

Stanford Research Institute is a "wholly owned subsidiary" of Stanford University. Stanford owns SRI and is therefore responsible for all the Institute's activities. These activities include:

1. research in Chemical Biological warfare, research in developing and testing a variety of chemical warfare agents which are internationally prohibited according to the Geneva accords or if not illegal most inhuman on their concentration on what is most defenseless in men: health and hunger.

2. research in counter-insurgency, research which fundamentally interferes with the natural political development of overseas countries.

In allowing such offensive research as CBW and counter insurgency to go on, is Stanford acting according to the human and moral values which are supposed to guide Universities?

Is the research at SRI restricted according to its value to society?

Should the War Dept. be allowed to defend its "academic freedom" to research anything it desires?

It is important to investigate university conducted military research for it leads to 1) ways to control America's staggering military technology, and 2) to questions as to what is the nature of the academic enterprise. How can the university as a critical institution have the greatest effect on society?

A committee is presently studying the relationship of SRI to Stanford and possible alternatives. The committee will probably offer four alternatives to the Stanford Community in April. Let us look at the possibilities.

1) The first possibility is to leave the relationship between Stanford and SRI approximately the same as it exists now. Let us look at some of the arguments for this. Seymour Hersh in his book says "University officials tend to describe their research institutes as non-profit research organizations that exist separately with different staff and budgets. Therefore it is argued restrictions on classified research that might ordinarily have some validity for the university proper have no place in a research affiliate. But since many grad students and faculty serve both as researchers and staff at the institutes and as members of the University, this seems to be a case of the officials wanting the best of both possible worlds". How does this commentary relate to SRI? Hersh has the following to say on the status of SRI: "IN 1967 a study noted that the General Accounting Office once accused SRI of attempting to defraud it of \$250,000 by charging the government had donated to Stanford University and which the University had later given to SRI. The GAO, in presenting its case, said 'that the Institute had acknowledged the close ties with Stanford University are clear cut and unmistakable as evidenced by the fact that the trustees of the University are general members of the Institute and elect the Institute's Board of Directors.' The Accounting Office added that 'the trustees of Stanford (themselves ~~also~~ directors of such top military contractors as General Dynamics, Lockheed and FMC), acting as general members of the Institute and as electors of the directors of the Institute are in a position to exercise control of the Institute as well as of the University".

The intimate connections between Stanford and SRI become clearer when one realizes that the following trustees are also directors of SRI: Ernest Arbuckle, Morris Doyle, William Fuller, Rich. Guggenheimer, Thomas Jones, Thomas Pike, Henry Symonds, and ~~W~~ previously David Packard. Also 53 faculty consult at SRI. The ties between Stanford and SRI are clearly very deep. To continue the relationship as it exists now would mean continuing to allow SRI to draw from the immense pool of talented personnel and resources available because of the University and also it would mean continuing to take no responsibility for the research taking place at the Institute. This solution leaves Stanford neither a purely academic place nor a responsible institution.

2) Another possibility would be severing all ties with the Institute so that SRI would become wholly autonomous and independent. All this solution probably would do is sever the Institute nominally from Stanford. Thus, this would purify the University at the sacrifice of letting everything go on as before. The University would not be confronting its own responsibility to society.

#3) A third alternative is not to merely sever ties but to sell the Institute under a restrictive covenant, a covenant which would bar and police research done there. As of now no one is responsible for the research done at the Institute. This solution would make the courts responsible for enforcing the restrictive covenant. This might be the most ideal solution for it allows the university to start ~~d~~ back on the road towards being a purely academic institution and this solution also sets guidelines for the Research Institute, thus not turning it loose in society with no moral restraints on the research to be done there. Although this may be an ideal solution, there is the question of whether it is practical. There is no precedent for this solution and it is very unlikely that the courts would take the responsibility for the surveillance of the Institute and for setting the necessary humane guidelines.

4) Thus we come to the only conceivable and practical solution which is to integrate the Institute closer into the University. This means the University would confront the responsibility it has for its resources and would subject SRI to the moral values of a university and encourage research which is morally and socially desirable. The Institute would concentrate its

research in such areas as air pollution, population explosion, urban problems, ways to prevent the breaking down of the ecology of our environment. The solution of integrating the Institute closer into the University would allow a strong complementary role to exist between Stanford and SRI for the betterment of human society rather than a complementary role for destructive ends.

The University is not a purely academic institution at present. Instead, it often is a ~~safe~~ sanctuary for researchers which provides them with the "garb of academic respectability" and "intellectual neutrality". Stanford University whose human and moral values would seem to be opposed to CBW research and to counter-insurgency research, "instead seems to provide a necessary shield for indiscriminate research".

"SRI is one of the principle CBW research centers in the United States."

SRI is a wholly owned subsidiary of Stanford University.

~~You are members of the University of~~

You are members of the community of Stanford.

Are you responsible to the people of this world whose freedom and ~~and~~ whose lives are being threatened by much of the research being done at SRI?

Are you responsible to this society and to the effect the resources of this University have upon society?

The SRI Coalition is a group composed of faculty, students, and members of the Stanford community who are opposed to the research being conducted at SRI in chemical and biological warfare and counter-insurgency. We consider research of this nature to be contradictory to the stated objective of SRI, to "serve the public interest through performance of research to improve the standard of living and the peace and ~~and~~ prosperity of mankind." We further challenge the fact that "there is no institutional policy which provides for rejection of research projects from legally established bodies, including the Dept. of Defense, on the basis of moral judgments concerning the ~~the~~ nature of the work or the client's function." We recommend that measures be taken to bring SRI under closer regulation by the university and that no contracts in CBW or counter-insurgency be renewed or accepted by SRI. A petition to this effect will be circulated; we urge you to express your concern by signing. If you wish further information or if you wish to work with the SRI Coalition, please contact Dave Pugh (3262745) Bob Abshear (321-7858) or Anne Baxter (3269341).

-----  
Much of the information for this leaflet came from Seymour Hersh's book Chemical and Biological Warfare and from the January, 1968 issue of Viet-Report.