

# Text of Franklin Statement

The text of Professor H. Bruce Franklin's opening remarks to the Advisory Board on September 28 is reprinted in the following four pages. A few sections have been deleted for reasons of space; otherwise the content is unchanged. The *Chaparral* feels that Professor Franklin's speech deserves the widest possible circulation: it presents a consistent and well thought-out point of view of a popular member of the faculty. We recognize that his point of view is a minority one. We also recognize that the opposing Administration arguments have numerous outlets for publication, such as the *Stanford Observer* and *Campus Report*. Since these publications are paid for out of unrestricted University funds (provided mainly by tuition), we have chosen not to duplicate Administration efforts by including the opposing arguments.

I am being charged with manifest neglect of duty. And this seems to be my first opportunity in quite a few months to actually perform my duty at Stanford University, which is the duty of a teacher. And therefore, there is a certain amount of leeching that has to be done.

I am not going to comment at this time about the facts of the case, other than to say that in the investigation of the actual facts in relationship to the charges made I think that the question of basic honesty is going to come up very very frequently. And I think that we are going to be able to show quite conclusively why it is that the administration, with all its professed ideals of a quest for truth, has to be dishonest when it is engaged in the business it is presently engaged in in general and in particular in this case.

Now the basic question I think that is raised by the administration's arguments is the question of force and violence and coercion. We think that is pretty much at the heart of the matter. And those of us who are in the revolutionary movement are people whose lives are dedicated to opposing and ending violence. And I think if we look at the people in the revolutionary movement today we see that we fall in basically two different categories. One group of us proceeded to develop through the antiwar movement. Many of us were committed pacifists at that time. We were involved in a protest against the violence being inflicted by the ruling class of this country against its victims or people that it was trying to make its victims.

The other group of revolutionaries comes from the people who are themselves the direct victims of this violence.

But in either case, what we have to begin with is force, violence and coercion on the part of the people who have power against people who do not have power. A protest against that violence, beginning as a peaceful protest with a commitment to radical and absolute nonviolence, and then in the course of that protest people receiving so much violence for engaging in the protest that many of them learn that in order to continue that protest they have to resort to revolutionary violence in order to defend themselves. That is why the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—and it really was a student nonviolent coordinating committee—became a revolutionary organization dedicated to a revolution that would have to use revolutionary violence in order to overcome the violence of the state.

## Revolutionary Violence

At no time in the course of this hearing or at any time in the last several years have I or any of our comrades concealed the fact that we believe in the necessity for the use of revolutionary violence against counter-revolutionary violence. And I trust that that belief is not in issue, or even the suppression of that belief is not in issue.

I think that there is an issue about what happens when people have that understanding and some people act on that understanding. But we will certainly be getting into that.

Now the administration in arguing for a certain kind of procedure—an argument that was basically accepted here—describes the University as an institution thoroughly dedicated to "the balanced exchange of ideas" and as "totally opposed to force, violence and coercion."

Now if that were true about this University, I think we could all agree that none of us would be doing what we are doing today. We wouldn't be sitting here having this hearing.

## Rational Exchange

Now I have tried over the past several years, as many of us have, to attempt to discuss all this rationally with as many people as possible. And an example of that occurred on April 18, 1969, during an annual crisis

brought about by the violence of the state and the participating violence of the University, when I rose to speak in the academic council, recognized by President Sterling as a speaker, and began with words roughly to the effect that the origin of violence on this campus was not with the people who were protesting it.

And at that point, after just about that many words, I was hooted down, booed down, shouted down by many of the so-called "colleagues" who now profess an absolute dedication to unrestrained free speech. And I was given at that time 60 seconds to complete my remarks.

Now they tell us that the University has at the center of it the idea of a "dedication to balanced and rational exchange of ideas."

Now what they call "disruption" from their point of view is inexcusable because "The opportunity for rebuttal is always present."

Now if the administration's description of the University were accurate, then none of the incidents in question and in fact, no protest movement at all against the University or anything it is doing would have ever come into being. But the fact is, as I have argued elsewhere and as I intend to demonstrate in this hearing, that "The main business of Stanford University, the main business, is maintaining and expanding an economic area in the Pacific Basin; that is, the areas of the world bordering the Pacific Ocean. And it does this by producing the needed research, ideology, hardware and super-skilled manpower and by providing the vehicle for the interlocking of the appropriate corporate giants."

Now in what sense is the planning of an amphibious invasion during the invasion of Laos, while Ky is calling for an invasion of North Vietnam, such as was being conducted at the Computation Center last February, in what sense is that "a balanced, rational exchange of ideas?"

Now how does one take advantage of the opportunity for rebuttal to this invasion plan? By arguing for a more efficient invasion?

Now we are in absolute agreement that people in the University are to have a commitment to refrain from violence and that in fact violence, force and coercion should not take place.

## In the Classroom

To get a perspective on this, what would be the reaction if a professor at this University were in his classroom teaching students how to make Molotov cocktails for use (say) against the pigs? Would that be something that could be construed as protected by academic freedom?

Well you see, that is not some totally fanciful thing. Because in fact in classrooms in this University weapons research on a much higher order than the construction of Molotov cocktails is at this moment going on. And not only is this weapons research going on, but the weapons developed at this University have been used and are being used for the purpose of actually inflicting death on at least hundreds of thousands of people around the world.

There are courses given in this University essentially on how to be professional killers, in the Reserve Officers Training Corps. And it was not the administration that saw in that the teaching and urging and inciting to violence. It was the movement, even before it was a revolutionary movement.

In fact, in 1963, when I debated against Phillip Rhineland, the ROTC instructor and the students threatened to beat me up.

Now we would welcome a successful ban on the main cause of disorder. Because that would in fact mean that the revolution has won. Because the greatest cause of disorder in the history of man has been in fact capitalism. Now that disorder is by no means entirely a bad thing. It has a good side. In the words of the Communist Manifesto: "Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast, frozen relations with their train of ancient and removable prejudices and opinions are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life and his relations with his kind."

Now that struggle and that disorder takes place today not only in the University, but throughout the world. But it does take place in the University, right here in this arena. And the changes are very very rapid, and have been for some time.

## The American University

We have to ask: "Why does it take place at this particular time?" In order to do so, I think we have to

understand the historical development of the modern American university.

Now in this opening brief, trial brief, which may or may not be admitted, there are fairly lengthy arguments about the main thing about the University and that one's duties within it are a centuries-old tradition in what they call the "western university." Now "western" is, of course, a very racist concept. "Western university": By that they mean white European. And it doesn't count if it is a Latin American university or a Chinese university or a Cuban university. But they are the ones who raised the issue of "What is the university?" and "Why is it that certain functions are appropriate to the university and certain functions are not." Which is why I think it would really be better if they were approaching this thing not from a legalistic point of view but were really getting into the substance of the thing.

In order to understand the University we have to understand who actually controls it, the class character of its faculty, its student body and its workers, how all these interrelate to each other and with the rest of the society and how they have been all going through a process of rapid shift approaching a radical transformation.

## Three Stages

Now I would like to distinguish three stages in the history of the university. The first is the medieval or feudal university; the second is the university of the bourgeoisie; and then the future university of the poor and working people.

Now each of the first two stages has, of course, contained within it the preconditions of the next emerging stage. And that is: What we are now witnessing right here at Stanford University is an institution in the process of transcending itself, being revolutionized, turning into its opposite at the very moment that it is developing into its own extreme.

When we talk about the university as an institution, we are not talking about burning down the universities. We are talking about revolutionizing that university so that the facilities of this university actually serve the needs of the poor and working people.

Now in the medieval university student and faculty power was total, and devotion to the humanities was complete. It was a feudal institution, making no bones about its total service for the church and the aristocracy. The ideal of contemplation outside the struggles of society; the fraternity of scholars; the quest for philosophic truth, as opposed to practical truth; the purity of the academy: Those were ideals that were dominant ideas in that feudal or medieval university. And they are still present to some degree inside the present university. There are still vestiges of that, particularly in the humanities. And strange as it may seem, the university is the last stronghold of that central medieval concept which was so completely shattered by the Renaissance, the rise of capitalism and modern science. And that is the ideal of timelessness—the vision we get (say) in the Sistine Chapel of all time happening in the same place, in the same instant.

That medieval university still exists in the minds of many academics. And of course, it is not a coincidence that we call them "academics" and we talk about "academic freedom." Because it is the academics who occasionally resent the intrusions of the war machine almost as much as they resent the protest demonstrations against the war machine.

Periodically, ever since the development of the bourgeois university, that medieval ideal has been resurrected to serve as a shield against the dynamic forces reshaping a far different university.

You can go back to Cardinal Newman's 1852 glorification of a dead institution in "The Idea of a University" or you can go right on down to S. I. Hayakawa's recent wishful claim that "In another time I would have been a priest."

Now the university of the bourgeoisie has itself developed stage by stage. In America the colonial colleges—most typically, Harvard and Yale—on the surface seem to have been the most advanced form of the medieval university. Totally under the control of the New England theocracy and totally committed to an orthodox religious view of experience, it would seem to have been the bastion of conservatism. But in fact its religious orthodoxy was Puritanism—American Puritanism at that. And just as American Puritanism provided an ideological base for the rising merchant class the colonial college, only superficially transformed, became a main base of political and economic power for that class.

Now in Europe the demands of the dynamically developing 19th century capitalism brought a radical innovation to the idea of the university—the German model, stressing scientific research, scientific method in



all fields, bringing graduate instruction. And this model reached America at a crucial time—shortly after the Land Grant Act of 1862 and the radical changes in class relations that were being brought about by the Civil War and during the powerful westward expansion of youthful American capitalism. The land grant university, rather than the New England college, was to be the prototype of the university of the future, though that was to include the graduate and research facilities imported by Johns Hopkins University.

But the next qualitative changes came with the Depression and World War II, when the federal government became increasingly involved in the universities. This represented part of the process of the collapse of private enterprise capitalism and its replacement by monopoly and state capitalism.

#### The Multiversity

In World War II the university was recruited directly into war research and the so-called "cold war," together with the increasing demands of monopoly capitalism at home and abroad, has fused now what is commonly called the "military-industrial-educational complex," which I think can be best understood as an early stage of state capitalism. In this stage the medieval university, a cosmos fused by a single purpose, that community of scholars with the stress on "community"—has been completely transformed into its opposite, what Clark Kerr has aptly named the "multiversity," where the central value is the bourgeois ethic of competition. Not cooperation, but competition is the dominant value at all levels and in all activities within this university.

So nobody I think would argue well, I guess they would! with Kerr's contention that the multiversity "has become a prime instrument of national purpose."

#### Professors

I don't like to focus too much on Professor Shockley, because his theories about genocide are really an embarrassment to the liberal establishment. I mean, he comes right out and says: "We ought to sterilize black people, we ought to sterilize poor people." And everybody says: "Pshaw, pshaw." You know. Don't give the game away. Because it is the nice liberals that are actually doing that genocide.

Then there is Professor Staley, who designed a strategic hamlet program for Vietnam, or Professor Rambo, who was a founding member of that society dedicated to the advancement and development of electronic warfare.

Now the multiversity's virtually all-white and overwhelmingly male faculties profess the most democratic and liberal of bourgeois ideals. But there are some contradictions there. For one thing, the student body is changing. It is now a third female. Black and brown and Asian people, native American people are becoming students in some kind of significant number at this time. There are even a few of these people who have managed to get on to the faculty. The class origin of the student body and the class origin of the faculty also is widening. So there are these contradictions that are taking place upon the university campus.

The university is at the same time an essential bulwark of the status quo and a source of very revolutionary social, economic and political ideas—the ideas, of course, mirroring the reality of the world as a whole.

So we find the question of power in the universities is being seriously debated at a time when it should be perfectly clear that no group can control the universities without controlling society as a whole.

#### Who Runs The University

Now who actually does run the universities? As far as ultimate power, the answer is very simple. The owning class runs the universities, much as they run the rest of society.

In capitalist society power comes from ownership and ownership comes from power. The owning class not only owns the means of production, but also the means of communication. All major political candidates must therefore either themselves be members of the ruling class or be directly selected by that ruling class.

Now one has to understand this power historically. When commodities were typically produced by a man who both owned the tools and did the labor, there wasn't any question as to who did or should own the product. I mean, he owned the tools and he made the product. It was his product. But what happens when you separate the worker from his tools and somebody owns the tools and somebody else is doing the work? Who owns the product? If I borrow a neighbor's tools and make a cabinet in my garage, does the cabinet belong to my neighbor?

Well, of course that question never really arose in any kind of conscious way historically. It was settled by brute power; that is, the people who owned the tools owned the products. Fundamental alienation of the worker from his own tools. And the power was there because there were more workers and fewer tools than were needed. And that is why the man who owned the tools had the power to claim sole ownership of the product. And why only this was legitimate power or why that was not construed to be force, violence or

coercion: That is, of course, the central premise of capitalist society. Now its consequences are cumulative. The more one owns, the more power one has. The more power one has, the more one can own.

So two of the central ethics that follow from this are: The person who does own something is the person who should own it, and those who have power are the ones who should have it. That is legitimate. Other power is illegitimate.

Now of course, there are antitheses to all this.

I want to make it very clear that these arguments are not now kind of being developed in an opportunist way to squirm out of these overwhelming charges. These are the utmost political beliefs upon which we act. And secondly, the Advisory Board and the rest of the people are going to hear again and again, in the speeches I make and the speeches that other people make, this political understanding brought to bear on the concrete situation at Stanford. But I would like to interject one thing here, which is not there. And that is to suggest the legitimacy of force and violence.

Mr. Norris talked about "Some people were injured at the Computation Center." But who were they injured by? They were injured by the police—or we call them, more accurately than "police," which is a false consciousness, "pigs." People can see a bunch of police running around with guns and clubs and mace. That is not violence. The people who called in that organized violence can still say: "We abhor violence. We are not committing violence." Why? Because it is legitimate violence because they have the power to call these armed men on campus and they make the law that only those people with guns can run around on campus, only those people were beaten up.

Now of course, there are antitheses to all this. The actual work of capitalist society is not done by the owning class. And the working class knows this, sort of dimly I think in prosperous times but very acutely in periods of economic distress. Work, as well as ownership, is at least a potential source of power. And the working class recognizes this in practice. Its main effective day-to-day tactic is withdrawing its labor, having strikes. And the legitimacy of a strike is going to be a very important issue in this hearing. Not just a political strike but also the right of the workers of this university to have a strike over economic issues or whatever issues. And it is no coincidence that the synonym for "strike" that is being used here is "activities that disrupt the business and functions of the university." And that issue is being dodged.

Now by challenging the legitimacy of the power of the owning class, the working class makes possible a challenge of the source of that power, which is private property.

In the university useful labor is performed by students, faculty, sometimes by administrators, nonteaching workers, both blue-collar and white-collar. Some of the tools are physical such as books, classroom buildings, equipment and so on. These are made by the interdependent labor of intellectuals and industrial workers, both directly and by using capital created by other workers. The main tool and the main product is knowledge, which in its totality is nothing less than the most important product of all previous humanity. It is the inherited consciousness, which is our most precious human possession. It is what distinguishes us from all other beings that we know about—that consciousness. And there are at least three distinct kinds of knowledge used and produced in the university. First is useful knowledge or "know-how" which creates, among other things, factories, industries, power, weapons, empire. This kind of knowledge can be owned, at least temporarily, which is a fact attested to by the patent office, by the laws governing ownership of industrial research and by the security classifications of the Department of Defense. The other two kinds may be called "ideological knowledge" and "cultural knowledge." These belong to the class that produced them and serve only the interests of that particular class.

Ultimate power and legal control over all the physical tools and products of the university lie in the hands of the corporate elite, both directly through their total occupation of the boards of trustees and regents, and indirectly through the political apparatus they control. The same is true for the useful knowledge, which becomes the property of either corporations or the state. By having ultimate control over the procedures and principles of hiring, the trustees and regents so far have been able to make sure that only the culture and ideology of their own class and of previous ruling classes can be propagated in their universities.

Now the lines of power in the so-called "private universities" are very neatly drawn. And Stanford is a very good example, particularly because a lot of basic research on the power relationships here has been assembled.

#### Stanford's Will

Now of course, all power at Stanford legally derives from Leland Stanford's plunder through Mrs. Stanford's will. We sit here and we put forth an ideal. This is just kind of a timeless application of pure mind when buildings, real buildings, physical buildings were built on stolen land, lands stolen from Mexican and native

American people. It was their land, and it was stolen land. And these buildings were built because Leland Stanford was able to plunder the lives of workers, principally Asian workers brought into this country and worked literally until they were dead and Mexican workers and native American workers and some white workers. That is the origin of power in this University. And now there is a precedent, a very interesting precedent for this case. Because back at the end of the 19th century there was another professor here who had some ideas that are very similar to our ideas. His name was Professor Edward Ross. Professor Ross was a professor of economics, and his specialty was banking and railroads. And he advocated that the railroads, even Leland Stanford's railroads, should be municipally owned.

So Mrs. Stanford wrote a letter to President Jordan. She read accounts of the speech, and she wrote a letter to President Jordan. She said—and this is a quote—"I must confess I am weary of Professor Ross. And I think he ought not to be retained at Stanford University. I think he should now be dismissed."

Well of course, it was nothing to get Professor Ross fired. They just asked for his resignation. Because he said: "We have built up some rights that are profits of the revolutionizing process that is going on."

When Professor Ross was fired, we can see how far we have come (say) since 1908. There was one student who protested. And that student was beaten up—which is typical of the right-wing violence on this campus—by right-wing students. He was beaten up and thrown into Lake Lagunita, which had the approval of the administration, the professors and all the other students. He was called a "perpetual freshman!"

Professor Ross said: "I have long been aware that my every appearance in public drew upon me the hostile attention of certain powerful persons in interest in San Francisco, and they redoubled their efforts to be rid of me. But I had no choice but to go straight ahead." And he also talked about his firing being a blow aimed directly at academic freedom, a deep humiliation to Stanford University and to the cause of American education. And he said that "That blow"—these are quotations—"proceeds from the sinister spirit of social bigotry and commercial intolerance, which is just now the deadliest foe of American democracy."

Professor Branner, later to become president, expressed his hearty approval. He said: "Are professors in this institution at liberty to attack the university management in the presence of classes? If such a liberty is looked upon as academic freedom, then I beg to say once and for all that such freedom—"such" is the word—"is not and will not be tolerated in this institution so long as it is under its present management."

Well, it's true that we have fought and won some rights since 1908.

Now that legal power today legally belongs to the board of trustees, which can generally be broken down into four inter-related groupings: San Francisco finance and construction, oil, electronics and aerospace (which included at the time of this writing the presidents of General Dynamics, Hewlett-Packard and Northrop Corporation)—all people, of course, dedicated to the timeless pursuit of truth and the rational and balanced exchange of ideas!

#### The Pacific Basin

The main business of Stanford University is maintaining and expanding that economic empire in the Pacific Basin. And this is why the research, the ideology, the hardware and the super-skilled manpower, even the board of trustees, exist. The overall theory of this Pacific Basin empire is itself a Stanford product. At the time of this writing the Stanford Research Institute was a wholly-owned subsidiary. Because of the movement it no longer is, although what we have asked for was life, not death. We asked for a real, rational, balanced exchange of ideas and so forth to go on.

The Stanford Research Institute and Stanford together constitute the second largest university contractor in the country for the Department of Defense.

The overall purpose of Stanford Research was well defined back in 1951 by the Stanford Research Institute's director, Jesse Hohnson. This is what he said:

"This nation occupies 6 percent of the land area of the world, has 7 percent of the world's population, but it now produces 50 percent of the world's goods and possesses 67 percent 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."

Now that is not a revolutionary saying that.

Stanford is the proud home of Professor Eugene Staley's strategic hamlet plan for Vietnam as well as the ill-fated McNamara line, whose sophisticated electronic components were to be produced by firms represented on the board of trustees—Hewlett-Packard, Watkins-Johnson, General Telephone and Telegraph. The School of Engineering and the School of Business are integrated directly with the Stanford Industrial Park. The Electrical Engineering Department, which provided the Pruvost while aerospace and electronics were ousting the railroads and shipping from domination of the



board, has more faculty members than the departments of history, classics, anthropology and philosophy combined. The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, which has open connections with the FBI and CIA, is one of the world's main centers of cold war propaganda. It was founded explicitly, in the words of its founder, "to demonstrate the evils of the doctrines of Karl Marx." ... "Thus to protect the American way of life." According to *The Wall Street Journal* (June 2, 1967) the Hoover Institute now has "a network of agents around the world," one of whose main functions is stealing documents and bringing them to the Hoover Library. This is a charge which was made public again not by revolutionaries, but by *The Wall Street Journal*.

And talking about force, violence and coercion: I don't think that charge has ever been investigated.

The board of trustees has direct and interlocked financial interests in Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Australia, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Venezuela, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Mexico, Korea, Taiwan and Japan. In the latter two Stanford has graduate campuses. Stanford is doing research on counterinsurgency in 12 of these countries. Yet when faced back in 1967 with a nonviolent demonstration against recruiting for the Central Intelligence Agency on campus, the administration and much of the liberal faculty held up the medieval image of the University as a sacrosanct place of tranquil and disinterested contemplation of timeless truth.

#### Effective Control

Now it has been argued that merely sitting on the governing board of a university does not necessarily equal having effective control over the university. Those who make this argument point to the power within the universities that the faculty has through its own senate, on tripartite committees and within departments over hiring and firing procedures, course content, academic regulations and so forth. That argument, in fact, is part of one or more of the huge documents that Tuttle & Taylor submitted over the summer. They said: "Look. The faculty gets to make its own rules. So that is why these procedures have to be judged in a very different light."

But the point here is that it is the board of trustees that has the power to hire and fire that faculty, given certain limits like constraints developed by the power of the people. And that means that there is a kind of self-censoring and self-selection going on. And if it is true that the governing boards, like the board of trustees, do not have the real power, one wonders why the representatives of monopoly capital fight so hard and so successfully to maintain their complete domination of these boards.

No contradiction between the present managers or administrators and owners or trustees is a class contradiction any more than contradictions between the management of Ford and General Motors are class contradictions; and, for that matter, there aren't any contradictions between the state capitalist managers of the U.S.A. and the state managers of the Soviet Union, which has roughly the same economic-social-political system that the United States has. The class enemies of all these are the poor and working people of their own countries and, most acutely, the peoples of the third world, the oppressed nations of the third world. And that is why the administrators of the American multiversity are just as eager as their boards of trustees and regents to throw the full might of their institutions, all their resources, against the forces of what they call "instability" in the world and at home. They are dedicated to force, violence and coercion on a world-wide scale.

But the administration has limits placed upon it from other directions. Caught between the trustees or regents on one hand and the forces in rebellion against that very class, it sometimes finds itself in the position of attempted mediator or buffer in a class war. This is complicated by the fact that most administrators have their immediate origin in the faculty, a group which itself is torn by internal contradictions.

Now the faculty of the multiversity doesn't consist primarily of some kind of medieval academician. It primarily includes powerful businessmen, professional military officers, there are some would-be humanist scholars, there are scientists who have independent contracts and who hire and fire researchers and other workers, there are doctors and lawyers, even some bohemian writers.

But most professors are objectively—that is, in relationship to the means of production—and subjectively—that is, in terms of what they think—members of the middle and petty bourgeoisie. And as such they share a very common idea of their class—that class struggle, if it exists at all, involves other people and springs from the fact that these other people are irrational. "We are rational. Those people out there struggling are irrational." Hence the liberal idea that conflict comes from people who don't communicate well enough with each other.

As a subclass professors fervently cling to the belief that they, perhaps alone of all groups, are somehow above that sordid field of confused class war. This belief justifies their very reason for existence, for the belief

that they alone can offer a neutral, objective, classless, more or less truthful view of the other classes, of the history of their struggles and of the culture which springs from this history and gives it comprehensible form. Their procedure of such pure truth, of course, incidentally commits them to lives where they associate only with other members of the middle and petty bourgeoisie, particularly other professional people. Even though they may advocate integrated schools and housing, they live in essentially all-white ghettos and send their children to schools with some kind of token integration. Although they may be sympathetic to workers in the abstract, they probably don't even know a single blue-collar worker personally, unless they work for him, and therefore they lament that the industrial working class is "content with their cars and TV sets. Not like us."

Now I am not saying that in any sense that they as individuals shouldn't exist. But our beliefs are that the social class of which all are members should not exist. And we are dedicated to making sure it doesn't exist. And so we are challenging the ideas that you all are teaching in your class rooms every day, challenging very fundamentally the assumptions.

The bourgeois view of things, I think, comes out very sharply in a statement that Professor Panofsky made at an antiwar rally on April 30, 1970. Because I saw, when Professor Panofsky spoke, that he had a real passionate belief in these ideas and that the ideas which we are challenging, these were outside of his framework of perception. I didn't really think it was possible for him to understand these other ideas. But what he said—this was during the anti-Cambodian invasion movement—he attacked those who "put your bodies on the line."

"The power of man is through his mind, not his body. If the power of your body is all you have, then the future is indeed dim."

#### Mind-Body Dichotomy

And I was thinking of that when I wrote an article in *College English* about the mind-body dichotomy amongst university professors and why they are so horrified when any member of their own social class, another member of the faculty, says just in the abstract that people do have to put their bodies into action, that mind alone cannot change reality. And we think that the most intelligent action is one that represents the full dialectical relationship between mind and body. But there is a reason why that dichotomy exists the way it exists and why Professor Panofsky and other bourgeois physicists cannot understand existing parallels within their own theoretical field, within advanced theoretical physics, which is the mind-body dichotomy. The reason is, you see: There is Professor Panofsky working over there, and in a material environment. That is SLAC. He didn't build that linear accelerator. The workers built

that linear accelerator. Now the people who did it were operating with a combination of mind and body, subject and object.

But the alternate view is one that was put out by Professor Pittendrigh after the Lodge incident, when he went beyond the administration. And he is a good liberal who is against the war, and so on. And he says he is passionately against it. And he said that I should have been fired just for the Lodge incident, whereas Lyman only said that I should be suspended for one quarter without pay for the Lodge thing. And Professor Pittendrigh based that entire argument of why I should be fired on that dichotomy between mind and body. And he talked about the university as a place of pure mind. I mean, expressly neglecting all this other stuff. I know it was a little bit boring, but all that stuff doesn't exist. And you see, we have to recognize, as he apparently doesn't, that his argument is a very important prop for the unjust power and privilege he enjoys by himself and his social peers and superiors. In fact, his argument represents one side in the main ideological and class war of our age. Fortunately, it is the losing side.

Professor Pittendrigh defines "the nature and function of the University as a social institution" as "the institutionalization of mind." He thus functions within the tradition of Plato and his academy. That is, just like Plato. There is Plato. Plato is a part of a decadent social class. The class is being destroyed, absolutely wiped out.

I answered Pittendrigh in an article and I described what my opinion is, which is also the dominant idea of why they believe what they do.

"In the dialectics of history, culture is primarily an expression of objective economic and social relations and only secondarily an influence upon these relations. Petty bourgeois intellectuals cannot grasp this concept, for they believe that ideas come primarily from other ideas, so that a true intellectual must be a pure intellectual. They are therefore condemned to the delusion that they and their ideas are not the products of their class and historical experience." They kind of fall out of the sky.

And this is the part that I wrote when I was thinking of Professor Panofsky: "Why are most professors shocked when a few professors use their bodies to effect social change? Why do they find this not only non-intellectual but Mindless? Because bourgeois values teach that there are two different kinds of

activity—physical activity and mental activity. On the one side we have one category of beings, people who work with their bodies. And those people are mindless, they are not human. Particularly, of course, people who are nonwhite. Then on the other hand there are those who think, intellectuals, disembodied intelligences whose physical existence is essentially irrelevant to what they think." They are just pure mind.

Professor Panofsky couldn't possibly have our ideas and still be the actual manager with essentially an employer-employee relationship to all those workers at SLAC. He would have to say at some point: "This ain't right." The decisions here should be made by all the workers and not just by the people who are working here, but also by the people who have been deprived of work, the people who live in East Palo Alto or the people in Mountain View and San Jose.

Now the consciousness of these professors, like all consciousness, comes from the condition of their being. Their political and social ideas are essentially rationalizations to justify and support their privileged existence. They are philosophical idealists because they literally cannot afford to recognize the source of their material comforts—their nice homes, and so forth. Their highly privileged lives.

Now like the professors here: I mean, let's face it. You teach in my department six, six and a half, maybe seven hours a week eight months a year. And big vacations inside that eight months.

So the professors say: "We deplore the most blatantly vicious aspects of U.S. imperialism. We are against the war." While they hide from the fact that their own university is one of the principal institutions of the imperialist system. They think that Stanford University, which designs much of the strategy and weapons of the war against the people of Southeast Asia, is an institute of pure and disinterested mind. Those ideas, your ideas are just as doomed as the system which you all support.

Only inside the university do the professors act on what they understand to be class relationships. They are kind of a middle class, in a sense, between the students and the administration. And then the workers are kind of invisible to their understanding. And there is, I think, sometimes some resentment against administrative policies, maybe on salary matters and things like that. But generally the faculty only really gets upset with the administration when the administration permits the faculty's security and privileges to be exposed to the onslaught of the unwashed masses—that is, students, workers and poor and working people from the surrounding community. Because the faculty do have tremendous power over students. And that class distinction exists. Of course, you can see it written out right on the restrooms that are marked "For Faculty Only."

With one foot in the working class and the other rubbing against the ankles of the ruling class, sort of ambiguously in between, completely dependent on this social and political and economic system but often outraged by what the system does, the faculty behaves as it might be expected to behave; that is, it vacillates in its loyalties but in a crisis it tends to line up with the party of order, the people up at the top.

Now that is really nothing new. And the faculty of the multiversity as a whole tends to behave just like its historical predecessors.

#### Faculty Response

Here, for example, is the faculty's response to a student strike called at one university and spreading to others. This is a quotation.

"The professors lament and snivel, imploring the government not to take the road of reaction and to make use of an excellent opportunity to ensure peace and order with the help of reforms in a country exhausted by convulsions—imploring the students not to resort to unlawful courses which can only play into the hands of reaction, etc., etc., etc. How ancient and antiquated, how hackneyed are all these tunes."

Now that is not a description of Stanford University in 1970. It is Lenin's description of St. Petersburg University in 1908. When Lenin describes even earlier events, it sounds like the 1964 Free Speech Movement at Berkeley and its aftermath: The liberal professors join with the students to gain student freedom of assembly and speech; but when the students invite revolutionary speakers to their meetings these same liberal professors run around denouncing the "troublemakers." Then they waver and dash from one side to another, "urging the revolutionists to desist from revolution, and the police to desist from reaction."

Now more important than the similarity between the behavior of American professors in the 1960's and Russian professors before 1910 is the similarity between the behavior of each of these groups and the social class to which they belong. Lenin raises the key questions: "Indeed, was the liberal professors' behavior before and during the Moscow events fortuitous?"

"Does this behavior express the individual peculiarities of a given group of the liberal bourgeoisie, or does it express the fundamental interests of this entire



class in general?" That is, including a lot of the rest of the professional bourgeoisie. And anyone familiar with the American liberal left in the 1960's must realize that the liberal faculty—and most faculties are now, as they were in Russia 60 years ago, overwhelmingly liberal—represents and speaks for a larger class within our society. That is the class that supported Eugene McCarthy, as the candidate of that class.

In France, it has its own party, the P.S.U.—the so-called "Unified Socialist Party." It successfully ran Mendes-France as a peace candidate to settle its war in Vietnam.

Some portions of the faculty, of course, are the real ruling class and really are consciously identified with its interests. But most of the faculty feel kind of alienated from power, both within the university and in the society at large, and indeed they are. These are the middle-class professionals whose fate Marx and Engels accurately saw in 1848. "The physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science" become converted into "paid wage laborers." As such they are alienated from both the ruling class and from the industrial working class, both of whom they fear and sometimes despise. That is the liberal faculty.

Now there is a new ingredient here having to do with the broader base of that faculty. I mean, really it is very different from what it was a few decades ago when you had to be basically from a very affluent family in order to go to graduate school and get a degree, and so forth and so on. Join a club, and so on. Now there are a lot of people, like me, with working class backgrounds who are members of the faculty, even some who are proud members of the faculty. And that begins to change things some.

#### Role of Students

The same thing is true among the students. And there is a rapidly broadening base, class base, among the students. Of course, it is different from one place to another—at the prestige universities, the state university, the state colleges, junior colleges and so forth. But even here, on the other hand, there is something I think that we have to understand about the particular role of students in the university in which they have kind of a declassé existence, living in a limbo between their past, whether it was a wealthy past or a working class past, and whatever careers they have been channeled into. They are generally not considered as adults. They say that is changing very fast, but yet and clearly people of 17, 18, 19, 21 and so on are among the most intellectually alert and best informed people of society. And they are youthful, energetic and so on. But they are not permitted either to sell their labor or to own property. They are camped beneath their class. So that is why students, perceiving the contradictions of an intellectual point of view and living a kind of semi-declassé existence, line up with really oppressed people in their struggle.

University students are now the sons and daughters, even, of all classes, even some of the lowest classes, even some of the oppressed peoples and nations of the third world inside the United States. The number of college students now approximately equals the country's total armed forces plus its three largest unions—the Teamsters, UAW and United Steelworkers.

People who are not part of the thing should really, I think, take the opportunity to see what we are talking about by going over to graduate business school 75 and watching the Bureau of Statistics trial or hearing.

Now on the campus there is another group, in fact which is never even thought of in the kind of discussion that we have of this wonderful mindless place without any coercion and force. And that is the nonteaching employees. And the lowest strata of this group—janitors, gardeners, maintenance men, kitchen workers, maids, clerks, typists—include a far higher proportion of people from oppressed nations and national minorities inside the United States, live in neighborhoods removed from the faculty and administration but often shared with students, particularly graduate students, and are the most direct representatives of the exploited masses fully on the campus. Generally these people are looked upon by all of the other groups within the university—administration, faculty and students—as not being part of the university. In fact, they come close to being invisible. As they organize, one demand that they are going to raise is that the actual educational facilities of the universities be made available not only to their children, but to them. Not just the educational facilities, but also the practical facilities such as the health care. And their presence in classes is going to change things very radically. It is going to change that false consciousness that is now dominant.

Now we have tried to indicate in the course of this movement a movement which is in process of giving political power to poor working people. What we are in now is the quantitative change part. The quantitative and qualitative change, the Marxist concept. The quantitative part is: You have water. It gets hot. It gets to be hotter water and hotter water and hotter water. Qualitative change comes when that hot water turns into steam. It changes its state. That is a revolutionary transformation.

page six

#### Free Speech

Now looking at the present struggle that grew out of this very rapid transformation that has taken place, you begin to get some perspective. Here is the administration. "Absolute free speech, a balanced exchange of national ideas, and blah-blah-blah." Yet in 1963—this is just the year before the free speech movement in Berkeley—here is the official administration policy. This is a quote from the January 25, 1963 Daily. It is signed by H. Donald Winbigler. "The President and the Board of Trustees have begun a review of the University's policies relating to institutional participation in and identification with political and social action. At the request of the President of the University I am writing to inform you that, pending a policy review and until further notice, Stanford student organizations may not take public stands on issues affecting affairs beyond the Stanford campus without prior University approval. This provision applies also to offices of Stanford, student organizations and their official capacity, although it does not limit the right of any student as an individual to participate in undertakings which are not identified with the university."

Student organizations can't take positions on outside matters. What was the big flap about? It was because a student organization had taken a position against a congressional investigation of KPFA. "That is a subversive organization." Really. You know. It was eight and a half years ago, and we have come a long way!

Antiwar movement, teach-in. The period of 1964, 1965. During 1965 a peaceful vigil in White Plaza was the most radical action on campus. Those of us who participated in the peaceful vigil were attacked and thrown in the fountain while the police looked on.

You ask for police protection!

Later on in 1965 we had a blood drive for victims of American bombing in Vietnam. When we spoke there—I was a speaker—we were pelted with garbage and called "dirty Jew bastard" by ROTC students who received leadership credit to improve their grade for their participation in that event.

That spring came the first sit-in, the first terribly coercive act!

Now the question of a sit-in: You have to get some of the rhetoric, I think, of the great owners of corporations when they were first faced with the sit-in back in the 1930's.

For instance, William S. Knudsen, executive vice president of GM, said: "Sit-downs are strikes. Such strikers are clearly trespassers and violators of the law of the land. We cannot have bona fide collective bargaining with sit-down strikers in illegal possession of plants. Collective bargaining cannot be justified if one party, having seized the plant, holds a gun at the other party's head." Meaning the plant. Of course, they already had the plant, which is the gun they had at the workers' head.

The question of legitimacy is right there. It is not a seizure of the plant if the bosses seize the plant. It is a seizure of the plant when the workers seize the plant. And we see that right here in our university. The fact is that all the university premises and almost all the university employees have already been physically captured. And this is the central contradiction of the university, its embodiment of that primal bourgeois expropriation.

We used to have a thing in a building right near White Plaza called the "Experimental College." The administration decides that they don't like the education going on there. So what do they do? They seize the building, they capture the building, physically seize it. They destroy the Experimental College and they turn that building into a placement office where interviews are held for employment with the CIA, Dow Chemical and so on. But that is not force, violence and coercion. There is nothing improper about that, nothing illegal. Of course! Because they make the laws.

Now if the students had sat in to protest that, that would have been, of course, force, violence and coercion. The physical capture of the premises.

There was even a more interesting case in some ways, less in others, when the administration decided to seize the old Union and turn it into an office building for itself. It used to be a dormitory where there was the best interchange between students and faculty on the campus. It was noted as kind of really the intellectual center of the campus. And when the administration decided they were going to seize that building and kick everybody out, my own department submitted a petition signed by almost every single faculty member pointing out that the administration was about to destroy a unique intellectual center, the most productive meeting place on campus of faculty and students. Was that a balanced, rational exchange of ideas? No. The administration didn't even bother to reply. They just took over the building.

Then, of course, in 1968 when we had the first massive sit-in in the building protesting the suspension of seven students involved in a peaceful demonstration against CIA recruiting, we had all the rhetoric about "force, violence, coercion and seizing the building" and so on.

The first sit-in was back in the spring of 1966. What was it about? Violence. What was the violence? The violence was that the administration was having draft tests given here so that people could compete with each other to see who was going to get to kill in Vietnam. And they were hiding CIA contracts. It was interesting, just parenthetically, that the chairman of our organization, Aaron Manganiello, who was at that time a thorough-going pacifist, was a worker here at that time. He was the one who made that discovery about that first CIA contract. He was fired, with no hearing at all, for discovering that.

Well, that was the first time that the faculty even confronted any of these issues before the academic council meetings. We would go to the academic council meeting and there would be an agenda of memorial resolutions for our colleagues who died or a vote for degrees. The president would make a speech, everybody would clap and go home. It was the real political strength in that first meeting of 1966 which started asking questions about gas research. Who were the ones who asked that question? Was it the professor, the great gentleman, the one with such high convictions and ideals? No. It was people who were denounced by practically everybody, even in the antiwar movement, for such an outrageous act as sitting in President Sterling's office. And we tried a repetition of that each year. And certainly one of the issues here is the question of the strike. And when a strike was first called, we did that back in January of 1966 at the resumption of bombing. We called for a strike. You know. Everyone was for that. There even were 40 to 45 professors who came out there to the microphone. We called people at 3:00 or 4:00 in the morning. And they came out. And practically everyone came up to the mike and said: "I deplore that thing. That is just an act of coercion. I am against the war." And of course, there were more of us the first time that we got them out there to say "I am against the war."

There is just one final thing. And that is that we believe that being determines consciousness. That is true. But that is the primary relationship. But we are not mechanical determinists. We are dialectical materialists. That means that we believe that the essence—this is the way Marx put it—of being human is that we have consciousness that derives from our material being, and by having that consciousness we have the ability to change the material reality in which we have our existence and so that the spiral of human existence is the spiral to higher and higher levels of consciousness and through that higher and higher level of consciousness to a higher and higher level of freedom, which is what Marxism and communism are all about.

We know that the university that we are struggling for here and the society that we are struggling for here is going to be a society that has freedom that makes these alleged and phony freedoms seem to be exactly what they are. Bourgeois freedoms have played a very important role in the development of humanity. There were tremendous qualitative advances over the freedoms that existed in feudal society. And we would never repudiate or reject those bourgeois freedoms. But what we are about is going beyond those bourgeois freedoms, through and beyond those bourgeois freedoms to a much higher freedom.

You see, even the idea in that statement on campus disruption about respecting everybody's rights: What an illusion, what a false consciousness, I mean, at least we should be on the level of understanding that rights are in conflict with each other. The right of the Vietnamese people to live is in direct conflict with the right of the United States to drop bombs on them and to guide missiles with missile-guiding systems developed at Stanford University at them because their anti-aircraft radar happens to lock onto a plane that is flying near their country. Those are rights in conflict. And it is true that the right to plan an invasion possibly of North Vietnam is in direct conflict with the right to put a stop to that. And when you get right down to it, you are going to find that there is no room for neutrality and people are going to have to take sides. Everybody in this room is going to have to take sides. Everybody, in fact, has already chosen sides, even when they fail to realize it. That doesn't say that people have to remain fixed in the side they have chosen. They can change sides.

Now just a final thing. The question most asked by the press, and so forth, is: "Do you think it is going to be a fair hearing?"

And I said: "Well, clearly not. Because a fair hearing would be a hearing to determine the criminality of the real criminals. It won't be a hearing to try somebody for protesting against those crimes. So it is inherently unfair."

There is also an unfairness about the people doing the trying. Nevertheless, we welcome this hearing because we see the hearing as a tremendous opportunity to raise consciousness and to bring to very large numbers of people a much clearer understanding of what the university is, what the revolutionary movement in the United States and in the world is all about.

Power to the people!