

4/23  
Save

## ON SRI: A SHORT REVIEW OF THE FACULTY'S INACTION

I think that it would be very easy to be uptight about the fact that the faculty was not able, during their meeting on Tuesday, to come to a decision about SRI; I think, however, that it would be a mistake. Let me briefly explain why I think so.

First, I think that we have allowed ourselves to consider the retention of SRI as tantamount to achieving our goals and demands; I think that's wrong. Doron Weinberg has shown that a restrictive covenant is almost surely unworkable, but that doesn't mean that we have to keep SRI, especially since we have not outlined what we mean by retaining SRI and bringing it closer; in short, we have not been able to come up with a model which is feasible both financially and in terms of meeting our demands. There are altogether too many problems which we haven't yet considered: what to do with the dissent which is currently being registered at SRI by the employees, who are angry because they have not been consulted by anyone (except the students) as to how they feel about the question, and they therefore feel like second-class citizens -- pawns in the games which we at Stanford are playing. Also, we haven't looked at all at the problems of finding funding for the SRI projects which we have rather loosely called "socially acceptable" research. Further, we don't know any better than anyone else what SRI's worth (in dollars and cents) is, nor do we know how much it would cost the University to tighten the ties with SRI.

To be sure, what I'm saying above is cryptic-- but I think that there are a myriad of questions which desperately need answers-- none of which are provided by either of the SRM Study Group reports. It is on the basis of the above that I am rather pleased that the faculty was unable to reach a decision. It's only been in the last few days that people in the Movement and in the University have really been able to get through the report, and only recently have we been able to see the severe flaws in it. So rather than act hastily-- which we might be prone to have the faculty do-- I think that it's time to begin to look for answers to these questions, and to try to drum up other, more imaginative, responses. There are many other models which we can suggest-- Rockefeller University in New York, and other labs, much like SRI, which went from war research to acceptable research, but only with a lot of trouble. And we can't get away from the fact that there are no easy answers to the problem of SRI. We have to work with the faculty and the SRI people, and save our time for that rather than dealing with the faculty's inaction on SRI on Tuesday.

Victor von Schlegell

WHAT NOW, SRI?