

tries, including Vietnam, who had quite an influence on us. When we came back to this country we were Marxist-

Leninists and we saw the need for a revolutionary force in the United States."

Looking around, the Franklins found no existing organization that fitted their beliefs and agenda for action, and so, with friends, they formed an organization called the Peninsula Red Guard, which eventually merged with similar Bay Area groups into an organization called the Revolutionary Union, which lasted until 1970.

**W**HILE Franklin's radicalization was going on, Aaron Manganiello had broken on ideological grounds with the Brown Berets—the Chicano equivalent of the Black Panthers—and was building up Venceremos as a "multinational" organization that soon included white revolutionaries. Prominent among these was Bruce Franklin, who, with a like-minded group from the Revolutionary Union (which Manganiello considered "racist and petty-bourgeois"), came over to Venceremos on New Year's Eve, 1970, after an eight-hour meeting to discuss the merger. Franklin became, and still is, a member of the Venceremos central committee.

The document which came out of the New Year's Eve marathon was a five-point manifesto. The first point was national liberation and international revolution; the second, the dictatorship of the proletariat; the third, democratic centralism as an organizational principle; the fourth, the liberation of women. The fifth was armed struggle, and it is here that came the sticking point for Stanford liberals, for by armed struggle was meant the right to bear arms and to use them if necessary. ("The right of the people to defend themselves cannot be taken away by anybody. . . . Every Venceremos member must learn to operate and service his weapon correctly, must have arms available, and actively teach the oppressed people the importance of armed and organized self-defense.")

Every member of Venceremos, Manganiello claims, has at least one weapon avail-

able. The organization recommends the M-1 carbine and the 30.06 rifle, the .45-caliber automatic and the 9-mm.

**One hundred and ten eyewitnesses were heard and over a million words of transcript recorded. 99**

pistol on the grounds that, even if a gun-control law comes, the ammunition for these weapons will probably still be relatively easy to come by. When I asked Manganiello how often they had had to use their weapons, he answered that "during the last three to five months we've drawn weapons on police and been on the verge of a shoot-out at least once every two weeks." (How much of this account reflects the romanticism of the armed revolution-ary, I do not know.)

**T**HE charges that Franklin has trained guerrillas in the hills go back several years, and have most recently been aired before the Eastland committee. Franklin, who has denied the charges repeatedly, pointed out to me that he is under frequent surveillance and that if any evidence had been discovered by the law agencies who have shown an interest in his activities, he would surely have been arrested long ago. "What they've been trying to do for three years," Franklin said, "is to find some fact to fit the case they themselves put together."

The constitutional right of the citizen to bear arms is of course a matter of current debate, with conservatives, leftist radicals and nonpolitical hunters finding themselves unexpectedly in the same boat. In California, it is illegal to carry a loaded weapon in places where it would be illegal to fire it. It is still permissible to keep a rifle or shotgun in one's home or place of business.

Franklin keeps a Remington 12-gauge automatic shotgun "very available" in his house and has carried it when meeting policemen at the front door. "We often have extra armed security in the house,"

he told me. (By "extra armed security" he meant other members of Venceremos, who are called together by an alert system when the police threaten them.) Most recently, about two months ago, "a lot of police came looking for some house-burglars they said had jumped over our fence. They had all these police out front who demanded to come in and look for this guy. Finally, after we got a lot of people here, we allowed one of them to come into the back yard, under supervision, to look around."

On the day that I talked to Franklin at his house, he was dressed in a disarmingly petty-bourgeois style—a navy blue sports shirt, dark slacks and suede boots. One wrist was wrapped in an elastic bandage, but not, as it turned out, from revolutionary skirmishing. His hair is not notably long. Sometimes his diction bounds disconcertingly from the natural style of an educated young Easterner to the rhetoric of the revolutionary. (He once told a group of scholars, "The heroic struggle of the revolutionary masses of Vietnam throws the lie into the rotten teeth of those who libel and degrade humanity.")

As we talked, Jane Franklin was pounding a typewriter in another room. The children—Karen, 15, Gretchen, 13 and Robert, 8, were at school. (The older children share their parents' politics, and "some people have forbidden their kids to play with them.")

When I asked Franklin how he got along with such non-violent revolutionaries as David Harris, he replied that "the oppressor feeds on non-violence." He went on: "There's the myth, you know, that violence begets violence. With the police we've found that simply to survive we have to be armed and we have to be able to draw on comrades very rapidly in our defense."

Franklin has been arrested twice, for failure to disperse and for assaulting a police officer. The first charge was dismissed. He was acquitted in the second case after a five-week trial.

**T**HE seven full professors of the faculty advisory board, of course, officially knew nothing of these more picturesque

matters. Meeting in a physics lecture hall, their charge was simply to determine whether or not Franklin had forced Lodge to abort his speech and had "intentionally urged and incited" the other incidents of disruptive behavior. As President Lyman put it in August, "It's no longer a question of opinions, popular or unpopular. It's a question of actions."

The hearings, which lasted from the last week of September to the first week of November, from 10 o'clock to 6 o'clock, Monday through Saturday, did little to clarify what Franklin had actually done. One hundred and ten eyewitnesses were heard, testifying to conflicting accounts of what had really happened in Dinkelspiel Auditorium or outside the Computation Center or in White Plaza or the Old Union courtyard. One hundred and twenty documents, 230 photographs and four tape recordings were repeatedly consulted, and over a million words of transcript recorded. The university was represented by a firm of lawyers imported from Los Angeles. Franklin represented himself.

The hearings were eventually regarded on campus as something of a bore although not a complete bore. ("It doesn't speak highly of Stanford, but for a long time Bruce has been our only subject of conversation," one faculty member told me. "You'd think we could have come up with two or three others.") The extra hearing rooms that had been equipped with sound systems for the expected overflow were never used. (Yet, when the campus radio station became clear to me that, tragically, there was no sensitivity for civil liberties on the Stanford campus. 99

tion stopped broadcasting the proceedings, there were enough protests to induce it to resume.) There were a couple of incidents of "guerrilla theater." In one of these, five young men wearing pig masks and sheriffs' stars were subdued by five members of the

audience. Then all 10 actors left the room, shouting "Power to the people!" The proceedings became so informal that, as one observer recalled, "stray dogs wandered in and out, looking for their masters."

Toward the end, a general view was expressed by a Stanford alumnus who told me thoughtfully that although he didn't think the prosecution had made a watertight case, he would on the whole feel a little more comfortable if Bruce Franklin were to be ejected from the Stanford family.

This view of the matter was notably not shared by an interested observer, Alan M. Dershowitz, a professor from the Harvard law school who is visiting Stanford. Dershowitz's involvement in the case provides an acute commentary on the climate at Stanford while the hearings were going on. A small, scholarly looking man of 33 with sandy hair, a red mustache, and gold-rimmed spectacles, Dershowitz wryly recalls that he had decided to spend his year at the Stanford Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in writing a book and avoiding any distractions. "I tried my damndest to stay out of this Franklin matter but it couldn't be done. Literally the first full day I was in residence here at the center in August, I got a call from some concerned faculty. They kept in touch and then I began to get calls from time to time from Mr. Franklin himself. Then there came a time when it became clear to me that, tragically, there was no sensitivity for civil liberties on the Stanford campus. Most tragically, it was blatantly absent among the law school faculty."

Dershowitz went on, "I've been shocked by the response I've gotten as a result of my involvement in the case. Frankly, I've been made to feel like a Northern lawyer who went down to Mississippi and started speaking out on behalf of the blacks, and the local people said, 'Shhhhh, don't mess around, don't stir the natives up.'"

The brief that Dershowitz prepared with the help of local lawyers for the American Civil Liberties Union (he has served on the A.C.L.U. national board) was essentially the classic lib-

ertarian argument directed toward establishing Franklin's right to free speech under the First Amendment and his right to engage in political conduct that went right up to the very line of permissibility. Its conclusions were that Franklin should not be disciplined in the Lodge affair unless it could be shown that he intentionally tried to cut short Lodge's speech. In the matter of Franklin's arguing with police about their dispersal order outside the Computation Center, the brief found no cause for discipline. Finally, the brief argued that both speeches he made on February 10—the White Plaza speech and the Old Union courtyard speech—were clearly within the limits of the First Amendment.

I remarked that I'd been struck by the extent to which Franklin seemed to have made it deliberately his business to outrage the Stanford community. Dershowitz looked weary and said, "He outraged me, for example. When I was approached to be involved in the case, I came to the hearing room for the first time and saw a picture of Stalin on his counsel table. I wouldn't dream of sitting at a counsel table with a picture of Stalin. There's only one possible picture that would outrage me more than Stalin's, and that would be Hitler's."

Dershowitz continued, "there's a sense in the Stanford community that Franklin's a very, very bad person indeed, that he's armed Chicago, that he's advocated the use of violence and guns against the police, and that he's possibly been involved in the bombing of a house on the Stanford campus. All those things are in the air. What can be proved against Franklin is very different from what people think they know. What can be proved is not much."

For the most part, the faculty stood aside. "I don't think they saw their own interests involved," I was told by William Chace, the English professor. "It wasn't at all like the loyalty oath or the McCarthy years."

Others, including Jack H. Friedenthal, a law professor who last year headed the Stanford committee of the American Association of University Professors, took com-

fort from the fact that Franklin's fate was being effectively decided by a faculty group. "The president's powers are in fact very narrowly circumscribed," Friedenthal told me in explaining why the faculty didn't feel threatened by the administration's move against Franklin. "The advisory board is us. It's our elected people."

Virtually the only expressions of visceral concern came from small groups of liberals and conservatives. Shortly after the hearings were over but before the verdict was in, a group of politically active, generally leftist professors presented a long brief to the advisory board on Franklin's behalf. Prominent among the 60-odd signers was Linus Pauling, the Nobel laureate chemist. Charles Drekmeyer of the political science department, who had been active in organizing the brief, told me that there had not been any real effort to collect as many signatures as possible. He thought that at the most a third of the faculty of a thousand might be counted on as being sympathetic to a strict construction of Franklin's right to tenure. (This was probably a generous estimate, according to other sources.) Conservatives also submitted letters to the hearing board, most notably in the case of 24 professors in the earth sciences department.

**P**EOPLE I had talked with at Stanford had without exception predicted that the hearing board would take a middle course, finding Franklin guilty as charged and punishing him by suspending him for one or two quarters without pay. ("He'll just spend it writing another book," one professor told me bitterly.) Instead, the board surprisingly found Franklin innocent on the count of interfering with the Lodge speech, but by a vote of 5 to 2 recommended his immediate dismissal on the other three charges, which had to do with the two speeches and the confrontation with the police at the Computation Center. (The recommendation was endorsed by President Lyman on Jan. 9 and passed on to the board of trustees for their concurrence. There seems little likelihood that they will change

either the verdict or the dismissal.)

Franklin promptly called a press conference at Venceremos headquarters in Palo Alto. I missed it, but William Chace described to me what he saw on the television screen: "I'd sort of expected in the back of my mind that this would be a crushing blow to Bruce. He's lost his job, he's 37 years old, he has three children. And there he is on television—bright, happy, enthusiastic and winning, with that kind of boyish, impish way he has." Jane Franklin had stood alongside him, not smiling and carrying an M-1 carbine.

There was nothing impish about Franklin's reception of the verdict. He said there were lies on every page of the 168-page report, described the members of the board as "liberal Fascists," and recommended violence on the campus. When, later, I asked him if he'd really meant this, he said, "Sure. I don't think anything would be going too far. I certainly don't think the people on the advisory board should be allowed to keep teaching their classes."

Franklin went on to say that he was going to try to raise the money (a minimum of \$25,000, he thought) to take his case to the courts, either as a breach-of-contract case or, by choice, as a First Amendment case. When I asked if he expected ever to get another academic appointment, he laughed and said, "The main decision as to what I do now is going to be made by the central committee of Venceremos, so we haven't even discussed it yet."

The reaction on campus was even by Stanford standards unexpectedly mild. The public comments that were made fell into predictable channels. The Daily, which had recommended Franklin's reinstatement, expressed its dismay. The faculty political action group was outraged. Linus Pauling described the verdict as "a great blow, not just to academic freedom but to freedom of speech." The Student Council of Presidents and the Student Senate warned that "the lid may now be off on repression of political dissent on the campus." The assistant dean of earth sciences welcomed the dismissal