many of us who have transcended this world materialism and who feel that it is obscene for us to decide whether or not we should continue to oppress people in the Third World. Even if a majority of our community favored bombing North Vietnam--as it once did--then our concerns would necessarily respond to the needs and desires of those directly affected--the Vietnamese--and we would act, even as a minority at Stanford. A referendum is not an action.

In terms of this radical world-view, the question of the legitimacy of a poll at Stanford is absurd. But even if we were to assume some legitimacy for this poll, the questionnaire itself creates disturbing problems, the worst of which is that the alternatives are inaccurately presented. For instance, the poll uses the word "integration," suggesting incorporating SRI into the Stanford departmental structure, which we have not advocated. Our proposal of closer interaction with the research institute is not included. In asking our supporters to vote for the "integration" suggestion, we feel that some, in confusion, will underemphasize the importance of control.

Another part of the questionnaire which we ask voters to support is the proposal to sell SRI with enforceable restrictions. As worded, many of us in the April Third Movement might support such an alternative. However, we feel that the application of this proposal is impossible. And even if an enforceable restrictive covenant could be written, there would be no one willing to buy SRI under such considerations. We contend that this alternative, then, is really no alternative at all.

Another of the questionnaire's problems is its suggestion of a "review board from the University Community". By structuring the review board in this manner, the considerations of SRI researchers would be ignored. We feel that a truly representative community review board must include SRI employees as well as representatives from Third World groups and the non-campus community. Yet, the questionnaire forces us to endorse an ivory tower review structure or none at all.

A final point--one that increases our concern and skepticism--is interpretation. We want to know more about the nature of the count (see side-bar) and we want to know by what formula will all the numbers be manipulated into community concern? Why did only certain staff receive ballots?

Despite our doubts, we have asked everyone who received the questionnaire to complete and return it, for it will indicate the inclinations of the community. Although we expect support, we ask that the results not be binding on us--or on the Vietnamese--if some of our positions are rejected by a majority of those privileged to vote. It is not binding on the Board of Trustees.

.....
 "A man must be willing to make
 decisions on the vital issues which
 confront him in his time, at the
 risk of never having lived."

--Hon. Oliver W. Holmes

Justice Holmes would have given up on the Stanford faculty long ago, but members of the April 3 Movement awaited last Tuesday's meeting of the Faculty Senate with hopes of finding some sign that their professors were indeed alive. We were disappointed. The Senate adjourned without taking any action.

Our Movement's tradition of openness has not yet penetrated the Stanford faculty. Tuesday's meeting, as usual, was closed. Although any member of the larger Academic Council (asst. prof. and "up") is allowed to attend the Senate meetings, there are only six extra seats in the Senate's meeting room in the Biz School. Besides Charles Anderson, president of SRI, the only non-faculty member allowed to sit through the entire

meeting was Robert "Bias" Beyers of the Stanford News Service, who jotted busily all afternoon. (This DECLASSIFIED story comes from the notes of a sympathetic senator.)

The Senate met ostensibly for discussion of the SRI Committee report and the future of Stanford's relationship with SRI. Harry Cleaver and Anne Bauer, authors of the committee's minority report, presented testimony opposing sale of SRI until the good Senators had heard enough and asked them to leave. Prof. Bart Bernstein moved that they be allowed to stay. Senate Chairman Leonard Schiff ruled this out of order--and he had plenty of support from the gallery. Cleaver and Bauer left. This left Provost Richard "Lie-Man" Lyman and Ken

Continued page 5, col. 1

.....
*...and on the 19th day, the faculty
 decreed their concern...*

*and they saw that it was
 good, and they rested...*

During the AEL occupation we treated the faculty as a separate force in our struggle to retain SRI and to eliminate immoral war research from our Community. This perspective was based on the assumption that the faculty is a distinct and powerful element of University policymaking, of great importance to our effort to implement our demands.

By the middle of last week we began to see the fallacy of this approach. While there are faculty members who support the demands, they are caught in a rigid and corrupt structure which is unwilling to back up moral concern with actions which might offend the trustees.

The self-perpetuating Board of Trustees has the power: all of it. The faculty is afraid to assert a challenge to this anachronistic system. This renders them politically irrelevant to our struggle against the trustees. The faculty has capitulated by default.

Faculty members who agree with our objectives belong in our Movement. They must realize that cohesiveness and community have become as much a part of the April 3 Movement as the demands themselves.

of Life

5

...continued from p. 4

Scott, signers of the majority report, to explain the report's subtleties to the Senate.

When it was suggested that the Senate adjourn for dinner and reconvene that evening, history professor Bill Clebsch said "that would upset everybody's social calendar." Lyman, Scott, and Rambo joined in. The suggestion died.

SRI president Charles A. Anderson spoke from a prepared statement. Anderson said that "the overwhelming majority" of SRI employees were "appalled" at the recommendation that "restraints be placed on SRI to make sure it doesn't do anything morally objectionable in seeking to solve the problems facing the government agencies and private industries of the United States."

When Anderson continued by threatening to resign if restrictions were placed on SRI, it became clear that he was talking for the trustees. Here's how he (they) answer the question of applied military research: "As to research in support of national security, we feel that we have a nation-wide morals committee of voters who elect representatives to decide what is and what is not needed for the common good."

The senators did not consider inviting the trustees onto campus for a discussion of the issues surrounding SRI. They were mainly hung up on a "lack of information" about several aspects of the question, especially finances. This gave Anderson plenty of room to fill the air with stories of a restricted SRI which would be a financial disaster and bring the University down with it.

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A resolution introduced by Henry Breitrose of the Communications Department appears to have a chance of being adopted in some form when the Senate discusses SRI next Tuesday. Breitrose was part of a powerful Medical School group headed by Dr. Halstead Holman, the youthful, ruling-class chairman of

the Department of Medicine. Holman was the professor whose resolution focussing on student demands during last spring's Old Union sit-in smashed Wally Sterling out of the Stanford presidency.

Continued page 10, col. 1



Swords Into Plowshares

Many members of the Stanford Community believe that the most recent version of the Guidelines for Research is the final presentation of the April Third Movement's research policy demands. In fact, they are still in tentative form.

The original committee to establish the guidelines for research first convened after the April 3 demands were made. The demands were then reworked into a more readable form, and an explanatory opening paragraph was added. The Guidelines consist of positive suggestions concerning what type of research could and should be done here. A formal review board was proposed and a Community Shadow Review Board has been suggested to review research proposals and to give the Community a say in what research should be encouraged or discouraged.

These original guidelines were distributed at Dinkelspiel during the April 9 meeting, but were passed over in the urgency of the sit-in. As a result, the April Third Community did not approve them until its Thursday meeting at AEL. At this point, the Community as a whole became involved in constructing the guidelines. The guidelines committee is open to anyone wishing to contribute. With the revisions and new ideas that came from the Community, the guidelines committee worked until 6:00 a.m. Friday trying to incorporate new ideas into the guidelines while maintaining readability. William Baxter and Hugh Hefner, members of the Baxter Committee on Research Policy also talked with the guidelines committee. The revised guidelines were subsequently approved Friday during the regular meeting at AEL with the provision that the guidelines were not yet in final form.

At the Sunday meeting, Steve Weissman and Harry Cleaver joined the guidelines committee, and another revision resulted. A new introduction was written, but the demands and the formal review board were left unchanged. The Community review board was reshaped; departmental caucuses were proposed, with a representative of each participating on the Board.

From this idea of departmental caucuses, a new Research and Guidelines Committee was formed. The purpose of this committee is to make the guidelines, still in the draft stage, into a more viable form.

This committee wants new ideas, researchers, and members. The task is fundamental to our Movement--redirection of war research into peaceful purposes. Those who would like to participate should get in touch with Judy Strasser at the April Third offices on the third floor of the Clubhouse. A meeting for those interested will be announced in the near future. This is a community effort, and we need your help--please join us!!



A WALK IN THE 'PARK'

Monday afternoon, April 21, at about 12:45 the first is a series of informal, informative Movement-sponsored tours got under way from the Old Union Courtyard. Leading the procession was Leonard Siegel. While runners went ahead to announce the tour in dorms across the campus, Len and the marchers paused briefly before the UGLI, where several remarks concerning the ongoing research in paper-airplane design were exchanged. This set the general tone for the whole march, light humor mixed with pertinent fact, dispelling the rumor that the April 3rd Movement has forgotten how to laugh.

The group then moved down Escondido, picking up support from Stern, Wilbur, and Branner, until the marchers eventually numbered over 100. Somewhere along the way we also picked up about a half-dozen newsmen and photographers, including our well-known friend Mr. Bob "Bias" Beyers.

The first stop on the schedule was Utah Construction and Mining Co. While several shapely secretaries peered through partly open doors, our chief of research, Mr. Peter Dolinger, gave the crowd a short summary of Utah's involvement in exploiting the resources of the Third World, paying special attention to mining operations in Peru. The group then moved down Hanover St. to SRI.

It was hoped that the march might include a directed tour of the SRI grounds and perhaps the building itself. However, Homer Meaders, head of Public Relations for SRI, met us in front of the building and in a very friendly (one might almost say apologetic) manner informed us that such a tour was impossible. He did say, however, that we could schedule such a tour "any time you want to," which might be worth considering.

In the meantime, a brief discussion of SRI's counterinsurgency work got under way. Again, several employees looked on from offices on the second floor. A few exchanged peace signs with members of the march, while another hung a sign reading PAX in a window. At this point someone asked Bob

Beyers for a definitions of counterinsurgency. He said, "It is an attempt to undermine the activities of one group by police or other people." It has been suggested that Mr. Beyers is pretty good at this sort of thing himself.

The march then resumed in the direction of Varian Electronics.

As the tour continued, it became increasingly clear to all present that the Stanford Industrial Park has been designed with military-based industry in mind. Len Siegel continued to point out a host of major corporations as we moved along, while Pete Dolinger filled in the details. He described not only the sorts of work done at the various plants, but also the many ways in which our own trustees, administrators, and professors are connected with these plants, as directors,



founders, and principal researchers.

In all we devoted time to at least 15 such corporations in the park, including Lockheed (the biggest employer in the Bay area), Metronics Corp. (said to be "interested in air pollution," read: particle distribution of CBW agents), Watkins-Johnson (headed by trustee Dean Watkins, once bought and sold in three weeks by trustee Gardiner Symonds), Hewlett-Packard Co. (where police guarded all entrances and at one point turned back one of our cars attempting to enter the main parking lot), the Wall Street Journal building (Steve Weissman: "Is there anybody here who doesn't know about Wall Street?"), and Control Data Corp. (computer research for the military).

The sun was hot and the march was long, but spirits and interest continued to run high among the marchers to the very end. The tour served to point out that a tremendous amount of warfare materials is made by our trustees' companies, right in our own back yard.

Join us, and get the whole picture.

Everybody Look

IT WAS THE BEST OF TIMES:
IT WAS THE WORST OF TIMES

October 8--SDS nails demands concerning Stanford research to Trustees' door.

January 14--SDS eats dessert with Trustees at Faculty Club.

March 11--Hewlitt and Ducommun laugh-in at Mem. Aud.

April 3--April 3rd Coalition (14 organizations) pass the four demands.

April 8--Trustees express their concern: from California St. in The City.

April 9--April 3rd Movement votes to occupy AEL (campus housing problem solved).

April 10--Pitzer expresses concern.

DECLASSIFIED publishes first issue, by the authority of The People.

Anti-Sex literature discovered in AEL printing room.

April 3rd Movement organizational "non-structure" begins to non-form.

The Academic Senate expresses its concern.

April 11--Research-freaks begin to expose AEL contracts--around the clock research.

Everyone expresses concern.

April 12--Establishment media goes to work on "hippie, anarchist, commie-red-pinko, hard-core, radical demonstrators."

Committees in full gear--dorm and community leafletting.

April 13--A3M notified that faculty cops will be here Monday morning.

A3M decides that everyone's name is "April 3rd Movement" and everyone's address is "AEL."

Sen. Lee Metcalf of Montana informs us that we are aiding anti-ABM drive in Congress.

Cops are disarmed.

DECLASSIFIED focuses on SRI.

A3M holds faculty tea--concern expressed by all visitors.

Leonard Schiff expresses concern on behalf of Academic Senate Executive Committee--and asks us to leave the building so that the faculty may address the issues.

April 14--Solidarity Statement begun--605 sign first night.

April 3rd Movement informed by Trustees that they are concerned, but that they will not hold open decision-making meeting today.

The Goods on Rambo hits the press--The Old Crow electronic warfare club uncovered...

The faculty investigating committee decides to set up headquarters in room 205 AEL for anyone who wants to tell them their "real" name.

Trustee Dean Watkins is visited by a few A3M people...They learn that he is not afraid of anything, and that he will not talk to us further until we "clear out of the building and start acting like adult, civilized human beings..."...SLAM!

A3M and SRI staff mingle in SRI parking lot for a "Lawn-In." There was no grass.

Leafletters visit Industrial Park.

April 15--85 signatures received from SLAC in support of our demands.

Severance exposed in DECLASSIFIED for what it's worth--money.

Professors and T.A.s begin to hold classes at AEL.

What's Goin' Down

Marc and Carrie wedded--candle-light ceremony; Violent films shown--much like the ones on T.V.

Tom Hayden, of the National Mobilization Committee, and Bobby Seale, of the Black Panthers, come down to rap.

Concern continues to pour in from the faculty and administration.

April 16--DECLASSIFIED calms paranoid scientists by explaining that we are not against all science, but only those sciences which are against us.

R.W. Lee, Research Associate at AEL endorses the A3M's demands and actions.

A3M refuses to send a representative to SJC deliberations.

A3M sends 15 persons to Peter Allan's office to pick up good copies of the SRI Committee Minority Report to take to SRI employees...two days after the majority report had been sent to SRI.

Concern still heavy on campus.

April 17--Research and Guidelines Committee issues tentative guidelines.

General Meeting passes guidelines and asks any researchers who wish to resume their "peaceful" research to submit their projects to our Review Board.

SJC ultimatum is delivered at 2 a.m.--People rejoice--They are going to shut down the lab for us!

April 18--A3M votes to leave AEL, tentatively...

11 a.m. Academic Council meeting--faculty expresses concern.

1 p.m. General Meeting of the Student Body--everyone expresses concern, and Denis Hayes loses his chair.

A3M moves to the Clubhouse, down the hall from Hillel and UCM.

April 19--A3M notified that it won Denis Hayes' popularity poll--Bob Beyers notifies no one...

April 20--The April 3rd Movement reorganizes committees: Seventeen committees reduced to eight...bureaucracy loses again.

April 21--Rally Old Union Courtyard at noon--Raps on SRI, the Industrial Park, and the Mid-peninsula political-economy. Tour of SRI and the Industrial Park.

8:00 p.m. John Watson of DRUM comes down to rap.

April 22--S.F. Mime Troupe entertains A3M at noon.

"Day of Concern"--everyone concerned.

Tour of the Business School, noon till three.

Academic Senate reiterates concern--puts off the question of SRI until next Tuesday.

TOMORROW AND TOMORROW AND TOMORROW

April 24--Academic Senate meets for its first discussion of research policy on campus.

April 25--Noon: A3M and Community Mass Rally in AEL Courtyard--a real meeting with real decisions.

WEEK OF APRIL 28th--

Tuesday--special Academic Senate meeting to vote on proposed non-solutions to campus problems.

Someday or other, maybe--Trustees visit the colony for firsthand view of native unrest.

Proposal:

1. Insufficient information has been made available to the Senate by the SRI Committee. A new committee is proposed which will study legal and financial aspects of different possibilities for the future of SRI. The committee would report back in Autumn Quarter, 1969/70. No decision on the future of SRI would be made before then.
2. Secret research and research on chemical-biological warfare, radiological warfare, and counterinsurgency warfare are "inappropriate" for a University and its affiliates. This point urges the trustees and SRI management to establish these principles immediately at SRI, although differences between research policies at Stanford and SRI are called "necessary." Counterinsurgency research is defined as "investigation intended to provide advice concerning the use of armed force in countries other than the

United States by governments or citizens of those countries.

3. A Faculty Senate - SRI personnel review board is proposed to determine SRI research policy at SRI. No students are mentioned in this or any of the other Breitrose proposals.

If this proposal did not have Holman's backing, it wouldn't have a chance. Even with Holman's support, the Senate is likely to amend the proposal to uselessness. And in the rare chance that the Senate lets too much of the proposal go by, the even more conservative Academic Council which has veto power, is likely to kill it.

This is the system that imprisons the minds of faculty members at large American Universities like Stanford. We cannot expect sympathetic faculty to be of help to us in winning the demands unless they reject the morass of academic politics and start thinking and saying and doing what they believe in.

Then they will have joined our Movement.

