

The afternoon of Friday, April 18 was sunny and pleasant for the more than 8000 students and faculty who overflowed Frost Amphitheater, but they weren't there for fun.

It was an extraordinary mass meeting called on Thursday by Student Body President Denis Hayes to discuss the serious issues behind the nine-day sit-in which then ended Friday morning. The demonstration protested classified and war-related research at Stanford and Stanford Research Institute.

Among the many speakers was Paul Bernstein, graduate student in political science from New York City. Because his extemporaneous remarks summarized what brought on the sit-in, they appear here in full.—The Editor.

We should not keep talking about anything, but we should look inward to ourselves.

But it is not enough merely to look inward. The whole purpose of this movement has been not only to get us to look inward, to realize what our moral concerns are, but to call upon us not to sit with those moral concerns, but to take actions—so that we can still respect ourselves as human beings.

Many people have spoken today expressing their concern. And I have strained my ears; and I think many other people have listened very carefully, trying to find out what the conclusion of that concern would be.

What would be the actions that these individual human beings would take, having expressed their indignation at, or their difficulty of agreeing with, the kinds of research that are going on, or especially with the applications of that research? What are they going to do about that? How could they ask us to respect them as experts—or as individual human beings—if they are only going to talk about the disagreeableness of a situation, the badness of a situation, or even, yes, the difficulty of a situation without talking about taking honest steps to solve the situation?

NOW, IT IS this state of mind that has been concerning a number of people on campus, not only students. And these people are represented in the April Third Coalition—which has now become the April Third Movement. Now the question is very, very relevant to every person on this campus of what precisely does one do after coming to a decision on one's moral concerns.

It's not as though this question has been ignored here, but I don't think we've come yet to the core. Professors have spoken of their faith in the democratic process. We, too, would like to have faith in the democratic process, but we also have eyes, and we have to judge from our own experience whether or not the democratic process is operable, and under what conditions it is operable. . . .

This University would choose to operate as a democracy. It therefore has persons who are acknowledged by the rest of the community, within this University, of taking upon themselves [objections from the crowd were voiced]—I'm sorry, but that's the way it happened; perhaps there should have been a referendum first as to which people should have the authority.

The way it is set now, these people (trustees, administrators, and faculty) declare upon themselves the moral responsibility for the governance of this University. We are supposed to assume that they have not only the expertise, but also the sensitivity to the needs of this University in order to deserve that responsibility.

THAT IS the only justification by which we can allow them to make decisions on our own lives. Surely the deliberate, quiet, reasoned processes should lead to decisions which are for the benefit of society. But the problem here, and it's been demonstrated very well today by speakers throughout the whole spectrum, and I hope to present that to you right now—is one of not living up to those responsibilities.

The majority report (of the Stanford-SRI study) is the report of a committee set up through the democratic processes or at least set up in faith of the democratic principles of this University, believing that a question as serious as the kinds of research for which we are responsible could be examined in a reasoned manner.

Yet the way that those questions were examined shows very much the faults in our assumptions about whether or not we are working as a democracy here. Professor Solomon from the Business School spoke about the kinds of research we ourselves in the Coalition have raised here.

HOW DID he talk about that research? He said something about Vietnam war research, chemical and biological research, telling us it should be judged—warfare research—by the fact that it's one per cent of what SRI does. That was the measure he used to tell us about its importance. Similarly he spoke about research which is related to the war in Vietnam, and the war against peoples in Laos and Thailand, and he said that was something about 10 per cent of SRI's funds.

Ten per cent of SRI's funds is not necessarily all one

needs to know about that research in order to understand how to make a moral decision upon it.

The fact is that the inputs to the research can be completely unrelated to the consequences of the research, and the consequences of that research are monstrous and are huge, and should not be measured just in terms of the perspective of SRI, in which case it's only 10 per cent.

It should be very easy for them to get rid of that, and we would welcome that ease, but the fact remains that this is research which up to now we have been producing as members of a community. We would sit by and cooperate with the research, even encourage the people who do the research, and we must now understand the research in that context.

SO LET ME get right to the point. The Black Student Union came up here and proposed that they should have decision-making power in the future of the research at SRI. The logic behind that can be made perfectly clear.

The consequences of the research affect thousands of people all over the world about which we know absolutely nothing. Inherently we don't know anything about Vietnam; we can try to learn about Vietnam, we can do research on Vietnam, but do we know what it's like to be a Vietnamese? Do we know what it's like to be bombed? And do we know what it's like to press a political point in Vietnam and find an American disagreeing with you, and because he has the techniques, because he has the weapons, you lose.

The only people in this country who come even close to understanding the situation which we are producing by that research are the black people in this country, and they are now getting to a point of telling us about it. Maybe they're asking even more of us that we deserve; they talk to us as though we can actually listen.

They are saying, and yet the very reason that they have talk to us is because for the longest time, we have not been able to understand. We have not even known what we ought to understand. We look completely at our actions on the basis of how it affects us.

Ten per cent? All right, perhaps the research is a little bit improper; we'd like to keep it, but if we have got rid of it, we'll get rid of it.

AND THAT that should be the majority report, that that should be the way that the responsible institutions of this University present to the entire community the importance of that research, is the problem that we're facing.

The actual nature of the research in terms of consequences, in terms of the moral concerns that it raises were not apparent to us while we were a quiet, deliberative, intellectual community.

Those people who did recognize the consequences of the research, those people who did look at the total activity that we were encouraging and promoting on this campus, had to take it upon themselves to announce to the rest of us that there is something more going on here than we were able to admit.

And the way, unfortunately, that people are awak-

ed in our society to concern about an issue, is through crisis.

These people in the Coalition, and those in the SDS before them, had to artificially create a crisis because the issue itself was not apparent to the rest of the people in the community.

LET US face it. We are all sitting here, Friday afternoon, April 18. Why? Was it because the members of our elected government, the student council representatives, the ASSU, recognized the moral imperative of this issue, independent of the politics of this University? Was it really that the democratic processes were so good that we could all understand that we ought to start setting aside some days to talk about this issue?

Or was it because there was a crisis on this campus, which came in the form of a sit-in, a sit-in under a great deal of restraint, and that we, all of us, could only sit down to think about what's happening to people around the rest of the world, and what we are doing to those people around the rest of the world, when our own lives were affected?

It seems to me that is the lesson, and it's a sad lesson, but it's a true lesson. And if anyone should have doubts about the justification of a sit-in, the doubts should not be what will happen to us if we allow disruptive tactics.

THAT'S THE question for the future. The question

we have to worry about right now, before we can even hope to get to a future, is what has happened to us, in the way we run our lives, in the way we make choices about our lives and the choices that affect other peoples' lives, when the moral import and the true results of our actions are not enough in themselves for us to sit down here and take deliberative action.

We have to try to understand why our faith in the democratic process is not enough to tell us about what's really going on. I'm not saying I understand it completely myself, but I am saying that those people who started the sit-in have raised it to us.

We are a people who react only to crisis. We are people who, when we write in what we think are ways of informing each other—newspapers only put on the front pages what's making trouble, not what's important. The only time The San Francisco Chronicle which is, you know, like one of the best papers around here, began to concern itself with the kinds of research that were going on at SRI, was after there was a sit-in.

Everybody can say "Yes, yes, I agree with your goals; I agree with your concern; I don't agree with your tactics." But the truth is, we wouldn't even have been talking about the goals of the concerns until this slight removal from our normal procedure made us aware of the lies we were living in.

- 2 -