

Minutes of the MLA Delegate Assembly

THE DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MET ON 29 DECEMBER 2007 AT THE HYATT REGENCY CHICAGO Hotel. First Vice President Gerald Graff presided. The assembly was called to order at 1:07 p.m. The chair made some preliminary announcements about the conduct of the meeting, called for a demonstration of the electronic voting system to be used during the meeting, and announced the quorum for the meeting, which was 72 delegates, because 141 delegates had signed in for the meeting at the beginning. [Note: Of the 267 delegates, 174 (65%) attended all or part of the meeting (see the list that follows for the names of the delegates in attendance).]

1. On behalf of the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee (DAOC), Luca Somigli moved the adoption of the agenda that had been sent to the assembly but with an amendment to item 7, New Business, which provided for the consideration of, in order, resolutions received in a timely fashion, emergency resolutions, motions, and other new business. The amendment was to remove the item covering emergency resolutions and to reverse the order of consideration of resolutions received in a timely fashion and motions. The New Business section of the agenda would therefore consist in the consideration of, in order, motions, resolutions received in a timely fashion, and other new business. In response to a question, Somigli explained that no emergency resolutions had been offered for the assembly's consideration and that the change in the order of consideration for motions and resolutions received in a timely fashion was the DAOC's response to concerns expressed the previous day during the assembly's open hearing. Since there was no further discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the adoption of the agenda as amended. The assembly approved the agenda by a vote of 116 yes and 1 no.

Somigli then offered a motion on behalf of the DAOC that the rules presented to the assembly be adopted. The motion occasioned no discussion and no objections. The chair therefore declared the rules adopted by unanimous consent.

Again on behalf of the DAOC, Somigli moved that the assembly approve the minutes of the 2006 meeting as printed in the May 2007 issue of *PMLA*. The chair asked if there were any corrections. Since no corrections were offered, the chair declared the minutes approved as published.

2. The assembly elected two of its members, Gaurav Desai (English, Tulane Univ.) and Brian Kennelly (French, California Polytechnic State Univ., San Luis Obispo), to the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee for three-year terms (2008–10). In the election of a delegate to serve on the Executive Council, Alexandra K. Wettlaufer (French, Univ. of Texas, Austin) was elected for a four-year term (2008–11). Voting from a slate of

nominees selected by the 2007 officers of the association, the assembly elected Timothy Hampton (French, Univ. of California, Berkeley), Haun Saussy (comparative literature, Yale Univ.), and Frank Trommler (German, Univ. of Pennsylvania) to the Nominating Committee for two-year terms (2008–09). Voting from a slate of nominees selected by the DAOC, the assembly elected the following persons to the Elections Committee for two-year terms (2008–09): Katherine Arens (Univ. of Texas, Austin), Margaret W. Ferguson (Univ. of California, Davis), Alan Nadel (Univ. of Kentucky), and Robyn R. Warhol (Univ. of Vermont).

The assembly also elected Albert Wendt to honorary fellowship in the association.

3. The assembly held an open discussion of academic freedom, a topic selected by the DAOC. Delegates had received background information on the topic in advance of the assembly meeting. The chair asked Second Vice President Catherine Porter to preside over the open discussion. Porter reminded all present that one hour had been set aside for the open discussion, and she reviewed the rules that would govern it.

Joanna Brooks introduced the topic and presented a statement on academic freedom and censorship that the MLA Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Rights and Responsibilities (CAFPRR) had drafted in 1990 for internal use. Brooks said that, because many new challenges to academic freedom had emerged since 1990, the DAOC believed that it was time to update the statement. She added that the motion the DAOC planned to introduce after the open discussion (see next item) called on the Executive Council to pursue the revision of the CAFPRR's statement and that the DAOC hoped the assembly's open discussion would identify issues to be addressed in a revised statement. To that end, the DAOC asked speakers to comment on changing conditions in higher education, including the following: increasing reliance on part-time and non-tenure-track faculty appointments; changing economic structures, changing managerial models, and new assessment initiatives within colleges and universities; organized and funded initiatives (lobby groups, media, private foundations, corporations, donors) that seek to influence program and curriculum development, classroom dynamics, hiring, tenure, and promotion; increasing requests from MLA members that the association intervene in individual cases (taking into account both the hazards and the benefits of intervention in personnel decisions by a professional association without investigative capacity); and accusations disseminated through the media of bias in literature classrooms.

Speakers who disagreed with the DAOC on the need for a revised statement said the 1990 draft was a good statement of principles and that revising it to address the conditions that the DAOC had identified would risk weakening it and sacrificing its simplicity, conciseness, and clarity. Most speakers, however, agreed with the DAOC on the need for a revised statement that would provide a def-

inition of academic freedom for the twenty-first century; address issues related to freedom of speech and oppositional speech; and offer a compelling defense of academic freedom by tracing its origins and its development and by establishing its importance to all, not just professors. Of those who favored revising the 1990 statement, most said that the MLA should not be involved in the investigation of individual cases but should instead look for and address themes or factors that are common to such cases. Speakers also said that a revised statement should comment on the situation of those who do not have tenure, on relevant economic factors, and on such issues as balance in classroom discussions, the relation between students' rights and teachers' rights, the role of politics in the classroom and in the profession, and the influence of outside groups on curricular and personnel matters.

The open discussion came to a close after one hour, at which point First Vice President Gerald Graff returned to the chair.

4. The chair called on Luca Somigli, chair of the DAOC, to present the DAOC's annual report. After the presentation, Somigli asked if there were any questions. There were none. The chair then recognized Joanna Brooks, a DAOC member, who presented an addendum to the committee's report. The addendum consisted in the following motion.

Be it moved that the Executive Council pursue the revision of the 1990 "Statement on Censorship and Academic Freedom" from the Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Rights and Responsibilities, taking into consideration the 2007 Delegate Assembly's open discussion of academic freedom.

The chair stated the question on the motion and called for discussion. Since there was none, the chair asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the motion by a vote of 135 yes and 7 no.

5. The assembly received a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Structure of the Annual Convention that asked the assembly to endorse two proposals. The first proposal put forward two solutions to the problem of impending gridlock in the convention structure: (1) allocating session hours equitably and (2) reducing the number of guaranteed sessions that MLA divisions and discussion groups, MLA committees, and allied and affiliate organizations can organize while providing more opportunities for these entities to propose additional sessions, including sessions on which two or more entities would collaborate. The second proposal was to introduce two new types of convention sessions: electronic roundtables and workshops. Rosemary Feal, the chair of the ad hoc committee, presented the report, noted that members' comments had been collected at the MLA Web site before the convention and that delegates had received a summary of those comments just before the assembly meeting, and offered an explanation of the committee's first proposal.

On the advice of the parliamentarian, the chair ruled that each of the committee's proposals would be discussed and voted on separately. The chair therefore recognized Mary Layoun, a member of the ad hoc committee, who moved that the assembly endorse the committee's first proposal. The chair then opened the floor for discussion of the first proposal. Feal and Katherine Rowe, another member of the ad hoc committee, responded to questions about the space available in a reconfigured convention for smaller fields and interdisciplinary sessions, about the effects of the proposal on allied organizations, and about the logistics of collaborative sessions. Time for discussion came to an end, so the chair stated the question on the motion to endorse the ad hoc committee's first proposal and asked the assembly to vote. The assembly endorsed the first proposal by a vote of 104 yes and 9 no.

Layoun moved that the assembly endorse the ad hoc committee's second proposal, to introduce two new types of convention sessions. The chair recognized Feal, who explained the proposal, and then opened the floor for discussion of it. After brief discussion, Joseph Loewenstein made a motion to close debate. This motion was seconded, and the chair called for a vote on the motion, which was not debatable and required a two-thirds vote for passage. The assembly closed debate on the ad hoc committee's second proposal by a vote of 107 yes (96%) and 4 no (4%). The motion to endorse the proposal therefore came to an immediate vote. It was approved by a vote of 107 yes and 5 no.

6. The assembly received a report from the Committee on Amendments to the Constitution. The report consisted in the amendments to the constitution that were published in the September 2007 (Directory) issue of *PMLA* (949–51). One amendment resulted from a proposal to allow electronic voting. The other amendments grew out of a recommendation to change the dates of the annual convention from late December to early January. The committee presented the latter amendments in two sets, one to address constitutional requirements for an annual convention and other annual meetings at the convention and the other to address the terms of office of the officers, members of the Executive Council, and members of the Delegate Assembly. The committee proposed that the assembly first discuss and vote on the amendment allowing electronic voting and then discuss and vote on the two sets of remaining amendments.

The chair recognized Paula Rabinowitz, who moved the adoption of the constitutional amendment pertaining to electronic voting. It read as follows (proposed revisions appear in boldface; each revision is followed by an explanation in braces):

IV. Administration

D. Any time this constitution authorizes a vote of the entire membership of the association, that vote may be conducted by electronic means. *{new provision}*

[E.–H.] *{paragraphs relettered because of insertion of new provision}*

The chair stated the question on the adoption of the proposed amendment, noted that amendments from the floor were not in order, and called for discussion. Clarification of the amendment was requested and provided. Since there was no further discussion, the chair restated the question on the adoption of the proposed amendment and asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the amendment by a vote of 103 yes and 3 no.

Rabinowitz then moved the adoption of the two sets of amendments related to changing the dates of the annual convention from late December to early January. They read as follows (proposed revisions appear in boldface; each revision is followed by an explanation in braces):

Set 1

XII. Conventions and Meetings

A. The association shall hold one or more conventions annually, **with the following exceptions. This constitutional provision and any others that are inconsistent or interfere with changing the dates of the annual convention shall be suspended at the discretion of the Executive Council** *{new provision}*. In an emergency, the Executive Council shall have the power to cancel a convention.

[B.–D.]

E. The Delegate Assembly shall hold **a meeting in conjunction with each** *{replaces: at least one meeting annually, normally in conjunction with a}* convention of the association. Meetings of the Delegate Assembly must be announced in an appropriate publication of the association at least three months in advance of each meeting and can be cancelled only by a majority of its delegates responding to a mail ballot on the question.

IX. Delegate Assembly—Responsibilities

D. At least once a year, **except in any year in which the annual meeting has been suspended in accordance with article 12.A** *{new provision}*, the assembly shall hold a session of open hearings to allow members of the association who are not delegates to present matters of concern to the assembly. No votes shall be taken at this session. These hearings shall terminate before the assembly begins its formal deliberations.

XI. Committees

C. Organizing Committee

4. The committee shall hold hearings open to all members of the association on all resolutions it has received or initiated. Hearings shall be held on **the** *{replaces: each}* day of the convention preceding the day of the assembly meeting. . . .

Set 2

VI. Officers—Election

B. The president and vice presidents shall serve for **a term of approximately one year, which shall begin**

at the close of the association's convention following the election of the second vice president *{replaces: one calendar year}*. The first vice president shall succeed to the office of president, and the second vice president to the office of first vice president. . . .

VIII. Executive Council—Composition and Election. The Executive Council shall be composed of twelve at-large members and two members from the Delegate Assembly. In accordance with the provisions of article 8.A.5, at all times there shall be on the Executive Council representation from the three groups of dues-paying MLA members established by the constitution: regular members, student members, and life members. **Executive Council members' terms shall begin at the close of the association's convention following their election.** *{new provision}* A council member's category of membership at the time of election shall stand throughout that council member's term of office. All members of the Executive Council must retain membership in the association during their terms of office.

X. Delegate Assembly—Composition and Election

C. Each year one-third of the members of the Delegate Assembly shall be elected for three-year terms, except for ex officio members, who shall serve for the duration of their terms in office. **Elected delegates' terms shall begin at the close of the association's convention following their election.** *{new provision}* Candidates for election must have been listed in the most recent printed directory of members of the association or, if they are graduate students, in the current membership list. . . .

After Rabinowitz reminded the assembly that a single vote would be taken on the two sets of amendments, the chair called for discussion. Since there was none, the chair restated the question on the two sets of amendments and asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the two sets of amendments by a vote of 111 yes and 1 no.

7. The assembly received the report of the executive director and the Finance Committee report. The chair noted that no action on these reports was required but that comments and questions were welcome. Delegates had no comments or questions on the reports, so the chair asked the assembly to turn to the annual reports it had received from the following association committees: *PMLA* Editorial Board, Publications Committee, Committee on Scholarly Editions, Committee on the New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, Advisory Committee on the *MLA International Bibliography*, Committee on Honors and Awards, Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Rights and Responsibilities, Committee on the Literatures of People of Color in the United States and Canada, Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, Committee on Information Technology, Radio Committee, Committee on Disability Issues in the Profession, Committee on Community Colleges, and Committee on

the Status of Graduate Students in the Profession. After noting that no action on these reports was required but that comments and questions were welcome, the chair called on Luca Somigli of the DAOC to present the reports. He commented on the richness and diversity of the work done by the MLA through its committees and drew attention to several committees' collaboration on larger projects. He called on committee members in attendance to stand and receive the assembly's thanks and encouraged members to communicate their concerns to committee members throughout the year. At the conclusion of Somigli's presentation, the chair opened the floor for questions and comments. There were none.

8. In the category of new business, there was one motion that had been received by the 1 October submission deadline and could thus be discussed and voted on by the assembly. The motion (labeled Motion 2007-1) was submitted by Laraine Fergenson, Barbara Foley, Keith Gilyard, and Susan O'Malley. It read as follows:

Whereas the MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Tolerance delivered its final report in September 2004; and

Whereas "the [executive] council thanked the members of the committee for their report and congratulated them on the seriousness and thoroughness of their report and recommendations"; and

Whereas when the report was published in *Profession 2005*, the recommendations section was not included; and

Whereas the four members of the former Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Tolerance sent a letter protesting the exclusion of the recommendations section on the grounds that the committee was charged with making recommendations and that they should be seen by the membership of the MLA; and

Whereas the committee was informed that this letter, which contained the committee's recommendations, would not be published; and

Whereas the refusal to publish a letter signed by all the members of the committee constitutes an impediment to the free exchange of ideas to which the MLA is committed in principle; and

Whereas MLA members have a right to read a letter addressed to them by the members of a committee, and the committee members have a right to communicate with MLA members through the *MLA Newsletter*;

Whereas the final report, including its appendices, contains ideas that the committee thinks would be valuable for MLA members to have and that permission to publish the results of San Francisco State's "Task Force on Inter-group Relations" was obtained in order to make some excellent ideas available to MLA members;

Therefore, be it moved that future committee reports should not be edited (except for minor matters of style) without consultation with the members of the committee; and

Be it further moved that the letter dated March 8, 2006 sent by the members of the Committee on Diversity and Tolerance be published as soon as possible in the *MLA Newsletter*; and

Be it further moved that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Tolerance, in its entirety, along with its appendices, be posted to the MLA Web site and that final reports of MLA committees generally be posted to the MLA Web site in order to make the work and conclusions of committees accessible to MLA members, such reports being edited or abridged if necessary in consultation with committee members.

Bonnie Kime Scott of the DAOC presented the motion to the assembly and noted that two documents were offered as background information. The chair explained the two-stage process of consideration for motions and resolutions with preambles. He would call first for debate and amendment of the *resolved* clause or clauses and then for debate and amendment of the preamble before putting the full text of each item to a vote. The chair stated the question on Motion 2007-1 and called for discussion of the *resolved* clauses. After brief discussion of the *resolved* clauses, including Fergenson's explanation of the genesis of the motion, the chair called for discussion of the preamble. Since there was none, the chair asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the motion as submitted by a vote of 86 yes and 21 no.

9. Also in the category of new business, there were three regular resolutions that were received by the 1 October submission deadline for resolutions. The first resolution, which was referred to as Resolution 2007-1, was submitted by Margaret Hanzimanolis on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and Modern Languages. It read as follows:

Whereas the 2007 AAUP "Freedom in the Classroom" report identifies dire challenges to academic freedom, and

Whereas contingent faculty are most vulnerable to non-reappointment from exercising their academic freedom, and

Whereas reliance on contingent faculty has grown significantly, such that up to 78% of in state college system faculty are part-time,

Be it resolved that the MLA publicly support state legislation aimed at ensuring fair pay for contingent faculty and establishing a higher proportion of full-time faculty, as developed, in part, by the AFT-led campaign for Faculty and College Excellence (FACE).

Joanna Brooks of the DAOC presented the resolution to the assembly along with the DAOC's recommendation that the assembly approve the resolution. The chair stated the question on the adoption of the resolution and called for discussion of the *resolved* clause. Cathy Birkenstein-Graff moved that the resolution be amended by insertion of

the phrase "and job security with full due-process protections" after "fair pay" and before "for contingent faculty." The chair asked Birkenstein-Graff to submit her amendment to the *resolved* clause in writing and then opened the floor for discussion of the amendment. After brief discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote on the amendment. The assembly approved the amendment by a vote of 93 yes and 8 no. The chair asked if there was further discussion of the amended resolution. Since there was none, he asked the assembly to vote on the amended resolution. The assembly approved it by a vote of 98 yes and 5 no. The text of the resolution approved by the assembly read as follows:

Whereas the 2007 AAUP "Freedom in the Classroom" report identifies dire challenges to academic freedom, and

Whereas contingent faculty are most vulnerable to non-reappointment from exercising their academic freedom, and

Whereas reliance on contingent faculty has grown significantly, such that up to 78% of in state college system faculty are part-time,

Be it resolved that the MLA publicly support state legislation aimed at ensuring fair pay and job security with full due-process protections for contingent faculty and establishing a higher proportion of full-time faculty, as developed, in part, by the AFT-led campaign for Faculty and College Excellence (FACE).

The second resolution (designated Resolution 2007-2) was submitted by Grover Furr on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and Modern Languages. It read as follows:

Whereas some organizations and individuals have urged that faculty, writers and speakers who criticize Zionism and Israeli policies be denied tenure, disinvited to speak, speak only when "balanced" by a pro-Zionist speaker, or be fraudulently called "anti-Semitic"; and

Whereas this constitutes a serious danger to academic study and discussion in the USA today,

Resolved that the MLA defend the Academic Freedom and the Freedom of Speech of faculty and invited speakers to criticize Zionism and Israel.

Mary Layoun of the DAOC presented the resolution to the assembly along with the DAOC's recommendation that the assembly not approve the resolution. The chair stated the question on the adoption of the resolution and called for discussion of the *resolved* clause. Cary Nelson made a motion to amend the resolution by substituting the following text for the original.

Whereas the MLA recognizes that the Middle East is a subject of intense debate, and

Whereas it is essential that colleges and universities protect faculty rights to speak forthrightly on all sides of this issue, and

Whereas public debate over the Finkelstein case at DePaul and other recent events demonstrate that continuing vigilance is necessary,

Resolved that, while people outside the university have the right to express their views, universities must resist the inclusion of unsolicited outside opinion in faculty appointment or promotion reviews, and

Resolved that the MLA defend the academic freedom and the freedom of speech of faculty and invited speakers to address the issue of the Middle East in the manner they choose.

This motion to amend by substitution was seconded, and Nelson explained his reasons for offering the substitute resolution. After addressing a point of order raised by a nondelegate, the chair reviewed the procedure for the consideration of a substitute resolution: first, the original resolution would be opened to amendment, and then the substitute resolution would be opened to amendment. After both versions of the resolution had been perfected, the assembly would be asked to vote on whether to accept the substitute resolution in place of the original resolution. After the assembly had chosen the version of the resolution that it wished to consider, no further amendments would be allowed.

The chair called for amendments to Resolution 2007-2 as originally proposed, first to the preamble and then to the *resolved* clause. No amendments were offered in either case. The chair then called for amendments to the preamble of the substitute resolution. Christopher Bell moved that the third *whereas* clause of the preamble be struck out. This motion was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. After brief discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the amendment by a vote of 80 yes and 20 no.

The chair asked if there were any amendments to the *resolved* clauses of the substitute resolution. Lawrence Coates proposed that the first *resolved* clause be struck out. This motion was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. Since there was none, the chair asked the assembly to vote. The assembly rejected the amendment by a vote of 28 yes and 68 no.

The chair asked if there were any further amendments to the substitute resolution. There were none, so the chair opened the floor for discussion of whether to accept the amended substitute resolution in place of Resolution 2007-2 as originally submitted. Speakers who favored consideration of the original resolution said their support was based on the original resolution's defense of students and faculty members who were under attack because of their opposition to Zionism. Those who preferred the substitute resolution said that it was necessary to recognize the right of all to speak on controversial issues and to oppose outside interference in tenure and promotion decisions. The chair announced that no more time remained for discussion of the question of whether to accept the substitute resolution in place of the original

and called for a vote. The assembly replaced the original resolution with the substitute by a vote of 63 yes and 30 no. The chair then stated the question on the adoption of the amended substitute resolution and called for discussion. Joseph Loewenstein made a motion to close debate. This motion was seconded, and the chair called for a vote on the motion, which was not debatable and required a two-thirds vote for passage. The assembly closed debate on the substitute resolution by a vote of 71 yes (78%) and 20 no (22%). The motion to adopt the amended substitute resolution therefore came to an immediate vote. It was approved by a vote of 70 yes and 21 no. The text of the resolution approved by the assembly read as follows:

Whereas the MLA recognizes that the Middle East is a subject of intense debate, and

Whereas it is essential that colleges and universities protect faculty rights to speak forthrightly on all sides of this issue,

Resolved that, while people outside the university have the right to express their views, universities must resist the inclusion of unsolicited outside opinion in faculty appointment or promotion reviews, and

Resolved that the MLA defend the academic freedom and the freedom of speech of faculty and invited speakers to address the issue of the Middle East in the manner they choose.

The third resolution (labeled Resolution 2007-3) was submitted by Kamala Platt on behalf of the Radical Caucus in English and Modern Languages. It read as follows:

Whereas, upon criticism of Professor Ward Churchill for his remarks concerning the 9/11 attacks, the University of Colorado initiated proceedings against him, and investigations of his scholarly work, and removed him from his directorship of the Ethnic Studies Dept. and subsequently from his tenured teaching position, and

Whereas such acts of retribution threaten free expression in the university setting, particularly against those in historically marginalized disciplines,

Be it resolved that the Modern Language Association condemns this action of the President and Regents of the University of Colorado.

Luca Somigli of the DAOC presented the resolution to the assembly along with the DAOC's recommendation that the assembly not approve the resolution. The chair stated the question on the adoption of the resolution and called for discussion of the *resolved* clause. Cary Nelson made a motion to amend the resolution by substituting the following text for the original.

Whereas, upon criticism of Professor Ward Churchill for his remarks concerning the 9/11 attacks, the University of Colorado initiated proceedings against him, and

Whereas such acts of retribution threaten free expression in the university setting,

Resolved that the MLA condemns the University of Colorado investigation and all such politically motivated investigations into the speech and scholarship of faculty members throughout the world.

This motion to amend by substitution was seconded, and the chair recognized Nelson, who explained the need for his substitute resolution. The chair again explained the procedure for the consideration of a substitute resolution, and the parliamentarian also elaborated on the logic of the process. Following these explanations, the chair asked if there were any amendments to the preamble of Resolution 2007-3 as originally proposed. Barbara Foley offered a motion to amend the first *whereas* clause by striking all the words after the phrase “proceedings against him, and.” This motion was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. Since there was none, the chair asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the amendment by a vote of 65 yes and 8 no. The chair then called for amendments to the *resolved* clause of the original version of Resolution 2007-3. None were offered.

The chair then called for amendments to the preamble of the substitute resolution. Michael Bennett made a motion to amend the preamble of the substitute resolution by adding the phrase “particularly against those in historically marginalized disciplines” at the end of the second *whereas* clause. This motion to amend the preamble was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. Since there was none, the chair asked the assembly to vote. The assembly approved the amendment by a vote of 63 yes and 15 no. The chair then asked if there were further amendments to the preamble of the substitute resolution. Since there were none, the chair called for amendments to the *resolved* clause of the substitute resolution. Sara Lennox proposed a motion to amend the *resolved* clause by adding the words “retribution against and” after “politically motivated.” This motion was seconded, and the chair called for discussion of the amendment. After brief discussion, the chair asked the assembly to vote. The assembly rejected the amendment by a vote of 9 yes and 60 no.

The chair asked if there were further amendments to the *resolved* clause of the substitute resolution. Michael Bernard-Donals challenged the existence of a quorum, and the chair ordered a count of the house. There were 74 delegates still in attendance, which meant that a quorum was present. The assembly proceeded with its business. The chair opened the floor for discussion of whether to accept the amended substitute resolution in place of the amended version of Resolution 2007-3. David Ball made a motion to close debate. This motion was seconded, and the chair called for a vote on the motion, which was not debatable and required a two-thirds vote for passage. The assembly closed debate on whether to accept the substitute resolution by a vote of 67 yes (92%) and 6 no (8%). The question of accepting the amended substitute resolution in place of the amended version of Resolution 2007-3 was

therefore put to an immediate vote, and the assembly accepted the amended substitute resolution. The vote was 56 yes and 18 no. The chair then stated the question on the adoption of the amended substitute resolution and called for discussion. After brief discussion, Michael Bennett made a motion to close debate. This motion was seconded, and the chair called for a vote on the motion, which was not debatable and required a two-thirds vote for passage. The motion failed by a vote of 45 yes (62%) and 27 no (38%). Discussion of the amended substitute resolution therefore continued. Speakers who supported the adoption of the resolution said that it was appropriate and even necessary for the MLA to oppose the politicization of faculty review processes. Opponents of the resolution’s adoption said that an MLA resolution should not cite a specific case and expressed deep concern that the resolution could be misconstrued as a statement of support for Ward Churchill.

Marianne Novy offered a motion to close debate. The chair asked if there were any objections to closing debate. Since there were none, the chair closed debate and asked the assembly to vote on the amended substitute resolution. The assembly approved it by a vote of 57 yes and 15 no. The text of the resolution approved by the assembly read as follows:

Whereas, upon criticism of Professor Ward Churchill for his remarks concerning the 9/11 attacks, the University of Colorado initiated proceedings against him, and

Whereas such acts of retribution threaten free expression in the university setting, particularly against those in historically marginalized disciplines,

Resolved that the MLA condemns the University of Colorado investigation and all such politically motivated investigations into the speech and scholarship of faculty members throughout the world.

10. The chair called for the announcement of other items of new business, noting that any new proposals could be discussed but could not be voted on until the next assembly meeting. No one came forward.

11. The chair called for announcements. There were none.

12. Since there was no further business before the assembly, the chair declared the 2007 meeting of the Delegate Assembly adjourned sine die at 5:45 p.m.

Delegates in attendance:

Divisional Delegates: Julia Abramson, William Baker, Pat Belanoff, Christopher Bell, Yelena Belyaeva-Standen, John Beynon, Rebecca E. Biron, Virginia L. Blum, John Bruni, James Buzard, Jean-Claude Carron, G. Thomas Couser, Soelvé Curdts, Nicholas K. Davis, Theresa Delgado, John M. González, Marshall Grossman, Achsah Guibory, Robin Hackett, Kelly Hager, Gregory S. Hutcheson, Lutz Koepnick, Bettina R. Lerner, Joseph Loewenstein, Tricia Lootens, Jean Marie Lutes, Peter M. McIsaac, David Chioni Moore, Cary Nelson, Crystal Parikh, James Petterson,

Sara S. Poor, Marc Redfield, Mark A. Reid, Claiborne Rice, Charles J. Rzepka, Iñigo Sánchez-Llama, Patricia Anne Simpson, Zachary Sng, Jared Stark, Cynthia L. Stone, Ronald E. Surtz, Andrea Tarnowski, Hector A. Torres, Benigno Trigo, Marjorie Tussing, Alessandro Vettori, Adrian Wanner, Robyn R. Warhol, Robert Warrior, Susan Wells, Jonathan White, Eva Woods Peiró, Takayuki Yokota-Murakami.

Special-Interest Delegates: Moneera Al-Ghadeer, Susan Amper, Barclay Barrios, Margaret H. Beissinger, Bret Benjamin, Cathy Birkenstein-Graff, Claudia Breger, Patricia R. Campbell, Eva Cherniavsky, Deborah Clarke, Lawrence Coates, Carol Colatrella, Eva L. Corredor, Diane Davis, Alicia M. de la Torre Falzon, Frederick L. De Naples, Gaurav Desai, Barbara C. Foley, Fred Gardaphe, James D. Hayes, Cara Hersh, Heather Hewett, Katie Hogan, Donna LeCourt, Sohui Lee, James Kyung-Jin Lee, Sara Lennox, Teresa Mangum, Eugenio Matibag, Anita Obermeier, Shelley Fenno Quinn, Kelly A. Ritter, Xiomara Santamarina, Lynn A. Searfoss, Lewis C. Seifert, Adrienne Ward, Rebecca Weaver-Hightower, Keith Williams, Helene Zimmer-Loew.

Regional Delegates: Hosam M. Aboul-Ela, Geoffrey Baker, David M. Ball, Michael Bennett, Michael Bernard-Donals, Robert E. Bjork, Elizabeth Black, Cristina Vischer Bruns, Stacey Dolgin Casado, Nina Chordas, Matt Cohen, Liz Constable, Mary Jean Corbett, Peter Coviello, Kenya C. Dworkin y Méndez, Nancy C. Erickson, Sue W. Farqu-

har, Elizabeth Fay, Maria L. Figueredo, Margaret Gates Frohlich, Sima N. Godfrey, Shane Graham, Ben Graydon, Karen Gross, Kristen Guest, Maureen Jameson, Hannah R. Johnson, Dalia Kandiyoti, Katie Kane, Brian Kennelly, Julie Klassen, Michael Kreyling, Joe Lenz, Typhaine Leservot, Caroline Levine, Robert S. Levine, Benjamin Liu, Carlos Martinez, Patrick A. McCarthy, Cristel Mejía, Robert Mitchell, Cheryl A. Morgan, Karoliina Nilsson, Marianne Novy, Denis M. Provencher, José G. Ricardo, Adelaide M. Russo, Thomas Spaccarelli, Paul Matthew St. Pierre, Amy E. Harris Tan, Joyce Tolliver, Gabriel Trop, Geoffrey Turnovsky, Alison Van Nyhuis, Elvira Vilches, Shane Vogel, Samantha Webb, Phillip E. Wegner, Alexandra K. Wettlaufer, Jonathan Wilcox.

Delegates Representing Regional MLAs: Elizabeth J. Abele, Kathleen Diffley, Salah J. Khan, Manling Luo.

Officers and Members of the Executive Council: Charles Altieri, Dorian F. Bell, Marilyn Gaddis Rose, Anne Ruggles Gere, Gerald Graff, Jane Harper, Francis Abiola Irele, Mary N. Layoun, Catherine Porter, Paula Rabinowitz, Guy Stern, Priscilla Wald.

Members of the Delegate Assembly Organizing Committee: Joanna Brooks, Laura J. Rosenthal, Bonnie Kime Scott, Cynthia Skenazi, Luca Somigli.

Parliamentarian: Martha S. Grise.

Clerk: Rosemary G. Feal.