

STANFORD UNIVERSITY NEWS SERVICE

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

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: Bob Beyers

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STANFORD —

Protesting "obviously prejudicial conditions" imposed by his banishment from campus, Associate Prof. H. Bruce Franklin Friday requested an Advisory Board hearing on charges which could lead to his dismissal from Stanford, provided President Richard W. Lyman explains how he can prepare his defense.

Under the terms of a preliminary injunction issued this week by the Santa Clara County Superior Court, Professor Franklin is barred from campus until his current suspension by the University ends.

But the injunction provides he may come on campus for judicial proceedings in which he is a party or a witness and, by order of the court or agreement with the University president, gather evidence on campus for such proceedings.

In a letter to the president, delivered Friday afternoon, Professor Franklin said, "You and the media have been able to convince several hundred members of the faculty, who claim to be ardently devoted to 'rational and objective consideration of facts and issues without prejudicial coercion' that I should be banished from the campus prior to any hearing by the Advisory Board."

(Earlier this week, more than 350 faculty members signed an open letter to the president supporting his efforts to obtain a court injunction. The letter did not mention Professor Franklin.)

Given the "obviously prejudicial conditions" imposed by the banishment, Professor Franklin suggested that President Lyman revoke the suspension "so that my side of the case, not just yours could be heard on campus prior to punishment."

He called for "equal access" to members of the Advisory Board, a group of seven professors which would hear his case, charging they now receive "a steady stream of lies, misrepresentations and half truths from your News Service, in bulletins written by two of the main prosecution witnesses."

(News Service has routinely distributed full texts of the principal correspondence between Professor Franklin and President Lyman to all members of the Academic Council, together with press releases summarizing events in the case.)

Professor Franklin said that "none of the charges against me stems from anything even associated with my regular duties. But even assuming that the suspension was reasonable before, certainly the injunction makes it quite superfluous now.

"Like registered students subject to the injunction, my behavior on campus would be highly restricted by the threat of contempt proceedings if I were even to suggest that any University business be interfered with in any way, even by a strike." (The injunction states that "this order does not prohibit peaceful and orderly picketing or the peaceful and orderly advocacy of a voluntary boycott of University functions or activities.)

In his letter, Professor Franklin asks how he can be free to gather evidence when the president, an adversary in the proceedings, has the right to decide when he may do so. He also asks how he can do such "simple matters" as seeking advice from his attorney, other colleagues, students and workers.

"Why should the several hundred students who have expressed interest in hearing my ideas in the classroom this Spring Quarter be prevented from doing so prior to any proof of the charges you have made?" he concluded.

Earlier, Professor Franklin requested postponements in indicating whether he would seek an Advisory Board hearing, pending specification of the charges against him and completion of the court proceedings on the injunction.

There was no immediate reply from the President's Office to his letter.

Under University tenure policy, the date for an Advisory Board hearing would be set by the Board's chairman, after Professor Franklin was informed of the charges against him and given an opportunity to prepare his defense.