

Stanford Waits For The Trustees

By David Pugh

It's been almost a month since the April 3 Movement demanded that Stanford and SRI cease their war-related and classified research. Almost all of that research continues today.

We haven't heard anything from the Stanford trustees yet, which is little short of incredible, or very understandable, depending on what you expect from the men who spend most of their time running the huge corporations that dominate the American and "free world" political economy.

But we do have a fair idea of the extent of our strength here at Stanford and at SRI. On top of the 1300 students and faculty who signed the AEL Solidarity Statement, we must weigh the results of the most recent in this spring's string of referenda. Forty-seven percent of the faculty and 77 percent of the student respondents found it "acceptable" to retain and control SRI. Well over half of the students and just under 50 percent of the faculty voted to end counterinsurgency, Southeast Asian war-related, and classified publications research. Approximately 20 percent of the students and faculty are either neutral or undecided in these areas.

Though the results of the

referendum are a bit heady, it would be a serious mistake to base the legitimacy of the A3M demands on a Stanford handout instead of on an ethical and political stance that emphasizes the right of every people to self-determination. In the area of counterinsurgency research, for example, the legitimate decision-making communities are either in the Third World or in our urban colonies. The referendum thus indicates that a majority of the Stanford community has decided that the research facilities of Stanford and SRI should not be used to deny the basic right of self-determination to effectively colonized peoples both at home and abroad.

Staff Not Happy

Though SRI has developed very sharp, internal political divisions, it is clear that the vast majority of the staff is not happy with any of the proposals laid out in the Scott Report. Few of them want to work for Lockheed, Litton, or some other conglomerate that might buy SRI. Fewer still would stay on at SRI if the university allowed SRI to "buy itself from Stanford" at the rate of \$2 million a year. This is just the amount SRI now has for exploratory, non-mission oriented

research, just the research we might want to encourage.

The people who work at SRI will be the first to tell us that the university must either let the Institute go its own way without a restrictive covenant (a solution which would make a growing number of the staff feel uneasy), or bring an SRI minus war research closer to the university.

Some of the most creative and socially concerned researchers at SRI would accept the latter alternative, but only if the university were willing to make a medium-size short term loan to the Institute in order to tide it over the period of transition from war research to peace research. Stanford would also have to devote more of its fund-raising energy to finding funds for socially constructive applied research at both Stanford and SRI. Still smarting from the Scott Report, SRI people would certainly want to participate heavily in the work of any new committee set up to work out an operational plan for bringing Stanford and the Institute closer.

President Pitzer is desperately trying to scapegoat the April 3 Movement by threatening to call off today's barely-open hearings if he doesn't get an assurance that

"order and decorum" will be maintained. If Pitzer were actively pushing for a meeting of the full board, open to the whole Stanford-SRI community, we might be more ready to believe that Pitzer's concern with order and good-manners is not just a diversionary tactic.

But what about the trustees themselves? After a month of arrogant silence, five trustees have finally come to collect selected "student-faculty-SRI input."

It is important to understand that the 5-trustee panel is not even close to being representative of the full board. None of the five (corporate lawyers Doyle, Brown, Guggenheim; lawyer's wife Mrs. Charles; judge Duniway) derive their power and wealth directly from corporations based on war production or expansion into the Third World. All but SRI board chairman Doyle are liberals, as the Stanford board goes.

Preview

If the cream-puff trustees decide to answer questions from the floor about SRI's research, as some of their fellow trustees did on March 11, we should get a preview of what we can expect from the full board this spring.

If all five trustees do not support ending SRI's OIW, counterinsurgency, Southeast Asian war-related, and classified research and forming a community research review board to apply these guidelines; if they do not support setting up a community committee charged with developing an operational plan for bringing a greatly weakened SRI into a new, productive relationship with Stanford as well as releasing some of the university's resources to make this possible, it is inconceivable that the full board will.

So here it is, April 30. Midterms are coming up. The sun shines hotter and drains us of our energy. Stanford normally studies and sunbathes at this time of the year. But something has happened this spring.

More than a few of us have the strong feeling that time is running out for the Stanford trustees and for research that stunts and eliminates human life in the name of a paranoid anti-Communism and a very scoldy planned economic empire.

(David Pugh is a member of the SDS and April 3rd Movement--Ed.)