

Stanford Students Continue Protest Sit-in for Second Day

200 Youths Stay Overnight in Administration Building in Attempt to Obtain Greater Role in University Affairs

WEP
5/1
BY DARYL E. LEMBKE
Times Staff Writer

PALO ALTO—The occupation for the second day of an administration building at Stanford University by students demanding a greater role in discipline and rule-making produced nonstop debate on campus Tuesday but no signs of a settlement.

The sit-in started Monday, and about 200 students stayed overnight in the Old Student Union building, now used for various administration functions.

As the sit-in continued overnight, fire broke out about 2 a.m. Tuesday in the Naval ROTC building at the other end of the campus and burned the structure to the ground. The loss was estimated at \$70,000.

Firemen Say Blaze Was Set

Firemen said the blaze was deliberately set at three different points. But administration officials emphasized that there was no evidence connecting the fire with the demonstrators.

The day's most dramatic event occurred at a noon rally when the university provost, Richard Lyman, standing at the edge of a crowd of 800 in the Old Student Union courtyard, was challenged to hold a hearing on the spot for seven students facing suspension for participating in an earlier demonstration.

The challenge was hurled by Marc Sapir, 26, a third-year medical student who is one of the seven whom a faculty committee recommended for suspension.

Dropping of Charges Asked

One of the main objectives of the sit-in is to get President J. E. Wallace Sterling to drop charges against the seven. Only four of the seven, who were among 100 students that blocked an entrance where the Central Intelligence Agency was interviewing job applicants on the campus last Nov. 1, are still in school.

Sterling refused to announce a decision on the suspensions immediately, stating he first wanted to interview each of the seven individually.

"President Sterling says he wants

to meet the four (suspended students still on campus) in private sessions," said Sapir at the rally. "The paternalism is clear. On behalf of the suspended students, I asked Mr. Lyman, who is in the audience, to come up here for Mr. Sterling and have that meeting now."

As many of the students began a rhythmic handclapping, Lyman briefly continued a conversation with Cesare Massarenti, student body president and leader of the sit-in, and then left without responding.

Contending that the sit-in had received unfair news coverage, Massarenti told the rally that the public should understand that "we are not here to destroy Stanford but to make it a better place to work and study."

Demonstrators inside the administration building kept aisles clear and said they had no intention of hampering operation of the offices. The administration, however, instructed employees not to report to work and the inner offices were kept locked all day.

Seek Backing of Faculty

Demonstrators hoped to win the backing of a majority of the school's 900 faculty members by this afternoon, when the faculty's Academic Council convenes to discuss the issues involved in the uprising. Sterling will preside at the closed meeting, to which the demonstrators have been invited to send representatives.

Eckhard Schulz, a student, strenuously objected at the rally to the refusal of the demonstrators to abandon occupation of the administration building. A general assembly of 1,800 students Monday night voted against the sit-in tactics.

In addition to asking that charges against the seven students facing suspension be dismissed, the demonstrators are demanding that the faculty disciplinary committee be disbanded and replaced by an appeals board of five students and four faculty members.

DOESN'T FIT INTO PL

2,000 Students at Stanford Sign Petition Opposing Sit-in

But 350 Youths Continue to Occupy Administration Building in Pressure for Larger Role in Campus Affairs

BY JOHN DREYFUSS
Times Education Writer

PALO ALTO—More than 2,000 Stanford students signed a petition Tuesday night opposing a sit-in as a tactic to try to force the university administration to drop suspension proposals against seven students.

Meanwhile, about 350 students occupied a campus administration building as the sit-in continued into its second night.

APSON investigators continued their probe into the Tuesday morning blaze which razed the Naval ROTC building, at the other end of the campus.

Firemen said the fire was deliberately set at three different points. But university officials said there is no evidence to connect the fire with the demonstration.

In a surprise move Tuesday night, trustee David Packard appeared at the sit-in to blast confrontation measures but encouraged the students to work with the administration.

"If you get into these confrontations, you may lose everything you've gained. Keep working with us and we'll find a good solution to this," Packard said.

Petition Signed by 2,000

The petition, signed by more than 2,000 of Stanford's 11,400 students, was one of several pro-administration petitions circulated on campus.

It did not object to the purpose of the sit-in demonstrators.

"The main point in question here is the method by which this group is going about attainment of an answer to their demands," it said.

Another indication of the rising tide of student disenchantment with sit-in tactics was a petition signed by 1,463 students asking for a campus vote that:

1—Forcible occupation of a university building is "unacceptable behavior at Stanford."

2—In advocating and participating in forcible occupation of the Old Student Union, Cesare Massarenti, student body president and sit-in leader, displays "behavior inappropriate to his office."

The measures could appear on the campus ballot scheduled for Tuesday. Six hundred petition signatures

are necessary to put a question on the ballot.

Provost Richard W. Lyman said the building would reopen to employees today. Almost every office in the building was locked and vacated after students moved in Monday noon for the sit-in.

Lyman left the decision on returning to work to individual staffers.

Sit-in participants Tuesday night voted 191 to 149 to designate two persons to meet today with administrators.

But the students—Nan Goldie, a sophomore from San Francisco, and Ann Johnson, a junior from Massachusetts—were not empowered to speak for the sit-in group.

Conditions Drawn Up

Conditions for the meeting were drawn up by Philip Taubman, associate editor of the Stanford Daily, a sophomore from New York City. They were:

1—Participants would be Lyman, Herbert L. Packer, vice provost; Dr. Alfred Hastorf, chairman of the psychology department; two sit-in designees, and two pro-administration students.

2—The meeting would be for exchange of views, not negotiation.

3—It would last half an hour at a secret location, but Taubman would be there to make tape recordings and report for the Stanford Daily.

Sit-in students generally viewed the meeting as a public relations tactic.

A Committee of Fifteen, composed of five students, five faculty and five administrators, continued their efforts late into the night to develop new rule-making and judicial bodies demanded by the sit-in students.

Student demands are:

1—Faculty recommendations for suspensions of seven students who took part in the demonstration against the Central Intelligence Agency Nov. 1 be dropped.

2—The Interim Judicial Body, composed of five faculty members

Please Turn to Page 22, Col. 7

STANFORD

Continued from Third Page

appointed by President J. E. Wallace Sterling be disbanded. It was this board that recommended suspending the students.

3—That a permanent appellate board be established with membership of four students chosen by students, four faculty members chosen by faculty, and one member chosen by the other eight members, from among the law school student body.

4—That the appellate board hear only appeals from students and that the administration have no right to appeal.

Sterling has refused to announce a decision on the proposed suspensions immediately. He said he wished to interview each of the seven students individually.

179
178
177
176
175
174
173
172
171
170
169
168
167
166
165
164
163
162
161
160
159
158
157
156
155
154
153
152
151
150
149
148
147
146
145
144
143
142
141
140
139
138
137
136
135
134
133
132
131
130
129
128
127
126
125
124
123
122
121
120
119
118
117
116
115
114
113
112
111
110
109
108
107
106
105
104
103
102
101
100
99
98
97
96
95
94
93
92
91
90
89
88
87
86
85
84
83
82
81
80
79
78
77
76
75
74
73
72
71
70
69
68
67
66
65
64
63
62
61
60
59
58
57
56
55
54
53
52
51
50
49
48
47
46
45
44
43
42
41
40
39
38
37
36
35
34
33
32
31
30
29
28
27
26
25
24
23
22
21
20
19
18
17
16
15
14
13
12
11
10
9
8
7
6
5
4
3
2
1

DOESN'T FIT INTO PI

Stanford Students Win Backing, End Sit-in

Faculty Vote Supports Demand to Set Aside Suspension of 7 in Anti-CIA Demonstration

BY JOHN DREYFUSS
Times Education Writer

PALO ALTO — After 57 hours, a student sit-in at Stanford University broke up Wednesday night when a divided faculty voted to support student demands.

Sit-in participants said they will reconvene in a campus rally at noon today.

In a 3½-hour meeting, the faculty voted 284 to 245 to back demonstrators' demands that President J. E. Wallace Sterling set aside the proposed suspension of seven students who had demonstrated against the CIA.

However, they also gave Sterling the option to call for a new hearing before a board yet to be established.

The Academic Council, which includes faculty of professorial rank, also said that no disciplinary action should be taken against the 400 students who have massed in the Old Student Union administration building.

Vote to Disband Group

Faculty members voted in effect to disband the five-man Interim Judicial Body, which had been appointed by Sterling.

Last Thursday the group recommended suspension of seven students involved in the anti-CIA demonstration Nov. 1 and that recommendation led to the sit-in.

(Results of a student referendum released late Wednesday showed they voted 3,920 to 672 to permit any employer to recruit on campus.)

Demonstrators had asked for a student majority on the new board to be set up to replace the IJB.

But the Academic Council recommended that a Stanford Judicial Council take over for the IJB, and that the council have four faculty members, four students and a chairman from the law school faculty.

More than 500 of about 940 Stanford professors attended the closed meeting in Dinkelspiel Auditorium.

Sterling chaired the meeting, but declined to comment on it. However, it was learned that Provost Richard W. Lyman said the administration would feel great moral pressure to accept the faculty recommendations.

A professor said Lyman indicated he felt that accepting student demands was repudiating the administration.

The faculty overwhelmingly supported a comprehensive plan for reforms in campus rule-making and student judicial procedures. A Committee of Fifteen had made the recommendations earlier in the day, apparently reacting to the sit-in.

The committee had discussed the changes for more than two years.

The new rules and judicial procedures increase student participation in disciplinary action against students involved in misconduct, but the final decision in every case rests with Sterling.

Faculty Defeats Amendment

Before leaving Dinkelspiel Auditorium, the faculty defeated an amendment asking students to "desist from further coercive conduct." Opponents indicated the amendment might be considered inflammatory.

The basic resolution adopted by the council was introduced by Dr. Halstead Holman, executive head of the Department of Medicine, and 14 of his medical school colleagues.

The introduction to the Halstead motion said in part:

"It is the desire and responsibility of the faculty to develop, together with the students and the administration, relationships which foster the most effective functioning of the academic community . . ."

Tentative Action Outlined by President Sterling, Who Voices Misgivings

BY JOHN DREYFUSS
Times Education Writer

PALO ALTO — Stanford University students tentatively were given sharply increased responsibility Thursday night by President J. E. Wallace Sterling, who expressed some misgivings about the action.

Two hours later, the student legislature approved in principle all the recommendations.

Sterling and Provost Richard W. Lyman endorsed recommendations approved by the faculty after proposal of the points by a 15-member committee composed equally of faculty, students and administrators.

Thus, in 26 hours, the administration, faculty and students all agreed in principle to sweeping changes in student legislative and judicial procedures. The actions followed a student sit-in.

The recommendations included establishing two new councils—one legislative and the other judicial—and disbanding existing rule-making and judicial bodies.

Sterling has long been committed to increasing student representation in these areas.

Suspension Proposals Dropped

The president also agreed to drop proposals of suspension for seven students involved in an anti-CIA demonstration Nov. 1.

The Interim Judicial Body, composed of five faculty members appointed by Sterling, had recommended the suspensions.

It was that recommendation which led to the student sit-in at a campus administration building. The sit-in lasted from Monday to Wednesday night.

A faculty recommendation that amnesty be granted for some 400 demonstrators was also accepted by Sterling.

"The president and his staff have given careful consideration to these recommendations," said a release signed by Sterling and Lyman.

"We have serious misgivings about the wisdom of some of them," it continued. "We nevertheless accept these recommendations and commit ourselves to their implementation."

Neither Sterling nor Lyman was available for additional comment.

Sterling's Approval Asked

The Academic Council, composed of faculty of professorial rank, had asked Sterling to approve the new disciplinary bodies, drop suspension proposals against the anti-CIA demonstrators and grant amnesty to the sit-in participants.

Sterling urged that all the recommendations be submitted to a student and faculty referendum.

He noted that the recommendations requested amnesty for demonstrators who had been active before Wednesday.

"We defer to that faculty recommendation," Sterling said. "We wish to emphasize that the faculty resolution speaks of demonstrations 'to date,' and accordingly we understand the faculty to support the view of the president that future disruptions will not be tolerated.

"It is the intention of the president to deal with such disruptions promptly and firmly."

By accepting the faculty recommendations, Sterling reserved the right to appeal the case of the anti-

Continued from Third Page
CIA demonstrators to the new judicial board. That board, to be called the Stanford Judicial Council, will be composed of four faculty members, four students and a chairman appointed by Sterling from the Law School faculty.

The new legislative body, to be named the Student Conduct Legislative Council, will include six faculty members and five students. The dean of students will be an ex-officio member with no vote.

The chairman will be appointed by Sterling from among the six faculty members.

Seven votes will be required to pass a measure, thus preventing passage without at least one student vote.

Decisions by both councils will be considered recommendations to the university president, who will have final decision-making powers.

Sterling's endorsement of the proposals followed by several hours a campus rally where professors told students they could not expect to have more power than faculty members in student rule-making and judicial matters.

At the rally, Dr. Sanford M. Dornbusch, a sociology professor, told about 1,000 observers that while the faculty wanted students to have strength, "it does not want to share equally in power with the students."

Dornbusch was a member of the committee that made the proposals accepted by Sterling.

"We have to go after the hierarchy . . . take power away from the trustees of this university," Stephen M. Weissman, a graduate student in Latin American studies who emerged as principal leader of the sit-in, said earlier.

Weissman, who was prominent in the 1964 Free Speech Movement when he was a student at UC Berkeley, also demanded that:

1—The next Stanford president, who is expected to take office by September, be approved by a student referendum and that students participate on the presidential selection committee.

2—Students be given a say over faculty tenure appointments.

3—No student be suspended except for unacceptable academic performance.

He warned that "force is very much part of the world—a fact of life. People who call themselves teachers had better stop

that fact

Stanford Sit-in 'Capitulation' Seen as Bid to Gain Stability

BY JOHN DREYFUSS

Times Education Writer

PALO ALTO—Stanford University's faculty and administration last week granted fully or in part the demands of a clearly illegal student sit-in group.

Why?

The answer is woven in a fabric with threads of fear, respect, concern for justice and inevitability.

Granting the demands—with some subtle but highly significant changes—was recommended by a badly divided faculty.

The professors decided on their recommendations in a 284-245 vote that concluded the biggest, longest and most controversial faculty meeting in recent Stanford history.

The next day, after the sit-in had ended, Stanford President J. E. Wallace Sterling accepted the faculty recommendations.

He expressed "serious misgivings about the wisdom of some of them."

Sterling had little choice but to accept the recommendations, regardless of misgivings.

To do otherwise would have repudiated one of the most distinguished faculties in the nation.

And the president knew that the 57-hour sit-in had ended because of the faculty vote. Refusal to accept the vote would probably have led to chaos at Stanford.

So the question becomes, "Why

did the faculty make its recommendations?"

To understand the answer, it is necessary to isolate and examine each of the demonstrators' demands.

To begin with, the faculty dealt with the problem which had sparked the sit-in at a campus administration building—a proposal to suspend seven students who participated in an anti-CIA rally Nov. 1.

The professors recommended the proposals for suspension be set aside, thereby granting one key demand.

But the faculty also insisted that Sterling be able to appeal for a new trial before a new student-faculty judicial board.

Privately, some professors admitted their votes were influenced by strong personal dislike for the CIA.

They also noted that the issues surrounding the demonstration had become extremely fuzzy.

"If we're going to go to the mat with demonstrators, we want to do it on a clear issue," was a feeling expressed by several faculty members.

Besides, they noted, the president could appeal the case to the new judicial board.

Please Turn to Page 29, Col. 1

Logic Told in Stanford Sit-in 'Capitulation'

Continued from Third Page

Suspension was considered a harsh penalty for the offense by many professors. They were fully aware that a suspended student becomes fair game for the military draft.

And the recommendation for suspension apparently caught most faculty and administrators off guard when it was handed down by a five-man faculty board appointed by the president.

Before the board's verdict, sources close to Sterling had predicted a recommendation for probation, which is an almost meaningless punishment.

Amnesty Granted

Another demand, this one granted without alterations, was for amnesty for the more than 400 sit-in participants.

Among the reasons for capitulation to that demand was Columbia University's riot, which recently shut down that New York City school.

"Another Columbia," without the racial overtones of the eastern university's problems, was unlikely but not out of the question in Palo Alto, and the professors knew it.

They were frightened by the prospect of a major riot. That fear contributed to granting amnesty as well as other demands.

The faculty also was influenced by the scrupulous care shown by demonstrators, who avoided all but minor damage to the Old Student Union building they occupied.

Students kept floors swept, and without being asked, they promised to pay for what little damage the building sustained.

And some professors felt that, beyond having broken into the building in the first place, there was little for which to punish the demonstrators.

The building was never closed. In fact, its doors were chained open.

Although administrators locked offices in the structure for a day and a half of

the sit-in, students made it clear that workers willing to step over and around a sea of bodies would not be otherwise hindered.

Demonstrators often invited faculty to join small groups and discuss the reasons for the sit-in.

All the good manners and apparent goodwill did not hide the militancy of the demonstrators.

They were for the most part a dedicated group which included some of the university's most respected graduate and undergraduate students.

The demonstrators' demand for disbanding the faculty board which had recommended suspension for the anti-CIA protesters was fully met, although indirectly.

group, since there would be no higher body for the appeal to reach. That fact effectively canceled the demand for limiting appeals to students.

The demonstrators' demand for a student majority on the new judicial board was not met. Professors, almost to a man, insist on keeping control at this time.

Faculty endorsement of the two new boards was almost automatic. The Committee of Fifteen, a respected group, had carefully developed the proposals for each board.

Those proposals had been expected—they were not caused by the sit-in, although as previously noted they were certainly

But as indicated by its name, the Interim Judicial Board was not intended to last forever.

It was appointed three years ago, and a Committee of Fifteen—composed equally of students, faculty and administrators—had been working more than two years to develop a substitute.

The sit-in forced that committee to rush its work to conclusion. And 18 hours after the group recommended establishing new judicial and legislative bodies, the faculty endorsed the recommendation.

Demands Listed

The endorsement covered three demonstrator demands, although it by no means granted them all.

Those demands were for:
1—A student faculty appellate board with a student majority.
2—Hearing of only stu-

accelerated by the demonstration.

Professors knew that establishing the boards answered in part some demands from the sit-in participants. But they said the board would eventually have been established without the demonstration.

Many professors, who voted against the recommendations that ended the sit-in saw a "yes" vote as capitulation.

But those who voted "yes" saw their votes as the only practical way to solve a series of intricate problems.

Regardless of how they voted, faculty members of Stanford nearly all agree that they have emerged from a crisis united

dent appeals by the new board, not those from the faculty or administration.

3—Disbanding the IJB. Instead of approving the student demands, the faculty endorsed substitute recommendations from the Committee of Fifteen. The substitutes were to establish:

1—A Stanford Judicial Council of four students, four professors and a chairman from the law school faculty.

2—A Student Conduct Legislative Council of six faculty members, five students and the dean of students who would be an ex officio member without a vote.

Sterling could veto decisions by either board.

The new judicial council would replace the IJB, requiring its being abandoned as the demonstrators demanded.

There would be no appeal from the judicial

against granting further concessions of administrative or judicial power to demonstrators in the immediate future.

But, they say, if the new system works, there is a chance for more student power without demonstrations.

There is a slim chance that demonstrations could erupt again before long.

The student legislature has endorsed the new system, but recommended several changes.

One of the recommended changes is that the chairman of the Stanford Judicial Council be chosen from the law school student body or faculty by the council's other eight members.

The faculty recommendation was for Sterling to select the chairman from the law school faculty.