

THREE STUDENTS SUSPENDED, ONE DISMISSED, BY STAR-CHAMBER COMMITTEE

Today, three students have been suspended and one dismissed by a procedure which makes a mockery of due process. Tomorrow, or whenever there is pressure on the University, the same 'process' may be applied to others. The procedural guarantees of 'due process', wrested with angry force by the Barons from King John in 1215, and by the American colonists from King George in 1776, protect defendants against terrorization by powerful accusers. Those who would impose tyranny first destroy the protections of the defendants. Without definite guarantees of due process no effective speech or action will be safe from the University or outside pressure groups.

NO LAW SHALL BE MADE ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH (1st Amendment) In an 'intellectual' community, these four students have been denied the right to protest an arrest they believe unjust, to discuss obscenity in a literary context, or to make political statements.

NO PERSON SHALL BE COMPELLED TO BE A WITNESS AGAINST HIMSELF (5th Amendment) In the hearings, the University counsel continually bullied the students to admit the charges.

NO BAILIFF SHALL UPON HIS OWN UNSUPPORTED ACCUSATION PUT ANY MAN TO TRIAL (Magna Carta 38) Assistant Dean of Students Murphy, accusing one student of leading a yell, was the only witness who testified to hearing this yell in its entirety.

THE ACCUSED SHALL ENJOY THE RIGHT TO BE CONFRONTED WITH THE WITNESSES AGAINST HIM (6th Amendment) One student was convicted on the evidence of a 'plain-clothes officer' who never appeared.

THE ACCUSED SHALL ENJOY THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL (6th Amendment) The Committee scheduled hearings for times when they knew the students' lawyer could not attend.

A MAN SHALL BE FINED FOR A SMALL FAULT ONLY ACCORDING TO THE MEASURE THEREOF (Magna Carta 20) One student has lost his Fellowship, and all have been cut off from their studies for months—a far greater punishment than a \$50 fine or a week in prison.

A LAW MUST BE SPECIFIC TO BE VALID (Constitutional Doctrine) The rules under which these students were convicted were too vague to allow prior knowledge of guilt, yet no argument on their validity was considered.

* By the 14th Amendment, the University, as agent of the State of California, may not abridge these rights. With time and money, we can avenge these students in court.

* To secure these rights, our ancestors had to form their own government to secure themselves against arbitrary monarchs. We must be prepared to do the same.

RALLY-SPROUL STEPS-12 NOON-TODAY THURSDAY APRIL 22