

AFFIDAVIT OF DAVID M. GLEN

I, DAVID M. GLEN, say and declare:

1. I am employed by the Board of Trustees of the LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY as Assistant Director of Administrative Records, and have been employed in this and similar capacities since *JUNE 3, 1968*

2. The attached document, entitled "Why?", and bearing the name of L. Siegel, is an exact copy of a document which was handed to me at a meeting of the "April 3rd Movement" held April 30, 1969, at 8.00 pm in Tresidder Union on Stanford University campus.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true.

Executed at Stanford, California, on May 9, 1969.



DAVID M. GLEN

## WHY?

Earlier today the question was asked, "Politically, how do we stand to gain from a sit-in?" The answers were inadequate. This is an attempt to briefly answer this question:

1. We want an end to counterinsurgency, war-related research, and classified research at SRI. To accomplish this, we want SRI brought under control.
2. The Stanford Trustees, several times in the past, have refused to stop, or work out a means of stopping, this objectionable research.
3. The trustees have refused to change research policy at SRI because the status quo is in their interests.
4. May 13 the Trustees have the opportunity to sever SRI outright, and eliminate any leverage we might have, from May 13 on, to effect SRI policies.
5. To bring about responsible decisions by the trustees we must make it in their interests to accede to our demands.
6. The orderly functioning of the University, and all its appendages, is also in the interests of the Trustees.
7. The Trustees understand their interests in terms of cost-benefit analysis.
8. Through our position in the University, we have the power to cost the trustees.
9. Depending upon how much we can cost the Trustees, we are making it in their interests to meet the demands, on the understanding that the cost which we create is based on their refusal to meet the demands.
10. Cost to the Trustees is not merely financial--they are too rich for that. The stability of this system--and the Universities relationship to it are more important than mere finances.
11. We threaten that stability--and thus the interests of the Trustees by
  - a) making it difficult for parts of their University to function
  - b) creating a climate in this center of the defense complex which is not conducive to war work
  - c) by building disaffection for the system amongst the Stanford student body, and thus threatening our production as a docile elite
  - d) by building a movement to challenge the functioning of the system as a whole--or at least the most harmful aspects of it.
  - e) ALL OF THE ABOVE, AND MUCH MORE
12. The more we cost the Trustees -by threatening the stability of the system--not merely by damaging property--the more we can win.

I THEREFORE PROPOSE THAT WE SHUT DOWN THE BUSINESS FUNCTIONING OF THE UNIVERSITY, AS WELL AS THE NEWS MANAGER'S OFFICE. THIS CAN BE DONE BY OCCUPYING AND CONTROLLING MOST OF ENCINA HALL, KEEPING THE BUSINESS STAFF FROM THEIR JOBS, AND FORCING THE TRUSTEES TO USE FORCE OF THEIR OWN IF THEY WANT TO RE\*OPEN THE OFFICES WITHOUT MEETING THE DEMANDS OF THE STANFORD COMMUNITY.

L. Siegel