

REPORT TO THE COMMUNITY

We left the Old Union Wednesday night when the result of the Academic Council's vote came. Our respect for the faculty's commitment to the justice of what we asked affirmed our decision that in the building our presence had been morally and tactically effective. The "occupation" forced an understanding of the seriousness and urgency of the issues by the student body, the Academic Council, and the administration.

These are the issues, as they were presented to the university Friday:

1. That the recommendation of the IJB not be accepted and that the case be dismissed;
2. That the IJB be disbanded;
3. That a permanent appellate board be set up in the following way:

It will be composed of nine members, four members will be students, chosen by students, four members will be faculty, chosen by faculty, and one member will be chosen by the other eight from the Law School student body.

4. That this appellate board hear only appeals from defendants.

The Academic Council formulated its own proposals, primarily those of Professor Holman of the Medical School. They incorporated point two and the substance of point 1, but offered President Sterling the option of reopening the CIA case before a student-faculty judicial board to be selected by himself. In principle the Council accepted the recommendations of the Committee of 15 on judicial reform, but more complete discussion is necessary before the faculty body can ratify the C-15's solution. Given the present mood of the campus, President Sterling should be expected to accept immediately the Academic Council's disavowal of the IJB's recommended suspensions.

Many of those who sat in have strong reservations about the C-15 proposal in that it does not provide for appeals, for equal application of rules to all members of the university community, or for faculty selection of faculty judicial members. The C-15 proposal therefore leaves unamended a basic flaw in the political structure of this university: faculty and students lack the franchise to make and enforce decisions about their own lives. The C-15 denied faculty and students this responsibility by leaving selection of judicial board members to the administration.

On very different grounds, Provost Lyman pleaded at the Academic Council against the Holman proposal. Lyman claimed that accepting the proposal would encourage actions similar to the Union Occupation or demonstrations of a destructive nature.

Yet such demonstrations would not occur if there were an equitable division of power and responsibility within the university community. The present system is not equitable and cannot fail to create crisis situations like the events of this past week. At present, power and responsibility for decision rests with the trustees and administration. Future militant responses by students can be avoided if the Board of Trustees and the administration are willing to accept equitable distributions of power.

WE WILL HOLD ANOTHER OPEN MEETING IN WHITE PLAZA, NOON, THURSDAY.