

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SENATE ASSEMBLY

Minutes of Assembly Meeting, March 15, 1971
and Continuation Session, March 16, 1971

ATTENDANCE

Present: Abrams, Alston, Asgar, Barnes, Bertolaet, Birch, Bishop, Bole, Bowditch, Bowman, Brown, Castor, Cornish, Crawford, DeKornfeld, Dowson, Eggertsen, Frye, Galler, Gilbert, Goodman, Graebel, Handler, Hinerman, Hooper, Huntington, Jensen, Kahn, Kish, Schaefer, Lind, Lloyd, Magee, Marsden, Meyer, Michelsen, Mills, Morgan, Nelson, Norman, Overseth, Hazlett, Porter, Price, Richards, Rigan, Rucknagel, Hildebrandt, Sandalow, Scherer, Dunn, Schuman, Sears, Sonntag, Wilkes, Yagle, Youngdahl, Yablonky, Weinberg

Absent: Bassett, Bett, Carter, Coon, Hauenstein, Iglehart, Rhodes, Shappirio, Cooperrider, Votaw

Guests: University Council Members, Classified Research Committee Members

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Weinberg called the March meeting to order at 3:20 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheatre.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes for the meetings of January 8 and January 20, 1971, were approved as distributed.

The minutes for the meeting of February 15, 1971, were approved with the following correction: That the word "Council" be substituted for "SGC" in the two places where "SGC" appears in the next to the last paragraph on page 2.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

In a series of announcements, Chairman Weinberg called attention to:

1. The annual meeting of the Senate, April 5, 1971.
2. The continuation March Assembly meeting, March 16, 1971.
3. The second part of the April meeting at which new members to SACUA will be elected. A nomination committee, he said, is being chaired by Professor Porter. Chairman Weinberg also noted that the new Senate Secretary, who also serves as Secretary of the Assembly and SACUA, would be elected at the April Senate meeting.

REPORT OF SACUA ACTIVITIES

Professor Gilbert, reporting on SACUA activities, said SACUA had held four meetings, two of them special meetings, since the last monthly meeting of the Assembly.

On February 19, SACUA discussed the question of open meetings of the Regents preparatory to meeting with the Regents to deal with the matter.

On February 22, SACUA heard a report by Professor Eggertsen, Chairman

of the Committee on University Relations, dealing with the activities of his Committee. Professor Alston, one of three members appointed to an ad hoc Committee on Nomination Procedures, gave a preliminary report on the recommendations of his Committee.

On February 28, SACUA met with SGC and discussed matters of mutual interest, among them, membership of students on faculty committees, including the Classified Research Committee and also the Resources Allocation Commission.

On March 8, SACUA completed the agenda for the March Assembly meeting. SACUA also discussed and referred to the Students Relations Committee a plan for new housing units from the OSS Housing Policy Board.

Professor Galler moved -- with a seconder -- the endorsement of a statement on "Academic Freedom and Responsibility" distributed with the call to the meeting and adopted unanimously by the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee on February 12, 1971.

Professor Galler said the University has not had such a statement, that essentially it is that of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the AAUP. He said the second section on tenure was not included since it was felt the Regents' Bylaws cover the tenure issue.

Professor Lind said he had difficulty with the last sentence on the first page. That sentence reads, "Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment." He said he finds the statement in general a good idea but hedging about is something that concerns him. He said the statement would take a good deal of interpretation and explanation. He said he would vote against adoption.

Professor Scherer said he also had a few questions about wording. How does some of the language of the statement affect classified research and what indeed is research, he asked?

Professor Galler said he did not want to interpret the words in the statement.

Professor Sandalow asked why the last sentence on page 1 is included in a statement for this institution?

Professor Galler said it's there because no one thought it was important to take out. He said it probably doesn't apply here.

Professor Rucknagel referred to the Committee in the Medical School on Human Use. He said the committee was forced on us because there were ethical problems involved in human use. We in the Medical School he said, do not have full freedom. He said, he too, has difficulty judging that phrase.

Chairman Weinberg asked whether formal action should be taken or whether the Academic Affairs Committee should be asked to take another look at the draft.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE

Professor Alston moved -- and it was seconded -- to return the proposal to the Committee with the request that the questions raised here be examined.

In a voice vote, the motion was carried to recommit the statement to the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee.

REPORT OF
COMMITTEE ON
NOMINATING
PROCEDURES

Chairman Weinberg called attention to the report of the ad hoc Committee on Nominating Procedures which had been distributed with the call to the meeting. He noted that the committee's recommendations were on pages 2 and 3.

Professor Alston, one of three members of the Committee, said the Committee addressed itself to the question of information or the lack of information when the Assembly had to act on appointments for SACUA and other units. He said the Assembly member had no basis for voting unless he knew the nominee personally. He said it seemed that it was appropriate for the Assembly to get more information on persons nominated. The recommendations, he explained, propose certain procedures for SACUA nominations.

Professor Alston moved, and Professor Galler seconded, that the report and recommendations of the Committee be adopted.

Chairman Weinberg noted that the present procedure follows points one and four. Points two, three and five are new proposals and the adoption of the recommendations would give legislative mandate to points one and four.

Professor Price asked how far in advance notice of meetings must be circulated. Chairman Weinberg said this question is covered elsewhere in existing rules requiring ten-days' advance notice. He said the chairman and SACUA have always asked for Assembly approval when this can't be done.

In a voice vote on the motion, the rules were adopted.

COMMITTEE OF
THE WHOLE

Chairman Weinberg suggested that the Assembly convene as a Committee of the Whole to discuss the proposed Council rules. He said that if we do not complete action today, we can defer final action until the continuation session tomorrow evening.

Professor Crawford moved, with Professor Gilbert seconding, that the Assembly convene as a Committee of the Whole, at 3:45 p.m.

During the 25 minutes while the Assembly sat as a Committee of the Whole, a number of the members expressed the central concern over whether existing provisions for faculty tenure were superseded by the proposed Council rules.

COMMITTEE
OF THE WHOLE
RISES

On a motion of Professor Lind, seconded by Professor Barnes, the Assembly rose from the Committee of the Whole and resumed normal procedures.

DISCUSSION
OF COUNCIL
RUI

Professor Porter moved, with Professor Eggertsen seconding, approval of Section 1.1 of the proposed new Council Rules.

Professor Sandalow asked whether a speaker invited to the campus would be covered. Professor Kahn, speaking for the Council, said he would. He explained that a complaint may be filed by any individual should there be any disruption.

Professor Norman asked what would happen if the visitor rendering a service is in the role of a defendant. Professor Kahn responded that we would have to take him to the civil courts if one were the complainant.

Professor Sandalow suggested that the language be clarified to include Professor Kahn's stated intent. He proposed that the words, "or any of its subdivisions or recognized bodies," be inserted in the third line following the words, "between any person and the University."

Professor Price moved, with Professor Sandalow seconding, an amendment to Section 1.1 inserting the phrase as proposed by Professor Sandalow.

On a vote, the amendment inserting the phrase was approved.

In the vote on Section 1.1, as amended, the motion was adopted.

In discussions on Sections 1.2 and 1.3, Professor Dunn said he opposed the double provision for "warning" and "censure" and argued that this was unnecessary.

Professor Kahn said there is an implied concept of correction. It provides latitude for the judiciary.

Professor Lind said the idea of probation suggests the idea of a continuing relationship and that of warning and censure is a one-shot affair.

In a vote on Sections 1.2 and 1.3, which were moved and seconded, the sections were approved.

Professor Porter, with Professor Eggertsen seconding, moved adoption of Section 1.4.

Professors Price and Dunn offered an amendment to substitute language in this section, which was defeated, as was substitute language proposed by Professor Brown.

In returning to the discussion of the original section, a question was asked as to the meaning of "the appropriate University scholarship fund." Professor Kahn said the matter was left to the Judiciary to define the fund.

A question was also asked about the power of the University to levy and collect fines. Professor St. Antoine said there is no problem of levying fines; collection is another matter.

On a vote, Section 1.4 was approved.

Section 1.5 was moved and seconded for approval.

Professor Sandalow offered as an amendment the addition of the following language, "or upon such other reasonable evidence that may be imposed by the Judiciary," to be inserted in the third line of the section following the words, "for a stated period of time."

Professor Sandalow's motion was seconded and approved.

The original section as amended was approved.

In discussing Section 1.6, Professor Dunn with Professor Price seconding, offered as an amendment that the last sentence of the section be stricken and that the following sentences be substituted, "If the offender is a faculty member or administrator, a fine of up to \$1,000 shall be regarded as equivalent to an exclusionary penalty. No other type of penalty shall apply."

Professor Kaplan said that this is a serious point, that the question of exclusion with students is serious. He said if we try to make changes in favor of faculty and allow to leave it for students, we should stop now.

Professors Wilkes and Lind also spoke against the proposed amendment.

In a vote on the Dunn amendment, the amendment was defeated.

Professor Scherer moved to strike the word, "temporary," from the first line of the section, with Professor Sandalow seconding.

Professor Alston said this way of proceeding confuses the issue in taking up the matter raised by Professor Galler on the question of introducing the matter of expulsion.

Professor Sandalow said dropping the word "temporary" would have no substantive effect.

Professor Kahn said the use of the word was an attempt to define and distinguish exclusion and distinguish it from the concept of expulsion.

Professor Scherer withdrew his motion to strike the word with the understanding that the Galler question would be taken up later with any editorial changes that might be necessary.

In the vote on Section 1.6, which had been moved and seconded, the section was adopted.

Chairman Weinberg announced that Section 1.7 and subsequent sections of the Council rules would be taken up at the continuation session Tuesday night.

Chairman Weinberg, in turning to the agenda item on the Report of the Committee on Classified Research, suggested we start by giving Professor Charbeneau, the Committee Chairman, a chance to present a general outline and Mister Michael Knox a chance to speak on his minority report. After that, he suggested the Assembly take the balance of time sitting as a Committee of the Whole to hear Assembly members, Committee members and others who wish to speak. Tomorrow, he said, we'll start again as a Committee of the Whole and we'll line up formal proposals. Then out of the Committee of the Whole, we can take up the proposals one at a time.

Professor Charbeneau said the annual report of the Committee is an attempt to share with the Assembly not only the results of its deliberations but also to share with the Assembly the results of other discussions and concerns and the manner in which the proceedings are carried out. For the remainder of his remarks, he summarized the contents of the six appendices attached to the report.

Mr. Michael Knox, in dealing with his minority report, read from a prepared statement which follows:

Late last November I was appointed by this body to the Classified Research Committee. As a member of this Committee, I was able to read all of the pre-proposal summaries which the Committee had reviewed since it began in the Fall of 1968. It became readily apparent to me that most of the approved research clearly violated the first criterion of the University policy on classified research. That is, that "The University will not enter into any contract supporting research the specific purpose of which is to destroy human life or to incapacitate human beings."

At Committee meetings, I have found myself compelled to vote in opposition to many proposals which, in the past, have received unanimous approval.

The University of Michigan is conducting millions of dollars of research to develop weapon systems and sub-systems which are being used by the military to kill and injure other human beings. The University is making a significant contribution to the war technology which is currently being used to kill and destroy in Southeast Asia.

Members of the Committee often point to the possible peaceful applications of military research. Somehow, these potential non-military uses are allowed to justify war research. However, the fact remains, that research funded by Defense Department agencies is used by the military for its own purposes. And, when the data and reports are classified, they are generally not available for peaceful and humane applications.

Some members of the Committee will emphasize the defensive nature of the systems being devised. But the University policy makes no such distinction between defensive and offensive weapons. All weapons research is inappropriate under existing policy.

Occasionally the issue of academic freedom will be raised. I too believe strongly that researchers should have the right to conduct investigations in any area of interest. That is, as long as they don't endanger the health and safety of others. The research which concerns me, however, does not fall under the umbrella of academic freedom because its results will be used by the military sponsor to kill and injure people.

You, as members of the Senate Assembly, have received a copy of my written report. In it I charge that inappropriate war research is able to continue here for several reasons including the following:

1. The CRC has consistently ignored Policy I of the University Policy on Classified Research by allowing such military research.

2. The Committee is not broadly representative of the University Community. The largest population on campus, the undergraduate students, are not represented at all. Even the 3 graduate student members are not selected by their student constituency. Of the 12 members, 9 are in the natural science or technical fields, only 2 are in the humanities and 1 in social science. All of the members are white, only 1 is a woman, and all faculty members are tenured. Further, no one who philosophically opposes classified research is permitted representation on the Committee.

3. The Committee has isolated itself from the rest of the University and from public opinion in general. Meetings are always secret and the details of proposed research are never made public. Members are not permitted to publicly discuss proposals or the work of the Committee. The Committee operates in a vacuum with no inputs from the rest of the University community.

4. The Committee has become an ally of classified research rather than a judge of its appropriateness. It has continually shielded the military research establishment from the public scrutiny which could jeopardize its continuation. In the two and one-half years of its existence the Committee has only rejected one proposal as inappropriate.

5. The Committee has not fulfilled its responsibility to make summary statements of all proposed research publicly available. The University Policy on Classified Research mandates the Committee to "make public sufficient information regarding the intent and sphere of the proposed research in order that its appropriateness may be perceived by the entire University." The Committee has never met this requirement.

You have received the Committee's annual report, a report from the Willow Run Laboratories, a report from the Institute of Science and Technology, Dave Chudwin's report, and my report to the Senate Assembly. You will hear many speakers - both pro and con. I believe that you will have sufficient information to make a decision, and I urge you to take some immediate action to rectify the situation.

In my report I make the following four recommendations for Senate Assembly action.

1. The amendment of University policy by the following addition: The University will not enter into any classified research contract funded by a Department of Defense agency or any other sponsor which kills or injures human beings.

2. That all classified research currently funded by Department of Defense agencies, or any other sponsor involved in the killing process, should be immediately halted.

3. That the veil of secrecy surrounding such research should be lifted to permit informed discussion within the University community.

4. That the Senate Assembly should evaluate the performance of the Classified Research Committee and publicly reconsider the appropriateness of conducting any classified research at the University.

COMMITTEE OF
THE WHOLE

On a motion of Professor Kahn, seconded by Professor Dunn, the Assembly convened as a Committee of the Whole, starting at 5:20 p.m.

During the session, the Assembly sitting as a Committee of the Whole heard from Professor Frithjof Bergmann, of LS&A, who spoke in opposition to the present practices of the Classified Research Committee and from Dr. Arthur B. French, of the Medical School, who spoke in support of the Committee's work.

On a motion of Professor Hinerman, seconded by Professor Price, the Committee of the Whole rose at 5:30 p.m.

NOMINATIONS
AND APPOINT-
MENTS

Chairman Weinberg announced that SACUA offered in nomination the names of Professor Wilfred Kaplan, Chairman of the Proper Role Committee, and Mrs. Connie Dunlap, of the Graduate Library, as University representatives to the Association of Michigan College Faculties.

With no additional nominations from the floor and on a voice vote, the nominees were declared elected.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m., with the continuation session called for Tuesday, March 16, 1971, at 7:30 p.m.

Continuation Session Tuesday, March 16, 1971

ATTENDANCE

Present: Abrams, Alston, Asgar, Barnes, Bassett, Birch, Bishop, Bole, Bowditch, Bowman, Brown, Castor, Cornish, Crawford, Dowson, Eggertsen, Frye, Galler, Gilbert, Goodman, Graebel, Handler, Hinerman, Hooper, Huntington, Jensen, Kahn, Kish, Lind, Lloyd, Rhodes, Magee, Marsden, Meyer, Mills, Morgan, Nelson, Norman, Overseth, Hazlett, Porter, Price, Richards, Rigan, Rucknagel, Sandalow, Scherer, Dunn, Schuman, Sears, Sonntag, Votaw, Wilkes, Yagle, Youngdahl, Yablonky, Weinberg

Absent: Bertolaet, Bett, Carter, Coon, DeKornfeld, Hauenstein, Iglehart, Schaefer, Michelsen, Hildebrandt, Shappirio, Cooperrider,

Guests: University Council Members, Classified Research Committee Members

Chairman Weinberg called the continuation session to order at 7:35 p.m. in the Rackham Amphitheatre.

With action completed on earlier sections of the University Council rules, the Assembly took up Section 1.7 which was moved for adoption by Professor Porter and seconded by Professor Eggertsen.

Professor Dunn moved and Professor Price seconded an amendment to add the phrase, "by some specified date," in the third line of the section following the words, "or social nature."

On a vote the amendment was carried.

On the vote on the original motion as amended, the section was approved.

On a motion by Professor Porter, and seconded by Professor Eggertsen, Section 1.8 was offered for adoption.

In the vote, Section 1.8 was approved.

Professor Porter, with Professor Eggertsen, the seconder, moved for adoption of Section 1.9.

Professor Dunn, with Professor Price seconding, offered his own draft as an amendment to the section. He noted that each violation is defined as an offense. He said this applies to Sections 4.3 and 4.4 and covers the matter of double jeopardy.

Professor Kahn said the Council spent a great deal of time and chose to define the term "act" on good legal grounds. The ultimate desire, he said, was to avoid pyramiding of penalties. Civil courts have traditionally respected the University in prosecuting cases which it has handled.

Professor Sandalow said with regard to the pyramiding of cases that everyone should understand the Judiciary would not be required to pyramid penalties.

Professor St. Antoine said the Council's desire was to limit prosecution with respect to double jeopardy. He said, I really think the rejection of the amendment is necessary; this is a most sensitive issue.

In the vote on the amendment, the amendment was defeated.

In the vote on Section 1.9 as originally proposed, the section was adopted.

Professor Porter moved and Professor Eggertsen seconded the approval of Section 1.10.

In the vote, Section 1.10 was approved.

On a motion and second, the Assembly convened as a Committee of the Whole at 7:55 p.m.

Professor Galler said he re-wrote his original proposal to give a definition to the word, "expulsion."

CALL TO
ORDER

PROPOSED
UNIVERSITY
COUNCIL
RULES

COMMITTEE
OF THE WHOLE

Professor Kaplan noted that the whole issue of exclusion was debated widely in the Council. He said it's our feeling that the impact of exclusion is hard to see. Persons can still remain on the campus even if he's excluded. By setting penalties too high, we're going to make the judicial system most difficult to work.

Professor Sandalow said expulsion is not unreasonable. He said a student always has the right to return and ask for a review of his case for re-admission.

Professor Porter asked whether the Council rules amount to revocation of the principle that no one can be fired for cause.

Professor St. Antoine replied by saying that if there are professional qualifications or academic standards that aren't being met, there may be cause for dismissal. The Council, he said, is not designed to write rules for the faculty per se or standards per se. A question which goes to the right of the faculty to remain members of the faculty per se is not the concern of the Council. He said once these rules are adopted, our job of writing rules has only started. We're writing basic standards at the present time; this is by no means an all-inclusive package at the present time.

Professor Kaplan noted that the effect on students and faculty in Professor Galler's proposal would be quite different. Students would be immediately separated from the University; for faculty, it would not be the same.

COMMITTEE

RI...

On a motion, which was seconded, the Committee of the Whole rose at 8:25 p.m.

Professor Galler offered his re-statement as a new proposed Section 1.61, which reads:

"Expulsion" means a permanent separation from the University. If an offender is a student, he shall be barred from further enrollment. If an offender is a faculty member, he shall be recommended for dismissal according to the provisions of Regent's Bylaw 5.09(5). If an offender is an administrator, he shall be recommended to the Regents for dismissal under the provisions of Bylaw 5.07.

In the vote on Professor Galler's proposal, the section was adopted.

Professor Porter moved, with Professor Eggertsen seconding, the adoption of Section 2.1.

Professor Dunn, with Professor Price seconding, offered a substitute text under the penalty provision.

Professor Kaplan spoke against the amendment, asking what kind of offense are you going to bring against a first offender which calls for exclusion and expulsion.

In the vote on the substitute penalty clause in Section 2.1, the motion was a tie vote and therefore was defeated.

Professor Price, with Professor Dunn seconding, moved to strike the phrase, "during any one calendar year."

In the vote on the amendment to delete the phrase, the motion was carried.

In the vote on the original section as amended, the section was adopted.

Professor Porter, with Professor Eggertsen seconding, moved for adoption of Section 2.2.

Professor Price, with Professor Dunn seconding, moved again to strike the phrase, "during any one calendar year."

On a vote, the amendment was carried.

In the vote on the original section as amended, the section was approved.

Professor Porter, with Professor Eggertsen seconding, moved for the adoption of Section 2.3.

Professor Brown moved as an amendment to insert the word "wilfully" in the second line of the section after the word, "shall." His motion was seconded by Professor Bowman.

Professor St. Antoine said the Council would have no objection to the insertion of the word.

Professor Galler said he was opposed to the amendment.

In the vote on the Brown amendment, the amendment was carried.

Professor Dunn announced that he was withdrawing the rest of his proposed amendments from here on.

Professor Sandalow moved to substitute language in the next to the last line of the section, with Professor Norman seconding. The proposed language, under the Penalty clause, would read: "Each violation of this Rule shall make the offender liable to warning, censure, restitution or fine not to exceed a total of \$500.000, work assignment, or any combination of these."

In the vote on the Sandalow amendment, the new language was approved.

In the vote on Section 2.3 as amended, the section was approved.

The motion to approve Section 2.4 was offered by Professor Porter and seconded by Professor Eggertsen.

Professor Price asked what the word, "Interference," is likely to mean significantly.

Professor St. Antoine replied by saying that the language can only be made concrete when the Judiciary deals with specific cases. He said the word was intended to mean serious interference with someone on the campus.

In the vote on Section 2.4, the section was adopted.

The motion to approve Section 2.5 was offered by Professor Porter, with Professor Eggertsen as the seconder.

Professor Galler asked about the word "significant" and whether janitors interfered with would be a basis for a finding.

Professor St. Antoine said he would not regard this example as interference. He said he would suspect that a violation will come in cases involving injury or damage to property in this section.

Professor Galler moved to delete the word "significant" (the first word in line 6 of this section). Professor Price seconded.

Professor Price said there is a serious problem of security on the campus. He said it is necessary to adopt some security precaution and to be able to close the University at night. It's simply a question of a janitor and his mop, he said.

Professor Alston said in practice the Judiciary will make decisions on each individual case whether regulations have been violated regardless of the word.

Professor Sandalow asked whether the Council would not like to reconsider this section.

Professor St. Antoine said it's quite impossible to anticipate everything that may happen. He said this rule was carefully considered. He said he did not intend to suggest that he was trivializing the work of the janitor and his mop.

In the vote to strike the word, the amendment was defeated.

Professor Crawford moved to delete the last two sentences from Section 2.5. He was supported by Professor Magee.

Professor Magee asked for the meaning of the phrase, "substantial risk of injury." He said the Judiciary will look at what happened in fact. It is the view of the Administration, he said, that peaceful overnight occupation of buildings is in fact impossible.

In the vote on the Crawford amendment, the motion was carried.

In the vote on Section 2.5 as amended, the section was adopted.

Section 3.1 was offered for approval by Professor Porter, with Professor Eggertsen seconding.

In the vote, Section 3.1 was approved.

Professor Porter, with Professor Eggertsen seconding, moved for adoption of Section 3.2.

Professor Dunn, with Professor Price seconding, moved to substitute the word "may" for "shall" in the second line of the section.

Professor Kaplan said the intention of the Council in using that word implies "must".

In the vote on the amendment, the amendment was defeated.

In the vote on the original motion, Section 3.2 was approved.

Subsequent sections 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 were offered for approval by Professor Porter, with Professor Eggertsen seconding.

In separate votes, each of these sections was approved.

With the completion of consideration of the proposed draft, Professor Price offered the following motion, with Professor Dunn seconding:

Nothing in this document shall, however, be construed to prohibit the ordinary disciplinary bodies of the University from suspending, excluding, or expelling a member of the University convicted of a felony in the public courts when such action is deemed in the best interest of the University community, or necessary to maintain professional standards.

In a vote on the Price motion, the motion was defeated.

Chairman Weinberg said the Council will now be asked to take the amendments under consideration. The Regents and SGC also will be looking at the new proposals. He said they may propose changes in sections which the Assembly has approved. The Assembly may have to go through a formal procedure later.

Chairman Weinberg reminded the Assembly that we now return to the Classified Research issue and suggested that we go back to the Committee of the Whole. He noted that additional material on the issue had been distributed at the meeting.

On a motion, the Assembly convened as a Committee of the Whole, at 9:15 p.m.

Chairman Weinberg indicated that he had a list of 28 speakers who wished to be heard and asked whether the Assembly wishes to set aside a block of time for them.

Professor Norman suggested that we listen to the speakers for an hour and then decide on a further procedure, perhaps setting up a three-minute limit for each subsequent speaker.

REPORT OF
CLASSIFIED
RESEARCH
COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE OF
THE WHOLE

The following persons addressed the Assembly: (Texts of remarks are on file in the SACUA Office wherever such prepared texts were used and made available to the Secretary):

Professor Joseph Rowe, Chairman, Department of Electrical Engineering.

Mr. David Chudwin, Managing Editor, The Michigan Daily.

Mr. Donald Winter, graduate student in physics, working at the Willow Run Laboratories.

Mr. Jerry DeGriek, representing a group opposing classified research at the University.

Professor George Kish, ISR, member of the Classified Research Committee.

Professor Raymond Grew, LS&A (History).

Professor Thomas Butler, Department of Electrical Engineering.

Mr. Douglas Cornell, representing the Radical Independent Party.

Mr. Bruce Arden.

Mr. Robert Vincent, graduate student, at Willow Run Laboratories.

Mr. Jim Brugh, representing Brain Mistrust.

Mr. Ted Birdsall.

At 10:45 p.m., Chairman Weinberg raised the question as to a further procedure, noting that he still has a substantial list of names of speakers who want to be heard.

Professor Galler suggested the Assembly continue to hear the speakers, with a three-minute limitation on each speech.

Additional speakers who were heard were:

Mr. William Brown, Willow Run Laboratories.

Professor Norman Barnett, Architectural Acoustics.

Professor Leslie M. Jones, Department of Aerospace Engineering, member of Classified Research Committee.

Professor William Ribbens, Department of Electrical Engineering.

Mr. Phil Alexander, graduate student.

Professor Alan MacNee, Professor of Engineering, with Cooley Laboratories.

Dean Gordon Van Wylen, College of Engineering.

Mr. Jerry Zelenka, Head, Optics Section, Willow Run Laboratories.

Mr. John Latta, Willow Run Laboratories.

Mr. Donald Sweeney, graduate student, Willow Run Laboratories.

Mr. Carl Leonard, graduate student in Electrical Engineering, Radar Optics Laboratory.

Professor John Lyon, College of Engineering.

At this point Chairman Weinberg indicated that all those who wished to speak have been called. He called attention to the resolutions which have been distributed.

Professor Lind suggested a set of procedures. Chairman Weinberg suggested that he proposed to take up the most drastic changes that have been proposed first.

Professor Rucknagel asked whether we're excluding resolutions not proposed by Assembly members.

Chairman Weinberg said, "no". He said we're merely trying to line up procedures for consideration when we get out of the Committee of the Whole. No resolution, he said, will be considered unless they're made by Assembly members.

It was agreed to take thirty minutes for general discussion of all the proposals at the end of which a straw vote will be taken to decide on the sequence in which to take up the resolutions.

Professor Crawford asked to be invited to consider a motion for adjournment.

Chairman Weinberg explained he should move to have the Committee of the Whole rise.

Professor Crawford moved that the Committee of the Whole rise, and his motion was seconded.

Professor Scherer rose to a point of order. He asked when we can get together again.

Chairman Weinberg said we cannot call a meeting for tomorrow night since we have no way of notifying absent members in so short a time. The only possible earliest meeting time is Friday night, he said. He also noted that a motion to rise from the Committee of the Whole is not debatable.

COMMITTEE
OF THE
WHOLE
RISES

In the vote to rise from the Committee of the Whole, the motion was carried and the Committee of the Whole rose at 11:55 p.m.

Professor Crawford moved to suspend the rules. His motion was seconded and, on a vote, was carried.

Discussion followed on the question of setting another meeting time. It was proposed to meet at the regular time on Monday, March 22, at 3:15 p.m. Notification of the meeting place will be announced later.

Professor Crawford moved to adjourn. His motion was seconded and, on a vote, was carried.

ADJOURN-
MENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:58 p.m.

Ben Yablonky
Secretary