

Of course, as President Pitzer pointed out at a press conference, individual professors have the right and responsibility to judge what research to undertake and what kind of teaching to promote. As things now stand, however, professors exercise their free choice within a marketplace limited by the availability of funds. And the trustees, directly and indirectly, play a key role in deciding how and where money will be spent.

They officially control the university budget, giving them a large say over which departments and fields in the university will be able to afford new staff and new equipment. They serve as leaders on the business-dominated advisory committees to the Engineering and Business schools. As wealthy benefactors with equally wealthy friends, they exercise additional informal power over which departments will get new buildings. The pattern of recent construction--new buildings for earth sciences, engineering, space sciences, physics, and business--bears more than a coincidental relationship to their business interests.

The university is also building a new art history building. But then no one accused Leland Stanford's successors of being philistines.

The trustees, and their like-minded colleagues, are also the area's largest employers. They determine the job market for Stanford graduates in engineering, business, and the sciences, and this in turn gives them indirect influence over the content of university education. In addition, Frederick E. Terman, who brought Stanford to the top in electronics, set a policy early in his career of keeping Stanford's extensive laboratories open to industry. As one journalistic account of Terman's relationship to the electronics industry points out, "the industry's raw material is brain-power, and the university's students and professors are a prime source."

The trustees also have important links to the foundations and government committees which determine the availability of research money on a national level. Former trustee and now SRI director Stephen Bechtel serves as a director of the Ford Foundation. Trustee John Gardner, everyone's best guess for president before the announcement of Pitzer, is a former president of the Carnegie foundation and Lyndon Johnson's earlier Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Trustee Hewlett presently serves on the President's Science Advisory Committee, along with Pitzer, who is also on the Carnegie Endowment for the Advancement of Teaching. A number of other trustees serve on lesser foundations, and as a group, Board members enjoy extensive business contacts with foundation directors not directly related to Stanford.

The shaping of the academic marketplace, field by field, is of course too complex to be summed up here. And, unfortunately, the foundations are not falling all over themselves to finance such a study.

Nonetheless, we can see something of how money, accompanied by the prestige of keeping company with the rich and powerful, helps shape faculty attitudes. Last year, in the faculty vote to support the demands of the student sit-in, the law school, engineering, and business schools voted against the demands and for the administration. These were precisely the groups closest to the business community represented by the trustees, the better paid faculty members with additional opportunities for consulting work. Humanities and Sciences, which supported the sit-in, represented the most neglected professors in the present distribution of rewards and status. The exception to this rule of thumb was the well-paid, high-status Medical Faculty. The M.D.'s supported the students, probably as a result of previous organizing by student radicals around the Vietnam War and racism.

Another effect of the university's closeness to business is the "vocationalism," the orientation toward specialized careers which pervades even the humanities and social sciences. Where the engineering departments directly train students to serve the technologically advanced industries, the social sciences preach a professionalism which excludes the kinds of questions about the present uses of technology and the present distribution of power which might upset the corporate applecart. In the

United States, as in most societies, honestly answering such questions would be subversive and quite at variance with official descriptions of social reality. But most professional social scientists would not even think of asking embarrassing questions about the businessmen with whom they serve on committees and meet socially in and around the university. As a result, professional social sciences at Stanford, as at most good universities, seem like little more than an academic varnishing of liberal wisdom.

The best example of this has been the university's "concern" about the War in Vietnam. While a good part of the student body is quite ready to say "get out," such attitudes are made to seem irresponsible by administrators and influential faculty members. Sharing the framework of and being responsible to those in power, they are not about to reject totally America's position in South East Asia. Ritualistically, they demand that the government's position, or at least a moderate dove position, be one side of any debate, as in the administration's intervention into last year's Days of Concern. To them, the war is at most a mistake, an aberration, the wrong war in the wrong place. Until recently, they wouldn't even entertain the thought that the present occupation of South East Asia and the university's many economic development programs might be part of a systematic policy of imperialism. Now, in phrases recalling the white man's burden, some professors are even suggesting that imperialism might not be such a bad thing. It isn't hard to predict how they will react to forthcoming efforts to get Stanford out of South East Asia and take control of this university out of the hands of imperialists.

The alliance with the men of wealth and power, and particularly the trustees, is equally apparent in the reaction of the administration and influential faculty members to questions of race and poverty. Last year, without hesitation, they gave university support to a scholarship collection in memory of Martin Luther King, Jr. They held up their hands in horror when students with a different political perspective asked for similar cooperation on behalf of a campaign to raise money in memory of slain Black Panther leader Bobby Hutton.

Many of these same people are directly tying in with David Packard and other trustee-businessmen in an effort to set up a local chapter of the Urban Coalition, the national industry-backed group which continues to promise massive employment for blacks. Stanford and SRI researchers, along with the aerospace companies intent on the socio-economic market, are at the same time preparing top-down systems analysis approaches to poverty and, of course, more efficient anti-riot plans.

But few university leaders, and fewer of the university's resources, will be put at the disposal of any militant black groups which realize that the Urban Coalition will only respond to riot threat. University men will appear positively anti-intellectual when the blacks point out that, economically, the big firms don't find it profitable to create sufficient jobs, both because of technological advances and because of a war-induced inflation. And, when any of the blacks try to tie their demand for jobs to the fight against imperialism, at least a few of the university men will join their business allies in trying to find communists under the rug.

All of this is to be expected at Leland Stanford's farm. After all, it's only business.

Stanford Research Institute

The Stanford Research Institute (SRI) is a "wholly owned subsidiary" of Stanford University, but whenever you say anything bad about SRI, Stanford administrators will tell you there isn't any real connection.

In 1964, when the Government Accounting Office accused SRI of having swindled it of \$250,000, the government pointed out that the Stanford trustees elect the SRI directors. Nine of the directors of SRI are presently also trustees of Stanford, most of the rest serve on the advisory board of the School of Engineering and the Graduate School of Business. There is also a great deal of "consulting" done at SRI by Stanford faculty members, especially those in the sciences, political science, engineering, and the business school. The big dish radio telescope has been operated as a joint venture.

Probably in the next few years, pressure -- they'll talk of "economy" -- will force Stanford to cut SRI loose. But these same men will stay on as directors, trustees, members of the various advisory boards, and consultants from the various departments, and things will be essentially unchanged.

SRI is a vastly compartmentalized institution, many of whose researchers do valuable work in such things as smog control and heart disease. Its two greatest concentrations of work, however, are for the federal government (75%, most of it in defense) and in international business (20%).

In the early fifties, SRI's defense of this concentration was blatantly imperialistic. Jesse Hobson, SRI's first president, told the American Institute of Engineers in 1951 that "this nation occupies 6 % of the land area of the world, has 7 % of the world's population, but it now produces 50 % of the world's goods and possesses 67 % 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."

SRI has helped increase this imbalance but it now uses more sophisticated rhetoric: "The raw materials that enable the rich countries to grow richer must increasingly be bought from the poor," Ed Robison, Vice President of SRI International, told the 22nd Annual Meeting of the SRI Associates last December. Explaining how this works in one country, he told his audience that the Indonesians have "cut out the cancer that was destroying their economy". It was a bloody operation, he said. "The number of lives sacrificed ran into the hundreds of thousands," but

SRI has done and is doing what it can to advise Indonesia and to draw the attention of potential entrepreneurs to the need and the opportunity now presented for constructive and profitable investment."

VIETNAM INVOLVEMENT

Just who would profit, Robison went on to explain: "The Australians and the Japanese are already in the field.... The large scale petroleum industry, which is mostly American, is expanding its operations. American firms have made important new commitments for mineral resource development...." One of those oil firms is Stanford trustee Gardiner Symonds' Tenneco, which also has interests in Biafra, Venezuela, and Guyana.

"The institute supports the foreign involvements of our government," Robison told the Associates. Since the '50's, SRI policy makers have been well aware that communist nationalist movements, particularly in Asia, challenge the position of U.S. business as producer of half of the world's goods and owner of two-thirds of its wealth. In 1957 Robison told a gathering of Stanford alums that "the free world must not lose Southeast Asia. . . as it has already lost China." At the same time SRI researchers were preparing a study for McDonnell Aircraft on "Limited Warfare". It reviewed "the basic considerations which would affect the conduct of small wars in various peripheral areas of Asia." The study argued essentially the Johnson line: Characterized by political instability, social unrest, and very low standards of living, these areas are "extremely vulnerable to communism". The U.S. would be inclined to "counter aggression" wherever it occurred, though, "for indigenous participants, limited warfare is likely to appear as civil war."

SRI was involved from the beginning in Vietnam. Senior economist Eugene Staley, who has also been a professor of education at the University, headed a special government mission there in 1961 to bring back suggestions for meeting the Diem regime's "most pressing financial, military, and political needs." Staley spent six weeks in the country, most of it in Saigon, and then recommended increases in military and economic aid, "measures which could restore security within 18 months," according to the New York Times. They didn't.

Much of industry on the peninsula is "defense"-related. During the early '60's, aerospace and electronics suffered a depression brought on by defense cut-backs. At the time, SRI's Weldon ("Hoot") Gibson soothed the panicky industrialists. "There are indications," he explained, "that short term losses over the next few years may be recouped later in the decade with new developments in anti-missile missiles or a new generation of strategic weapons."

He was right on both counts, and may have been tipped off by the double-time research commissioned to SRI by the DOD in 1964, obviously in preparation for an expanded war in Vietnam. This was research on surveillance and reconnaissance, jungle communications, and helicopter vulnerability to ground fire. (He may also have been tipped off by the 23-man squad SRI maintains in Washington. San Francisco's Mayor Alioto wants to employ that team as S.F.'s lobbyist, but SRI says it can't legally lobby. Or, at least, it can't call it that. Next slide, please.)

ENSURING U.S. INFLUENCE

While the hurry-up research for Vietnam was being done at SRI, the Institute also began its participation in the DOD's Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) "Project Agile". Agile is the Pentagon's world-wide counterinsurgency research program, bivouaced primarily in Thailand. Initially, the SRI projects in Thailand, primarily in insurgency communications, were mostly in the development and testing of weapons and tactics for Vietnam. With the increase of guerilla activity in Thailand in 1966, the program began to concentrate on building counterinsurgency capabilities for the Thai oligarchy and on putting the U.S. in a "knowledgeable position" should "largescale intervention in Thailand be called for."

Stanford trustees and SRI directors currently have corporate interests in Thai oil, iron, aluminum, and steel. For Robison, SRI's involvement in Thailand is part of "the struggle to maintain another Asian bastion of strength for the free world."

SRI has pulled similar shenanigans in South America, where the same companies -- Union Oil, Kaiser, Castle & Cook (Dole, Standard Fruit), Utah Construction & Mining -- have similar interests in bananas, sugar, cotton, iron, oil and phosphates. In Peru, Eugene Staley's International Development Center of SRI engaged a \$1.2 million "development" contract for the Agency for International Development.

An SRI economist of that contract later performed a secret ARPA project entitled "COIN" Peru. ARPA described "COIN" Peru as "a study of the advantages and disadvantages of providing U.S. operational assistance to armed forces of Peru as well as alternatives to insure U.S. influence on the course of action. Another SRI man performed a similar ARPA contract to "insure U.S. influence" in Honduras, one of the most banan of banana republics. (ed: sic: banan!)

Just as "development" and "counterinsurgency" go hand in hand for SRI in South America, so "renewal" and "riot control" go hand in hand at home. SRI is working on an urban renewal plan for Oakland at the same time that it has begun research into riot control devices, presumably to reap an expanding federal and state market. Following the more theoretical gas warfare research done by S. U. chemists, since the late fifties SRI has performed Chemical Corps contracts in packaging of chemical weapons, among them CS, a harsh tear gas first used to "flush out" troops and civilians. Most recently CS was used against the man in the street during the Chicago convention.

SRI has played a role in the Pentagon's highly controversial decision to construct an anti-ballistic missile system. After several years of feasibility studies, SRI received millions of dollars annually for "discrimination studies,"--it's a bird, it's a plane, it's a Chinese mistake. Numerous Stanford trustees and SRI directors are profiting from the development, including men like Donald Douglas of major contractor McDonnell Douglas.

SRI, with its important role in National Defense and international development, can be expected to expand. Already planned are a \$2 million center for SRI international and a \$4.5 million engineering laboratory. Stanford Village, a low-rental housing area adjacent to SRI, is being torn down to provide the space.

the trustees

Though Stanford trustees are developing a strong distaste for student revolutionaries, the present board is itself the product of a palace revolution.

After the deaths of Leland and Jane Stanford, the university's 15-man Board of Trustees remained in the hands of older San Francisco capitalists--men who had made their money in railroads, banking, corporate law, shipping, and newspapers. Trustee Herbert Hoover perhaps best represented their views.

But from the late forties on, Stanford was moving too fast for the old guard. Frederick Terman, Dean of the School of Engineering, was helping his former students set up businesses based on booming Cold War and consumer demands. At the same time that area business leaders connected with Stanford created SRI, the university mapped out the Stanford Industrial Park. To new research industrialists like Terman-protégés William Hewlett and David Packard, it was time for an American-style, legal coup d'état.

As a result of the growing strength of these upstarts, Stanford went to court in 1954 to change the original university charter. Under the revised charter approved by the court, five additional regular (10-year) trustees and three 5-year "alumni trustees" were packed onto the board. Packard immediately picked up a spot on the larger board, along with Ernest Arbuckle, now board Chairman of Wells Fargo Bank and Arjay Miller's predecessor as Dean of the Stanford Business School. By 1964 all of the trustee elders had departed, nine of them booted upstairs to positions as non-voting emeritus trustees.

The present group of trustees breaks down roughly into four distinguishable, though interrelated sets of interests: San Francisco finance and construction, oil, electronics, and aerospace.

San Francisco Finance and Construction

The San Francisco trustees are particularly important, in that they represent one of the country's few centers of international finance at all independent of Wall Street. Trustees Arbuckle and Edmund Littlefield serve as directors of both Wells Fargo, the nation's eleventh largest bank, along with Stanford Business Affairs Vice President Alf Brandin, and of Utah Construction and Mining, a world-spanning construction firm. Littlefield holds down posts as President and General Manager of Utah Construction and Board Chairman of Utah's Peruvian subsidiary, Marcona Mining. Trustee President W. Palmer Fuller III is a fourth Wells Fargo director, while David Packard serves on the board of Crocker Citizen's Bank, the nation's twelfth largest.

A big recent (1964) addition to the Montgomery Street trustees is Fred Merrill, Chairman of the Board and President of the Fund American Companies, which serves as an umbrella for at least a dozen insurance companies. Former President Wallace Sterling holds down directorships on two of these companies. Other trustees with financial interests include Charles Ducommun, Thomas Pike, Gardiner Symonds and Dean Watkins, directors respectively of Security First National Bank (10th largest), Lincoln Savings & Loan, Philadelphia Life Insurance Co., and Stanford Bank.

Oil

The oil industry has also staked out a large claim on Stanford trusteeships. Arthur Stewart, Board chairman of the Union Oil of California Foundation and director of Union Oil, was the first of the present crop of oilmen elected to the Stanford Board in May, 1954, just before the packing of the old board. Two years later, he was joined by Monroe Spaght, President and Director of Shell Oil, the nation's fourteenth largest corporation. Spaght left in 1965 to go to England with Shell, transferring his trusteeship to his successor at Shell, Richard McCurdy.

Tenneco, the 39th U.S. corporation and a leading conglomerate, gained a seat in the Boardroom in January, 1961 when its Chairman of the Board and President Gardiner Symonds became a Stanford trustee. Symonds is also a trustee at Rice, where he has been able to watch Kenneth Pitzer work. With its purchase of Kern County Land Company, Tenneco has developed additional ties with Trustees Hewlett and Arbuckle, both Kern County Directors.

Among the other oilmen on the Board are Lawrence Kimpton, vice president and Director of Standard Oil of Indiana, and Thomas Pike, Board Chairman of Pike Corporation and National Engineering Science.

Electronics

The Stanford trustees' electronics caucus centers around David Packard, William Hewlett, and three other Hewlett-Packard directors, Arbuckle, Pike, and Attorney Robert Minge Brown. Trustee Dean Watkins, of Watkins and Johnson, has profited neatly from Stanford science, holding a professorship in Electrical Engineering from 1953 to 1963. Currently he is president of the politically significant Western Electronics Manufacturers Association. Tenneco's Symonds is also interested in electronics through his directorship at General Telephone and Telegraph, owner of Sylvania.

mid-peninsula politics. Packard is now the central figure in the local Urban Coalition, and a significant voice in just about any local issue, including last spring's sit-in. Watkins is vice-chairman of the Sequoia Union High School Governing Board, which just recently received hard criticism for its racist policies.

Aerospace

The Aerospace and related defense industries are the fourth significant cluster on the Stanford Board. Groups of trustees carry the greatest responsibility for tying the university both to Southern California and the Department of Defense.

Roger Lewis, Chairman of the Board and President of General Dynamics and Eisenhower's Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, assumed a Stanford trusteeship in 1964. William Rogers, director of Aerojet-General, joined up in '66. And just this year, Northrop's top man, Tom Jones, became a Stanford trustee. Jones is also a member of many policy groups, including the Board of Directors of the Air Force Systems Command, the Board of Admissions of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the Department of Defense Advisory Council.

Others representing this group are Charles Ducommun, a director of Lockheed, Space Labs, and president of his own Ducommun Inc.; Packard, who serves on the General Dynamics Board; Littlefield, a director of General Electric; and William Hewlett, a director of FMC, Chrysler, and the Rand Corporation, along with President-select Pitzer.

Straddling this four-way division are the corporate attorneys, who both represent firms and hold directorships in all the major areas. U.S. Circuit Judge Benjamin Cushing Duniway, of Cushing, Cullinan, Duniway and Gorill, is a director of Shlago Lock Co., San Francisco's largest industrial firm. Trustees Morris M. Doyle and Robert Minge Brown come from one of the areas most important firms, McCutchen, Doyle, Brown and Enerson. Richard Guggenhime, a director of Union Sugar, works with Heller, Ehrman, White and McAuliffe. And Mrs. Allen E. Charles is married to a partner of Lillick, Wheat, Adams and Charles, attorneys for ABC, Bethlehem Steel, Raytheon, Texaco, and Lockheed.

The one apparent exception to this corporate domination of the Stanford Board of Trustees is John W. Gardner, former HEW Secretary, and President of the Carnegie Corporation. Gardner holds no directorships on any significant corporations. But his ties to the nation's business elite are no less real or important. Gardner is Chairman of the Urban Coalition, the big business-led organization which seeks to contain and channel the black revolution within both the present structure of American society and present priorities on U.S. expansion abroad. With Carnegie and then HEW, Gardner is probably the man most responsible for rationalizing university involvement in international studies, in an effort to build the resources necessary to staff and support the American Empire.

These are the men who run Stanford. They are not educators. Understanding the bases of power from which they qualified for positions on the Stanford board is a first step towards understanding the priorities they bring to Stanford.



THE FIRE COMES HOME

White gloves light no matches,
Pull no triggers as the bodies fall.
They scribble signatures, pat backs,
Shake gloves with Deans of Business,
Guiding Arbuckles to the top
From Standard Oil of Stanford, the Peace Corps,
Peru, Wells Fargo, on to better things
For better living as in SRI
Countering insurgency,
Conjuring the McNamara Line,
Counseling Strategic Hamlets.

A thatched hut after all is nothing much.
One of the hired men's lighters brings it down.
Can it compare to a fine rare book
Collection?
A wife and child or two at going rates
Perhaps worth eighty dollars--can they compare
In sterling value to this damage worth
\$300,000?

In unison, bare hands reply, unite.
Now Sterling in his shirtsleeves walks among
Ashes that just now were precious things,
Fit for a showcase in some dead museum.
(They could have stood in rows
Where Stanford shows
Mrs. Robber Baron's clothes.)
When the fire comes home
White gloves blacken in the smoke and flame,
The hands that they have shaken start to shake.

by Jane Morgan

Where We're At



The Stanford Left

As we have seen, most Stanford students will graduate well-prepared to assume a position in society. Some however, become so disillusioned or angered in their years here that they become "student activists." Despite the pictures usually portrayed of Stanford, Stanford has a strong tradition of radical politics.

Stanford has been a center for outcast politics and a bohemian life almost since its inception. The University's first president, David Starr Jordan, vociferously opposed our "colonial war" in the Philippines and joined Grover Cleveland and Mark Twain in forming the Anti-Imperialist League. Administrative repression began almost as early. A turn-of-the-century bohemian colony was routed out and Thorsten Veblen, the Vance Packard of his time, was dismissed from the university for sleeping with too many faculty wives. In the thirties, the left fielded an intramural basketball team with hammer and sickle jerseys, and just before World War II University wits formed a chapter of the Veterans of Future Wars.

Protest politics returned to Stanford in the early 1960's, when an all night vigil in front of the president's office protesting the opening of shelters against atomic attack, brought a positive response: the banning of such demonstrations. The "shelters" are still maintained.

A major step in the growth of the Stanford movement came in the spring and summer of 1964. Stanford students were the most active on the West Coast in SNCC and CORE activities in Mississippi and Alabama. Busloads of freshmen departed for the South, much to the uneasiness of trustees and administrators, some of whose businesses were involved in the difficulties there.

But things really began hopping at Stanford in late 1964, when the Graduate Coordinating Committee (GCC)--which was not limited to graduates--emerged in response to the Berkeley Free Speech Movement. The GCC involved itself in university reform, the farm workers' struggle, and opposition to American involvement in South Africa and Vietnam. The Free University of Palo Alto and the campus-based Experiment, now melded in the Midpeninsula Free University, came out of the GCC, as did Stanford's SDS chapter, the university anti-Vietnam War movement, and a series of newsletters and newspapers which culminated in the Peninsula Observer.

The Stanford Committee for Peace in Vietnam (SCPV), a GCC off-shoot, became the largest, most active voluntary student group at Stanford in '65-66, drawing in well over 500 members. Its fall activities began with a week-end vigil and forum which was waterbombed by fraternity members, and an abortive attempt to bomb Big Game with anti-war leaflets. A sometime SCPV member was later arrested and charged with dropping leaflets on the Oakland Army terminal at night from a light plane. Other such incidents at Disneyland and the San Diego Naval Station went unexplained.

Other SCPV activities included the initiation of the nation-wide boycott of Dow products and a local referendum attempt against the manufacturing of napalm by United Technology Center in Redwood City. The attempt failed when the city attorney refused to process the signatures on the petition for referendum and the Committee Against Napalm discovered that forcing him into court would take three years, well beyond the end of UTC's contract.