

Com. and

STANFORD - Prof. Avram Goldstein, chairman of an ad hoc student-faculty group, today (JUNE 3) called the McClellan subcommittee subpoena of Stanford "a political attempt to suppress dissent" on campus.

Several other individual faculty members warned the subpoenas could trigger a new witch hunt in higher education. They spoke at a campus news conference.

At a separate session, Provost Richard W. Lyman repeated his criticism of the so-called anti-riot appropriations riders, saying it is "much better for the university to deal with problems than for Congress to cope with individual disciplinary matters by blanket legislation."

Prof. Goldstein said he welcomed the University's response to the subpoena "in so far as it points out the threat" to free and unfettered association on campus, but said he hoped President Kenneth S. Pitzer "will go much further in pointing out the hazards" to the public.

Prof. Robert McAfee Brown said he had hoped for a stronger stance by the University. The main effort now should be "not to start down the slippery slope" toward conformity.

"All of us here remember what the late Sen. Joseph McCarthy did," he added. "We fear a repetition of that kind of witch hunting...."

"Unless groups all over the country take a strong stance, the senator will have a field day."

Prof. Gavin Langmuir, history, said he felt it would be "much better if federal funds and investigation were not engaged in repressing student dissent" but in dealing with its causes. "Getting names is not going to stop campus dissent or enable universities to deal with it," he emphasized.

Prof. Sanford Dornbusch, sociology, said "this kind of fishing expedition to get lists of malcontents creates a climate of fear" that is not in the best long term interests of America. It also greatly complicates the university's ability to manage its own affairs internally, Dornbusch added.

Lyman admitted that these "widespread fears" are difficult to counter. "We recognize the interest of Congress in learning how federal money is spent...and in the general health of American universities."

"We are fearful that unless (this and other) investigations are undertaken with the greatest of care (they may) become persecution of dissent" which could damage universities "most seriously."

The anti-riot riders hurt economically poor students while leaving the rich immune, he said.

In separate statements, Prof. Leonard Schiff, physics, chairman of the Senate of the Academic Council, said he felt the University's response was "very reasonable."

Prof. Gerald Gunther, law, said "I think it is precisely the appropriate response because it defends the ideals of civil liberty in a precise rather than an overly emotional way. The important aspects to me are that it recognizes the concerns of associational privacy in its response to the questions about officers of organizations, while acknowledging the limited Congressional interest in federal financial aid programs.

"In short, I find it to be in accordance with the soundest constitutional principles."

Prof. William Clebsch, religion, said, "It seems to me premature to surmise that the McClellan subcommittee is over-reaching its proper legal function in issuing this subpoena, and I therefore commend the University authorities for responding as they are doing.

"The moment I am convinced of repressive political moves by this or any other Congressional committee, I shall oppose it with all my might and main."

In its response, the University provided the names of 16 persons found guilty of taking part in disruptions and listed information on federal financial aid received by 27 individuals at the University.

Stanford did not disclose the names of officers for 12 listed organizations, pointing out that several were not connected with the University and it did not require others to file lists of officers as a condition for recognition.