

Editor, THE DAILY:

A great many people have been reacting to the moral issues and concerns of the April 3rd Movement and discoursing on them at length. The whole issue of morality and people setting themselves up as moral judges is debated at length but often in a vacuum. Are not the great religions of the world at least in part concerned with issues of morality and making judgments about the actions of men? Do not laws which punish murder have at least a partial grounding in a moral belief that killing is wrong, as well as socially dysfunctional? Is not the substance of the moral concerns of the April 3rd Movement in regard to research a product of our Judeo-Christian heritage?

Furthermore, the Research Guidelines Committee of the April 3rd Movement showed great willingness to be flexible in formulating guidelines which would allow consideration of each research proposal on its own merits. Is not a community review committee for research more realistic and less absolutist than any provision written into a restrictive covenant? And more compatible with a humane academic freedom than the kind of academic license which many parade under the term "academic freedom"?

It would be more than unfortunate if the emotional charges or actions of either the April 3rd Movement or its critics are allowed to obscure the real issues at Stanford today: should Stanford or SRI permit research which results in the death or oppression of human beings? Should Stanford or SRI serve the interests of other institutions qua institution? should the Trustees alone have the legitimate power to make decisions which affect in fundamental ways (i.e., life or death) the lives of other human beings, either on campus, or in Oakland, or in Peru, or in Southeast Asia?

Finally, it strikes me as somewhat inconsistent that at the

same time President Pitzer is declaring a state of emergency on campus that the Trustees insist on maintaining a "business-as-usual" attitude which allows them to defer resolution of the issues on campus. If they really gave a damn about what goes on here, they would be prepared to make a few personal sacrifices (for a change), come to the campus, hold extended open hearings, and most importantly make a decision. It is their inaction which increases frustration and tension on the campus and increases the likelihood of disruptions which so many deplore.

Bob Eager
Graduate Student
History Dept.