

STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE

To: The Staff

Date: April 14, 1969

From: Charles A. Anderson

Location:

Subject:

Answering:

The attached self-explanatory statement was released to
the press today.

Charles A. Anderson



STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE
Menlo Park, California 94025 • U.S.A.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

April 14, 1969

NOTE TO EDITORS:

As you know, some students have been protesting research for national security at Stanford University and Stanford Research Institute, an independent contract research organization affiliated with the University. Today (April 14, 1969) some of the students scheduled a "lawn-in" outside SRI to exchange views with SRI staff members. Also today, a report was released by a committee (Scott Committee) ^{to whom?} appointed by a former acting president of Stanford University, which comments on the affiliation between the University and SRI and whether the affiliation should be continued, changed or severed.

In response to many questions about the reaction within Stanford Research Institute, President Charles A. Anderson released the following statement.

-0-

As to the central question -- that is, whether the University-SRI affiliation should be changed -- it would not be appropriate for me to make a public statement now. The Scott Committee report is only one of many opinions the Stanford Board of Trustees must weigh in making a decision and that decision has not been reached. In addition, I do not yet know how the staff at SRI feels on this question and it is important to have their views before I give an opinion to our Board of Directors and the University Trustees. I have sent a copy of the Scott Committee report to all our staff and I have asked for their reactions.

There has not been time to study this report fully but it seems to reflect some long and thoughtful work. Unfortunately, it also seems to contain some sections that could be misleading as to the activities of Stanford Research Institute and it

seems to make political judgments not appropriate to its assignment.

On these sections and on some of the misleading statements being made elsewhere, I owe it to SRI's 3000 staff members to comment.

First of all, some of the contributors to the report so distort the aims and purposes of some of SRI's work in support of our national security that an inaccurate picture is drawn and the Institute's other work is overlooked.

SRI currently is working on some 775 projects for industry and for various government departments and agencies. Our staff members are at work throughout the free world on such projects as economic analyses, cancer research, housing, the use of sonar to help blind persons, astronautics, processed foods, flight systems, transportation economics, materials research, entomology, air traffic control, animal husbandry, smog control, agriculture, textile fibers, plant nutrition and many others.

About 11 per cent of last year's 1200 contracts involved classified material in some way and many of these are in such fields as aerospace and electronics. SRI's work in chemical and biological warfare, often mentioned of late, comprises two very small projects, neither of which is classified. We are respecting the request of the Stanford University Trustees not to take on any other such projects for the time being.

An increasing amount of our work involves the complex social problems of today that require broad, interdisciplinary programs of research -- problems such as education, hunger, pollution, transportation, urban living and unemployment. The men and women of SRI are making really significant contributions to the improvement of life in the United States and abroad.

I believe the vast majority of students everywhere, including those engaged in demonstrations, sit-ins and "lawn-ins", would be very favorably impressed with SRI if they knew more about it. We have encouraged seriously interested individual students to visit here and have even issued invitations through the Stanford student newspaper. So far this academic year, only 16 have responded, but the invitation is still open under proper conditions.

A few persons don't think we or anyone else should work on matters of national security.

We respect the right of every well-meaning person to seek to persuade others to his viewpoint by all lawful means. That is one of the basic American rights that make this nation so well worth defending.

We do not recognize misrepresentation or distortion of the facts as proper means of persuasion.

I have great faith in our form of government by elected representatives and in the basic good sense and decency of the American people who elect them. When that government, responsive as it is to the majority will of the people, asks our help, it will get our help -- whether the problems deal with national security or with urban problems, economic problems or problems of housing, hunger or health. We will not abdicate that responsibility to suit the whims of dissident groups who do not represent the majority will of the people or their government. Neither will we tolerate disruption of our operations or of the work we are doing for our clients.

###