

## *Executive incompetence*

Sir:

Would the mistakes made on the part of the Executive Committee during the recent honor hearing have occurred if a white student had been involved?

This is a hard question to answer and probably will never be. However, several points should be made. The "White Book" states, "The accused student must be informed of his status with a brief description of the offense involved at least three hours before the hearing is to begin.

If, as had been suggested by the defendant, this right of the accused was not met, what would have been the proper remedy? Certainly, double jeopardy was not!

The errors were those of the Executive Committee and should have been dealt with in a just manner. Since recent events prove that the E.C. is fallible, there should be explicit avenues for redress of such errors and they should not include double jeopardy.

Another matter that must be confronted (whether or not the rights of the accused had been

(Continued on page 3)

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

(Continued on page 2)

violated) is the resultant leakage in this case. The "White Book" declares, "if the suspected student faces the charges, is found guilty, and withdraws from the University without requesting a Student Body Hearing, his record shall only state that he withdrew from the University.... All such information is considered highly confidential."

Here again, the Executive Committee seems to be in direct violation of the "White Book."

The only conclusion that may be drawn is that if these "mis-haps" would have occurred with a white student, then the E.C. was not bigoted, just incompetent.

Tony Carli '80