
CAMPUS REPORT

A Weekly Publication for
Stanford University Faculty and Staff
Vol. I, No. 28 April 23, 1969

Meetings This Week To Determine Research Guides, Sit-in Tactics

One meeting is scheduled to be conducted this week that could formulate the University's future research policy guidelines, while a second may determine whether Stanford faces another sit-in.

The Senate of the Academic Council will meet tomorrow (April 24) and address itself to these issues:

1. The status of classified research on the Stanford campus.
2. New research policy guidelines which prohibit research that involves secrecy of sponsorship or results. (The Senate, at its meeting last week, requested the Committee on Research Policy to prepare the guidelines.)

A mass meeting is scheduled for Friday (April 25) by the sit-in group to "assess programs of our demonstration and decide any tactical moves we deem necessary which may include the reoccupation of a University building."

The threat of continued, extended demonstrations and/or sit-ins was voiced by the dissidents when they left the Applied Electronics Laboratory last Friday after paralyzing its operations for nine days. The laboratory was closed Friday noon for one week upon order of President Kenneth S. Pitzer.

The sit-in group also called on the Board of Trustees to consider the issues by April 30. The trustees already voted on April 8 to have a trustee committee hold a hearing on relations between the University and SRI following publication of the student-faculty ad hoc committee report on the subject last week.

In its deliberations tomorrow, the Senate also will consider three resolutions adopted by the Academic Council at a special meeting called by President Pitzer last Friday.

With more than 700 of the University's 999 faculty members attending, the Council gave a standing ovation to President Pitzer for his "restraint and firmness" in dealing with the sit-in. The Council met 45 minutes after the dissidents voted almost unanimously to "temporarily suspend" their occupation of AEL.

Emergency Powers Cited

President Pitzer told the Council he had been informed Thursday by the Stanford Judicial Council that the sit-in violated campus disruption policy which warranted the use of Presidential emergency powers granted under the Legislative and Judicial Charter.

The Council's conclusions empowered the President to close the AEL for a week, and provided immediate temporary suspension of partial salary for faculty members and immediate temporary suspension of students who did not vacate the AEL premises.

The Council "strongly endorsed" the President for the

Ultimate Uses of Research Projects Difficult to Determine

The over-riding problem facing scientists and everyone concerned with the control of pure research is that no one can predict in what direction it might go.

At the outset, it is virtually impossible to determine whether the ultimate use will be good, bad, warlike, or for the furtherance of the peace and health of the world.

This complex and long-range consideration was scored poignantly by Physics Professor Arthur Schawlow, codeveloper in 1959 of the laser.

"I worked on lasers," he explains, "and newspapers immediately talked about 'death rays.' Ten years later, we have no death rays. The first use of the laser was to repair detached retinas, and I'd never heard of detached retinas when I began.

"You can't tell what's coming out when you start."

His comments and those of others concerned with research at Stanford were made last week at a two and a half hour open hearing conducted by the University Committee on Research Policy and attended by 250 students and faculty.

The meeting preceded a special session of the Senate of the Academic Council on the same subject.

All the meetings were held as the sit-in by students continued at the Applied Electronics Laboratory to protest war related research both at Stanford and the Stanford Research Institute.

Objectivity Difficult

Professor Schawlow's comments were in reply to a question by Professor Hans Andersen, chemistry, who asked: "What control does the scientific community have over research done by that community? It's difficult for scientists to be objective about their own work."

Committee Chairman William F. Baxter, law, noted that the community has "two shots" at such control. "Pure research can be controlled at the start," he said, "but it shouldn't. Secondly, the community can attempt to control the uses to

(Continued on page 5)

handling of the sit-in and "expressed its confidence in his judgment as he chooses among future alternatives" in dealing with campus disruption.

A second motion said the Council "joins the President's expressed commitment to the principle that 'Stanford shall live by procedures of judicial due process upon which all constituencies have agreed.'"

A third motion, introduced by Nobel Laureate Joshua Lederberg, executive head of genetics, said that "given the restoration of an atmosphere of order on this campus conducive to a rational examination of the issues that underlay the occupation of the AEL, the Council commits itself to continued, intense dialogue with the rest of the University community in the expeditious solutions of the problems there raised."

In his opening remarks to the Council, President Pitzer said the University faced a choice at the AEL, between imposing its own emergency sanctions—"an internal martial law"—or "to turn immediately to external authority."

He pointed out that the University should be a "bastion of rationality against the forces of coercion . . . We can maintain this freedom only if we govern ourselves."

President Pitzer rebuked some members of the faculty when he declared:

"Frankly, when we've asked some of you to help maintain freedom actively by participating in the course of procedures against those violating the freedom of others, the response has not been anywhere near as good as we would have liked. I must ask all of you now for your active commitment to this concept of freedom and campus independence. This means active support of the Stanford Judicial Council and the other elements of campus self-governance."

Immediately following the Council session, a previously scheduled mass meeting of students was conducted in Frost Amphitheater to discuss issues raised by the sit-in. Called by Student Body President Denis Hayes, it was attended by approximately 4,000 students, faculty and staff members.

During the meeting in Frost Amphitheater, an informal vote was taken, and 1,633 students indicated they would participate in another sit-in if the Board of Trustees does not "positively respond" to demands concerning research at SRI; 1,438 said they would not participate.

* Students also voted 3,073 to 203 to commend the April

Statements During The Occupation of AEL . . .

✓ **President Kenneth S. Pitzer**—" . . . the demonstration is inherently an ugly, sometimes fierce threat to an infringement upon the right of researchers to research, students to study, and teachers to teach."

✓ **Richard Kuhns**, Law School Teaching Fellow—Students "got nowhere in their long attempts to get the University to come to grips with the issues . . . about war-related research. The sit-in was the only means possible and should not be considered a disruption."

Alexander Sawchuk, Ph.D. candidate in electrical engineering—"One (dissident) was particularly upset. He shouted obscenities and said if I asked him again to leave he would kill me. I left."

Larry Christiani, suspended for previous disruptive activities—"We did not open any locked files (in the AEL). No papers were destroyed, and all were returned."

Provost Richard W. Lyman—"It (the sit-in) has halted work for 150 AEL employees, affecting those who are doing electrocardiograph research as much as those whose projects the sit-in opposes. Continuing payroll costs of more than \$5,000 a day can be made up only from University general funds. This amount is equivalent to nearly two full-year scholarships a day."

✓ **A letter signed by 123 faculty members**—"It is our strong view that the Senate should take no action having to do with the substance of demands now being pressed by those who are illegally occupying the Applied Electronics Laboratory. It is further our view

that for the Senate to respond to those demands while the sit-in is in progress would be to violate previous actions by the faculty and student body which specifically and categorically repudiate coercive tactics as a means of attaining objectives within the University . . .

"If (the Senate) should decide that the pressures of coercion are too strong to resist—or that the moral claim under which they are pressed relieves the faculty of the obligation to resist—it will have ended for the foreseeable future the right of the Stanford faculty to claim stewardship for the values of reason and tolerance that make universities unique and priceless institutions."

Professor Leonard I. Schiff, physics, chairman of the Senate—"It is important to note that the Senate has taken a strong moral stand on the issue of war-related research versus research directed toward peace and human welfare. This is far more meaningful than a hasty attempt to specify precisely what is meant by counter-insurgency research and then rule it out of bounds. With regard to chemical, biological, and radiological warfare, the Senate has been assured by the University's Research Administrator that there is no such activity on the campus.

"I regard it as of the greatest importance that persons in the Stanford Community who share the Senate's concern with these matters appreciate to the fullest extent the very strong and positive actions taken and attitudes expressed by the Academic Senate in its role as the official representative of the Stanford Faculty."

Third Coalition, which led the sit-in, for "helping focus the attention of the campus upon the nature of the research being conducted at the University and SRI."

They urged the cessation of classified research by a 2-1 majority and opposed research in chemical-biological warfare, counterinsurgency, and Southeast Asia by even wider margins.

In a 2,630 to 572 vote, the students said it would be in the interest of the University for the trustees to discontinue the kinds of research specified and to decide the future relationship of the University and SRI no later than the trustee's May 13 meeting.

Professor Loderberg told the audience "the real problem is not the laboratory work here, but the disease of militarism and nationalism, and its effects on society. I can't blame you," he said, for reacting to "changes in the last few years."

However, he added, "If the use of bodies instead of brains is the best you can think of doing, God help us all."

Professor Wolfgang Panofsky, director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, declared that Stanford "... should not sponsor research whose output is classified," but researchers "should have access to classified information" to guide their work more intelligently.

Sophomore Leo Bazile, chairman of the Black Student Union, led a group of BSU members on the stage during the

meeting and said if the SRI wants to show "what we can do when we do research," it should solve East Palo Alto's problems.

Robert Arnold, SRI researcher, said employees "intend to guard our autonomy and retain our control over SRI."

Questionnaires seeking the opinion of faculty and students on the issues in the relationship between the University and SRI were mailed to them last week and are to be postmarked by midnight tonight. (See story on page 5.)

While the student meeting at Frost was underway, about 400 engineering students at Cubberley Auditorium heard Professor Hubert Heffner, electrical engineering and physics, warn that "academic freedom is not a law but an idea, and it is terribly fragile."

"There is an attempt to change the course of universities by intimidation and coercion, which can draw attention but not real change," he stated. "The 'research immorality' charge involves creation of a 'research goon squad to tell you whether your research is moral or not.'"

The Senate has asked the Committee on Research Policy to determine, following tomorrow's meeting, how the University can bring about a further reordering of its own research priorities and to a reordering of the research funding patterns of Federal Government agencies, "reporting as soon as practicable on these two issues."

SENATE REPORT NUMBER 19

On Thursday, April 15, 1969, beginning at 7:30 p.m., at a special meeting called for the purpose of considering the status of classified research on the Stanford campus, the Senate, after a discussion in a Committee of the Whole lasting more than four hours, set the matter as an agenda for its regular meeting on Thursday, April 24, 1969, and asked the Academic Council Committee on Research Policy for a further report at that time. The following resolution was adopted on a voice vote, with one dissent:

The Senate desires a significant change in University research policy, greater than that proposed in the April 15 Majority Report of the Committee on Research Policy. We request

CAMPUS REPORT

Published weekly in Autumn, Winter, and Spring and bi-weekly in Summer quarters by the University Relations Office. Stanley I. Wilson, editor; Jan Studebaker, associate editor.

News items, letters to the editor, questions for the Q and A column, housing notices (Stanford faculty and staff only), and other editorial communications should be directed to the Publications Service, 332 Encina Hall. (See Calendar for special instructions.)

On-campus distribution queries should be directed to the Interdepartmental Mail, Ext. 2450; at the Medical Center, to the Mail Room, Ext. 5130. U.S. mail (first class) subscriptions at \$6.00 a year available at Publications Service, 332 Encina Hall, Stanford, Calif. 94305; make checks payable to Stanford University. Second-class postal permit pending at Palo Alto, Calif.

that the Committee prepare for the April 24 meeting of the Senate new research policy guidelines which prohibit research which involves secrecy of sponsorship or results. We further desire that after April 24 the Committee address itself to the issues of how the University can bring about a further reordering of its own research priorities and to a reordering of the research funding patterns of Federal Government agencies, reporting as soon as practicable on these two issues.

The term *secrecy*, as used in the foregoing, shall be defined in the terms used in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Minority Report of the Committee (presented by Mr. Michael Sweeney), which read as follows:

1. The University should enter no contract and accept no grant to carry out research under circumstances that restrain the freedom of the University to disclose known applications of the research.
2. The University should enter no contract and accept no grant to carry out research if there is substantial possibility that foreseeable results of the research will be subjected by the sponsor to restrictions on publication of research results for a period in excess of that reasonably required for the sponsor to ascertain whether classified information would be disclosed by publication.

E. Howard Brooks was seated as the Representative from Electoral Unit No. 11 for a term ending in 1969, replacing Herbert L. Packer; and the Steering Committee announced that, pursuant to the Senate's action of April 10, 1969, a special meeting of the Senate had been called, beginning at 3:15 p.m., on Tuesday, (April 22) to consider possible action as a result of the Report of the Committee to Study the Relationship between the University and the Stanford Research Institute.

H. Donald Winbigler
Academic Secretary

Research Uses Unpredictable

(Continued from page 1)

which such research is put, and the community should do a better job than it has in the past. It involves the entire community, and we have to work harder at the general political processes."

Professor Baxter noted that Stanford has strict policies relating to classified research, and the committee which must approve new classified contracts "takes a sharp distinction between the interests of the researcher and his work and the interests of the sponsor; we lean toward the researcher.

"If the notion is that no research should be done here that enhances the ability of the United States to wage war, then the range of research would run far beyond classified research, which would only be an infinitesimal part of it."

Knowledge Use Important

Professor Robert J. Moffat, mechanical engineering, says that what is done with new knowledge is even more important than what can be done with it.

"The output of research in the physical sciences is not dangerous or immoral," he said. "It's how it's used. Ideas are likely to be more dangerous than hardware.

"Research into ideologies and political philosophies may lead to the application of physical sciences in warfare. These may make them more dangerous. What is proper and moral should be expanded to ideas."

An Air Force contract called "Laboratory consultation on Air Force electronic systems and electronic techniques problems," was raised by Sophomore Marc Weiss, who asked how it "contributed to human knowledge," adding that it was "basically military."

Professor Baxter replied that its main purpose was "development of techniques for sampling the electromagnetic spectrum—for example, monitoring broadcasting traffic. You can't talk about the purpose of research, only the purpose of people."

"Then why is the Air Force sponsoring it?" snapped Weiss. "Why do you consider it suitable for an academic atmosphere?"

"It had a wide variety of applications, and there was no mystery about it to anyone," said Professor Baxter.

Cannot Legislate Morality

Professor Joseph M. Pettit, dean of the School of Engineering, said "You cannot legislate or coerce morality. It is clear that in these changing times, particularly the last 12 months, that individuals in the academic community are alienated by policies in Washington and are choosing to work on other things.

"We won't solve it by talking about academic purity; neutrality is useful to no one. If we can make an impact on Washington to get more money in urban problems and transportation, we want to help."

QUESTIONNAIRES ON SRI DUE TONIGHT

Questionnaires seeking the opinion of faculty and students on the issues in the relationship between the Stanford Research Institute and the University must be post-marked no later than midnight tonight (April 23) in order to be counted.

The poll was requested by President Kenneth S. Pitzer on April 10, and 12,800 ballots were sent to members of the Academic Council, nonmembers of the Council who have teaching responsibilities, and students.

Nathan Maccoby, communication, is chairman of a committee named by President Pitzer to conduct the balloting. In a cover letter with the ballot, the committee urges the voters to review carefully the SRI report submitted last week by a student-faculty ad hoc group which spent six months studying the issue.

Five major areas of consideration concerning the future status of the University and SRI are included in the questionnaire.

President of SRI Says Facility's Sale Would Not Bring 'Windfall'

Charles A. Anderson, president of the Stanford Research Institute, has issued a statement declaring the student-faculty ad hoc committee on the University-SRI relationship is in error in expecting an estimated \$25 million to \$45 million "windfall" from the proposed sale of SRI because the facility "cannot afford the sums suggested."

In the opinion of Anderson, no one should start planning ways to use the money "because requirements of the Scott [student-faculty ad hoc] Committee report could turn SRI into a heavy financial burden to the University instead of a financial asset."

Anderson, commenting after a week of discussions about the report among SRI's 3,000 employees, said an overwhelming percentage of the scientific and professional staff has said they would not submit to the restrictions on their research suggested by the committee.

"This goes beyond questions of the so-called morality of projects in support of our national security," Anderson said. "Some staff members already decline projects on military work and they value this right of self-determination. However, virtually all the staff members say they would refuse to have an outside group decide for them what is or is not a morally acceptable study. The suggestion of such thought control and restrictions on the search for knowledge strikes them as unacceptable. As to national security work, it is the Institute's policy to support its government."

SRI, Anderson pointed out, is a professional and scientific community just as the University is and "our members are just as jealous of their academic freedom."

SEA Denies It Published Leaflet In Support of AEL Sit-in Group

The Stanford Employees Association has issued a statement that it "did not print or authorize" the publication and distribution of a leaflet that purports SEA support for the AEL sit-in group.

A leaflet was distributed April 14 carrying only the signature of "concerned Stanford employees" with no names affixed. The leaflet heading carried the name of the association and the notice of the April 15 meeting; however, no further mention was made of the meeting or its agenda.

The text which followed the meeting announcement contained arguments against biological research and statements directed to Stanford officials urging cessation of "research on weapons of death."

The leaflet further stated, "We support their [students'] human goals for administrative action... on setting the guidelines for new, more constructive research and work at this university." The name of SEA did not appear in the text.

Representatives who said they were members of the sit-in group appeared at the meeting but were told the agenda did not provide for a discussion of the AEL issue.

The SEA bulletin of April 15, issued under the name of Mike Fineo, physical plant, chairman of the Stanford chapter, pointed out that the leaflet was not printed or authorized by the SEA group.

It further stated: "SEA believes in protests—as long as they are orderly and lawful.

"SEA respects the rights of others—as we expect our rights to be respected.

"SEA has made gains by meaningful discussions with Stanford University Administration."

"All members are encouraged to attend the meeting tonight for a discussion of these gains."

SEA officials said they were "besieged" by telephone calls from chapter members objecting to the unauthorized leaflet.

Cobden-Sanderson Binding, Press Work To Be Shown in Bender Room Today

An exhibition of the superb binding and press work of Thomas James Cobden-Sanderson will open in the Bender Room of the Stanford University Library today (April 23).

The opening will be the occasion of a 3:30 p.m. lecture: "Cobden-Sanderson: The Master Craftsman" by Norman H. Strouse, author and bibliophile, who recently retired as chairman of the board of the J. Walter Thompson Co.

Strouse, who now lives in St. Helena, is coauthor with John Drefuss of a forthcoming "leaf-book" on Cobden-Sanderson which will be printed this summer by Leonard Bahr at the Adagio Press.

The exhibition consists of a sampling of books and manuscripts from the Cobden-Sanderson collections of Strouse and the late Mr. and Mrs. Morgan A. Gunst of San Francisco.

UNIVERSITY TO ADMIT 1,350

From an applicant pool of 9,300—the largest in Stanford's history—the University will admit 1,350 freshmen next Fall Quarter.

Dean of Admissions Rixford K. Snyder points out that virtually all of the 9,300 are qualified for entrance to Stanford, and that this year's entering class will represent more diversity than ever before.

Last year's total of 8,200 applicants was the previous record. Of those, 1,850 were admitted.

Notices of acceptance must be received from the successful applicants by May 1.

Although a detailed profile of the incoming class will not be known until after May 1, Dr. Snyder says there will be a "significant increase" in the number of Blacks and Mexican-Americans admitted.

He also explains that the University "sought a greater emphasis on the diversity in social backgrounds, interests in nonacademic areas, meaningful evidences in social concern, and interests in tutoring and involvement in inter-city academic activities."

There are successful candidates from all 50 states.

Dr. Snyder states his staff conducted over 3,000 interviews on the Stanford campus with applicants since last Fall, and another 6,000 were contacted off campus in groups or individually.

Professor Richard Scowcroft Appointed Director of Creative Writing Center

Professor Richard Scowcroft, for more than 20 years co-editor of the annual Stanford Short Stories series, has been appointed director of the Creative Writing Center succeeding Professor Wallace Stegner. The latter, who was director for 20 years, has been named to the endowed Jackson Eli Reynolds professorship in the humanities.

A native of Utah and a graduate of the University of Utah, Professor Scowcroft holds master's and doctoral degrees in English from Harvard. He has published a series of novels, including *Children of the Covenant*, *First Family*, *A View of the Bay*, *Wherever She Goes*, and the forthcoming *The Ordeal of Dudley Dean*. He has been assistant director of the Center since 1947.

In making the announcement, Professor Ian Watt, chairman of the English Department, also disclosed the appointments of Emerson L. Brown, Jr.; David R. Riggs, Jr.; and David W. Williams to the faculty.

The first three new faculty members have been appointed assistant professors of English effective September 1, and A. J. Young will be at Stanford for the Summer Session as an instructor in creative writing and continue as Jones lecturer for the ensuing academic year.