



Is Stanford firing Bruce Franklin for neglecting his job or his students?

No. He is a leading scholar in two fields (the study of novelist Herman Melville and Science Fiction) and a popular, hard-working teacher.

Is Stanford firing Bruce for disrupting the speech of Henry Cabot Lodge?

No. Even the Advisory Board which wants to fire Bruce found that he did not disrupt Lodge.

Is Stanford firing Bruce for violent or unlawful acts?

Not at all. Only for talking:

--A speech in White Plaza on February 10, before a non-violent sit-in protesting the invasion of Laos and the use of the computation center for War Research.

--Talking back to the police after the sit-in.

--Two speeches in the Old Union Courtyard that evening, in which Bruce advocated "using the methods of Peoples War."

Did any of these speeches break the law?

Not in the opinion of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Not in the opinion of the Santa Clara County District Attorney, who heard tapes of the speeches and then advised the administration that no criminal court would ever convict Bruce.

Doesn't Bruce Franklin generally advocate the use of violence?

Yes. He is a revolutionary and believes "in the necessity for revolutionary violence against counterrevolutionary violence."

Is that against the law?

No. We all still have the right to support even the overthrow of the U. S. government by force and violence.

Did Bruce call for violent tactics in his Peoples War speech?

No. He did not. Bruce defined "using the methods of Peoples War" with two specific examples--going back to the dorms to build support and (non-violent) actions like walking about the campus and playing touch football to make the presence of police on campus visible. He might have approved, or even wanted violence, but he didn't call for it.

Was there violence following Bruce's speech?

Yes there was. Anti-war people and members of the conservative Free Campus Movement fought. Two trash cans were burned. Someone shot a high school student in the leg.

Can the Advisory Board hold Bruce responsible for that violence?

Not according to the United States Constitution. A speaker can be held legally accountable only for specifically advocating unlawful actions, and only then in narrowly defined circumstances.

Did Bruce urge and incite the Computation Center sit-in?

No. Many other people planned and specifically advocated the Sit-In. Bruce did not, and did not enter the building.

Bruce resisted the police order to disperse after the Sit-In. Isn't that illegal?

No. The order to disperse was unlawful, and Bruce had every right to remain and urge others to remain. The District Attorney never even filed charges against those arrested after the order.

Did the Advisory Board find Bruce guilty "beyond a reasonable doubt"--the criminal court standard?

No. Here too the Board let its standards slip, asking only that evidence against Bruce be "strongly persuasive."

Even if Bruce's speeches broke no laws, did they violate University rules?

No one knows. During the entire hearing the Advisory Board refused to state any specific rules by which they would judge the speeches. In their verdict the Board announced full First Amendment protections and then violated these protections to convict Bruce for incitement. Catch-22.

If the Board really is protecting "Free Speech," how can it convict Bruce?

They can't. But they did. If their decision stands, a speaker at Stanford University can be punished for a speech that would be legal in Palo Alto.

Why would members of the Board, many of them anti-war liberals, make such a decision?

Perhaps they fear Bruce's Maoist ideas, or his "perception" of the University "as a central agent in domestic oppression and in an imperialist foreign policy." Perhaps they fear that his "pattern of conduct" will spur an attack from the right or a cut-back in financial contributions from the rich? Or, maybe they simply fear that he will lead us astray. Ask them.

Why did Bruce ever agree to appear before such a Board?

He had little choice. To appeal his firing in the courts, he first had to go through all the prescribed University channels. He also wanted to bring his case to the entire Stanford Community.

Will he now appeal to the courts?

Yes, if he can raise the necessary \$25,000.

If his speeches were within First Amendment protections, won't the Courts give him back his job?

Not necessarily. The Courts still have not decided whether a private university--like a company town--must guarantee full First Amendment rights.

Why the student referendum?

No one ever consulted us in setting up the Advisory Board or in deciding what rules and safeguards on speech Stanford should have. Now, before the Trustees make the final decision at their January 22 meeting, we want to show how we feel about keeping or firing Bruce.

Will the Trustees listen to us?

They might, if the Yes vote is large enough. But they probably will not.

Then why should we bother voting?

--If there's any chance at all to save Bruce's job, we have to try.

--If they fire Bruce even after we make our support clear, everyone will know that the Trustees are acting against our wishes.

--If we show our support, then we can begin to build pressure--at Stanford, at other universities, and out in the community--against the growing campaign to fire radical and anti-war professors.

Some of us disagree with Bruce's ideas. Why should we vote Yes?

We are not voting for or against Bruce's ideas. We are voting for or against his right to keep his job, our right to keep him as a professor, and, in the long run, the right of everyone to speak out against war, racism, and poverty.

**BRUCE FRANKLIN SHOULD BE RETAINED AS A
STANFORD PROFESSOR.**

ASSU Referendum Wednesday & Thursday (Jan. 19-20)