

STANFORD UNIVERSITY NEWS SERVICE

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Beyers

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA
Zip 94305.
(A/C 415) 321-2300, Ext. 2558

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STANFORD —

Under the Nuremberg principles, Stanford should declare its official intent to sever itself from the war, form a campus commission to dig out individual instances of involvement, and then take prompt action in each case, Prof. Pierre Noyes of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center said Thursday night, Oct. 7.

Attempts to do so last year were headed by a group calling itself The Inquisition, "a name which makes vividly clear its historical antecedents," replied Vice-Provost Robert Rosenzweig.

They were two of four panelists debating whether the Nuremberg principles and University involvement with the military are relevant to defining the limits of dissent on campus. About 80 persons attended the Cubberley Auditorium session, which was sponsored by the Associated Students Council of Presidents.

Prof. Halsted Holman, chairman of the Department of Medicine, said the Nuremberg principles "provide a shield between the individual and the actions of those governments which violate "the principles."

"Citizens are responsible to uphold the Nuremberg principles irrespective of the consequences in their own area," he added.

Assistant Prof. John Barton of the Law School argued that the Nuremberg principles do not create "a criminally enforceable duty to disrupt" speakers like Henry Cabot Lodge. "The duty of the university is to maintain itself as a forum to be free for discussion," he added.

Much later in the three-hour session one young man said from the floor: "Lodge doesn't have the right to be alive, let alone speak on a university campus." Then, in direct reference to Barton and Rosenzweig, he added: "What about punks who defend Henry Cabot Lodge? They don't have those rights either." Scattered applause ensued.

A specialist in international law, Barton conceded that the prospects for building institutions which could implement the Nuremberg principles "don't look very good" except for "kangaroo courts." He suggested direct, popular election of UN representatives in each country might be one means of making that institution more responsive to popular will.

Rosenzweig, the recipient of most audience questions, said it was "easy enough to decide that the University should not make bombs," but beyond that it is difficult to draw clear lines. Medical research, for example, significantly enhances the ability of nations to wage war by lowering casualty rates—yet that does not mean medical research should be banned, he said.

Noyes said it took "many years of effort" to force the end of classified research on campus and "it took a peaceful sit-in to enforce" this decision. Now "peaceful methods of opposition have been systematically outlawed" at Stanford, he added, to strong applause.

Holman indicated the Lodge incident was only "a little inconvenience or very tiny infraction of the law." A speaker from the floor drew applause when she noted that Lodge had refused to discuss Vietnam and said the University shouldn't invite speakers who limit their topics this way.