

# MEMO of the Month

Excerpt from Minutes of Proceedings  
Board of Higher Education Meeting  
February 28, 1972

**CLARIFICATION – AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY OF THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION:** Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the Board endorsed the following clarification made by the Chancellor of the Board's Affirmative Action Policy approved November 22, 1971, Cal. No. 9:

There has been some misunderstanding of the intent and purpose of the recent Board of Higher Education action approving the Affirmative Action Report prepared pursuant to federal Executive Order 11246 and Executive Order 11375.

As you recall, the report went through several revisions and the final official document was the one approved by the Board of Higher Education on November 22. Throughout the revision process it was the specific objective of the Board, the Affirmative Action Committee, and the University administration to develop a policy statement that would meet the criteria of the federal executive orders but would not be erroneously interpreted to mean that the University was attempting to establish an employment quota system based upon race, religion, gender or ethnic origin. The document approved on November 22 was felt to accurately reflect that intent.

Our affirmative action policy requires the colleges and the central administration of the University to develop affirmative action plans that would overcome the causes as well as the conditions of de facto discrimination in employment against women and minorities. This does not mean that the plans or their implementation require preferential treatment in recruitment, hiring, or promotion on the basis of criteria other than merit. It is our overall personnel policy, of which affirmative action is an important component, that the choice among candidates for hiring or promotion is to be that candidate demonstrating the maximum potential for meeting the job's requirements. Employment selection is to be based primarily upon vocational or professional competence within the framework of those constraints set by civil service law, the Board's bylaws and those professional standards duly established by constituent faculty.

It is the Board's feeling and my own personal conviction that this policy will enhance rather than impair our ability to eliminate conditions of de facto discrimination where they now exist within CUNY. Implementation of this affirmative action policy will require serious and sustained effort to reach and convince members of all groups which are presently the victims of de facto discrimination that this University is determined to achieve a genuine and meaningful policy of equal employment opportunity.

# The Brookings Budget: One Schultz Is Like Another (e)

---

by John Rothchild and Charles Peters

---

As Congress sinks into the budget, it has a harder and harder time reaching up to divide the pie. There is little choice but to follow the ruts left over from last year's cut, which are the same ones from the year before that, only they get a little deeper each time. Until recently, there haven't been any other \$200-billion pies around to compare with the one we are stuck with, but several groups are now in the business of dreaming up counter-budgets and other works of economic fantasy in an effort to find a way to reform the real one.

---

*\*Setting National Priorities: The 1973 Budget.* Charles L. Schultze, Edward R. Fried, Alice M. Rivlin, Nancy H. Teeters. Brookings Institution, \$3.50.

---

Charles Peters and John Rothchild are editors of *The Washington Monthly*.

The most prominent of the counterbudget attempts has come from the Brookings Institution.\* Brookings has certain advantages over other research organizations—it enjoys the influence of a shadow Cabinet without the indignity of Senate confirmations, the respect of a university without the bother of students, and the prestige of foundation money without the usual popular indifference to projects financed by it. Any mention of Brookings in the press is almost always preceded by adjectives like “staunchly nonpartisan,” or “highly regarded,” or as the *Boston Globe* put it, “that fortress of dispassion and bastion of non-ideology.” Brookings works hard to maintain this reputation, which makes projects like the alternative budget, first published two years ago, more influential and effective.

This year's installment—*Setting*

*National Priorities: The 1973 Budget* has generated considerably more interest and furor than last year's, primarily because it was published at the same time people were trying to figure out what was wrong with McGovern's economic proposals without the vaguest notion of how to do it. The Brookings budget provided a point of comparison, and it made the front pages of *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, the editorial pages of dozens of newspapers, and even warranted an Administration counter-attack. In all the articles and editorials on the Brookings substitute budget, the only word of doubt about the seemingly unimpeachable projections from Brookings came from John Ehrlichman of the White House staff.

The Administration differed with the pessimistic Brookings conclusions about the regular budget: that the

numbers don't add up, that the great peace dividend supposedly awaiting the end of Vietnam will not exist, and that even without any new programs, there will have to be a tax increase. But the gloomiest and most influential sections of the study are those in which the authors enter their own budgetary fantasy, when Brookings starts moving around the slices of pie presumably freed from the influences of Dita Beard, Lockheed lobbyists, oil-depletion people and warring agencies. The surprise is that the optional budget that emerges from the fortress of dispassion turns out about the same as Nixon's. One is left with the impression that the nation's budgetary problems are not so much political as they are fatal, and that even when intelligent outsiders are freed of all the conflicts of interest and compromises, they still can't find