The picture that administrators assert emerges is a trusting tableau in which administrators come before the faculty to provide them with accurate information, and have the faculty approve a set of principles which will guide the necessarily small administration group that assumes responsibility for handling a crisis. Among these principles, presumably, are unstated notions of academic and intellectual freedom in the university. It is this set of guiding principles that Johnson asks the faculty to affirm, and it is this virtually universally accepted set that somehow guides any decisions made to deal with a threat to the university structure.

What actually happened is rather different.

Exactly what the president was requesting from the faculty, both in January, and in the meetings of November 3, 4, and 6, 1969, during the November Actions, was kept, perhaps purposefully, rather nebulous. No explicit appeal was made for support by the faculty of a set of principles. In fact, the only principle ever enunciated was the declaration that the president would not negotiate with a group that presented ultimatums and used force and violence, and this was not stated as a proposition for the faculty to affirm: Johnson simply announced that he would not talk with the office occupiers.

The minutes of the faculty meetings for November 3, 4, and 6 and January 15 never express the idea that the president requested any manner of support by the faculty. In the minutes for November 3, for example, it is an obliging Prof. French who, persuading that all this (the November Actions) is a blow at the heart of crushing bad and complex problems in a civilized way, and believing that the officers of the Institute must have the support of the faculty and the community in taking steps to counter a direct, symbolic threat to the principles of our society, and to the faculty, they affirmed the president in the actions that he announced today.

Those actions had consisted largely in obtaining a temporary restraining order against the November Action Coalition. The minutes of the November 3 meeting continued:

To a question as to the meaning of the restraining order, the measure of our court over its applications, and faculty jurisdiction in the matter, the president said that it was specifically temporary and slow in its specifications of unlawful acts; that the reporting reporting responsibility is ours but the court could act on its own if we chose so to act, but that if the faculty said it did not approve, he would be in an awkward position but violence and coercion cannot be tolerated. (Unread notes.)

The president himself was finally implicitly requesting support of an action he had already taken.

After a report on a confrontation at the Placement Office involving recruiters for the General Electric Corporation who had come on campus during a GE strike,

Professor Grecup's statement was followed by what the minutes call the execution of administrators' decisions. But the president himself was implicitly asking the faculty to approve his actions, perhaps again in order to avoid a civil action. He presented the minutes, but the minutes are silent on the matter.

In fact, Letwin had said considerably more, but the minutes are silent on the matter. For Howard Johnson, the expressed reason for a faculty meeting becomes somewhat more complicated. He recalled recently:

We had stayed, in all of these things, in close communication with the president and (00 side with him and had been of the president and (00 side with him and had been of the president. But you ask what he really wanted?... He was looking for the faculty to relieve the administration of its responsibility under the circumstances.

And the purpose: First, when you have something high before the faculty, they are informed and they must approve policy. They can be informed and they must approve policy.

When you talk principles, you could be talking very vaguely; I don't mean it vaguely. You're talking & plan, a plan of where the bridge acceptable

We had to talk to the faculty as well as other groups to make sure we were getting on a basis that was (a) understood, and (b) supported.

They [the faculty] can't make a decision in terms ofdoesn't make a decision in terms of what.

And there was a sort of massiveness to the principle. They might have said, this is a principle to be followed, and then they might not have said that this is the way to deal with the problem of communication in a face to face meeting.

Well, I hoped and expected that by that time there might be a move on the part of the people to move out of there. But we had a situation to deal with; the question of what do you do about it; was responsible for any action there was going to be making place, but it was my practice to stay in close touch with the faculty as well as other groups to make sure we were getting on a basis that was (a) understood, and (b) supported.

They [the faculty] can't make a decision in terms of doing it or not doing it. They can't be accused of not being in an educational institution.

And when principles, you could be talking very vaguely; I don't mean it vaguely. You're talking a plan, a plan of where the institution is going, that is supported and supported by all the people and groups involved.

If you have principles and you have a plan, then finally you get to relatively minor questions during that period. Those three questions became very important—questions of tactics. And there I was guided by the notion, as I had of ours, that I did not want to see a situation in which police were necessary on campus. But that's almost the other level, l would suggest. Stone institutions row and fall on that.

And on the tactical level frequency you can neither take the fire nor have the time to have large communication and review it. But I proposed, I think, the idea of citizen-initiated fire alarm, not a situation in a very situation. And that's the way we do it.
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We had to talk to the faculty as well as other groups to make sure we were getting on a basis that was (a) understood, and (b) supported.

They [the faculty] can't make a decision in terms of doing it or not doing it. They can't be accused of not being in an educational institution.

And when principles, you could be talking very vaguely; I don't mean it vaguely. You're talking a plan, a plan of where the institution is going, that is supported and supported by all the people and groups involved.

If you have principles and you have a plan, then finally you get to relatively minor questions during that period. Those three questions became very important—questions of tactics. And there I was guided by the notion, as I had of ours, that I did not want to see a situation in which police were necessary on campus. But that's almost the other level, I would suggest. Stone institutions row and fall on that.
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