

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 278

HE 001 377

TITLE REPORT OF THE SPECIAL TRUSTEE COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS UNREST AT CORNELL.

INSTITUTION CORNELL UNIV., ITHACA, N.Y.

PUB DATE 5 SEP 69

NOTE 70P.

AVAILABLE FROM OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, 620 COLLEGE AVENUE, ITHACA, NEW YORK 14850 (\$1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.60

DESCRIPTORS *ACADEMIC FREEDOM, *ACTIVISM, ADMINISTRATION, *AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDIES, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS, GOVERNING BOARDS, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *NEGRO STUDENTS, STUDENT BEHAVIOR, STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP

IDENTIFIERS *CORNELL UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

THE SPECIAL TRUSTEE COMMITTEE WAS CHARGED WITH INVESTIGATING THE SEIZURE BY BLACK STUDENTS OF WILLARD STRAIGHT HALL AT CORNELL, AND ALL SURROUNDING CIRCUMSTANCES, UNDERLYING ISSUES AND FORCES THAT HAVE BEEN TROUBLING THE CAMPUS. THEIR REPORT DESCRIBES THE EVENTS THAT OCCURRED BETWEEN THE MORNING OF APRIL 18, THROUGH THE AFTERNOON OF APRIL 23, 1969. INFORMATION WAS OBTAINED BY INTERVIEWING ABOUT 750 PERSONS: FACULTY, STUDENTS, TRUSTEES, ADMINISTRATORS AND ALUMNI. THE RESPONDENTS CITED PROBLEMS IN: (1) THE HANDLING OF DISCIPLINE AND THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM; (2) THE ADMINISTRATION AND HANDLING OF COSEP (COMMITTEE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION PROJECTS) AND AFRO AMERICAN STUDIES PROGRAMS; (3) THE QUESTION AND PROTECTION OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM FOR FACULTY AND STUDENTS; AND (4) THE LACK OF COMMUNICATION AMONG ALL ELEMENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY. RECOMMENDATIONS ARE MADE ON EACH OF THESE ISSUES AND SUGGESTIONS FOR A MORE EFFECTIVE ROLE FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES. (AF)

ED036278

The Report of
the Special Trustee
Committee on

Campus Unrest at Cornell

Submitted to the Board of Trustees
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
September 5, 1969

SPECIAL TRUSTEE COMMITTEE

Morton Adams, Walter G. Barlow, (Miss) Patricia J. Carry,
H. Hays Clark, Charles E. Dykes, H. Victor Grohmann,
Royse P. Murphy, William R. Robertson, CHAIRMAN

U S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY

HE001377

Contents

Charge to the Committee	4
Introduction	5
A Chronological Report	9
Discipline and the Judicial System	31
COSEP and Afro-American Studies	41
Academic Freedom	57
Communication	63
Responsibility of the Trustees	71

Charge to the Committee

The Special Trustee Committee

This Committee is charged with the full responsibility for an investigation of the seizure of Willard Straight Hall and all surrounding circumstances, the underlying issues and forces that have been troubling the campus and that reached a climax with the seizure of the building, and the complex of issues raised during that week. Based upon its findings, the Committee is also charged with making positive recommendations designed to preserve the academic freedom and integrity of all members of the Cornell University community, and to enable the University to resolve the issues raised in a peaceful and orderly manner.

I have requested the administration of the University, as well as the members of the faculty and student body, when called upon, to cooperate fully with the Committee. The Committee is authorized to retain or employ such outside assistance as it deems necessary to complete its findings effectively.

The urgency for prompt completion of this report is evident. However, because of the magnitude of this assignment, it should be stressed that the thoroughness of the investigation is of greater significance. The Board of Trustees requests a progress report from this Committee at the next Board meeting, June 8, in Ithaca.

Finally, on behalf of the Board of Trustees, may I express our sincere appreciation for your devotion to Cornell, as shown by your willingness to accept this difficult assignment. In a period of severe crisis, there is a great challenge and a real opportunity for this Committee to contribute much to the future of an even greater Cornell.

Robert W. Purcell
CHAIRMAN, CORNELL UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Introduction

American universities, facing most unusual and difficult problems, are being forced to undertake searching self-examination. Those institutions, such as Cornell, where confrontation and disruptions have been present, are of course deeply involved, but the self-examination in higher education today is going on on a world-wide basis.

The modern university is torn between the ever more complex responsibility of teaching and research on the one hand and, on the other, the pressures from an activist society to involve higher education directly in the solution of civilization's deepening social problems. What the balance of emphasis should be represents a most important question yet to be answered.

The ravaging effects of inflation bear down heavily on the university of today. And the financial squeeze is increasing because today's society is placing more and more emphasis on students' going on to college, and consequently larger numbers continuing on to graduate school. Growing deficits pose the dilemma of having to reduce the quality or quantity of education given or go still further down the route of governmentally-financed higher education.

Today's students have been extensively studied, at first with the belief that their actions and thoughts were somehow the modern form of youthful rebellion, inflamed by an activist few. But the unrest and frustration of these students is neither a passing fad nor limited to the few. The disapproval of society in general, and higher education in particular, by so many articulate and intelligent students must continue to be a highest level concern for boards of trustees and university administrations alike.

This Committee has been privileged to interview a large number of students, both singly and in groups. Without exception,

6

these young people have great intellectual and social curiosity. They are well informed. They are experiencing deep frustrations about the war in Vietnam, blight in our cities, racial strife, and poverty in a world of affluence. They are demanding and are determined to get better answers. But even more, they expect action. Those at the helm of Cornell or any other university cannot escape a basic confrontation with the aroused youth of today.

It is against this backdrop of widespread pressures and the sobering Willard Straight occupation that the Board of Trustees of Cornell University appointed the Special Trustees Committee. The Board gave it an explicit charge to investigate events leading up to the Willard Straight occupation, the event itself, and subsequent happenings, and to make appropriate recommendations back to the Board. (The Committee's charge appears at the beginning of this report.)

What stood out from the start of our inquiry was that there were several problem areas on the Cornell campus, somewhat interrelated. These were problems not easily solved and deep-seated in the minds of many, that had caused a polarization among highly intelligent and concerned groups of people. It is hard to hear this testimony, sometimes expressed with bitterness, sometimes with bias and prejudice, but generally with sincerity, without becoming confused by such diverse views. It takes time for quiet reflection and deliberation to sort out these varied opinions.

The full committee has held nine two-day meetings since May 23. There have also been many smaller meetings involving some of the members. Countless hours have been spent by each member in studying reports, minutes, and the transcripts of the testimony and in the preparation of this report.

From its initial meeting, the Committee concluded that it should make itself available to those who wished to testify, as well as to those it expressly needed to interview. This occasioned more meetings than otherwise would have been the case, but the Committee is convinced that this policy contributed to the generally favorable campus reaction to the Committee's work as it progressed. The Committee sought at all times to apply itself conscientiously to its charge, to pursue diligently the facts, and to be frank and honest in reporting its findings and making its recommendations.

Jackson O. Hall, director of public affairs education programs during the period of the Committee's work, has served as the administrative assistant to this Committee since its inception.

President James A. Perkins kindly arranged for his services, which were many, varied, and sometimes on sensitive assignments. It would have been most difficult for the eight widely scattered members of the Committee to have pursued their charge without the strong support and help given it by Hall. For all his fine assistance, the Committee wishes to express its deep appreciation.

To assist it in its efforts, the Committee retained James F. Henry, Esquire, a partner in the New York law firm of Lovejoy, Wasson, Huppuch and Lundgren. He worked with the Committee primarily in its study of the judicial system and its application at Cornell. His input was a valuable contribution.

In order to have the best understanding of the thinking of important segments of the Cornell Community, this Trustee Committee retained the services of Douglas Williams Associates, Inc., a New York attitude research firm. Their representatives, working from Ithaca as a base, have talked with a total of approximately 750 persons—students, faculty, administration, trustees, and alumni. This was handled by personal interviews or by telephone, each interview averaging forty-five minutes. These inquiries were conducted in depth. Questions were asked of those interviewed concerning their feelings on matters in the sensitive problem areas into which this Committee is probing. This Committee feels that Williams Associates has achieved an impressive result in accomplishing this field work in less than two months.

The findings of the Williams report, which are expected to be presented at the October meeting of the Board of Trustees, will be of the utmost value in following through on the recommendations contained herein.

The Committee has been greatly impressed by the full cooperation it has received from those who came before it. Promised anonymity, they spoke openly and fully. Their deep concern and affection for Cornell was a gratifying feature of this assignment.

It should be pointed out that on three occasions student members of the SDS were invited to testify and at no time did they appear. Certain of the blacks also declined invitations, although we heard from many blacks, including students, faculty, and others.

The Committee makes special note that the statements of fact and the views expressed in this report simply reflect our best effort to record the testimony of the persons interviewed and our reflections on this testimony. We do not contend that the facts have been established beyond a reasonable doubt. It is not our purpose to hold any person or group of persons up to public

8

criticism. It is our purpose to report faithfully and fully to the Board of Trustees the results of our weeks of study and inquiry.

In the charge from the Board of Trustees, the first request was that the Committee investigate the events surrounding the seizure of Willard Straight Hall. On the pages immediately following is the account of this event.

A Chronological Report

**Friday Morning, April 18,
through
Wednesday Afternoon,
April 23, 1969**

The preparation of a report on the events surrounding and including the seizure by the blacks of Willard Straight Hall might appear to be a routine reporting assignment. However, to relate this story with accuracy and fairness has proven to be a difficult task.

The Carter Commission Report,* which covered brief spans of this period in depth, stated in its introduction:

We have been unable to arrive at a wholly satisfactory, factual basis. The testimony conflicts; the pieces do not quite fit together; the facts do not always speak for themselves. One of the things we have learned in four weeks of investigation, discussion, and reflection is that the community cannot even agree on the facts, to say nothing of judgments and interpretations. An atmosphere of crisis and fear creates poor observers. The facts do not make sense apart from the tissue of mistake, conjecture, and misrepresentation that surrounds them. A rumor believed has the same motive force as a fact, even after an event has occurred, even at times after the rumor has been challenged or exposed.

This Trustee Committee experienced this same difficulty in its task of putting together this chronicle. Based on substantial evidence presented in various written reports and in testimony

*Report of the President's Committee to investigate police activities related to a burning cross incident and the attack on Willard Straight Hall.

given before this Committee, the following factual report is presented.

The disruption of Cornell's campus life in the period from Friday morning, April 18, through Wednesday, April 23, 1969, had its most tangible origins in the black students' impatience with the alleged procrastination of the administration in response to strong demands for a black college and a black studies program. Back in December and January the black students carried out a series of comparatively minor disruptions, having the apparent purpose of testing the tolerance limits of the Cornell community, as well as drawing attention to their position. When six of them were cited in February to appear before the Conduct Board for these alleged violations, the Afro-American Society argued that these persons were acting politically on behalf of the entire AAS, that there were no blacks serving in the judicial system, and that the University adjudicatory system was not in a position to judge a question involving the University itself. They apparently refused to recognize the system.

More than four months after the events of December 12, the Conduct Board finally handed down reprimands to three of the black students and acquitted two. The sixth student cited had withdrawn from the University. These decisions were reached and announced at 2:00 A.M. on Friday, April 18.

The next significant event occurred shortly thereafter at Wari House, 208 Dearborn Place, a cooperative for sophomores, juniors, and senior women whose admissions to Cornell have been sponsored by COSEP (Committee on Special Educational Projects). Eleven coeds resided there. Miss Charisse Cannady, a senior and head resident there, was awakened by a brick thrown at a window in her bedroom on the ground floor of the frame house. She quickly went to the window and saw a burning cross on the front porch steps. At 2:53 A.M. she pulled the fire alarm in the building. After seeing that all the girls were aroused and safe, she gathered them in the kitchen and, being well aware of the racial overtones of this burning cross, had the girls lie on the floor.

Police from three sources were promptly at the scene: City of Ithaca, Cornell Division of Safety and Security, and Cayuga Heights. A city detective who was patrolling nearby reached the scene almost immediately, found the cross burning on the steps, and removed it to the front yard. He and a Cornell campus patrolman smothered the fire. This police action took only about four minutes from the time Miss Cannady turned in the alarm at 2:53 A.M. Beginning at 2:57 A.M. there were three fire alarms

set off within a two-minute period from three of the women's large dormitories—Donlon, Dickson, and Risley Halls.

The Ithaca and campus police were ordered to report immediately to these dormitories, which housed many coeds. The burning cross had been quickly extinguished. The Cayuga Heights patrolman did not go to these other alarms since the dormitories are all located within the City of Ithaca. He returned to his regular patrol route and continued to check 208 Dearborn Place periodically.

All three of these alarms were false; they were among eleven such false alarms set off in University buildings between 1:43 and 5:08 A.M. Officials have no knowledge of who set off any of these false alarms or of the purpose behind this irresponsible action.

According to Safety Division records, at 3:20 A.M., less than a half hour after the cross-burning was first discovered, a campus patrolman returned to 208 Dearborn Place and remained there until 3:40 A.M. when he was relieved by another campus patrolman who policed the premises until later in the morning.

At 3:30 A.M. Mrs. Ruth Darling, associate dean of students, telephoned the Safety Division because Miss Cannady had called her requesting protection for Wari House. The campus patrolman on duty apparently had not made known his presence to the residents. He was instructed to do so and did immediately, before being relieved at 3:40 A.M.

At approximately 5:30 A.M., with the first light of day, two men from the Safety Division went to 208 Dearborn Place and took pictures of the window which had been broken, of the steps where the cross had been burning, and of some footprints which were found outside. The cross itself was about six feet long and three feet wide and had been wrapped in white cloth, which had not been completely burned. It was later determined that the wood came from the Campus Store, being sold there frequently for use in art courses. There is no official knowledge of who may have been responsible for the cross-burning.

The long-standing resentment over the slow progress of the black studies program, plus the recent decisions against the blacks by a judicial system whose validity they did not recognize, followed closely by the cross-burning at Wari House—these were the apparent irritants which led to the take-over of Willard Straight Hall. The blacks, numbering between fifty and one hundred (the estimates vary widely), entered Willard Straight Hall at approximately 5:30 A.M. Saturday, April 19. This was Parents Weekend at Cornell and the blacks indicated that they

planned the building take over for that weekend to make their plight known to the parents. They chose Willard Straight Hall because, particularly on a weekend such as this, there is a high level of activity in the building, involving many students. The take-over of the building would interfere with the lives of many, thus publicizing their cause to a very great extent.

From the black students themselves, it was learned that there were more women than men in the group taking over the building. There were also about ten non-students from downtown Ithaca, believed to have been of high school age, in Willard Straight at least part of the time during its occupation.

The blacks immediately began their take-over by securing the building, removing the employees from the building, and then the overnight guests. There were three groups of blacks who had been assigned to clear the building of its occupants: one group to handle the house department employees, another the dining employees, and the third the guests.

The Safety Division received the first word from the employees at 5:38 A.M., notifying them that the building was being seized by some blacks. The first calls to the Safety Division from guests came at 5:48 A.M. The Safety Division told people to lock their doors but later indicated to the guests that they should not resist and should follow the directions of the blacks. There were about 30 guests occupying the bedrooms of Willard Straight Hall that night, mostly parents who were there for Parents Weekend.

These guests were awakened, given ten minutes to dress, pack up, and leave. They were dealt with firmly, reasonably politely, and courteously, although there were reports by guests of several unpleasant experiences, none physical. The guests were led down the main stairway through the Memorial Room, down the back service stairway to the basement, and out of the building from a loading dock on the west side of the building.

The guests were asked to pack their bags, but in the confusion some left without packing all of their belongings. Later that day arrangements were made so that the guests received their property, with apparently no significant losses reported.

Although one or two of those ejected said that they saw several guns and at least one white girl, most guests and employees reported seeing no such weapons and no whites. It is felt by the Committee that the take-over was led by members of the Afro-American Society, who entered the building without guns, and no whites were among them.

Among those originally entering the building, a group carried

a large supply of wire, chains, and rope with which to secure the entrances to the building. This work was quickly completed and by shortly before 6:15 A.M. all persons except the blacks were out of the building, and it was secured.

The campus patrol arrived before 6:00 A.M. and verified that the east and west doors were secured from within the building. They assisted the guests and employees who had been evicted, taking or guiding them to Sage Graduate Center. The campus police on duty in front and in back were instructed to inform persons approaching Willard Straight of the take-over and not to allow anyone to attempt to enter the building. At about 6:30 A.M. a black couple came up the hill, verified that the building was taken over, and asked to go in and join the occupants. Eugene Dymek, director of the Safety Division, ordered his men to permit blacks to enter the building. The policy of the Safety Division was thus established. The building was not to be closed off, nor isolated. Whites were not to enter, but to be steered away. Blacks, however, might come and go at will.

At 7:05 A.M. a group of about fifty SDS members arrived from Anabel Taylor Hall and began picketing in front of the building in support of the blacks' action. At the request of the police, they stayed off the main sidewalk on Central Avenue. About one hour later they were carrying signs. Later in the day the SDS group had grown to around 150. They indicated that they would protect the blacks in Willard Straight from any attacks by white student groups.

Between 7:30 and 8:00 A.M. Vice Provost Keith Kennedy tried unsuccessfully to talk on the telephone with Edward Whitfield, president of the Afro-American Society. At approximately 9:15 A.M. University Counsel Neal Stamp, Safety Division Director Dymek, and Kennedy appeared in front of the building, asking to speak with Whitfield. When Whitfield appeared at the window, Kennedy asked to talk with him in person. Whitfield said that he would discuss the request with his colleagues. When he failed to appear, Dymek, on Stamp's instructions, took a bullhorn, identified himself, and demanded the evacuation of the building. This order was repeated several times as Dymek walked around the building.

At about 9:35 A.M. about twenty-five white students, mostly, if not all, from the DU fraternity (Delta Upsilon), tried to gain admission to the Straight through a window with a broken pane on the south side ground level of the building. This window leads into the studio of WVBR, a student-operated radio station. Of

14

this group approximately a dozen entered the building, and some of them got as far as the bottom of the steps leading to the Ivy Room. Here they were met and turned back by the black men and forced to leave by the same window they entered. Three whites and one black were injured in the melee; all were treated at the Gannett Clinic next door. None of the injuries was regarded as particularly serious. Harsh words and threats were exchanged inside and outside while the whites were retreating.

The DU's were able to gain access to the building despite the policy set up by the campus patrol that whites should stay away because all seven campus police on duty at the Straight at this time were guarding the front and rear doors. There was none stationed on either the north or south sides of the building.

Whatever the motives were that brought on this action by the DU students, the abortive attempt to gain entrance was ill-conceived and irresponsible in the minds of this Committee. Certainly, this act was an important contributing factor to the blacks' growing fear of reprisal by the whites for the building take-over. This fear apparently was a major cause of the later introduction of arms.

At 8:00 A.M. that Saturday, the members of the University administration who were in Ithaca began their deliberations. Stamp first met with President Perkins in his office in Day Hall. Because of rumors of a possible take-over of Day Hall by SDS to show sympathy for the blacks, this meeting was moved before 8:30 A.M. to the White Art Museum where these men were joined by Kennedy, Controller Arthur H. Peterson, Vice Presidents Mark Barlow and Steven Muller, and by Dymek and Lowell T. George of the Safety Division. Faculty Trustees W. David Curtiss and Royse P. Murphy were present by invitation. Dale R. Corson, then University provost, and Robert Miller, dean of the Faculty, were in New York City and returned to Ithaca early Saturday evening. Stuart Brown, vice president for academic affairs, remained in Day Hall.

The discussion at the meeting in the Andrew Dickson White Study turned to the use of the court injunction. Stamp emphasized that the blacks occupying Willard Straight would have to be ordered to leave before an injunction could be used. It was at this time that it was decided that Stamp, Kennedy and Dymek should go to the Straight and make their demands that the blacks leave as stated above.

President Perkins had indicated that without discussion with representative groups of faculty and students, he did not want

to recommend police force, such as could result from an injunction. In this manner, should police action be necessary, he hoped to avoid the bitterness generated by the administration at Harvard, which reportedly decided on the forceful eviction of the radical students from University Hall without either consultation or notice to its faculty or students.

Because there has been no student government at Cornell since the student body voted to abolish it in 1968, the task of consulting with a representative student group was made most difficult, if not really impossible. Therefore, it was decided by the administration that the Faculty Council should meet, and Acting Dean of the Faculty Ernest F. Roberts, Jr., convened this meeting at 11:00 A.M. in Myron Taylor Hall. Many members of the Faculty Council were away that weekend. By prearrangement six additional faculty members were invited to attend, as well as eight students chosen from a list of volunteers submitted by Vice President for Student Affairs Barlow. Members of the administration sat in on this meeting. This group expressed a strong sentiment for the settlement of this take-over without the use of violence. They awaited the demands from the AAS which Whitfield had promised Kennedy at 11:30 A.M. These were finally delivered to Kennedy at 12:30 P.M., just after the Faculty Council had adjourned for lunch.

Earlier that morning, at 9:00 A.M., President Perkins was scheduled to talk to the Parents Weekend group in Alice Statler Auditorium. There were rumors that the SDS might try to take over that building or have an unpleasant confrontation with the President. It was decided that Barlow should represent the President on that occasion.

After the DU incident, retaliatory feeling among the white students was running high. Vice President Muller went on the air over station WVBR asking students to remain calm—to cool it! Elmer Meyer, Jr., dean of students and assistant vice president for student affairs, and his assistant, Albert Miles, went to Noyes Student Center to talk reason with a group of students, mostly fraternity men who had gathered there after the DU's had been ejected from the Straight. This meeting turned into an IFC (Interfraternity Council) meeting. They elected a representative to the meeting of the Faculty Council and agreed to have him request of that group an injunction against the black students occupying Willard Straight Hall.

The demands of the AAS were three in number: 1) that the judicial action against the five black students be nullified; 2) that

16

the University reopen housing negotiations; and 3) that a full investigation of the cross-burning at Wari House be undertaken. Later that afternoon the demand regarding housing was dropped, but the third was amended to include an investigation of the attack by the DU group.

At 1:00 P.M. a meeting of the IFC Steering Committee was held. A statement drawn up by this group was ratified by the full IFC, 43 to 2, at 2:00 P.M. The statement opposed the use of the injunction or the intervention of civil authorities because they felt it would lead to further violence.

At 3:30 P.M. the augmented Faculty Council reconvened in Myron Taylor Hall, together with some members of the administration. They deliberated over the demands made by the blacks, control of fraternity groups, the DU incident, and ways of dislodging the students. It was agreed that for the time being there would be no injunction and police would not be summoned. It was decided that Acting Dean Roberts and Kennedy should talk with Whitfield, the AAS president. They went to the Straight and discussed with Whitfield various options, such as appealing the cases against the blacks to the Student Faculty Appellate Board. This he rejected as implying recognition of the validity of that judicial system. This talk led to no agreement or progress toward one.

A large part of Saturday, Stamp had been working on the papers to request a court injunction, and he had been in contact with police and court officials.

Saturday afternoon at 1:00 the SDS held a meeting at Anabel Taylor Hall where they discussed plans for the seizure of Day Hall. That evening at 8:30 the IFC and SDS sponsored a teach-in in Bailey Hall. There was strong sentiment for the blacks among these students, the feeling being that the judicial system had broken down in the handling of their case. IFC representatives made a strong pro-black statement which was received with cheers.

There was much informal action by small groups all day long and rumors were steadily growing in number. There had been a strong feeling of resentment between many blacks and whites prior to the cross-burning. There was resentment by many in the campus community over lack of discipline applied to violations of the conduct code by black militants and other activists. The unsolved muggings by blacks (not known whether students or non-students) and the rumored purchase of guns and ammunition by both blacks and whites all contributed to tense racial feeling

on the campus before the take-over of the building. The seizure and the incident of the DU students obviously made the campus even more tense. And so the rumors had an atmosphere of distrust and fear in which to grow and spread. The Dean of Students' office set up a rumor clinic to which anyone might call to check the veracity of a story or rumor as he heard it. This office, with three phones, was used constantly and, without doubt, had a calming effect.

The planning by the blacks included a communication system after they had taken over the building. They had the use of telephones. They also had brought along intercom equipment and could talk with observers outside whom they had placed in strategic locations on the campus. The result was that the blacks heard these rumors and such threats as: 1) a bomb was to go off in Willard Straight Hall; 2) the Wari House was to be burned; 3) a group of fraternity men were gathering at Noyes Lodge, drinking, and were organizing to attack the Straight. From time to time reports came in that other groups were collecting with arms to drive up to the Straight and "get back their building." The blacks had made a bold move in taking over the building. They had had time to think about it, and they knew that there was strong feeling on the campus. Witnesses agreed that they became truly frightened.

At 8:00 that night President Perkins met at his home with members of his staff. Roberts, Barlow and Kennedy were present and shortly were joined by Dean of the Faculty Miller and Provost Corson, who had just returned from New York City. At about 9:00 P.M. they received a call from Whitfield inquiring about a rumor that eight carloads of students with guns were coming toward Willard Straight. Whitfield wanted to know what the University was going to do about it. Roberts checked with the Safety Division which confirmed that there was such a rumor, but stated that they could find no substance behind it. The administration tried to reach Whitfield to pass on this information, but the lines were tied up and they were unable to get through to him.

This meeting at the President's house was just breaking up at about 10:15 P.M. when word was received that between 9:45 and 10:00 P.M. the campus patrolmen on duty behind Willard Straight had observed blacks taking guns into Willard Straight Hall.

At 10:30 P.M. Kennedy went to the Safety Division and telephoned Whitfield. Whitfield admitted the presence of arms in the Straight. He said they were only for protection; the blacks had no confidence that the campus patrol would protect them from

the threatened attacks by the whites. Kennedy tried to persuade him to have the blacks leave the building, and he offered to bring buses around to take them home. The answer was negative. He then requested Whitfield to bring the guns out and put them in the trunk of Kennedy's car. Whitfield hesitated quite a while and finally turned down this request.

As he left Perkins's home, Provost Corson commented, "It's a new ballgame." He also went to the Safety Division headquarters, where he stayed until a bomb threat to Barton Hall forced him to leave. While the rumor about the bomb was coming in, there were false alarms, a bad fire at the Chi Psi Fraternity house (actually two separate fires of suspicious origin, although the Ithaca Fire Department has decided that arson was not involved); and a rumored sniper in the Library Tower who turned out to be a night watchman replacing a light bulb in the tower. There were rumors of carloads of white students roaming the campus with guns. These were never confirmed. Corson later reported to the Board of Trustees at their special May 1 meeting that he was most concerned about the possibilities of getting through that night without serious trouble.

At 7:30 A.M. Sunday the SDS held a meeting in Anabel Taylor to plan a rally later that morning. They resumed their picketing of Willard Straight Hall.

At 9:00 A.M. President Perkins and some members of his executive staff met in Myron Taylor Hall. There followed sharp discussion of the alternatives for action. There was a sense of the necessity to remove the blacks that day, as they feared for the ability of the campus to remain peaceful another night. Finally Dean Miller offered the suggestion that he call a meeting of the University faculty on Monday and recommend nullification of the decisions against the blacks, provided the blacks leave the Straight immediately.

The news of the guns was out. It was heard over the air early that morning. The press kept asking Director of Public Information Thomas L. Tobin, "What are you going to do about the guns?"

The expanded Faculty Council, now grown to twenty-five, met at 11:00 A.M. in Myron Taylor. Corson, Roberts, Perkins and Miller attended this meeting, or portions of it.

At the staff meeting it was decided that Kennedy should call Whitfield. The latter thought it might be useful to talk. It was finally decided by the group that Muller accompany Kennedy. There was considerable discussion as to the advisability of Mil-

ler's proposal. Some felt that the faculty would not rescind the decisions, and the reaction of the blacks to this further rejection would be serious. The President returned from the Faculty Council meeting and held phone calls with Trustees Robert W. Purcell and Jansen Noyes, Jr. Later he insisted that there must be quid pro quo agreement by which the blacks would agree to help in deciding on a new judicial system and would abide by it when adopted.

At 12:00 noon Muller and Kennedy left for Willard Straight. It had been agreed that they would talk with the blacks and that the points of discussion would be:

1. The University would investigate the cross-burning and the DU incidents
2. Miller would call a faculty meeting and recommend nullification
3. The blacks must leave the building right away
4. The blacks must help in building a viable and acceptable judicial system

A black law student, Barry Loncke, who had been talking with Whitfield earlier, warning the blacks of the legal problems they had created for themselves, was in the conference along with Whitfield and another black, Bob Jackson, plus Kennedy and Muller. Muller stated that their goal was to get the blacks to leave the building as quickly as possible.

Whitfield asked that the faculty meeting be held right away while they still occupied the building, rather than on Monday. This was rejected. The blacks must leave the building first. He raised the question of refusal by the faculty to nullify and was told that all that Miller could do was recommend the nullification. The vote was up to the faculty.

After thirty to forty minutes of discussion, Kennedy and Muller left, returning to Myron Taylor Hall. There the President, with members of his executive staff, continued the discussions. They agreed that the University not provide legal services to the black students. Stamp left before 1:00 P.M. to go downtown to arrange for, and be prepared to use, a court injunction if, later, that was decided on. He arranged a meeting with a number of city officials, as well as state police, for 2:00 P.M. in the office of Mayor Jack K. Kiely. He kept in touch by telephone with Corson at the Law School.

During this period Kennedy talked to Whitfield by phone. Whitfield also talked with Miller and asked if he was prepared to call the faculty meeting and recommend nullification. Miller re-

plied that he was prepared to do so if they got out of the building right away. Miller stated to Whitfield that if the faculty refused to nullify the penalties he would resign as dean of the faculty. On his later return to the meeting of the expanded Faculty Council, Miller repeated this promise made to Whitfield.

Muller had the main points of agreement typed up. He and Kennedy returned to Willard Straight shortly after 3:00 P.M. They met with Whitfield, Jackson, Zachary Carter (vice chairman of AAS) and a few others. In addition to a discussion of the points to be covered in the agreement, the question of the role of the SDS in their leaving the building came up. It was decided that the group of 150 SDS who were picketing outside should be asked to leave, and the blacks arranged this. Finally, the subject of the guns came up. Muller and Kennedy asked that they be left behind, but Whitfield insisted that they were needed for protection. After considerable discussion, because they wanted to get the students out as quickly as possible, it was determined that the blacks were to leave with their guns, unloaded, and with breeches open. At no time during the negotiations did the blacks threaten these men with their weapons. In fact, the blacks, according to Muller and Kennedy, were at all times respectful, though grim and determined.

Muller had talked with Corson and reported that the blacks were insisting that they leave with their guns. Stamp, still at the mayor's office, learned of this and he reported that the officials downtown, city and state police, were very upset about this situation.

The entire group in the Straight was delayed while the blacks cleaned up the building. It had been agreed that the blacks, with Kennedy and Muller, would walk over to 320 Wait Avenue, headquarters for the AAS, and that the pact would be signed there.

At 4:10 P.M. the front doors of Willard Straight opened and out came 120 black students, many of them brandishing guns, with Muller and Kennedy. A large group, estimated at 2,000, had gathered as word spread of the pending evacuation of the building. As the blacks emerged, a loud cheer went up, but they themselves remained silent as they marched across the campus to their headquarters at 320 Wait Avenue.

It was during this exit and march that the press and television representatives took the pictures which were seen around the world and gave such an ugly impression of the event.

At 320 Wait Avenue, shortly before 5:00 P.M., after the agreement had been put in its final form, it was signed by Kennedy,

Muller, Whitfield, and Zachary Carter. Whitfield read and signed it outside before a large gathering of onlookers and the press. The pact read as follows:

**AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE AAS AND CORNELL
RELATING TO BLACK STUDENT DEPARTURE
FROM WILLARD STRAIGHT HALL**

PART I

In a meeting to be held 21 April 1969 the Dean of the Cornell Faculty, Robert D. Miller, will recommend to the full faculty that the judicial procedures taken against the five students as a result of incidents last December and January be nullified by action of the full faculty.

PART II

The University promises best efforts to secure legal assistance to defend against any civil actions arising out of the occupation of Willard Straight by the AAS. Such efforts will be made on behalf of individuals or the group.

PART III

The University will press no civil or criminal charges, or take any measures to punish by means of expulsion or otherwise, activities of the AAS involved in occupation of WSH. The University will assume all responsibility for damages to WSH.

PART IV

The University will provide 24-hour protection for 208 Dearborn Place (Women's Co-op) and 320 Wait, with men assigned this task at all times.

PART V

The University undertakes to investigate thoroughly police activities related to both the burning of the cross incident and the attack on Willard Straight Hall by unknown individuals. A detailed report will be issued to the AAS and made public including identities of those involved.

PART VI

The AAS has discontinued the occupation of Willard Straight Hall.

PART VII

The AAS undertakes to cooperate in devising a new judiciary system to promote justice on Cornell's campus for all members of the student body.

Signed on 20 April 1969

FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Steven Muller

VICE PRESIDENT

W. K. Kennedy

VICE PROVOST

FOR THE AAS

Ed Whitfield

CHAIRMAN

Zachary W. Carter

VICE CHAIRMAN

Damage done by the blacks during the take-over of Willard Straight at first was believed to have been minimal. Unfortunately, a thorough survey estimated the total costs to be approximately \$10,800. This included food used or spoiled, property damages, and labor to restore the building to full use. Included in this was the cost of \$2,000 for replacing all locks and keys in the building, as the blacks had taken the master keys from employees. They also broke off a number of billiard cues to use the butts as clubs to defend themselves. The total cost of this item was \$1,780. In addition to this expense of \$10,800, it was estimated that there was loss of business of \$15,000 over the three-day period as Willard Straight had to remain closed until Tuesday morning. What the profit loss from this amount of business would have been was not in this estimate, but obviously it would have been relatively high since the overhead items, including labor, had to be paid regardless of the occupation of the building.

It would be almost impossible to chronicle with accuracy the numerous events that transpired on the three succeeding days through Wednesday. This report will cover only the highlights in the order of their occurrence.

On Monday morning at 9:15 President Perkins issued his first statement since the building occupation. He announced that firearms were banned from the campus, with violators facing automatic suspension. Anyone involved in a building occupation would experience the same penalty.

At 12:15 P.M., in a further statement, he declared a state of emergency on the campus, and established an advisory board, with himself as chairman. He also assumed full authority and responsibility for the maintenance of safety and security. In so doing he

acted on the authority vested in the President, and with the full agreement of the Board of Trustees chairman. He announced that the regulations covering the prohibition of firearms and building occupancies were being drafted. He also called a convocation for Barton Hall for 3:00 P.M. before the University Faculty meeting at 4:30 P.M., and he invited all members of the campus community to attend.

The convocation brought together in Barton Hall at 3:00 P.M. a crowd estimated at 12,000 students, faculty, University employees, and interested Ithacans. The President in his talk, which lasted about 20 minutes, made no reference to the events on campus of the previous two-and-a-half days, asking all to approach the days ahead as humane men.

The University Faculty meeting was called to order at 4:40 P.M. in Bailey Hall, with 1,100 faculty members in attendance. After a statement by President Perkins, Dean Miller moved for the nullification of the judicial procedures taken against the blacks. After a long discussion, a seven-point motion introduced by President Perkins was substituted, which refused to agree at that time to dismiss the penalties but directed the AAS representatives to meet with the Faculty Council the next day and report at a faculty meeting on Friday. This substitute motion was passed. As a result of this failure of the faculty to vote on the dean of the faculty's motion for dismissal of the penalties, Miller, as he had promised the blacks on Sunday, announced his resignation as dean.

The news of the faculty decision spread fast. As the faculty was leaving Bailey, the SDS moved into the hall, along with 2,000 students. This group voted to remain active until the demands of AAS were met.

Tuesday was a day of frenzied activity on the campus. The threats and rumors had started up again Monday night. The action by the faculty on Monday afternoon was interpreted by the students as rejection of nullification, whereas it was meant as a postponement of any decision, as the faculty did not want to decide under coercion. Postponement meant delay and to the students delay was unacceptable. Many groups met. The faculties of several colleges voted to approve nullification. Finally, the Faculty Council on Tuesday evening at 7:25 voted to recommend nullifying the penalties and called another faculty meeting for Wednesday at 12:15 P.M. in Bailey Hall.

At 6:00 P.M. Tom Jones (a member of the Afro-American Society) gave a lengthy talk over the local radio station, ending up

threatening Perkins, four top administrators, and three professors, and "giving Cornell three hours to live."

At Barton Hall the SDS rally had grown to over 6,000 students and faculty. That evening the SDS apparently lost control of the meeting. They were recommending a building take-over that night. When news of the faculty meeting the next day was announced, the less radical group was willing to await that outcome. The atmosphere became much calmer. The moderates gained control of the group and they turned the meeting into a forum for constructive discussion.

Wednesday's faculty meeting again drew 1,100 members. These attendance figures are significant because routine faculty meetings had averaged fewer than 300 members over recent years. The President, after making an opening statement, received a standing round of applause. Acting Dean Roberts moved for nullification of the judicial procedures taken against the blacks. After lengthy discussion, the faculty reversed its position of Monday and by a voice vote gave the motion a strong approval.

Many reasons have been advanced for the reversal of the position of the faculty. Concerned faculty had turned out for both meetings in large numbers, had learned more about the situation, and decided the blacks' case had merit. Others changed because they talked with many moderate students between the two meetings and found out that these concerned undergraduates, in large numbers, favored nullification. Other faculty took another look and changed because they felt that they must sacrifice principle to avoid violence and bloodshed on the campus and irreparable damage to the future of the University.

The above report of the six days is our attempt at an accurate chronicle of the important events of this period. It could not cover all points but we have tried to include the actions and events of significance.

Observations

The Committee feels an obligation to make certain observations regarding specific incidents or actions that occurred during this period of crisis:

1. *The Seizure of the Building by the Blacks*

The Committee condemns as an act of violence the seizure of Willard Straight Hall by the members of the Afro-American

Society. There can be no such thing as a nonviolent building occupation—the very act is a threat of the use of force. As in the case of many illegal and violent disturbances, the Committee feels that the results of the take-over went far beyond anything planned originally by the blacks. The outcome was far more serious than they intended, and the damage to Cornell University was immeasurable.

2. *The Criticism of the Campus Patrolmen in the Wari House Incident*

The blacks were critical of the members of the campus patrol for their neglect of the girls left unprotected in Wari House after the cross-burning, a serious symbolic threat to these coeds. Just as the flaming cross was extinguished, fire alarms had been sent in from three different women's dormitories, housing hundreds of coeds. These alarms went off at 2:58 A.M. and the police left at once. One of them returned at 3:20 A.M., 22 minutes later, after these alarms were proven to have been false. He stood watch outside of the Wari House. It was unfortunate that he did not notify the occupants that he was on duty, because at 3:30 A.M. the head resident called asking for protection. The officer on duty was contacted, and before he was relieved of duty by another patrolman at 3:40 A.M. he had let the occupants know of his presence.

This Committee feels that under the pressure of the possibility of serious fires in buildings housing many girls, the campus patrol acted with proper discretion, leaving Wari House unprotected for twenty to thirty minutes. The Committee makes this statement despite its sense of the deep fear engendered in the minds of the black occupants by the burning cross, a feeling that possibly might not be so apparent to many members of the Cornell community.

3. *The Decision Not to Cordon off the Building*

Shortly after the seizure of Willard Straight Hall, Director of Safety and Security Dymek made a significant decision: the blacks were free to enter or leave that building at will, but whites were to be barred from entry. This decision was based on an experience occurring almost a year before, when two campus patrolmen were knocked to the floor by blacks when these police had tried to prevent some blacks from entering a Goldwin Smith Hall office already occupied by black students.

There was the possibility right from the start of this build-

ing seizure, of cordoning off the area so that no one, black or white, might enter the building. A decision to do this might have followed and superseded Dymek's order to allow blacks to enter. The desirability of such a move would have to be carefully weighed. To attempt a cordon and have it fail would not improve the situation.

Willard Straight is a deceptively large building. Though it has but nine outside doors, it has many windows at ground level on several floors. Dymek has estimated that it would require three hundred men to prevent an invasion of the building. The University at this time employed thirty campus patrolmen and detectives, and the City of Ithaca had a police force totaling fifty. All of these men work on shifts, with many occupied by other essential duties. It might have been possible through reassignment to muster twenty-five campus patrolmen and city police to try to seal off this building. Since the blacks were holding it from within, the early decision by Dymek to allow blacks access but to deny whites entrance was undoubtedly sound, particularly at the outset, until a later assessment might be made by the administration.

If later it were decided that a cordon was called for, and if Dymek's estimate of three hundred men needed to accomplish this safety was correct, obviously police strength from outside would be required. Under New York State policy, the next echelon of police help would come from the County Sheriff's Mutual Aid plan under which arrangement a sufficient number of deputy sheriffs from counties throughout central New York would be summoned.

The presence of off-campus police forces on any campus has an escalating effect on students. The real issues tend to be forgotten. The activists make capital of their presence; the moderates tend to flock to the side of the radicals, and the attitudes of most students change abruptly, becoming violently hostile toward the police. The administration was most anxious to settle this disturbance, if possible, without bloodshed or violence. The use of force on a campus often leaves deep psychological wounds that heal slowly.

Toward its goal of avoiding violence, the administration had the strong support of the expanded Faculty Council and of the student Interfraternity Council. This Committee encountered virtual unanimity that, all points considered, the primary objective at the time had to be getting the building vacated without violence or bloodshed.

4. *The DU Incident—Charges of Police Complicity*

This abortive invasion attempt would appear to have been a fairly spontaneous movement by a group of white fraternity men who were disturbed that the blacks were interfering with their rights in taking over this public building. Two of them had first found an open side window, which apparently was unguarded either from within or by the campus patrolman outside. They led this group of about two dozen there, unnoticed. The SDS were picketing in front. The seven campus police on duty were located four in front and three in the rear. The DU's came up from the direction of their house in the rear of Willard Straight and continued past the south side of the building, up the walk and steps toward Central Avenue and the front of Willard Straight. The campus patrol at the rear thought that they were going to the front, and so advised those in front. However, they stopped at this open window and entered through it. As soon as their presence became known, the SDS and the police rushed to the south side of the building and stopped any more fraternity men from entering.

Immediately the blacks claimed that there had been collusion between this group of whites and the campus patrol. The campus police not only did not keep the whites out, as they had been instructed to do, the blacks asserted, but they stood idly by and had encouraged the whites to invade the building. The Carter Commission, appointed to investigate these charges against the campus patrol by the blacks, finds no grounds for these allegations, nor does this Committee. That the police were not guarding the two sides of the building might be open to question, but they were handicapped by a shortage of manpower. All of those on duty, except the seven at Willard Straight, were at other campus locations, because the atmosphere was tense and rumors of further disturbances by other activists were rampant.

The Interfraternity Council held a Vice Presidential Investigation under the rules of IFC Judicial Board since the president of DU admitted that the fraternity as a whole was responsible. The IFC investigation report stated that the DU fraternity was believed guilty of contributing to disorderly or irresponsible conduct. Because of the political nature of the Willard Straight incident, and because of the confused status of the judicial system by the time of their investigation, the IFC did not press charges. This Trustee Committee feels that the DU group did act irresponsibly and may have contributed

substantially to the tensions and fear, which, in turn, led to the introduction of arms.

5. *Handling of this Serious Campus Disturbance*

The take-over of Willard Straight was by far the most serious of all campus disturbances to date. It was the first building seizure and it was unexpected by the University. The take-over found the administration not well prepared through planning to deal with such an event.

The administration staff had not determined where to establish an emergency base of operation, when they decided that Day Hall might be vulnerable to take-over. When the Faculty Council was called to meet, it was decided to enlarge that group, adding more faculty and some students. This group thus became strictly an advisory body with no clearly established goals for its meetings. The steps to obtain a court injunction, if one had been needed Saturday morning, had not been taken in advance. There was no single person left in charge of the campus patrolmen on duty at Willard Straight until later Saturday morning after the DU incident. The members of the administration appeared to hold meetings and make decisions on an ad hoc basis.

During the summer, this Committee notes, Provost Corson requested Controller Peterson to take charge of contingency planning. He has been working diligently, drawing up plans for the effective handling of building seizures and other campus disturbances, if such unfortunate events occur in the future.

6. *The Visibility of Leadership During the Take-Over*

The lack of visibility of the leadership of the University was most apparent. Except for the radio message Saturday morning by Muller asking the students to remain calm, and the press conference held late Sunday afternoon by Muller and Kennedy, no public statement came from an officer of Cornell until over fifty hours after the building was entered. This was a broadcast over the local radio stations made by President Perkins. The vacuum of leadership played into the hands of the activists because the only sounding board was in support of violent means.

7. *The Final Decision—Peaceful Means*

The question was raised as to the advisability of attempting to

remove the black students by legal means—through a court injunction. This question would have to be weighed at two different times—on Saturday before the guns were brought in, and again on Sunday after the arms appeared.

If, on Saturday, the University had applied for a court injunction and if that order made by a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York was not sufficient to move the blacks from the building, then the students would be in contempt and the court would be forced to act. Control of the situation would have moved into the hands of the law and completely out of the hands of the administration. It would be up to the court to order the city police and deputy sheriffs to move in and arrest the blacks.

With strong sympathy for the blacks being clearly demonstrated outside by the SDS members, as well as by hundreds of concerned moderates, the group outside and the blacks inside would make a formidable foe. The prospects of serious injury on both sides would be real.

The administration chose to have the blacks remain inside Saturday night rather than face the potential of violence. Hopefully, if the campus calmed down on Sunday, they might be able to talk them out of the building that day without any large concessions.

Unfortunately, the growing fear of the blacks waiting inside Willard Straight drove them on Saturday to bring in arms for their own protection. A court injunction on Sunday, not honored by the blacks, would force the judge to use police and deputies to try to dislodge the blacks. This would have to be a last resort, knowing that those inside were armed with guns and ammunition. Certainly no man in a position of responsibility wanted bloodshed on the Cornell campus.

Feelings had run high throughout the community on Saturday night. The administration was determined that there not be another such night of terror. The decision was made to get the blacks to leave peacefully. This was done through the agreement made Sunday afternoon—an agreement that exacted an enormous price from Cornell. Cornell had no bloodshed, no headlines of murder, no substantial property damage, no students hospitalized, and in very short order a campus that was returned to relative peace.

No one will ever know if this was the right way to settle this disruption. This was a matter of judgment. These men made the decision to place the protection of life above the

reputation of the University. They knew that the price to themselves and to Cornell was great—but was it greater than the price of human life?

To this Committee, after long hours of listening, the Willard Straight seizure by the blacks seems to have been a symbol of all the unrests that were breeding on the campus. It served as a catalyst to bring to the surface and out from within many complaints and ills. Gradually, as this Committee continued listening and studying, these complaints and troubles fell into several distinct categories. It became obvious that there was a pattern of complaints and that there was an interrelationship between these problem areas and the unrest on the campus. The problems were largely in four areas:

1. The handling of discipline and the judicial system
2. The COSEP and Afro-American Studies programs
3. Academic freedom
4. Communications

The problems that have grown in these four areas appear to have been the principal causes of unrest. Therefore, we have focused our attention on these subjects and will take them up in order.

Discipline and the Judicial System*

The facts and opinions already learned by this Committee in studying the events encompassing the occupation of Willard Straight Hall on April 19, 1969, have convinced us of the urgency of presenting this interim report to the Executive Committee now, to express the immediate need for a great deal of work to be done on the disciplinary and judicial system. This work must be started at once to be prepared for the start of the school year in September.

There are now pending in the Ithaca Civil Court cases against two groups of Cornell students which cannot be tried before the September session of the court. The very existence of these legal actions will be added cause for student unrest. Tom Jones, a black militant leader, in a speech given June 29 in Willard Straight Hall, has declared that "John Hatchett's going to be the issue in the fall. We have a right to have him as our teacher, and we're not going to forfeit that right." This position forecasts further trouble for the Ithaca campus.

Although the new Adjudicatory System went into effect in May 1968, the administration of the judicial system has been neither consistent nor punctual, and has been bypassed in nearly all sensitive cases involving violations of the code. The definition

*This section of the report was prepared earlier and presented almost verbatim as given here to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees at its meeting in New York City on July 15. This Committee felt that such an urgency existed for prompt attention to the findings of this portion that it should not wait to be presented at this meeting of the full Board in September.

This Committee is pleased to note that the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees did request that a task force be appointed. With Professor Franklin A. Long as chairman, this group has been working long hours since the middle of July on this assignment.

of responsibility has been vague, and the resulting vacillation has been conspicuous. Since the nullification vote by the faculty following the Willard Straight occupation, there has been a strong question in the Cornell community concerning the validity of the judicial system, despite the fact that the faculty by formal action reaffirmed that the system was in effect. The members of the two adjudicatory boards have not served since the nullification and no machinery has been put into effect to elect new members for the coming year.

The much needed revision of the Student Conduct Code has been under way for several years and is long overdue.

During the summer months the University administration, a project committee of the Constituent Assembly* (which feels it is merely a research committee and is not empowered to act for the entire Constituent Assembly), this Trustee Committee, and possibly other groups, are reviewing the code and the judicial system. Last spring the Board of Trustees superimposed the "New Campus Regulations" on the existing rules. The Executive Committee is acting today on the University Regulations on Public Order, as required by New York State. This situation indicates clearly that with only two months left before the reopening of the University, there is a critical need for action now.

This Committee firmly believes that a major effort must be made, and priority given to enable completion of all the necessary work to insure that the University will enter this coming term with an adequate judicial system capable of operating with fairness and dispatch. Equally important, the University must be prepared to convince the entire University community of the need for such a system. The failure to introduce effective law and order to Cornell by September threatens dire consequences.

1. TO FULFILL ITS AIMS AND PURPOSES THE UNIVERSITY MUST HAVE AN EFFECTIVE DISCIPLINARY AND JUDICIAL SYSTEM.

As stated in the resolution of the faculty of March 12: "Fundamental to a University is respect for the principle of the right to speak and the right to hear. These principles embrace, on the one hand, the encouragement of diverse views and dissent, and, on the other, the maintenance of those basic community interests

*An organization of representatives of students, faculty, alumni, employees, administration, and Trustees created by action of the Barton Hall Assembly and the University Faculty for the purpose of studying the structure and governance of the University.

and needs without which community nor diversity nor dissent can truly exist."

The teaching scholarship and research of Cornell will thrive only if intellectual freedom and intellectual honesty are protected without compromise. Each professor must have the right to teach without interference. Each student must have the right to learn, to question, to express his views, and to be heard.

In subscribing to the underlying principles of Cornell, the scholar incurs the responsibility to preserve the aims and purposes of the University. Only if all segments of the University accept and recognize this responsibility for law and order can the University be preserved and improved. The student and the faculty member will accept such authority only if it is administered equitably, efficiently, and punctually. Inadequate and inconsistent administration of the judicial system is bound to result in a loss of regard and respect for the prevailing system.

2. CONTEMPT FOR LAW AND ORDER ARE CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

Today, more than ever, universities are the agents of change. Out of the universities have come scientific, conceptual, and behavioral discoveries which have profoundly changed society. The emergence of mass communication, particularly television, has made the university vulnerable to those who see the university as an ideal power center in which to operate. It is the rare educational institution that has developed mechanisms that can successfully contain the new revolutionaries while continuing its basic role of expanding and transmitting knowledge. Cornell has been no better equipped than other major universities to deal with this problem. Since the purposes and demeanor of Cornell and other universities have been founded in reason and learning, the role of law and order has traditionally been secondary.

The protection and preservation of order has now become of paramount importance to the University because of the emergence of that minority on campus who seek to replace reason with power. For example, the reply of the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs to a statement by the Afro-American Society questioning the adjudicatory system of the University, stated as follows:

Some of today's campus voices seem to be asserting that the justice of their cause excuses the employment of coercion and force in their methods. Whatever the sound-

ness or morality of their goals, they seek to impose their orthodoxy on the entire campus, forbidding others to speak or hear what they have proscribed as unspeakable and unheard. To permit such repression and intimidation can only be fatal to freedoms essential to a university. For all of us, but particularly for those who understand, sympathize with, or endorse the substantive goals and deeply felt needs of those pursuing major changes, an uncompromising support of these freedoms is required.

The June 9, 1969, statement on campus disorders prepared by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence more bluntly described the faction of students confronting the American university today as follows:

A small but determined minority, however, aims not at reform but at the destruction of existing institutions. These are the nihilists. They resort to violent disruption as the means best suited to achieve their ends.

. . . When they have managed on occasion to provoke counter-force to an excessive degree, they have succeeded in enlisting the sympathies of the more moderate campus majority.

They are the agent that converts constructive student concern into mindless mob hysteria. They are the chief danger to the university and its basic values.

There is also a minority of students who are not nihilists, but who feel that violence and disruption may be the only effective way of achieving societal and university reform.

. . . a minute group of destroyers . . . have abandoned hope in today's society, in today's university, and in the processes of orderly discussion, to secure significant change.

These 'destroyers' seek to persuade more moderate students that verbal expressions of grievance go unheeded while forcible tactics bring affirmative results.

Those described above are indeed a small minority but they, for the moment at least, are setting the destructive pace and atmosphere.

3. IS THE UNIVERSITY EQUIPPED TO PROTECT ITS PURPOSES?

The National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence noted that "the university, precisely because it is an open community that lives by the power of reason, stands naked before those who would employ the power of force." Cornell, like other

universities, has traditionally experienced little need for sophisticated tools of law and order.

Our review of the Cornell judicial system and the testimony of members of the administration, faculty and students regarding such system resulted in nearly unanimous agreement that the judicial system is fundamentally sound. A thorough review of the system in fact reveals a remarkably thoughtful achievement which gives the student a significant voice in the judicial process. With the possible reservation of the means by which the student judiciary is selected, the system meets every demand of those who seek student participation on the University campus. To question or discredit this system threatens a step backwards in the progress of the student in responsible participation on campus.

Therefore, this committee has concluded that the failure of the judicial system has not been due to the system itself but to the manner in which it has been administered. When confronted with complications of disorder and the special problems surrounding activist groups, Cornell has not only consistently failed to employ disciplinary procedures available to it but by refusing to employ such procedures has threatened materially the usefulness of these procedures for the future. Accordingly, the task becomes one of not only revitalizing the disciplinary and judicial system but also one of reestablishing the mandate and confidence of the University community in this system.

While the University no longer serves in loco parentis, disciplinary procedures have been conducted with a view more toward counseling and flexibility than objective justice. The campus offender today is of a litigious and legalistic frame of mind, and the University disciplinary and judicial procedures must be administered in this context. In this regard, the law is being continually tested and the issue of due process will become more important in protecting student and faculty rights.

The administration of discipline and the judicial system have been impaired and complicated by a series of arguments being tested on campuses. Generally, these arguments fall into one of the four following categories:

1. The argument that one may use unlawful procedures to further his cause when, in his estimation, he has exhausted legitimate means of dissent
2. The position that the university is unqualified to sit in judgment of violations which are "political in nature,"

especially in those instances in which the university is alleged to be a party in controversy

3. The argument that certain transactions are "organizational in nature" and, as a consequence, cannot be ascribed to individuals
4. The assertion that "institutional racism" compels separate standards of justice and obligations by the judicial system for minority groups

This Committee has examined these issues and finds them to be without either logic or reason. We do not intend to discuss these issues here except to note that the Faculty Committee on Student Affairs in its report of March 25, 1969, thoroughly discussed and disposed of the arguments outlined above as being without basis. In this we concur.

One issue that is related specifically to Cornell has been the difficulty of obtaining legitimate student representation in the judicial system since May 1968, when Cornell student government was dissolved.

The judicial system has been further tested by the conclusion on the part of some that an inadequacy in the judicial system permits any member of the University community to reject the applicability of the entire system. On the contrary, there is an obligation on the part of any member sensing an inadequacy to move for its correction. The University has the responsibility to maintain the machinery by which such correction can be effected.

Apparently, inadequate thought and planning had been devoted to the problem of restoring order in the event of major confrontation. The campus police are not prepared or expected to handle demonstrations of large groups. It is an open question whether the Ithaca police or any other constabulary upon whom the University may readily rely could have adequately handled the Willard Straight affair or whether their experience has made them sensitive to the special problems of campus demonstrations.

The fact is that Cornell, along with other universities, has entered a new era of campus discipline. The role of the governmental authorities, or at least the professionalism and discipline of laws and procedures, must be increasingly applied to the minority of persons who would otherwise attempt to destroy the University.

Recommendations

Based upon our study and analysis, the following recommendations are made for consideration by the University:

1. Any code or judicial legislation must be based on the fundamental principle that the individual is responsible for his own actions.
2. The revision of the Student Conduct Code must be completed before the fall semester begins. The new campus regulations and the Regulations for Public Order, as required by New York State, must be integrated with this code. Careful consideration should be given to codifying the range of penalties for each given violation.
3. The principles developed from the report of the University Commission on the Interdependence of University Regulations and Local, State and Federal Law, dated September 27, 1967 (Sindler Commission Report), and contained in the 1968-69 Student Code Handbook on pages 6 to 8 should also be integrated into the code. Assignment of the responsibility for the Code's administration must be clarified.
4. The present adjudicatory system, adopted from the faculty legislation of May 1, 1968, is not only sound, but represents a model of campus judiciary and student participation and should be continued.
5. To place the judicial system on an equitable, efficient and punctual basis, the University should create the position of judicial administrator. He would assume the responsibility of assuring order and freedom within the University community necessary to fulfill its aims and purposes. He would be responsible for the administration of a well-defined procedure for citation of code violations and for the judicial system to insure that all such code violations are processed equitably, efficiently and punctually. This official should report at a very high, if not the highest, administrative level. He should not be in the Dean of Students' office and would eliminate the need for the present position of code administrator. This official should also be responsible for the development of all necessary procedures to avoid campus disorder

- of any nature. He should be concerned with relations between the University and the town, county, and state officials responsible for the maintenance of order. In administering the code and adjudicatory system, this official must supervise the task of assuring the publication, understanding and support of the system by the University as a whole. It is obvious that this administrative official must be mature, able, and fully qualified to handle the increasingly sensitive responsibilities outlined above. Giving the position substance and dignity will increase support for the entire judicial system.
6. All University codes and regulations of conduct must require complete adherence. Refusal to be governed by the appropriate judicial system can only be interpreted as a denial of one's membership in, and responsibilities to, the University community. Such refusal must subject a student to suspension from the University and a faculty member or employee to suspension from his position with the University. Neither the University nor any other form of community can exist on less stringent standards of compliance.
 7. The student body must provide some reasonable and orderly process for the democratic selection of student members of the judicial system. Hopefully, some method of accomplishing this will come from the Constituent Assembly.
 8. There must remain one code and one judicial system to be applied equally to all students, without regard to race, creed, ideology or social group. In this regard, we have raised and rejected the employment of arbitration since the use of the device itself serves to dignify or separate certain infractions. Furthermore, arbitration is an admission that the University and the offender are equals in controversy; that is simply not the case.
 9. If freedom and the basic purposes of the University are to mean anything, the University must not in the future negotiate under duress. There must be no amnesty for infractions of the code.
 10. Procedures must be provided for the handling of violations by the faculty members of the regulations of the University covering faculty conduct. Faculty members who participate

with students in violations of the Student Code should be subject to these faculty procedures. Enforcement may differ but the rules should be common to all.

11. Procedures must be provided for the handling of violations by employees, both academic and non-academic, of the regulations of the University covering employee conduct. Employees who participate with students in violations of the Student Code should be subject to these employee procedures.
12. It is of paramount importance that the code and judicial system be explained and clarified and that campuswide endorsement be sought at the earliest practical date. Most important, the members of the University must be convinced that Cornell cannot operate effectively without law and order.
13. As a major deterrent to the disregard for law and order, the University must provide channels of communication, both formal and informal, at every level and by every reasonable means pursuant to which criticism or suggestion for revision by students, faculty or administration will be encouraged and find meaningful consideration.
14. Any violations of law committed upon the Cornell campus by anyone other than students, faculty, and University employees must be referred to the proper civil or criminal authorities promptly for prosecution.
15. The President of the University must be given power and responsibility to maintain law and order, if the faculty or students refuse to assume or choose to abdicate their responsibilities as members of the judicial system.
16. The University By-laws and implementing regulations must be modified to reflect practices now employed by the faculty concerning Student Conduct Committee appointments. The By-laws must also provide more specific sanction for the control of faculty and employee conduct. Further, the By-laws should be reviewed to make clear the position and power of the President in the matter of University conduct and order.
17. Plans and procedures must be developed to the greatest pos-

sible extent in advance to cope with incidents of group disorders such as building take-overs, sit-ins, confrontations, and disruptive demonstrations.

This Committee has the strong feeling that, had discipline at Cornell been enforced over the last two or three years, simply by fair but firm adherence to the code and judicial system in force, a tragic event of the dimensions of the Willard Straight incident might well have been avoided.

This Committee feels that Cornell has a fundamentally sound and viable student judicial system. With a good deal of thoughtful full-time attention and work in the weeks directly ahead, this system can be revitalized and strengthened. Then, if the procedures for its operation are clearly delineated and if mature and able leadership is provided for its administration, this system will be capable of insuring the freedom and order needed. The tests that this system will face this next year will require the full support of all segments of the University community, particularly the Board of Trustees, which, in the last analysis, bears the ultimate responsibility.

COSEP and Afro-American Studies

It is clear that one of the most complex and urgent problems facing Cornell is the future of the COSEP and Afro-American Studies programs. Some blacks are demanding autonomy for this studies program and others are predicting that the blacks will soon be making further demands, including the possibility of a demand for an open admissions policy. Tom Jones has put everyone on notice that the disapproval of Mr. Hatchett's appointment to a faculty position in the Center for Afro-American Studies will be an issue as soon as school opens. Another contributing factor may be the trial in the fall of the court case brought by the grand jury against some of the blacks involved in the seizure of Willard Straight Hall.

In order to try to gain some insight into, and understanding of, these problems, this committee heard testimony from many in the Cornell community, including both militant and non-militant black students; members of the administration and of various administrative departments; one of the faculty members of the Center for Afro-American Studies, its director, James Turner; other black members of the Cornell faculty; white faculty members, including some who have been on the COSEP or Afro-American studies committees; student members of the Constituent Assembly research group studying the Afro-American Studies program; and representatives of the academic advising office of the Arts College. All of these were most cooperative and informative. Invitations were extended to Tom Jones, Harry Edwards, and Gloria Joseph who either indicated they had nothing to say to this committee or never replied to the invitation. (Dr. Joseph did, however, meet with us at one time to discuss the actual events of the April 18-23 period.)

BACKGROUND

Prior to 1964 there were fewer than twenty black American

students at Cornell. As a result of a determined effort to bring more blacks to the University, there will be about three hundred in the fall of 1969.

In 1963 President Perkins appointed a committee which later became the Committee on Special Education Projects (COSEP) to "recommend and initiate programs through which Cornell could make a larger contribution to the education of qualified students who have been disadvantaged by their cultural, economic and educational environments." To this COSEP committee it was clear that a black student with an outstanding high school record could get a first-rate college education in this country with little difficulty. That group felt, however, that many blacks whose academic records and scholastic aptitude test scores did not indicate an ability to do work of the quality demanded by Cornell might well be able to do it. It recommended, therefore, that Cornell establish a special scholarship fund for "students whose credentials will appear marginal or worse by the usual Cornell admissions standards but who otherwise give evidence of being able to compete at Cornell." Thirty-seven entered under this program in the fall of 1965, forty-nine in 1966, sixty-seven in 1967, ninety-four in 1968, and one hundred seven are expected in this fall's freshman class. Most of these came from ghetto areas of northern cities or from the South.

Perhaps because of a lack of certainty of the success of the program and of not wanting to have those in it prejudiced, it was not established along normal university lines. In fact, although it raised important issues of educational policy, its existence was communicated to only a limited number of faculty and few alumni. This bred misunderstanding and resentment of the program on the part of both groups. This Committee feels this was the first of several misjudgments which drastically affected the future success of the program and its relationship to the rest of the University community. (We feel confident, however, that these were errors of judgment made with the best intentions and in what was thought to be the best interests of the program.) This lack of knowledge led to resentment on the part of some faculty members when they found students in their classes who were not as well prepared as the majority of the others in the class and were having difficulty keeping up with the work.

It is possible they would have felt a sense of participation in the program if they had been a part of the decision to bring these special students to Cornell and would have been willing to help them. (In all fairness to the decision not to consult with the

faculty as a whole on the program, this Committee has heard testimony from several sources that even if the faculty had been consulted a portion of it might not have become involved. Some of these faculty members had chosen Cornell in part because they wanted to avoid turbulent urban campuses and, therefore, they did not like what they felt was a disruptive element being brought to Ithaca. It is possible that some indifferent faculty members who did not want to try to understand the program or the plight of the blacks used the method in which it had been brought about as an excuse for not becoming informed and, in some instances, for becoming antagonistic to it.)

Alumni, and particularly alumni secondary school interviewers, became incensed when good white students from their local schools were not offered admission to Cornell but black students with much less impressive records were. If the purpose of the program had been properly communicated to them before the fact they, too, might have felt differently about it. To this day, there is no mention of COSEP or Afro-American Studies in the University's General Information catalog (Announcement).

It must be remembered that the COSEP program was started when most whites in this country believed blacks wanted to become integrated with whites and to acquire common values and standards. It was in this belief that the first black COSEP students were brought to Cornell. The community was stunned to find that this was not so, and that as time passed the blacks became more and more vitally involved in separation and in staying within the black community, and less and less interested in becoming an integral part of the Cornell community. They viewed the opportunity for a Cornell education not as a way of moving up and out of the black community, but demanded from it courses which they felt were relevant to the plight of the black, and which would enable them to go back to help the blacks within the black community.

If the Trustees and administration were naive about this in the first years of the program, they were no more naive at that time than the vast majority of whites across the country. We feel that it would have been very difficult for the Trustees or the administration to have foreseen this rapid and drastic change in the objectives of the blacks.

RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS

When the COSEP program first got started, the primary source of students was referrals from organizations concerned

with identifying qualified prospective black students. These include the Cooperative Program for Educational Opportunity, the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, ASPIRA (for Puerto Ricans) and the National Achievement Scholarship Program (administered by the National Merit Organization with Ford Foundation sponsorship). Members of the Office of Admissions concentrated their recruiting efforts in the ghettos and, in addition, received recommendations from high schools they visited with a high concentration of minority group students.

As the program became more widely known, recruitment began to take care of itself, although Admissions Office people continued to visit high schools, particularly in New York City, Washington, D.C., Chicago, Cleveland, Atlanta, and Jackson, Mississippi, and they continued to work with the referral agencies. Other applications are now received as a result of suggestions by alumni and high school counselors and, more recently, by letters from potential students themselves, many of whom are inspired by students already in the program. Until this summer there was a white member of the Admissions staff specifically responsible for the recruitment of blacks. He stated that he resigned at the end of the last academic year largely because he felt a black person should be in charge of this part of the program.

Those applying for admission were carefully screened for indications of such non-scholastic qualities as motivation and leadership, class rank, recommendations by teachers and counselors, and evidence of earnestness of purpose. These were given more weight vis-a-vis SAT scores and extracurricular activities than in the case of whites. (The Admissions people feel that in most instances it is difficult to predict from the records who will turn out to be activists.) The final selection is made by the individual college admissions committee. The great majority of the blacks apply to the College of Arts and Sciences and until this year all COSEP students were judged against one another and not against regular white applicants. Under this procedure, almost all blacks with high SAT's were assured admission.

This year, however, the procedure was changed and the COSEP students were divided into three categories, depending on their SAT scores. Those in Category I (scores of 650 or better) were thrown into the general admissions pool, which meant they were competing for places against white students and not against other COSEP students. One of the members of the Arts College men's admissions committee felt strongly that this was wrong,

and was able to use influence to get admission offered to sixteen of the seventeen male applicants in this category (of these, seven are entering).

Apparently, no one who felt this strongly served on the women's committee because admission was offered to only eight out of twelve—although black women in the other categories with much lower SAT's were accepted (of those eight, only two are entering). As an example, one of the girls in Category I was not offered admission because "her cultural and educational background does not indicate deprivation to the extent necessary for qualification as a disadvantaged . . . student. In spite of the fact that both her parents are laundry workers, she has been adequately motivated by them to a point that she has achieved academic success and some degree of cultural sophistication." The fact that the economic background of the family left much to be desired financially was not enough to qualify her for the program.

We were told by one dean that "there's no doubt we're bending things for the blacks." In fact, he said that in May he permitted late registration to a black student but that he would have told a white student that enrollment for the fall term had been closed. He was quick to point out, however, that the student will have to perform up to his school's standards in order to remain.

This committee *recommends* that a thorough review be made of all COSEP recruitment and admissions policies including the following items:

1. A qualified person, preferably black, be placed on the Admissions staff and given responsibility for COSEP recruitment;
2. Recruitment be expanded to cover not only schools in urban ghetto areas but also those in smaller cities and suburban areas, too, where there are no doubt qualified blacks, many from disadvantaged backgrounds and with financial need;
3. Recruitment by present black students must be as carefully controlled as possible in order to avoid involving primarily militant students who will tend to interest only other militants in applying;
4. Admissions be offered to the brightest and the best black students as well as to those with lower SAT scores. Although the COSEP program was set up to provide an opportunity for disadvantaged blacks to receive a Cornell education, we feel that this should not be to the exclusion

of other blacks. We believe that it would be desirable to have a more representative cross-section of blacks than we have been seeking. (We have been told by more than one person that the policy has been that "middle-class blacks do not belong at Cornell." We disagree.);

5. A statement of policy be made to reaffirm that all recruitment and admissions of COSEP students should be conducted through the regular University admission organization and according to policies established by it;
6. A report of the quantitative results of the Admissions and Scholarship records of the COSEP participants be prepared and presented to the Board of Trustees at an early meeting.

FINANCIAL AID

The basic policy of the COSEP program has been to provide financial aid to every student to the extent of his need and not to offer anyone admission under this program without at the same time offering him aid. This aid is now most usually in the form of a package—approximately \$300 in loan, \$400 in work-study opportunity entailing eight to ten hours of work a week, and the rest of the demonstrated need in scholarship. With the first few COSEP classes, the proportion of loan to scholarship was higher than currently granted. While we feel this might still be preferable, we realize that the change had to be made in order to meet the competition. For instance, we were told that MIT is now offering full scholarships to black disadvantaged students admitted, and that Stanford gives full scholarships for the first two years.

As with the whites, it is the middle-class black family that has worked hard and saved money for its children's education that is hardest hit by the present method of determining need. We realize that Cornell does not determine this need and, therefore, the total amount of aid offered by all colleges will be roughly the same. We feel, however, that some deserving black students in this situation have gone elsewhere because, although the total amount of aid offered was roughly the same, other colleges offered them a greater share through outright scholarship money. In line with our recommendation that we try to attract a better cross-section of black students, we *recommend* this policy be reviewed with the thought of making the percentage of loan and work-study offered all black students more consistent, no matter what the

total need. Increased acceptances by students in this group might make this change worthwhile.

ACADEMIC ADVISING

The COSEP pamphlet states, "Close attention is paid to academic progress and each student's program is evaluated carefully in light of the needs of the individual. If it is deemed desirable, tutoring is arranged, a lighter course load is suggested and, in some cases, attendance at summer school before entering Cornell is advised." If Cornell assumes the responsibility for bringing disadvantaged students to Ithaca, it must also assume the responsibility for providing this kind of continuous help and guidance. It appears that recently it has not been fully living up to this promise.

If a student's record indicates a need for summer school prior to starting regular college courses or in order to relieve the course load in the first year, consideration should be given to *requiring* him to attend and not just advising him to do so. Cornell is doing him an injustice and asking for unhappiness and discontent on his part if it puts him into courses for which he is unprepared or gives him a heavier course load at the outset than he is able to handle.

It seems that the policy of paying close attention to the academic needs of the COSEP student has not been followed as strictly as it should. In most cases, the only time a student receives guidance or special help is when he specifically asks for it. (Admittedly, in some colleges this has been a problem for the whites as well as the blacks. But Cornell did not accept the whites with a promise of special academic advising.) Some of the black students have told this Committee they feel in many cases more tutoring is needed but that the black students, for the most part, will not ask for it.

In the early years of the program, when it was considerably smaller, the blacks had white advisers. But as the mood on the campus and in the country changed, they began to regard this as paternalism and started to turn, instead, to the COSEP office for academic advising, as well as social counseling. (This may have been due to some extent to the advising system of the Arts College, but the prime reasons appear to have been the change in attitude of blacks towards whites and, perhaps, the more sympathetic reaction they received from the COSEP office.) Some of the college advising offices have indicated that in the past two years they have seldom seen any COSEP students and feel their efforts

have been undermined by the COSEP office, which assumed authority over academic matters such as canceling and changing students' registrations in courses without the advice or prior consent of the college academic offices. It appears that nothing was done to change this practice.

We *recommend* that all academic advising be removed from the COSEP office back to the advising offices of the individual colleges since we feel strongly that only the college involved is capable to, or should, handle the academic counseling of students, including COSEP students. We understand that last spring several Arts College professors offered to play larger roles as counselors and advisers for COSEP students in that college. They and others should be encouraged to do so. We realize it will now be difficult to get present black undergraduates to participate willingly in this kind of program or to ask for help. Therefore, it is extremely important that the advising offices and advisers assume responsibility for proposing help and guidance. Entering freshmen must be made aware that they will be receiving this kind of help and be encouraged to avail themselves of it.

We realize that implementation of the above will take additional financing and hope that it can be found. If not, the available funds might be better used in giving more aid and special help to fewer students rather than spreading the money over a greater number. To cut the program at the present time might cause other serious problems, but in order to carry out the program Cornell must give these students effective and adequate advising. This would not only help their academic work but might also make some of them feel more secure and less discontented.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The COSEP pamphlet states, "... the students in this program are obliged to meet all the usual academic requirements. In no way are the academic standards of the University lowered or compromised."

We believe that on the whole this has been true but in the future we must be sure that it is followed. The percentage of black students who have left Cornell for academic reasons has been small, and the success most have been able to achieve has been gratifying. Of the thirty-seven who enrolled in 1965 as the first COSEP group, we were told that only two had left for academic reasons. Twenty-five were graduated in June and six others are still in good standing at Cornell. Of the graduates, a number are going on for advanced degrees.

We have been told by some that the optimistic academic reports given on the program so far are suspect for two reasons:

1. Some professors, for whatever reason, have tended to mark black students easier than they do whites;
2. Some blacks with poor academic performances are being kept in the University longer than whites with similar records would be.

We have found no official evidence to prove these charges, but if there have been instances of them we would strongly disapprove. If a conscientious black student needs tutoring or a lighter course load he should be given it, but the marking standards must be the same for all students. Not only would white students resent any such preferential treatment but black ones who had earned good grades would resent it even more deeply because they would feel their degrees were second-class.

We *recommend* that it be reaffirmed that there must be no double standard of grading or retention in the University. Once students are at Cornell, all must be judged by a single standard whether as to grades or remaining as a student in good standing in the University. Only in this way can we be sure that the high standard of a Cornell degree is upheld.

SOCIAL COUNSELING

It has been suggested to us that the social area is the one to which it has been most difficult for the blacks to adjust. It was assumed at Cornell, as elsewhere in the country, that the blacks were seeking integration and, therefore, would eagerly become a part of the white community and need no special identification. At the start of the program this assumption might possibly have been correct, but it quickly became clear that for many of them this would not be so for long.

The black was seeking to establish his own identity and his own community. The first year there were relatively few students, each of whom had a COSEP faculty committee member personally responsible for helping in this adjustment. Even so, the adjustment from an urban ghetto area to a rural white community was extremely difficult. They found no local black community of significant size with which they could relate. Life in the dormitory was alien to them and they were spread so far apart they were unable to find security in one another. Many were given white roommates from comfortable middle-class backgrounds, which

often made the adjustment harder. The women could buy no makeup in suitable shades at the campus store. A qualified woman was named counselor for the group, but she was a woman and was a symbol of the matriarchal society from which many of the black male students were trying to escape.

The University had addressed itself to bringing blacks to Cornell but failed to address itself to the special needs of the black students once on campus. Much was made of the question of adjustment to the University by the blacks but adjustment to the blacks by the University was sorely neglected.

All this, together with the national trend toward separatism pulled most of the blacks together *outside* the white community. Only a few joined fraternities and sororities even though they were actively sought as members. The Afro-American Society was formed as a social group, developed into a cultural group bringing in speakers—mostly militants—from the black community, and finally became political. The blacks did not feel accepted by the whites. They found even the most sympathetic whites had no real comprehension of ghetto life or the problems of the blacks. They decided they did not want to be guinea pigs for white students and grew tired of trying to educate them to black problems. Most resigned from the fraternities and sororities, some, we were told, because of the coercion of black militants. Demand began to build for a black women's residence from those who found the pressure of dorm living too great and finally such a residence, as well as one for men, was set up. Many black students—and not just militants—became separatists and felt oppressed by, and distrustful of, whites, particularly the white establishment.

Blacks who wanted to remain outside this separatist movement found themselves shut out by the militant blacks and subject to derision by, and pressures from, them. Some have been strong enough to ignore this and to make their own way. Still others, including outstanding students, have determined to remain outside this black movement but are wondering whether the price of doing so at Cornell is too high, and some are considering leaving.

Militant activity built up momentum. The University responded by what we believe was a sincere effort to communicate, to try to understand, to use reason, and to try to avoid confrontations. Because of this stance, the militants were able to commit violations of conduct for which they were not cited, and to make demands to which the University should never have acceded.

These demands became more insistent and finally culminated in the seizure of Willard Straight Hall.

Cornell has a class of over one hundred black freshmen coming to Ithaca for the first time this month. The COSEP pamphlet states, ". . . upperclassmen are playing an important part in helping entering COSEP students to become oriented to college life, particularly as it relates to them. Largely through the efforts of the Afro-American Society, freshmen find that the problems inherent in adjusting to an alien society are alleviated. During the days of formal orientation and registration, the upperclassmen arrange activities that are relevant to the COSEP students in particular. In addition, throughout the year, the upperclassmen offer tutoring and counseling and arrange dances and parties." The pamphlet explains that as student participation becomes greater in recruitment, orientation, and counseling, they will operate with little more than formal help from the COSEP committee.

We understand the militant blacks are organizing their own unofficial orientation program for black students during Freshman Orientation Week. We hope this separatist effort can be more than offset by a University program utilizing some of the stronger non-militant black students in personal contact with other blacks. In our conversations with several of these non-militants, they have indicated a willingness to do whatever they can to help. However, they expressed the belief that young blacks coming from the ghetto today are probably already militant by the time they get to Cornell. Despite this feeling, we *recommend* that such an effort be made and that this be a continuing counseling effort.

Now that Dr. Joseph has resigned her position in the COSEP office, indicating a desire to join the faculty of the Center for Afro-American Studies, we *recommend* that a careful (but prompt) selection be made of a male director (with sufficient staff support) who will have the understanding to communicate with these students and the stature to stand firm when he must. We further *recommend* that a review be made to ascertain to which member of the President's executive staff such a director should most appropriately report. We also *recommend* that in the absence of such a person an interim system be devised to provide support and social guidance for the black students, particularly those in the incoming freshman class.

Dealing with the militants who have been on the campus will be a more difficult problem. It is possible that no matter what the University does they will not be convinced of its good intentions.

Probably the best that can be hoped for is to make them realize that the administration intends to be firm but fair. It has to make it plain the University is acting—not reacting; that the University is not on trial, but those who are combatting it are. It must be prepared to do all it can to meet the legitimate aspirations of the blacks and to acknowledge their legitimate grievances. But it is its duty to insist on conduct compatible with the preservation of an atmosphere of reasonable discourse and to choose its students on that basis. Those who are not prepared to accept these terms need not remain at the University and can, and must, be separated from it.

As to the future, there must be a large enough COSEP staff to do the job satisfactorily and to communicate with the black students. We feel that the heart of this problem is the need for communications and personal contact, utilizing the best the University has to offset the influence of its own militants.

HOUSING

In the matter of housing, Cornell's inexperience in working with minority groups created problems. Blacks were given white roommates and spread singly throughout the dormitories so that many felt completely isolated, unhappy, and confused. One extreme example involved two freshman coeds who were paired together as roommates. One was a black girl from a large city ghetto area; the other was the daughter of a white southern professional man. These two eventually had a falling out. It is, perhaps, not surprising that this black girl was a leader among those responsible for starting the drive for a black women's residence.

We realize that rooming decisions for the future will undoubtedly be influenced by HEW (Department of Health, Education and Welfare) rulings. But, while we certainly do not condone separatism, we do feel that in the dormitories blacks should be placed in close enough proximity to one another and in numbers large enough to give them a sense of security and compatibility. If not a violation of discrimination laws, we feel that black freshmen should be asked explicitly if they want a black or white roommate. As it stands now, an incoming black student cannot be assured of having a black roommate unless he or she takes the initiative and so requests.

CENTER FOR AFRO-AMERICAN STUDIES

This program is starting under a cloud and in an atmosphere of deep suspicion, in large part because of the way it was devel-

oped, without sufficient faculty involvement. We *recommend* that one of the first and most important steps taken be to communicate the plans and purpose of the Center to the entire University community as soon as possible. In particular, we *recommend* that the administration request from Director Turner a detailed statement of his plans for the operation of the Center, including matters of curriculum, course study content, budget, etc. This report should be made available to the Trustees at their October meeting if possible.

At the same time, the community should be clearly reminded that as the University's 1969-70 Announcements and General Information booklets state, "Cornell at founding was considered a startling innovation in American education. Instead of pursuing conventional academic ideas, it proposed to offer any intellectually qualified person instruction in any subject. Ignoring, as it did, distinction based on religion, sex, and color, the Cornell idea was viewed as a questionable experiment."

It should be stressed that the University has had a history of experimental programs which were as strongly opposed at their inception as this one is now. A recent example is the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations. Many faculty members will remember the furor that arose when it was proposed that representatives of labor (whose academic credentials were not acceptable to the Arts College) be permitted to teach courses in the Industrial and Labor Relations School in fields in which they were experienced. No one today would question that this has evolved into a distinguished School. A determined effort must be made to get the faculty to look at this new Center and those who will make up its faculty as another such experiment in which deviations from normal University-wide practices, procedures, and standards must be permitted.

Some thoughtful professors have indicated to us that they understand concessions will have to be made as to faculty, but they urge that these disparities not become so great that the internal relationships in the University become unmanageable. One professor told us he thought salary disparities will be accepted only if the faculty can be convinced that Cornell can make a constructive and useful contribution to solving racial imbalances in this country. We *recommend* that a system be set up to maintain channels of communication to keep the community current and informed on developments at the Center. The more understanding there is of it and its work, the more chance there is for its acceptance.

Vice Provost Kennedy has said of the Black Studies program,

"The main thrust of its undergraduate program is expected to be towards the education of young professionals to work with people from depressed rural and urban areas, especially minority groups. The program will include applied courses in economics, sociology, education, housing, labor and business management, with special emphasis on inner city and depressed rural area problems and their solutions." The Center also expects to offer general courses in African and Afro-American history, literature, art, and music.

The administration must be in a position to give Mr. Turner, the director of the Center, and his faculty as much autonomy as possible in developing this program but, at the same time, the administration must retain control as it does of other centers in the University, and must be determined in this matter.

We expect that Turner will be making every effort toward a successful program for the Center. Militant students will no doubt be putting tremendous pressure on him to move more rapidly and radically than he may want to, and some of them may even be vying with him for power within the Center. (The July Alumni News reported that Turner "saw himself as a leader of an academic program and not as a leader of students. Nor, he wanted to make it clear, were they the leader of him . . . He was not coming to Cornell as the chief black.") He will need administration understanding and support. The administration must, however, maintain steady resolve in relation to developments at the Center in order that the program be a success. Most importantly, all must remember that the ultimate responsibility for this lies with the President and not with Turner.

The director has already found that some good black faculty are reluctant to come to Cornell because of its rural location in a basically white community offering little opportunity for working within a black community. Therefore, an added incentive to Turner to make this program a success is that only if it does succeed will he be able to convince quality staff personnel to come to Ithaca.

Neither this committee nor HEW is willing to accept the premise that the Center be open to blacks only. Turner has indicated that admission to the courses will be based on experience, interest, and academic qualification, without reference to race. We *recommend* that courses at the Center not only be open to serious-minded white students genuinely interested in these problems, but that these students should be encouraged to participate.

Faculty members have stressed the need for the Center to work more closely along established procedures. For instance,

they have suggested that approval of Center faculty members by two highly placed administrators is not sufficient. They have noted the lack of procedures for evaluating the program. A faculty advisory board has been suggested to our Committee as a solution to the communications problem between the program and the University at large. Problems of tenure and salaries are predicted for the future. They believe—as do we—that as many appointments as possible should be joint with an established academic department. We agree that all of these steps would be highly desirable, but from our investigation we feel that they probably cannot be realized at this time. As stated earlier, if the program is to succeed it must be thoroughly understood and conscientiously communicated as an experimental one which only with success and the passage of time can be subjected to these established procedures. Some of these questions hopefully will take care of themselves when the Center is in a position to offer a major, or to offer tenure, to its faculty. At this time, we *recommend* that the Center become subject to established procedures and practices of the University.

MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS

1. The expression “institutional racism” has been used widely on the Cornell campus over the past year or two. This Committee has been unable to obtain a clear definition of the term. It is difficult to advise white students and faculty how to conduct themselves in the light of charges concerning institutional racism without better understanding of its meaning. This Committee suggests that the Center for Afro-American Studies, under Director Turner’s leadership and guidance, might be requested to prepare a paper defining institutional racism for communication to the whites in the Cornell community.
2. Black students coming to Cornell should be considered and should consider themselves to be Cornell students. The term COSEP student should be used as little as possible.
3. Throughout all of this investigation, it has been evident that clear communications regarding both the COSEP and Afro-American Studies programs have been seriously lacking both on the campus and among the alumni. The University must be willing to explain actions taken and decisions made on these matters to its various constituencies and should devise a program to follow through on this.

Academic Freedom

Cornell historians have almost unanimously agreed that during the first century of the University there has been a high degree of sensitivity to the rights of all members of its community. They report that from the beginning Cornell has prized and supported the highest principles of academic freedom because it has been considered the heart of the University.

The concept of academic freedom is not a new one in the academic world. In American universities the definition of academic freedom as interpreted for the teacher and researcher has periodically become an important issue. More recently, the rights and freedoms of students have come under consideration. Statements of these have been issued. Exact definitions of academic freedom for the faculty, and precise elucidations of the rights and freedoms of students have historically varied with the times and the nature of the issues which seemed to threaten these concepts. When these issues and associated conflicts impinge upon civil or human rights of individuals, through harassment, coercion, or acts of violence, the threat to academic freedom invariably increases.

The basis for this present, generally accepted definition of academic freedom was developed by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges in 1940 and has been endorsed by at least sixty-three academic societies. The AAUP and the United States National Student Association have recently developed and endorsed a joint Statement of Rights and Freedoms of Students.

To illustrate the nature and scope of the concept of academic freedom, we present quotations from three documents from among the materials which have been submitted to us:

1. The AAUP-AAC (American Association of University Pro-

fessors and Association of American Colleges) statement:

The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure and agreement upon procedures to assure them in colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.

2. The joint AAUP and NSA (National Student Association) statement:

Academic institutions exist for the transmission of knowledge, the pursuit of truth, the development of students, and the general well-being of society. Free inquiry and free expression are indispensable to the attainment of these goals. As members of the academic community, students should be encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth. Institutional procedures for achieving these purposes may vary from campus to campus, but the minimal standards of academic freedom of students outlined below are essential to any community of scholars.

Freedom to teach and freedom to learn are inseparable facets of academic freedom. The freedom to learn depends upon appropriate opportunities and conditions: in the classroom, on the campus, and in the larger community. Students should exercise their freedom with responsibility.

The responsibility to secure and to respect general conditions conducive to the freedom to learn is shared by all members of the academic community. Each college and university has a duty to develop policies and procedures which provide and safeguard this freedom. Such policies and procedures should be developed at each institution within the framework of general standards and with the broadest possible participation of the members of the academic community. . . .

Student Affairs: Freedom of Inquiry and Expression.

Students and student organizations should be free to examine and discuss all questions of interest to them, and

to express opinions publicly and privately. They should always be free to support causes by orderly means which do not disrupt the regular and essential operation of the institution. At the same time, it should be made clear to the academic and the larger community that in their public expressions and/or demonstrations students or student organizations speak only for themselves.

Students should be allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing. Those routine procedures required by an institution before a guest speaker is invited to appear on campus should be designed only to insure that there is orderly scheduling of facilities and adequate preparation for the event, and that the occasion is conducted in a manner appropriate to an academic community.

3. The Cornell University faculty on May 11, 1969, unanimously adopted the following statement of principles:

Academic freedom for the faculty of Cornell University means:

Freedom

- of expression in the classroom on the subject of the course and of choice of methods in classroom teaching;
- from direction and restraint in scholarship, research, and creative expression, and in the discussion and publication of the results thereof;
- to speak and write as a citizen without institutional censorship or discipline, and

Responsibility

- to perform faithfully the duties of the position;
- to observe the special obligations of a member of a learned profession and an officer of an educational institution to seek and respect the truth;
- to make it clear that utterances made on one's own responsibility are not those of an institutional spokesman.

With this background and perspective, it was unexpected at Cornell, and yet in retrospect not surprising, that important issues involved with academic freedom and student freedoms and rights emerged from the unrest of the year and the crisis of April. The alleged violations of these vital rights and freedoms in the University included not only those arising from the conventional threats, but also from acts or threats of acts of coercion, harassment, and violence.

Previously, the need for protection of academic freedom for

faculty has been largely from pressures of individuals or groups outside the campus community. What has recently been happening on the Cornell campus has not been the threat of a normal abridgement of academic freedom from the outside. Rather the threat has been from within the Cornell community (faculty, student, and administration). The Committee feels that the faculty, through its Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure and other appropriate groups such as the Constituent Assembly, should concern themselves with these matters. Of the many examples portrayed to this Committee as possible violations of academic freedom, some of the most often repeated allegations included:

1. Threats of physical violence, both openly and under cover of anonymity
2. Emphasis by the administration on public service and social change which some faculty found disturbing when this emphasis seemed to lead quickly to politicization of the University and to concentration on tactical matters
3. Suggestions, direct or implied, to teachers to avoid certain topics
4. Lack of a "platform" from which to present opposite points of view on controversial issues
5. Introduction of change and establishment of new interdisciplinary programs without formal faculty discussion and/or approval
6. Classroom disruption and monitoring of lectures for purposes of challenging concepts presented in the classroom
7. Lack of defense by the University of faculty and/or student academic freedoms.

This Committee believes that freedom to learn as well as freedom to teach are inseparable facets of academic freedom. Therefore, we believe the University should address itself to the establishment of academic policy which clearly and objectively defines academic freedom of the student to learn and the faculty to teach and do research. Once these policies have been established and endorsed by the majority of all segments of the Cornell community, then the governing bodies of the community, including the administration and the Trustees, must provide methods of implementing these policies. However, this Committee is of the opinion that academic freedom cannot be guaranteed by legislation alone. Also needed is the faculty's and students' separate ability to pre-

2

serve mutual respect, as well as the trust of society and the University community. In times of social turmoil, trust and respect are often among the first casualties.

Much has been said about the need at Cornell for the freedom of choice. Western culture has increasingly been identified with the notion of choice. Freedom of choice can never be absolute, since absolute freedom for any one person would intolerably restrict the rights of others. Freedom's maintenance is hard to describe. It requires a delicate balance of opposite forces.

Unrestricted freedom of speech may lead to unjust curtailment of the freedom of others. Thus, the freedom of students to learn imposes upon the professor the duty to fulfill his teaching duties conscientiously. He must also be open-minded and respect the views and aspirations of an impatient younger generation and of cultural minorities which seek to assert their identity. The student likewise must recognize that "freedom to learn" implies his acceptance of his duty to abide by the guidelines of society and the community in which he has chosen to live.

This summary of opinions and statements by this Special Trustees Committee has not to this point provided a list of specific recommendations which, if followed, would guarantee absolute academic freedom for students and faculty, nor defined what Cornell's academic policy should be.

The goal is a concept of academic freedom which the Cornell community will support. To accomplish this goal, the committee *recommends* that the University under the leadership of the administration:

1. Examine the alleged threats to academic freedom reported herein to determine those which may have substance. Procedures for handling such threats should be examined and, where inadequate, revised or replaced. The Committee feels that the Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure should play a significant role in this.
2. Develop a statement of academic freedom for faculty and students. This statement should define the responsibilities of all members involved (trustees, administration, faculty, and students). Particular attention should be given to the sources of pressures which might produce restrictions of academic freedom.
3. Plan for annual convocations on the campus for discussion of

62

academic freedom. The participants should include representatives from all segments of the Cornell community, including the Board of Trustees. We make this suggestion because of our conviction that academic freedom is not a right which, once won, can be enshrined in an agreement. It is a state of mind which must be constantly renewed if it is not to wither away.

4. Arrange a program on the subject of academic freedom to be presented at an early meeting of the full Board of Trustees.

Communication

In its investigation, the Committee has constantly encountered the need for "better communication" among all elements in the Cornell community.

Administrators question the ability of current lines of communication with faculty and students both to get information across and to relay back quickly and sensitively its reception and understanding.

Faculty, starting with the deans, feel inadequately informed as to administration actions and the reasoning in back of them, and exhibit considerable confusion about their role in communicating with students and faculty in other colleges.

Students, hypersensitive to their changing role on campus, question both the amount and the accuracy of what they are told by administration and faculty, and are prone to regard faulty communication as a deliberate attempt on the part of the "Establishment" to frustrate their desire for more involvement in University affairs.

Nonacademic employees, in the middle of explosive changes and events on campus, and involved in changes of their own, such as the advent of unionization, wonder what is happening and what it will mean to their careers.

Alumni, basing much of their judgment on what they read in the press or hear through the electronic media, and having to rely far too heavily on rumor, react in a variety of ways that suggest their lack of understanding of University objectives.

The Ithaca community and surrounding towns watch events unfold at Cornell with apprehension as to what the autumn will bring once the students are back.

Throughout the Committee's study, it needs to be heavily underlined, there has been seen a remarkably deep reservoir of dedication and goodwill: Where complaints have been bitter,

they have frequently been directed at the *system* of information distribution rather than at the motives of those involved. It is equally clear, however, that a thorough review of that system and its effectiveness is called for if it is to function effectively in the fast-moving and highly-charged period immediately ahead.

Before coming to general recommendations, it is felt wise to establish certain principles regarding the communications process which govern the Committee's thinking.

First, and above all, communications effectiveness starts with the conviction on the part of leadership from top to bottom that good information management is crucial to the achievement of the University's goals. Without it, goals cannot be understood, cannot capture the support and enthusiasm of the groups which must pull together to achieve common objectives. In short, communications is a leadership function.

Second, good communications leadership begins with the clear establishment of goals, both near and long-term. Only if goals and objectives are explicitly defined can the responsible officials expect any system of communications to interpret the organization to its constituent "publics" and gain their support.

Third, communications leadership means that information is transmitted for a purpose beyond simple enlightenment: People are informed so that they will both believe and act.

Fourth, in that any organization speaks with many voices and through many means, it is essential that coordination of these messages be present so that they mutually reinforce one another and, above all, do not conflict.

Fifth, the complexity of the communications process, involving as it does personal contact, the written as well as the spoken word, the use of visuals and the entire gamut of communications techniques, requires staff professionalism of a high order to serve the needs of leadership.

Sixth, being a top management function, the communications function needs to report directly to the chief executive and be intimately involved in the establishment as well as the dissemination of policies and goals.

Seventh, while the function can be delegated, communications visibility of the top officials in the organization is essential: Those led, universally, want to see, hear, and communicate with their leaders. The symbol of the willingness to communicate is of added importance.

Eighth, communications is a two-way process and to be effective must be set up so that the means are at hand to furnish

regular and sensitive "feedback." Leadership needs to know how well its goals and objectives are understood and accepted. Knowledge of how the attitude and opinion environment in which it must live is changing is crucial input to permit readjustment of goals and priorities. Operating well, a good feedback system alerts leadership to emerging problems before they reach crisis status and while there is still time to take necessary action.

With these principles as background, the Committee makes the following generalizations on the status of communications organization and effectiveness as it has been able to observe it. Necessary to point out is that sheer time limitations on the Committee's scope of investigation makes these observations subject to more detailed verification.

First, both the apparatus and the staff capabilities for communicating with the "outside" world under normal circumstances (the press, radio and TV, the Ithaca community generally) seem to be in place and functioning well. The Willard Straight incident, however, demonstrated that staff resources are currently too limited for coping effectively with matters of major communications importance.

Second, lines of communication to the faculty, both directly and particularly through the various colleges to their own faculties, are believed to be inadequate and need strengthening.

Third, lines of communication to the students are badly in need of complete reexamination and considerable strengthening. Students today must rely far too much for their information on such sources as the *Cornell Daily Sun*, WVBR, local press, radio and TV for their information, and far too little on the University as an institution and the faculty as a group.

Fourth, communication to the nonacademic staff is deficient in that it does not give adequate attention to the key role that this staff plays in facilitating the entire academic process. These employees need to know more "why" things are done, and the way in which what they do is related to the achievement of a better and fuller professional experience for the faculty and administration, a richer life on the campus for students, etc.

Fifth, communications responsibility for getting information to various groups in the Cornell community is imperfectly defined, and the amount and frequency of information distributed to the various groups—non-faculty staff, faculty, students, etc.—varies widely. In some instances, it is unclear as to just who is directly responsible to whom for seeing that given groups are informed and listened to.

Sixth, as a generalization regarding all groups, there is an apparent reliance on non-University channels for much of the general information about developments and a heavy reliance on them for "news." The *Sun*, the *Ithaca Journal*, local radio, even the *New York Times*, are involved. This is another way of saying that the University's own channels, where it can tell its own story in its own way, are not currently sufficiently well developed to work as "official" counterbalances.

Seventh, feedback to the administration from its various key publics appears to us to be sporadic and, for the most part, informal.

Eighth, as nearly as the Committee can gather, there is not yet developed coordinative mechanisms capable of adequately reviewing the status of communications overall from the administration to its various "publics" and among those publics themselves.

It should be pointed out that in making these generalizations, the Committee is well aware of the fact that Cornell is far from unique. No major university to our knowledge has functioning today the kind and caliber of an effort which characterizes many successful business operations. But the Committee is equally aware of the opportunity that Cornell, as it considers its future, has to set in motion those steps that will ensure that it develops the set of principles and mode of operation which will put it in a leadership position in the field of communications and information management.

Recommendations

Our recommendations are as follows:

1. That immediate communications priority be given to establishing on a University-wide basis that the new Student Code and Adjudicatory System for Student Conduct are in effect and have the full support of the Board of Trustees and administration and top faculty organization. We would not presume to detail the means whereby all elements of the community, from alumni and the public generally down to the latest student arriving on campus, are informed, save to urge that a specially created program of communications effort involving all available means be put into operation to make the initial effort, and then to prosecute it vigorously during the current academic year.

2. As stated earlier, effective communications must be based on established University goals and objectives. Academic, operational, and other goals are now under major review. At the earliest opportunity these goals need to be studied for the purpose of establishing communications objectives and priorities. Such decisions then permit the development of communication plans and programs specifically supportive of the University's basic objectives themselves.

Candidates for consideration as needing communications attention, in addition to the matter of the judiciary system, are:

- A. Afro-American Studies and COSEP programs
- B. The role of the Constituent Assembly
- C. The issue of academic freedom as it is being resolved at Cornell
- D. The Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory
- E. Cornell's role in the field of social change

The above list is not meant to be either complete or necessarily in order of importance. The principle involved is the conscious establishment of communications priorities and the subsequent amount of effort to be placed in back of each. It goes without saying that different subjects will require different emphasis depending on the group involved and will call for differing usage of the means of communication—personal contact, meetings, bulletins, convocations, printed materials, articles, etc. It is assumed that the use of paid space in local papers and paid time on local radio and television will be considered as potential mechanisms for idea dissemination.

3. An analysis should be made to determine where current communications responsibility rests for getting information both to, as well as from, each of the University's publics. Included in this inventory should be all of the many groups with which the University must deal:

- A. Those "outside" the campus, such as:
 - 1. National, state and local governments
 - 2. Trustees
 - 3. Alumni and alumni organizations
 - 4. The Ithaca community
 - 5. The media, etc.
 - 6. Other universities and colleges
 - 7. High schools, private and secondary schools

8. Academic and other important professional organizations
9. Foundations, research organizations, commissions, etc.
10. The business community

B. Those groups within the campus, for example:

1. The administrative staff
2. The faculty as a group
3. The colleges through their respective deans
4. The nonacademic organization and its many departments
5. The Constituent Assembly
6. The students and the multitude of student organizations

Once such an inventory is made, the Committee recommends that assignment of operational communications responsibility be made to specific individuals, and that this be considered part of their job description. It is even conceivable that the administration might grant additional compensation for this work. Whether or not that is done, the assignment should be clear, and understood by those for whom the individual assumes communications responsibility. It is also recommended that in performance reviews of such people for promotion, raises, etc., an evaluation of communications leadership be a part of such decisions.

4. Assignment at the highest administrative level of staff responsibility for the University's communications activities: For those activities of an off-campus nature, responsibility appears to be currently so assigned; it is particularly vital that such responsibility be assigned for communications within the University. The person in charge here should obviously report to the President and have a staff capable of producing the materials and furnishing the skills needed to implement the administration's program of communications priorities. Where communications functions are lodged in various key offices and major divisions of the University, this staff person should have clearly defined supervisory responsibilities.
5. Assumption by the top officers of the University of the responsibility for personal communications leadership. The Committee understands, for example, that the University provost

is planning radio and personal appearances as part of the fall activities; this is to be highly commended.

6. Establishment of a Communications Council (or called by some other appropriate name) composed of the key individuals charged with operating communications responsibility as a result of the analysis outlined in 3 above. This group, meeting periodically and probably with the officer charged with overall communications responsibility as chairman, would be responsible for the coordination of their efforts to achieve maximum impact and effectiveness. In addition, this group could be expected to advise the administration on changes needed in priority of communications goals, the establishment and allocation of budgets, and emerging problems perceived through their respective feedback capabilities.
7. That communications be separately budgeted, including all appropriate costs wherever in the University they are incurred, so that periodic review can be made of expenditure patterns and performance.
8. That the mechanisms to ensure feedback be developed and incorporated in all communications assignments made. Each individual, starting with the officer in overall charge, should make provision for regularly evaluating what his group is thinking and an understanding of why. Further, it is probably desirable that the overall officer in charge develop a modest system of independent feedback through surveys of appropriate nature.
9. On the assumption that many people assigned operational responsibility for communications to various groups will not have had adequate training in the principles of communications and their proper management, the establishment of a short, professionally-conducted seminar in communications management. It is assumed that already in residence, in the various colleges, are talents which could be recruited. The University numbers among its alumni literally scores of recognized experts in the field whose volunteer services could undoubtedly be secured. The principle involved here, of course, is that if communications is perceived as a leadership function, those charged with its responsibility need to be given the training necessary to the task.

10. That the administration capitalize on its actions in the communications area by communicating those actions themselves. If the need for better communications is anywhere near as great as the Committee senses it to be, all elements of the University community will be basically interested in what is being done to make them better.

An end objective of the whole communications process is making every member of the Cornell community, however exalted or humble, a knowledgeable Cornellian who talks with understanding about his or her University. It is obviously an unattainable goal to expect that every individual be an enthusiastic supporter. However, if the vast majority of Cornellians, wherever they are, become in truth ambassadors for what their University is, it puts to work the strongest communications process known: individual face-to-face contact.

The Committee readily recognizes that to achieve excellence in the field of communications, effectiveness will take money as well as time. But it is convinced that a program of planning and development, begun in the fall of 1969, can in the space of a year achieve noticeable results. Consciously pursued over the next five years, it can put at the disposal of the University a system that will enable it, through professional management of the information process, to build the understanding and support that it will need to achieve its avowed goal of continued leadership among the world's great universities.

Responsibility of the Trustees

This Committee admires the dedication shown by the members of the Board of Trustees toward Cornell University. The level of their interest is high and their generosity is impressive. Attendance at Board meetings is excellent. Cornell is indeed fortunate to have such devotion among its Trustees.

However, members of the Board are not without responsibility for recent campus problems. In retrospect, the evaluations on which policy guidance was given and decisions made, in some instances, were based on too meager information or faulty judgments. Decisions or lack of them in these matters undoubtedly contributed to the campus unrest.

The Committee believes that there are several ways in which Board members might increase the effectiveness of their participation:

1. In order to be certain that Board action and advice are effective and responsible, Board members must probe and explore in depth all items brought to them. If the facts presented appear inadequate, more information or more time for their development must be requested.
2. All Board members must be prepared to participate actively in the Board deliberations.
3. After Board decisions have been reached, members must keep themselves informed as to the execution and progress of such decisions.
4. Personal interest and involvement by Board members in the activities of the University, particularly those on campus, are highly desirable.

After a crisis, such as occurred last spring at Cornell, there might be a tendency on the part of the Board to overreact. The Board must guard against such a reaction and must be certain that it does not infringe on the duties of the administration.

This Committee *recommends* the following steps to be taken:

1. That in arranging meetings of the Board of Trustees and of the Executive Committee priority be given in terms of frequency and length of time to assure maximum deliberation before reaching policy decisions.
2. That meetings of the Board and its committees be planned so that the visibility of the Trustees on the Cornell campus may be increased.
3. That Trustees take a greater responsibility in representing the University at meetings of various alumni groups, in coordination with the offices of the Vice President for Public Affairs and the Alumni Secretary.
4. That, after the installation of a new President, the responsibilities of Trustees, administration, and faculty be explained and delineated at a regular meeting of the Board of Trustees.

This report is respectfully submitted by the Special Trustees Committee.

Morton Adams
Walter G. Barlow
(Miss) Patricia J. Carry
H. Hays Clark
Charles E. Dykes
H. Victor Grohmann
Royse P. Murphy
William R. Robertson, CHAIRMAN