

## The Official Vote of the Student Body

"I, as a member of the Stanford University community, choose to change the present policy on military and corporate recruiting. I therefore vote:

1. To prohibit the use of Stanford lands for military service recruiting. (1947--yes, 1496--no).
2. To prohibit the use of Stanford lands by corporations that are directly producing material and research for the military, "directly producing" to be defined by a joint committee of 3 elected representatives from the Faculty Senate, 3 elected representatives from the ASSU Senate, and 3 representatives elected from the Stanford staff at large, which will make its decision no later than May 25, 1971." (1758--yes, 1596--no).

The administration has disregarded the provisions above. Rather than implementing the provisions of the referendum and establishing the "joint committee" to define "directly producing", it has chosen another committee, the Committee on Services to Students (COSS) to review the issue (allowing recruiting to go on as before). The establishment of the joint committee is not dependent upon a review by COSS. The conclusion is clear: the administration has chosen not to respect the decision of a duly constituted election.

This example of administrative disregard for due process is by no means unique.

In the case of ROTC, the administration chose to override both student and faculty decisions to end future enrollments in ROTC, and allowed incoming freshmen to receive credit for sophomore Military Science courses and allowed students to join a "New Two Year ROTC Program" of the Army.

Last Winter, in spite of agreements to the contrary, an SRI program simulating amphibious assault operations was being run on the 360/90 at the Computation Center. When the Comp Center was occupied, police were called. During the confrontation, Provost Miller stated that the disputed contract had been terminated 2 days previously. This scenario leaves two possible analyses: a) the contract had not, in fact, been terminated 2 days before, in which case the administration was lying; or b) the contract had been cancelled, but the administration had not made this information public--deliberately provoking a confrontation.

Rather than deal with the issues involved in various protest actions last year, the administration sought an injunction to prevent specific "agitators" from coming on campus. Individuals were banned without having broken laws, but merely because it was inconvenient for the administration to have them on campus raising critical issues.

In these and other cases (including the Lodge incident, SJC hearings, and Medical Center Sit-In last year), the administration has established and enforced unprecedented policies without consulting the other nearly 20,000 members of the Stanford Community.

Recruitment by military and war corporations is just one facet of Stanford's involvement in the war. From examining the corporate affiliations of our trustees, the University portfolio with stocks and bonds in major war companies, the large amount of Department of Defense research conducted at Stanford, and the firms to which we rent our lands in the industrial park, it is clear to all of us that Stanford's contribution to the war effort is not insubstantial.

Only through a coalescence of faculty, staff, and students around a substantive issue can we see a significant change in the University. Only by students joining together at the Placement Center Monday, can we, as a student body, show that we are as serious about our policy decisions as Richard Lyman is about his.

Join us for lunch at 12:30 on Monday November 1st at the Student Placement Center.

ASSU Council of Presidents  
Columbae Community