

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Hackney, Sheldon: Humanities Chairman
Nomination Hearing (1993)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996)

6-7-1993

Hackney, Sheldon: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1993): Correspondence 04

David J. Morse

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_29

Recommended Citation

Morse, David J., "Hackney, Sheldon: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1993): Correspondence 04" (1993). *Hackney, Sheldon: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1993)*. Paper 23.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_29/23

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Hackney, Sheldon: Humanities Chairman Nomination Hearing (1993) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA

Policy Planning

4200 Pine Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-4090
Tel. 215-898-1532
Fax: 215-898-2920

93 JUN 15 AM 11:57

June 7, 1993

The Honorable Claiborne Pell
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
SD-428 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510-6300

Dear Senator Pell:

I am enclosing the response sent by Penn's President, Sheldon Hackney, to a letter sent to him by Reuben and Donna Gross of Teaneck, New Jersey, regarding issues of freedom of expression and alleged racial harassment at the University that have received considerable public attention. I believe that Dr. and Ms. Gross sent you copies of their original correspondence, and I wanted you to be aware of the resolution of this matter and of the steps President Hackney and the University are taking to address these important issues.

First, there will be an inquiry to determine what went wrong in the handling of the particular case in question. As President Hackney stated, "it took too long, created an erroneous impression of "political correctness" on campus, and served neither the complainants, the respondent, nor the University well."

Second, the Charter of the Student Judicial System is clearly in need of a thorough review. President Hackney has said that "not only must justice be fair, but it should also be expeditious, particularly when young lives and academic careers are at stake."



The Honorable Claiborne Pell
June 7, 1993
Page 2

Finally, and most importantly, we at Penn know, as President Hackney has stated, "that no set of policies and procedures can by itself establish a workable framework for the kind of diverse, humane, and supportive community we seek to create. Claire Fagin has announced her intention to make 'community' the central issue of her interim presidency. We need to discuss and set forth the principles that bind us together as a community, and then make sure that those shared beliefs are clearly embodied in the policies that govern the University."

Please let me know if I may provide you with any additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "D. Morse", written over the word "Sincerely,".

David J. Morse
Assistant Vice President
Policy Planning

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA

Office of the President

100 College Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6380
215-898-7221

June 1, 1993

Dr. Reuben E. Gross
Ms. Donna L. Gross
961 Teaneck Road
Teaneck, N. J. 07666

Dear Dr. and Ms. Gross:

I can well understand the distress and incomprehension that press accounts of the racial harassment case involving Eden Jacobowitz have aroused amongst his neighbors, friends and relatives. I suspect that nothing I say or do can correct all of the inaccuracies and distortions that have appeared in the media. I would only caution you against assuming the worst of what is still a great University and believing everything that you may have read or heard about the case.

As you probably know by now, the case itself is over. The complainants have withdrawn their charges of racial harassment against Mr. Jacobowitz, and the matter is formally closed. (The final statements of all parties are enclosed.) During the weeks and months ahead, the University will continue to work with both Mr. Jacobowitz and the complainants to ensure that their academic and personal lives are normalized as quickly as possible. The University has also agreed to undertake an inquiry to determine what went wrong in the handling of this particular case and to begin a thorough review of the Charter of the Student Judicial System. We agree that not only must justice be fair, but it should also be expeditious, particularly when young lives and academic careers are at stake.

Interim President Claire Fagin and I will be announcing soon the ways in which we intend to pursue these tasks. Though Federal law and University policy prevent me or other University officials from discussing the details of **any** case involving an individual student, to protect his or her right to privacy, let me try briefly to put the events of the past few months into context.

First, whether Eden, or any other student, has violated a University policy is not something that I, or any other administrator, determines or adjudicates, whether wisely or capriciously. The University's four undergraduate schools have adopted a judicial charter that generally provides an orderly process for the resolution of such cases. The courts have upheld the fairness of that process and Penn's right as a private institution to impose its procedures and responsibilities as part of the implicit contract between the institution and its students. It includes

rights of appeal and review of proposed sanctions to protect any respondent from inappropriate punishment.

Though that process does not appear to have worked well in this particular case, the University had little alternative but to stand behind an established system of due process, knowing that whatever the appearance of silliness or "political correctness," there would in fact be ample means to ensure fairness if the process were allowed to run its course.

Much has been said in the media to characterize inaccurately Penn's policies regarding freedom of thought and expression. Let me state clearly that Penn's only "speech code" is freedom of speech. That principle is clearly stated in the University's Guidelines on Open Expression which assure the right of all parties to engage in debate of even the most repugnant ideas. Freedom of expression has been, and remains, the paramount value at Penn, and we are unwavering in our commitment to protect it.

One of the ways in which freedom of expression has needed protection in the special setting of the University community is to ensure that all members of that community are able to exercise their right to full participation in the intellectual discourse of the campus. Unfortunately, for some groups (including at different times in Penn's history, women, African-Americans, Jews, and political minorities), speech that is used solely to intimidate and harm can prevent such full participation in the "marketplace of ideas." At a private, residential university that seeks to have a lively and inclusive campus community, it is appropriate to tell students that they can say anything they wish, express any idea, but that they may not use racial or ethnic slurs solely with the intention of hurting someone else. Penn's very narrowly-drawn Racial Harassment Policy says that and sets an extremely high test for any complaint to satisfy.

Of course, whether that test would have been met in this or any other case, I cannot say. That would have been up to a hearing panel of faculty and students to decide, with ample avenues of appeal if errors were made.

The Penn community is open, politically diverse, and engaged. We come together regularly to discuss and debate constructively the rules under which we live together. It seems clear that the time has come to do so again. I can assure you that the fact that Penn's policies have had unintended or unsatisfactory outcomes will be addressed rationally and carefully.

These are painful and emotional issues, especially when those close to us are directly involved or we feel that fundamental principles of our society are in dispute. However, I do hope that

June 1, 1993


Page 3

you will recognize that, regardless of whether the University's policies and procedures are right or wrong, effective or ill-considered, they were not adopted lightly, without debate, or without keeping foremost in mind the need to protect freedom of expression for all on this campus. The University, and I, remain deeply committed to that principle.

I share with you and many others in concern for the well-being of both Eden Jacobowitz and the other students involved in this matter. I am also deeply grieved by the distorted view this case may have given you of this University. Penn is not the home of "thought police" or rampant "political correctness." It is a place in which all sides can and do debate controversial ideas. Members of our community generally do so without engaging in ad hominem personal attacks, racist or anti-Semitic hate speech, or other forms of intimidation that are inimical to both academic and inter-personal discourse.

As those who were here in May for Alumni weekend and Commencement can attest, Penn's faculty and students, even those who disagree with me on some of the policies at issue, do not share the same sense of crisis and calumny that has been so much in the news. I hope that fact will give you at least brief pause in which you may recognize that the worst that has been said about the University these past weeks is almost certainly not true. For that I would be grateful, as I am for your taking the time to write.

Sincerely,


Sheldon Hackney
President

Enclosure