

# STANFORD UNIVERSITY NEWS SERVICE

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

TWO STORIES: Harry Press

Bob Beyers

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

PALO ALTO —

Hearings on a preliminary injunction sought by Stanford to bar certain nonstudents from campus, including Associate Prof. H. Bruce Franklin, were put over until 10 a.m. Tuesday by Santa Clara County Superior Court Judge Richard W. Rhodes here Monday, March 1.

A telephoned bomb threat briefly cleared the court chambers, where an overflow crowd of about 100 had gathered.

Three intervening petitions were filed with the court by a group of 55 faculty members (see separate story for details), the United Stanford Employees, and Stanford Trustee Denis Hayes, who called the injunction "a profoundly unwise course" of action.

Using language similar to that in the faculty group's petition, Hayes criticized the language of the proposed injunction as "dangerously vague or overbroad."

Various "hard-line actions" being taken by authorities across the country "constitute a far greater threat to the integrity of the university than do the evils they are supposedly holding in check," he added.

Hayes said he did not question the motives of those trying to restore campus stability, but said the injunction would "stifle critical inquiry and the free demonstration of opinion on campus at a point in time when society is in most serious need of a conscience."

Hayes said he did not support "random acts of violence against property or any kinds of violence against individuals," but he felt the merits of an injunction are far outweighed by its faults. "What profit it a university if it saves its windows and loses its soul?" he asked.

United Stanford Employees said the injunction could hinder its functions as a labor group, since some employees might be members of Venceremos, a radical group cited in the injunction. —30—

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STANFORD —

Officially replying to a petition of intervention filed with the Santa Clara County Superior Court earlier Monday, March 1, Associate Provost Robert Rosenzweig of Stanford said:

"The events which moved the University to seek this injunction were not political advocacy, picketing, boycott, or other forms of peaceful, noncoercive protest, much less classroom teaching. Nor is the injunction directed against acts of that kind.

"The acts that are to be enjoined are specifically enumerated in the order. They include, for example, intentionally throwing rocks, boarding up, painting, bricking, burning, smashing, trashing, sitting or milling in, intentionally disrupting or obstructing, and so forth.

"The acts that are to be enjoined are precisely those that, in the words of the petition, 'are not conducive to an atmosphere in which teaching and scholarship can flourish.' No teaching or scholarship flourished at the Computation Center on Feb. 10."

Commenting on a claim that the injunction "in fact cancels the bargaining position of one group" within the University, he said: "The only groups whose bargaining position would be affected are those that would commit violent acts or practice physical intimidation against others. A bargaining position that rests on such tactics deserves no protection in a university."

Rosenzweig noted that the faculty group's petition "does not challenge the facts upon which the University is seeking the injunction. It argues instead that injunctions are by nature dangerous.

"Perhaps because it does not deal with the facts, but is couched very largely in abstractions, the petition seems to float in the air some distance from the real world. . . .

"Of course injunctions can be dangerous weapons; of course they can be abused; of course they have been used improperly in the past. None of those generalizations says anything important or useful about the specific action now before the court.

"If the University does not make its case—and it will properly be challenged by the defendants to do so—then it will not deserve and should not have the relief it seeks. If, as I believe, the case can and will be made, the result will be to protect the open clash of ideas, the only battle which is properly fought within the University."