
CAMPUS REPORT

A Weekly Publication for
Stanford University Faculty and Staff

VOL. I, No. 29 April 30, 1969

Campus Research That Involves Secrecy Is Ruled Out By Senate

The Senate of the Academic Council has gone on record declaring that "the principle of openness in research... is one of overriding importance" and that no research that requires secrecy be conducted at the University.

Meeting last week in the wake of widespread and full airing by students and faculty into the question of campus research policies, the Senate declared, in part:

"... It is the wish of the Senate that that principle (openness of research) be implemented to the fullest extent practicable, and that no program of research that requires secrecy (as hereafter defined) be conducted at Stanford University, subject to the exceptions set forth in Paragraph 4 of this Resolution. (See Senate Report No. 21, page 2.)

In addition to the Senate action, Professor Joseph M. Pettit, dean of the School of Engineering, addressed the body and

disclosed plans for an orderly phasing out of several classified contracts in the Stanford Electronics Laboratories. The laboratories were the target of a nine-day sit-in earlier this month.

Dean Pettit also disclosed that "we will not request any further extensions of contractual arrangements supporting this (classified) research and will negotiate the earliest feasible termination."

Warning that the campus community faces a crisis of governance, Dean Pettit cited the "evident loss of faculty support necessary for the pursuit of this (classified) activity in a university" as the prime reason for his decision.

University President Kenneth S. Pitzer, who has often spoken in opposition to classified research on campus, emphasized the need for gradualness and "reasonable deliberation" in implementing this change.

Noting that Lee A. DuBridge, President Nixon's science advisor, recently agreed that "it is not appropriate for secret military research to be carried on within university campuses," President Pitzer said:

"It should be clear that this action at Stanford implies no conflict with the policies of our federal government."

After hearing from Dean Pettit and President Pitzer, the Senate of the Academic Council unanimously expressed its confidence in their judgment in working with the faculty to achieve an effective transition. After a six-hour session, the Senate also adopted new guidelines restricting secret research on campus.

In a letter to President Pitzer, disclosed at the meeting, Dean Pettit said "we will not request any further extensions of contractual arrangements supporting this (classified) research and will negotiate the earliest feasible termination."

The contracts represent an annual research volume of more than \$2 million, portions of which may be renegotiated on an

Scientists Express Great Concern Over Research Cutback

Following the decision announced last week to phase out several classified research projects at Stanford Electronics Laboratories (see story above), the following statements were made by University scientists:

Professor O. G. Villard Jr., electrical engineering, is the son of the late Oswald Garrison Villard, famed crusading editor of *The Nation* and of the *New York Evening Post*. He conducts classified research on radar averaging about \$1 million a year:

"As the son of a liberal who was a devoted pacifist and founder of the NAACP, I have searched my conscience from the beginning of this work and have always felt I have been completely faithful to the pacifist traditions of my family. I have always considered that the research I have been engaged in was 100 per cent directed toward the saving of human lives.

"This development essentially brings my research here to an end, and I believe the decision will have a most unfortunate effect on the long-term viability of the School of Engi-

neering and even of the University itself. I am willing to submit to the decisions which have been made, but the overriding importance of my research problem causes me to reserve judgment as to whether I should remain at the University or continue this work elsewhere.

"There are six Ph.D. candidates and three other students working in this research, and their welfare is uppermost in my mind. I believe it is a shocking thing for a School of Engineering to be, in effect, ordered to cut itself off from research in vitally important areas."

Professor William Rambo, associate dean of the School of Engineering and director of the Stanford Electronics Laboratories, who conducts approximately \$600,000 per year in classified electronic research:

"No one can yet know what the total effect will be, but I can say there will be profound effects on the major research undertakings centered in the Applied Electronics Laboratory and on the futures of the individuals engaged in it. Consider-

(Continued on page 5)

unclassified basis. Sponsored by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, several involve electrical engineering studies of radio-propagation and signal processes. One has potential applications in monitoring international arms control agreements.

Together, they represent about two-thirds of the present work done by SEL, which was established in 1951. The Applied Electronics Laboratory, one of its major components, was occupied by several hundred students protesting classified and war-related research April 9-18.

Commenting on the sit-in in his letter to President Pitzer, Dean Pettit said: "The community seems unable to assure an adequate minimum of protection to faculty offices, personal files and property." Defense of the faculty whose activities were disrupted is "conspicuously missing."

He urged the President and the Senate to "perceive the repeatable scenario" of critics who pick a controversial research target, laud the "issues" and brush aside "tactics," gaining support for "reform" and then have their attack succeed. "There are many potential targets at Stanford," Dean Pettit said. "How many must go down before we learn how to protect ourselves?"

While several details were referred back to the committee, the new guidelines would permit one or more researchers to have access to classified information when their project would be "significantly advanced" by this knowledge.

But the guidelines add: "The relationship between the classified data and the overall research endeavor must be sufficiently remote so that a member of the research group who does hold a security clearance would nevertheless be able to participate fully in all of the intellectually significant portions of the project."

In addition, there should be "no substantial basis for an exception that any part of the final results of the research, or any but a trivial part of the research processes, will be subject to restriction on publication."

Sponsoring agencies would have time "reasonably required" to determine that no information which the sponsor is entitled to have treated as confidential is disclosed. One Stanford project is now regarded as classified solely because the

launch date of a lunar probe may not be publicly disclosed, for example.

In his letter to President Pitzer, Dean Pettit said he does not believe "it is a fair test of sponsored research in a university that it be judged by possible applications thought by someone to be 'objectionable,' no matter how much outweighed by 'acceptable' applications.

"The only escape from such an inquisition would be that the professor work only on those matters which have no possible application," he added. "In the School of Engineering, it is our function to produce knowledge which can be applied to the needs and wants of people; we must be allowed to do this. Indeed I would hope for wide support from the community on this concept.

"I have not changed my continuing view that it is moral for an individual in my faculty, as his conscience permits, to engage in research, either classified or unclassified, which is sponsored by or might be useful to the people of this nation in the common defense.

"At this moment, I wish to stand with those of my colleagues who have been personally vilified for working in a university on electronic warfare; I have done such work myself."

He urged his faculty colleagues to join in assisting those whose research and livelihood "will be affected by this seemingly inevitable outcome of our present crisis."

Talking informally with the Senate, President Pitzer joined in deploring the "coercive atmosphere" and criticized the "specific, very intense" pressure directed at Dean Pettit and Professor William Rambo, who heads SEL. Secret research was introduced on many campuses during World War II and continued as a result of cold war pressures, he noted. There has been a change in the government's ability to have certain kinds of research done off campus, and thus it should be possible to shift the present pattern over a period of time, he observed.

"Our success in negotiations with sponsoring agencies and in retaining our faculty colleagues will be greatly enhanced if we act with deliberation and consideration, without undue delay," he concluded.

CAMPUS REPORT

Published weekly in Autumn, Winter, and Spring and bi-weekly in Summer quarters by the University Relations Office. Stanley I. Wilson, editor; Jan Studebaker, associate editor.

News items, letters to the editor, questions for the Q and A column, housing notices (Stanford faculty and staff only), and other editorial communications should be directed to the Publications Service, 332 Encina Hall. (See Calendar for special instructions.)

On-campus distribution queries should be directed to the Interdepartmental Mail, Ext. 2450; at the Medical Center, to the Mail Room, Ext. 5130. U.S. mail (first class) subscriptions at \$6.00 a year available at Publications Service, 332 Encina Hall, Stanford, Calif. 94305; make checks payable to Stanford University. Second-class postal permit pending at Palo Alto, Calif.

SENATE REPORT NO. 21

At the regular meeting of the Senate of the Academic Council on April 24, 1969, the following actions were taken:

A. The Senate officially received resolutions adopted by the Academic Council at a special meeting on April 18, 1969, as previously reported individually to members of the Academic Council.

B. Based upon recommendations from the Academic Council Committee on Research Policy, the Senate adopted New Research Policy Guidelines on Secrecy in Research as follows:

Resolved:

1. That the principle of openness in research—the principle of freedom of access by all interested persons to the underlying data, to the processes, and to the final results of research—is one of overriding importance. Accordingly it is the decision of the Senate that that principle be implemented to the fullest extent practicable, and that no program of research that requires secrecy (as hereafter defined) be conducted at Stanford Uni-

versity, subject to the exceptions set forth in Paragraph 4 of this Resolution.

2. That a research program shall be regarded as requiring secrecy (a) if any part of the sponsoring or granting documents that establish the project is not freely publishable, or (b) if there is a reasonable basis for expectation that any documents to be generated in the course of the research project will be subjected by an outside sponsor to restrictions on publication for a period in excess of that reasonably required for the sponsor to ascertain whether information he is entitled to have treated as confidential would be disclosed by publication, or (c) if access will be required in the course of the project to confidential data so centrally related to the research that a member of the research group who was not privy to the confidential data would be unable to participate fully in all of the intellectually significant portions of the project.

3. That the rules adopted by the Academic Council on September 29, 1967, are hereby amended and, as amended are reaffirmed:

a. No research on a thesis or dissertation should be undertaken if, at the time the topic is set, there is any substantial possibility that it will lead to a secret thesis or dissertation.

b. No secret thesis or dissertation should be accepted as the basis for a degree unless, in the judgment of the Committee on the Graduate Division, the imposition of secrecy could not reasonably have been foreseen until the work was so far advanced that modification of the thesis topic would have resulted in substantial inequity to the student.

c. Scholarly activities not accessible for scrutiny by the entire Advisory Board should not be considered in connection with appointments, reappointments or promotions.

d. The University should enter no contract and accept no grant to carry out research if the grant or contract restrains the freedom of the University to disclose (1) the existence of the contract or grant or (2) the general nature of the inquiry to be conducted or (3) the identity of the outside contracting or granting entity, or (4) the research results provided, that clause (3) shall not apply either (a) to anonymous gifts or grants that do not call for the performance of specified lines of inquiry, or (b) to research grants or contracts from individuals or non-governmental entities who request anonymity out of a justifiable motivation to protect individual privacy.

4. That a program of research, appropriate to the University on other grounds, shall not be regarded as unacceptable by reason of secrecy merely because one or more of the following circumstances exist:

a. In a program of research involving the examination, through interview techniques or otherwise, of a living human being, reasonable provision may be made to protect the rights of that individual to privacy.

b. In a program of research the purposes of which would be significantly advanced by access to information generated elsewhere which has been subjected to security classification, provision may be made for security clearance and for access to that information on the part of one or several of the participating investigators provided that the classified information is peripheral to the research program in the following sense: the relationship between the classified data and the overall research endeavor must be sufficiently remote so that (1) a member of the research group who did not hold a security clearance would nevertheless be able to participate fully in all of the intellectually significant portions of the project; and (2) there is no substantial basis for an expectation that any part of the final results of the research, or any but a trivial part of the research processes, will be subject to re-

'DAY OF CONCERN' HELD

In a student sponsored event, a "Day of Concern" was conducted last Tuesday during which a series of five panel discussions was held and students and faculty participated. Diverse areas were probed, including "The Population Bomb"; "Counterinsurgency: At Home and Abroad"; "Research Secrecy and Academic Freedom"; and "Stanford and SRI: Toward a Viable Relationship."

President Kenneth S. Pitzer and Provost Richard W. Lyman agreed that "full and balanced" discussion of these questions were warranted. They encouraged faculty members to reschedule or cancel classes to enable students to participate in the day's activities.

restriction on publication more enduring than those described in Paragraph 2.

c. In a program of research sponsored by an outside entity, provision may be made for a short delay in the publication of research results, the period of delay never to exceed one year, if (1) the sponsor has a *bona fide* intention to apply for a patent covering applications of the research in a country whose laws establish either (a) a "race-to-file" patent system, or (b) that patentability would be destroyed by publication earlier than as provided in the sponsorship arrangement; and (2) the delay provided for does not exceed that reasonably required to accomplish the sponsor's patenting objective in that country.

d. If, in a program of research, an outside person or entity has made available to the investigator confidential information, provision may be made to preserve confidentiality and for a short delay in the publication of research results during which time the information source may examine the proposed publication in order to assure that the investigator has not disclosed, intentionally or unintentionally, any portion of the confidential information supplied; provided that any such provision for delay must contain assurances from the information source that he will conduct his review as expeditiously as possible, that he will not attempt to thwart publication for any reason except to protect confidential information previously supplied, and that he will indicate with specificity any sentence or sentences which he contends constitute such a disclosure.

e. If, in a program of research, private papers, documents, diaries or analogous materials have been provided to the investigator, provision may be made to preserve the confidentiality of those materials for the purpose of protecting the individual privacy of the author, or of the addressee, or of the immediate family of either the author or the addressee.

5. This policy shall be reviewed at least annually by the Committee on Research Policy in one of its meetings. This meeting and others primarily devoted to considering a revision of research policy shall be announced publicly through the University calendar and other suitable means.

C. The Senate urges that every effort consistent with financial responsibility be made to relieve the hardships imposed on faculty, staff, and students by the changes in policy relating to secret research. With full confidence in the Dean and Faculty of Engineering and the President and Provost, the Senate asks them to plan and effect the transition to these policies. The Senate also expresses its appreciation to Dean Joseph M. Pettit for his letter

of April 21, 1969, to the President, which to some extent anticipated the sense of the Senate resolutions.

D. In addition, certain related matters were referred by the Senate to the Committee on Research Policy for advice and recommendation to the Senate.

E. The following resolution was adopted by acclamation:

Whereas, Mr. Denis A. Hayes, as President of the Associated Students of Stanford University, is about to yield his ex officio seat as the Senate's most faithful guest,

Therefore, the Senate thanks Mr. Hayes, wishes him well, and asks him to come again soon and often.

In addition, the Senate received reports on the following matters on which no action was requested or taken:

1. From the Committee on Committees, confirmation of the appointment of Dean Lincoln E. Moses as a member ex officio of the Committee on the Graduate Division, the Committee on University Libraries, and the Committee on University Publications, respectively, replacing Virgil K. Whitaker.

2. From the Committee on Committees, the appointment of Dean Moses as Chairman of the Committee on the Graduate Division for the remainder of the current academic year, replacing Virgil K. Whitaker.

3. From the Committee on Committees, the appointment of Robert E. Greenberg, Associate Professor of Pediatrics, as a member of the Committee on Research Policy, for a term ending in 1969, replacing Professor F. Eugene Yates.

4. From the Committee on Committees, the appointment of William F. Miller, Associate Provost and Professor of Computer Science and in the SLAC, as a member of the Committee on Research Policy for a term ending in 1970, replacing Professor H. Pierre Noyes.

5. From the Steering Committee of the Senate, the appointment of the following Representatives to serve on the Conference Committee:

Lawrence J. Altman	Electoral Unit No. 6
Holt Ashley	Electoral Unit No. 4
Jonathan L. Freedman	Electoral Unit No. 7
Edwin M. Good	Electoral Unit No. 8

6. From the Chairman of the Student Education Council, the appointment of the following to serve on the Conference Committee, representing SEC:

Barry E. Askinas, Graduate in Sociology

Frederick N. Bradstreet, Graduate in Law

Joel R. Primack, Graduate in Physics

Patrick A. Shea, Junior in Political Science

7. From the Steering Committee, the appointment of Vice Provost E. Howard Brooks and Professor J. Merrill Carlsmith to fill vacancies on the Committees for the remainder of the current academic year, replacing Professor Bradley Efron and Vice Provost Herbert L. Packer.

SENATE REPORT NO. 20

A special meeting of the Senate was held on April 22, 1969, pursuant to Paragraph d. of the Senate's Resolution of April 10, 1969, as set forth in Senate Report No. 18 (see *Campus Report* of April 15, p. 3), for the purpose of considering the report of the ad hoc Presidential Committee to Study the Relationship between the University and SRI, dated April 11, 1969.

A session lasting more than three hours was devoted to this matter by members of the Senate, meeting as a Committee of the Whole. Almost two hours were allocated to questions raised by members of the Senate and responses by members of the Study Committee and by SRI President Charles A. Anderson, who had been invited to be present for this purpose. In addition to Kenneth E. Scott and Richard W. Lyman, who are members of the Senate, the Committee members who participated were: Anne C. Bauer, Barton J. Bernstein, Harry M. Cleaver, Nick P. Falk, G. Victor Hori, J. Patrick McMahon, and David S. Nivison. By unanimous consent of the Representatives, the Senate also received statements from Lincoln Malik, of the Third World Liberation Front, and Professor Albert J. Gelpi.

Following the departure of the special guests, alternative resolutions were considered in Committee, but none was reported out. When the Committee rose, the Senate referred the matter, including resolutions which had been introduced and others which were anticipated, to the Steering Committee for reformulation and scheduling for consideration at a later meeting, probably to be held on Tuesday, April 29. The Senate also set the matter as an agenda for its regular meeting on April 24, immediately following the previously scheduled special order of business (University Research Policy).

H. Donald Winbigler
Academic Secretary

AAUP To Sponsor Four Meetings To Discuss Council Behavior

The Executive Committee of the Stanford chapter of the American Association of University Professors has expressed its disapproval of the "inappropriate behavior" of some members of the faculty at the last meeting of the Academic Council and has scheduled a series of discussion groups to probe issues underlying recent unrest.

The meetings will be held one evening a week for two weeks beginning tonight (April 30). The second meeting of this session will be held May 7, and the following set will be conducted tomorrow (May 1) and May 8.

Following in part is the statement by Professor Sanford M. Dornbusch, president of the Stanford chapter:

"1. The Executive Committee of the AAUP has voted to express its disapproval of the inappropriate behavior of some members of the faculty at the meeting of the Academic Council. We are specifically referring to jeering and heckling of several speakers. It is the responsibility of the President of the

University to decide whether a faculty member's comments are out of order. If the President does not rule them out of order, it is the responsibility of each member of the Academic Council to listen attentively and treat other members with courtesy.

"2. Discussion of the issues underlying recent unrest must cut across the usual barriers of school, discipline, rank, and age. The AAUP is therefore setting up small discussion groups whose members are randomly selected from the faculty. You will be discussing these issues with colleagues whom you now don't know, and you will have the opportunity to persuade and learn from people of diverse perspectives.

"The Academic Council has voted its formal commitment to consideration of these issues. One step by which members of the Council can express their individual commitment is by sharing the ideas which they are developing through discussion and reading."

Scientists' Reactions

(Continued from page 1)

ing the action of the Senate, coupled with our experiences in the period of the laboratory sit-in and the subsequent lock-out, it is obvious that the climate of research generally is undergoing a most unattractive change.

"I am very sad at the demise of a program I have long been associated with personally, and I am naturally provoked by the Senate's decision, in part by the low priority assigned to research which is in some support of the defense of the U.S. But the real priority matter now is the future of our people. Some are going to leave the University at the earliest possible opportunity. In view of earlier happenings, some would have left without the Senate's decision, and others will be forced by it to leave.

"One can question the amount of consideration given to these people most directly affected. They fall into three classes. There are the tenured faculty who fortunately may choose from a variety of possible adjustments within the University. There are students, well into their Ph.D. work, who are going to find their progress suddenly and drastically affected.

"Finally, there are the staff members, including professional researchers, who are now faced with major career adjustments. Their role in the University is really peculiar. It is perhaps symbolic that the questionnaire sent to all students and faculty regarding the SRI-Stanford relationship was not sent to the staff members at all. The loss of these professional research people will remove a significant University asset."

Professor Donald J. Grace, associate dean of the School of Engineering and senior research associate in the Applied Electronics Laboratory, who conducts research in electronic devices averaging about \$500,000 a year: "I am particularly concerned about the students involved in this research who will be seriously hurt by decisions completely beyond their control. The work they have done toward advanced degrees is in jeopardy, and it is doubtful if some of it can be completed.

"Only a few of those who seriously questioned whether it was appropriate to do classified research came from engineering. Most were from other fields of study who were not in a position to understand what we are doing and who did not accept our invitation to inform themselves before establishing a position.

"Some of the professional staff, of which I am one, have been here as long as 18 years. Many have lectured, advised students, and contributed otherwise to the welfare of the Electrical Engineering Department. Yet there was only minimal communication to the staff from the President and the faculty before the decision was made.

"Staff members regularly have examined their consciences and have had no doubts that they were doing morally acceptable work. Of the research within the classified contract framework, 85 per cent of the reports coming out were unclassified. Unfortunately we will lose all of this research through the Senate decision."

A Message From President Pitzer

(The following statement was sent to members of the Academic Council by President Kenneth S. Pitzer.)

To All Members of the Academic Council:

I want to thank you once again for the support that you expressed Friday for the manner in which the sit-in at the Applied Electronics Laboratory was handled. Your action has reinforced my determination to deal with future disruptions as far as possible through the University's own processes.

In this undertaking, I appreciate the invaluable work, done at considerable personal sacrifice, by the Stanford Judicial Council under the chairmanship of Professor Jack Friedenthal, and by the Faculty Consultative Group on Campus Disruptions. The Council's findings were instrumental in ending the sit-in, and its suggestions remain the most effective sanctions that we have for the internal solution of any new campus disruptions.

As I indicated Friday, I have accepted and put into effect the Council's findings and suggestions. This means that if any major disruption occurs during the remainder of the Quarter, it will be dealt with in the same manner as proposed in the case of the Laboratory sit-in, a procedure that I intend to initiate promptly should the situation require. This includes the use of immediate, temporary suspension of students, and immediate, temporary suspension of salary for faculty and staff, to be in effect until hearings before the Stanford Judicial Council can be held, in the event of unauthorized occupation of University buildings. In this connection, the Judicial Council action can be effective only if members of the campus community cooperate in persuading demonstrators to end their disruptions, and in assisting in the identification of individuals engaged in such acts. I trust that your action of last Friday is an indication of your willingness to assume a part of this responsibility.

That there will be other difficult moments this spring appears likely. Certain members of the "April 3rd Movement" continue to insist that the campus community act precipitously and in a manner that they prescribe. Under these ground rules, the suggestion that complex issues be studied thoughtfully and thoroughly is regarded as a delaying tactic, and questions as to the propriety of physical coercion on the campus are viewed as an evasion of the "basic issues."

The issues associated with the Stanford-SRI relationship and the broader question of classified research on the campus are very important. Appropriate groups had studied, or were studying, those questions before the sit-in began. I believe we can honestly say that the Senate of the Academic Council is moving expeditiously toward decisions or recommendations. In addition, I also have not hesitated to make clear my own position on certain issues—both local and national—a position which often coincided with that of most concerned students.

Having done so, I would call attention to another issue which should be of equal concern to this community: the threat which coercion represents to the continued existence of the university as a center for open inquiry and free speech. This has become tragically apparent on other campuses in recent days. It is present in the implied threats which have accompanied—and still accompany—specific demands on this campus.

In their zeal to convert all members of the University to their point of view, some members of the community apparently have rationalized the infringement of the rights of others, have condoned the interference with personal and private property, and have threatened further disruptions if their demands are not met.

As a result, we face on this campus a clear test of the University's commitment and capacity to govern its own affairs. The re-

sponse of the Stanford Judicial Council and of the Academic Council of the University at its meeting last Friday gives strong evidence that the commitment and the capacity exist. I sincerely hope that we can remain a center of reason against forces of coercion, whether from without or from within, and that each of

us will continue to stand behind the internal judicial procedures upon which all constituencies have agreed. Only in this manner can we protect the rights of all to teach, to study, and to work in freedom.

Kenneth S. Pitzer

Charles A. Anderson Issues Position Statement on SRI

The following is a portion of a statement submitted to the Academic Council and made available to the Campus Report by Charles A. Anderson, president of the Stanford Research Institute following the issuance of the student-faculty ad hoc committee report on the University-SRI relationship:

Stanford University and Stanford Research Institute, long affiliated and both working under the overall guidance of the Board of Trustees, have much in common as sister organizations; we also have some differences. The University must keep in mind the purpose of the University to make its knowledge known to the general public.

SRI, on the other hand, was the result of a strong need in the West for an independent contract research organization which could work on projects resulting in proprietary and classified information as well as projects leading to information open to all. This was, and is, SRI's role and its success has been due in large measure to its independence and its authority in selecting projects. Giving the University itself control over SRI would contradict the original purpose of SRI.

One of the most unfortunate parts of the Scott Committee report was the idea that SRI could pay the University \$2 million per year for 20 or 25 years. Under the conditions envisioned in the report, SRI would be not a financial asset but a potential financial burden to the University.

This table on SRI's cash flow, derived from our audited financial statements for the years 1964 through 1968, shows the problem clearly.

SRI CASH FLOW SUMMARY 1964-1968

	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
In					
1.	\$ 2,800,000	3,600,000	3,300,000	4,200,000	4,100,000
Out					
2.	\$ 2,500,000	3,300,000	3,900,000	4,250,000	3,400,000
3.	\$ 300,000	300,000	(600,000)	(50,000)	700,000
4.	\$ 2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
5.	\$(1,700,000)	(1,700,000)	(2,600,000)	(2,050,000)	(1,300,000)

Legend
 1. Earnings, depreciation & contributions.
 2. Capital additions, debt payments, working capital.
 3. Net Increase Cash (Decrease)
 4. Scott Committee Payment
 5. Cash Flow Deficit.

During all this time, moreover, SRI has been accumulating a growing backlog of capital equipment needs that we have not been able to afford—a backlog for equipment and facility modernization estimated now to be over \$2 million.

Let us now consider the recommendation that restraints be placed on SRI to make sure it doesn't do anything morally objectionable in seeking to solve the problems facing the government agencies and private industries of the United States.

An overwhelming percentage of the 1,500 scientific and professional staff members at SRI say that if some outside morals committee is set up to tell them what is and what is not

morally acceptable in the search for knowledge, they will walk out. I imagine the same would be true under similar circumstances on the campus. As for myself, I don't think any reasonable man would care to be president of an organization burdened by such restrictions.

If a going concern such as SRI can't afford \$2 million a year now, you can imagine what kind of financial strength it would have with a serious loss of professional staff.

There is no need or reason for outside control of research. There is already internal guidance at SRI on research projects and we have taken steps to improve and strengthen the process of setting research policy and long-range goals. As to research in support of national security, we feel that we have a nation-wide morals committee of voters who elect representatives to decide what is and what is not needed for the common goal.

Concern Over Suppression

We are concerned that learned men and women are seriously considering whether one small group can suppress research. As Stanford professor Hubert Heffner said recently, "Academic freedom is not a law but an idea, and it is terribly fragile." I agree and I would expect that the vast majority of the faculty would fear acceptance of the idea that a small morals committee can be set up to dictate what is morally acceptable in the search for knowledge.

We feel these principles of self-determination and freedom of research are important. But in addition to these principles, the hard fact is that attempts to implement the recommendations of the Scott Committee majority will create a heavy financial burden for Stanford University by crippling one of the world's truly outstanding contract research organizations.

75th Annual Medaille Joffre Debate With UC-Berkeley To Be Next Tuesday

The Stanford Debate Union will host the 75th annual Medaille Joffre Debate between UC-Berkeley and Stanford at 8 p.m. Tuesday (May 6) in Dinkelspiel Auditorium.

The debate, sponsored by the Alliance Francaise of San Francisco, always concerns current events, usually political, within France. In 1917 the name of the award was changed from the Medaille Carnot to the Medaille Joffre, honoring the French war hero, Marshal Joffre.

The Stanford Debate Union is coached by Kenneth E. Mosier, assistant professor of speech and drama and director of forensics.

Dr. Kaplan Wins Peace Award

Dr. Henry S. Kaplan, executive head and professor of radiology in the Medical Center and a pioneer in radiobiology and the application of supervoltage and electron beam therapy in cancer, has been named a recipient of the Atoms for Peace Award.

He is one of seven scientists from four countries selected to receive Atoms for Peace Awards for pioneering work in peaceful uses of atomic energy.

These awards, and the previously announced award to the late Dwight D. Eisenhower, will be presented May 14 in Washington, D.C. They will conclude a program begun 14 years ago to recognize distinguished 10-year contributors to the peaceful uses of the atom.

In addition to Dr. Kaplan, other award recipients include Aage N. Bohr and Ben R. Mottelson of Denmark; Floyd L. Culler, Jr., and Anthony L. Turkevich of the United States; M. S. Ioffe of the Soviet Union; and Compton A. Rennie of England.

Counting the newest recipients, 22 persons from eight nations have been named to receive the Atoms for Peace Awards. The seven recipients just announced will each receive a gold medallion symbolizing the award, and each will also receive an honorarium of \$15,000.

Dr. Kaplan was cited for research which has contributed to understanding how radiation induces leukemia in mice, and for the development of the "cancer gun" at Stanford University Medical Center. He was also cited for his introduction of radiation biology into clinical radiation therapy training programs.

When Dr. Kaplan organized the Department of Radiobiology at Stanford 20 years ago, he felt that early work in radiology had been done by physicians whose prime orientation was toward pathological anatomy, perpetuating an emphasis on static images. "It was clear to me that the stature of the field depended upon research," he said recently.

Letter to the Editor

Editor, *Campus Report*:

During the past week I received a number of administration and faculty declarations that express commitment essentially to the same principles and ideals voiced by the students who occupied AEL. These declarations invariably continued to their main point, that the vehicle chosen by the students for expressing their moral concern is intolerable on campus.

I should like to point out that I have been on campus almost ten years, and the only occasion I can recall on which this issue was raised officially by an administrative or faculty source is the event of three years ago, when the Academic Council acted to form the Committee on Research Policy.

The information that the students in AEL have just circulated, shows only too clearly the manner in which that committee has functioned. I should emphasize that the students' disclosures are based on unclassified information they found in AEL. Whatever may be buried in locked files is open to conjecture by all of us.

There was one other occasion when I raised the issue in a broader context at an informal faculty meeting. At that time I was as-

sured, precisely by the author of one of the current declarations, that there was no substance in the matter and that I was raising a bogeyman for which I had no evidence. He was quite right that I had no evidence at the time. I had to wait for the students in AEL to produce it.

In any event it is apparent that the issues raised by the students have found a response throughout the University. I should like to express my personal hope that the faculty will not now content itself with vindictive punishment of the acts, out of context with the social reality that led to them.

The students have perhaps made their point too dramatically, but they are basically in the right. I suggest we concede the point and concede we were wrong in the past. The crime of killing, to which our complacency and inaction have made us all accomplice, is no less a crime than that of interfering with legalized preparations for killing. It is time to wipe the slate clean and to start anew, armed with a social consciousness for which we must thank our student activists.

Robert Finn
Professor of Mathematics

NEWS ROUNDUP

HOUSING NEEDED—1) John Voorhees, Ext. 4755 or 326-5815, needs 2 BR unfurn house. Up to \$200/mo.

2) New psychology faculty member needs 2-3 BR unfurn. housing beginning Aug. or Sept. Write Keith E. Nelson, 48 Soundview Heights, Branford, Conn.

HOUSING FOR RENT—1) Prof. Mordecai Kurz, Ext. 2220, renting 2 BR furn. campus house Sept. 1 to Dec. 25, 1969. \$350/mo.

2) Dr. C. P. Rosenbaum, Ext. 5343, renting 3+ BR furn. Menlo Park house June 15 to Aug. 20. \$600/mo., including utilities and gardener.

3) Richard Cottle, Ext. 4095 or 841-

2985, renting 3 BR+study Los Altos home (in Palo Alto school district) from June 1, for a year. \$360/mo., plus cost of gardener.

4) Prof. Chernoff, Ext. 2626 or 323-9890, renting 4 BR+study and TV room campus house for summer, or part of summer, beginning June 15. \$375/mo.

5) J. L. Pellegrin, Ext. 82401 or 948-6148, renting furn. 2 BR Los Altos Hills house with pool June 15 to Aug. 15. Adults only. \$350/mo., including utilities, weekly cleaning, garden maintenance.

6) Robert L. White, Ext. 4431 or 948-9748, renting 5 BR furn. Los Altos Hills view home, on one acre, from around mid-July 1969 to Sept. 1, 1970. \$500/mo.

7) Victoria Emmons, Ext. 4438 or 323-

1925, renting 2 BR+study furn. Menlo Park home June 15 to Aug. 31.

8) Dr. Peter B. Gregory, Ext. 5991 or 324-0897, renting 3 BR+family room furn. Menlo Park home July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970. Five minutes to campus. \$375/mo., including gardener and water.

9) Dr. Rabinowitz, Ext. 83396 or 328-6065, renting 1 BR apt. (pool, air conditioning, sauna). \$150/mo. unfurn, or will furnish.

10) Anne Kostelanetz, Ext. 2668 or 941-3734, renting 1 BR, furn. Los Altos house June 30 to Sept. 15. \$175/mo.

11) Robert Coen, Ext. 2426 or 328-0920, renting furn. 2 BR, 2 study, Palo Alto house from mid-June through Dec. \$275/mo., including gardener.