

STANFORD UNIVERSITY NEWS SERVICE

321-2300, ext. 2558

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Beyers
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STANFORD - The Stanford Judicial Council has unanimously found that the "occupation of the Applied Electronics Laboratory constitutes a disruption of an approved activity of the University" and that it involves "extraordinary circumstances" which would permit the use of emergency powers granted President Kenneth S. Pitzer under the Legislative and Judicial Charter.

By a 5-2 vote, the Council majority has suggested that the President declare the AEL and immediate surrounding areas "closed" to all persons for a period of one week, starting at noon Friday (APRIL 18).

If adopted by the President, this suggestion reportedly would not involve the physical removal of persons from the building. Any student who remained there after that time would face temporary suspension, effective immediately, pending disposition of his case by the Judicial Council.

Faculty and staff members would face temporary suspension of pay, effective immediately, not to exceed 25 per cent of a year's pay.

As suggested by the minority, these sanctions would remain in effect only until the Council or another appropriate tribunal held a hearing and rendered a decision regarding the individual's alleged violation. Those certifying they had not been in the building after noon Friday (APR. 18) would receive priority in those hearings.

Three faculty and two students comprised the majority, while two students dissented. They maintained the President clearly has the power to institute summary action and "has primary responsibility to adjudicate violations...when there are extraordinary circumstances."

President Pitzer authorized mailing of the report to Council members late Thursday night. He has called a special Academic Council meeting at 11 a.m. Friday in Dinkelspiel Auditorium. "I intend to report on these matters to the Council prior to taking action," he declared.

"Members of the Academic Council are requested to make alternative arrangements or cancel classes normally held at that hour."

The Council majority suggested that the president seek a civil injunction to prohibit those not subject to University jurisdiction from disrupting campus activities. If this proves unsuccessful, it recommended having the president consult with the Santa Clara County district attorney to institute appropriate criminal action. The Council unanimously found that "there is imminent danger that external forces, beyond University control, in particular federal troops, may enter the campus to deal with various aspects of the occupation (of AEL). "There is serious danger that the disruption will be escalated by some or all of those persons now occupying the AEL. There is serious danger that certain individuals or groups of individuals will attempt to retaliate with force against those persons occupying AEL...."

"Persons engaged in the occupation have failed to cooperate with University authorities by refusing to identify themselves when properly requested to do so, in accord with the disruption policy...(and) have refused to cooperate with the...Council by voting not to send a representative to (its) hearings."

In a statement published Thursday (APR. 17), Pitzer noted that "the classified document files in AEL constitute a very special and serious problem." Noting that the University has a contractual obligation to safeguard those files, he added: "Should the federal government find it necessary to actively take over this responsibility, clearly the community will have lost, at least in part, control over our own affairs."

He has repeatedly emphasized his determination to end the demonstration through internal means, if possible. Before occupying the building, students voted overwhelmingly not to tamper with the classified files, a position they have twice reaffirmed.

The Council's suggestions followed hearings of several hours duration Thursday. The suggested "closing" would affect regular laboratory employees, as well as demonstrators now occupying the building.

Only those specifically appointed by the president solely for the purpose of maintaining the security of the premises would be allowed there without penalty. Doors of the building reportedly would remain unlocked. The Council minority suggested that "even if the Council determines that extraordinary circumstances exist...it may not, consistent with the Charter, make recommendations to the President to impose sanctions on individuals without a prior hearing. An important reason for the promulgation of the Charter last spring was to protect students in political cases, such as this one," they added. "We recommend that the case be returned to the President because the Council cannot take action on the substance of this case at this time." The majority report suggested that the President summarily impose similar sanctions for the remainder of the current academic quarter in the event any other building is occupied.

To do so, the majority said, the President should be convinced "beyond a reasonable doubt" that the disruption policy has been violated and so inform those involved in the disruption. He also should request those involved to immediately vacate the building and, if they refuse to do so, request their identification