

lished "The Axon," a daily news bulletin which carried schedules of meetings, reports of committees, and editorials. The Faculty Senate of the Medical School issued a statement deploring the war escalation in Indochina, and the use of violence to register protest on campus. By the end of the week issues in addition to the war became matters of concern. In particular, violence on other campuses and the deaths of students at Kent State and Jackson received great attention.

There were, of course, pro-Nixon feelings also expressed by various segments of the Medical Center. Ken Marich, a senior research assistant in pathology, and Dr. William Trytl of the Department of Pathology collected more than 300 signatures in support of the President from students, faculty, and staff. Insisting that "we are not a prowar group," Marich said the people who signed his petition felt the President was earnestly acting in good faith to bring "the unfortunate situation in Southeast Asia to a swift and honorable end."

Antiwar sentiment was by no means limited to the campus. More than 450 practicing physicians from the Midpeninsula added their voice to the number of those protesting the war. And in an unprecedented action, the Santa Clara County Medical Society's governing board passed a resolution endorsing the students for working to present their antiwar sentiment through established political institutions. "We urge others to support their approach since they represent the previously uncommitted nonviolent majority of medical students who now hope to take and hold leadership from the militants and to pursue a constructive course," the statement said.

IT IS VERY DIFFICULT to assess in precise terms the effects of the May activities on national policy or the Medical School, but some generalizations can be made. At the Medical Center the surge in nonviolent political action came at the time when destructive acts against campus facilities by a small group of dissident students and nonstudents were increasing. Many of the students and faculty were impelled to take up nonviolent political action in part, at least, in response to the escalation of violence and destruction on campus during which police had used tear gas for the first time at Stanford. Opposition from moderates against campus militants was far more important than the few class cancellations that occurred at the Medical School. There is no evidence that there was coercion and that academic freedom was infringed. Most of the activities involved faculty and students during off class hours in seminar-type gatherings dealing directly in research on social and political problems designed to produce viable solutions. For example, one recent meeting, which brought together Bay Area union leaders, faculty, and students, dealt with the effects of the war on organized labor, the University, and the economy. One aspect of the seminar examined the impact of the war on health care services at a time when the nation is suffering from serious shortages of doctors, dentists, and paramedical personnel. Some emphasis seems to have been placed on antiwar work in the community, of a fairly general

character and aimed at establishing contacts outside the campus. Other efforts supported Congressmen on issues or specific peace efforts.

Perhaps the most subtle effect of the May activities was in getting faculty and students talking together. Dr. Leon Cohen, associate professor of medicine, and chairman of the faculty senate, put it this way: "Patient care went on unimpaired. There has been an opportunity for those who may have fretted privately to discover ways to work in support of their opinions. Meaningful exchanges have taken place with individuals and groups outside the Medical Center, as well as among professors and students. This is healthy and will be of value in the future if we can keep the newly developed lines of communication open."

How effective these lines of communication will be remains to be seen. For many campus radicals, which the nonviolent political activists sought to isolate last spring, the University is simply an extension of the establishment they would like to topple and a source of recruits to their ranks. As a target, Stanford is an easy mark. Among the many tasks the University faces in defending itself is that of moving for the prosecution in the civil or criminal courts, or through campus judicial machinery, of those accused of causing disturbances or damage. Unfortunately, radicals often gain impact on campus with charges of prosecution.

In a recent issue of *Science*, reporter John Walsh, who visited the Medical School in the spring, has raised another more ominous issue: "Of the new cadres of nonviolent political activists one must ask whether their present ardor will endure through all the slogging in the precincts and through the probable disappointments of the next election and the next," he wrote. "It should also be noted that perhaps a majority of these activists are not interested in what one calls 'trivial change.' Their disenchantment with Congress as it operates, for example, is thorough. Perhaps most significantly, many of those who have decided to work within the system to change it hope, but only half-believe, it can be done that way."

If some nonviolent protesters are doubtful about the effectiveness of their efforts, why do they bother at all? Randolph H. Chase, a first-year medical student, gave this answer: "Regardless of the effect our work might have on the elections in November, we feel strongly that our summer efforts have been worthwhile. The very exchange of ideas and views with labor unions and service organizations has helped, we feel, to diminish the polarization which has already reached too high a level in the community, in the Bay Area, and in the nation."

For faculty and students, the most significant aspect of contact with the community this summer may well be the realization that the strong reaction by alumni, physicians, and other citizens to the campus violence has made communication difficult. Those who believe in nonviolence feel they must get the community on their side. As Chase put it, "We want to show that the University is not a place where rock throwing is condoned as a method of solving problems."

—SPYROS ANDREPOULOS