

Position paper of April 17, 1969 presented by Department Chairmen, the Dean of the Faculty and the President in response to the 9 points submitted to their attention by the concerned faculty.

We welcome the opportunity to respond to these 9 points in their specific relevance to the present crisis. The statement from our group issued publicly on the morning of April 16 was addressed of necessity to a far larger audience composed of the many and diverse campus groups whose advice we had either sought or gladly accepted.

The present response to the nine points seems to us all the more urgent since the concerned faculty have wisely considered the broader professional and philosophical implications of the present situation -- implications of which student behavior, faculty and administration concern, are only symptoms.

RESPONSES TO THE NINE POINTS

1. The relationship of the complainants to the pending work of the Grand Jury is far too complex to be discussed adequately in this paper. We hasten, however, to affirm our awareness of the disparity between the gravity of the charges against the 39 individuals and their purpose in provoking and accepting arrest. It is plain to all that although these individuals are under criminal charges they did not commit the actions which led to their arrest with what could be fairly described as criminal intentions. Finally, it seems to us inconceivable that, at this juncture in history and in the current political and social climate, a Grand Jury in New York City should remain insensitive to the foregoing considerations.

Submitter
voluntarily

More
political
not criminal

2. We believe that the restraint exercised in recent days, in the face of what we clearly perceive to be escalated provocation on the part of the Ad Hoc committee, is ample demonstration of our reluctance to bring outside authorities onto this campus. We welcome the occasion to affirm once more that, barring absolutely outrageous provocation, we will not abdicate our own responsibility for maintaining calm and order on this campus.

3. The first part of this position having already received positive response in our statement of April 16, we will say here only that the referendum concerning recruitment on campus promised by President McMurray will be held on

4. The case of Professor Henry Lesnick is highly complex. Here again an effort must be made to distinguish motive and intention from behavior. In this instance, it could be argued convincingly that the bylaw invoked in charging Professor Lesnick with unprofessional conduct may no longer be consonant with prevalent professional mores. In view of a felt disparity between the strictest interpretation of the bylaw concerned and a flexible view of the individual's freedom with respect to involvement in dissent to open controversial social causes, this group would recommend to the President that Professor Lesnick be restored to his former status.

5. By a happy coincidence, a Special Committee established last December by the University Senate has reviewed the bylaws of the Board of Higher Education and has made recommendations for major changes in the provisions for faculty voting rights and tenure. These recommendations include 1) extending faculty voting rights to all appointees on tenure-bearing lines, 2) the enfranchisement for internal departmental purposes of third-year and later reappointees on non-tenure bearing lines, 3) the option of departmental enfranchisement for all other full-time appointees including visiting and adjunct professors. A document suggesting liberalization, within the existing bylaws, of current departmental P & B procedures is now under consideration by the Council of the Deans. It is expected that the College P & B committee will receive these recommendations for its consideration in the near future.

With respect to specific opposition to the Max-Kahn report, our statement of April 16 recognizes the difficulties raised by the regulations that have been inferred from that report. The point raised here will

naturally come under serious consideration in the course of the open hearings that have been proposed for the purpose of examining in detail the entire Max-Kahn memorandum.

6, 7, 8. These three points must be viewed in their relation to the report by the Ad Hoc Faculty Student committee on College Governance. Although this report does not consider specifically the P & B system at either the departmental or the college level, it does place a mandate upon any eventual student-faculty academic senate to give these matters high priorities among its projected business. The same can be said with respect to improved grievance machinery which cannot come about without eventual adjustment in the present bylaws.

9. In view of the slowness of appeal machinery and given the time of year, we recognize the grave difficulties that Dr. Delaney might have in procuring a suitable position for a coming academic year in the event that her final appeal were rejected. We therefore recommend to the P & B committee of the English Department that in view of these considerations it undertake to see whether or not Dr. Delaney could not be offered a one-year terminal appointment for 1969-70.

Legal: make strong document
fact - fiction