

A night in Milpitas

By Mark Funk

I have no criminal record. Or at least I didn't until Monday night when I was arrested along with 293 others for an "illegal" occupation of Old Union. It was also the first booking for the vast majority of them.

The man at Elmwood Rehabilitation Facility said the charges will go down on my record as PC602, 407, 408, 409 and 416. To the layman it means trespassing and failure to disperse.

"This was the first one," said Bob DeGrasse, a reporter for the *Grapevine*, as we made our way back from processing in Milpitas. "It didn't happen in Berkeley or back East. South Africa is going to be a nationwide issue and it started here."

And he reasoned that, in a stroke, Stanford had assumed the spiritual leadership of the investment controversy.

After our release from Rimwood Rehabilitation Center on our "own recognizance," six of us got a ride to Stanford. As we drove down Highway 17, we passed the Santa Clara county sheriff's bus going to Milpitas with another load of protesters.

United left

"This will unite the left like it hasn't been united for quite some time," a companion observed. "It used to be we'd walk around in threes and think everybody else here were fascists. Now we know where people stand."

"It just goes to show," said DeGrasse. "That Stanford people think."

About seven hours earlier a number of the demonstrators had been doing some serious thinking. The police were rumored to be outside Old Union and it was time for those inside to decide whether they were going to face arrest or depart.

It would be a dishonest attempt at psychoanalytic journalism to inter-

pret what people's feelings were at that point. I can only tell you what I was thinking.

The demonstration was called, ostensibly, to protest Stanford's investment in corporations which have holdings in South Africa in general. A four-point demand, among other things, called on the Board of Trustees to reverse its previous abstentions on a Ford Motor Company stockholder resolution relating to apartheid.

The University owns 94,000 shares of Ford stock.

Questions

From 5 p.m. to the time the arrests began, debates droned on. Would we stay? Leave? Should we sign citations? Go limp and let the police carry us out?

My thoughts revolved around three things: I wondered what would happen to us if we were taken into custody. Where would they take us and would we have to spend the night at the North County Jail or Milpitas? What would happen if, as appeared likely, we had to go to court? Would they fine us? Would the court date fall during the summer? Or worse yet finals week?

More mindboggling was the possibility that the University would convene the Student Judicial Council to mete out punishment. For a senior on the job market with one month to go before graduation, the prospect of suspension was most unpalatable.

And then there was my girlfriend. She was determined to be arrested, but she also receives financial aid from the University. I didn't want her to risk losing that. And her parents probably wouldn't understand why she had participated in the protest, much less allow herself to be arrested.

Finally, there were the cops. Decked out in full battle gear and totting riot batons, they looked intimidating. I did not want to give them the opportunity to get in a lit-

tle stick time at my expense.

In retrospect those fears might seem shrill. But at 6:50 p.m., when Chris Coleman, a member of the Stanford Committee for a Responsible Investment Policy (SCRIP) was led away, they had to be taken into consideration. I was nervous. Singing helped a little.

Arrested

Forty-eight minutes later I was under arrest. It had not been an easy decision to make. Sgt. Marvin Moore grabbed me by the shoulder and said, "You're under arrest." Officers took four of us back to a small anteroom where we were photographed and slapped in "plastic."

They did not have enough handcuffs for 294 prisoners so the police made do with plastic strips that got tighter if you moved your hands too much. The strips were not removed in some cases for up to two-and-a-half hours, ample time for them to cut off circulation and swell the hands of some of the more unfortunate prisoners.

As they waited to take us through the crowd to waiting buses and vans, the cops talked about World War II. "Yes, I was with Mauldin (a famous journalist) for the big one," a deputy informed us.

Outside we could see the swelling ranks of supporters. This was heartening. Many people at Rimwood said later that the crowd which gathered outside made the arrests worthwhile.

It was a strange experience for me because for the first time, I was on the other side of the cameras. I wasn't taking the pictures — I was the picture. Most of the photographers were friends of mine so my arrest was recorded for posterity.

Mom will be pleased.

We waited in the vans for transportation to the Stanford police station. It took a long time for them to fill up because initial processing in the Old Union was slow. It would



Birdman of Milpitas

Daily reporter Mark Funk (center) is led to a waiting van by members of the Stanford Department of Public Safety. Funk, who refused to sign a citation, was subsequently transported to Elmwood Rehabilitation

Facility in Milpitas, where he was released on his own recognizance. When a member of the *Daily* staff presented this picture to Officer J. Burton (left), he autographed it for Funk's parents.

—Photo courtesy of Paul Selma

get much slower at the police station.

'We Shall Overcome'

As we left we started singing. Before we got to the station, freshman Jill Marshall had taught us a number of new verses to "We Shall Overcome."

The policemen kept us in a meetingroom adjoining the Stanford fire station. Initially, they were preprocessing people for transportation to Milpitas there, but things got so noisy, according to a deputy, that they started taking us inside the police station itself.

Preprocessing is a bureaucratic nightmare. They took pictures

again. They wanted to know my name, date of birth, social security number, current address, parents' name *ad infinitum*. They even asked for my religious preference. This was to insure that if one of us demanded Last Rights we could have the clergy of our choice.

Each interview took about 15 minutes, but there were only four people taking information so a backlog of protesters built up almost immediately. First they tried to cut down on time by not taking personal items. Finally they gave up and started sending everybody directly to Rimwood for preprocessing.

They just weren't prepared to handle so many prisoners and many of the deputies admitted as much. We all thought this was pretty funny.

In fact, camaraderie was developing. If it hadn't been for those plastic strips, things would have been just fine.

Some of the men (women were processed more rapidly) were over by the door talking with deputies. DeGrasse said he had a bet with Coleman that over 450 people would be arrested. Bob lost.

Slowly, enough people filtered out so our bus could start for Milpitas. (Please turn to back page)

The Stanford Daily

Board tells SCRIP abstention stands

By Mike Carlson

The Board of Trustees yesterday voted unanimously to sustain the recommendations of its Committee on Investments and not reverse last

Larson reportedly added comments indicating the seriousness of student sentiment and Henkel's said she spoke about the "growing consciousness nationwide" on the issue of corporate

Protesters choose not to face arrest

By Bill Burger

Over 300 people repeated Monday's sit-in at the Old Union for five hours before moving outside minutes before they were told arrests would begin.

The sit-in followed a noon rally in White Plaza where over 900 people gathered to continue the campuswide protest against the Board of Trustees' decision to abstain on the Ford proxy vote calling for the company to withdraw its holdings in South Africa.

James Stena, legal adviser to President Richard Lyman, said last night that no "internal disciplinary action will be taken by the University" against those students arrested in Monday's sit-in. Students still face criminal proceedings under state law.

Of the 294 people arrested Monday night and early yesterday morning, 253 were booked and all but three were released on their own recognizance. Another 41 signed citations and were immediately released. Three men, Steve Hansch, Reginald Mason and Duke Crestfield, spent the night in jail.

Not arraigned

Mason was released on \$500 bail at 2:30 p.m. yesterday, while Hansch and Crestfield were not arraigned by the time court ended at 5 p.m. yesterday and were released with no charges.

Hansch and Crestfield could face charges in the future, however.

When asked about the University's decision to have Monday's protesters arrested, Lyman said, "We found luck in the days when protests were prevalent that it just didn't work to leave people in the building. The complexion of the crowd can change faster than you can react to it."

PA results

Byron Sher, a professor in the Law School here, garnered 8887 votes last night to keep his seat on the Palo Alto City Council.

Sher is presently on the council and is a former mayor. Five seats were up for grabs with a field of 17 active candidates. Sher was the only incumbent in the race.

Other winners were Barry Fazzino, a Stanford grad and former KZSU station manager, with 6306 votes, Alan Henderson with 6313, Ellen Fletcher with 5983 and Frances Brenner with 5369 votes.

The newly elected council takes office on July 1. There was little active campaigning in an election which remained largely devoid of issues. The one issue which drew concern was the growth or no-growth future of Palo Alto. The terms on the city council last four years.

Just after 4:30 p.m. a vote was taken to indicate how many persons were willing to continue participating in the sit-in and face arrest. Approximately 70 said they would stay; only a few of those arrested Monday night voted to face arrest a second time.

Continue the sit-in

This vote was immediately followed by another to find whether the group favored having some protesters continue the sit-in. Loosely counted vote totals showed protesters were evenly split on the question, and a decision was postponed.

Only a few minutes before 5 p.m., the scheduled closing time for the building, an almost unanimous decision for all to abide by the majority vote was adopted.

At that time, Chris Coleman, a member of the Stanford Committee on Responsible Investment Policy (SCRIP) indicated to the crowd that a 30 minute extension on the 5 p.m. deadline had been granted by John Schwarcz, vice president for medical affairs.

Robert Rosenzweig, vice president for public affairs, said Schwartz was in charge of University activities because Lyman was in San Francisco at the time, and Schwartz had experience dealing with protests in the early 1970s.

Delayed closing

Schwartz said he had delayed closing Old Union in order to let protesters hear a statement by the Board of Trustees. The board's statement was read to ASSU Co-president Greg Larson by Anne Henkels, another co-president.

Henkels called from San Francisco where she had answered some of the trustees' questions concerning the protesters' position and had given protesters here a running account of the board's proceedings.

Larson said the board voted unanimously to sustain the Trustees Investment Committee's recommendation to abstain on the Ford proxy vote.

Larson then told protesters he and Henkels believed another sit-in would be detrimental. He said if a small group sat-in yesterday following Monday's massive occupation of the building, "it will be seen as a second try that didn't quite make it."

'Outrageous'

The demonstrators then declared unanimously that the board's action is "not satisfactory and is outrageous."

The question of continuing the sit-in was again raised. Senior Seth Froly spoke in favor of remaining in the building. He said to the protesters, "This sit-in makes it clear we won't go away. What we did last night was right and the board's decision today was atrocious."

Alumnus Chris Gray and junior

Mike Jennings spoke against continuing the sit-in and stressed the reduced impact a second disturbance would have on the board. Both called for further community support for the cause and mentioned problems another group of arrests could give the movement.

The vote was then taken at 5:25 p.m. and by a margin of about 180 to 135, the group decided to vacate the building. The crowd quickly left, chanting, "The people, united, will never be defeated."

The conference continued in the Old Union courtyard for one hour. Petitions calling for dismissal of all charges against foreign students involved in Monday's sit-in were circulated in the crowd while speeches were given for and against a campuswide strike tomorrow.

Told the crowd

At 6:20 p.m., Samuel Manuel, a member of the Los Angeles Committee Against Racism, told the crowd, which then numbered about 200, that he had given up a speaking engagement to come here on Monday. "To participate in the struggle against apartheid is much more important than talking about the struggle against apartheid," Manuel said.

Manuel noted this is not the first group to fight against apartheid and that the struggle is likely to be a long one.

Junior Eddie Sosa announced a SCRIP meeting would take place at Casa Zapata at 8 p.m. The crowd then sang "We Shall Overcome" while

forming a large circle and holding hands.

According to Gray, those at the SCRIP meeting decided to have some sort of "quiet symbolic protest" on Thursday. Gray indicated the focus of SCRIP in the next 10 days will be on a massive education campaign teaching people "why we are involved, and why our sit-in was an overwhelming success."

"We can't believe the trustees won't vote yes next year," he said.

Arrest procedure

During yesterday's sit-in, demonstrators repeatedly expressed concern over what arrest procedure they might face.

Several legal advisers testified that those arrested would have difficulty being released on their own recognizance, whereas those arrested Monday had little trouble getting such a release.

The decision not to take University action against those arrested Monday might have been different, legal adviser Stena said, if demonstrators had taken a different course of action yesterday.

Instead of continuing the sit-in, protesters had suggested an all-night vigil in the Old Union courtyard, a takeover of a University office and a march to Lyman's front lawn to hold a potluck dinner. None of these suggestions were voted on.

(Contributing reporters to this story were Jacob Young, Jim Tranquadd, Bonny Rodden, Randy Keith and George Anders.)

Arrests won't hurt scholarships

By Will Nixon

With the announcement yesterday that the University will not take any internal action against protesters arrested Monday night, arrested students can apparently rest easier about the status of most scholarship monies they might hold.

"We don't withdraw Stanford financial aid as long as the student is still able to enroll and has demonstrated financial need," said Financial Aids Director Robert Huff when asked about possible repercussions from a student being convicted either by a court or the Stanford Judicial Council.

"I don't know whether federal or state aid will be affected, I simply can't say," said Huff. "This will have to be reviewed by lawyers to determine if federal and state statutes concerning student disruption have been violated."

"From my understanding what constitutes disruption is open to discussion."

"No way," said Assistant Registrar Walter Findeisen when asked if being arrested would affect veteran's benefits. Matters would be changed, though, he said, if students were forced to drop classes.

"My opinion is that nothing will happen to foreign students based on what happened last night," said Director of the Bechtel International Center Lee Ziegler.

"In order for a student to lose his student visa he must lose his student status or commit a crime of moral turpitude," Ziegler said he would be surprised if the sit-in were considered such a crime.

Representatives of the California State Scholarship Commission were not available for comment.

Major Company shareholder proposal calling for company divestment from South Africa.

The board also voted to accept committee recommendations to:

—publish letters sent to the companies explaining the abstention along with the corporate responses in the Daily;

—to undertake a study on costs and benefits of University divestment from corporations with South African investments;

—to have President Richard Lyman and two other members of the trustee investment committee meet with members of the Stanford Committee for a Responsible Investment Policy (SCRIP) within the next few weeks; and

—to discuss possible alterations in the Commission on Investment Responsibility (CIR).

Announcement of the board decision was made by Board President Dr. Peter Ring who read a statement which board members prepared.

The decision came after what Vice President for Public Affairs Robert Rosenzweig called "the longest consideration of a single issue" he could remember. Trustee Otis Pease called the session "as constructive as I've heard in a long time."

'No doubt'

"There is no doubt whatsoever that the members of the Board of Trustees each hold a deep aversion to the practice of apartheid," the board stated.

"What is in dispute is the much narrower question of whether Stanford University can best take a step toward that end (ending apartheid) by voting yes on the proxies or by abstaining and making its views known in writing to the heads of the corporations involved."

"Between those two positions lies no difference of principle, but a difference of judgment about which of two essentially symbolic tactics is more likely to succeed," the statement read.

University proxies on the Ford shareholder proposal will be voted as an abstention at the Ford annual meeting tomorrow.

SCRIP stays home

No members of SCRIP traveled to the board offices in San Francisco for the meeting, though SCRIP member Kim McCall had been allowed to present his organizational viewpoint to the board investment's Committee at its meeting here Monday.

Before the full board convened yesterday, Anne Henkels, Glenn Jordan and Greg Larson, three newly-elected ASSU Co-presidents (COP), did appear before the Academic Affairs Committee, Henkels said.

She said the group was greeted warmly and listened carefully to Jordan's explanation of Monday's sit-in at Old Union which resulted in the arrest of 294 students. Jordan told the committee some reasons for the protesters' position on the issue, Henkels said.

Not just students but church groups, citizen groups and the government are urging corporations to divest. Henkels said she told the board.

All three COP members ended their statements with a plea for an improvement in communication between students and the board.

"Communications between trustees and students has to be improved and made more effective," Henkels said.

Trustees complained to the COP that they felt students had a misconception of the board as being unwilling to communicate, according to Larson.

"We felt they were really sincere when they said they were deeply disturbed by the students' claim that they were insensitive to student concerns," Henkels said.

'Clear and eloquent'

The board statement called the COP members' presentations "clear and eloquent."

Pease, who chairs the Academic Affairs Committee, agreed board communication lines with the students must be improved, but much of this must come from individual trustees, not from the board as a group.

"It has to be done individually because the board must be at least one step removed from the University," Pease said. "Between the board and the University must come the administration."

"The board must not intervene in the administration of the University," Pease said.

Henkels and Lawrence Cref, student member of the trustee Committee on Investments, stayed in San Francisco for the afternoon board session while Jordan and Larson returned to the University to talk with students who reoccupied the Old Union lobby yesterday.

Board aware

In the board statement, members claimed to be "aware of the deeply held convictions of many members of the Stanford community." But Henkels said the board still had failed to address two points:

—Why U.S. corporations can justify staying in South Africa by claiming to be progressive forces for change while black majority leaders have urged foreign corporations to get out of South Africa; and

—Why the trustees have failed to concretely demonstrate how U.S. corporations have been and are being progressive forces for change in South Africa.

Cref, however, said Bug "is extremely familiar with the South Africa issue from both sides and very informed on both views."

"I think this has dramatically sensitized issues with the trustees," Cref said. He said he felt in the future, most South Africa issues would receive the attention of the full board.