

Academic Council thinking about the issue of research policy. Years later, concerned attention was focused, by action, on the ongoing military role played by the Stanford Research Institute in Southeast Asia, and the lack of university control over the activities of that Institute. The issue was brought home by the peaceful occupation of a classified laboratory on campus (AEL). Unclassified documents from that laboratory made it clear that the university had made no effort to reveal (some would claim, had made an effort to conceal) the direct military implications of research in some of our academic departments. The limited response was to change the policy on campus research, and to abandon any hope of controlling SRI by severing it from the university. Although the faculty voted a no-credit ROTC policy during that period of heightened consciousness, the administration came back from Washington with a contract which implemented the position the faculty had voted down. The faculty accepted that reversal; it took a militant anti-ROTC movement and the reaction to the invasion of Cambodia to restart the phasing out of ROTC.

These actions, and the verbal positions taken at the time of Cambodia, hardly amount to a clear rejection of complicity in the war by this university. Indeed, we are so involved that it is a real question whether we could continue to survive in anything like our present configuration if we honestly tried to end our connections with the continuation of the war, and with the institutions which may lead to similar wars even if this one "winds" down and out of public consciousness. Fear that, if we actually disengage, we will lose so much federal and alumni support as to become non-viable as an institution may lie behind many rationalizations which are current, and help explain the substantial number among us who are willing to accept outright political suppression of our most vocal critics, especially Professor Franklin, in the name of "saving the university." But we would betray still further our academic heritage if we did not face this issue openly. The following questions about university policy are intended to show how deep the issue goes.

(1) All Department of Defense contracts last year were legally required to be directly relevant to each agency's military mission. Is there any way we can accept DOD support here without either accepting that requirement or being intellectually dishonest?

(2) Although we are supposed to have only trivial involvement in classified research, we maintain a facility clearance, and over 200 people still hold security clearance directly through Stanford University. Why?

(3) What controls, if any, do we have to insure that unclassified work subcontracted here is not playing a significant role in military programs elsewhere? Specifically, why did work excluded by policy change here get recontracted to SRI, and "acceptable" portions subcontracted back, with faculty approval? Why should the university allow professorial status here to provide a basis for military and government consulting?

(4) Do the recruitment of entering students into advanced ROTC courses, and the new graduate ROTC program, violate either the letter or the spirit of last spring's faculty action?

(5) What controls, if any, do we have to exclude military work from our Computation Center? We know it has already been used this year to plan amphibious landings in North Vietnam. Is there any way to learn when the next such misuse of our facilities takes place?

(6) Should the university own stock or other investments which draw profit from the war?

(7) Should we continue to rent our land to firms engaged in war work?

(8) Should we allow the military and war industries to recruit here, drawing people into positions which we now know may force them to commit war crimes or crimes against humanity?

(9) Can we find a way to provide adequate rebuttal to spokesman for the war invited here for ceremonial occasions, while still giving them a chance to express their opinions?

(10) Can we persuade the administration that one primary task at this point in history is to disengage the university from complicity in the war, and that political suppression of vocal opponents of the war must be abandoned?