

Stanford aide hits riot bills

WASHINGTON — The man in charge of the Stanford University electronics laboratory that was occupied by student demonstrators last spring urged Congress today not to adopt tough anti-riot laws.

He is Prof. William Rambo, director of the Stanford elec-

tronics laboratories and supervisor of the applied electronics laboratory, which was the target of the student sit-in, made the plea.

Testifying before Sen. John L. McClellan's subcommittee investigating student disorders, Rambo said such laws would "add nothing to the authority already in existence in the university."

Rambo also argued the application of federal legislation would "substantially undermine the essential support of the university community from the president and the administration, and hence reduce their practical power to exercise that authority."

"The positive, direct effect can only be small; the negative effect, though indirect, can be enormous," he said.

It was the second day of testimony before the permanent investigating subcommittee of the Senate by Stanford officials.

On Tuesday, an angry McClellan accused Stanford President Kenneth S. Pitzer of applying a "double standard" under which lawbreaking students are immune from criminal laws applied to everyone else.

Pitzer asserted there are "categories of things which are technically violations of the law that are better dealt with by campus authorities."

Pitzer indicated local police agreed to let Stanford mete out academic justice to more than 200 students involved in two building seizures in the spring.

Actually, Santa Clara County sheriff's deputies were called on campus on only one occasion, when student militants occupied Encina Hall, the campus main administration building.

Sheriff Charles J. Prelsnik today denied there was any advance agreement with Stanford officials not to arrest student demonstrators.

Prelsnik said he never called him and said students were

guilty of trespass, and promised to file a complaint if their arrests were necessary.

"We don't operate on a double standard at Stanford," Prelsnik said. He added that university officials have acted in full compliance with established law enforcement procedures.

C. D. Mayron, the sheriff department's field enforcement supervisor, said no demonstrators were arrested at Encina because they obeyed an order to disperse and leave the building. If they had not left after being warned they would have been arrested, he said.

Pouncing on Pitzer's statement, however, McClellan shouted, "That is an agreement outside the law. If you can make agreements like that with your sheriff, so can I. So can anybody."

"Those who are on the campus may violate the criminal laws with impunity. I wonder if that is a good example and conducive to law enforcement throughout the country."

Pitzer said even before the days of riots police traditionally let college authorities handle enforcement of minor crimes. Sen. Abraham A. Ribicoff, D-Conn., called it the traditional "separation between town and gown."

Today, McClellan questioned Stanford Provost Richard W. Lyman about four activists.

(Continued on page 2, col. 4)

Continued from page 1
President Kenneth S. Pitzer, Gerontologist Weissman and associate English professor H. Brent Franklin.

Lyman said Cohen had been active on campus and had been involved in campus disciplinary action on at least two occasions, following the board of trustees disruption in January and the Encina occupation May 1.

He said both Gererson and Weissman were not currently enrolled at the university. He added he had "no knowledge of Prof. Franklin's memberships in any organization," and said Franklin had never been a defendant in campus judicial proceedings.

On Tuesday, Pitzer rejected McClellan's suggestion that Stanford keep membership lists of all campus organizations and that the militant groups such as the Students for a Democratic Society be banned.

Both Pitzer and Lyman said that would be "a weak weapon at best," and that the university prefers to judge students by their individual actions rather than by the manifestoes of an organization to which they might belong, but with which they might not completely agree.

PAT 7/2/69