

Stanford is simply too dishonest to put the anti-war and anti-imperialist movement on trial. Or too smart, for that would be an invitation to their own beheading.

Instead they are putting certain actions on trial and trying to pin that on one person who played a leading role in the revolutionary movement.

According to Administration witness Bob Beyers, head of the University News Service, Bruce Franklin would get up and speak and all of a sudden mindless students and community people would be breaking into buildings, beating and shooting, and provoking the riot police to run amok. Or as Bruce has characterized it, he would quack-quack and all the ducks would follow.

Another witness, Prof. Alan Waterman, tells how he was sent to watch a protest at the Stanford Computer Center as a "faculty observer" last February 10th:

The people are there to shut down an obvious machinery of war—obvious because it was revealed that an SRI program called GAMUT II, which worked out the plans for an amphibious invasion of North Vietnam (as called for by Marshal Ky) was running on the computer.

Waterman is there to "observe." He observes people leave the Center after the arrival of riot police; he observes an illegal dispersal order given to the people outside and he observes Bruce Franklin run up to "every third or fourth policeman and shout 'pig, pig, pig' in his ear" and lead the crowd in "vicious chants." The police then charge and

In fact, Bruce was arguing that there was no legal basis to declare an "illegal assembly." The police charged after unsuccessfully trying to grab Bruce while he was debating with a pig sargent.

Now who is this Waterman dude and why is he lying? Waterman is a professor of electrical engineering with classified Department of Defense contracts for developing the electronic counter measures which enable U.S. planes to evade radar detection and bomb the North Vietnamese. Waterman admits, in cross examination, that the anti-war movement threatens his vicious job.

And he's right. In fact, it threatens the entire existence of Stanford as an institution serving the ruling class.

But, to the Advisory Board trying Bruce Franklin, what Waterman does is as "irrelevant" as possible and, like the Lecture Invasion which sparked the campus response, must have happened on another planet.

According to the Administration, Bruce is guilty of "violence" or "urging and inciting" this violence.

But the facts show Bruce Franklin acting as a righteous Communist revolutionary playing a key role in the development of a highly conscious anti-imperialist movement.

According to the Administration, people would never have moved on that computer center if Bruce hadn't "incited" them.

Let's see:

On February 8th, a research group, the Inquisition, exposed SRI's use of the computer for GAMUT II. The next evening, 550 people vote to have a mobile strike in response to the Lecture Invasion, citing

Hoover Institute and the Comp Center as possible targets. A final decision rally was scheduled for the following noon.

At the rally, several people suggest going to the Comp Center. The Administration sends one of its student lacky, Bob Grant, down to argue that we should leave the University alone and go out and tell the people in the surrounding communities how bad the War is.

A 37-year-old salesman replies: "The killing is done right here in this University, right here."

Isabel Cerney, from the Palo Alto community, tells the University to avoid another Orangeburg Massacre, insisting there be "no armed men on campus" and adding: "We will defend ourselves if necessary."

Another speaker reports the latest news of the Laotian invasion and then Bruce gets up to speak.

The University calls it "urging and inciting." We call it being a Communist leader: taking the scattered ideas of the people, putting them together, explaining them so people can put them into action and test them that way. That's why Marxism is for real, a way of scientifically dealing with the situation.

Bruce gets at the dialectical relation between the campus and the surrounding communities by showing the "false consciousness" implicit in the idea that the campus represents "the most advanced opposition to the war."

Bruce supports the agreed upon strike, but he really gets down into it:

We're just ripping off that term strike when we talk about

striking at Stanford. This isn't a strike. We're not risking anything. It's a voluntary boycott. A shutdown of some of the activities of the university. Now we did have a strike last year (during Cambodian invasion) for about three days...But that much electrified the working people of the area...and in four states teamsters linked up concretely with student strikers and said that they would be willing to strike if the students were willing to strike. So what we're asking is for people to make that little tiny gesture to show we're willing to inconvenience ourselves a little bit and to begin to shut down the most obvious machinery of war, such as I think it is a good target, that Computation Center.

So this, according to the University, is what "urged and incited"

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 21)

and is responsible for all the "violence" February 10th.

But it should be clear that the consciousness which that speech brought is what the University is really afraid of, for that speech explains the role of a student movement in getting on the revolution led by poor and working people.

For students, with that first bit of consciousness and ideology got things started just as black students in Greensboro, North Carolina, in 1960, staged the first sit in in the South and pushed forward the liberation struggle of black people.

The shabby and deceitful prosecution case is wearing its end, and the peoples' offense (or "defense") is ready to begin.

Now it is Stanford which will be tried.

PAMOJA VENCEREMOS

By Jeffrey Youdelman, Venceremos