

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Beyers  
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
STANFORD --

Restricting campus recruitment "is not only offensive, but also impractical and unworkable in a university," 271 Stanford faculty members declared Thursday, Jan. 6, in a *Stanford Daily* advertisement.

Signers included 24 of the 65 members of the Faculty Senate. Stanford has about 1,000 faculty members.

"We must not as a community abrogate by referendum or edict the rights of other individuals or groups at Stanford," the advertisement stated.

"Unless we protect the minority who hold the unpopular, or as some think, immoral views—yes, even those who would interview with General Motors or Honeywell—then no minority and no individual is safe here."

A week-long series of protests against campus recruiting by defense-related firms last November was marked by mill-ins at the Career Planning and Placement Center.

Stanford Community Women for Peace, which led peaceful picketing at that time, has announced plans to protest Defense Department recruiting at the Graduate School of Business Monday, Jan. 10.

The Committee on Services for Students (COSS) currently is reviewing recruitment policy, following student referenda last spring, which proposed barring Stanford to "corporations that are directly producing material and research for the military."

The faculty advertisement said a "fair and even handed application of such a policy would be impossible and the attempt to apply it would do untold damage to the life of this University.

"Everyone at Stanford has ample opportunity to express his views about these corporations. Educating the public is important, and full disclosure of corporate activities and nondisruptive picketing can contribute to that education. . . .

"We wonder how many of the persons who have interfered with the Placement Center recently are students who need jobs and use the Center. Jobs are scarce today, at all degree levels. Not to have recruitment, or to make life so miserable for the recruiters that none will come, would mean a great hardship for those very students in need of help.

"Are their rights, their needs, of no concern? Such a policy represents a particularly sinister form of *in loco parentis*. It is called Big Brother. It must be rejected."

Disagreeing in a *Daily* guest column, Prof. Hubert Marshall, political science, said "The opponents of war recruiting have no power and, indeed, no desire to limit the beliefs of any individual. Nor is the question of free speech involved.

"The Associated Students Council of Presidents has invited representatives of the war manufacturers and the military services to speak on campus. Their right to present their views on the campus must, and will, be protected. . . .

"What is at stake is the so-called right of individuals and firms to engage in *acts* that are genuinely harmful to others. Recruitment is not speech. Rather it is the first, and perhaps the most vital, step in the process of production. . . . In a truly literal sense, the end result of a recruiting interview at Stanford may be the successful destruction of a Cambodian village."