

STANFORD UNIVERSITY NEWS SERVICE

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

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: **Harry Press**

*Southern California editors may
contact Stanford Regional Office,
621 S. Hope Street, Los Angeles
Zip 90017. (213) 627-0653*

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STANFORD —

Associate Professor of English W. Bruce Franklin and four students were found in contempt of the Stanford Judicial Council Friday, Jan. 29, during a tumultuous hearing into the disruption of the Henry Cabot Lodge speech on the campus Jan. 11.

Judicial Council Chairman Howard Williams, professor of law, recommended to President Richard W. Lyman that all four students be suspended immediately until the case is completed, and "appropriate disciplinary proceedings be instituted" against Professor Franklin.

Professor Williams—who recessed the hearing without setting a date for its resumption—wrote Lyman that he had "attempted to maintain order but was frustrated by a number of persons," including Professor Franklin, and four defendants—Geraldine Foote, sophomore; Michael Holman, sophomore; Jeffrey Youdelman and Janet Weiss, both graduate students.

They and four other students—Professor Franklin was appearing as counsel for one of them—are charged with violation of campus disruption policies.

President Lyman had no immediate comment on Professor Williams' letter. The Judicial Council chairman, under the Council charter, has "absolute authority to control the conduct of persons" in the hearing room.

In the shouting match that took place, both from defendants and members of the audience, an unidentified female threatened Williams' life, saying that he had better carry a gun.

The hearing, scheduled to start last night, was disrupted when an overflow crowd pushed their way into the small hearing room, and Williams was forced to adjourn.

Although a larger room was used today, seating 160, the same thing happened and more than 100 persons forced their way in past campus police. This time, however, the defendants called for order from the audience and Williams attempted to proceed.

But no evidence was able to be presented in the three and a half hour session. The entire time was taken up with legal arguments and questioning of Council members by defendants and their counsel, who were seeking to establish prejudice.

It was over these questions, and answers or lack of them, that animosity, interruptions and shouting gradually increased.

Chairman Williams several times threatened some of the defendants with contempt, and finally acted.

The defendants charged, in return, that Williams was being arbitrary and not allowing them to conduct a thorough questioning of Council members.