

MAY 2nd SENATE RESOLUTION: A DIALOGUE

Senate Resolution:

The Senate of the Academic Council recognizes that the Report of the Stanford-SRI Study Committee was rendered to the President of the University to assist in the formulation of his recommendations to the Board of Trustees, and that a final decision on this matter does not lie within the jurisdiction of the Senate. Nevertheless, the actions of the Board will have a far-reaching impact on the community, and therefore the Senate believes it has a responsibility to advise the Board on this matter.¹

The Senate suggests that the President consider recommending to the Board of Trustees further detailed exploration, with professional staff,² of a number of alternate possibilities: sale of SRI, participation in the purchase by SRI employees, the feasibility of sale, and the feasibility of other possible alternatives.³

The Senate further believes it desirable that at least a tentative or preliminary decision be reached as promptly as possible after consultation with the professional staff of SRI.⁴

However, the Senate recognizes the complexity of the issues as well as the level of concern in the community and urges that the results of the further detailed exploration referred to above be reported in the Fall Quarter 1969 and that no final decision or commitment to action be made until then.⁵

In the event that ties between Stanford and SRI continue, the Senate believes that determination of research policy at SRI should involve active participation of the research personnel of the Institute.⁶

*Adopted by SU Faculty Senate, May 2, 1969.

1. The likelihood of advice being accepted is frequently in direct proportion to the forcefulness with which it is given. This statement validates the Faculty Senate's right to advise on the issue of SRI but gives no indication that the Senate cares whether its advice is accepted.

2. Students are specifically left out of the study group on SRI called for by the Faculty Senate. Since students of the A311 have demonstrated the interest and ability to sustain a detailed study of the inter-relationships between SRI and Stanford, and since they are now in possession of a great body of information on the subject, excluding students from the membership of this committee can only be seen as a direct attempt to exclude a particular point of view in the face of compelling reasons for non-exclusion.

3. Retention of SRI with controls, (voted for by 68% of the students and 35%, the largest single group of the faculty) is herein relegated to "other possible alternatives."

4. When? May 13? June 1? August 1? Does the Senate care? Is the tentative decision to be made only after consultation with the professional staff of SRI? Who is this professional staff of SRI? How are they to be consulted? Considering the SRI testimony at the last hearing, are they likely even to discuss the relevant information?

5. We realize that the Faculty Senate has been working harder than ever in its history over these last few weeks. Nonetheless, the urgency of this decision must take precedence over "business as usual." Much of the necessary evidence has already been gathered. Other information has not been made publicly available; once this were to be released, it would be only a short time before this new information can be tabulated and interpreted.

In the last analysis, however, the moral and common sense considerations concerning this relationship between SRI and Stanford have been before us for months,

Establishment of procedures to this end at SRI would greatly facilitate development of an appropriate relationship between Stanford and SRI and of new research policies at the Institute. The Senate stands ready to form, in cooperation with elected representatives of the professional research personnel at SRI, a conference committee to consider research objectives and policies at both institutions.⁷

The Senate urges the Board of Trustees to work with SRI's professional staff toward the elimination of any projects dealing directly with the development of weapons of biological or chemical warfare at SRI.⁸

At the Friday meeting, the Senate voted approximately 24-16 to "postpone indefinitely" the consideration of a resolution against military counterinsurgency at SRI.

and, as the campus referendum has shown, for the majority of the community these are sufficient to make a decision in favor of retention of SRI with restrictions on war-related research.

6. It has always been the principle of the A3II that those affected by decisions must have a voice in making the decisions. SRI professional staff should long ago have begun to consider what kinds of research they want their institute to do. But, as SRI employees have told us, the picture is not so simple. First, SRI employees do not have tenure and are therefore extremely susceptible to pressure from their superiors. Second, since 45% of SRI contracts are defense work, a large portion of the staff are basically pre-selected in favor of defense work. Third, people at SRI have been living under condition of rather intense internal political repressing. These considerations make it clear that institutional changes must be made at SRI before political power can be transferred to employees.

7. Again, we reiterate: Research policy committees must have representatives from groups other than faculty and researchers, e.g. students, outside community members influenced by this research, etc.

8. The Board of Trustees has already placed a moratorium on CBU contracts. We are told there is only about \$40,000 worth of CBU research currently in existence at SRI. If the faculty really meant business here, they would have included counter-insurgency in this restriction.