

Material sent to the Board without
covering memo on 15 January 1969

1. CCS's speech to Faculty and Students
at 1:45 P.M. 13 January, in Clothier

2. Quotation from Thucydides sent by
two students, Geoff Selling and Dick
Hegner, on 10 January.

3. Phoenix Supplements of 16 January,
11 January, 13, January, 14 January, and
15 January 1969.

GS

Courtney
President/Smith's Statement to the Faculty and Students
of Swarthmore College presented at 1:45 P.M. on
13 January 1969 in Clothier Memorial Hall

Let me say just a few words about what I think
we have been doing.

In my letter of December 31st to the Faculty I asked
our entire College community to consider conscientiously and
imaginatively the best way to achieve what I believed to be
the underlying concerns of SASS*, and of the Admissions
Policy Committee. I believe that we have been doing that.

Certainly the Faculty, for which I can speak as its
presiding officer, has responded in a way that has deepened,
if that were possible, my pride in Swarthmore. The Faculty
met in long sessions -- last Tuesday afternoon, Thursday
night, Friday afternoon, Friday night, Saturday morning,
Saturday afternoon, Sunday morning from 10:00 A.M. to close
to 2:00 P.M., Sunday afternoon from 3:30 P.M. ^{to} /close to
7:00 P.M., and Sunday night from 8:30 P.M. to around 3:30 A.M.
One faculty member reports that his youngest child did not
recognize him when he got home for a quick meal. At about
3:20 A.M. this morning Professor Alburk Rosenberg rose to
say that from his supply of three buttons he carries with
him for his lapel he was going to change to a new one with
three words on it. While he tried to find the button, the
weary faculty naturally speculated on the words, with "We
Try Harder" a leading possibility. The button he actually
put on had only two words -- "Escalate Peace."

*Swarthmore Afro-American Students' Society

I strongly support the actions we have taken as a Faculty, and I will strongly support them to the Board of Managers. I am confident that the Board shares the same values and concerns that have motivated the Faculty in our actions. I feel so sure of the Board's feelings on these matters that I am ready to begin immediately to implement the actions we have taken.

What we have passed is clear to those of us who have passed it, and we believe it to be right. Details will have to be worked out as we go along, just as details of our Commission on Educational Policy actions have to be worked out every day, but I see no problems in that if, as I am assuming, we can work in a spirit of mutual trust. I hope, I pray, there will not be any who will seek to sow distrust. I am sure SASS will want to work in a spirit of mutual trust, and I call on all of us to seek and work through the good in each other.

It is possible to use our present problem to escalate real and fancied differences that exist in any community. But I would ask of all of us never to trade Swarthmore's excellence and fineness and readiness to hold itself open to new light, from whatever source it comes, never to trade these things for slogans and hate. It took no force to bring about comprehensive proposals for the development of Black Studies. It took no force to bring about our fundamental and comprehensive examination of ourself in our Commission on Educational Policy. Students were involved, were urged to be involved, in

all of those considerations. I realize that some now sneer at the CEP, but there was no sneering in the Danforth groups and no sneering in the referendum which students were urged to take in order to express themselves on every one of the recommendations.

We have lost something precious at Swarthmore -- the feeling that force and disruptiveness are just not our way. But maybe we can see to it that this one time is only the exception that proves the rule. For certainly if there are any who now think that direct action should eventually be used for Black Studies, or Student Week, or any proposals that might come out of a Student Week, or the Sex Rule, or Dormitory Autonomy, or the University City Science Center, or the Physical Education requirement, or Beards, or on the question of institutional structure and the governance of higher education Let me digress to say that I am far from convinced that the prevailing system of governance of higher education in America is right for our times, though I am also far from convinced that it is wrong ; and I am very conscious of the fact that the abstractions of the description of the governance of our own particular institution always obscure the basic humanity and warmth with which we have tried to proceed; But these matters of governance are in my opinion ones for deep and thoughtful consideration^{from} then, to come back ~~to~~ my digression, I have to say that I seriously doubt their faith in education,

and the educational process, and I would be saddened to see further acceptance of force as against those qualities of trust and tolerance and humility and anti-totalitarianism and willingness to seek the good in others -- those qualities that have made, and can make, Swarthmore especially "fine" as an institution.

10 January 1969

So revolutions broke out . . . and in places where the revolutions occurred late the knowledge of what had happened previously in other places caused still new extravagances of revolutionary zeal, expressed by an elaboration in the methods of seizing power . . . To fit the change of events, words, too, had to change meanings. What used to be described as a thoughtless act of aggression was now regarded as the courage one would expect to find in a party member; to think of the future and wait was merely another way of saying one was a coward; any idea of moderation was just an attempt to disguise one's unmanly character; ability to understand a question from all sides meant that one was totally unfitted for action. Fanatical enthusiasm was the mark of a real man, and to plot against an enemy behind his back was perfectly legitimate self-defence. Anyone who held violent opinions could always be trusted, and anyone who objected to them became a suspect. To plot successfully was a sign of intelligence, but it was still cleverer to see that a plot was hatching. If one attempted to provide against having to do either, one was disrupting the unity of the party and acting out of fear of the opposition. In short, it was equally praiseworthy to get one's blow in first against someone who had no intention of doing any wrong at all. . . . These parties were not formed to enjoy the benefits of established laws, but to acquire power by overthrowing the existing regime; and the members of these parties felt confidence in each other not because of any fellowship . . . but because they were partners in crime. If an opponent made a reasonable speech, the party in power, so far from giving it a generous reception, took every precaution to see that it had no practical effect.

--Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War,
Book III

In times of crisis, whenever passion, irrationality, and force, have prevailed, knowledge, reason, and true values have been obscured and actual goals lost in the confusion. Let us ~~remember~~ remember the lessons of human history in our own time of crisis.

Geoff Selling '71
Dick Hegner '71

The Phoenix

SUPPLEMENT

JANUARY 15, 1969

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Phoenix is planning to run a full page of letters touching on any and all aspects of the "crisis." Letters should not be more than 200 words. They must be received by The Phoenix no later than Thursday evening. We urge every member of the college community to write a letter if he wishes to comment.

TUESDAY CLASSES MEET

Most classes which had not yet ended for the pre-exam reading period were held as scheduled yesterday. Despite the call for continued suspension of classes by the student plenum Monday night, attendance at many classes was between 50 to 75 per cent. At least one exam was given with all enrolled students present. Many professors gave their classes the choice of holding the class or discussing the campus crisis. In the introductory psychology course, for example, psychological aspects of the situation were discussed.

MODERATES HEAR SASS-FACULTY SPEAKERS

Sam Shepherd, '68, former president of SASS, spoke at length to the so-called moderate caucus at 1:30 p.m. Tuesday on SASS' clarified demands and the goals of the group's demands and action.

Toward the end of the meeting, faculty members Leon Bramson and Patrick Henry told how SASS-faculty discussions were proceeding, and asked the students to be patient.

The group, which dwindled during its three-hour meeting from 150 to about 50, also discussed the previous night's plenary session and heard several student calls for conciliation with the so-called radical caucus.

Shepherd began his remarks with some points on the lack of communications and cohesiveness within the student body. He said that he could not believe the extent of differences he observed within the student body during the plenary sessions. He suggested the moderates be more respectful of other white students' opinions when discussing with them.

On the matter of the present discrepancies between SASS demands and faculty resolutions, Shepherd offered several comments. The demands stated at the Monday night plenum were not escalations, he said, although he agreed they might have appeared so to some. He noted that several of them extended into an area the faculty had not yet really considered, namely, that of decision-making.

The faculty-approved Black representation on the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee does not, he said, seem to guarantee Black perspectives in decision-

making. He pointed out as an example that the Black students on the Black Studies Committee have constantly had to compromise their views in order to produce a document that would ultimately be acceptable to the faculty, which had review power over the committee report. The structure of the decision-making process influenced which perspectives prevailed on a matter intensely relevant to Black people, he explained.

Shepherd went on to explain the intent of the Black Interest Committee, and to squelch the "cultural veto rumor" (apparently referring to a comment made at the Monday evening plenum). He said the type of thing intended is, for example, that the Cooper and Collection committees designate certain deates and funds for programs chosen by SASS. The Black Interests Committee would "review" Black-related cultural programs and other events, and if its recommendations were not respected it would suggest action to SASS. But, Shepherd added, "SASS does not want a censorship or a veto of all cultural activities." "SASS wants to make its point of view known," he said, so that there would be no disruptions of the type that occurred last year around the Collection on South Africa, about which Blacks were not consulted. What SASS seeks through Black Interests Committee, said Shepherd, is a stable way of resolving such things without resort to action.

Regarding the role of white students in the present situation, Shepherd pointed to the difference between Swarthmore and other schools where Black students have recently taken action to support demands. At San Francisco State and Brandeis, he said the student body was split on support of the action. Here, he said, the basic reaction of the students was overwhelming support for SASS demands.

"I was up in the air for about 48 hours" said Shepherd of his relief and elation when he heard of the white students' vote of support, because he knew the Black students would not be isolated. He said he knew they would be less likely to have to withdraw from their action or to escalate tactics, neither of which would have been desirable, than if they had not received general student support.

When asked about the possible self-defeating nature of SASS' tactics in occupying the very office that would have to function smoothly if the demands were to be met, Shepherd defended the continued occupation as what anyone would see as the proper course. SASS, he said, is working for a principle, its right to self-definition and the integrity of Black perspective, and for a basic change in the process by which certain decisions are reached. Clearly that must weigh more heavily than a temporary delay in the admissions process, he added.

He said that in recent days SASS has been asked often about its tactics, has begun to see that white students many times did not perceive what SASS thought would be obvious, and has tried to explain its tactics to those students, expressing disappointment that this has to be done, but maintaining a willingness to do it. Shepherd added further that he expected SASS would be patient and tolerant of problems in implementing admissions policy where its occupation of the office has brought those problems about.

To a question about what would happen if the faculty did not respond satisfactorily to SASS, Shepherd said he thought that would not happen, and hoped not. He said the group had not decided what it would do in such a case, since the choices would be bleak either to abandon its principles or to escalate its tactics.

Following Shepherd's departure, the students remaining discussed the problems of whether or not to return to classes, the continuing explosiveness of the situation on campus, and the factioning and divisive talk and action in the student plenary sessions. There was also consideration of what action the students should take on the clarified SASS demands, and the standing disagreement between the faculty and SASS.

To shed light on the relation of students to that situation, Bramson and Henry reported on the steps being taken by the faculty. Bramson recognized that students felt a need to act. But, he urged, "The most important thing I can tell you is that in my opinion and that of other members of the faculty what is needed most is for time to elapse so that there can be a process of mutual clarification between SASS and the faculty." He assured the group that this was now happening.

The necessary clarifications are not small, but large, said Bramson, and can best be achieved in an intimate atmosphere. He urged that students avoid a "fantasy superstructure" that sees things as polarized. The best thing students can do, he added, is to let the clarification happen in an atmosphere devoid of bitterness, rancor, and escalation.

Henry described the "revolution" his feelings had gone through in the hours since SASS announced its points of rejection of the faculty action at the Monday night plenary session. Several students had previously described similarly how they had become less angry and disappointed at SASS and the radical group in the plenary meeting as they came to understand the clarified demands and their meaning to the white students.

Henry said he was still somewhat disappointed that SASS had not chosen to "trust us to mean what we said"; but he also recognized that "we aren't as far apart as we thought we were last night."

On possible student action at this point, he had two comments. First, that moderate students would do well to try to point out the closeness, and try to urge effective discussion. But he added that this did not mean requesting the faculty to go into continuous session. "Very few things could be more useless" (than continuous faculty meetings now), said Henry.

Furthermore, he said, small discussion groups of faculty, SASS members, and possibly students would not necessarily be useful to resolving the situation, since SASS speaks with a unified voice and would not like to express itself officially in so many groups.

SILENT MEETING AND WORKSHOPS

Following a one-hour Quaker-style silent meeting in Bond beginning at 1 p.m., two student groups met with SASS representatives in the lodges Tuesday afternoon for explanation and clarification of the full set of SASS demands. Bernard Greene and Mike Graves led the discussions, which were attended by approximately fifty people.

Topics discussed were (1) the apparent inconsistency between the various deadlines for the hiring of Black administrators, (2) the composition and review powers of the proposed Black Interest Committee, (3) the jurisdiction and composition nominating the proposed Black administrators, and (4) whether or not SASS' clarification constituted escalation of demands made previously. Graves and Greene emphatically answered the latter in the negative.

SASS-FACULTY MEETING REPORTED TO PLENARY SESSION

The student plenary session which was held last evening was shortened considerably in interest of more rest for its members and of less divisiveness and bitterness among them. However, they did hear significant statements on the part of SASS and the faculty communication committee and pass a resolution stating that the money saved from a general student fast be devoted to Black scholarships.

The meeting began with a statement by Mr. Urban of the faculty communications committee concerning the establishment at the request of Asmarom Legesse of increased communication with SASS in hopes of clarifying the SASS position on the faculty's proposals concerning their demands. President Smith, as announced in a statement passed out at the meeting, designated the faculty communications committee to act in this capacity. When this committee is satisfied that it fully understands the SASS position he will call a meeting of the faculty at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Urban also reported that the faculty communications committee had met with Clinton Etheridge, Mike Graves, Don Mizell, and Sam Shepherd that afternoon and had discussed general issues "including attitudes toward acceptance of the Black perspective in the Swarthmore community and two-way information flow between SASS and the faculty." He concluded with an announcement that the parties concerned will meet this evening to discuss discrepancies between the SASS position and faculty resolutions.

Mike Graves then clarified SASS' position as stated in the previous plenary session. The following is an official condensation of his statement.

"1) Regarding the question of whether or not there has been an escalation of demands: We see the Black Dean of Students called for as a specification of our demand for a counselor and thus not as an escalation. His counseling function would be similar to that of Deans Barr and Lange. The date March 1 was specified to stress the need for immediate action by the faculty. In regard to the Black Interest Committee: the functions of this committee were discussed with the faculty. The statement of its functions is not an escalation in so far as it addresses SASS' demand for involvement in the decision-making process at all levels, this being the cultural level.

2) Regarding the question of whether or not SASS has demanded the right of censorship: the third and fourth duties of the Black Interest Committee shall be reworded to read:

'3) reviewing cultural programs at the College which pertain to Black people before they are presented, if the party making the presentation so wishes

'4) recommending actions to the SASS membership should its offer of review not be utilized.'

It is by no means implied that SASS shall exercise censorship. We merely wish to provide a committee which can be consulted to avoid incidents like that last year with Paul Leavin's play.

3) Regarding the question of whether or not SASS has demanded an institutionalized process for minority coercion: SASS' involvement in decision-making processes does not imply minority coercion but rather expresses Black self-determination. There has been a redefinition of SASS membership to include all Black people of the world (i.e. people at Swarthmore who are not students and interested people in surrounding communities, as well as Swarthmore students).

We wish to reassure the entire College community, however, that voting on those issues relating to College policy shall be restricted to Swarthmore Black students. SASS preserves its right to determine voting procedure on issues which do not involve college policy, e.g. whether or not a Black History Week should be held."

Sam Shepherd, Swarthmore alumnus and President of SASS last year, then read the following statement as a formal letter communicating SASS' thoughts to the faculty:

"To the Faculty and Administration of Swarthmore College:

We thank you for the hard work and sacrifice you put into your deliberations. We commend you for your responsiveness thus far in this situation. We do sincerely and earnestly believe, however, that a lasting, genuine settlement package--one which institutionalizes the Black perspective--has yet to be produced. We are, therefore, urging that the faculty reconvene in this crisis situation to focus attention on Black policy-making and Black decision-making issues yet unresolved. What we in SASS and, hopefully, you of the Swarthmore faculty and administration seek is a stable, viable mechanism for dealing with the Black perspective. As Black people, we cannot and will not accept a decision-making process that compromises the dignity of Black people and jeopardizes the integrity of the Black perspective. We wish to express the fact that we feel no animosity in registering our differences. We hope we can continue to deal with each other from a position of respect on both sides, showing emotion on neither side.

Swarthmore Afro-American Students' Society"

The letter will be distributed to the faculty as soon as possible. He also said that SASS realized that its statement at the previous plenary was unclear in certain respects and that SASS was at the moment reworking the statement.

Mr. Bramson then addressed the students expressing his feelings on what would best help solve the present solution. He felt that the community should "foster an atmosphere of tranquility where the necessary effects of discussion carried on by mandated representatives of the faculty and mandated representatives of SASS can be felt." Thus he urged students to attend class because "to create a background of crisis as the atmosphere for such a discussion is inimicable to the interests of SASS, the faculty and administration, and the student body." After a question concerning his knowledge of what the student body passed last night which served mainly to lighten some of the tension in the building, the meeting moved on to the business on the agenda which consisted of three issues: the student fast, and two questions concerning the issue of student power. The first passed unanimously and before the second could be brought up a motion was made to adjourn.

Chairman Ellen Schall then stated that she had received several suggestions as to the time for reconvening and that the student body should take a straw vote on which of the following should be the statement as to the time: Feb. 3, 10, or 17, when the coordinating committee decides, or when the faculty considers SASS' clarification and SASS then responds. The fourth of these was accepted and the students voted to adjourn.

RADICALS PLAN CONTINUING ACTION

The afternoon and evening radical caucuses focused on means of informing students of "the continuing crisis." "Some people are still under the impression that the faculty has been acting completely responsibly," Joe Horowitz argued. The caucus decided to hand out leaflets in front of classrooms and hold workshops and dorm meetings today. Leaflets will explain the reasons for boycotting classes and announce workshops at 10 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. in Bond. At the discretion of each dorm, dorm or hall meetings will be held tonight to discuss Black perspective as well as the crisis as it remains.

The meeting protested Mr. Bramson's speech at Tuesday's plenary session as a personal opinion and not an official statement. Tuggy Yourgrau emphasized that "we should not pull what the faculty pulled on us" and close meetings to outside opinion. A message was therefore sent to the faculty asking that faculty opinions should not be presented except in the form of proposals to be voted on by the plenum (as student opinions cannot). Only official statements should be accepted at the beginning of each session.

Alan Feldman suggested that the caucus begin forming its own propositions instead of passing proposals to be sent to the plenary sessions. "We should realize we are operating as the vanguard of student opinion." Lenny Nakamura stressed the possibility that the crisis may "destroy" Swarthmore. He emphasized the need for personal student-faculty communication to clear up such a fear.

Frank Ackerman '67 suggested that interested caucus members draw up position papers and present them to a caucus meeting Thursday. Vin Berg announced an open meeting of the Swarthmore Labor Committee at 1:30 today in the Student Council room for a discussion of Swarthmore's relation to the outside world in its policies relevant to "Black and white working people." Subi Sahgal announced that she will hold a workshop of all Asian students in Lodge 3 at 1:30 p.m. today.

SASS, FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES MEET

SASS representatives met with faculty-SASS liaison Legesse and the faculty communications committee until late last night. Mr. Piker called it a good meeting and said that the faculty members present were to write up a statement about the results of their discussion. The statement is to be reviewed by SASS this morning. After both groups have signed it, the statement will be forwarded to President Smith. In calling for the meeting of SASS representatives and the faculty committee, President Smith stated, "As soon as this Committee is satisfied that it fully understands SASS' position I shall then call a meeting of the Faculty at the earliest opportunity."

*

*

*

The organizational meeting for Honors has been postponed until 11 a.m. Thursday in the Meeting House.

The Phoenix

SUPPLEMENT

JANUARY 14, 1969

FACULTY REPORTS TO MORNING PLENARY

Monday morning's plenary session consisted of faculty reports and announcements, as other business was postponed. First the delegation from the faculty meetings, Professors Urban, Piker and Wood, read and expanded upon Sunday's faculty decisions. The report consisted of the faculty's decisions on both sets of SASS demands, and was printed verbatim in Monday's Phoenix. When entertaining questions from the floor, the delegation affirmed that the faculty had not at that time reconsidered the role of the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee in the light of SASS objections. Previously the faculty had stated that the committee would act in the role of other Swarthmore committees, i.e., advisory to the faculty. They announced that the next faculty meeting was scheduled for Thursday; it could be called back into session at any time.

Also at the meeting, Professor Peter van de Kamp announced that since he would not allow himself to be pressured by any group, he would hold his classes that morning. Professor Frederick Pryor delivered a short speech concerning his views of the crisis. He said that student conduct during the last week indicated their "slave mentality." Questioning the validity of the student power proposals, he cited the lack of student initiative previously --their unwillingness to use the power they already now have to influence their curriculum. He said that he considered the students unwilling to consider their long-range implications of the demands for a student-faculty governing body.

Because the 490 students present did not represent a quorum of the student body and because SASS had not yet responded to the faculty proposals, the business of the meeting was postponed until an evening session.

PRESIDENT SMITH'S CLOTHIER ADDRESS

(Editor's note: President Courtney Smith's statement to the faculty and students of Swarthmore College presented at 1:45 P.M. on January 13, 1969 in Clothier Memorial Hall)

"Let me say just a few words about what I think we have been doing.

In my letter of December 31st to the faculty I asked our entire College community to consider conscientiously and imaginatively the best way to achieve what I believed to be the underlying concerns of SASS, and of the Admissions Policy Committee. I believe that we have been doing that.

Certainly the faculty, for which I can speak as its presiding officer, has responded in a way that has deepened, if that were possible, my pride in Swarthmore. The faculty met in long sessions-- last Tuesday afternoon, Thursday night, Friday afternoon, Friday night, Saturday morning, Saturday afternoon, Sunday morning from 10 a.m. to close to 2 p.m., and Sunday night from 8:30 p.m. to around 3:30 a.m. One faculty member reports that his youngest child did not recognize him when he got home for a quick meal. At about 3:20 a.m. this morning Professor Alburt Rosenberg rose to say that from his supply of three buttons he carries with him for his lapel he was going to change to a new one with three words on it. While he tried to find the button, the weary faculty nat ally

speculated on the words, with "We Try Harder" a leading possibility. The button he actually put on had only two words--"Escalate Peace."

I strongly support the actions we have taken as a faculty, and I will strongly support them to the Board of Managers. I am confident that the Board shares the same values and concerns that have motivated the faculty in our actions. I feel so sure of the Board's feelings on these matters that I am ready to begin immediately to implement the actions we have taken.

What we have passed is clear to those of us who have passed it, and we believe it to be right. Details will have to be worked out as we go along, just as details of our Commission on Educational Policy actions have to be worked out every day, but I see no problems in that if, as I am assuming, we can work in a spirit of mutual trust. I hope, I pray, there will not be any who will seek to sow distrust. I am sure SASS will want to work in a spirit of mutual trust, and I call on all of us to seek and work through the good in each other.

It is possible to use our present problem to escalate real and fancied differences that exist in any community. But I would ask of all of us never to trade Swarthmore's excellence and fineness and readiness to hold itself open to new light, from whatever source it comes, never to trade these things for slogans and hate. It took no force to bring about comprehensive proposals for the development of Black Studies. It took no force to bring about our fundamental and comprehensive examination of ourself in our Commission on Educational Policy. Students were involved, were urged to be involved, in all of those considerations. I realize that some now sneer at the CEP, but there was no sneering in the Danforth groups and no sneering in the referendum which students were urged to take in order to express themselves on every one of the recommendations.

We have lost something precious at Swarthmore-- the feeling that force and disruptiveness are just not our way. But maybe we can see to it that this one time is only the exception that proves the rule. For certainly if there are any who now think that direct action should eventually be used for Black Studies, or Student Week, or any proposals that might come out of a Student Week, or the Sex Rule, or Dormitory Autonomy, or the University City Science Center, or the Physical Education requirement, or beards, or on the question of institutional structure and the governance of higher education [let me digress to say that I am far from convinced that the prevailing system of governance of higher education in America is right for our times, though I am also far from convinced that it is wrong; and I am very conscious of the fact that the abstractions of the description of the governance of our own particular institution always obscure the basic humanity and warmth with which we have tried to proceed; but these matters of governance are in my opinion ones for deep and thoughtful consideration] then, to come back from my digression, I have to say that I seriously doubt their faith in education, and the educational process, and I would be saddened to see further acceptance of force as against those qualities of trust and tolerance and humility and anti-totalitarianism and willingness to seek the good in others-- those qualities that have made, and can make, Swarthmore especially "fine" as an institution."

RADICAL CAUCUS RESPONDS TO PRESIDENT

The radical caucus met twice in Tarbles Monday afternoon, first in preparation for President Smith's speech and then in reaction to it. In anticipation of the group's disagreement with the President's comments, Chairman Alan Feldman urged "absolute courtesy." The consensus of the caucus was that the "highest priority" should be given to questioning Mr. Smith after his speech. Several

possible questions were reviewed to clarify them and to insure that the important issues would be raised.

Reconvening after Mr. Smith's speech, radical reaction to it was largely negative. Some members felt that the speech represented all that they were fighting against. The radicals were upset that the President refused to answer questions. Joe Schoenfeld felt the group should emphasize at the plenary that Ellen Schall, SC president, asked President Smith to answer questions from the floor and he directly refused. Lennie Nakamura questioned whether the radicals should press Smith to answer questions. "Courtney Smith is an incredibly astute politician." Nakamura added that Smith has out-thought on his feet some very intelligent members of the student body. Tactics at the plenary that evening were considered. Hoping to have passed student demands before the meeting adjourned, the group believed it necessary that student power demands be considered before SASS demands are. Frank Ackerman '67, and Subi Sahgal were appointed to ask SASS not to speak to the plenary until after student power resolutions were voted on.

In previewing the proposals to be discussed at the plenary, the radicals were planning to postpone the interim senate resolution and concentrate on the student week resolution. Believing that students do not yet realize how much they do not know of what happens at faculty meetings, another priority will be a resolution in favor of student observers in those meetings.

A statement of the radical group was drawn up and read to the group. The reading was followed by loud applause. The statement follows:

"We do not question the values of trust, humility, tolerance or anti-totalitarianism but we question the practical meaning of trust at a time when effective communication has been hindered by the inability of students to observe faculty deliberations crucial to student interests. We fail to understand President Smith's refusal prior to his speech this afternoon, to entertain questions raised by that speech. Student plenaries have been open to all sections of the community and meetings of various student groups have been similarly open. In view of this, we question the accuracy of implying that student behaviour has defied a tradition of trust. Rather, the present crisis has created an unprecedented level of communication between students and faculty.

We feel that the present "breakdown of trust" is not an exception which proves the rule but a situation which has been building for some time. We regret that a crisis of this magnitude has been necessary in order to communicate the fact that SASS is but one of the elements of this community which does not feel that its interests have been represented within the decision-making structure of the college.

It is clear from the present crisis that there are real differences within the Swarthmore community. To pretend that a single group or person can define the interests of the entire community only exacerbates this crisis and makes future confrontations inevitable."

FOUR SASS MEMBERS INITIATE HUNGER STRIKE

At about 9:30 p.m. January 13, a SASS representative gave the following statement to Student Council president Ellen Schall, which she immediately read to the plenary session in Clothier (see full story below on Clothier meeting):

"We, the undersigned, believe that the faculty has NOT as yet met the

SASS demands to the satisfaction of SASS. Therefore, as of 8 p.m. EST tonight, we will retire to Commons where we will fast until those demands have been met. We will only consume water and will communicate only through brothers and sisters. It is hoped that the administration, faculty and student body will realize the seriousness of our intent and that until Swarthmore makes an honest commitment to the entire Black Community by beginning to meet the needs, in terms of the SASS demands, of the Swarthmore Black Community, we will continue this protest.

Ruth Wilson, George Harrison, Bill Shorter, Pat Connell"

When asked as to the purpose of this new form of protest, Clinton Etheridge, chairman of SASS, commented that the action was intended "to further dramatize the issue at a time when careful and concerted attention needs to be focused on the policy-making aspects of the SASS demands." The fast began in Commons, a large meeting room on the second floor of Parrish directly above the Admissions Office, and the four protesters later moved to Parrish parlor, on the first floor. This was done for the convenience of officials in charge of the building, which is a girls' dormitory in addition to an administration building.

The reason, according to Clinton Etheridge, for the fact that the hunger strike is taking place in a location other than the Admissions Office, is that the action is a separate one. All the SASS members support their fellow members in their effort. As Etheridge stated, "They voluntarily undertook the protest, strictly on their own, but are working in conjunction with the main group in the Admissions Office."

EVENING PLENARY MEETING VOTES

In a five and one-half hour meeting last night, the student plenary session listened to a speech on the background of institutional racism, heard Don Mizell explain that SASS is still "committed to the occupation of the Admissions Office," approved statements to SASS and the faculty, and approved a motion to endorse the clarified SASS demands, to urge that college academic business continue in suspension and to request the faculty to reconvene "at their earliest convenience and consider and act upon these demands."

A second proposal addressing itself to the resumption of academic business also received majority endorsement. The proposal expressed support for the faculty response, terming it "a satisfactory attempt to act on [the SASS demands] in the best interests of all parties." SASS was urged to begin open discussion of its differences with the faculty "outside of the Admissions Office" and warned of possible withdrawal of support through suspension of academic business if SASS actions do not reflect "godd faith." This proposal later lost in a run-off vote between the two statements.

The plenary session began at 7 p.m. with an address by Father James Woodruff, an Episcopal minister, giving background on Black history in an attempt to clarify the situation at Swarthmore. Father Woodruff explained that stereotypes about Afro-American history colored white perception of the current situation. He argued that higher education produces an unwillingness to examine analytically the common white perceptions of Blacks. Woodruff urged a rethinking of the theory of integration and in conclusion pointed out the need to investigate institutionalized racism as distinct from individual racism.

There followed a statement by SASS leaders of the organization's position on the faculty resolutions. A document read by Mike Graves gave a point by point consideration of SASS demands, faculty actions, and current SASS policy (see below). Terming the institutionalization of Black interests in the decision-making process the major unfinished business, Don Mizell called for the faculty to reconvene immediately to consider this problem.

During the question period, Mike Fields arose to read the following statement:

"We, the undersigned, while we feel that the College Community has moved in 'good faith,' it has not addressed itself to the central issue before us. The Swarthmore Afro-American Society has just made public the clarification presented to the faculty at the Sunday meeting. We do not feel that the crisis is over. Harder to express our desire that the faculty continue to meet until this central issue has been dealt with to everyone's satisfaction, we have chosen this time to join our brothers and sisters in the admissions office. We also wish to take this opportunity to reiterate our belief that the Swarthmore Afro-American Society is advancing the cause of Black People."

The letter was signed by Mike Fields, Karen Johnson, Esther Mellon, Sherry Browne, Nancy Boyd, Fred Warren, Bridget Van Gronigen, Wilbert Greenhouse, Patrick Connell Jr., Sheryl Sebastian, Tralance Addy, Myra Rose, Phylis Caruth, and Gary Williams.

The meeting was called officially to order at 8 p.m. with 723 students present. A quorum was maintained throughout the meeting with 576 staying until the final vote. The first proposal to be considered and approved was a request of SASS that it guarantee inclusion of non-SASS members in all its deliberations and keep them informed of its actions. There followed discussion and passing of a motion to use all money won by the College Bowl team for implementation of Black admissions programs.

By a vote of 363 to 215, with 16 abstentions, the body approved a motion to protest the faculty's decision to close its meetings to students. Increased communication between students and faculty was cited as a justification for the request that future meetings be opened to student observers, and, at the faculty's option, participants.

After a motion to postpone the rest of the agenda, consideration turned to proposals dealing with the resumption or continuing suspension of College academic business. Voting on all six proposals, students attained majority support of two positions. The first, which passed 306-264, with 34 not voting, endorsed the clarified SASS demands, called for reconvening of the faculty sessions, and urged the continued suspension of academic business. A vote of 281 in favor, 280 opposed, and 33 abstaining achieved passage of the proposal supporting the faculty handling of the situation. The run-off vote between the two proposals endorsed the first proposal 315-230, with 31 abstentions.

A minor procedural crisis was engendered by the one-vote margin on the faculty support proposal. Parliamentarian Barry Wohl invoked Robert's ruling that abstentions are not considered in determining the number needed for majority. Calls for a revote were ruled out of order under the plenary session rules, the proper motion being to rescind, which would have required 2/3 approval. The motion to rescind was never advanced, and a run-off vote was approved, with the provision that both proposals would be sent to the faculty, with the votes enumerated.

Before adjourning until 7:30 p.m. tonight, students tendered a standing ovation to session chairman Ellen Schall. Phoenix representative Doug Blair read a statement issued by President Smith early yesterday morning concerning Drew Pearson's column about the Swarthmore crisis. The text of the response is as follows:

"Speaking for a community that has been trying to resolve a very complex human problem, I regret that the version I have seen of Drew Pearson's article on the Swarthmore Afro-American Students' Society fails to reflect the way in which this community is united in seeking solutions to this problem. The article is inaccurate in a number of respects and thus obscures the depth and seriousness of concern that all at Swarthmore feel for this problem.

Courtney Smith
President
Swarthmore College."

The statement was released to the wire services and to the Evening Bulletin at 7 a.m. yesterday.

SASS STATEMENT

Last night SASS presented "a concise statement of those resolutions which are satisfactory and those which are unsatisfactory to SASS:"

In this presentation of last night's statement, for the sake of perspective, the faculty resolutions and current SASS position are preceded by the SASS demand which prompted the faculty resolution. The order of the following sets of demands, faculty resolutions, and SASS positions (in this presentation) parallels the order in which they were presented by SASS (to the plenary session). Within each set, the statements of faculty-SASS interchanges are arranged chronologically.

The SASS quotations of Jan. 13 were taken from a xerox copy of the written statement read to the plenary session.

(E.n. S --- SASS
F --- Faculty)

S 1/9: "that a complete identification and description of the decision-making organs of the college on every level be made public."

F 1/12-13: "The President and faculty welcome an opportunity to provide any information they can that identifies and describes the decision-making organs of the college on every level, and will do so within a matter of days after the resumption of normal college activity."

S 1/13: "we accept this resolution... (make) the report public."

S 1/13: "The second set of resolutions deals with our second demand, to include Black people on policy-making levels. This is where the biggest discrepancy between faculty resolutions and our original demands lies."

S 1/9: "2) that Black people be participants in policy making on all levels outlined in compliance to the first demand."

S 10/16/68: "3) That the college actively recruit, subject to our review, a high-level Black administrator."

S 12/13: "c) that the college take steps to seek out and appoint an Assistant Dean of Admissions, subject to consultation with SASS, who shall be Black and who shall be directed to concentrate his efforts on recruitment, enrollment and post-enrollment support of Black students and other minority group students. This dean shall be installed no later than November 31, 1969.

d) that the college take immediate steps to recruit and appoint subject

to recruit and appoint subject to review by SASS a Black counselor available to all Black students for the purpose of providing confidential advice and guidance. It is to be understood that this counselor shall not be responsible to the Deans for providing them with any confidential, privileged information."

F 1/11: "3) That the college take immediate steps to recruit and appoint subject to review by SASS a Black counselor available to all Black students for the purpose of providing confidential advice and guidance. It is to be understood that this counselor is not to be responsible to the deans for providing them with any confidential, privileged information. (This corresponds exactly to SASS demand E d, page 2 of 23 December 1968 demands)."

F 1/11: "D) Among the responsibilities of the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee are the following: 1) To seek out and recommend appointment at the earliest possible date, of an Admissions Officer who shall be Black."

S 1/13: "Our position is:

That there be a Black dean of students who shall serve as the counsellor for Black students, while having other administrative duties commensurate with that post by March 1, 1969.

That there be an Assistant Dean of Admissions, who shall be Black, and who shall have the other administrative duties commensurate with that post by September 1, 1969.

That the hiring of the two aforementioned administrators shall be by Presidential appointment. A list of prospective candidates will be developed through the efforts of SASS and any outside organizations it deems necessary and the administration. Final approval of the two administrators shall be at the discretion of SASS."

S 1/13: "the part on the Black administrator (D₁) we have already deleted."

S 12/23: "a. the acceptance and enrollment of a significant number of so-called "risk" Black students for the academic year beginning September 1969. Significant defined here to fall between ten (10) and twenty (20)."

S 12/23: "a. that the College agree to increase the total number of Black students enrolled to one hundred (100) within the next three (3) years and to one hundred fifty (150) within the next six (6) years."

F 1/10: "That the College should set as its goal the enrollment of a significant number (approximately 10) of so-called risk Black students for the academic year 1969-70."

F 1/10: "The College will strive to enroll a minimum of 25 Black students in each freshman class. It is hoped that this number can be increased to 35 after a three-year period."

S 1/13: "That at least 35 Black students be admitted into the freshmen classes over the next three years so as to accommodate the goal of 100 Black students by 1972, and 40 over the next six years so as to meet the goal of 150 Black students by 1975.

It is understood that we accept the resolution to encourage enrollment of Black transfers with scholarships."

S 10/16: "2) That the faculty and administration form a committee to cooperate actively with the SASS College Relations Committee on an on-going basis. This Black Interest Committee would insure that Swarthmore in the future will be sensitive to the interests of Black people."

F: No Resolution

S 1/13: "The faculty has made NO resolutions about the Black Interest Committee originally demanded.

Our position is:

That the college recognize a Black interest committee which shall be charged with!

- 1) obtaining a delineation of the decision-making process as pertains to cultural activities
- 2) Sharing in the initiation of programs of a cultural nature for the entire college community with the Cooper Foundation, Collection Committee, Music Department, LTC, and similar groups.
- 3) Reviewing cultural programs at the college which pertain to Black people BEFORE they are presented
- 4) Suggesting actions to the SASS membership should its right of review not be respected.

This committee shall consist of Black students responsible to SASS who shall be available for recommendations and consultation to the entire college community."

S 12/23: "e. the review and revision of present admissions standards and practices involved in evaluating Black applicants by a group consisting of Admissions Committee members and SASS members. This group shall determine standards and practices to be applied to Black students seeking enrollment in September 1969."

F 1/11: "At its meeting on Saturday morning, 11 January, 1969, the faculty passed the following motion:

- A) To facilitate the establishment of this committee, the faculty recommends the prompt establishment of an Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee.
- B) We propose that this Committee consist of 3 faculty members, 5 students including representation of SASS, 2 administrators; the representatives of each group to be chosen by that group.
- C) The chairman of this committee will be chosen from the committee by the committee.
- D) Among the responsibilities of the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee are the following:

- 1) To seek out and recommend appointment at the earliest possible date, of an Admissions Officer who shall be Black.
- 2) To review present admissions standards and procedures involved in evaluating Black applicants, to recommend standards and procedures to be applied to Black applicants, and in particular to propose means for implementing Black admissions policy.
- 3) To consider changes in the membership of the standing Admissions Policy Committee.
- 4) To prepare reports as it sees fit.

It is understood that this committee be free to make use of outside professional

consultants."

F 1/12: "the third change deleted the word professional from the AHBAC's final charge, to 'be free to make use of outside professional consultants.'"

S 1/13: "We accept the resolution with additions."

"That the Ad Hoc Committee for Black Admissions be charged with

- 1) The formulation of Black admissions policies, i.e. procedures and qualification criteria
- 2) A review of the implementation of these policies by the College Admissions Committee and consideration of any problems resulting from such implementation
- 3) The reformulation of Black admissions policy in the future as the committee sees fit.
- 4) The power to elect a chairman from the committee and to increase its functions pertaining to Black admissions (e.g. supportive programs) as it sees fit.

That the structure of said committee consist of the following:

- 4 Black students
- 1 white student
- 3 faculty members, one of whom shall be Black
- 2 administrators, one Black when he arrives

These members shall be chosen by their respective groups, in accord with the faculty resolution.

That the final approval or disapproval of said committee's policies are to rest with SASS."

S 12/23: "b. negotiations with institutions presently conducting summer enrichment or reinforcement programs for entering freshmen so that "risk" students accepted by Swarthmore for the academic year 1969-70 may attend such a program.
d. negotiations with several quality private secondary schools so as to arrange that "risk" students accepted by Swarthmore for the academic year beginning in September 1969 may have the option of attending such a school for one year prior to entering Swarthmore with the students total expenses for that year paid for by the College.
d. the designing and implementation in academic year 1969-70 of a past enrollment 'support' program that would be available to Black students after enrollment and that would take special consideration of "risk" students mentioned above. Such a package shall be designed by the Admissions Policy Committee in consultation with SASS."

F 1/12: "1) It is resolved that the college enter into negotiations with institutions at present conducting summer reinforcement or enrichment programs for entering freshmen, so that students accepted by Swarthmore for the academic year 1969-1970 who need this preparation may attend such a program.

4) That immediate action should be taken to design and implement for the academic year 1969-70 a 'support' program that will be available to Black students as necessary. Such a program shall be designed by the curriculum committee in consultation with SASS. (This corresponds to demand d, page 1 of the 23 December SASS demands)."

S 1/13: "It is understood that those resolutions which deal specifically with supportive programs are acceptable as appropriate for investigation by the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee."

S 1/9: "4) that no disciplinary action whatsoever be taken against Black people, both students and employees, who have participated in this direct action."

F 1/12-13: "The College does not contemplate disciplinary action for the SASS actions that are presently known to it. While it does not anticipate cause for disciplinary action, it cannot guarantee amnesty for matters on which it has no information."

"Amplification:

1) With reference to resolution 7, concerning amnesty: By 'presently known to it,' the faculty refers to its knowledge of SASS' orderly occupation of the admissions office, and of the shutting off of windows and exits. The faculty is encouraged by the verbal assurances undertaken by representatives of SASS upon their first entering the admissions office--to wit, that property would not be harmed, files would not be rifled, and people not detained against their will. Assuming there are no other grounds for offense, SASS has no cause for concern."

S 1/13: "We interpret the faculty's amplified statement of amnesty as an acceptance of our original demand for amnesty."

S 1/9: "2) that Black people be participants in policy making on all levels outline, in compliance to the first demand."

F 1/12-13: "6) In the actions of the faculty responding to the SASS communication of 23 December and to the report of the Committee on Admissions Policy, the faculty has authorized the participation of Black people in shaping policies on matters relating directly to the special interests of Black students. The faculty is determined to adhere to this principle wherever it applies."

S 1/13: "That black people shall participate in decision-making processes relating to the special interests of black people."

Anyone wanting to submit material for a regular Phoenix should place articles in College Mail no later than tonite.

THE PHOENIX SUPPLEMENT

Jeff Spielberg, Editor-in-chief

Managing Editors: Russ Benghiat, Doug Blair, Bob Goodman, Karin Sundquist, Dan Taylor

Staff: Helen Darmara, Galen Fisher, Don Fujihira, Ken Giles, John Lohr, Sue Perchonock, Ann Reichelderfer, Ken Roberts, Bill Ryan, Jan Sriver, Pete Solar, Pete Welch.

The Phoenix

SUPPLEMENT

JANUARY 13, 1969

MORNING AND AFTERNOON FACULTY MEETING RESULTS

At its Sunday morning session, the faculty continued action on issues of Black recruitment and supplementary teaching programs. It also decided to delay until later in the day a decision on continuation of classes Monday.

It resolved, "That the College enter into negotiations with institutions at present conducting summer enrichment or reinforcement programs for entering freshmen" so that students accepted to enroll next fall might benefit from the programs.

In a second decision, as reported by the designated communications committee of Linwood Urban, James Wood, Asmarom Legesse, and Steven Piker, the faculty resolved that the college recruit and encourage the enrollment of Black transfer students from two-year and remain open to transfers from four-year colleges. It further stated that financial aid would be available where appropriate.

The third resolution was that "The college endeavor to enhance opportunities for all Black students to attend colleges." Five specific measures were suggested, to be done in consultation with the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee: continuation of Upward Bound, consideration of using college facilities for an ABC-type program, study by a student-faculty committee of the possibility of weekly evening seminars for socio-economically deprived local high school upperclassmen, continued participation in area programs to increase the number of college-bound students, and trying to arrange with local private schools to offer Black Swarthmore applicants an extra year of schooling if necessary.

The faculty public relations committee pointed out that the three resolutions pertain to three of the original (December 23) SASS demands.

In its afternoon session, the faculty amended its resolution of the previous day on the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee. It also acted on the question of Black student life and financing of recently approved admissions policy recommendations. During the meeting it heard a statement from SASS chairman Clinton Etheridge, on the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee.

The action on financing, as reported by Messrs. Urban, Wood, and Piker, was this:

"6) The faculty urged, in the form of a resolution, that the President and the board secure funds to carry out the recommendations of the faculty, based on the SASS communication of 23 December and the report of the Admissions committee; the faculty recognizes that such a course requires a reappraisal of budgetary and fund-raising priorities."

On Black activities, the resolution was reported as follows:

"1) The following resolution was passed: The faculty urges the student council and other organizations to be constantly aware of the need to provide support for activities which, while open to the entire student body, would be largely Black in orientation (APC report, pg. 11, C)."

Three amendments were made in the proposal for the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee. The first named as a specific duty of the committee to "review and make recommendations concerning the college's geographical pattern of recruit-

ment of Black and other minority group students."

Another amendment added after the word "consider" in part D,3 the words "and recommend" (the section now charges the AHBAC to "consider and recommend changes in the membership of the standing Admissions Policy Committee"); the third change deleted the word professional from the AHBAC's final charge, to "be free to make use of outside professional consultants."

The latter two amendments were "enacted in response to communication from SASS," according to the faculty public relations committee. The first amendment was passed "because a number of the faculty felt that there were many unanswered mechanical questions in this area, and wished to leave specific determination to the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee, within whose range of competence such problems would fall."

A final amendment revised the language of the January 10 resolution encouraging the enrollment of some "so-called risk Black students." The phrase was changed to "Black students whose qualifications are outside normal admissions criteria."

The faculty also resolved "that classes will be held Monday at the discretion of the instructors." (During its third session, the faculty reversed this decision and declared that all Monday classes are cancelled because the faculty meeting lasted until so late.)

Clinton Etheridge, Don Mizell, and Marilyn Allman of SASS visited the faculty meeting to present the organizations's views on the proposed Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee and to ask President Courtney Smith about his presentation of faculty resolutions to the Board of Managers.

The statement on the AHBAC, as reported by Etheridge, had two parts. First: that SASS views the faculty-proposed AHBAC as an advisory rather than a policy-making body. Second: that SASS proposes a committee composed as follows: four members appointed by SASS, one white student, three faculty members (a strong feeling obtained that at least one should be Black), and two members of the administration (again, there was strong feeling that when a Black administrator--or at least a Black counselor--was appointed, that at least one of those persons should be included).

Following that statement, Etheridge asked President Smith if he were prepared to use the full influence and prestige of his office to win approval for the faculty resolutions on Black admissions, Black student life, and Black policy-shaping.

It was reported by Etheridge, and also by Steven Piker at the student plenary session, that Smith said this went without saying. In addition, it was reported that he added later that, in his tenure as President, the Board had never rejected a faculty resolution supported by him.

Etheridge reportedly added that SASS would have recourse to direct action again if the Board of Managers failed to endorse or accept in toto the faculty resolutions on Black admissions, Black student life, and Black policy-shaping.

MORNING AND AFTERNOON RADICAL CAUCUSES

The pre-plenary session radical caucus meetings Sunday at 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. focused on what action should be taken in light of the clarified SASS demands. SASS stated in an interview in Saturday's Phoenix that they were primarily interested in Black problems, and not in "Student Power" at this point. The question for the meeting became whether the meeting wanted to back SASS or to

immediately support radical action.

The immediate question was whether or not to return to classes Monday. On the possibility that classes would be held, even though SASS had not evacuated the Admissions Office, the meeting proposed that students could boycott classes, hold constructive vigils outside classrooms, read statements and ask to lead voluntary discussions in classes asking for support, or sit in at an appropriate location. If classes were called off, either a vigil outside the faculty meeting or tactics supporting the faculty were suggested. Final decisions were put off until faculty action was known.

Also at the meeting, actions for Student Power were discussed. Some members suggested boycotting classes even after SASS leaves the office, in order to get more student power immediately. At the afternoon meeting, Neil Prose presented a statement which the meeting voted to have read at yesterday's plenary session. It called for a faculty commitment by the third week in February for a student-faculty governing body with substantial powers, and for a student week at that time. The formation of a Student Power Organizing Committee (SPOC) was announced with the purpose of protesting the legitimacy of the College's rule-making process, through civil disobedience. Areas where civil disobedience may be used are compulsory physical education, women's hours and the locked doors in Parrish. Interested students were urged to join the committee.

A statement to be presented at the plenary session was prepared to protest student-observer exclusion from faculty meetings. A committee was formed to collect money for food for SASS.

* * * *

Since the SASS treasury is not equipped to handle the present drain caused by; the food cost of staying in the admissions office, a SASS Emergency Fund has been formed. Donations may be made through the Business Office to SASS Emergency Fund in care of Crispin Miller or Barbara Boardman or directly to Crispin Miller, Barbara Boardman, Hilary Radner, Louis Heavenrich, Linda Tsu, or Jeanie Gaylord.

* * * *

EVENING PLENARY SESSION

In the general student plenary, attended by over 600 students plus numerous faculty and outside persons last night, the student body considered and passed motions concerning the resumption of academic business while the crisis situation still exists and the composition of the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee. They also postponed indefinitely consideration of a number of statements opposed to different portions of SASS' action.

The meeting began with a statement by the faculty public relations committee explaining what the faculty had passed in its two meetings held that day and that the faculty was reconvening at 8:30 p.m. It then moved quickly onto an explanation by Ellen Schall, the chairman of the meeting, and Barry Wohl, the parliamentarian, as to the procedures under which the meeting was going to be run. These procedures were a slightly modified version of Robert's Rules of Order and were accepted by the student body. Students also briefly considered and accepted the agenda worked out by the student co-ordinating committee and handed out at the door.

Immediately after item III of the agenda on "Statements concerning actions of SASS" was brought up, a motion was made that the whole item be postponed indefinitely because it did not address itself to a resolution of the present crisis or the problem of decision-making at Swarthmore and therefore could in no way speed the solution of the present situation. It was added that moral statements on SASS' action would only prove divisive to the whole community if they were passed by the student plenary. People who felt that the proposals should be considered pointed out that a dangerous precedent was being set and that therefore this precedent should be considered by the student body. The whole proposal was then postponed indefinitely by a substantial majority of the student body.

The next item on the agenda was a modification of the Nussbaum proposal considered the night before, calling for the "inclusion of Black people at all relevant levels of decision-making process in the college."

Those in favor of the motion pointed out that it was not an interpretation of SASS' position, but a statement of the position of the white student body. It was also pointed out that the white students represented a third group directly concerned with SASS' demands and therefore its view of what is an appropriate resolution of these demands is extremely relevant and should be expressed. Finally, it was also explained that the motion as stated separated completely the question of student power from the present crisis and that this question should not be allowed to muddle the present issues.

Those opposed expressed the view that the statement was meaningless because too many interpretations were possible, that it doesn't add anything to what has already been said, that we should not pass anything that could possibly divert the faculty's attention, and that in actuality the student plenary was in no legitimate bargaining position. After considering amendments concerning to whom the Black persons in decision-making positions should be acceptable, the student body accepted the following proposal:

The inclusion of Black people at all relevant levels of decision-making in the college: while in the future we feel that this SASS demand will be met by the appointment of Black faculty, administrators or counselors, until such time as there exists sufficient Black representation in the faculty to accomplish adequate representation of Black interests, this demand must be met by the inclusion of Black students or outside resource people acceptable to Black students. This is to insure that no decision concerning Black people can be made without Black interest being represented in the process of reaching that decision."

While the group was considering action on the problem of the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee, Don Mizell was given permission to address the meeting as a SASS representative. Mizell stated that SASS would consider it a betrayal of faith if the students return to academic business as if nothing has happened before the whole issue is settled. He went on to say that if they did, however, it would be consistent with the history of race relations in America and that it was SASS' position that it is necessary that college business not resume until the issues are settled. After a brief question period Mizell was asked to determine SASS' position on the proposal that the students were considering concerning the ad hoc committee and report that opinion to the student plenary.

After Mizell had agreed to do this, the question of the ad hoc was postponed until his return and the plenary turned to the problem of the resumption of academic business.

After a series of procedural problems concerned with how the proposals

should be considered and voted on, the student body heard two speakers speak in favor of each of the proposals and then voted on them in order of exclusiveness so that as soon as a substantial majority approval of one of them was received voting on the issue could stop. The proposals, in order of their consideration were:

- 1)"That the business of the college resume if SASS has voluntarily vacated the Admissions Office."
- 2)"Until the faculty has finished with the agenda of SASS demands to the faculty's satisfaction, and until SASS has responded to all the decisions made by the faculty, we proposed a.) that all academic business of the college be suspended and b.) at this time this body will decide whether academic college business should be resumed."
- 3)"That the business of the college resume if the students decide that the faculty has satisfactorily passed on all business."
- 4)"That the business of the college resume, if the faculty has finished with the agenda of SASS' demands to the faculty's satisfaction."
- 5)"That the business of the college resumes if the faculty decides it shall"

After the presentations, the students defeated by a vote of 230-283 number one of the above and passed by a substantial majority number two of those. Those in favor of this proposal pointed out that it postponed the vote until the student body was aware of the specific positions of the faculty and SASS while not making a commitment to either group. They felt that it also expressed the important view that the faculty should meet as often as possible, not interrupted by classes, until they have considered all of SASS' demands. After the passing of number two, voting on this issue was discontinued in compliance with the original procedure adopted.

The students then returned to consideration of the question of the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee. Under consideration was a proposal that the committee be given policy making power and that it be composed of four students chosen by SASS, one student selected by the student body, one Black faculty member endorsed by SASS, two faculty members picked by the faculty, and two administration members. Don Mizell reported that while this proposal was not SASS' position, it was not unacceptable to them, and therefore they encouraged the students to accept it.

After brief consideration of an amendment to lower the Black representation and rejection of that amendment, the students voted that "At this time the Committee be composed of four students elected by SASS, one student elected by the student body, one faculty member endorsed by SASS, two faculty members elected by the faculty, and two administrators."

The portion of the proposal concerned with ultimate decision making power was next on the agenda. However, it was never brought to the floor because a motion of adjournment until 10 a.m. this morning was passed by the plenary in view of the fact that most of its members were in need of rest. The rest of the agenda, including consideration of student power questions will be considered at that time.

EVENING RADICAL CAUCUS DEBATES DIRECT ACTION

Last night's meeting of the Radical Caucus came out against direct, coercive action in a "straw poll" of the approximately 150 students present. Although

agreeing that classes should be boycotted today if they were held, the meeting felt that direct action, such as a sit-in, would alienate both students and faculty, and turn them against future radical causes, such as the student power issue.

Chairman Al Feldman outlined possibilities of action proposed at the caucus held at 4 p.m. A vigil was suggested to remind students of the boycott, and of the plenary session at 10 a.m. today. Greater participation in the plenary session was stressed to increase the students' feeling of the legitimacy of the session's decisions. A sit-in was suggested in an unspecified administration office in protest of the lack of continuous faculty sessions if they were not to meet this morning and had not addressed themselves to all of SASS' demands. The sit-in did not receive general support.

The meeting was interrupted by three official representatives of the faculty meeting who answered questions. Clinton Etheridge also answered questions, and said that SASS was "thinking harder about the student power implications of the demands." It was announced that the faculty had finished deliberating the SASS demands and sent their proposals on to SASS and classes had been called off today. The meeting decided that no action was necessary before the 10 a.m. plenary session. The session ended with a consensus that if SASS rejected the faculty proposals, and yet classes were called again, that the caucus would take action, even if not supported by the plenary.

FACULTY CONCLUDES ACTION ON SASS DEMANDS

The last meeting of the faculty, lasting from 8:30 p.m. January 12 until 3:30 the next morning, dealt essentially with the last four demands of SASS (those announced on January 9). After adopting a formal agenda, the faculty took this action: "The faculty affirms the statement of the President in his letter of 31 December 1968 that 'This college has never been and must never be governed by demands or moved by threats.'"

As a further confirmation of the fact that the faculty's decisions have not been swayed by pressure, that body passed this motion: "Faculty resolutions made on the basis of the SASS document of 23 December 1968 and the report of the Admissions Policy Committee have been accepted because the faculty believes they are right." Basically the resolutions spoken of in the latter statement consist of those which the faculty had passed prior to this last meeting.

How the faculty's deliberations are to take effect is indicated by the next motion approved by the faculty: "The President announces his strong support of the actions taken by the faculty, of which he is the presiding officer, and will strongly recommend them to the Board of Managers. He is confident that the Board shares the same values and concerns that have motivated the President and the faculty in their actions."

The next three faculty proposals directly corresponded to the January 9 SASS demands 1, 2, and 4 (the third demand of that date concerned the original demands on which the faculty passed prior to this meeting). It can therefore be stated that the faculty's consideration of all the demands in continuous session has been completed. The next faculty meeting has been scheduled for Thursday.

The motion corresponding to the first SASS demand of January 9 is the

following: "The President and faculty welcome an opportunity to provide any information they can that identifies and describes the decision-making organs of the college on every level, and will do so within a matter of days after the resumption of normal college activity." The similarity in language and intent of both the demand and this motion indicate that they are in agreement. It was felt by some faculty members that the delineation of the decision-making structure of the college might not add significantly to what is generally known about that structure.

In relation to the second demand, "that all Black people be participants in policy-making on all levels outlined in compliance to the first demand," the faculty took the following action: "In the actions of the faculty responding to the SASS communication of 23 December and to the report of the Committee on Admissions Policy, the faculty has authorized the participation of Black people in shaping policies on matters relating directly to the special interests of Black students. The faculty is determined to adhere to this principle wherever it applies." It is uncertain whether the faculty motion to set up the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee, in which Black people would participate, is considered by SASS to possess adequate "policy-making power," which might be considered necessary by SASS.

Finally, with regard to the SASS demand for amnesty for students and employees involved in the direct action, the following statement was issued: "The college does not contemplate disciplinary action for the SASS actions that are presently known to it. While it does not anticipate cause for disciplinary action, it cannot guarantee amnesty for matters on which it has no information." In an amplification of this resolution, spokesmen for the faculty stated, "By 'presently known to it,' the faculty refers to its knowledge of SASS' orderly occupation of the admissions office, and of the shutting off of windows and exits. The faculty is encouraged by the verbal assurances undertaken by representatives of SASS upon their first entering the admissions office--to wit, that property would not be harmed, files would not be rifled, and people not detained against their will. Assuming there are no other grounds for offense, SASS has no cause for concern." The prevalent feeling among the faculty was confidence that SASS members had done nothing which would warrant disciplinary action.

The last resolution passed stated that because many faculty members were in the meeting until almost 3 a.m., most classes scheduled for Monday would not be productive. Monday classes were therefore rescheduled for Wednesday, and Tuesday's classes are to take place as normally scheduled.

* * *

COLLEGE BOWL RESULTS

The Swarthmore College Bowl team was successful in its second trip to New York last night, defeating Augustana College of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, by a score of 225-85. The Raffmen, consisting of Nancy Bekavac, Mike Miller, Mike Hattersley, and Bill Holt, came on strong in the second half following a 65-65 halftime score. Next week's opponent will be Oklahoma State. The program was pre-empted on KYW-TV by Super Bowl coverage. However, the program will be shown on that station (channel 3) next Sunday at 1:30 p.m., preceding the live broadcast at 6 p.m.

* * *

Students interested in serving on Budget Committee should sign up as soon as possible on the Student Council bulletin board.

The Phoenix

SUPPLEMENT

JANUARY 11, 1969

ETHERIDGE, STOTT MEET IN MEDIA

Clinton Etheridge and Don Mizell (chairman and vice-chairman of SASS, respectively) and Mr. Gilmore Stott (Administrative Assistant to President Smith) met at the Media Fellowship House yesterday at noon in response to telegrams from Mr. Robert Woodson, head of the Fellowship House, for a press conference and a luncheon. Woodson was emphatic at both gatherings in stating that the affair was designed to "air publically" the situation at Swarthmore from both points of view. He further asserted that the Media Fellowship House was not trying to mediate the dispute, nor had it taken on the support of either contender, but that he reserved the right to take a definitive position at a later time.

The press conference was short, consisting essentially of prepared position statements from Mr. Stott and the SASS leaders. Mr. Stott, speaking first, stressed the irony of the present crisis, in light of the fact that there seems to be a great deal of agreement between the SASS demands as expressed in its December 23 letter to President Smith, and the final conclusions of the Admissions Policy Committee report, made public right after vacation (January 6). With this view, Stott criticized the Black organization's timing of the January 7 ultimatum and the January 9 demands, since, in his opinion, the situation was resolvable without resort to the action which has followed.

Clinton Etheridge began the SASS position with a prepared statement: "In our action, we are seeking a relevant education for both black and white students in this day and time. For too long and too often, white liberals at Swarthmore have been defining, redefining, analyzing, synthesizing, and intellectualizing the problems of black people. Our objective, by contrast, is a rational, democratic process whereby all interest groups are reflected and represented. Unless these kinds of demands are met, there can ultimately be no creative solution to the greatest domestic crisis of this century." Mizell followed up this statement with a rereading of the SASS demands as of January 9, including the original demands made in the December 23 letter.

Following the press conference, at which Channel 6 TV, Philadelphia, and various newspapers were represented, came a luncheon-discussion from which all members of the professional news media were excluded by the request of Mr. Woodson, in the interest of an unhindered exchange of views. Etheridge began the discussion with a speech concerned basically with the historical background from which the present crisis evolved.

For a long time, said Etheridge, Black students had faith in the efficacy of the traditional channels for change. The experiences of this year, however, served as a "rude awakening" for SASS members. The SASS chairman began the documentation of his case by explaining the injustices that were perpetrated in the promulgation of

Dean Hargadon's original working paper on Black admissions. Etheridge indicated that the complete absence of consultation with Blacks on the formation of this report is a manifestation of "the failure of well-intentioned white liberals on this campus to realize that a uniquely Black perspective exists", and that this perspective, this life-style, cannot be properly understood or reckoned with without direct involvement of Blacks.

When SASS promulgated its first set of demands in October, the feeling of the group was such that they had "to shock these people out of their complacency." When Student Council passed a resolution supporting the demands, Dean Hargadon, according to Etheridge, sent a critical letter to SC in which he indicated, among other things, that his own admission of the members of SC had been a mistake in judgment in light of their subsequent behavior.

At this point, Etheridge continued, the legitimacy of SASS as a representative organ for the Black community was contested. It was subsequently pointed out that those Blacks who did not belong to SASS nevertheless supported, and still support, the demands.

Finally, when SASS representatives tried to have outside Black admissions professionals brought to the campus to help advise the Admissions Policy Committee in its deliberations, Dean Hargadon declined the offers on the grounds that the committee was too busy for such criticism, albeit constructive.

Although President Smith tried to arrange a vacation meeting with Etheridge, the latter declined on the grounds that he could not engage in talks without consulting the members of his group first.

The rationale behind the final action, the taking of the Admissions Office, was simply that the demands had been over-looked, and that the only way to spur authorities into immediate recognition of the urgency of the demands was to take immediate direct action themselves. The demands became non-negotiable when it became apparent that the administration had ignored SASS' previous desire to negotiate.

Mr. Stott, in his response to this history of grievances, addressed himself to the lack of trust and confidence between the disputing parties, maintaining that in real terms, both parties' positions had too much in common for real division. He noted that the concern and sincerity of the administrators were cast into question by SASS' latest actions. Admitting that some mistakes had been made and that slowness to act was one of these, Stott contended that some progress had been made in the furtherance of the goals and "felt needs" of the Black community. He was emphatic in assuring his audience that ideas from both sides will be fully considered in faculty meetings, and that all possible steps were now being made to resolve the crisis for all concerned as soon as possible. One issue, in relation to admissions, that Mr. Stott felt to be basic was the balance between "quality education and social equality" as goals for Swarthmore College. Neither side in this meeting saw any serious conflict in these two goals.

SASS RADIO STATEMENT POSTPONED

WSRN reports that as of 11:30 last night, SASS decided to take more time to consider the statement that had been scheduled for release then. The station will announce the time of any future SASS statements.

EXTENDED FACULTY MEETING CONSIDERS ADMISSIONS

In the second faculty meeting to act on the admissions problems, four concrete proposals were adopted with a large measure of consensus. The faculty members of the Council on Educational Policy were asked by President Smith to prepare an agenda for the meeting (which lasted from 4 p.m. to 11:30 p.m. with a dinner break) and the following motion was passed with regard to that agenda: "That the faculty adopt the agenda as presented by faculty members of the Council on Educational Policy, and continue working with this agenda and other items connected with it in continuous session until we have disposed of all of them".

First on the agenda was "discussion with students", which included speeches by Clinton Etheridge, chairman of SASS, and Mike Fields, a non-SASS Black student who supports the demands and the actions of the members of that organization.

The second motion passed by the faculty was more elaborate than its correlative on the agenda, but both were in basic agreement that: "The College recognizes that it is necessary to maintain a viable Black student community. Realizing that such a community ultimately depends on the decision of the students both to enroll and to continue their education at Swarthmore, the College will strive to enroll a minimum of 25 Black students in each freshman class. It is hoped that this number can be increased to 35 after a three-year period." This recommendation was essentially the same as the SASS demand of December 23 dealing with numbers of Black students to be enrolled.

It is important to note here that the faculty voted last Tuesday to center debate on the demands made by SASS on the above date, and not the proposals made by the Admissions Policy Committee. With some changes, the faculty discussion has been essentially consistent with this distinction.

The third proposal, perhaps a corollary to the second, read as follows: "That the College should set as its goal the enrollment of a significant number (approximately ten) of so-called 'risk' Black students for the academic year 1969-1970." The only difference between this proposal and the demand parallel to it is that the "significant number" was defined by SASS as ten to twenty.

On the other hand, it is important to consider that an amendment to the third proposal (the amendment to the effect that a Black Assistant Dean of Admissions be appointed, subject to consultation with SASS) was defeated by the faculty, and that this amendment would have been the equivalent of the SASS demand for such a Dean.

Again, a faculty spokesman emphasized that the proposals made so far are by no means comprehensive. The first motion indicates that the faculty plans to consider all issues concerning the SASS demands. Issues already on the agenda (lack of time prevented their consideration last night) include post-enrollment support programs for "risk" students, the possible reappraisal of budgetary priorities, and plans for "increased academic assistance to those who appear to be greater academic risks."

The faculty will hold another meeting to continue with their deliberations tomorrow at 10 a.m.

MODERATES VIEW PROPOSALS

A meeting for moderates attracted about 200 students to Commons at 7 p.m. John Edgar and Tom Hammond led the discussion. The meeting entertained several proposals, but produced no votes or resolutions.

The main topics of discussion were 1) student week: whether students should ask for it immediately or defer it until February; 2) a student-faculty senate: whether there should be one at all, and, if so, how it should be composed and how much power it should have. The group also dwelled on the relationship between the SASS demands and action and the issue of general reform of the college decision-making process.

Toward the end of the meeting, views were traded on the relations of so-called moderate opinions to those expressed in radical caucuses. An informal poll of those remaining showed overwhelming disapproval of a continuation on Monday of the suspension of classes.

Jim Stark proposed that moderates identify their proposals more explicitly and effectively through a political organization. He called a meeting in the Rathskellar to draw up a platform. The move was opposed by some on the grounds that it drew too-sharp lines within an essentially cohesive student body. The chairmen adjourned the meeting until 12:30 Saturday, at which time it would discuss specific proposals presented in the morning.

SASS STATEMENT

It is clear from statements of unequivocal support from Black students, Black workers, and numerous political, economic and religious groups in the Black communities of Philadelphia and Delaware County that SASS's action is indeed representative of the needs and desires of the Black community at large.

Ideas which are so contrary to this obvious majority cited by any single individual must be viewed with suspicion. In this case, it is clear, but unfortunate, that the product of an allegedly educational institution is so unable to comprehend our oft-stated goals. In fact, that there are such examples of the college's failure to train its students to analyze such simple demands is the very reason we must continue to reject this type of education.

The administration's past arguments have been rejected; any re-statement of their position--no matter who makes it, and under what guise of authority--is a choice to ignore and to misrepresent the true issues. Must we again state our position?

Because we seek to redefine the underlying philosophy of education here, we must reevaluate the standards which support it. The concept of a "risk" student, implies that there are those who cannot succeed in this academic system; but we reject this system itself. We seek to make education here more responsive to the human needs of people both in and outside of the college walls; and this implies changes on all levels in the present system of policy-making. Any threat to the power of interests as entrenched as those which now direct Swarthmore College will inevitably be countered with recrimination, personal attack and distortion of the issues, to divert attention from the need for change. We are not afraid to face this latest attack; and we do not face it alone.

SASS

MIKE FIELDS REACTS TO MORROW LETTER

As an independent Black and a student at Swarthmore, my reaction to Mr. Morrow's letter was at first anger, then disbelief, and finally sadness. The Swarthmore that Mr. Morrow graduated from was the Swarthmore in which I began my education during the fall of 1964. It is not the Swarthmore from which I will be graduating. Times, places, and people change. As Mr. Englund pointed out in Clothier Thursday, four years ago there was no "Negro" problem;—but then there were too few of us to be a problem.

(I also remember the frequent bull sessions that I, along with the few other Black men students had in Mr. Morrow's room. Maybe we were all insecure and huddling together in a strange and often hostile environment.) These are the reasons for my sadness.

I was angry because, as I look over 300 years of Black history, when I can get access to it, there has always been someone willing to play the role he has chosen. Brothers have always been too easily separated by the artificial distinctions of color and education; and whites have never had to look far to find brothers, however misguided, to perform their dirty work. Fortunately, this is changing with time, and such brothers are becoming scarce.

I did not believe Mr. Morrow's letter because much of it is untrue and misleading. At the original admissions meeting, Mr. Morrow stated that he did not feel that the administration should have consulted any students, much less Black students on admissions policy; and while I am forced to agree that the whole matter of admissions policy would have been solved peacefully, I question whether it would have been reasonably.

Fortunately, this is one of the respects in which Swarthmore has changed since Mr. Morrow graduated. SASS has never asked for the admission of risk students "because they are Black", nor disregarded the problem of their welfare once they get here. If Mr. Morrow will direct his attention to the demands, quite clearly stated is cognizance of the need for supportive programs and preparatory programs to prepare them "academically" for Swarthmore. "Risk" students are not necessarily "academically" unqualified in that they can't do the work, but perhaps they never learned to play the game in such a way as can be measured by academic criteria (e.g. College Board scores). Thus it does not necessarily follow that this entails a lowering of Swarthmore's standards, but rather an extension of the opportunity to be raised up to Swarthmore's standards and the extension of the potential Black leadership class beyond the middle class. Finally, Mr. Morrow says that the members of SASS are dissatisfied, insecure, and egoistic. To the first, quite clearly the members of SASS are dissatisfied. I find it hard to believe that any Black person in this country can be satisfied, and if we are merely dissatisfied after 300 years of oppression then this country is luckier than it deserves. I would say, yes, the members of SASS are insecure. I do not know how any Black person can be secure in a country in which the greatest problem is white racism (Kerner Commission Report). In such a case, to be secure might be deadly. (The Jews in Germany were secure.) If it is egoistic not to be willing to wait for what others—the "man" Mr. Charles, or Chuck—is willing to give his good little darkies when he is willing to give it; if it is egoistic to want to be dealt with as an equal (when you don't have any power, you end up making compromises to the other side: they have no need to compromise) and from a position of respect, then I am afraid SASS is also egoistic.

We are all Brothers, and we are in this together. I will close this already too long letter by asking Mr. Morrow the question that Brother Malcolm asked a Black professor serving on the faculty of a large liberal institution. "What is a Negro Ph.D. called?" The answer to that question is "Nigger!" And that is why we must

be united and stand together, because no matter what the color of our skin, our educational background, or any other artificial distinctions we could make, when it gets down to the nitty gritty, we are still all "Niggers".

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION PROPOSED

(Editor's note: The following proposal is included in The Phoenix because it was formulated too late to be printed with the other proposals.)

We urge the students and faculty to consider this proposal in the workshops, meetings, and plenary sessions today.

A Constitutional Convention shall be convened in February to review and determine all aspects of the decision-making processes of the College. The composition of the convention shall insure a just representation of all elements of the community. The members shall be elected by their constituencies: 25 students, 20 faculty, 10 administration and members of the Board of Managers.

Ron Thomas
Lauren Brubaker
Roger Wood
John Edgar
Tom Hammond
Sue Snider
Lyle Snider
Anne Newman
Mike Miller

COALITION SEEKS BROAD-BASED STUDENT ACTION

An eight-hour meeting of a coalition group of SASS supporters ended early this morning with the formulation of a request to the faculty for immediate perusal and support of the content of all SASS demands. Composed of so-called radicals, moderates, and many undefined participants, the coalition voted to present a conciliatory statement to the Faculty Agenda Committee, asking for faculty acceptance of the eight SASS demands to the satisfaction of SASS before the night of Sunday, January 12.

Attempting to establish an agenda for action, the group first dealt with the possible impact which direct action by a radical minority might have upon the student body. On the broader issue of student power, the coalition recognized the influence of SASS' unprecedented action. It was clearly emphasized that fellow students should never be the causes or targets of direct action. In response to continual debate over conflicting proposals, a distinction was made between action directly concerning SASS demands and that concerning the larger issue of student power. Discussion then centered upon the current SASS crisis with the assumption that certain parallels exist between the SASS situation and that of student power.

Because of the felt need for majority support of all initial student actions, the coalition sounded out moderate views as gleaned from the day's workshops. The

moderate leadership speculated that a majority of the students would support a move to suspend classes until SASS 'is satisfied'. Efforts will be made today to prepare students for the possibility of suspension of academic functions. As a statement of the coalition's minimum necessary demands or goals to be approved by a student majority, a student/faculty senate proposal was voted down, but the coalition did view as mandatory the suspension of college classes until SASS demands are met.

Again the matter of student power arose. A Hammond-Brubaker proposal for a constitutional convention in February was welcomed but not voted on because it was felt that SASS should be the primary focus for the time being.

Several faculty members joined the group at 1 a.m. and presented an account of the faculty meeting. While gains had been made, it was feared that the most stressed parts of the SASS demands (especially dealing with Black student power) will not be passed by the faculty. It was felt that the faculty in continuous session is dealing not with the exigent SASS demands but solely with previously examined matters of Black admissions. The faculty agenda committee meets today at 9 a.m. and opinion was expressed that discussion will probably preclude student involvement in decision-making. Some skepticism had been raised as to the faculty's willingness to face the SASS demands from a concretely positive or negative viewpoint, and it was deemed crucial that the Swarthmore student body be aware of the faculty's alleged lack of desire to accept or reject the SASS proposals as they stand.

At this point Greg Englund's motion for the request to the faculty was presented and eventually passed, with further action by the coalition dependent on activities of SASS and of the student body as a whole today. The coalition will meet at 4 p.m. in Tarbles S.C. room.