

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Beyers

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STANFORD —

Approving recommendations of the Stanford Judicial Council, President Richard W. Lyman Thursday, Feb. 25, announced the suspension of six students for disrupting a scheduled Jan. 11 speech by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge.

The suspensions, which range from one to four quarters, will take effect Friday, March 5, unless individual defendants request that the penalty be postponed to the start of Spring Quarter March 29.

Sentences recommended by the SJC and approved by the President were as follows: Jeffrey Youdelman, graduate student from Palo Alto, four-quarter suspension, with two quarters stayed; Geraldine Foote, sophomore from Portland, Ore., and Theresa Ramirez, sophomore from Denver, four-quarter suspension with three quarters stayed; Michael Holman, sophomore from Stanford, two-quarter suspension with one quarter stayed; and Bradley Dowden, graduate student from Los Gatos and Merle Rabine, graduate student from Beachwood, Ohio, one-quarter suspension.

The stays all are subject to good behavior. Suspension means termination of all student privileges.

Remanded to the Council for further consideration was the case of Janet Weiss, recommended for four quarters suspension. In a letter to the President, Mrs. Weiss contended there were irregularities in the proceedings by which the SJC arrived at its recommended penalty.

In a letter to SJC Chairman Howard Williams, President Lyman noted that Mrs. Weiss "charges she believed the maximum penalty she could receive was one quarter suspension because she did not consider her convictions in civil court for violation of an injunction obtained by Stanford to curb disruptions on campus would be considered in these [campus] proceedings.

"I am not persuaded that Mrs. Weiss could reasonably have assumed that those offenses against the University would not be relevant in her case. . . She [also] charges that the Council assumed that those convictions were before the SJC, and infers that this influenced its decision. The opinions do not clarify this issue." He asked the Council to specifically address the relevance of the fact that her convictions were in court rather than before the SJC for participating in two disruptions on campus.

In his letter to Professor Williams, President Lyman added: "The entire Stanford community is in your debt and in debt to the Council for the patience and care which you demonstrated in dealing with this most difficult case in the face of considerable provocation and threats.

"If our internal self-government survives in anything like its present form, it will in large measure be a tribute to people such as you and your fellow Council members."

In one dissenting opinion, President Lyman noted, a Council member asserted that the University's policy on campus disruption is meant to suppress "effective" dissent.

"If by effective dissent one means dissent that achieves some specific objective utterly regardless of the means used to achieve it, then this argument, if accepted, would replace the rule of law in the University with the rule of brute force," he said.