

STATEMENT OF THE 29 DEFENDANTS

Since the fall of last year, Stanford Students for a Democratic Society has raised the issue of Stanford's military and economic involvement in Southeast Asia. The Stanford corporate-defense complex's involvement ranges from Chemical-biological warfare studies and counterinsurgency work at SRI, military electronics work on campus in the Applied Electronics Lab, faculty consulting for the Pentagon, to trustees' corporations supplying the War effort and holding major investments in SE Asia. Actions at SRI, AEL, and Pitzer's office this fall were directed toward keeping the issue of the human suffering in South east Asia before the University community. Yawns.

Christmas vacation left a rapidly diminishing amount of interest in these issues. So Stanford SDS drew up a set of 9 specific demands directed towards getting Stanford out of SE Asia, and attempted to present them to the trustees and the community on January 14. These issues had to get out in public again. You see, the Vietnamese don't work on a quarter system.

Whatever their motivations, many of the Stanford trustees run corporations that inflict death on Vietnamese and support oligarchies which condemn people of the Third World to poverty, illiteracy, and early death. ~~Since~~ The Vietnamese and most of the people of the Third World have been denied the right of self-determination by such ~~men~~ as the Stanford trustees, And given the rapid growth of SRI, the Industrial Park, and the Schools of Engineering and Business since WW II, there can be little doubt that the trustees have consciously coordinated Stanford's development with the US's expansionist foreign policy. Here again they are responsible to no one but themselves.

We often hear that most social problems result from failures to communicate. Well, at their October meeting and on January 14, the trustees were asked to hold open meetings. They refused on both occasions. After the doors to the trustees' meetingroom were opened, the students did not force the trustees to leave but instead asked them repeatedly to stay and discuss the University's involvement in SE Asia. Granted there was a lot of noise on and off (much of which came from red-faced trustees and administrators), it was clear that the major disruption was in the minds of the trustees, since they were getting uncomfortably close to a group of human beings who were raising the issue of their participation and Stanford's participation in the violence in SE Asia.

Placed within a context of the systematic violence practiced by the US and the Stanford defense complex in the Third World, placed within a context of our noisy presence at a trustee meeting devoted to business-as-usual, the recent trial of 29 students emerges as a travesty of justice. It's impossible to treat the SJC as a legitimate body when one sees that the trustees should have been put on trial along with us if the community is really interested in halting disruptive-violent acts (especially the latter). In its opinion, the SJC wrote that it "views as most serious those acts which, directly or by implication, threaten violence to any person." We agree. And we are especially worried about acts which do violence to other people.

Since the SJC derives its power directly from men whom it should be putting on trial under widely accepted moral standards, the Council's political function and its verdict can't be separated. The SJC is clearly not obligated to look into the workings of a repressive and violent status quo, both here and in Southeast Asia. Stanford's institutionalized racist admissions process and curriculum is a daily violation of human dignity, but it is a sure bet that the judicial process will latch onto property destruction in the bookstore rather than to the daily perpetuation of racism by the University.

Given Stanford's participation in violence abroad and its functionally racist policies at home, we feel that the University has no right to punish the Black Students

Union for its response to administrative stalling any more than it has the right to punish SDS for its response to the trustees' unwillingness to confront basic issues of human suffering in Southeast Asia. If accepting the SJC's verdict would get Stanford out of SE Asia, we would gladly do it. But Stanford remains in SE Asia. We don't want chaos, but justice across the board.

We view the sentence imposed by the SJC as a clearcut act of political intimidation. Many people can agree that there are situations, especially in the most conservative country in the world, when normal channels for change don't work and when laws or campus rules must be broken to raise moral issues. The suspended suspensions imposed by the SJC are a clearcut effort to prevent people at Stanford from raising important moral and political problems and acting on them.

But we are not going to cry on the community's shoulder about the suspended suspensions. Stanford's judicial process is not the central issue. The next time we act, we once again will raise the real issues of violence both in the Third World and in the urban colonies rather than the false issue of violating a campus policy on disruptions. This is hardly a threat--rather it is a statement of moral principle.

In light of the SJC's failure to examine ~~the~~ acts of corporate violence by the trustees, we have decided not to pay to the University the punitive \$1900 fine levied by the SJC on the defendants. It is very likely that the University will not let us register next quarter if we do not pay the fine. With community support, we feel that registration will not be withheld.

However, we thank the SJC for reminding all white people of our responsibility to support the black liberation movement. We feel that the money should go where it's needed most and that black people should control the use of the funds instead of the Stanford administration. In addition, we feel that it is grossly hypocritical for the University to direct this money into the Martin Luther King fund. The BSU fought last spring and is fighting now to force the University to direct its ample funds into more financial aid for black students. Our \$1900 will simply release an equivalent amount of the University's ~~to~~ go elsewhere.

Instead, with the support of the BSU, we have decided to raise ^{as much money} ~~as much money~~ as we can from ourselves and the Stanford community for the Black Panther Party. Along with their ongoing need for legal defense funds, the Black Panthers are running a free breakfast program out of Oakland churches for black children, and are planning to set up free health clinics and liberation high schools in Oakland. We urge the community to support both the BSU's demands and the Black Panther Party's community organizing.

In view of the human sacrifices made by the Vietnamese people and the black people of this country, we can hardly let the threat of suspension or expulsion halt our struggle. We feel it is your struggle too. Join us.