

March 12, 1971

RECEIVED

MAR 12 1971

To: Richard Lyman

From: Bruce Franklin

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

According to the newspapers, you and the media have now 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. If you would explain how I can possibly prepare a defense under these circumstances, then I request a hearing before the Advisory Board. Please include in your reply answers to the following three questions:

1. How can I be free to gather evidence when you, my adversary in these proceedings, now have the right to decide when I may do so?

2. How can I prepare those parts of the case which involve processes other than the gathering of evidence, even including such simple matters as seeking advice from and working jointly with my attorney, other colleagues, students, and workers?

3. How can I have equal access to the members of the Advisory Board, who receive a steady stream of lies, misrepresentations, and half-truths from your News Service, in bulletins written by two of the main prosecution witnesses?

The injunction, which was sought by you and granted by the arm of Stanford's corporate power known as the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, gives to you arbitrary power to dissolve the banishment by revoking my suspension. Certain other questions therefore arise:

1. How does performing my regular duties constitute a threat of immediate harm to myself or others? 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.

2. Given the obviously prejudicial conditions imposed by the banishment, would it not be in the interest of "rational and objective consideration of facts and issues without prejudicial coercion" to revoke the suspension so that my side of the case, not just yours, could be heard on campus prior to punishment?

3. 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?

Victory to the peoples of Southeast Asia!

Free all political prisoners!

