

## Judicial proceedings

Stanford's chapter of Students for a Democratic Society met Sunday night, February 2, to draft procedural requests to the Stanford Judicial Council. Approximately 30 students, most of them SDS members, were charged with violating a university demonstration policy on January 14, 1969. The Judicial Council requested our suggestions:

1. that preliminary conferences be held in public and with all alleged violators present.
2. that the judicial hearings hear all cases together rather than separately. Although our collective decisions at Bowman Alumni House indicate our collective responsibility for actions taken at the Faculty Club, the judicial proceedings are trying to single out individuals. Since these requests are predicated on our collective responsibility, we wish all defendants to be treated equally.
3. that the hearings be open and held in an auditorium large enough to accommodate all interested members of the community.
4. that the judicial proceedings not make an attempt to separate political and evidential questions, since we and the trustees were at the Faculty Club for political reasons, and the very nature of the trial is political.
5. that the hearings be held on consecutive nights.
6. that we exercise our right to subpoena any and all witnesses, including students, faculty, administrators, and trustees whether or not they live in the area.
7. that the university compensate legal counsel for the defendants.
8. that copies of all evidence be presented to the accused students so they may prepare their defense. This includes prints of photographs, names and photos of everyone present at the Board of Trustees meeting, copies of tape recordings and statements by witnesses.
9. in a related case, that the university compensate legal counsel for James Edward Johnson, accused of a misdemeanor during the demonstration. This privilege is now being extended by the university to Robert Koff of the Education Department in his dealing with the Human Relations Commission.

We do not believe a fair trial is possible. The law is not neutral. This is a very political trial. The Stanford Judicial Council has power to recommend actions to the president of the university. He is Kenneth Pitzer, selected as president by the very same trustees whose financial and ideological interests in SE Asia and this university we challenged. Pitzer can hardly play an impartial role.

The administration's effort to crush SDS is also indicated by its failure to bring charges against the YAF for their disturbance at AEL, and a YR members, classified as a "non-involved bystander" who jumped an SDS member at the Board of Trustees meeting.

Members of Stanford SDS will cooperate with the judicial hearings,

but not because we consider justice a possibility. Our main concern is this university's involvement in American Foreign policy in South East Asia. We do not want to precipitate divergent issues. That is why we, unlike the trustees, want open hearings. That is why political and evidential matters cannot be separated. And that is why we will not tolerate individuals being singled out for prosecution, but will stand together.