

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, December 1, 1969 Room 350 Modern Languages

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, December 1, 1969, in the Modern Languages Building auditorium (Room 350). Fifty-one members were present with Vice President McMillan presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Anthony, Ares, Armstrong, Bannister, Bartlett, Blecha, Blitzler, Bok, Brewer, Burton, Davis, Delaplane, Dewhirst, DuVal, Fahey, Gegenheimer, Goodwin, Green, Herber, Higley, Houston, Hull, Kassander, Kemmerer, Krebs, Krutzsch, Lytle, Mautner, McMillan, Mees, Murphy, H. Myers, Nigh, Paylore, Resnick, Richard, Robson, Saarinen, Selke, Siegel, Sigworth, Skinner, Spicer, Svob, Tomizuka, M. Voris, W. Voris, Windsor, Wise, Yoshino, and Zwolinski. Student representatives attending were Mark Ginsberg, Bill White, and Alex Kelter.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Barnes, Bingham, Carlson, Christopherson, Dutt, Forrester, Gaines, Gould, Harvill, Hetrick, Johnson, Little, Lowe, Massengale, Miller, L. Myers, Paulsen, Rhodes, Roy, Sorensen, and Younggren.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of November 3, 1969 were approved as distributed, with the following corrections: On page 1223, line 13, preceding the comment by Dr. Robson, the following should be inserted: "Dr. Hetrick said that he appreciated the fact that the University may have lost some friends. However he did not see why faculty members needed to be publicly reminded of their obligations, especially in view of the resolution adopted by the Faculty Senate on October 6. The newspaper treatment of the Regents' action was unfortunate and many people saw the threat of an attack on academic freedom."

In the fifteenth line in the sentence reporting Dr. Robson's comments the word "teaching" should be replaced by the word "lecturing". The corrected sentence should read, "Professors do not owe students a certain number of hours of lecturing."

CATALOG MATERIAL: The following catalog material was accepted:

New

New Courses for Extension Regional Winter School:

Agricultural Economics 6220C, Public Affairs Education (1-2) II Mauch

Agricultural Education 6253C, Innovative Methods in Extension Education (1-2) II
Schneeflock

Agricultural Education 6399C, Seminar--Today's Agricultural Challenge (1-2) II Olsen

Home Economics 6252C, Effective Approaches to Nutrition Education (1-2) II Todhunter

Home Economics 6266C, Developmental Approaches in Consumer Education (1-2) II Bradish

A proposal to offer the Master of Science Degree with a major in Alcohol Studies was approved, subject to financial support being found feasible.

Metallurgical Engineering 199, Independent Study (1-3) I, II Staff
Microbiology (Medicine) 360, Structure and Function of the Immunoglobulins (3) I, II
Pinckard
Microbiology (Medicine) 361, Immunologic Aspects of the Lymphoreticular System (3) I, II
Pinckard
Physics 131, Introduction to Atomic Physics (3) I, II Vuillemin & Chambers

Changes

Psychology 9, Systematic and Contemporary Psychology (3) I, II DELETE
Psychology 362, Personality and Cognitive Assessment I (4) change to Clinical Assessment
Psychology 363, Personality Assessment II (4) II change to Personality Assessment (3)

CLARIFICATION OF OPERATING PROCEDURE FOR UNIVERSITY HEARING COMMITTEE APPROVED BY FACULTY SENATE ON OCTOBER 6, 1969: Dr. Dewhirst, representing Vice President Johnson, explained that the ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee on the Adjudication of Disputes Related to Nonacademic Activities of Students recommended certain changes for the purposes of clarification in the report of that committee accepted on October 6 which established the operating procedures of the University Hearing Committee. These recommendations would implement what was understood as having been included in the approving action of October 6.

The changes were as follows:

1. All references to "days" in Item 5, Operating Procedure, should be preceded by the term "school".
2. The sentence, "For purposes of this document, school days are all those days on which classes are held (Including summer sessions)," should be added at the end of the first paragraph following the statement, "Although circumstances. by the Committee."
3. Item 5. Operating Procedure, subsection "b" should start with the phrase, "The hearing shall begin," rather than, "Scheduling the initiation of the hearing," as was questioned but approved by the Senate.
4. Item 5. Operating Procedure, subsection "c" the phrase, "...the initiation of the hearing..." should be changed to, "...the hearing begins..."

Paragraph 5 and subparagraphs a, b, c, with the clarified wording, would then read as follows:

5. Operating Procedure: Appeals to the Committee must be made within two (2) school days after a decision by the Dean of Men or Dean of Women. Upon receipt of a request for action by the Committee, the Chairman should within three (3) school days initiate action on the case by the University Hearing Committee. Although circumstances may vary, the following procedures should be minimal for cases requiring action by the Committee. For purposes of this document, school days are all those days on which classes are held (including summer sessions).

- a. Certification in writing to the appellant that a request for action has been received.
- b. The hearing shall begin as soon as possible, but in no case later than eight (8) school days after receipt of an appellant's request for action.
- c. The student should be informed, in writing, at least three (3) school days before the hearing begins of the reasons for the proposed disciplinary hearing with sufficient particularity to insure opportunity to prepare for the hearing.

The written notice should include the information that the student appearing before the University Hearing Committee has the right to be assisted in his defense by an advisor of his choice from the faculty, staff or student body. Should the student desire advisory assistance but does not know where to obtain it, the Chairman of the Committee should render assistance by providing names of faculty, staff or students who would act in that capacity.

On motion by Dr. Dewhirst, seconded by Professor Mees, the Senate voted its approval of the clarified wording with no dissenting vote.

ELECTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO THE UNIVERSITY HEARING COMMITTEE: Mr. McMillan called on Dr. Philip Krutzsch, chairman of the Committee on Committees, to present a slate of nominees for the faculty members of the recently created University Hearing Committee. The document establishing the committee had provided that the Hearing Committee be composed of five members, two members from the student body and three members from the teaching faculty. The three faculty members were to be elected by the Faculty Senate by secret ballot upon nomination by the Committee on Committees which was to furnish twice as many names as persons to be elected. Not more than one member of a college faculty should be on the committee at the same time. The term of membership should be three years, one person to be elected annually. At the time of the first election the person with the highest number of votes should serve for three years, the next highest for two years, and the third highest for one year. Subsequent elections were to be for three years. Members could be re-elected to the committee. The document otherwise provided for the election of student members and for the replacement of committee members.

Dr. Krutzsch reported that the Committee on Committees wished to place in nomination six names as follows: Dr. Clifford Lytle, Dr. Andrew Wilson, Dr. Samuel Fain, Dr. Albert Picchioni, Dr. Leonard Dewhirst, and Dr. William H. Dantzler. Mr. McMillan asked Professor Mees and Professor Burton to serve as tellers. Voting was by ballot. It was later reported that the three persons elected were Dr. Dewhirst, Dr. Lytle, and Dr. Wilson. Dr. Dewhirst, having received the highest number of votes, will serve three years. Dr. Lytle received the next highest number of votes and will serve two years. Dr. Wilson, in third place, will serve one year.

Mr. Ginsberg reported that the student members of the Hearing Committee, already elected, would be Margaret McConnell and Randy Tufts.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMBERS OF AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY UNIVERSITY CLASS ATTENDANCE

POLICY: The secretary informed the Senate that in accordance with action by the Senate at a recent meeting approving a memorial from the Student Senate concerning the University's course attendance policy (Student Senate Act #231-- See Faculty Senate Minutes of October 20, 1969), President Harvill had appointed an ad hoc committee to study this question. The members were as follows: Professor Alethea Mattingly, Chairman; Professor Timothy Brown, Jr; Professor Lloyd E. Burton; Professor Louis C. Gasper; Professor Neal D. Houghton; Professor Thomas M. Morris; and Professor Harry E. Stewart.

DISCUSSION OF THE PHOTOGRAPHING OF STUDENTS AT CAMPUS GATHERINGS BY UNIVERSITY

POLICE: At this point Dr. Skinner moved that item 9 on the agenda, "Discussion of the photographing of Students at Campus Gatherings by University Police", be moved to the next order of business, ahead of agenda item 6, "Further Discussion of Report of ad hoc Committee to Develop Statement regarding Freedom of Expression". The motion was seconded by Dr. Siegel. Dean Myers said he saw no need to alter the agenda. Dr. Bartlett said he would like to know what the student representatives thought about this issue. Mr. Ginsberg said that the matter was of some urgency in the minds of the students. He hoped it could be discussed at this meeting. After several other comments by Senate members for and against changing the agenda order, the question was called for and the motion carried.

Dr. Gegenheimer said he felt a full statement from responsible sources was needed about the issue of the photographing of students at recent campus gatherings. So many wild reports had been circulated that he for one felt he was ignorant and in doubt. These had included reports of students being so badly beaten by campus police that they were in St. Mary's Hospital, reports of University faculty members being injured by campus police, etc. Dean Hull said that he had read much in the Wildcat about students being photographed but felt that Wildcat reports could not always be depended upon to be correct.

Mr. McMillan then asked Vice President Houston if he would speak to the Senate about this question. Mr. Houston said he would be glad to do so. He said he had been shocked to read the memorandum that had been circulated by certain members of the faculty criticizing the taking of pictures. He said he would like to be enlightened as to what was wrong with the procedure being followed by the campus security department. Reports on the activity in the Wildcat had been misleading, he said, in that the reports had been biased and had reported only one side of the matter. He said he could have written a letter to the editor of the Wildcat refuting the statements in the newspaper, but he had chosen not to do so. He felt it was appropriate to discuss the matter in the Senate so that all sides of the issue could be presented. He said he therefore would try to give the side of the "big, bad campus policemen".

He explained that the University of Arizona has a number of rules and regulations which the campus police are charged with the responsibility of enforcing. One of these is that students are not to pass out leaflets on the campus indiscriminately, without permission to do so. The reason for this is one of economics. It is difficult to clean up the litter of leaflets that are thrown on the ground when they are passed out; the dollars this would cost are hard to come by. There is concern with what is printed on handbills, Mr. Houston said, but this is of secondary consideration.

He said that the Wildcat had reported that the leaflets being circulated during the recent November Vietnam Moratorium period had been approved by Vice President Johnson. In fact Mr. Johnson had approved the distribution of only one leaflet, Mr. Houston said, the announcement of the schedule of events of the moratorium. A number of other leaflets, handbills, and brochures had been passed out also those same days, Mr. Houston said, and he held up several of these to show the Senate. These included a Black Panther publication, a reprint of a Wildcat article, and several other items. Mr. Houston asked the senators to hold in mind that the campus police were only concerned with maintaining University rules and regulations. They are human and they sometimes do make mistakes. When an officer asks a student a question or attempts to enforce a campus regulation and the student says to the policeman, "Go to _____, you _____ pig," and when the individual refuses to abide by a direction the officer gives him, the officer's decision then usually is to try to identify the student with whom he is experiencing the difficulty. When the student refuses to be identified, it sometimes becomes necessary to take pictures. "How else can you identify a student," Mr. Houston asked, "than by taking a picture when the student has declined to identify himself?" He told the Senate members he would be glad to have suggestions from them how to identify students. He said he didn't want to suppress freedom on the University of Arizona campus or curtail freedom of expression or speech. This nation is based on this freedom. However it is necessary to maintain order.

Mr. Houston said some persons had claimed that officers had in recent situations taken pictures of individuals after their identification had been presented. This may have happened. Officers can make mistakes.

He said he had seen a picture of an officer taking pictures of students and he did not know what the explanation of this might be. Who was taking pictures of the policemen? He said there did seem to be a preconceived plan to break down order on this campus, in some fashion, thus "getting back" at the University administration.

Officers, being only human, do make mistakes, Mr. Houston said again. He said, however, he had given orders not to take pictures of any individual who was cooperative and gave his identification. He said he could not guarantee that problems would not come up in the difficult activity of maintaining order. He said he had seen newspaper quotations that students were under the spectre of the fear that dossiers were kept on individual students including pictures. He assured the Senate that his department did not maintain files on students' activities with or without pictures.

He said one might ask why pictures are taken at Speakers' Corner. He said speakers often use four-letter words. This is not the way he believed the Administration wanted students speaking publicly on the campus to speak. He said a number of parents had called or written the University complaining about the language used by some speakers at Speakers' Corner. He said he had been accused of speaking roughly himself at times, but he said the foul language used by some speakers at Speakers' Corner even turned his stomach. If you don't get pictures of people speaking at Speakers' Corner, they will sometimes not admit later that they were participating there, he emphasized.

Mr. Houston said he would like to point out that President Harvill's belief is never to keep permanent records on students' behavior. Permanent University records should not carry all the mistakes a student makes while an undergraduate. They should be wiped clean when he graduates. Therefore, Mr. Houston said, the security office keeps nothing in its files after an incident is over.

Mr. Houston said he was hurt when he read the memorandum being circulated over the signatures of a number of faculty members because none of them, with the exception of Dean Ares, had made any attempt to reach him to learn the other side of the story.

Dr. Gegenheimer said he would like to ask Mr. Houston several questions. Were pictures taken of individuals passing out the duly authorized leaflets? Mr. Houston said he understood such persons were not photographed. Mr. Houston said he would like to emphasize that only a very few pictures were taken in any event.

Dr. Gegenheimer asked if pictures were taken of individuals receiving the pamphlets from the distributing people. Mr. Houston answered that as far as he knew only persons passing out leaflets were photographed. Of course in the background of any picture someone might be seen receiving a pamphlet. Dr. Gegenheimer asked if anyone was physically hurt during the photographing activities. Mr. Houston said, "No, absolutely not."

Mr. McMillan then recognized Mr. Bill White, one of the three student representatives to the Faculty Senate. Mr. White said he was personally involved during the recent moratorium activity both as vice president of the Associated Students and as one of the ^{active participants} planners of the moratorium observance. He said he himself was photographed so he would like to make a statement to the Senate. He said early in the week of the November Vietnam Moratorium activity a number of students had complained to him that pictures were being taken. It was noted that on Monday a camera with a telescopic lens located in the ROTC building (Old Main) was used to take pictures of persons speaking at Speakers' Corner. He commented that if obscene remarks are made at Speakers' Corner and a person is offended by them, he doesn't have to remain to listen. He said he found the situation rather contradictory that a camera set up with a telescopic lens in the ROTC building would be used to take pictures of persons speaking at Speakers' Corner in case they used obscene language. How could the photographer hear what the speakers were saying?

The reports of the students being photographed continuing to reach him, Mr. White said on Wednesday he attempted to reach Mr. Paxton but Mr. Paxton was out of his office. He then called Vice President Johnson and told him of the activity. Mr. Johnson assured him he would look into the matter. Mr. White said that he then assumed that the photographing would be discontinued. He said the picture taking continued and he grew increasingly concerned, feeling that this activity was indeed inhibiting the freedom of speech on the campus. Some students felt that if their pictures were being taken the pictures probably were going to end up in some file. He said he knew of no way to convince students otherwise when they begin to fear that the taking of pictures by campus police are for the purpose of placing such pictures in some University file for future

action against the students concerned. After his visit with Vice President Johnson, however, he felt the matter was going to be resolved.

The next day ^{Thursday} on finding that picture taking was still taking place, he again talked to Mr. Johnson. He said that he and the other ASUA leaders were making every effort to keep things peaceful on this campus and stay on top of potentially explosive situations. He said Mr. Johnson assured him that the matter was being taken care of and that he had approved the distribution of the leaflets describing the Vietnam Moratorium schedule. The following day the picture taking continued to take place. He said he called Vice President Johnson who then came to the Associated Students Office and assured the students that he had approved the distribution of the handbill on the schedule.

Mr. White commented that Vice ^{President} Johnson did not approve the other literature for distribution. However he felt that the other items that Mr. Houston reported as having been distributed were in fact harmless.

He said having again been reassured by Mr. Johnson that what was going on was officially approved, that is, the leaflet distribution, he went to Louie's Lower Level to have lunch. Three students came to him saying that they had just had their picture taken and they were frightened. He said he couldn't believe the picture taking was still going on. He then himself obtained a supply of the schedule of events officially approved by Vice President Johnson and went to the University mall to pass them out. Sergeant Childs of the campus police force came up to him with a camera and took his picture. He did not ask for any identification. He did not see what Mr. White was passing out. He did not ask to see what he was passing out. He did not ^{indicate that a university rule was} criticize him for passing ~~out anything.~~ ^{being violated.} He simply took his picture. He was told by a number of other students also that this was the procedure that was being followed by the campus police. Mr. White said now he was completely at a loss. He returned to the Student Union. Vice President Johnson happened to be coming out. He reported to Mr. Johnson what was happening and asked for Mr. Johnson's help. Mr. Johnson said he would see what he could do. Mr. White said ^{that in a short time he observed} at this point he observed Sergeant Childs taking ^{passing out the schedule} pictures of a University woman student and then of a German professor. ^{approved by Mr. Johnson that morning. At that point a German student, the student whose picture had been taken, a German professor, and Mr. White converged simultaneously.} He said he asked Sergeant Childs why he was taking the pictures of himself (Mr. White), the coed, and the professor. Sergeant Childs answered, "I am taking them for my scrapbook." ^{in Sergeant Childs' response to an inquiry of why he was taking the pictures, Sergeant Childs answered, 'I am taking them for my scrapbook.'}

^{Early in the morning of the following day} Later in the day Mr. White said students continued to come to his office reporting that they had had their pictures taken while distributing the moratorium schedule. These students were genuinely frightened when they saw that the campus police were photographing them while participating in what they had been told was an officially approved activity.

Mr. White said at this point he decided ^{He} to would "tail" Sergeant Childs. He observed that when several Jewish students and a rabbi left the Student Union carrying scrolls and certain picket signs printed in Hebrew characters, Sergeant Childs took their pictures. He asked Sergeant Childs why he was taking these pictures and the officer replied, "Go see Paxton." He commented that ^{responses such as 'I am taking them for my scrapbook' and} campus police rather commonly say to students when they ask why certain things are being done either "Go see Paxton" or "You're here to get an education, not to demonstrate." ^{which both on bad taste and an insult} Mr. White said he asked Sergeant Childs to

call Mr. Paxton on his police car radio. Sergeant Childs declined to do this. Mr. White said he then did something illegal. He blocked Sergeant Childs' car for a period of time. He said he finally left the Student Union area and went to the Physical Plant Office in an effort to see Mr. Paxton to learn why the photographing was going on. *Mr. Paxton then agreed to get the camera away and indicated that the pictures were being taken to demonstrate to complaining University officials, off-campus police departments, and other concerned citizens that there were no violent incidents or any other activity.*

He then summarized his remarks: In a number of cases the campus police photographed students distributing leaflets that had been approved for distribution by Vice President Johnson. Mr. White said he knew of at least five cases where the students photographed were not asked for any identification whatsoever. He said he was trying to make the point that if students believe that when they are photographed the picture is going into some University file as part of a permanent record, the student leaders can tell him that this is not so, and Vice President Houston can tell them, and Mr. Paxton can tell them, and President Harvill can tell them, and they still will not believe it. The result then is that in the minds of the students, the picture taking by the police threatens to bring some dire result later, and thus the students have been intimidated. He said he would like further to comment that he did not feel avoiding litter on the campus is a sound basis for cutting down on freedom of expression on the campus. He said that during the recent activity he was unaware that at any time any officer ever told any student that leaflet passing was breaking any University rule or regulation. He said he could not accept Mr. Houston's statement that there was a preconceived plan to undermine the Physical Plant Department or the security program of the University. If there were such a plan he himself would be party to it, and he was not party to any such plan. *He had simply reported to the Senate what he himself had participated in, what he himself had done, and what had happened to him. As to Mr. Houston's comment that the Wildcat had not obtained proper information from the Physical Plant Office, he said that some of the Wildcat reporters, including Mr. Joe Gold, had tried to do so, but the only answer that they had gotten from the officials they talked to was, "We will not comment."*

By the way, the activities of the campus police could possibly be a part of a preconceived plan on the campus.

Mr. Paxton had declined to answer in the subject of trying to contact Mr. Paxton and his reply to the subject of what we are consulting our lawyers.

Dean Ares said he would like to ask Mr. Houston several questions. Do the officers have instructions to take pictures of people passing out leaflets only when the leaflets are not approved, and when the individuals passing out the material will not identify themselves? Mr. Houston said no, the officers do not have such specific instruction. Many items must be left to the judgment of officers, and of course, sometimes they fail to use good judgment. Mr. Houston said he wanted to emphasize one point. President Harvill had at no time ordered any picture taking. Mr. Houston said he would like Senate members to give him suggestions on how to maintain order if Senate members were dissatisfied with the procedure being followed by his staff. He emphasized again that the police do not make University rules and regulations. They just enforce them.

Dr. Burton said he was unsure from Mr. Houston's comments as to at just what point pictures that are taken are destroyed---as soon as an incident is over, at graduation time, or when? Mr. Houston said that there is not a set time for such pictures to be destroyed.

Professor Davis said he would like to know what had become of the pictures taken during the recent period under discussion, both of speakers at Speakers' Corner and of persons passing out leaflets. Mr. Houston said that he

had showed the pictures to several student representatives, including Mike Griffin, Bruce Eggers, and Steve Fishbein. To the best of his knowledge they had not been shown to anyone else. Mr. Davis asked if the Physical Plant office still had in its possession all of these pictures. Mr. Houston said he did not know.

Dr. Sigworth asked Mr. Houston if he would make these pictures available to the Tucson Police Department, for example, or the security force of another university. Mr. Houston said no, unless during the same incident some crime was committed that was connected with this incident.

Dr. Gegenheimer said it had been reported that some of the photographing had been done by persons other than by members of the campus police force, for instance, by representatives of the public safety forces of the state of Arizona. Was this true? Mr. Houston said that to his knowledge no such persons had taken pictures. He said there were other photographers on the campus, for instance those of the Druid Press, and obviously, he said, there had been persons taking pictures of the policemen taking pictures.

Dr. Tomizuka said that he was one of those signing the faculty memorandum referred to and that he had not contacted Mr. Houston in advance because he thought it would be much better that a statement be made to the full Senate and thus receive wide reception. Mr. Houston's explanation to Dr. Tomizuka would satisfy only one individual while a report to the full Senate would have much wider distribution. Dr. Tomizuka went ahead to ask that if the prints of the pictures were destroyed, were the negatives destroyed? Mr. Houston answered that there are no negatives when polaroid pictures are taken. The question was asked if the talks of speakers at Speakers' Corner are recorded. Mr. Houston said that an effort to record these had been made once but had not been successful. Mr. Houston was asked whether the students were made aware of the administration's way of doing certain things, for instance, under certain circumstances photographing students. Further, are there guidelines at Speakers' Corner? Mr. Houston said there are written rules and there are implied rules. He said perhaps it is unfortunate that these are not more widely understood.

Dr. Lytle said he assumed the basis of the rationale that pictures must be taken for purposes of identification is that a picture might be needed later in determining what should be done if the student broke a rule. How often are pictures used in determining what punishment should be meted out, for instance? Mr. Houston said his department had nothing to do with the punishing of students. This was handled by the Dean of Men or the Dean of Women. Dean Svob responded that never had he asked for or received pictures of students from Mr. Houston's office. Dr. Robson asked Mr. Houston how a picture of a speaker could be taken from a distance and the photographer hear what the speaker was saying. Mr. Houston said that other persons nearer the scene would know what the speaker was actually saying. Mr. Houston said that Mr. White had commented that if a person did not like four-letter words he could leave. He said some people have daughters on the campus and they do not want them to be exposed to such language. Mr. Houston said he would agree with Mr. White that there was no need for the seemingly secret taking of pictures as, for example, with a telephoto lens camera from Old Main. He said he had not ordered that such pictures be taken.

Professor Green asked if the Dean of Men was not making any use of the pictures, was the intent then of Mr. Houston's security staff to use picture taking as a means of intimidation? Mr. Houston said that one cannot anticipate in advance what sort of record will be wanted. If a riot should evolve from a certain activity, and later hearings are necessary about what went on in activities leading up to the riot, officers often must be able to identify specific persons.

Mr. Ginsberg said that the remark had been made that you won't find pictures in the files of individuals who hadn't broken rules. However he said Bill White had not broken any rule and his picture had been taken. Mr. Houston said it had been a mistake for Sergeant Childs to take a picture of Mr. White.

Dean Ares said he appreciated the difficult job Mr. Houston had. He said he did believe, though, that if speakers were going to have their pictures taken and if distributors of leaflets were going to have their pictures taken, the result could not be other than intimidation on the campus. Dean Ares asked, "Wouldn't it be better if no pictures were taken unless a rule was being broken and the student concerned would not identify himself?" Mr. Houston said these had been his orders but sometimes it is difficult to judge whether or not pictures should be taken. Dean Ares said he had worked closely enough with law enforcement officials to know that they must make judgmental decisions and they need guidelines.

Dr. Skinner said he appreciated Mr. Houston's talking as candidly to the Senate as he had. However he felt that the photographing of students as had taken place recently did thwart freedom of expression. Further, such activity by the security officers can incite the very thing that everyone is trying to prevent on this campus.

Several persons said that this whole question of the photographing of students related closely to the general topic of freedom of expression which the Senate is in the process of studying.

Dr. Robson said that certainly there are rules and regulations on the campus and certainly there are enough laws to hang anyone. Mr. Houston had referred to the litter on the campus. He said the campus police are not controlling the heavy distribution of all sorts of commercial literature in campus classrooms. In any event, he said, discretion is the better part of law and order. If the climate of fear on this campus gets worse the University of Arizona could have an experience similar to that of San Francisco State College. You could develop enough laws that you would have no litter on the campus, and you could develop enough laws that you would have no foul words being spoken on the campus, Dr. Robson said, but by that time you would not have a University of Arizona either.

Mr. Houston said he was sure that all persons in the room were interested in the same basic principle. The question is how far to go. An officer resents being called foul names and being spit on. How far should he go to control such actions? Returning to the matter of picture taking, he asked what is a better way to identify a student than picture taking. He said he needs to know. Don't forget, he said, that many non-university students come on the campus. "However," he said, "if you members of the Senate do not like the rules, change them. But don't propose taking away the police, because the result of that would certainly be chaos and anarchy."

Dr. Saarinen asked Mr. Houston what evidence he had of preconceived plans to destroy the campus or buildings on it. Mr. Houston said he had no proof but he had enough evidence to make him assume such danger. He said he could not believe that it was just coincidence that every time an officer took a picture of a student someone promptly stepped from behind a tree and in turn took a picture of the officer.

Dr. Tomizuka said he did not see why police officers were needed at Speakers' Corner. If a student wants to speak, he is willing to identify himself. He felt the ASUA officers could monitor and control Speakers' Corner.

Dr. Lytle said he had trouble seeing the justification of picture taking when no rule or regulation was being broken, but he said he could conceive of instances when identification was necessary. What is needed is some system more sophisticated than what has been developed up to now. Could not a group of faculty members and students sit down with Mr. Houston and come up with some new ideas? Mr. Houston said he would be willing indeed to have such an opportunity to discuss this matter with interested persons.

Dr. Dewhirst said that on this campus there is not yet established enough of a delineation of general behavioral expectations for students. Such a delineation is being developed and should reach the Senate shortly however.

Dr. Bok said he was surprised that Mr. Houston had not told the University administration in advance that the picture taking was going to be done. He should have done so and the burden of responsibility would then have been on the administration. Further, he said, we have heard this afternoon from students and from faculty members. What about the attitude of the administration on this issue? Mr. McMillan responded that Vice President Houston had spoken for the administration.

Dr. Burton asked if the students had ever considered being fully responsible themselves for the managing of Speakers' Corner. Mr. White said that they had not investigated this matter. Mr. Ginsberg commented that the ASUA officers, including the president and the vice president, are almost always at weekly Speakers' Corner. People hear things differently at Speakers' Corner. What one person might hear as a speech inciting a riot, someone else would not hear as such a statement at all. In any event the idea of the students managing Speakers' Corner might well be worth investigating. He said he did hope that Dr. Lytle's suggestion could be developed whereby students and faculty members would work with Mr. Houston in developing procedural rules that would be better accepted. The University cannot well operate with one group's knowing what is going on, but another group's not being aware of what is going on at all.

Dr. Blitzer said that one might grant that picture taking might be necessary to help in the enforcement of campus regulations. In consideration of what has happened, however, did Mr. Houston not feel that more negative than positive results on campus harmony had come about from the recent picture taking? Mr. Houston responded that as a matter of fact he had received many more statements supporting the picture taking than against it. A common response had been, "Why would anyone object to having his picture taken?" Many people in the Senate chamber at this meeting had said so to him privately and individually, he said, but they were not speaking up today. Perhaps they were intimidated. He said he would repeat again that Mr. White's report had given only one side of the situation.

Mr. Ginsberg said that the students were not suggesting that the campus police should not maintain campus security. But students when their pictures are being taken should be told why, and they should be told where the pictures go. Do they go into some permanent file, or what does become of them? Further, the students need a clearer understanding of what the sanctions are when rules are broken. The students are seeking procedure, he said. He said he himself asked Officer Holmes in Old Main why he was using the telephoto camera. "I don't have to answer that," was the answer. This taxes one's sensibilities, Mr. Ginsberg said. The students want procedures developed that are honest and fair and equitable, and they want to know what the procedures are.

Dean Fahey said that if he understood Mr. White correctly, Mr. White was attempting to show that a student's effectiveness in advocating a point of view is inhibited or prejudiced the moment he loses his anonymity. He said our concern about freedom of expression should really be about a responsible freedom of expression. Is not the right of advocacy much like the responsibility of sending a letter to an editor? Such letters must be signed. Does not the freedom of expression carry with it the responsibility to be identified as the specific person advocating the point in question? Mr. White said he had not been claiming that anonymity should be part of freedom of speech. He certainly had been willing to be identified. The difficulty is that students are unaware what they can and cannot do. They had assumed it was in order to pass out a reprint of a Wildcat article or a copy of a Senate resolution. Suddenly if a policeman is taking a student's picture in the act of passing out material, the student wonders, "What is wrong?" Or if the officer asks for his identification, the student feels, "What was I doing that was illegal?" He suddenly has doubt. He does not know where to go for clarification. Suddenly his freedom is inhibited. The policeman does not tell him what he has done wrong. The policeman just says, "I want to know who you are," without further explanation. The result is intimidation.

Dr. Sigworth said that while the Vietnam Moratorium was not popular everywhere, it seemed to be, at the moment, a respectable activity. He said that one should not forget the days of McCarthyism, however, an era when individuals suddenly had dredged up from their past of some twenty years earlier certain activities in which they had participated, activities which at that time had been no more unpopular than to participate in the Vietnam Moratorium is today. Old files had been resurrected during the McCarthy era and reputations had been ruined and careers had been ended. Students are aware that this can happen. Thus they naturally are frightened when they see picture taking going on and they don't know what is to become of the picture. Dr. Sigworth said he was relieved when Mr. Houston said that the pictures were not going to go into any file or be used in any particular way. He said he believed Mr. Houston when he stated this. But he said he did feel that there was something ominous in the photographing procedure and it should be discouraged.

The hour of 5:30 having come and gone, Dean Myers moved that the meeting adjourn with the topic under discussion to be the first item on the agenda of the next meeting. Dr. Delaplane seconded the motion.

Dean Ares commented that he for one felt relieved by Mr. Houston's remarks. Several persons asked that a special meeting be scheduled before the next regularly scheduled one. The question on Dean Myers' motion, however, was called for and carried. The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.



David L. Windsor, Secretary