

## MORALITY IN POLITICS

We have used the word "morality" more than often in our expressions of political position. We have claimed that CBW and counter-insurgency are "inhuman" in their effects, and because the Trustees will not halt this research that they tacitly approve of it, that they are "immoral". Morality of the issue becomes the basis of our stand.

Yet even the most simplistic of conservatives will quickly point out that such very moral men as Einstein and Szilard were anxious to initiate atomic bomb research at the beginning of the war, in response to their fear of German militarism. And not many years later in 1945, both of these men deplored the research they had initiated.

We deplore CBW and counter-insurgency research. Yet if we should fight a war with the Chinese, CBW and counter-insurgency might be used (again) and be praised in the name of peace and democracy. After WW II the great pacifist Bertrand Russell enthusiastically advocated escalating U.S. atomic diplomacy against the Soviet Union.

It also seems unlikely that the Stanford Trustees consider themselves to be "immoral" men because their investments in SE Asia are protected by counter-insurgency and chemical warfare.

In short, the morality of weapons research is very inconstant. And unless we claim to possess the true and exclusive morality, we should base our opposition to war research on stronger ground.

We do not see the Vietnamese as an enemy as our parents did see the Germans and the Russians. Nor do we see that Vietnamese liberation poses as much of a threat to us as the existence of a war and the waste of a military machine, and the destructive effects of those on American society. We therefore oppose war research as part of a system which threatens our existence.

But to the Trustees, the Vietnamese, the Thais and the Peruvian peasants are real enemies. Hewlett stated that the University supports the policy of the U.S. government. The government wages wars in SE Asia largely because U.S. investments and influence there are threatened. The Trustees are among the few men who direct the corporations which invest in and influence SE Asia, Latin America and elsewhere.

Hence the Trustees' "morality", although perhaps not the one they pay lip-service to (Hewlett is remarkably honest in this respect), is based on their interests and justifies the war and its required research.

On the campus, one of the most destructive effects of this Trustee "morality" is that the University and much of its faculty become dependent for their livelihood on the war and its required research.

We must keep in mind that the Trustees will not meet our demands when they come to share our "moral concerns." They cannot come to share our interests with regard to the war and the war research at Stanford and SRI, despite their most pious pleadings.

Once we recognize this essential conflict of interests, we realize that the Trustees will not be persuaded--they will have to be coerced.

Emiliano