

File
Dick Lyman

5/29/68

open forum at TMC

NOTES

70-80 students there plus several administrators

speaking of barrier to communication - mutual suspicion hasn't been as rampant as now in my 40 years. It is not my position, but it is general in the society today.

Q. Monday night meeting - what was the purpose

Purpose was ill-defined in that it was just for me to appear.

I was naive in my estimate of the possibilities in such a meeting.

I also wish someone else had chaired it. I never heard what

David Pugh said because I was off with fire marshal.

Q/ Presidential selection

I comment as an individual because I have no part in it.

I am not really better apprised of the situation than you.

I don't think there will be student members on the committees (

faculty and Trustees) but I feel that Fuller would welcome

comments on people or qualities students would like. Kennedy,

Potter, Moser and the rest on the faculty committee are all

professors that students can talk to.

Q. applicability of U.S. Constitution on campus.

You'd better be glad you'd not be in criminal prosecutions if

the Supreme Court passes what I think it will.

We are now in a condition that rests uneasily between two others-

past and future (I) the past: the University was old-fashioned,

paternalistic, no rules and a vague standard.

future: every institution of higher education in this country

will have to have a codified set of rules. We will have moved to formal procedures, and a safeguards & bureaucracy of the civil courts.

I do not happen to believe it is desirable for the whole structure to disappear and have no difference between here and Palo Alto.

Life will be ~~not~~ less free and less educationally free then.

You would have gained realism but you may lose some kinds of freedom which are very much a part of the learning experience.

Q. Why not make the budget open to the public.

Tactical procedures etc., but at the base of your question is the feeling that there are inequities. But I feel that if all

feelings were aired in budget proceedings, we would have much the same end product as we do now. There are such pressures

from one year to another that there is much uncertainty. We

depend so much on federal money. You cannot make sure something will endure if you are dependent on federal money. You do not

know that you DO have influence on the budget but you do.

If the budget were entirely open it would be subject to alliances, lobbies etc. just as the Congress. And then Stanford would be

a different kind of institution. You may feel that this would be more democratic but I believe that we can be more democratic

and free in other ways. Deans now are a focal point for people sending ideas up. I would not be in favor of making public the

detailed budget, but much needs to be done in this area. What we do make public - one might say it doesn't reveal more than

it obscures

Q. ROTC stays

You must distinguish between the presence of ROTC at all and its presence for academic credit. It is theoretically possible for the academic credit (etc.) to be removed without removal entirely. I think practical, too. I am skeptical of the viability and validity for its present organization.

It should be on campus because that option should be available to students who want to work off their military duty that way. We should have it because a sufficient number of students are interested in it.

(Fred Cohen: if a sufficient number of students wanted to learn insurgency instead of counterinsurgency would you allow us to?)

What is at issue is the kind of service. You have to admit that the ROTC students' ideas are consistent with the legal structure of the U.S.

That the CIA ought to be in Dink answering questions is an accurate bar. But free speech is not the way to defend its presence on campus. I would defend it on the grounds that the students want these services. It is not freedom to come and talk but making available to students a wide range of alternatives (for jobs etc.)

If more people believed that it was more important that ROTC might have a malignant effect on the rest of the campus and on education here than that students should have this possibility, ROTC wouldn't be here. You are wrong when you think that you cannot effect a change in the status of ROTC.

Q. relationship of Calif. to U.

The Charter is granted by the State and in that we are invested with a public responsibility, Boards of Trustees are being questioned throughout the U.S. But the underlying rationale for a Board is that without one the institution could in essence become a public institution. You should argue to do away with the institution, not just tinker with the mechanism, but remember at what price. The Wyman amendment is in the malevolent tradition of the Broyhill amendment. Universities are trying to fight it, but once it gets onto the floor, it's almost too late.

Q. A Is the University willing to sue in the courts on behalf of a student in such a situation.

I would give serious consideration to something like this to try to help the students.

We desperately need new ways to get federal money to the University in other than research.

QIDA and Stanford ties.

It is my impression that the IDA is itself severing its institutional ties.

Q. Can dialogue exist here?

dialogue hasn't been effective here but it can be. Communication is possible between people with different status and power.

(Mary Hanson X we do not want to be havened off.)

Lyman 5.

Lyman : The university's change will be better if it is done gracefully. We have to move in the direction of more influence for both students and faculty more clearly understood.

I do not believe that it should be a democratic institution because while this would be a learning process it would not be a university.

Student opinion can be made more effective. We should have a better way for student referendum.

Student opinion on teaching should be stronger and influential.

Why not support wider, better grounded course review.

Q. residence shortage on campus.

Because of a lack of resources and we didn't know what kind of dorm to build.

Byman: The university cannot be an agent of revolutionary change without being something quite different from what it is now, something I would not like to see it become.

Scholarly functions of the University are not talked about much now. And this is the core of a university. The university makes ideas available and in this it affects the social order.

The American university have become a mix of such diverse entities that we in them find ourselves defending one purpose and not the others. We get mixed up ourselves.

Undergradual education may be unduly influenced by vocational training (as opposed to "pure" knowledge)

If the only effective means of change is a resort to force, what is to prevent that from becoming the way of all students of all different points of view.

Tom Grissom: YOU have to make some move to dispel the distrust. You should say that this is not a democratic institution. You should stop recruiting students on the basis that this is a residential campus since we don't have the residences.

Lyman: mutual trust will not and cannot be formed between me and several of you here. There is simply too much fundamental disagreement. But we must spell out why we disagree and this is ~~xxxx~~ not the kind of meeting to do that in.

Students there: Mike Weinstein, Tom Grissom, Mary Hanson, Dennis Hayes Eckardt Schultz, Phil Taubman, Fred Cohen, John Shippie, Charles Countee, Eric Treisman