

Stanford, September 29

By the end of the second day of Prof. Bruce Franklin's dismissal hearing, the University Administration finished presenting all its available evidence regarding Bruce's participation in the alleged "disruption" of a speech by Henry Cabot Lodge last January 11.

Lodge, during his tenure as U.S. Ambassador to South Vietnam, was in overall charge of American military policy and action.

The university offered no evidence to substantiate its charge that Prof. Franklin "significantly contributed to the disruption." Stanford President Lyman has specifically stated that the charge is not "heckling"; an act Prof. Franklin has stipulated to.

Raymond Fisher, one of the Administration's lawyers, indicated, however, that he would search to produce additional witnesses before the hearings conclude. The hearings are expected to last 4-6 weeks.

The Lodge incident is one of four charges levelled at Prof. Franklin as the basis of their desire to fire him.

The other three relate to events which took place last February 11 during a campus protest against the Laotian invasion and university complicity. They include: a speech at a noontime political rally, a confrontation with police following a mill in at the University's Computer Center and a speech later that evening during a police occupation of the campus.

The other university lawyer, William Norris, has characterized these charges as pertaining to "violence." The Lodge incident represents, according to Norris' opening remarks, "violence to the freedom of a university department to conduct an activity."

Hooover Institute, which sponsored the Lodge talk and is, according to the Washington Monthly, a strategic think tank for the Department of Defense, is not a University department.

Administration lawyers produced three elderly community residents and two students in an attempt to establish its case.

Mrs. Francis Beckwith was called to give direct testimony on Prof. Franklin's actions. She stated that she sat through the heckling of Lodge with an eye toward identifying "campus troublemakers." She received this suggestion from Stanford's alumni magazine which asks alumni to help kick out participants in the anti imperialist movement rather than withdrawing alumni donations. Since the OFF ROTC movement, two years ago, alumni contributions have dropped substantially.

Mrs. Beckwith testified that a "demented lady", shouting out questions about war crimes, was brought to her attention. When she turned around, she was able to identify this "demented" (to her) woman as Mrs. Jane Franklin. She then noticed a blond, nine year old boy, whom she assumed was Mrs. Franklin's child, sitting next to a man in a "black turtleneck sweater" whom, she somehow concluded, was Prof. Franklin. She stated that the man in the turtleneck would repeatedly yell out "murderer" and "napalm" and thereby "get everyone started."

During cross examination by Bruce Franklin, Mrs. Beckwith repeated her identification of the man in the turtleneck, at which point Bruce announced that he was, in fact, wearing an open necked shirt and white T shirt.

The Administration then called Mrs. Katherine Matthews who admitted that the man she observed "making noise" was the man Mrs. Beckwith herself had identified to her as Bruce Franklin.

Having heard Mrs. Matthews confirm this misidentification, Prof. Franklin dispensed with any cross examination and complimented Mrs. Matthews on "her honesty."

After presenting three more witnesses, one of whom admitted that noise was coming from all over the auditorium (contrary to the Administration's characterization of Bruce as ringleader and chief disrupter) and one of whom observed Bruce merely shouting out "questions like 'what

The audience at the hearing was dumbfounded.

Prof. Franklin, reiterating previous statements describing the case as a "shabby, hollow pretext" to fire him, moved for dismissal of the Lodge charge.

The Advisory Committee, seven white tenured academic gentlemen assigned to judge the case, deferred on an immediate ruling on the basis of Fisher's intention to dig up some more (reliable?) witnesses at an unspecified later date.

Bruce Franklin contends that the very manner in which the University Administration is presenting its case — "dishonest" and "shabby" — gives the lie to what, in yesterday's opening statement, he terms the "essence" of the University's case: the premise that the University "has at the center of its values a dedication to a balanced, rational exchange of ideas."

In his opening statement, Prof. Franklin amplified on this by saying: "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 would have come into being. But the fact is, as I have argued elsewhere and intend to demonstrate at this hearing, that 'The main business of Stanford University is maintaining and expanding an economic empire in the Pacific Basin, the areas of the world contiguous to the Pacific Ocean. It does this by producing the needed research, ideology, hardware and superskilled manpower and by providing a vehicle for the interlocking of the appropriate corporate giants (H. Bruce Franklin and John Howard, Who Should Run the Universities, Washington D.C., AMERICAN Enterprise Institute for Public Opinion Policy, 1969, p.45).'"

Prof. Franklin demonstrated how Stanford concretely contributed to the Imperialist war in SouthEast Asia, over which Lodge presided, by such work as the GAMUT-H program on amphibious assaults in Asia which the Computer Center was running last February 10.

In addition to Vietnam, the Stanford Board of Trustees has direct and interlocked financial interest in Thailand, Laos, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Australia, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Venezuela, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Mexico, Korea, Taiwan and Japan.

It is clear, he showed, that "no group can control the University without controlling the society as a whole."

After tracing the development of the imperialist multiversity, Bruce focused on the class interests of students, campus workers and professors — the Professors being "virtually all white and overwhelmingly male" and "professing the most democratic and liberal of bourgeois values."

Examples were not far away, as Prof. Franklin zeroed in on two members of the Advisory Board: self avowed "liberal" Robert MacAfee Brown and Wolfgang Panofsky.

Panofsky, in response to war protesters "putting their bodies on the line" had written that "the power of Man is through his mind, not his body."

Franklin replied: "Why are most professors shocked when a few professors uses their bodies to affect social change? Why do they find this not only non intellectual but 'mindless?' Because bourgeois values teach that there are 2 different kinds of activities — physical and mental. On the one side, we have beings who work with their bodies. These are mindless, less than human. Then there are those who think intellectuals, disembodied intelligences, whose physical existence is essentially irrelevant to what they think."

In exposing the class basis of Brown's thought, Bruce quoted from an "anti war" essay by Brown in which he claimed that "communism feeds on poverty." Brown suggested that the nation's rulers eliminate poverty so they can get on with the business of fighting communism.

Brown and Panofsky, along with fellow "liberal" Sanford Dornbusch are recent additions to the Advisory Board.

Dornbusch is on record as saying that "any faculty, staff or students who participated in this afternoon's attack on intellectual freedom (the Lodge incident) are attacking values that this university and society have long labored to develop and cannot lightly lose (Stanford University News Service, January 11, 1971).

Outside the hearing room, two time Nobel Laureate Linus Pauling led a faculty picket line and carried a sign reading "~~Faculty Opposed to Political Binings~~ TRY Lodge, NOT FRANKLIN."

Pauling commented: "I believe Lodge is guilty of crimes against humanity and I think he and some of our other leaders might be found guilty if ever tried for xxx those crimes."

He continued: "I don't think Franklin broke any Stanford laws."

After hearing the University Administration's case on the Lodge incident, most spectators agreed with that.

ALL POWER TO THE PEOPLE