1 A peaceful world requires not only the cessation of war research, 
2 but the establishment of centers of research for peaceful purposes. 
3 We believe that Stanford Research Institute and Stanford University 
4 can form such a center, in which scientists investigate the bio-
5 logical, psychological, political, economic and physical prerequisites 
6 for peace and social justice. The results of basic and applied re-
7 search can and should benefit all peoples.
8 
9 These guidelines are intended to orient research priorities 
10 toward meeting pressing needs of the world's population. To do this, 
11 they cannot be separated from the encouragement of new research di-
12rections and an enlargement of effective intellectual freedom. To 
13 be politically effective, they cannot be separated from the consid-
14eration of the role which Stanford and SRI now play in the defense 
15 economy, in the crisis-ridden cities, and in the wide world beyond.
16 
17 BACKGROUND 
18 A "wholly owned subsidiary of Stanford University," SRI was created. 
19 in 1946 to serve West Coast industry. In the words of a university 
20 press statement, "The institute plans to do the kind of research that 
21 industry itself might do if each company could set up its own compre-
22hensive research organization, supported by the resources of a great 
23 university."
24 
25 Until the 1950's SRI was so concerned with existing California 
26 industries --oil, food, chemicals--that it did only about 25 per cent 
27 of its research for the government. Under Frederick Terman's guid-
28ance, the university far surpassed SRI's efforts in developing the 
29 basic science, spinning off the electronics and aerospace firms, and 
30 encouraging industrial parks-together the hubs of the present Cali-
31fornia economy.
32 
33 SRI quickly learned the value of a subsidized defense economy 
34 and brought Terman and most of the large defense contractors, many 
35 of the Stanford Trustees, onto its own board and into the list of 
36 SRI Associates. In the past decade it has moved further, from a 
37 'department store' for industrial and military research into a strategy
center and intellectual staging area for the expansion of free en-
erprise into both Eastern Europe and the underdeveloped countries
of the Pacific Basin. In this role it helps to organize the efforts
of individual firms from all over the free world, coordinates their
efforts with government, and builds public opinion to support their
efforts. Counter-insurgency and CBW are simply two outgrowths of
the investment studies and high-level business meetings which SRI
sponsors around the world.

**BENEFITS OF A CLOSE STANFORD - SRI RELATIONSHIP**

We envision two positive methodological benefits from the estab-
lishment of SRI and the Stanford community as a peace research center.

**Interdisciplinary approach** A program of research to benefit
all peoples will necessarily transcend narrow disciplinary perspec-
tives and consider the interrelation of many aspects of each research
problem. The physical impact and psychological implications of tech-
nological progress must be continually projected. Stanford Research
Institute has already developed an interdisciplinary approach to many
of its projects. Our objection to the present content of SRI research
does not keep us from appreciating the need for this approach. We
courage the extension of this approach to all applied research
problems within SRI and the Stanford community.

**Scientific cooperation** At its best, science is a cooperative
venture. Stanford Research Institute was originally established to
aid and supplement scientific research at Stanford University. We
anticipate that the establishment of a scientific community including
both the Institute and the University will enable Stanford and SRI
scientists to share the resources, equipment, libraries and knowledge
of both institutions. Current institutional division of resources is
wasteful and often detrimental to the advancement of science. Devel-
oping a close, rational relationship between the laboratories,
departments, and institutes at Stanford and SRI will be an important
move toward a cooperative science.

We propose the following areas for top-priority research. (For
details of specific research topics within these areas, see the posi-
tion papers written by the caucuses within each discipline.)

**Life Sciences.** Research in the life sciences must seek to im-
prove both the health and life span of all the world's people and
the methods by which population on this planet may be limited. In-
terdisciplinary studies immediately are necessary to find ways to
1 convert discoveries in the life sciences into actualities accessible
2 to all people, rich or poor, American businessman or African tribesman.
3 Environmental studies. Man has severely damaged the land, sea
4 and air he depends upon for life. Together we can expand study of
5 the ecology of this planet, and consider appropriate means of conser-
6 ving our resources, independently of the interests of corporate
7 funding sources.
8 Engineering. Engineering research should evolve devices, tech-
9 niques and systems which will increase man's ability to deal con-
10 structively with his environment. Cooperate effort between Stanford
11 and SRI will allow an orientation of engineering research toward prob-
12 lems of social relevance.
13 Social science. Through their examination of human behavior
14 and institutions, social scientists can help us to realize our visions
15 of a more just society. Social science research must enable people
16 to better understand the forces governing them, thereby facilitating
17 social change.
18 ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND FUNDING
19 Fears are continually expressed lest the adoption of community
20 guidelines bring about curtailment of academic freedom. But freedom
21 cannot exist without responsibility. We have already accepted the
22 moral responsibility to limit our research in a variety of ways.
23 Under the guise of "ethical" behavior we agree not to steal someone
24 else's research ideas, particularly if the individual is young and
25 in training and would not have the resources to compete with a well
26 funded, well organized research operation. We agree that research
27 on human beings, regardless of its scientific merit is not justi-
28 fied if it jeopardizes the health or well being of the subject. It
29 is well within our principles for the responsible exercise of aca-
30 demic freedom to limit research to those areas which do not destroy
31 life or increase oppression.
32 It is the pattern of funding of research, and not the demand
33 for community guidelines which is the great threat to academic free-
34 dom today. Scholars today are encouraged to do the work of the
35 powerful at the expense of the poor. Close to half of all monies
36 spent on America's scientific research come from the department of
1 Defense, including non-military projects and programs which, in a
civilized society, should be justified in terms other than "national
defense". Industry, much of which is itself subsidized by the DOD,
finances another important portion of research and shapes the job
market, consequently the education, for all too many scientists.
Even the foundations and the non-military agencies of government too
often reinforce, rather than oppose, the restrictive trends.
At this point of reappraisal, we must start the process of inter-
posing humane guidelines between the marketplace and scholarly re-
search. To refuse this responsibility is to allow those who monopo-

lize the marketplace to determine the scope of our freedom.
At the same time, we believe that the general public, with the
aid of the scientific community, has the power and the responsibility
to redirect America's research funding priorities. We call upon the
peninsula scientific community—members of Stanford University, Stan-
ford Research Institute and Stanford Industrial Park, in particular—
to focus their energy and influence to the redirection of scientific
funding away from those areas of science which destroy life and in-
crease oppression.

RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

Certain research does not benefit humanity. We therefore pro-
pose the following limitations on research in the Stanford community:

1. Cease all classified and secret research at Stanford and SRI
2. Terminate and refuse all SRI and Stanford contracts and
   subcontracts that involve classified publication or class-
   sified communication of any sort. An appeal-hearings
   process might be provided for researchers who require
   clearance to obtain certain classified information (e.g.
   launch dates).
3. Terminate and refuse projects requiring security clear-
   ances needed to obtain access to classified information.
4. Terminate and refuse all contracts funded by sources whose
   identification is not available.
   Maintain central, public files of all communications con-
   cerning research in progress at SRI and Stanford. These
   files should include open financial accounts, interim and
   final reports, memos, letters and notes on verbal commu-
   nications with project sponsors.
Explanation: Classified research is directly opposed to the free flow of scientific information. Classified inputs into research make it impossible for everyone to replicate work, a procedure essential to scientific inquiry. Use of classified information should be allowed only where the reason for classification is not related to the work being done. Professors and students who claim they need security clearances to keep up with "the state of the art" or to find new dissertation areas should be encouraged to do research in fields which do not rely on classified material. If a Stanford researcher's work is shown to have been done before, but subsequently classified, the work should count toward degrees and professional advancement. Classified research does not increase the amount of information available to the scientific community.

Stanford Electronics Laboratory presently has six contracts worth $2.2 million requiring security clearance for researchers and resulting in some classified publications. Stanford has at least two other contracts of military relevance which involve obtaining access to classified material, four additional classified contracts including classified launch dates and similar information. SRI has about $85 million in partly-classified continuing government contracts and an additional $44 million in fully-classified continuing government contracts.

II. Cease all CBW research at SRI and Stanford
Terminate and refuse any research funded by the Department of Defense, by other government agencies, or by corporate sponsors, that has a strong probability of being used for chemical or biological warfare.

Explanation: The distinction often made between "offensive" and "defensive" CBW research is largely false. "Defensive" research involves the creation of offensive CBW agents and delivery systems against which the "defensive" techniques may be tested.

The Department of Defense presently finances $404,000 of research directly related to CBW at SRI. There are $96,000 worth of contracts pending.

III. Cease all counterinsurgency research at home and abroad
A. Cease all research in support of the wars against the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Thailand.
B. Cease research into methods of controlling or suppressing insurgent movements in foreign countries or in the United States, especially in the urban ghettos, funded by any body, corporation or government.

Explanation: The Joint Chiefs of Staff define counterinsurgency as "those military, paramilitary, political, economic, psychological and civic actions taken by a government to defeat the subservive insurgency."

Counterinsurgency research which must be ceased includes military operations and social science techniques directed toward suppressing insurgent or nationalist revolutionary movements, whether in Vietnam, Thailand, Peru or Oakland. SRI presently has $6,236,000 in DOD contracts relating to the war efforts in Southeast Asia. SRI researchers have done "cost-analysis studies of alternative reconnaissance routes /read: bombing routes/ over North Vietnam." They are also working on the electronic Maginot line in the DMZ. SRI presently has 43 permanent staff members at the Thailand R&D Center in Bangkok working on contracts such as "counterinsurgency communications requirements for Thailand." SRI's Vietnam researchers have worked on a "land reform" program for the Ky-Thieu government, and SRI's Thai researchers have written ethnographies of the "unstable areas" in Thailand. SRI has also done counterinsurgency work for the Department of Defense in Peru and Honduras.

IV. Cease all applied military research and development efforts at SRI and Stanford. Terminate and refuse research intended primarily for military applications, funded by the Department of Defense or any other sponsor, in electronics or any other field.

Explanation: Work on any devices, systems or techniques which promote the efficient destruction of human lives or alteration of resources essential to human life, must be ceased.

Electronic warfare research done in the early 1960's is now being used in Vietnam (e.g. jamming of radar-directed anti-aircraft fire). Techniques being developed now will assist counterinsurgency operations in the 1970's. The University Committee on Classified Research has not performed satisfactorily in reviewing this work, which generates classified reports to the Pentagon and requires access to classified material.
The Stanford Electronics Laboratory is presently doing over $2.2 million in classified applied military electronics work for the Department of Defense.

**WHY NOT SEVERANCE?**

Severance from the university, even with covenants against particular tactics in SRI's overall strategic effort, would only free the hand of SRI's business leaders and financial supporters to pursue their efforts more easily. It would remove the influence of the newly-awakened Stanford community and our concern for control by those affected by SRI, furthering the tendency toward an unchecked monopolization of economic and political power in our society. It would allow SRI and its defense industry associates to pursue their well publicized planned entree into the "socio-economic market" (including America's own ghetto colonies, educational and transportation systems) with their anti-participation social engineering.

Paradoxically, it would also encourage a new and -- for the corporation leaders who dominate both Stanford and SRI-- more profitable division of labor between the two institutions. Stanford, through institutional financing from foundations and non-military government agencies, would handle basic research and development of skills, supported, for example, by the International Education Act. SRI could then do the contract research and classified projects more directly related to international expansion and its defense--quite possibly the same projects which Stanford University is now refusing, with faculty members serving as consultants.

**REVIEW BOARD**

A Review Board must be created which is empowered to terminate existing contracts and grants and to veto the acceptance of new contracts or proposals which violate community guidelines. All members of the Board must accept the sense of the community guidelines for research at Stanford and SRI.

The Board must include individuals with technical competence to evaluate projects, individuals expected to benefit from or be affected by research in various areas, and individuals broadly concerned with the use of science and technology by those in power in the society to achieve political and social ends.

It is not anticipated that the Board will need to review in depth all contracts and research proposals at Stanford and SRI. It
1 is likely that by consideration of titles, abstracts and funding
2 agencies, the Board will be able to approve most proposals. It will
3 then be free to concentrate on those projects which appear to
4 violate the guidelines set down by the community. Provision must
5 be made, however, for members of the community to request a review
6 of projects by presenting evidence indicating a reasonable possi-
7 bility that community guidelines are, or will be, violated.
8 This outline for establishment of a Review Board should in no
9 way be construed as an attempt to establish a one-sided body. There
10 is ample room within the community guidelines for greatly divergent
11 views concerning the priorities which should be given to various
12 areas of research. These viewpoints should be represented on the
13 Review Board.

14 OPEN DECISIONS OPENLY ARRIVED AT
15 Deliberations and decisions of the Review Board must be open
16 to the community. The University must disseminate information about
17 research at Stanford and SRI as well as time and place for Review
18 Board meetings. To these ends, a regular publication of the univer-
19 sity should list, at least once, all Stanford and SRI contracts pre-
20 sently in existence, and then continue to present titles of new
21 proposals, with subsequent indication of acceptance by the Review
22 Board and the funding agency. In addition, this publication should
23 carry essays, articles and letters concerning research at the uni-
24 versity, national and international priorities for research, methods,
25 procedures, and criticisms of the new guidelines or the reinterpre-
26 tation or possible deletion of current ones.
27 All proposals, contract reports and related literature must be
28 filed for community perusal and research in a public library.