

What happened at the second hearing?

Only two students had received notices to appear on Saturday. They appeared with three of their lawyers and tried to enter the hearing room, but the Stanford Police would at first only allow one lawyer per defendant. It took intervention by the University Prosecutor before the police let the lawyers in.

The defendants asked whether the Administration would have proceeded with the hearing if Schwartz had not had the time to produce his witnesses. They received no answer. The students had not found 20 hours enough time in which to find their witnesses and ask them to attend this early Saturday morning hearing, so they moved to continue the trial (re-schedule it for a later day). The motion was denied. At the following hearing, however, when the University Prosecutor moved that the testimony delivered on Saturday be stricken from the record (which is in effect exactly what the defendants had tried to accomplish on Saturday), the hearing officer granted the motion. This sort of maneuvering helps the Administration say that it went out of its way to be fair by having the Saturday session removed from the record; the reality of the situation speaks differently.

The defendants moved for an open hearing. That motion was denied.

Finally, the hearing officer said she would try these defendants separately from the other two who had not received notices and had therefore not appeared. The defense had tried to assert that their case rested on all of the defendants being present, and a severance would be unfair, but the hearing officer refused to allow the collective defense to continue. This injustice was rectified by the benevolent University Prosecutor on Monday when the hearing officer accepted his motion regarding the Saturday hearing. Again the Administration can claim

fairness, after initially denying the defendants' motions.

After protesting proved useless, the defendants left the room.

What was happening outside at the Saturday hearing?

About 80 students chanted, sang, and banged on the doors to express their outrage at the unjust judicial system. A pane of glass on an outside fire extinguisher cabinet was accidentally broken by an over-zealous noise-maker. Eighteen members of the police tactical squad surrounded the demonstrators and refused to let them leave, on the orders of Police Lt. Tamm. Tamm admitted that nothing illegal had occurred and that the demonstrators were not illegally assembled, but he did not immediately let the people leave. After several minutes of denying the protestors the right to leave, Tamm said people could leave in one particular channel through the circle of police. When John Dolly tried to walk out of the circle between two policemen, he was grabbed by the policemen after being shoved back five feet into the circle by the officers with their four foot long clubs, and was charged with interfering with a police officer. Later the absurd charge of felonious assault on a police officer was added. Over thirty persons signed a list as witnesses for John.

What did the Prosecutor and the hearing officer do after the defendants walked out.

They went ahead with the trial anyway. It seems that the presence of the defendants at their own trial is not necessary; the right to face one's accusers and cross-examine witnesses is a technicality to be brushed aside at the Administration's whim. Schwartz prosecuted the absent defendants for over three hours on Saturday. The hearing officer and John Schwartz coincidentally