



On the afternoon of March 2, John Thomson, a young poet, sat down at the Bancroft Strip holding a small card bearing the phrase "Fuck (verb)", intending (he explained) to protest against the war in Viet Nam. About an hour later he was arrested by a Campus policeman.

At that time the Campus was in a state of amicable bustle. Political groups were sharing their place in the sun with fraternities. The Campus reacted like any healthy academic community -- with vigorous discussion. Are the obscenity laws too strict? Too lax? Out of date? What had John Thomson's sign to do with Viet Nam? All sides of the incident were discussed during the ensuing days in formal rallies, and after the noon hour "a dozen heated little debates broke out among the students who had participated" (S.F. Chronicle). Tabu words were used and eight more arrests were made.

It must be emphasized that at this stage the Campus was in no special state of uproar; arrests have been an occupational hazard of students since mediaeval times. The uproar came from off campus. The resentments which had built up in the State of California against the FSM had found a scapegoat. By Tuesday of the following week, the President and the Chancellor had resigned. On Saturday, the full Board of Regents - including Brown, Anderson, and Unruh - met in emergency session. The resignations were finally withdrawn after an ominous promise by President Kerr that "proceedings are now under way to discipline the students involved in an orderly and prompt way".

On the following Wednesday (March 17) charges against four students - Dave Bills, Art Goldberg, Mike Klein and Nicholas Zvegintzov - were filed by the Dean of Men with the "Ad Hoc Committee on Student Conduct". Because of the grave sanctions implicitly threatened against the defendants and against the prosecuting University, the proceedings of this Committee never obtained a calm objectivity. The students charged "railroading"; the Committee countercharged obstruction. Defendants and Committee exchanged angry accusations of insulting behavior. University Counsel played the role of prosecuting D.A. The final sentences were unprecedently harsh -- three suspensions, one expulsion.

These sentences were hasty and unjust. The academic careers and reputations of the four have been jeopardized in symbolic retribution for the hubris of the Free Speech Movement. To enable these students to make an appeal through the Courts, they now appeal to you for a contribution. Please give generously to their appeal fund. It has been given the name "DUE PROCESS FUND".

The students will go before the Superior Court of Alameda County or before the Federal District Court and ask for an order requiring the University either to stay the sentences pending a re-hearing or to void the sentences entirely. The students will argue that the University, as an agency of the State, is subject to all the provisions of the U.S. Constitution. In particular, they will argue:

- (1) In Dixon vs. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F.2d 150 (1961), (a similar case involving a disciplinary hearing in a State University) the Court held that if a hearing committee does not make the final decision the defendants must have the opportunity to make comments on the committee's recommendations before the final decision is made. The students and their lawyer were not shown the Ad Hoc Committee's report until Chancellor Meyerson had handed down the sentences.
- (2) In Belshaw vs. City of Berkeley, Alameda County Superior Court #33851 (1964), (the "firemen" case) the Court ruled that the phrase "conduct reflecting discredit on the City of Berkeley" is unconstitutionally vague. The students will argue that "conduct unbefitting a student" is similarly vague.
- (3) The University refused to delay the hearings until after the verdict in the concurrent criminal prosecutions, yet used the concurrent proceedings as a pretext for withholding items of evidence - the original police reports of Lieuts. Chandler and Halloran and the transcript of the University tape of the rallies - requested by the defendants. The students will argue that this violated their 6th Amendment right "to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in [their] favor", and will cite Jencks vs. U.S., 353 U.S. 669 (1957), where the Court voided the decision of an administrative committee which had withheld a pertinent F.B.I. report.
- (4) Goldberg and Klein will additionally argue on 1st Amendment grounds. All the students are charged with using or displaying various tabu words. In addition the charges and the findings make it clear that planning, addressing, and moderating the meetings of March 4 and 5, and introducing speakers, are held to intensify the violation. The students will argue that, under the 1st Amendment, all evidence of serious participation, of sustained discourse, and of deliberate coordination of discussion must be held to mitigate the violation.



BEFORE THE CONSCIENCE
OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

DAVID BILLS, ARTHUR
GOLDBERG, MICHAEL KLEIN,
NICHOLAS ZVEGINTZOV

vs.
THE PEOPLE AND THE STATE
OF CALIFORNIA

AN APPEAL

"If the University's end result is fundamentally unfair and therefore illegal, no courts in the land are more open than those of California to redress grievances should University remedies be found wanting." (Prof. David Louissell, UC Legal Advisory Committee)

SPONSORS:

Kenneth Anger, Ford Fellow, Film-maker
C. West Churchman, Professor of Business Administration and Associate Director of the Space Sciences Laboratory, UC Berkeley

Art Hoppe, Columnist, SF Chronicle

John Paterson, Associate Professor of English and Assistant Dean of the College of Letters and Science, UC Berkeley

Although we do not necessarily agree with every argument in this leaflet, we urge the academic community to give generous support to these students' appeal.



*Please send your checks
to:*

DUE PROCESS
Box #830
Berkeley Calif. 94701

questions —



WHAT DID THE STUDENTS DO ? WHAT WERE THE SENTENCES ?

David Bills - for taking responsibility for a sign bearing John Thomson's word, in an appeal for defense funds - suspension for the semester;
 Michael Klein - for reading aloud the last eight paragraphs of Lady Chatterly's Lover in the Campus Police Station - suspension until September;
 Arthur Goldberg - for moderating meetings in Sproul Hall Plaza - dismissal;
 Nicholas Zvegintzov - for leading a football "spell-out" using John Thomson's word - suspension until September.

WHAT IS OBSCENITY ?

"Obscene material is material which deals with sex in a manner appealing to the prurient interest... All ideas having even the slightest redeeming social importance -- unorthodox ideas, controversial ideas, even ideas hateful to the prevailing climate of opinion -- have the full protection of [First Amendment] guarantees." (Justice Brennan, Roth vs. U.S., 354 U.S. 476, 1957)

DID THE STUDENTS' BEHAVIOR CONSTITUTE OBSCENITY ?

In intention at least, the students' behavior had social importance. Bills thought of the sign as protesting an unjust arrest. Goldberg explained at rallies that verbal tabus are mediators of class and racial discrimination. Klein argued that the taboo on frank speech in "mixed company" and the shibboleth of "shielding" women from certain words defines women as members of an inferior caste. Zvegintzov, a foreign student, parodied the grossness of American college sports fans.

SHOULD THESE STUDENTS HAVE KEPT THEIR IDEAS TO THEMSELVES ?
 As one witness said at the hearing, "All rallies annoy someone". New ideas and new forms of expression are always uncomfortable. If these students succeeded in making others - willy nilly - think and discuss a forbidden topic, could that not be "conduct becoming a student" ?

DID THE COMMITTEE VIOLATE THE "DECEMBER 8 RESOLUTION" ?

Yes. On December 8 the Berkeley Division resolved that "the content of speech and advocacy should not be restricted by the University". The Campus must face the fact that this policy would make the University less restrictive than society at large (which admits restrictions on freedom of speech in the context of libel, fighting words, and obscenity). The supporters of the resolution argued that society - with its police and courts - would impose its own restrictions; additional restriction by the University is ignoble. The implementation of the policy will require courage.

WERE THE SENTENCES HARSH ?

Yes. One of the students lost a fellowship by his suspension. All have suffered the painful humiliation of exclusion from their chosen community. In the words of the Cole-Linde-O'Neil Memorandum to the Academic Freedom Committee: "University disciplinary sanctions, although not 'criminal' in the technical sense, are likely to be far more drastic in their effect than typical criminal penalties. Almost any student would rather pay a \$25 fine, or even serve a week in jail, than be expelled from college".

DO THE SENTENCES CONSTITUTE "DOUBLE JEOPARDY" ?

Perhaps. The Fifth Amendment forbids an agency of government to use its powers in a punitive fashion to compound a judicial penalty. When an individual connected with such an agency behaves so as to threaten its intrinsic interests, it may constitutionally proceed to sever his connection, provided the severance rests upon a careful analysis of what its intrinsic interests are. Out of the recriminations against these students has emerged the proposition that a University's intrinsic interests include "aesthetic considerations" and "decorum". Such a proposition rests on a Hollywood conception of a University. If an academic must have a suave manner or an equable temperament and a University must have well-kept lawns, many of the world's finest minds and finest institutions are excluded.

DID THE STUDENTS "FLAUNT" THE WORDS ?

Webster defines "flaunt" as "to display boastfully, brazenly, or the like". These students come from an environment -- a whole generation, perhaps -- that does not take verbal tabus very seriously. In using the words they perhaps intended to tease society; they had no notion of launching a brazen or boastful attack. Contrary to rumor, nobody marched around Campus with immense signs daubed with tabu words.

WHY SUCH AN ELABORATE FUND DRIVE ?

The students calculate that to take their case to the Supreme Court of California will cost them \$7,500. If they lose in the lower court, they will appeal; judging by the vehement participation of the Office of the Regents' Counsel in the prosecution before the Committee, they assume the University will appeal if they win. The cost of this flyer (\$75) comes from cash donations at a Sproul Hall Plaza rally.

DAVID BILLS (b. 1946, Marin Co., Calif / Publications: Editor, Redwood HS Orpheus, 1964 / Previous arrests: Sproul Hall)
 "I'm quite surprised the Committee should ask me about myself. In seven months at Berkeley I haven't been asked to talk to a Professor for more than 30 seconds except about the FSM. This brutal lack of communication suggests to me a brutal lack of interest. I haven't been able to identify with your interests, gentlemen, and I doubt if you would identify with mine."
 (Statement to Ad Hoc Committee)

ARTHUR GOLDBERG (b. 1942, Inglewood, Calif; B.A., Berkeley, 1964; Graduate Program in Education; Chairman of SLATE, Spring 1964 / Previous arrests: Sheraton-Palace, Oakland Tribune, Sproul Hall)
 "I have never been able to understand why certain words were considered obscene while others weren't. I become enraged over a sign that says 'I hate niggers' and I consider it to offend my standards of decency... I also consider President Johnson's ordering the bombing of innocent women and children in Vietnam to be one of the greatest obscenities in American history, yet I do not see him being arrested for his obscene acts." (Spider, 1, 2, p. 22)

MICHAEL KLEIN (b. 1939, Brooklyn, NY; B.A., Rochester, 1960; M.A., Minnesota, 1963; PhD student in English / Publications etc.: Pitch White (play); Moonlight Sonata (film); articles on Polish Cinema and Truffaut / Previous arrests: Sproul Hall)
 "D.H. Lawrence's vision is the antithesis of that of the multiversity, his language the direct opposite of the jargon of the prophets of the multiversity. His defense of the equality of women calls on society to abolish the patriarchal system which denies women dignity and good jobs. There are few women on the Faculty, and there were none on our Committee." (Free Student - forthcoming)

NICHOLAS ZVEGINTZOV (b. 1940, England; B.A., Oxford, 1962; PhD student in Business; Ford Fellow, 1964-6; Irving Prize for American Wit and Humor, 1964 / Publications: Editor, Oxford Circus, 1961; various working papers and translations in computing and management science / Previous arrests: Sproul Hall)
 "I want to remind the Committee of something only the University Counsel seems fully to understand -- that the procedural guarantees of due process exist to protect the defendant. We've been condemned by the Regents, the Legislature, Governor Brown, and the people of California. I don't think anything can prevent us getting squashed, but maybe due process will help." (Statement to Ad Hoc Committee)

quotes



It is deeply rooted in me that to use such words as "fuck", in public or in my presence, is wrong... It comprises the same type of injury I would feel if someone were to accuse me of being a Communist, or to strike me... My basic rights as a human being [include] my right not to be subjected to things which are contrary to my inner convictions.

Martin L. Van Loucks, complaint to UC Police Dept., March 5 1965

Four-letter words are suppressed because they have magic power over respectable society... Frightened out of our wits by the breaking of [a] taboo, we accuse an intelligent and honest generation of degeneracy, when we should acknowledge their courage and their seriousness.

Prof. Richard Tansey, Conference on Sex Education, UC Med Center

The Division joins with the President, the Acting Chancellor, and the student body in condemning the willful flaunting of obscenity on this campus as a travesty of the legitimate uses of free speech... UC Academic Senate, Berkeley Division, March 12 1965

The President and the Chancellor, who had, of course, immediately resigned, selflessly withdrew their resignations. "The issue", they said, "is not whether Sam should be strung up by the thumbs. We all agree to that. But simple justice requires we hold the proper hearings before we string him up by the thumbs."

Arthur Hoppe, SF Chronicle, March 17 1965

From the 15 page report we must assume the committee ignored the most essential issues in the case -- what is conduct unbecoming a student, what is obscenity, who were offended by the obscenities allegedly used, and when may a student use obscenities (or is a student constantly under purview of the fatherly eye of the University?)... The committee showed no concern with the context of the allegedly obscene words. They admitted the words may have been motivated by "social protest" but claimed that makes no difference... The committee assumed throughout the report that the "obscenities", when used loudly in any public place, were "conduct unbecoming a student". No discussion was evident on whether this was valid.

Editorial, Daily Californian, April 28 1965

Issues of free speech in a democracy often arise out of marginal cases. We do not decide whether an issue has been raised by pointing to all the free speech that abounds. The hard case and the forlorn sect may give us trouble beyond their due, but they also summon us to reaffirm our fundamental commitments.

Prof. Philip Selznick, Commentary, March 1965

Published sometime after 1965 04-28

BEFORE THE CONSCIENCE OF THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

DAVID BILLS, ARTHUR GOLDBERG, MICHAEL KLEIN, NICHOLAS ZVEGINTZOV

vs.

THE PEOPLE AND THE UNIVERSITY AND THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AN APPEAL

"If the University's end result is fundamentally unfair and therefore illegal, no courts in the land are more open than those of California to redress grievances should University remedies be found wanting." (Prof. David Louisell, UC Legal Advisory Committee)

SPONSORS:

Kenneth Anger, Ford Fellow, Film-maker

C. West Churchman, Professor of Business Administration and Associate Director of the Space Sciences Laboratory, UC Berkeley

Art Hoppe, Columnist, SF Chronicle

John Paterson, Associate Professor of English and Assistant Dean of the College of Letters and Science, UC Berkeley

Although we do not necessarily agree with every argument in this leaflet, we urge the academic community to give generous support to these students' appeal.

Please send your checks to:

DUE PROCESS

Box #830

Berkeley, Calif. 94701

On the afternoon of March 2, John Thomson, a young poet, sat down at the Bancroft Strip holding a small card bearing the phrase "Fuck (verb)", intending (he explained) to protest against the war in Viet Nam. About an hour later he was arrested by a Campus policeman.

At that time the Campus was in a state of amicable bustle. Political groups were sharing their place in the sun with fraternities. The Campus reacted like any healthy academic community -- with vigorous discussion. Are the obscenity laws too strict? Too lax? Out of date? What had John Thomson's sign to do with Viet Nam? All sides of the incident were discussed during the ensuing days in formal rallies, and after the noon hour "a dozen heated little debates broke out among the students who had participated" (S.F. Chronicle). Tabu words were used and eight more arrests were made.

It must be emphasized that at this stage the Campus was in no special state of uproar; arrests have been an occupational hazard of students since mediaeval times. The uproar came from off campus. The resentments which had built up in the State of California against the FSM had found a scapegoat. By Tuesday of the

following week, the President and the Chancellor had resigned. On Saturday, the full Board of Regents - including Brown, Anderson, and Unruh - met in emergency session. The resignations were finally withdrawn after an ominous promise by President Kerr that "proceedings are now under way to discipline the students involved in an orderly and prompt way".

On the following Wednesday (March 17) charges against four students - Dave Bills, Art Goldberg, Mike Klein and Nicholas Zvegintzov - were filed by the Dean of Men with the "Ad Hoc Committee on Student Conduct". Because of the grave sanctions implicitly threatened against the defendants and against the prosecuting University, the proceedings of this Committee never obtained a calm objectivity. The students charged "railroading"; the Committee countercharged obstruction. Defendants and Committee exchanged angry accusations of insulting behavior. University Counsel played the role of prosecuting D.A. The final sentences were unprecedently harsh -- three suspensions, one expulsion.

These sentences were hasty and unjust. The academic careers and reputations of the four have been jeopardized in symbolic retribution for the hubris of the Free Speech Movement. To enable these students to make an appeal through the Courts, they now appeal to you for a contribution. Please give generously to their appeal fund. It has been given the name "DUE PROCESS FUND"

The students will go before the Superior Court of Alameda County or before the Federal District Court and ask for an order requiring the University either to stay the sentences pending a re-hearing or to void the sentences entirely. The students will argue that the University, as an agency of the State, is subject to all the provisions of the U.S. Constitution. In particular, they will argue:

(1) In Dixon vs. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F.2d 150 (1961), (a similar case involving a disciplinary hearing in a State University) the Court held that if a hearing committee does not make the final decision the defendants must have the opportunity to make comments on the committee's recommendations before the final decision is made. The students and their lawyer were not shown the Ad Hoc Committee's report until Chancellor Meyerson had handed down the sentences.

(2) In Belshaw vs. City of Berkeley, Alameda County Superior Court #33851 (1964), (the "firemen" case) the Court ruled that the phrase "conduct reflecting discredit on the City of Berkeley" is unconstitutionally vague. The students will argue that "conduct unbecoming a student" is similarly vague.

(3) The University refused to delay the hearings until after the verdict in the concurrent criminal prosecutions, yet used the concurrent proceedings as a pretext for withholding items of evidence - the original police reports of Lieuts. Chandler and Halloran and the transcript of the University tape of the rallies - requested by the defendants. The students will argue that this violated their: 6th Amendment right "to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in [their] favor", and will cite Jencks vs. U.S., 353 U.S. 669 (1957), where the Court voided the decision of an administrative committee which had withheld a pertinent F.B.I. report.

(4) Goldberg and Klein will additionally argue on 1st Amendment grounds. All the students are charged with using or displaying various tabu words. In addition the charges and the findings make it clear that planning, addressing, and moderating the meetings of March 4 and 5, and introducing speakers, are held to intensify the violation. The students will argue that, under the 1st Amendment, all evidence of serious participation, of sustained discourse, and of deliberate coordination of discussion must be held to mitigate the violation.

page 2

questions—

WHAT DID THE STUDENTS DO? WHAT WERE THE SENTENCES ?

David Bills - for taking responsibility for a sign bearing John Thomson's word, in an appeal for defense funds –

suspension for the semester;

Michael Klein - for reading aloud the last eight paragraphs of Lady Chatterly's Lover in the Campus Police Station – suspension until September;

Arthur Goldberg - for moderating meetings in Sproul Hall Plaza –dismissal;

Nicholas Zvegintzov - for leading a football spell-out" using John Thomson's word - suspension until September.

WHAT IS OBSCENITY ?

"Obscene material is material which deals with sex in a manner appealing to the prurient interest ... All ideas having even the slightest redeeming social importance -- unorthodox ideas, controversial ideas, even ideas hateful to the prevailing climate of opinion -- have the full protection of first Amendment guarantees." (Justice Brennan, Roth vs. U.S., 354 U.S. 476, 1957)

DID THE STUDENTS' BEHAVIOR CONSTITUTE OBSCENITY ?

In intention at least, the students' behavior had social importance. Bills thought of the sign as protesting an unjust arrest. Goldberg explained at rallies that verbal tabus are mediators of class and racial discrimination. Klein argued that the tabu on frank speech in "mixed company" and the shibboleth of "shielding" women from certain words defines women as members of an inferior caste. Zvegintzov, a foreign student, parodied the grossness of American college sports fans.

SHOULD THESE STUDENTS HAVE KEPT THEIR IDEAS TO THEMSELVES ?

As one witness said at the hearing, "All rallies annoy someone". New ideas and new forms of expression are always uncomfortable. If these students succeeded in making others - willy nilly - think and discuss a forbidden topic, could that not be "conduct becoming a student" ?

DID THE COMMITTEE VIOLATE THE "DECEMBER 8 RESOLUTION" ?

Yes. On December 8 the Berkeley Division resolved that "the content of speech and advocacy should not be restricted by the University". The Campus must face the fact that this policy would make the University less restrictive than society at large (which admits restrictions on freedom of speech in the context of libel, fighting words, and obscenity). The supporters of the resolution argued that society - with its police and courts - would impose its own restrictions; additional restriction by the University is ignoble. The implementation of the policy will require courage.

WERE THE SENTENCES HARSH ?

Yes. One of the students lost a fellowship by his suspension. All have suffered the painful humiliation of exclusion from their chosen community. In the words of the Cole-Linde-O'Neil Memorandum to the Academic Freedom Committee: "University disciplinary sanctions, although not 'criminal' in the technical sense, are likely to be far more drastic in their effect than typical criminal penalties. Almost any student would rather pay a \$25 fine, or even serve a week in jail, than be expelled from college".

DO THE SENTENCES CONSTITUTE "DOUBLE JEOPARDY" ?

Perhaps. The Fifth Amendment forbids an agency of government to use its powers in a punitive fashion to compound a judicial penalty. When an individual connected with such an agency behaves so as to threaten its intrinsic interests, it may constitutionally proceed to sever his connection, provided the severance rests upon a careful analysis of what its intrinsic interests are. Out of the recriminations against these students has emerged the proposition that a University's intrinsic interests include "aesthetic considerations" and "decorum". Such a proposition rests on a Hollywood conception of a University. If an academic must have a suave manner or an equitable temperament and a University must have well-kept lawns, many of the world's finest minds and finest institutions are excluded.

DID THE STUDENTS "FLAUNT" THE WORDS ?

Webster defines "flaunt" as "to display boastfully, brazenly, or the like". These students come from an

environment -- a whole generation, perhaps -- that does not take verbal tabus very seriously. In using the words they perhaps intended to tease society; they had no notion of launching a brazen or boastful attack. Contrary to rumor, nobody marched around Campus with immense signs daubed with tabu words.

WHY SUCH AN ELABORATE FUND DRIVE ?

The students calculate that to take their case to the Supreme Court of California will cost them \$1,500. If they lose in the lower court, they will appeal; judging by the vehement participation of the Office of the Regents' Counsel in the prosecution before the Committee, they assume the University will appeal if they win. The cost of this flyer (\$75) comes from cash donations at a Sproul Hall Plaza rally.

DAVID BILLS (b. 1946, Marin Co., Calif / Publications: Editor, Redwood HS Orpheus, 1964 / Previous arrests: Sproul Hall)

"I'm quite surprised the Committee should ask me about myself. In seven months at Berkeley I haven't been asked to talk to a Professor for more than 30 seconds except about the FSM. This brutal lack of communication suggests to me a brutal lack of interest. I haven't been able to identify with your interests, gentlemen, and I doubt if you would identify with mine." (Statement to Ad Hoc Committee)

ARTHUR GOLDBERG (b. 1942, Inglewood, Calif; B.A., Berkeley, 1964; Graduate Program in Education; Chairman of SLATE, Spring 1964 / Previous arrests: Sheraton-Palace, Oakland Tribune, Sproul Hall)

"I have never been able to understand why certain words were considered obscene while others weren't. I became enraged over a sign that says 'I hate niggers' and I consider it to offend my standards of decency ... I also consider President Johnson's ordering the bombing of innocent women and children in Vietnam to be one of the greatest obscenities in American history, yet I do not see him being arrested for his obscene acts."

(Spider, 1, 2, p. 22)

MICHAEL KLEIN (b. 1939, Brooklyn, NY; B.A., Rochester, 1960; M.A., Minnesota, 1963; PhD student in English / Publications etc.: Pitch White (play); Moonlight Sonata (film); articles on Polish Cinema and Truffaut / Previous arrests: Sproul Hall)

"D.H. Lawrence's vision is the antithesis of that of the multiversity, his language the direct opposite of the jargon of the prophets of the multiversity. His defense of the equality of women calls on society to abolish the patriarchal system which denies women dignity and good jobs. There are few women on the Faculty, and there were none on our Committee." (Free Student - forthcoming)

NICHOLAS ZVEGINTZOV (b. 1940, England; B.A., Oxford, 1962; PhD student in Business; Ford Fellow, 1964-6; Irving Prize for American Wit and Humor, 1964 / Publications: Editor, Oxford Circus, 1961; various working papers and translations in computing and management science / Previous arrests: Sproul Hall)

"I want to remind the Committee of something only the University Counsel seems fully to understand -- that the procedural guarantees of due process exist to protect the defendant. We've been condemned by the Regents, the Legislature, Governor Brown, and the people of California. I don't think anything can prevent us getting squashed, but maybe due process will help. " (statement to Ad Hoc Committee)

quotes

It is deeply rooted in me that to use such words as "fuck", in public or in my presence, is wrong ... It comprises the same type of injury I would feel if someone were to accuse me of being a Communist, or to strike me ... My basic rights as a human being [include] my right not to be subjected to things which are contrary to my inner convictions.

Martin L. Van Loucks, complaint to UC Police Dept., March 5 1965

Four-letter words are suppressed because they have magic power over respectable society ... Frightened out of our wits by the breaking of [a] tabu, we accuse an intelligent and honest generation of degeneracy, when we should acknowledge their courage and their seriousness.

Prof. Richard Tansey, Conference on Sex Education, UC Med Center

The Division joins with the President, the Acting Chancellor, and the student body in condemning the willful flaunting of obscenity on this campus as a travesty of the legitimate uses of free speech...

UC Academic Senate, Berkeley Division, March 12 1965

The President and the Chancellor, who had, of course, immediately resigned, selflessly withdrew their resignations. "The issue", they said, "is not whether Sam should be strung up by the thumbs. We all agree to that. But simple justice requires we hold the proper hearings before we string him up by the thumbs."

Arthur Hoppe, SF Chronicle, March 17 1965

From the 15 page report we must assume the committee ignored the most essential issues in the case -- what is conduct unbecoming a student, what is obscenity, who were offended by the obscenities allegedly used, and when may a student use obscenities (or is a student constantly under purview of the fatherly eye of the University?) ... The committee showed no concern with the context of the allegedly obscene words. They admitted the words may have been motivated by "social protest" but claimed that makes no difference... The committee assumed throughout the report that the "obscenities", when used loudly in any public place, were "conduct unbecoming a student". No discussion was evident on whether this was valid.

Editorial, Daily Californian, April 28 1965

Issues of free speech in a democracy often arise out of marginal cases. We do not decide whether an issue has been raised by pointing to all the free speech that abounds. The hard case and the forlorn sect may give us trouble beyond their due, but they also summon us to reaffirm our fundamental commitments.

Prof. Philip Selznick, Commentary, March 1965