

charge me with acting in, but if it is, I request a public hearing before the Advisory Board in order openly to defend my brothers and sisters in Gay Liberation against this kind of attack. Another important reason for hearing the charges first lies in the fact that, as Paragraph 15 states,

"technical rules of legal evidence need not be strictly applied" before the Advisory Board, there is no stated provision for challenges, the accused person is not granted the power of subpoena, and the presentation of the prosecution's case is not restricted by statute and case law. Perhaps you are going to charge me with a serious criminal offense, a felony punishable by life imprisonment. It might then be extremely dangerous to have the kind of mock trial represented by an Advisory Board hearing, rather than taking the case first to court, where there are at least some rules and precedents and where the jurors would not be paid employees of the prosecutor. To be "convicted" by the Advisory Board, and of course in the press, prior to a criminal trial would hardly improve one's chances of being acquitted in court. Now this possibility is not so fantastical. After all, here is your only stated justification for suspending me: "because of the important role which you played in the tragic events of Wednesday, February 10." I'm not certain which tragic events you mean, but I suspect that you are trying here to connect me by implication and innuendo with the shooting which occurred on campus that night. If you are going to allege that the "unlawful" acts I have "urged, incited and led" include attempted murder then you better say so before asking me whether I'd like a hearing before the Advisory Board on this charge.

But meanwhile you didn't wait for my reply before starting other proceedings against me, proceedings directly calculated to prevent my having any kind of reasonable opportunity for a defense before the Advisory Board. Even before you sent your letter of February 12, you had the University's lawyers go into court to request that I be prevented from coming onto the campus except to attend my own disciplinary proceeding and to gather "evidence" when and only when either you or the court sees fit. Paragraph 15 is quite clear about the accused individual's right "to prepare his defense," and that includes a good deal more than gathering evidence whenever his adversary gives permission, particularly in a highly political case. The proposed injunction would also bar from the proceedings many of my witnesses, if the case concerns, as I think it may, the anti-war movement at Stanford and Stanford's involvement in the war. One clear purpose of the proposed injunction is to prevent me from presenting a political case before the Advisory Board. But there is hardly any point anyhow in trying to keep my job at Stanford if a court, following your request, effectively fires me by permanently banishing me from the campus.