

A Short Primer On Running Stanford University

By HERB BOROCK
and YALE M. BRAUNSTEIN
Commentary

The aftermath of the Off ROTC movement this past spring has demonstrated that a legal, non-violent, mass action cannot be successfully prosecuted in the courts; cannot be handled by the Stanford Judicial Council (SJC); and threatens the university administration most by threatening and harming the institution least, thereby showing that the administration is impotent in these cases.

The administration's response to this spring's protests also provides useful information on what sorts of things Aeling President Richard W. Lyman will approve. Associate Provost Robert Rosenzweig was the person who made tactical and strategic decisions for the administration during the Off-ROTC movement, subject to Pitzer's and Lyman's approval. Although Kenneth Pitzer was still president during the spring, Lyman often acted as de facto president in regard to campus disruptions. In his current position Lyman is de jure, as well as de facto president. And he is a leading candidate to replace Pitzer as permanent president.

Most of the damage to buildings, all battles between police and students, and most arrests of students took place as a result of calling police on to campus to confront students sitting-in at the Old Union on April 23 and April 29. The administration charged 54 students who participated in the sit-ins with violating

the campus policy on disruptions. All these cases were either dismissed or dropped for lack of supporting evidence. The police arrested 28 people in the two sit-ins. All the charges were dropped for lack of evidence.

Damage Totaled \$580,000

By the end of May, the Controller's office was claiming \$580,000 worth of damage and lost income. While attracting a great amount of attention, the rock throwing and "vandalism" that occurred prior to the first Old Union sit-in totaled less than \$20,000. The remainder of the damage happened in the wake of the police's breaking up the two Old Union sit-ins.

The total damage to windows and other property was \$100,000, and research revenue and overhead not collected amounted to \$92,000. This resulted from the blockades and sit-ins at the engineering laboratories, primarily AEL and ERL. Of the remainder the largest item is the \$250,000 spent on salaries and benefits for the day off declared by President Pitzer.

Therefore most of the total loss results from student and administration activity following Nixon's invasion of Cambodia and from student and non-student activity following the administration's calling in the police to disperse the Old Union sit-ins—sit-ins that not only were completely legal but also were not in violation of university policy.

SJC Box Score

Despite accounts in the press of busts, mass busts, SJC charges, and possible SJC charges, most of the activities of the spring proved to be legal and within university rules. In mid-May, administration prosecutor Paul Valentine said that 117 students involved in 209 incidents would be brought before the SJC. The box score to date is 23 convictions, 79 cases dismissed, dropped or acquitted, and 27 set for the fall quarter. The convictions grossed approximately \$2000 in fines.

The cases that were to be heard in the county courts ranged from trespass in malicious mischief to assault on an officer. Protests and rock-throwing started the night of March 31. Although no one was arrested that night, four were arrested for assault the following night when activities resumed. Condemnations of "reckless, wanton violence" were common, and Provost Lyman charged that the protestors were carrying dynamite and Molotov cocktails.

An order for five Off ROTC protestors to show cause why they should not be held in contempt of the old Encina Hall injunction was the next legal action. Originally charged with two or three counts each, three were found guilty on two counts, one was guilty of one count, and one was completely exonerated. The three week trial cost Stanford an estimated \$1000 per day plus preparation costs.

Old Union Sit-Ins

On April 23, 400 students occupied the Old Union. They had to get past 40 members of the Free Campus Movement who were blocking the doors of the building. Although President Pitzer told the faculty senate that "disciplinary action" would be taken against individuals "on both sides," no member of the FCM has been brought before either the SJC or the county courts for the incident.

At 1:10 a.m. the following morning, 50 Santa Clara County Sheriff's Deputies swept through the building, arresting 23 people. Those arrested were charged with trespass, but their cases were dropped by the district attorney in June for lack of evidence. In frustration, those not arrested shattered windows at the Business School, President's Office, Treasurer Union, the Police Station, the Post Office, Lou Henry Hoover Library, and Encina Hall. The cost of window damage that night (\$40,000) was more than double the cost of damage done during the previous three weeks.

A day long hearing by the Committee of Fifteen packed the Treasurer lounge



Photo by Rick Embury

STUDENT STRIKE BEGINS: A riot unit guards the withdrawal of fellow deputies from Encina Hall on May 1.



Photo by Phil Fauthman

ARCHITECTS OF THE OLD UNION BUSTS: President Pitzer (left) consults with Prof. Orbach, Prof. Farich, and Associate Provost Rosenzweig after Sheriff's deputies left for second Old Union sit-in.

and heard the first vocalizations of a developing theme: "If we condemn rock-throwing and violence, and you prohibit peaceful protest, what is left?" Many felt the university was providing those who saw violence as the means of the revolution with the support they needed. And many were beginning to realize that the administration feared mass non-violent action more than rocks.

Students occupied the Old Union for a second time on April 29. Capt. Rosa of the Sheriff's office planned a police strike for 7:30 p.m. Just as Provost Lyman was concluding an address to the campus on KZSU, Lyman began his talk at 7:00 p.m. However, the police could not get their buses loaded in time (the wife of one of the sergeants was having a baby) and the police strike did not occur until 8:50 p.m. Ten persons were arrested for trespass, and the charges against them were also dropped at the end of June.

Street Fighting

The police charge resulted in violent street fighting throughout the campus. Students fought 274 police who responded to a mutual aid call (code 20). Police arrested six students including Bijay Sharma, an Indian student, who was beaten by police in the undergraduate library. Charges against Sharma were dropped. There has been no disposition of the other cases.

The following night (April 30) students fought police for over four hours. The crowd, as large as 1000 students at times, faced 225 police. Many police and some students were injured, but there was only one arrest. That case is still awaiting trial.

Student Strike

On May 1, the student strike started in response to Nixon's invasion of Cambodia. During that afternoon, 40 Santa Clara County deputies swept across Encina lawn in an ineffectual attempt to disperse some 400 demonstrators. The deputies were chased back to their bus by the students. Previously, Sgt. Tazumi and Capt. Rosa arrested two students for blocking the entrance to Encina Hall. When questioned later, Rosa said, "The confrontation this afternoon at Encina... was an error... A sit-in is legal as long as it doesn't violate other people's rights." He later retracted his statement.

Also on May 1 rumors were circulating that the Trustees were considering firing Pitzer. The Palo Alto Times reported that the Trustees would meet in emergency session the following week to consider the matter. Although these rumors were confirmed the same day from independent sources, no confirmation of such a meeting has ever come from the Trustees.

stanford **DAILY** published Tuesday & Friday during the summer

Administration Approves Photo ID Cards; But Still Underminded On Central File

By MARSHALL KILDUFF

The University administration has decided to issue student body cards that will include color photographs, but acting president Richard Lyman has postponed any decision to maintain a central file of student pictures.

The new cards will resemble the present meal tickets and will have space for checking off voting and sports privileges on the back side. Dean of Students Peter Bulkeley claims that the new card will help to cut down on the number of forged checks and unreturned library books. The new card will serve as a meal ticket in University dormitories.

Legal adviser to the president James Siena argued that the new identification cards have "nothing to do with problems of discipline" stemming from the trashing last spring. He felt the cards would be of little value in quelling disruptions. "If the National Guard were on campus and enforced a curfew, then these ID's might help," he said.

Siena maintained that Lyman has made no decision on whether to approve a central file which would contain more than 11,000 photos of all undergraduate and graduate students. "This is a separate step, and it is still being debated," declared Siena.

Delicate Investigation

At the moment the delicate subject of the file is being investigated by the Ad Hoc Committee on Protection of Privacy. The group is headed by George Gregory of the University legal staff and is currently holding open meetings. Lyman is expected to make a decision on the files after being advised by the committee.

Gregory stated, "No one has raised a strong objection to the photo ID card. Our concern is whether the central file raises problems."

On Monday Lyman told a group of students that the file proposal grew out of two weekly meetings of the presidential staff late last month. Some staff members felt the pictures would be useful in identifying students during disruptions.

Campus Lights

A related proposal that called for \$90,000 worth of floodlights across campus was approved, and the lighting is now being installed. Another suggestion to organize teams of faculty and staff to memorize names and faces of students is still under consideration.

The new cards will be issued at registration and will be handled through a Polaroid camera technique similar to the type used by the Food Service. Assistant Registrar Peter Dahl claimed that no preparations had been made for taking a second set of the central file, but that the camera unit could be easily adjusted for this purpose.

Dean Bulkeley described the proposed file as "potentially viable." He declared, "It's just unrealistic to think that the University can sit by and watch itself be systematically dismembered." He commented that "if you had people who were clever enough, it might be useful... but there isn't a university in the country that has done this."

Bulkeley said "there is a very large price to be paid for it [the files], and one must assess the pros against the cons. It's a terribly difficult decision."

Demolition Ban?

The Palo Alto City Council, acting as the "Committee of the Whole," voted to consider at next Monday night's regular Council meeting, an emergency ordinance that will, if passed, place a sixty day moratorium on all demolitions of occupied residential dwellings in Palo Alto.

The motion, proposed by Councilman Kirk Comstock, and seconded by Councilwoman Ed Pearson, originally called for a one-year moratorium on demolitions of all rental residential units, and asked for rent controls for that same period. The move was amended three times by Councilman C. Grant Spaeth, who is also an attorney for the Palo Alto Medical Research Foundation, which

recently attempted to demolish low-rent housing in order to place a hospital in its place.

The amendments reduced the moratorium period from one year to sixty days, deleted all portions relating to rent control, and narrowed the demolition restriction to unoccupied dwellings only.

The final amended motion was proposed for next Monday night's Council meeting by a 5-3 vote, with Dr. William Clark, physician for the Medical Research Foundation, abstaining on conflict-of-interest grounds. In order to pass the proposed emergency ordinance, a four-fifths majority vote of the 11-member Council is required.



"Keep Them Independent"

Lyman Hits Political Campuses

Universities will survive only if their leaders keep them independent of politics, Acting President Richard W. Lyman declared Wednesday.

But at the same time, "both by precept and example," university administrators should encourage "an active responsibility for political judgment and action on the part of individuals," he said.

He spoke at a luncheon meeting of the Stanford Men's Club of San Francisco.

This approach, Lyman said, is "the essential alternative to the kind of coercive tactics and direct action espoused by the far left, and often the far right, tactics which are predicated on the assumption that our political processes won't work and cannot produce change."

Avoid Becoming Pawn

Lyman warned the alumni that "the university cannot remain the true home of free inquiry if it is subordinated to political purposes. A great university does not exist to make people feel comfortable by confirming their prejudices. It exists to keep alive the impossible but essential human quest for answers to the ultimate question, What is Truth? and to all the lesser questions that flow therefrom.

"To convert it into the ally or pawn of new left, old right, or middle-aged center, is to betray that purpose."

While universities often are involved in politics, whether making views known in Washington on Federal support for higher education, or meeting with neighboring officials on land problems, Lyman said, on broader issues a university would lose its important tax-exempt status if it became involved in political advocacy.

But much more important, Lyman warned, is that "once the university permits itself to become the instrument of political causes, it will be an instrument that everyone will be eager to enlist and control." In the subsequent buffeting, "freedom for all points of view can hardly be expected to survive."

Mob Threatens Speakers

Today's conditions are very close to just that situation, he said.

"Freedom of speech on the campus has in some respects been carried to extremes that are profoundly shocking to many, probably most, of the over-30 generations. But in other respects it has begun to be circumscribed, not by censorship but by the power of a mob—even a small mob—to heckle, deride, interrupt, and intimidate any

people's rights." He later retracted his statement. Also on May 1 rumors were circulating that the Trustees were considering firing Pitzer. The Palo Alto Times reported that the Trustees would meet in emergency session the following week to consider the matter. Although these rumors were confirmed the same day from independent sources, no confirmation of such a meeting has ever come from the Trustees. During the following week the strike shut down the entire campus. No arrests were made and no charges were brought before the SJC, although numerous buildings were blocked. The campus was witnessing its first successful mass movement since the April Third Movement, and the administration was again powerless, and unable to affect the outcome. The police did not come on the campus during the strike week. There were reports that they would not come again unless they were armed with birdshot. During the two nights of street fighting, 37 sheriff's deputies and 23 San Jose police were injured. They were not willing to come back again under the same conditions they faced on April 29 and 30.

Trustees Meet

The Board of Trustees met in San Francisco on May 11 and 12. They were persuaded by students present at the meeting not to call police on campus again since that would provoke more violent reactions. Instead, the administration reverted to SJC hearings. On May 12 and 13 it charged 44 persons with blocking the ROTC building. Less than one-third of those charged were convicted by the SJC; the others were acquitted or had their cases dismissed.

Early Monday morning, May 15, seven students were arrested for activities during April 23 and 29. That night, in response to the arrests, 75 students marched across campus breaking windows in numerous buildings including the ROTC, Aero and Astro, and both Hoover buildings. Most of those arrested had their charges dropped or were acquitted.

What are we to learn from this spring's activities? The administration can easily muster the support it needs to isolate participants in violent individual actions once it catches them. Its huge public relations staff even enables the university to deal with peaceful actions if mass support is lacking. But when there is mass support for a large peaceful action, it is no longer clear who is running the university. It is this type of situation that brought about the dissatisfaction with the regime of Kenneth Pitzer.

The damage inflicted on persons and property has been great. Kenneth Pitzer has resigned, after only 19 months in office. Large numbers of students have an ambiguous black mark on their records: an arrest which has not resulted in a conviction. The windows which were broken in April and May are slowly being replaced. And Stanford's Trustees are looking for a new president who will not make the same mistakes that the administration made this spring.

speaker whose views that mob happens to dislike."

There are many campuses, he admitted, where Jerry Rubin or Eldridge Cleaver might appear without trouble, while Spiro Agnew or Ronald Reagan would need "massive protection and preparation."

But the difficulties faced by universities today go beyond society's politicization, Lyman said.

They go, he warned, "into the ominous country of 'groupthink' and the outright denial of freedom for the individual. More and more—and from both extremes of the political spectrum—one hears people excusing and rationalizing the denial of freedom... The numbers are increasing of those who argue that the other end doesn't understand and won't respond to anything but force or the threat of force."

Participation Solves Ills

The answer is not removal from political action of individuals connected with universities, he insisted, but more responsible political action.

Lyman defended the right of university officers to speak out, if they speak as individuals and selectively on "issues of real moment." Silencing them would "amount to depriving all but the

most lowly plebe or unattached Americans of their right of citizenship," he said. "The ills of democracy are to be solved by more active participation in political life on the part of informed and responsible citizens—not less." Furthermore, he said, "silence generally operates in favor of the status quo, whatever that may be at the moment."

But when a university president or provost does speak out, Lyman said, "he must never forget that he is an educator, not a politician. He should avoid political invective; he should try not to be polemical; he should be at pains to make clear that he knows honest minds can differ and that durable political progress in a free society is more likely to come from the interplay of viewpoints and the working out of compromises than from having one side huddle on the other into submission."

Daily Ends

This is the final issue of the Daily for the summer quarter. The first issue of volume 158, edited by Bill Freiwogel and Marshall Kilduff, will be published Monday, September 28.