

The New York Times

# Stanford Risks Sanction in Drug Dispute

By Katherine Bishop,

April 23, 1991



See the article in its original context from April 23, 1991, Section A, Page 12 Buy Reprints

[VIEW ON TIMSMACHINE](#)

TimesMachine is an exclusive benefit for home delivery and digital subscribers.

## About the Archive

This is a digitized version of an article from The Times's print archive, before the start of online publication in 1996. To preserve these articles as they originally appeared, The Times does not alter, edit or update them.

Occasionally the digitization process introduces transcription errors or other problems. Please send reports of such problems to [archive\\_feedback@nytimes.com](mailto:archive_feedback@nytimes.com).

In its latest attempt to compel universities to enforce its anti-drug policies, the Government has warned Stanford University that it risks losing Federal money because an instructor there has advocated drug use and boasted of carrying illegal drugs on campus.

Stanford announced today that Donald Kennedy, president of the university, had ordered an investigation to determine whether the instructor, Stuart T. Reges, a lecturer in computer science, had "intentionally violated university policy on drugs and alcohol." The School of Engineering has placed Mr. Reges, 32 years old, on paid leave pending completion of the investigation, said Susan K. Hoergor, senior university counsel.

Mr. Reges said in an interview today that he was stunned by the Government's action. "It seems obvious to me that it is an infringement of my privacy and free speech rights and of intellectual freedom for me to express an opinion," he said. "What they call drug education is indoctrination. Drug users are becoming in the 90's what Communists were in the 50's." Objecting to Boundaries

Mr. Reges said that while he supported efforts to stop drug use among high school and elementary school students he believed the Government was "trying to move the boundary to include university students among the children."

The Government's warning comes a month after a drug raid involving Federal authorities at the University of Virginia and a declaration last week by Bob Martinez, Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, that the Bush Administration would monitor universities' efforts to comply with federally imposed anti-drug policies.

Stanford rules prohibit possession, distribution or use of drugs on campus, in the workplace or as part of any university activity. Violations can result in

sanctions, including dismissal.

The dispute comes as the private university in Palo Alto is already reeling from criticism about its use of public money. A Congressional panel is looking into whether Stanford might have overcharged the Government as much as \$200 million in the 1980's through improper claims for reimbursement on federally financed research projects.

The university acted after Mr. Kennedy was notified by Mr. Martinez that Mr. Reges, an instructor at Stanford since 1979, had written the Office of National Drug Control Policy to express his disagreement with the Government's anti-drug campaign. Mr. Reges took exception to provisions requiring universities receiving Federal money to take action against illegal drug use on campus.

In the March 28 letter, Mr. Reges told Mr. Martinez, "I am doing everything I can to make fools of you," including carrying illegal drugs in his backpack while on campus.

Mr. Reges told of how he had advised an undergraduate student about experimenting with the drug MDA, a chemical variation of amphetamine that produces euphoria. He also indicated that he had used university money to provide alcohol to students under the legal drinking age of 21 at a university-related dinner.

In his letter to Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Martinez said, "In all candor, I would find it beyond comprehension that a man who openly professes to have encouraged an undergraduate to ingest MDA could continue to enjoy faculty privileges at a pace-setting institution like Stanford University."

Mr. Martinez also reminded Mr. Kennedy that the university must insure that its drug policy was enforced if it was to "retain eligibility for Federal funding and financial assistance."

In copies of his correspondence furnished by Mr. Martinez's office, Mr. Reges says that an undergraduate student sought his advice about MDA, telling Mr. Reges he had already had "positive experiences" with other hallucinogens, like marijuana and LSD.

"I naturally reassured him that he had nothing to worry about and should go ahead and experiment with MDA," Mr. Reges wrote. He added that the two had a long discussion about "the important intellectual and spiritual lessons to learn from our drug use."

In letters to the campus newspaper last November, Mr. Reges described MDA as "my own personal favorite drug" because its primary effects are euphoria "and a sense of liking everyone."

"About the most dangerous thing you might do under the influence of MDA that you wouldn't do otherwise would be to hug or kiss someone," Mr. Reges wrote. He advised readers to openly defy campus drug policy and to refuse to allow the Government to dictate private behavior between consenting adults.

Benjamin F. Banta 4th, Mr. Martinez's press secretary, said today that Mr. Martinez had no further comment beyond his letter to Mr. Kennedy.

Federal money makes up nearly 30 percent of Stanford's annual budget. The university expects to receive \$122 million for the 1991-1992 school year. Only tuition provides a larger source of income.

A version of this article appears in print on April 23, 1991, Section A, Page 12 of the National edition with the headline: Stanford Risks Sanction in Drug Dispute