

CIA campus spying

blasted by Lyman

STANFORD OBSERVER OCT. 76

President Richard W. Lyman has strongly condemned any secret spying on campus organizations and said he was not aware of any secret CIA-sponsored activity at Stanford since becoming provost in January 1967.

His views were expressed in an open letter to David M. Klaus, a 1974 Stanford graduate living in Washington, D.C., who expressed concern about the recent report of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities.

Infiltration of campus organizations "for the purpose of spying on or using individuals or groups without their knowledge" is "wrong in principle and corrosive of academic values," Lyman declared.

"I know of no circumstances—and I explicitly include the years of Vietnam protest—in which that kind of secret activity was justified.

"Indeed, the experience of those years demonstrates vividly both the futility of that sort of meddling and the impossibility of separating 'legitimate' counterintelligence from the simple repression of legitimate political dissent.

"There is no circumstance, no matter how pressing it may appear to be, in which secret spying would not undermine the practice of free expression which is the foundation of the university's value to society."

Klaus noted that "in the past, the CIA has secretly funded individual professors and entire departments to carry out its research and gather intelligence." A recent executive order by President Ford permits such contracts to continue with knowledge limited only to "appropriate senior officials of the academic institutions and to senior project officials."

Lyman replied: "If it is true, as claimed, that CIA-sponsored activity on campus was known to 'appropriate senior officials,' then there has been no such activity at Stanford during my tenure, first as provost and then as president, unless one includes the holding of job interviews at the Career Planning and Placement Center—and these were advertised publicly, of course.

"Indeed, even before classified research was ended at Stanford (in 1969), it was the policy of the University not to accept funds for research unless the sponsor was prepared openly to acknowledge the fact of sponsorship.

"Thus the kind of arrangement described in the (Senate) report and your letter could only have existed at Stanford secretly and contrary to University policy. That is, of course, possible, but I have no reason to believe it happened.

"I believe our policy is sound and that any attempt to circumvent it would be met with vigorous action by the University."

Secret sponsorship by the CIA of books written by individual scholars is "deplorable and should be resisted and exposed when it is done," he added.

"The worst examples that one could cite of 'hired' research had to confront vigorous and open conflict of views in the intellectual market. That does not excuse efforts by government agencies secretly to manipulate opinion on important matters. . . .

"The real protection against such abuse, though, is to assure that genuinely free debate is kept alive. That is more likely to be the case if we do not mistake evidence of the abuse of that process for proof of its death."

Perhaps the most difficult problem academic institutions face is what policy to adopt concerning individual faculty who choose to work for, or in cooperation with, intelligence agencies, he continued.

"Stanford's policy is similar to that of most other leading institutions: Faculty are permitted, subject to time limits, to consult for pay with business or government agencies.

"We do not ordinarily know, nor do we seek to control, the identity of the organizations for which the individual works.

"As in so many other areas of university life, we are here faced with a choice between allowing the possibility of abuse of privilege or

SU
Int'l