

4/16

STANFORD UNIVERSITY NEWS SERVICE  
321-2300, ext. 2558

INFORMATION CONTACT: Harry Press  
OR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STANFORD -- A researcher testified before the Stanford Judicial Council today (APRIL 16) that he had been threatened with death by an angry demonstrator during the current Applied Electronics Laboratory sit-in.

Other witnesses, all from the AEL, told of being unable to work, of the theft of personal items, and of being doors unlocked by unauthorized persons.

Three sit-in participants testified the sit-in, which began April 9, was peaceful and that they had seen no violence. The demonstrators, as a group, twice have voted against violent tactics.

The threat of death was made to Alexander Sawchuk, Ph.D. candidate in electrical engineering from Silver Spring, Md., who told the Council he entered his laboratory Monday and "surprised three people in the server area examining equipment, turning over papers, and rearranging everything."

When Sawchuk asked them to leave they told him the demonstration's policy was not to damage anything in the building. He repeated his request, and two left.

"But one was particularly upset," he continued, "shouted obscenities, and said if I asked him again to leave he would kill me. I left."

Sawchuk was asked by Richard Kuhns, '67 Law School graduate appointed by Council Chairman Jack Friedenthal to represent the interests of the demonstrators, if there was "shouting back and forth."

"No," said Sawchuk. "I asked him in the most polite manner I could muster. He made threatening gestures, punching his fist in his hand, and shaking his fist in my face. He was six inches away."

Charles Shoens, director of the Systems Techniques Laboratory of the AEL, testified that "no harm was done to persons," but that doors were "opened and entered," that "several long distance phone calls were made, including one to Germany," and that the staff was unable to perform "normal functions" or work.

There was no physical threat, Shoens said, but "a physical imposition."

Researcher Rodney Edwards told how he lost the use of his office last Thursday, and his ability to work normally, and said his desk's contents had been "rearranged."

Several students "politely asked if they could use my office for a meeting," Edwards said, but when he returned in an hour, a new group was present.

"They asked who I was, and I said I'd come to close the office -- it was 6:30 p.m. They asked me to leave, saying I was interrupting their meeting, and that they had liberated that space. I left it in their control."

Since then, he said, the work he could do "depends on who's there," but it has been "minor work. I work by writing, engaging in thinking when the door is closed and it's quiet, or talk with graduate students. I use the blackboard as a scratchpad, leaving important formulas there. They have been erased.

"The number of persons in the office has grossly interfered with what I normally do."

Harry S. Hewitt, research associate, on Sunday found his locked desk "pried open and all the desks (in the office) gone through, with the drawers open and the papers in disarray."

He testified that items taken out of his desk included a 16mm camera, worth \$60 or \$70; his checkbook; and a ring of personal (not laboratory) keys. He also is missing a clock radio from his desk top, he said.

(more ... 4/16/69)

Asked by Chairman Friedenthal, a law professor, how keys to the laboratories might have been obtained, Dr. Itt said:

"The doors open outward, and hinges are on the outside. To get in, all that is necessary is that the hinge pins be removed, and that includes the office where all the keys are kept. I never saw anyone open a door with a key."

But the next witness, Torstein Lund, research assistant working on his Ph.D., did see that happen.

"Today, I locked the windows and three doors of my office and walked upstairs," he testified. "Three guys walked toward me, and I saw one of them take a key out, unlock an office and walk in. None of them were staff members of the AEL."

"Then I went downstairs and found my own office open and someone inside. I had locked it 10 minutes before."

Charles Granieri, a senior from San Francisco, who said he "spent quite a bit of time" around the AEL, testified he had "seen no acts of disruption or acts of violence. People were free to enter or leave anytime. We held very peaceful meetings."

A suggestion that Granieri be granted immunity to testify about the sit-in was denied by Friedenthal, because of the hearing's limited scope.

John Kramer, junior from Monrovia who said he's been in and around AEL "continually," admitted that it was "much more difficult for employees to work there by the mere physical presence of large numbers of people."

Asked if he had seen any acts of violence, Kramer said "absolutely none," and reminded the Council that the demonstrators twice had voted against such action.

Martha Scott, sophomore from Scottsdale, Ariz., said she had seen no one break in any offices, but that one boy began looking through papers in a desk and said he was on a committee trying to find out the research being done here."

When she reminded him that was against demonstration policy, "he just smiled and continued," she testified.

The hearing was to continue later tonight. ←

The Judicial Council hearing was called for the sole purpose of determining whether or not a disruption exists, and if so what the Council should do about it.

Meanwhile, about 700 demonstrators met quietly at the AEL tonight to discuss tactics.

####

(4/16/69)