More trials

Last Friday's open discipline hearing represented a careful attempt by the Discipline Committee to be more open and careful of due process than it was in the recent case of UAP Mike Albert's expulsion. Nonetheless, defendant George Katsiaficas and "the people" succeeded in making a shambles of the hearing without quite pushing things as far as they probably could. The successful guerilla theater on the part of the defendants, the questions which appealed to different sets of values, and the inability of the prosecution and defense dramatized the inability of our present institutions, however carefully they may be run, to relate to changing values. It was demonstrated clearly that there remains to be done the definition and responsibilities of the members of this community in a way that will win the support of everyone.

For the immediate future, we are stuck with the present structure. Whatever its defects, some sort of judicial system is necessary for the preservation of the Institute. There are, however, a few rather simple things which can be done immediately to improve the system, pending a careful overhaul which might include a formal declaration of rights and responsibilities. The Dean for Student Affairs should decide whether he wants to be a judge or a prosecuting attorney, for instance. The committee should decide if it is needed at all to give defendants more time to prepare cases as the cases become more complex. We also think that the committee might be well advised to think through (with the help of other members of the community) the problem of conflicting sets of values and how the Institute can address this problem. Finally, the committee should be more effective in its relations with the community. In the past, the committee has dealt primarily with problems such as cheating, and its proceedings have apparently been confined to the sets of the committee. However, there is a greater degree of openness. The open hearing Friday was a well-intentioned attempt to solve this problem. We do not expect the committee to hold future hearings under such circumstances, we trust that it will not return to its former policy of secrecy, and we will attempt to relate its deliberations to norms acceptable to all members of the community.
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