

SAVE
9/11

THE QUESTION OF TACTICS

There were two major reasons why we came here last night:
To stop the research which goes on at AEL which supports the wars.

To gain some bargaining power to effect our demands and demonstrate the seriousness of these demands.

No one can argue that we are not stopping the work here at AEL. There has been some question as to how we are affecting our bargaining power. These questions have focussed around the response of the Trustees and the faculty. We can probably anticipate certain attitudes and actions on the part of the Trustees and faculty.

The Trustees would prefer not to stop the research we want stopped. To stop it is not in their economic interest so they will not act on moral grounds. They have made their stubbornness abundantly clear. That is why we are here.

The Trustees will use any opportunity to delay a decision and compromise that decision. We must not give them that opportunity.

The Trustees and administration want to avoid a crisis. It seems unlikely that they will call in the police.

Our relation to the faculty is more complicated. The majority of the faculty is sympathetic to our demands. However, a small number of powerful individuals (powerful in part because they bring in large DOD research grants) feel threatened by the demands we have made. These faculty may try to pressure the Academic Senate to condemn our tactics on the grounds of interfering with academic freedom, disrupting campus stability and acting coercive. These are touchy issues among the faculty and to many of them may be more of a threat than CBW and counter-insurgency. The success of their careers in large part depends on the reputation of this university. The reputation of this university is largely based on its prestigious research, as exemplified by AEL.

We are here because we do not accept academic freedom to do war research and because the only channels left open to us are those of coercion and disruption. Clearly then, we cannot accept a condemnation of our tactics on the basis of academic freedom, disruption and coercion.

At least a large minority of the faculty is completely behind us, even if we should lose in the voting.

We are soon faced with a decision to stay or leave our position at AEL. Several reasons for leaving have been advanced:

--The sit-in obscures the issue of war research and substitutes the issue of the sit-in.

Yet we have seen exactly the opposite effect: we have forced the issue of research. President Pitzer is publicly committed to the support of our demands and our interpretation of the Trustees position. The Trustees' political and economic interests have been

shown to be in opposition to stopping war research. The entire campus is discussing our demands. We have mobilized a large number of people to work on writing and publishing educational information, forming committees to review research, guidelines and so on. More has been done in the last day than in the preceding week. We have properly focussed on the war research and cannot let the focus to be shifted to our tactics. We are here because our demands have been ignored and continue to be ignored.

--We should wait for the SRI Committee report.

The SRI Committee report addresses itself primarily to the relations between SRI and Stanford. It does not deal with the content of research either at Stanford or SRI. We can certainly wait for the Trustee decision on SRI's relationship until next week when the report is issued. The report is not relevant to the decision on the war research at Stanford -- there is no reason to wait on that demand.

--There will be no support over the weekend.

If we ~~press~~ press for an open decision making meeting of the Trustees on Monday, as has been suggested, we will continue to gather momentum and support. We will have the commercial press continuing to report so long as we stay here -- the issue will remain alive. We will continue to use the facilities of AEL - specifically the printing presses to publish educational material. We will build a community here during the next few days.

--If we leave, we can threaten to return if our demands are not met by a certain date.

Clearly the threat of returning to AEL in the future is less than the threat of our staying here. That is why they are so anxious to get us out. We stop far more research, create more bad publicity for the Trustees by staying than by leaving.

Since the Trustees did not respond previously to the threat of our moving here, it is unlikely that they will be forced to respond if we leave and the research continues.

The Trustees have not responded to moral pressure. That is why we voted to come here last night.

Can we expect, all of a sudden, that they will become principled?