

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Beyers
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
STANFORD —

Barring military recruiting from formal placement facilities on campus could cost Stanford \$16.4 million in NASA and Defense Department sponsored research contracts under existing law, President Richard W. Lyman said Tuesday night, Feb. 15.

In a 75-minute news conference and debate broadcast by campus radio station KZSU, Lyman said such a policy change would directly affect more than 1,000 faculty, students, research associates, and staff dependent on these funds.

Lyman said he was "impressed by the depth of feeling" shown by a seven-day fast against present recruitment policy, but "depressed" by the "utter unwillingness" of some people to credit him with having principles that might be wrong but are "held as strongly and deeply as those of the fasters."

"I am being asked to take steps that I believe to be wrong," he emphasized. "To do so would be dishonest, misleading, and an abuse of my responsibilities to this institution.

"It is precisely because I see very clearly the conflict of principles between us that I told the fasters yesterday that with one exception [a demand for an open meeting] I did not see how the differences between us could be negotiated."

Lyman said he was "impressed by their willingness to engage in real self-sacrifice in order to dramatize their cause. . . by the calm and unabusive character of our discussions and, for the most part, of the letters I have received."

These are all "virtues of considerable magnitude," he continued. "They do credit to the people involved, and that credit should be publicly acknowledged."

At the same time, he noted, "Whatever its other qualities may be, a fast is a political act. That does not make it wrong, but it's a fact to be recognized. . . .

"It is, to be sure, a non-violent method, but it is by no means non-coercive. It is intended to produce such guilt and anxiety in its object that he will yield rather than permit the fasters to harm themselves. It is intended. . . to make one person morally liable for the consequences of a voluntary act of self-denial on the part of others."

Lyman maintained that the proposed ban on military recruiting "goes far beyond the interests of students" because of the "principles and practical consequences involved."

He said those directly affected by elimination of NASA and Defense Department research support would include 98 faculty members, 306 students supported by these funds, 144 senior research associates, 416 other staff, and between 200 and 300 persons who would be affected by the loss of indirect cost recovery from these projects. (Lyman has frequently criticized federal appropriations "riders" and warned that a proposed system of federal block grants to universities could increase this kind of external control.)

He said that if students found the entire campus recruiting system "so abhorrent" they wanted no interviews on campus, "I wouldn't like it, but I could live with it."

Larry Diamond of the Associated Students Council of Presidents felt this suggestion should be taken up by the fasters as a possible compromise. Prof. Hubert Marshall, political science, a leading faculty opponent of present recruiting policy, said this would deprive "a large number of students of a very real convenience" and he would "rather see the Placement Center remain as it is" instead of barring all campus interviews.

Prof. Albert Elsen, art history, an outspoken critic of the war, said students should "boycott, not ban" military recruiting. A campus ban would provide "momentary ego satisfaction" but would not prevent students from going off campus to enlist in the Air Force or other services, he added. Elsen was among more than 200 faculty who last month signed a statement supporting open recruiting.

Diamond conceded that barring military recruiters probably would "do very little" to prevent students from enlisting, but said some acts are so "morally outrageous" they should be dissociated from the University.

Elsen said every available means should be used to educate individual students about various recruiters because "the University's task is exposure." But to bar recruiters selectively is to tell students, in effect, "we detest these institutions and don't trust your [individual] judgment" about them, he added.

Lyman said it was "difficult to see any compromise between open and selective recruiting," except in improving the information and educational resources available to students.