Plans for ROTC probe set

By Drew Jagnus

Preparations were made last week in various parts of the Institute for the Discipline Committee hearings of the students involved in last spring's ROTC incident.

In a set of controversial, poorly publicized hearings last Thursday, the Undergraduate Association Nominations Committee (UANC) selected two students to fill temporarily the two vacant undergraduate seats on the Institute's Discipline Committee. The Graduate Student Council had only one of its two seats filled. Meanwhile, the Dean for Student Affairs office attempted to advise students who would fill its seat for the hearings, since the current Dean for Student Affairs, Carla Cherkin, was not Dean at the time of the occupation.

A series of follow-up conferences by the deans and a dozen or so others met in Conron 4 to determine the future of the Institute's defense strategy and tactics.

Four members of the defense

Nomenom hearings

In the Nomenom hearings Thursday night Linda Tufts '74 and John F. Shorty '75 were appointed to the Discipline Committee until the ROTC hearings are held this week. Both students were present at the hearings before that time.

UAP Reeves confirmed the fact that he had told by Sorenson of the immediate need for the appointment of the undergraduate committee members, and that he had passed this information on to Longair by about Wednesday, September 13, five days before The Tech's headline.

When contacted again, Longair said that he had been told by Reeves by about Wednesday of the immediate need for the hearings. Prior to this Longair had intended to hold the hearings on Thursday, September 15, using the list for an organizational meeting for Nomenom. Longair decided by Friday that it would be better for Reeves to come to pick the Discipline Committee members than for one person to do so, and began telling people he ran into to get people to come to the hearings Thursday. Thursday night, Reeves identified himself and told witnesses that he had been told by faculty to go to the hearings. Observers claimed that by that time the administration had already decided to hold the hearings since Sorenson had been told by the Dean for Student Affairs, Carl Steiner, that he had violated the confusion.

The reference to precedent was involved when Mermelstein challenged attempts by the Institute's "aggressed representa-tives," David H. Boos, under Norman Sydney, to take testimony from then-Dean for Student Affairs James J. Culliton on Mermelstein's role in the occupation. Mermelstein, according to the accompanying notes, tried to show that the meeting in the hallway was a "full hearing," that it was done, and that the witness would have to substantiate his testimony. The fact that Mermelstein was present was challenged at the hearings at the time.

Observers claimed that Mermelstein's testimony seemed at least partially to contradict the days preceding, and that the Committee heard no leadees.

At no time did he admit his, identified Merinolstein as a "leader." Mermelstein stated that he had been asked to do the hearings in the building, and that there were therefore no offerers.

In the fall, so that there should have been plenty of time to hold the Nomenom hearings. It was claimed that Longair must have scheduled these hearings for Thursday night prior to present in the public room, the majority of whom seemed sympathetic to the defendants.

Myers stated that no deci-sions would be announced in any of the current hearings until all of them are completed. "The reason for law" statement was used several times in connection with the types of testimony allowed, and was clarified by one committee member, who pointed out that the committee was not a jury, and that the purpose of the hearings is to "find out what happened." Mermelstein's opening statement raised questions of common law precedents that might be applicable to the hearing, as well as whether for a clear announcement of the reputation which he had violated.
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