LIBRARY EME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1969

In the Matter of:

KENNETH R. JONES,

Petitioner,

VS.

THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF AND FOR THE STATE OF TENNESSEE, et al.

Respondents.

Duplication or copying of this transcript by photographic, electrostatic or other facsimile means is prohibited under the order form agreement.

Place

Washington, D. C.

Date

JAN 2 0 1970

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

300 Seventh Street, S. W.

Washington, D. C.

NA 8-2345

Docket No.

731

Pt. Z

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3 IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES 2 October Term, 1969 4 KENNETH R. JONES, 5 Petitioner, 6 : No. 731 VS. THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF T AND FOR THE STATE OF TENNESSEE, 8 et al., Respondents. 9 10 11 Washington, D. C. January 20, 1970 12 The above-entitled matter came on for argument at 13 10:33 a.m. 14 BEFORE: 15 WARREN BURGER, Chief Justice HUGO L. BLACK, Associate Justice 16 WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS, Associate Justice JOHN M. HARLAN, Associate Justice 17 WILLIAM J. BRENNAN, Jr., Associate Justice POTTER STEWART, Associate Justice 18 BYRON R. WHITE, Associate Justice THURGOOD MARSHALL, Associate Justice 19 APPEARANCES: 20 Counsel for Petitioner: REBER F. BOULT, JR., ESQ. 21 5 Forsyth Street Atlanta, Georgia 30303 22 ROBERT H. ROBERTS, ESQ. 23

Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Assistant Attorney General State Supreme Court Building

24

25

2

3

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

37

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MORNING SESSION

(At 10:33 a.m., Tuesday, January 20, 1970, the argument in the above-mentioned matter was resumed.)

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER: We will take up No. 731, Jones against the State Board of Education where we left off yesterday afternoon.

ARGUMENT OF ROBERT H. ROBERTS, ESQ.

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENTS

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chief Justice, may it please the Court:

I will conclude arguments for the respondents in this manner. I would like to call the Court's attention to an article written by Professor Charles Allen Wright in connection with a speech he delivered on the Vanderbilt University campus intOctober 1969, entitled "The Constitution on the Campus." This is one of the Oliver Wendell Holmes series and I think it is one of the best-written articles I have ever read, and I commend it to the Court if they haven't already seen it.

In it though, Professor Wright basically wound up by saying that expression can be restricted, if at any time it materially or substantially interferes with the normal procedures of the university or with the rights of others.

Now it is our contention that the basic issue involved here is just the action that this student had been accused and found quilty of committing, based primarily under the First

Par

Amendment rights.

2 Yesterday ---

 Ω There were additional findings of violations of regulations?

A Yes, Your Honor, there was a finding that he had committed a misdemeanor and found guilty in Court of the violation of the Student Handbook, which had been a specific charge against him in addition. They also found that he lied to the committee while before it and openly before it, and I might say this: It was not only just -- he just told the president of the fact that he was lying in front of this outstanding faculty group and other students and even the press were present when this happened, which compounded the disrespect that he showed the president on this occasion.

Yesterday I had the feeling that there was some question in the mind of perhaps Associate Justice Marshall in regard to why this action on the leaf-letting or the boycott literature didn't result in any kind of a serious incident. I didn't call the Court's attention to this, but I would like to at this time.

Mr. Jones at the time that he passed out this leaflet had already been temporarily suspended from the school. He was not on the campus at that time as a student when he passed out this literature. He was awaiting his hearing to see whether or not he would be admitted in the fall term or not.

This literature was passed out on August the 18th,

1967, which according to the calendar which you have in the 7 2 13 5 6

7

8

9

10

12

12

13

84

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

appendix in the Student Handbook part of it, which begins on page 175 of the joint appendix, the calendar of the school year, you will find this was the last day of final examinations for the last term of the summer guarter when he did this. Therefore, the baccalaureate service followed that by two days and school was out then until the fall term started.

That is the reason there was no more commotion following it. However, I direct your attention to the fact that this was followed itself by just a couple of weeks or so -- a riot on the campus and tensions were high. Now admittedly the faculty hasn't in its findings written out as a result of this literature being passed out on the final examination day that John Smith came to them and said, "Well, that bothered me and I couldn't correctly answer one of the questions on the examination," or anything like that, but they found it as a matter of their interpretation. They were there on the campus.

We are not talking about a rural constable or something like that that might be found in my home county of Pickett. We are talking about nine of the outstanding members of the faculty on Tennessee State University's campus. We are talking about the vice president emeritus, who is the chairman of the Waculty Advisory Committee, with some 30 years of experience as a school administrator.

We are talking about Dr. J. A. Paines, who acted because

of Dr. Basil's poor health as the presiding officer over this faculty advisory meeting, with a great many years of experience on the campus and as Dean of Students.

We are talking about the Dean of Women and the Dean of Men. School administrators practically all, if not all of them, hold doctorate degrees and had a combined experience of well in excess of a hundred years there on the campus. That is who we are talking about substituting the judgment on, as to whether ---

Q Supposing that this intemperate document hadn't been passed around on the streets outside the university, what would you say about that? Just just as uncouth, still just as intemperate.

A Yes, sir, and I think it would have been an altogether different situation. I think he could have perhaps even gone across the street a little way to Centennial Park and got upon a bench and maybe made a speech on it and it would have been somewhat different.

Here it was calculated to do one thing, cause unrest and try to prevail his ideas and his desires onto the student body there. He had already been suspended. It wasn't a matter for him not to register. He was trying to ask everybody else to join with him, because his conduct had caused him to be suspended to where he wasn't permitted to continue during the summer quarter and was calling on them to do so.

Now as to the type of thing that was in this, I think

boycott so far as it being designed to create unrest, and we have to keep in mind now that this was following a great deal of disturbance on the campus where property was destroyed and people were injured.

Some of the things that he said, for example: "If the puppets' -- talking about the school administrators -- that is the reference he makes to them. He calls them "puppets" throughout this -- "want to adopt the uncivilized tactics used by the man" -- and that sort of thing. Then he goes on with words like "Thus the campus will become a concentration camp controlled and contained by the legislation of the racist dogs downtown, the acts of the puppet administrators" -- here again referring to these people before whom he had already been advised that he was going to have to come and clear himself with before he could be re-enrolled -- "the billy clubs and guns of Nashville's racist cops and ultimately the ghetto tactics of the honorable National Guard whose pale faces have already been seen in Memphis, Nashville and Chattanooga.

"We as intelligent black students will not be guarded by trembling and perilous idiots who call themselves administrators."

Now that is what he is saying about the school administrators. He said earlier that he came down to Tennessee to go to school because he investigated and found that it was a great 2 3 t

5

6

7 8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

22

23

24

an 18-year-old boy he conducted himself in such a way and has the audacity to come out with something like this and talk about the very school administrator to whom he had chosen to go and earn an education.

And he closed then with this article in caps, and bright heavy caps: CAST YOUR VOTE FOR STUDENT POWER. BOYCOTT REGISTRATION SEPTEMBER 23 AND FOR AS LONG AS THE PUPPET ADMINISTRATION REFUSES TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THIS IS OUR UNIVERSITY.

Q What did he mean by boycott?

A Registration. He was asking them not to come in and register for classes and just to freeze the university, so he could bring it to a complete stop. That would be the effect of it.

- Q When was this?
- A This happened ---
- Q When were these leaflets handed out?
- A On August the 18th, which was the last day of the summer term. They have two terms here during the summer and operate on the quarter-hour basis.
- Q Suppose he got these boys and girls not to register and lost a considerable number of people. What do you say about that?
- A If it please the Court, I think it would be serious enough without urging the boycott. But you can't separa:e

it, it was all one article. He did all of it designed for one purpose. The administrators found that it was for the purpose of disrupting the school and that it didn't entitle him to remain on the campus any longer as a result of it.

Now if the Judicial Branch is going to substitute its judgment for people of the character that I have described, of this Faculty Advisory Committee on this question of fact, and it really is a question of fact of whether or not these things, these acts committed, were a type that would be disruptive on a school campus or were just plain free expression or not, and they found otherwise.

Now if we are going to get into this field, where are we going to stop? Wouldn't the next logical place be to examine the examination papers given to a student and determine whether the professor should have given him a passing mark or not?

After all, you can effectively expel him that way.

If he doesn't at practically any university in the country, if
he doesn't make his grades, he is not entitled to enroll the
next quarter. You could eliminate him in that manner.

I just respectfully urge the Court to give some support and some credit to these men with outstanding ability in
making a determination that involves a factual matter, and if
you do so, I feel the Court will affirm their action in it and
I thank you for your kind attention.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER: Mr. Boult, you have about

| 7 | nine minutes left. |
|--|---|
| 2 . | REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF REBER F. BOULT, JR. |
| 3 | ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER |
| 4 | MR. BOULT: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 5 | Q What about the previous convictions? |
| 6 | A Mr. Justice Marshall, if those two convictions |
| 7 | are to be considered, we have to reopen the entire disciplinary |
| 8 | proceeding. |
| 9 | Q Is it in the record anyplace? |
| 10 | A They are mentioned at several places in the recor |
| the control of the co | at page 48, for example, and various other places. The sequence |
| 12 | of that is |
| 13 | Q It appears to be contradictory in the record. |
| 14 | A Certainly, he was convicted and it was on appeal |
| 15 | at the time the hearing was going on. There is no |
| 16 | Q It was a part of the charge against him? |
| 17 | A It was a part of the charge against him. |
| 18 | Q And it wasn't answered. |
| 19 | A There was no conviction, so to speak, of the |
| 20 | Faculty Advisory Committee on these charges. |
| 21 | Q Well, isn't that sufficient to discipline him, |
| 22 | to be convicted in a criminal court? |
| 23 | A I don't think this is the issue of the case, Your |
| 24 | Honor. I doubt it. If I was to argue the point, if I thought |
| 25 | the point were in the case |

3 0 Doesn't it violate these rules on 75 or not? The rule on being convicted of any city, county or 2 Federal offense? 3 0 Yes. 1 I don't think it does, because it was on appeal. 100 It was not found? 6 It was not. The conviction was not final. The A 7 cases were on appeal at the time of the proceeding. 8 But that doesn't appear in the record. 0 9 Yes, I believe it does, Your Honor, on page 48. A 10 What has happened since? 0 9 9 A I don't know, Your Honor. 12 You don't know? 0 13 No, I don't. You see, this issue has really 14 been in the case throughout any of the lower courts because the 95 Faculty Advisory Committee exonerated him on these charges. He 16 was not dismissed from school for having violated that particular 97 rule. 18 The chairman of the committee so testified. The 19 charges make no mention of it. 20 Now does that mean that they ignored it? You say 21 they exonerated him on that. 22 A Well, they did not dismiss him from school for 23 23 that charge. They must have had adequate other grounds. 0 25

| 53 | 5 |
|----|-----|
| 60 | St. |
| | |
| | 200 |

A Possibly so. There were half a dozen charges against him and of the three students involved in the whole thing, there were about 18 charges and there was only findings of, shall we say, guilt on a small number of these charges. We assume — it has been assumed up to this level, all the way through case, that if the Faculty Advisory Committee did not make a finding that a student had done on a particular charge, then they were not disciplining him for it.

- Q Was the conduct from which these criminal charges developed on the campus or off the campus?
 - A Off the campus, totally unrelated to the campus.
- Q Bo you suggest that he could not be dismissed -laying aside the notice factor -- that he could not be dismissed for conduct off of the campus?
- A It depends on the conduct, Your Honor. This particular conduct, I would say not.
 - Q What was it?
 - A Disorderly conduct.
 - Q What was it?
- A As I recall the facts of the case -- they are not of record -- it was an argument with a police officer. I believe it was vagrancy and disorderly conduct.
 - Q It was just an argument?
- A It was just an argument. He was coming out of his house. He was well known around town as unpopular. He was

T

arrested on one of these general dragnet laws.

Now I am talking outside of the record, because this point would have been developed if it had been in the case at the time, but it was not.

The vagrancy statute in Tennessee under which he was arrested has since been declared unconstitutional and the discretely conduct, in fact, is similar to the one in the case before this Court of John vs. University Committee. So this particular conviction was probably unconstitutional.

Mr. Roberts has mentioned that the handing out of this leaflet followed a riot by a couple of weeks. That is not true.

He mentioned that Mr. Jones had already been suspended at the time he handed out the offending leaflets. The suspension was clearly unconstitutional on any of the lower courts' decisions on student rights. There was no notice, no hearing, no nothing, and ultimately it was rescinded.

He was supended on three vague charges, none of which were pressed later on in these proceedings.

Q Now the only findings against this man, as I understand it, appear on page 31 -- at the bottom of page 30 and the top of page 31 -- is that right?

A That is correct.

Q Which consist of the -- the only explicit thing is the distributing literature charge, although it says "on different occasions to promote unrest on the campus by such action

as distributing literature." It was designed for that purpose, that is one of the findings. And the other is that he didn't tell the truth?

A That's right, Your Honor.

In dealing with the case, we have given the benefit of the ambiguity to the university and assume that it was about the literature.

- Q Well, you will hardly get it in.
- A If, on the other hand, ---
- Q They certainly find that he did that, that he promoted unrest by distributing literature, and the ambiguity is whether the findings include other ways in which he promoted unrest.
- A Yes, and if there are other ways, we can say that due process has been violated because the man has not been told what he has been disciplined for.
- Q Now he was charged. He was told what he was charged for, including those criminal convictions?
- A Yes, but not disciplined for it -- not told that he had been found guilty of it.
- Q Are you urging that a college would not have the right to expel a man if they caught him in an outright falsehood?
- A I don't think that issue is in the case, Your Honor.
 - Q But they found him guilty of it?

A They never charged him with a falsehood. They never gave him a chance to say, "I didn't tell a falsehood."

They just came down one day and said, "You lied." That is all.

Q If a falsehood is committed as a part of the response to other charges, do you mean to suggest they have to start all over and give him some new charges, when the very people sitting in the room have heard him make what they regarded as a falsehood?

A Just to analogize to the outside world, it would be a perjury proceeding.

Q Well, this isn't a criminal decision, counsel.

You are trying to equate this to a criminal proceeding and all
the constitutional protection of a criminal proceeding.

A Not all, Your Honor, I think at the very least notice and opportunity to defend has been settled, although this Court has not directly passed on it. It has been considered to be settled ever since the Dixon case in 1961 or '2.

Q Are you arguing that if a man is held up to answer a charge before a board of college administrators and he deliberately falsifies in their presence about the charges, that they would not have the right to remove him from school?

- A Not at all, Mr. Justice.
- Q I thought they sentenced him.

A I am arguing that if he is thought to have deliberately falsified something, they should charge him with that, and --

| 1 | Q You mean, they have to charge him in advance? |
|----|--|
| 2 | A At least |
| 3 | Q The object of a school, E suppose, is to try to |
| 4 | get the students to learn and take part in the regular business |
| 5 | and I wouldn't suppose at least in the schools I went to, |
| 6 | they were compelled to give me formal charges of anything. If |
| 7 | they wanted to get me out, they could remove me without formal |
| 8 | charges, I would think. You don't think so? |
| 9 | A I don't think so, Your Honor. I don't think the |
| 10 | law has been so for the last six or eight years. |
| 12 | Q What cases have held to the contrary? |
| 12 | A Excuse me. |
| 13 | Q What cases have held to the contrary? |
| 14 | A Starting with Dixon vs. Alabama State Board of |
| 15 | Education, Knight vs. State Board of Education, probably I would |
| 16 | say 30 or 40 disciplinary cases in the meantime, ending most |
| 17 | recently with Scogan vs. Lincoln Memorial University |
| 18 | Q Any of those in this Court? |
| 19 | A None of those in this Court, Your Honor. A number |
| 20 | of them approved in a footnote in Tinker cited approvingly |
| 21 | in a footnote in Tinker. |
| 22 | Ω May I ask, that sentence of 31 is at the hearing? |
| 23 | He demonstrated his indifference by denying that he passed out |
| 24 | such literature despite positive statements by cafeteria personnel |
| 35 | and the president of the university that he had done so. And |

| 9 | my question is: Did cafeteria personnel and the president of |
|----|--|
| 2 | the university testify at his hearing and in his presence that |
| 3 | he had done so? |
| 4 | A The cafeteria worker testified in his hearing |
| 5 | in his presence. |
| 6 | Q Was the cafeteria worker was he represented by |
| 7 | counsel at the hearing? |
| 8 | A Mr. Jones? |
| 9 | Q Yes. |
| 10 | A Yes. |
| 18 | Q And was that witness from the cafeteria cross- |
| 12 | examined? |
| 13 | A Yes, and it was brought out that she was testify- |
| 14 | ing that the leaflets were handed out three months before it was |
| 15 | prepared. Her testimony was rendered fully incredible. |
| 16 | Q What about the president of the university? Did |
| 17 | he testify at this hearing? |
| 18 | A He testified. |
| 19 | Q And was he cross-examined? |
| 20 | A Cross-examined. It appears in the record at page |
| 21 | 1254. |
| 22 | Q Then I don't quite understand your point that |
| 23 | the charge was not or the fact that his lying, or the alle- |
| 24 | gation that he had lied. I gather your point is that that was no |
| 25 | a basis for the discipline that is imposed. |

24

25

| 1 | A It was not a basis for the discipline to anyone's |
|-----|--|
| 2 | knowledge until the findings came out some ten days after the |
| 3 | hearing. |
| 4 | Q Surely he must have known at the hearing himself |
| 5 | that the issue of his veracity was in his case. |
| 6 | A Your Honor, the next event at the hearing after |
| 7 | the president testified was Mr. Jones' testimony. His testimony |
| 8 | contradicted that of the president, and it simply Mr. Jones, |
| 9 | we presumed, thought he was telling the truth. |
| 10 | Q Do you want us to reexamine the issue of credi- |
| 9 9 | bility in this Court? |
| 12 | A I don't think it is at all necessary, Your Honor. |
| 13 | I think a reexamination of the credibility |
| 14 | Q Yes, but the finding of the committee was that we |
| 15 | have no doubt that this person did not tell the truth. As between |
| 16 | his testimony and that of the president and the cafeteria workers, |
| 17 | at least this committee resolved the question against Jones, |
| 18 | didn't it? |
| 19 | A Yes, and when |
| 20 | Q And you suggest that was not a basis for its |
| 21 | action in imposing discipline? |
| 22 | . A I don't think a man can be disciplined for defend- |
| 22 | ing himself. |

defense with impunity? Is that the essence?

Q You mean he has got a license to lie in his

| 4 | | A | The essence is if he is accused of lying | , he should | | |
|----|-------------------------|--------|---|-------------|--|--|
| 2 | have a ch | ance 1 | to prove whether he was or not. | | | |
| 3 | | Q | That is a new proceeding, like a perjury | proceed- | | |
| Ą. | ing in a criminal case? | | | | | |
| 5 | | A | I think so, Your Honor. | | | |
| 6 | | Q | What kind of a school is this? | | | |
| 7 | | A | It is a state university for Negroes. | | | |
| 8 | | Q | State run? | | | |
| 9 | | A | A state university for Negroes. | | | |
| 10 | | Q | Are colored people on that? | | | |
| 11 | - | A | The first warm | | | |
| 12 | | Q | Are the instructors colored or white? | | | |
| 13 | | A | Largely roughly 80 percent Negro, I th | ink. It | | |
| 14 | has since | been | put under the association plan. | | | |
| 15 | | Q | What was the president of the school? | | | |
| 16 | | A | He was Negro. | | | |
| 17 | | MR. C | CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER: Thank you for your | submission | | |
| 18 | The case is submitted. | | | | | |
| 19 | | (When | reupon, at 10:58 a.m. the argument in the | above- | | |
| 20 | mentioned | case | was concluded.) | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | |