

SDS and the Labor Movement

Last year marked the first time students on campuses around the Bay Area organized to support striking workers. When workers went out on strike against two of the world's mightiest corporations -- Standard Oil and Dow Chemical -- SDS people from Stanford, Berkeley and S. F. State were up at the East Bay plants walking the picket lines, rapping with the workers, and fighting the management's many attempts to squash the strike.

It is not unexpected that workers and students should be getting together -- we share a common enemy. The same big businessmen that are running Stanford University for their own class interests (and who are controlling the state educational system through such "politicians" as Reagan and Hayakawa) are enforcing poor working conditions and low pay on working people in order to increase their own profits and power. The directors of Standard Oil, for example, whose profit-making interests are in opposition to the needs of most workers, sit on the Board of Stanford Research Institute, target of student demonstrations here at Stanford.

Because of their direct relationship to the production process, workers are in a position of influencing and bringing about social change through their collective bargaining power. Students, being non-productive, are not in the same position to cripple the economy and cut the profits of these big businessmen. A good example of the strength of organized workers is the napalm contract at Dow. Before we had even become aware that there was a strike at the Dow plant last July, the workers had caused the cancellation of Dow's napalm contract -- the object of years of student demonstrations.

The first strike we joined began in early January when Local 1-561 of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers (OCAW) walked out of the Standard Oil refinery and the Chevron Chemical plant in Richmond. The union demands were a 72-cent wage increase over two years plus retirement and medical benefits. As the strike went on it became clear in negotiations that the company wanted to crush the union by hiring non-union people in the plant, breaking the union shop.

Although the "violence" at S. F. State was getting full coverage by the press at this time, there was a news blackout on events in Richmond. Police, encouraged by the company, beat, maced, and arrested oil workers, their wives and kids on the picket line. Richard Jones a union picket, was run down by a Standard truck and killed. No news of this was ever made public and the Richmond D. A.'s office has refused to prosecute.

Along the winding road around the refinery students joined workers in a series of street battles against tear gas and clubs, in addition to day-by-day picketing. Standard recruiters were chased off campuses and students began boycotting and picketing Standard oil outlets. In return oil workers began to appear on the S. F. State picket lines, and the union came out 2 to 1 in favor of both the student and the AFT demands.

In spite of the company's use of court injunctions, bribed scabs, police clubs and murder, the strike was settled with a partial victory for the workers -- a 58-cent increase and the rehiring of several militant workers that Standard wanted to fire.

The second strike that Stanford SDS concentrated on was the strike against Dow Chemical by Local 23 of the International Chemical Workers Union in Pittsburg, California. The key demand of Local 23 was working-class solidarity. The wage and benefits issues had been pretty much settled early in the strike -- although the increases amounted to less than the predicted 5 percent cost of living rise. The main concern of the Dow workers -- which kept them out for 2 months in the face of company cameras and mortgage payments demanded by the Bank of America -- was the issue of solidarity with their brothers in other Dow plants in California. Much like Standard's attack on the Chevron union shop, Dow was trying to write a paragraph into the contract banning sympathy strikes in support of other striking Dow locals. Both the company and the workers realized the potential strength of such concrete solidarity.

We went to the picket lines and talked with the workers about their experiences, about our feelings about Dow and about our experience with student strikes. By the end of the strike, when the company basically gave in on the solidarity issue, rank and file acceptance of SDS had reached a level such that when the company negotiator asked the union leadership to hold a joint press conference to "denounce SDS for interfering in our labor dispute", the union president told the company to forget it, that the union "knows who its friends are."

Some of us feel that we must join the working class by dropping out of school and getting factory or industrial jobs. We hope to gain a better understanding of the working world and the kind of oppression working people in America face by our own first hand experiences. And by working together with people, we feel we can better communicate our feelings about the war, about racism, about imperialism, and share the political understanding we have accumulated.

The Stanford Empire

Home-style Economic Development

Without great difficulty, it is still possible to find people who remember the days when Stanford lived in the provincial aloofness implied by the nickname "The Farm." But any dreams of reclaiming the pastoral past are pure fantasy. Stanford is now a "great" university. As Frederick Terman, the architect of the Stanford complex, is fond of pointing out, "The developments that have taken place in Palo Alto and its environs in the twenty years since World War II are inextricably bound up with the transformation of Stanford from a respected but essentially regional institution to one of the great universities in this country." Let us explore this transformation more closely and investigate its implications for the people of the world.

The new Stanford octopus started out as a gleam in Frederick Terman's eye. At the end of WWII, he returned to a position as Dean of the School of Engineering with a vision of the possibilities of a unique new partnership between business, government, and knowledge that could yield enormous wealth and influence for himself, his students, and his university. He wasn't slow in trying to turn his dream into reality. He encouraged students like Bill Hewlett, David Packard, and the Varian brothers to leave the campus, and with his advice and support, to set themselves up in business turning their new electronic discoveries into products that would prove valuable in the growing defense market. At the same time, he drew a group of bright, young electrical engineers into his department, men like Wm. Rambo, Allan Peterson, and Joseph Pettit, (many of whom had worked with him designing radar countermeasures during the war) men who would draw the best graduate students to the department. And once here, where else would the new degree-holders go but to the burgeoning new defense industries like SRI, Varian, Lockheed, and Hewlett-Packard, firms that had conveniently found homes in the new Stanford Industrial Park. The fit was almost too perfect to believe, so perfect in fact that it pleased even its creator:

"In engineering and applied science Stanford has emerged as a pace-setter in a new and expanding pattern involving research-oriented industry and a university under conditions where extensive interaction exists between the two. It is not just a coincidence that most of this type industry in the Bay Area lies within a 15-mile circle centered on Stanford, and that Stanford with 1400 graduate students in engineering is, after MIT, the largest producer (1) of advanced engineering degrees in the country.

"Stanford serves as a beacon that attracts the brightest graduates of schools located all over the nation. Once here, these young people naturalize easily. This is of real significance in the research-oriented industries, whose success in the market-place is a function of technological competence. On the average, the local companies have been able to recruit better brains than their competitors in other areas, and have been more successful as a result.

"We have been pioneers in creating a new type of community--one that I have called a 'community of technical scholars.' Such a community is composed of industries utilizing

highly sophisticated technologies, together with a strong university that is sensitive to the creative activities of the surrounding industry. This pattern appears to be the wave of the future."

A number of important changes had to take place in the university, however, before it became appropriately sensitive to the surrounding industries.

Terman and his protegees were moving too fast for the Board of Trustees, a group dominated by Herbert Hoover and older San Francisco industrialists in railroads, banking, and shipping. So in 1954, Stanford went to court to increase the size of the Board from 15 to 23, citing the necessity of handling "real estate development projects now in the planning stages" (read Industrial Park). The new spots on the Board were taken by young businessmen like Packard, Ernest Arbuckle (later Dean of the Business School), Arthur Stewart of Union Oil, and Edmund Littlefield of Utah Mining and Construction. Things began to happen immediately: Terman was appointed Provost in 1955 and Vice-President in 1959, the Industrial Park grew rapidly with Hewlett-Packard taking several big chunks. Internally, the university accepted more and more federal money; in 1948 Stanford received \$700,000 or 7% of its income from Washington, while last year this figure (including SLAC) reached \$72.5 million (almost 50%). And Industrial Park firms found it in their best interests to chip in too, as Hewlett-Packard donated the money to build the Applied Electronics Laboratories (site of the A3M sit-in) and joined other corporations in sponsoring scholarships and basic research in engineering.

By now, the integration of the university and the new defense complex is virtually complete.



William Rambo
Head, EE Research

"But a small, hard core of extremists with the greatest arrogance and the least faith in their country have escalated . . . from the legal range to the level of kidnap and blackmail. Unfortunately, in a few cases, substantial numbers of other students and faculty have supported these extremists or have opposed the feasible means of dealing with them."

Kenneth S. Pitzer
May 17, 1968

The Men Who Run the University

Few people would dispute the statement that the Stanford Trustees include many of the wealthiest and most powerful men in America. Yet many of the same people have been reluctant to admit that this fact has any significance for their life, the condition of the University, or the plight of the world.

Faculty liberals and student politicians generally see the Trustees as stodgy old men who rubber-stamp administration proposals and travel to Southern California to squeeze money out of upper-class friends. Any restraints that professors feel in their work come more often from tight-fisted bureaucrats in Washington than the Trustees, partly because the Trustees couldn't care less what some assistant professor in classics is doing and mostly because Stanford faculty members share the same outlook and values as the Trustees (though most of them would never admit it). Students, being younger and more adventurous, find many more restraints, but they usually blame these on professors and half-assed administrators. The apparent lack of conflict between the businessmen and scholars results more from the near-sightedness of students and faculty than from the Trustees' benevolence. While professors research and students play, the Trustees and their hired friends run Stanford.

The Trustees exert little control over the day-to-day decisions on University operations; such matters are left up to the good judgment of the Administration and the faculty. Their influence over Stanford results from their power to set priorities on campus, in their corporations, and in Washington. Thus, professors are free to pursue their research within the limits of the marketplace, an arena fairly well regulated by the needs of the Federal government and the big corporations. Likewise, students find their choice of career and major limited by a labor market which puts a premium on specialized technicians and scorns women and independent creativity. Again, as the men who direct the nation's economy, corporation leaders like the Trustees must accept the blame.

In a more direct way, the Trustees (along with Pitzer and his cronies) shape the University according to their interests. The pattern of construction in recent years reveals this nicely; new buildings for business, physics, earth sciences, operations research, engineering, and space sciences fit in conveniently with the needs of highly technological industry. At the same time, we have been provided with new art and psychology buildings and an eyesore trailer park. But where is the low income housing for students and staff or the institute for studying ecology, imperialism, the military-industrial complex? Could it be that the Trustees decisions are affected by their class interests? A look at who the Trustees are might answer that question.

Ernest Arbuckle first became a Trustee in 1954 while he was vice-president in charge of Central American operations for W.R. Grace & Co. In 1958, he quit the Board to become Dean of the Graduate School of Business. Last year he resigned to rejoin the Board and become Chairman of Wells Fargo Bank. Arbuckle is also chairman of the board of Stanford Research Institute (SRI) and director of Aetna Life and Casualty Company, Castle & Cooke, Inc., Hewlett-Packard Company, Owens-Illinois, Inc., Safeway Stores, and Utah Mining & Construction. He is also the member of two ruling class organizations pushing for the rationalization of local government to meet the needs of big business, the Committee for Economic Development and the Bay Area Council.

Robert Minge Brown has been Stanford Trustee since 1965. He is a corporate lawyer with McCutchen, Doyle, Brown & Enersen, San Francisco's second largest law firm. Last spring he was kept busy writing injunctions against the April Third Movement. Brown is chairman of the board and director of the California Water Service Company and is a director of Hewlett-Packard, the San Jose Water Works, and is trustee of Mills College.

Mrs. Allan E. Charles, a Trustee since 1954, is the wife of a San Francisco corporate lawyer. Like all good ladies of her class, she is active in civic affairs, most prominently as a member of the board of T.V. station KQED, San Francisco's educational station.

Morris M. Doyle is also a member of the law firm McCutchen, Doyle, Brown, & Enersen. When he is not writing injunctions against students, he sits on the board of SRI. Doyle has been a Trustee since 1959.

Charles E. Ducommun, a Trustee since 1961, gets by on taxpayers' money. He is president and director of Ducommun, Inc., a heavy defense and space contractor. He also sits as a director of Lockheed, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph, and the Security Pacific National Bank. He sees Arbuckle at meetings of the Committee for Economic Development and sometimes runs into Pitzer when he is in Claremont to attend trustee meetings of Claremont Men's College.

Ben C. Duniway is a U.S. Circuit Court Judge. He has been a Trustee since 1962.

W. Parmer Fuller III is Chairman of the Board of Trustees. He succeeded his father, who was on the Board from 1933 to 1958. The family business was bought up

recently by Pittsburgh Plate Glass, so Fuller is now vice-president, western region, of PPG Industries. He is also a director of Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company, Wells Fargo Bank, Western Pacific Railroad, and Yosemite Park & Curry Co.

John W. Gardner is Stanford's newest and best-known Trustee; in an article in Harper's this summer, David Halberstam called Gardner the head of the Establishment. Though ruling class is a more useful term than Establishment, there can be no disputing the fact that Gardner is a powerful man. From 1955 to 1967, he was president of the Carnegie Foundation. There he led the effort to create and expand centers for international education in American universities so as to be better able to train managers for America's far-flung Empire. As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from 1965-1968, he continued that effort as well as getting involved in the urban crisis. He now devotes full-time to the problem of cities as Chairman of the Urban Coalition, a corporate front that is trying to cool the ghettos through co-optation, black capitalism, and increased corporation control. Gardner is the intellectual on the Board; therefore he understands better than most that the student and black movements in this country, if not contained, represent a threat to the established centers of privilege and power. This explains why Gardner, though billed by the Daily as the most liberal trustee, condemns student radicals in rhetoric worthy of George Wallace or Strom Thurmond. Gardner is a director of American Airlines and TIME, Inc.

Richard E. Guggenheim is a corporate lawyer from San Francisco. He is a director of Union Sugar, USP Corp., California State Chamber of Commerce, and SRI, and has been a Stanford Trustee since 1958.

William R. Hewlett is a familiar face at Stanford even though he has only been a Trustee since 1963. He is President and chief executive officer of Hewlett-Packard; also, he is a director of Chrysler, FMC Corp., and Kern County Land Company. He is a trustee of the RAND Corporation, the Air Force's Cold War think-tank, and a member of the President's Scientific Advisory Council where he undoubtedly spent hours telling Nixon what prosperity ABM would bring to Industrial Park corporations.

Thomas V. Jones is another of Stanford's defense-minded Trustees. He is president and chairman of Northrop Corporation, a huge defense contractor which makes almost every weapon under the sun. Jones is also a director of SRI and The Times-Mirror Company. He keeps up with things in the defense industry as a member of the Board of Governors of the Aerospace Industries Association, the Industry Advisory Council of the Secretary of Defense, the Board of Visitors of the Air Force Systems Command, and the Board of Advisors of the Industrial College of the Air Force. When he gets tired of the military-industrial complex, he goes out to talk about the beauties of a liberal education at trustee meetings of the California Institute of Technology.

Lawrence A. Kimpton has been a Trustee since 1961. He is vice-president and director of Standard Oil Company (Indiana) and the Standard Oil (Indiana) Foundation.

Roger Lewis is America's #1 defense industrialist. He serves as Chairman and president of General Dynamics, the nation's largest defense contractor. His company makes combat aircraft (including the boondoggle F-111), nuclear submarines, surface ships, and strategic and tactical missiles, plus communications and data processing equipment. Lewis

formerly served as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force under the Eisenhower administration, so he understands the military machine from both sides of the fence. He has been getting acquainted with the Stanford end of things since 1964.

Edmund W. Littlefield has been on the Board since 1956. He is president and general manager of Utah Construction & Mining (which builds B-52 bases in Thailand) and chairman of Marcona Mining, the fifth largest firm in Peru. In addition, Littlefield is a director of Del Monte, First Security Corp., General Electric, Hewlett-Packard, Industrial Indemnity Corp., Pima Mining, SRI, and Wells Fargo Bank.

Richard C. McCurdy is the chief executive officer and director of Shell Oil Company. In 1965, McCurdy succeeded Morris Spaght as a Stanford Trustee. Spaght ran Shell before McCurdy did; could it be that Shell has its name on one of the chairs around the Board table?

Fred H. Merrill, a Trustee since 1964, is big in the financial world. He is chairman and chief executive officer of Fireman's Fund American Insurance, Fund American Investment Management, SSI Computer Corp., Commonwealth Group of Mutual Funds, and Shaw & Begg Begg, Ltd., Toronto. Among other things, the Fund American conglomerate handles Stanford's investment portfolio and most of its insurance. Merrill is also director and chairman of the executive committee of American Express Company and a director of American Factors, Ltd., and Middle South Utilities Co.

Mrs. Jesse E. Nichols has been a Trustee since 1963. She is also a trustee of the California College of Arts and Crafts.

Thomas P. Pike came to the Stanford board in 1957 while he was Assistant Secretary of Defense and Special Assistant to President Eisenhower. Presently, he is vice-chairman and director of Fluor Corp., a conglomerate in engineering and construction. He is also a director of Hewlett-Packard and SRI.

William Lister Rogers is a clinical professor of surgery at the University of California Medical School and chief of staff of French Hospital in San Francisco. He is also a director of California Canadian Bank, New England Fish Company, and Union Sugar Company. Mrs. Rogers was the director of social events for the recent International Industrial Conference. Dr. Rogers has been a Trustee since 1966.

Arthur C. Stewart has been a Trustee since 1954. He is president of the Union Oil of California Foundation and a director of Union Oil of California. When Union isn't busy polluting the beaches of Santa Barbara, it's pumping oil out of Thailand and Indonesia.

Gardiner Symonds, a Trustee since 1960, is chairman of the board and director of Tenneco Inc., a huge conglomerate which is the 39th largest corporation in America. In addition, he is a director of J. I. Case, General Telephone and Electronics (its subsidiary, Sylvania, has a site in the Industrial Park), Houston National Bank, Midwestern Gas Transmission, Petro-Tex Chemical Corp., Philadelphia Life Insurance Co., Southern Pacific, SRI, and Tenneco Corporation. As a trustee of Rice University, he had a good chance to see Pitzer in action when he worked down Texas way. Symonds serves his class as a councillor of the National Industrial Conference Board (co-sponsors of the recent International Industrial Conference) and as an honorary trustee of the Committee for Economic Development. He is also a member of the

Association of Reserve City Bankers, the Business Council, the Business Leadership Advisory Council of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Committee to Visit the Department of Business Administration of Harvard College, the Industry Advisory Council of the Department of Defense, and the Rice University Advisory Council in Economics and Accounting.

Dean A. Watkins is Stanford's success story. A Terman protegee, Watkins received his Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering in 1951. In 1953, he was appointed to a tenured position as a professor of engineering. However, he didn't last long in his new job, because in 1963 he had to quit to devote full-time to his position as chairman and chief executive officer of Watkins-Johnson Company, an Industrial Park firm that does 60% of its business with the Defense Department. Watkins didn't stay away from the campus for long: in 1967 he returned as a member of the Board of Trustees. Last year Watkins joined Glenn Campbell, director of the right-wing Hoover Institution, as Stanford's second Reagan appointee to the Board of Regents of the University of California. Watkins is also a director of the Stanford Bank.

There is currently a vacancy on the Board, caused by the departure of David Packard. Packard is now Deputy Secretary of Defense, a position which allows him to serve the people by promoting ABM and directing the Defense Department's efforts to tie the welfare of black people to the survival of the war machine by encouraging major defense contractors to locate in ghettos. Before his appointment, he was director and chairman of Hewlett-Packard and a director of General Dynamics and SRI, and a Trustee since 1954.

The man who works full-time to make the Stanford compound tick smoothly is Stanford's President, Kenneth S. Pitzer. He came to campus on December 1, 1968, bringing with him all the experience and administrative skills necessary for the maintenance of Stanford's reputation as a "community of technical scholars."

Born the son of a Southern California land baron, Pitzer started his climb to the high echelons of corporate America at the very bottom of the ladder, as a professor of chemistry at Berkeley. In 1943 he left Cal to serve his country as scientific director of the Maryland Research Laboratory where he studied gas cloud formation resulting from large chemical bomb bursts for the OSS, a precursor of the CIA. After the war, he returned to Berkeley as head of the Chemistry College. But Pitzer's government days weren't over yet. From 1949-1951 he was director of research for the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), where he was influential in the decision to develop the H-bomb. In 1958, Pitzer rejoined the AEC as a member and, later, chairman of the General Advisory Committee of AEC.

Pitzer knows well the interplay between politics and science. In 1954, he testified against J. Robert Oppenheimer when Oppenheimer was denied security clearance because of his opposition to the H-bomb. He also testified against Linus Pauling's 1957 petition to halt nuclear testing.

Pitzer was appointed President of Rice University in 1960. But being in Texas didn't mean an end to politics. In 1964, Pitzer helped organize Scientists and Engineers for Johnson, and for his efforts, he was awarded with an appointment to the President's Scientific Advisory Council. Nor did his close co-operation with the White House hurt the interests of Texas's oil and aerospace industrialists. He established the nation's first department of aerospace engineering to compliment NASA's \$173 million Manned Space Flight Center which was built on lands owned by Rice University and the Humble Oil & Refining Company, a subsidiary of Standard Oil (N.J.)

It should be clear that Pitzer's close connections with AEC and NASA make him an ideal director for the Stanford complex which depends heavily on funds from those two agencies. Though Pitzer will continue to wait that we need to change our national priorities, he will use his enormous power to serve the interests of the corporate elite of which he is a member. Stanford's budding Aero-Astro Department will boom, the Engineering Department will prosper, and more and more Stanford land will be turned over to the profit-hungry technological industries. And Pitzer will use all the resources at his disposal to smash any movement which seeks genuine social change in America.

Pitzer is a director of Owens-Illinois (with Arbuckle), a trustee of the RAND Corporation (with Hewlett), and a trustee of Pitzer College.



Change from the Top Down ...

Way back when the Stanford Trustees were students, no one gave much of a damn about the Board. Now the greying businessmen and lawyers probably yearn for the old days. The campus community's new interest in the Board of Trustees has put them squarely in the spotlight -- an uncomfortable position for men who have traditionally prospered in the anonymity of their executive suites.

Unfortunately neither SDS nor the April Third Movement clearly communicated their analysis of the Board of Trustees. Most liberals, among both students and faculty, still see confrontation as the result of a huge "communication gap" between those who study and learn, and those who manage and invest. The liberals assert that if communication is restored -- perhaps by restructuring the Board of Trustees -- students, faculty, and Trustees can solve their problems peacefully, together.

SDS, on the other hand, feels that the Trustees have class interests which govern their decisions. Communication, we feel, is best during confrontation, for our interests, and the interests of those with whom we identify, are contradictory to those of the Trustees.

"The restructuring of the Board of Trustees will solve the student crisis at Stanford."

John Gardner
April 28, 1969, during
the height of the A3M

John Gardner is the Board's leading advocate of the liberal analysis. On September 18, while this booklet is at press, he is expected to announce plans for restructuring the Board. Gardner sincerely believes that the proposed reform will answer the complaints of discontented groups. Like many other liberals, he interprets the militant action of blacks and students as a bold assertion of their desire to participate. He responds by offering minimal participation at the higher levels of decision-making.

In practice, this will mean more dialogue, as the Trustees integrate students and minorities into their elite. The contradictions between the Trustees and the campus community will not be so clear, but the results will be the same. Anyone who becomes a Trustee will be forced to work in a framework which severely limits decision-making. Financial priorities of the American ruling class will still determine what is possible. Whether or not the Board remains exclusive, it will have to function within the reality of the American system. Within these restrictions, a total replacement of the Board of Trustees could bring more flexibility. But as long as the balance of power favors the elite now in control, the Trustees will not even explore the limits of practicality.

The "increased participation" Gardner is sure to recommend will not increase democracy. The co-optation of closed-door "representatives" may actually widen the gulf between the Trustees and the average student. But more important, the reforms up Gardner's sleeves may confuse students, who will think that they finally have a voice setting the priorities of Stanford. Everyone may cheer, but nothing will have changed.

The Stanford Empire Architects

"This nation occupies 6% of the land area of the world, has 7% of the world's population, but now produces 50% of the world's goods and possesses 67% of the world's wealth. . . . Research must be the heart, the foundation, the life blood of our present defense economy if we are to maintain this position."

-- Jesse Hobson, 1951
then President of SRI, speaking to the
American Institute of Engineers

Stanford pioneered the lucrative research and development field by founding the Stanford Research Institute in 1946, as a wholly-owned subsidiary of the University doing applied research. Three groups were primarily responsible for the Institute: a university triumvirate led by Chemistry professors Robert Swain and Phillip Leighton, a research group from Lockheed in L. A., and a group of California industrialists led by Standard Oil of California director Atholl MacBean. Though each group had its own perspective on the value of the new institute, all found the idea delightful. The University people saw SRI as an important source of income (especially for government money), a stimulus for research, and a vehicle by which the University could lead the regional and industrial development of the Pacific Coast. Industry leaders wanted a center to handle the technical and research tasks necessary to keep California industry competitive with the rest of the nation. The wishes of both groups came true on Dec. 13, 1946 when the Stanford Trustees elected the Board of Directors of SRI, consist-

ing of three members from their own ranks plus corporate leaders from such major California corporations as Standard Oil, Pacific Power and Light, Southern Pacific, Union Oil, and Crown-Zellerbach.

In its early years, SRI concentrated on serving California industry, but not even a \$600,000 loan from the Stanford Trustees could keep the Institute's financial problems from pushing the new organization into the field of government sponsored research. The Korean War gave SRI the final push into the Cold War arena: the volume of government research doubled during the year 1950, reaching 45% of SRI's revenue. Not only did SRI take on contracts in the areas of strategic and military studies, but SRI officials became vociferous advocates of America's duty to cleanse the world of the Communist menace, a stance that, not coincidentally, encouraged public acceptance of Cold War mythologies and thereby assured a continuous flow of defense funds into the rapidly growing Peninsula complex. SRI became completely integrated into the new military-industrial

complex as Stanford's garrison state executives took control of the institute: Terman became vice-chairman of executive board in 1955, preceding the appearance of new directors David Packard (1958), Arnold Beckman (1956), Edgar Kaiser (1957), Tom Jones (1961), and former Eisenhower defense advisors Thomas Pike (1961) and General William Draper (1961). SRI defense revenues reached 60% in 1960 and an all-time high of 65% in 1965.

In addition to its role as supplier of techniques for the defense sector, SRI in the mid-fifties took on the task of coordinating industrial expansion, both on the West Coast and, increasingly, in Western Europe and the Pacific Basin. SRI officials have continually emphasized two objectives in their international program: "economic progress, and the strengthening of private business on an international scale. These are good and noble causes and we are proud to stand with international companies the world over in pursuit of the fundamentals involved. Our objective is to do everything in our power to develop the private sector as the basic factor in economic strength and progress." To support these ends, SRI has pursued a two-pronged program of co-ordinating business penetration of Third World nations, and of co-operating with the Defense Department in counter-insurgency research designed to maintain a stable climate of investment in areas where the natives do not share SRI's appreciation of American imperialism.

Beginning in 1957, SRI has sponsored a series of gatherings where corporate leaders have discussed and planned international expansion. The International Industrial Development Conference in 1957 brought together 500 of the world's top business executives to find ways of relieving international business of the burdens of competition. In recent years, the Pacific Basin has received the bulk of SRI's attention, as industrial development planners have articulated a Pacific Basin strategy in which business interests will rationalize and control the overall Pacific economy through the use of government funds and military might. Stanford Trustee and SRI Board Chairman Ernest Arbuckle opened an SRI business conference in Sydney, Australia last year with the statement that the vision of an integrated Pacific economy was an ideal "that remains today in principle and practice within both Stanford University and Stanford Research Institute." At a recent conference, SRI vice-president H. E. Robison praised the slaughter of half a million alleged communists during Indonesia's

1965 coup as a victory for freedom and private enterprise over the horrors of socialism, and followed up his rhetoric by leading 200 executives into Djakarta to arrange economic co-operation with the newest government of the "free world." The recent International Industrial Conference was SRI's latest effort in its continuing service to the multi-national corporations.

"It's a very nice thing to view the university as an open place where I do my thing and you do your thing, only your thing happens to be doing research on weapons of destruction and death in the name of this University...."

-- Jeanne Friedman
at the March 11 Forum

SRI is careful, however, not to let its idealistic vision of the Pacific as an American Lake obscure its view of reality. When local insurgents question the benevolence of American domination, SRI is ready to trot out a whole array of counter-revolutionary techniques. In 1961, SRI Senior Economist Eugene Staley returned from Vietnam with suggestions for President Kennedy about quashing the annoying guerilla movement there. The strategic hamlet program which he recommended was supposed to restore security in 18 months; it didn't. But the defense department didn't lose faith in SRI; researchers there have continued to receive contracts to research anti-guerilla surveillance, jungle communications, helicopter warfare, optimal bombing routes over North Vietnam, in addition to maintaining a 43 man center in Bangkok, Thailand, aimed at stopping the Thai guerilla movement. Nor does SRI hesitate to bring its counter-insurgency projects home to use on local dissidents. It was SRI that developed the techniques used when a National Guard helicopter spread CS tear gas on People's Park demonstrators and hospital patients on the Berkeley campus last May. A malfunctioning nozzle of SRI design killed 6,000 insurgent sheep near Dugway, Utah in 1967. In addition, SRI researchers have been increasingly active in helping the corporate elite implement its strategy for controlling the explosive potential of discontented groups in the American cities.

