

Stanford on the March

By Ira Arlook

Somewhere in the back of our minds each of us is aware that many major universities are active members of the military-industrial complex. We are continually reminded of this state of affairs by the periodic waves of outrage that accompany each new discovery of a university-military relationship: chemical-biological warfare research at the University of Pennsylvania, the CIA scandal at Michigan State, or even last year's revelation of a classified CIA research contract in Stanford's Department of Electrical Engineering. The relationships of American universities with military research and development are, however, more profound and less spectacular than these widely publicized examples might suggest.

The form which Stanford's relationship with the military-industrial complex has taken has been aptly described as a "community of technical scholars" by former Vice-President and Provost of the University, Frederick Terman, a man who played a major role in the creation and development of this community. Terman understands the development as "a new counterpart of...medieval 'communities of scholars'... (consisting) of universities which have strong programs in engineering and science, surrounded by companies emphasizing research and development, under conditions where there is continual interaction among all of the components, some formal, some informal, some organized, others unorganized." ("The Community of Technical Scholars", a speech delivered at a University-Industrial Liaison Conference, Colorado Springs, November, 1963).

Noteworthy Aspect

What type of work these "companies emphasizing research and development" engage in is only hinted at when Terman goes on to describe the "noteworthy" aspect of the Stanford community's history. It appears "that there had been almost no war research at Stanford, and at the end of World War II in 1945 there was almost no industry of the growth type here. Yet in eighteen years this area has become one of the liveliest and most creative centers in the country." These "growth" companies which have made or presently make Stanford's community of technical scholars so lively and creative are more often than not defense contractors like Varian Associates which in August 1963 contracted with the US Army Missile Command, Redstone Arsenal, to design and develop an automatic anti-personnel mine dispersal system (Roster of US Government R & D Contracts in Aerospace and Defense, Bowker Associates, 1965), or Clevite Corporation which in May 1964 contracted to provide its research services for the development of radiological warfare systems.

Just what is "lively" about radiological warfare systems or "creative" about anti-personnel mine dispersal, or what "growth" is achieved by these enterprises is at best unclear. What enables Terman to describe these members of our community with such glowing phrases is

one of the most Orwellian uses of language to be found outside the pages of 1984.

Terman is not, however, really attempting to deceive us. He is very frank in his account of the way in which the community came into being: "This development around Stanford has been widely publicized because of its spectacularly rapid emergence in the national scene, the clearly visible relationship with the educational activities at Stanford University, and the encouragement Stanford provided through the development of the Stanford Industrial Park on Stanford owned lands adjacent to the academic campus." (emphasis added). This encouragement by the University, which has brought Varian and Clevite to the Industrial Park, had additional consequences as far as the community's integration is concerned, and Terman describes the situation carefully:

"...the faculty members of a university that is part of such a modern 'community of technical scholars' live in no ivory towers. They have numerous contacts with stimulating, highly creative individuals in industry. They typically do some consulting with one or more adjacent growth companies on subjects in which they have professional expertise, and often they sit on a board of directors. For example, members of the faculty of the Electrical Engineering Department at Stanford between them hold some fifteen directorships in profit making corporations, more than are held by faculty members of our large and highly regarded Graduate School of Business. Moreover, a few of these professors are well on the way to becoming millionaires as a result of stock holdings in companies founded by their students--holdings acquired early when the company was very small and often received in return for consulting services before the stock was available to the public."

It was thus quite natural that Stanford became the 13th largest non-profit military research and development contractor (65th among all military R & D contractors) in fiscal year 1963.

Still Unclear

The impetus for the great community-building program came in 1946, when the Trustees of the University founded the Stanford Research Institute as a non-profit corporation to be governed by a board of directors whose members they would select. The new Institute was, among other things, "to promote the educational purposes of the Leland Stanford Junior University by encouraging, fostering and conducting scientific investigations and pure and applied research in the physical, biological and social sciences, engineering and the mechanical arts..." and in general "to promote and foster... the peace and prosperity of mankind." (See the Articles of Incorporation of SRI, Trustees Manual, pp. 92-3).

How these ends were to be accomplished by SRI's numerous contracts with the Army Missile Command for research and development of the Nike-Zeus missile

system, or its \$1.6 million contract with the Army Combat Experimentation Center at Fort Ord for "continued classified scientific studies for army combat development", or its \$3.7 million in contracts with the Army Chemical Centers for Chemical-Biological & Radiological Warfare, Ft. Detrick and Edgewood, Maryland, again remains unclear.

What we can be sure of is that SRI, as the fourth leading non-profit military R & D contractor (39th overall) in fiscal 1963, is a large and important member, or in Terman's words "component", in this case "formal" and "organized", of the Stanford community--a fact which is strongly confirmed by the presence of Wallace Sterling as President of SRI's Board of Directors, and Dean Ernest Arbuckle of the Graduate School of Business as Board Chairman.

There are yet other members of the Stanford community who are intimately involved with the military-industrial complex, and by now it should come as no surprise that they are some of the Trustees of the University and some of the directors of SRI. A few outstanding examples, made available by the Graduate Coordinating Committee's Newsletter (vol. II, no. 1, 1965) and its pamphlets on the corporate connections of Stanford's Trustees and SRI's Directors, follow:

Stanford University Trustees

- Charles Docomun- a director of Lockheed Aircraft Corp.; in fiscal 1965, the leading defense contractor with \$1,715 million in contracts.
- William Hewlett- President and a director of Hewlett-Packard; a director of Rand Corp., Hexcel Products Corp., Watkins-Johnson Co., and EMC Corp.-- all defense contractors.
- Roger Lewis- Chairman of the Board and President of General Dynamics Corp.-- in fiscal 1965, the 2nd leading defense contractor with \$1,178 million in contracts.
- David Packard- Chairman of the Board of Hewlett-Packard; a director of General Dynamics and a director of SRI.

SRI Directors

- Edward Carter- a director of Northrop Corp.; in fiscal 1965, the 17th leading defense contractor with \$256 million in contracts.
- Paul Davies- Chairman of the Board of the EMC Corp.; in fiscal 1965, the 36th leading defense contractor with \$124 million in contracts.
- Thomas Hones- Chairman of the Board and President of Northrop Corp.

This, however, is just a beginning, for as Terman hastens to assure us, the community "is still embryonic in character...the trend for the research and development industries to concentrate in such centers is clearly present, and is

(Cont. p.3, col.1)

Stanford...

(Cont. from p.2)

becoming more definite with each year that passes. Industry is finding that for those activities that involve a high level of scientific and technological creativity, a location in a center of brains is more important than a location near markets, raw materials, transportation, or factory labor."

Thanks to Terman's analysis, we can now understand that this University is encouraging industry to enter a community which Stanford's trustees, officers, and many faculty members are fashioning--a community which engages in many activities that cannot be described as scientifically and technologically creative or productive of "the peace and prosperity of mankind" without doing serious violence to our language.

Not only does the University encourage and provide services to firms which engage in military research and development and the production of weapons, but it has made itself hospitable to defense contracts (classified and unclassified) on the University campus. Trustees, officers, professors, and students traditionally have defended the University's action in terms of "the service station ideal", that is, the University should not take positions on issues (their fa-

vorite examples are positions on the ADA or the John Birch Society) in the interest of maintaining its impartiality and objectivity. It should, instead, as President Sterling has stated (in a speech at the Stanford Conferences in 1961), "perform service to the society that nurtures it: professional training, extension work, consultation."

It also has been traditional for spokesmen of the University to speak of its responsibility to criticize the society it serves. President Sterling, in the speech already referred to, maintained "that it is a university's function to be a critic of society. This is a function it shares with pulpit, press, and podium." The criticism, it would seem, is in the service of "the proposition that in a free society the individual properly belongs at the center of things, and that a university must exemplify that proposition", a proposition which Sterling insists "a university must not merely embrace but also champion."

Morally Wrong

It becomes clear, then, that the act of criticism implies taking a position and acting on it, and that there are some positions the University recognizes it ought to take. It is equally clear that one of these positions is that of serving a society which is fighting a war in Vietnam, and serving it in ways directly related to the fighting of that war.

The University is certainly not acting impartially--rather, it is approving of and supporting a war which it believes to be defending the cause of freedom.

We who believe that the war is destroying freedom maintain that Stanford's position is morally wrong--not that Stanford should not take a position--for as President Sterling has put it (in his Stanford Today and Tomorrow speech of January, 1964), "life is an exercise in making choices and value judgments." No individual or institution can avoid making choices or taking positions, for the very choice not to choose, not to take a position, is a choice and a position itself. What we insist is that Stanford must criticize society in the name of freedom, and that the military-industrial complex and the war Stanford is helping to wage are not serving the cause of freedom but of domination, and that the only way in which a criticism can have real meaning is through Stanford's refusal to cooperate in the war effort and to oppose, wherever possible, those who are fighting it.

Presently, a group of undergraduate and graduate students is engaged in further research on the Stanford community's support of the war effort. It plans in the near future to join with other students in demanding a reconsideration of the University's position. If you are interested in working on this project, place your name on the sign-up sheet posted in The Experiment building, or contact John Saari, 327-1894.

The woman across from me on the Sutter St. bus:
she wears a thin floral print dress
which catches up the slackness
contains in its folds the weary dispersion
of her wasting, unremitting flesh
her body is matter and matter was her only form
Strawberry vines quicken
to the jiggle of the bus, she jiggles
to the less than human monotony of motion
like digestion her floral print
and the ladies like her in Omaha, Nebraska
at the sewing machines sit on their porches
in summer the humidity as dense as flesh
as unnerivating as their work they complain
to their doctors of backsache they
haven't got their old pep.

In Omaha
where the free clinic handles Indians
and railroad and stockyard Negroes
been on the job a lo-ong time, sir
black ripples
never had these chest pains I ain't getting
any younger and the intern lectures him
on the poisonous Virginia weed the Indians
cunningly gave us

The old woman who always passes out
returns for a check-up in a floral print dress
and the x-rays show the intern
trained to read the penetrations of her flesh
the slipped vertebra

bone crushed against nerve
electric searing of the brain
these past ten years of passing out
and psychiatric referrals in Omaha, Nebraska
I'm fifty-eight
I had a job on the loom but I lost it
we made those dresses

She was cured
and the black porter refrained from cigarettes
life is too precious
for the woman on the Sutter St. bus not to feel
the ingratitude of her children the cost
of living and general rottenness of life
the headlines pleasurably confirm
in the hands of the man next to her
in a business suit and modestly elegant tie
her eyes steal his dime intermittently
her brown hound's eyes
flicker with lustrous disapproval

as the lines
of newsprint ease her into modulated indignation
and then to reverie the gentle tickling of her crotch
on the humming bus remembers
what she thought was life
Bob Fitzsimmons TKO'd a coon she didn't want to go
and he said nothing ventured nothing gained
and he said

"Does your mother know you're out
Ce-cel-la
it was because the fight excited her

She knew
he didn't have it in him to succeed
The Sisters of the Presentation called it sin
it felt like life but when it's gone
then money's life the Sisters were too innocent
to tell her that

"Does she know that I intend to steal ya
There is no statue of John Sutter on Sutter St.
it is in the park
we watch the decaying city
like a film the woman and I
toward our various destinations

--Robert Hess