

# STANFORD UNIVERSITY NEWS SERVICE

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

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: Harry Press  
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
STANFORD —

Final arguments will be held in Santa Clara County superior court Wednesday, March 3, in Stanford University's plea for a preliminary injunction which would ban Prof. H. Bruce Franklin and several nonstudents from the campus.

The University's attorney, David Heilbron, in listing the specific alleged incidents of damage, incitement to damage, and building closure which led to the legal action, said "violence escalated" in February, and "enough is enough."

Heilbron included these incidents:

\* On Feb. 7, after defendant Janet Weiss told a rally that Stanford ought to be "shut down," windows were broken in several buildings.

\* On Feb. 8, a mob tried to force its way into a Board of Trustees' committee meeting, and the noise and the door-banging was so intense that the meeting couldn't go on.

\* On Feb. 9, at a rally, Mrs. Weiss urged a "mobile strike."

\* On Feb. 10, Professor Franklin urged a rally to "shut down that most obvious machine of war, the Computation Center," and that a mob did indeed break into the Center and cause damage to computers.

\* That night, Professor Franklin told a rally that "mass militant action would be suicidal, called for a 'peoples' war,'" and urged those listening to "break into small groups, and do whatever you feel you ought to do, as late at night as possible." A short time later, Heilbron said, several students were assaulted by attackers, and beaten with fists and with a stick.

Defense Attorney Norton Tooby said that while Stanford is a "center of learning, it also is one of political and antiwar activity." Students are frustrated because they have "tried every lawful means," and this "doesn't always work."

There have been, he said, many "peaceful activities" on campus against the war. The proposed injunction, Tooby said, would be "extremely effective in wiping out 95 percent of the political activities at Stanford which should be protected." It would be, he said, "political oppression."

Defendant Janet Weiss, acting as her own attorney, said "I have no intention of destroying the University. It is far too valuable." However, she said, she "might want to stop certain parts from functioning [such as those] involved in war."

Mrs. Weiss said the complaint "fails to show I've damaged Stanford, or the movement as a whole has damaged Stanford."

Professor Franklin, also acting as his own attorney, said the University is "asking this court to fire me" and called it "firing by injunction."

He said "my real crime lies in exposing the true nature of the Board of Trustees and the Stanford empire," he said. Attempts to fire him began in 1969, he charged, after he coauthored a book titled *Who Should Run Universities*.

"The main business of Stanford," said Professor Franklin, "is maintaining and expanding an empire in the Pacific Basin."

Professor Franklin concluded:

"I personally find myself in the position of being a revolutionary accused of performing revolutionary acts which I did not do. So I do not want to stand before this court pretending that I am not a revolutionary or that I do not personally believe in the importance of the armed struggle to overthrow the power of the Board of Trustees and the rest of its class.

"I would say frankly that when I read of the bombing of the Senate yesterday, I thought that that was a wonderful act and I understand that according to what is left of our rights in this country that one supposedly has the right not only to believe that, but to say what I just said.

"The advocates of free speech are not prepared to allow free speech to people who think those thoughts and say those things.

"The injunction will not prevent those thoughts from being thought and those things from being said.

"On the contrary, when a peaceful sit-in or advocacy of a strike is threatened as criminal behavior, the state teaches us a lesson—that our revolutionary analysis is correct and that at some time we should advocate immediate armed struggle against the state."