

1. 13. '69

Swarthmoreana
Periodical c 2

The Phoenix

SUPPLEMENT

JANUARY 12, 1969

FACULTY MEETINGS PRODUCE RESOLUTIONS

"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."

In a three hour afternoon meeting, the faculty provided for a committee to communicate its decisions to the students, established an official liaison with SASS, and passed resolutions on selection of a Black counselor and support programs.

The committee, officially designated as three assistants to the faculty secretary, was instructed to prepare reports of resolutions passed in the meetings, and to communicate the reports to the student body as soon as possible. The three appointees were Linwood Urban, James Woods, and Steven Piker. They were joined later by Asmaran Legesse, who was named faculty-SASS liaison officer.

Following those appointments, the faculty considered requests initiated by The Phoenix and WSRN to allow student observers or reporters at its meetings. After considerable debate, the motion to accept two or more student observers was defeated.

Clinton Etheridge and Don Mizell, chairman and vice-chairman of SASS, respectively, read statements of the group's opinion on faculty action on their demands.

Those statements are reported on in detail in the article following.

The first substantive resolution of the faculty concerned recruitment of a Black counselor. As reported by the faculty communications committee, the resolution read:

"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."

The committee noted in its report that this resolution corresponded exactly to one of the original (December 23) SASS demands.

The second substantive resolution concerned support programs for Black students. The committee reported that the motion read as follows:

"That immediate action 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."

They pointed out that the resolution corresponded to another of the original SASS demands, with several exceptions. The main alteration was the deletion of the term "risk students," on the grounds that an adequate definition did not exist, and that the term was not favored by SASS, but had been adopted by them from the report of the Admissions Policy Committee.

The communications committee further reported that, "The faculty as well reaffirmed its intention to meet in continuous session until all of the demands presented by SASS on 23 December 1968 and 9 January 1969 have been treated."

SASS POSITION PAPER—ETHERIDGE INTERVIEW

The Swarthmore Afro-American Students Society (SASS) issued the following set of statements at approximately 5 P.M. January 11, 1969:

"As of the last meeting of the Faculty (morning, Ja. 11) we feel that their moves have not addressed themselves to the decision-making implications of our demands.

We have disrupted the admissions process by our action; as a result the college's attention has been focused on our demands.

This attention should not be diverted from our demands by the concern for the normal business of the college and action by other groups.

We welcome support and action from other groups as long as it does not confuse the issue or transform into the issues which are not our own.

There must be no confusion about what we mean by having Black people on all decision-making levels of the college. The interests of Black people can only be represented at Swarthmore by Black people whom we deem qualified to serve in this way.

"Student power," as it is now defined here, has not addressed itself to our demands and to our goals; and, is therefore a separate issue.

Our demand is for Black interests in all relevant positions of power."

In an interview with the chairman of SASS, some clarification of these statements was made. In regard to the first section, regarding "decision-making implications of our demands," Etheridge stated that these implications must be considered by the faculty in their upcoming deliberations, but that he did not mean to condemn the Faculty on this point as yet. In fact, in a later session,

statement by Don Mizell (vice-chairman of SASS) at the 8 P.M. plenary session, he indicated that his organization was pleased with the progress which the faculty had made so far.

Etheridge mentioned some specific areas in which he felt decision-making power for Black people was important. In regard to the motion passed by the faculty to set up the Ad Hoc Black Admissions Committee (AHBAC), Etheridge made it clear that it should be a policy-making body, and not merely an advisory one. He further stated that the student composition of this committee (5 out of 10) and the method of choice needed clarification. He wanted to insure that enough of these students be "Black," which he defined as Black people whose views are generally representative of Black opinion on campus.

Other specific areas on which Etheridge urged further action by the faculty concerned the proposed Black Assistant Dean of Admissions and counselor. The SASS leader indicated that the consultation in the choice of these two men had been largely included in the faculty motions, but that the power of Black people on this campus to review and perhaps veto these choices had yet to be guaranteed. The need for the power of review on this issue was, as Etheridge put it, "to insure that no 'Uncle Toms' are foisted upon us." He felt, further, that at least a tentative timetable for the attainment of the goals of the AHBAC should be suggested strongly by the faculty.

Etheridge went on to say in the interview that the part of the faculty's AHBAC proposal stating that one of the committee's responsibilities will be "To prepare reports as it sees fit" should include the stipulation that the preparation and public release of such reports should be in line with the first SASS demand of December 23. This demand, in relation to the original working paper by Dean Hargadon, stated that such reports must be approved by the Admissions Policy Committee, by SASS and by outside consultants, including consultants recommended by SASS.

In regard to defining the concept of "Student Power" as used in the SASS statement, Etheridge's feeling was that some elements of the student body were clouding the real issues at hand by insisting upon power for students in other areas besides those specifically demanded by SASS. The statement was meant to point out to the students that the powers demanded by SASS were not of a generally applicable nature, and that any demands concerning a Student-Faculty governing body for the College and other such general "Student Power" issues were separate from anything SASS has demanded. He further implied that the raising of such issues at this time would tend to confuse the real issues now under consideration, namely, those which involve Black people.

SATURDAY MORNING PLENARY

Saturday morning's plenary meeting in Clothier summarized Friday's events and organized Saturday's. Chairing the meeting, Ellen Schall announced that a coalition of 100-200 radical and moderate students had passed a proposal Friday night and had presented it to the faculty agenda meeting at 9 a.m. Stressing that 'time is running out,' the message urged that the faculty act favorably on both sets of SASS' demands. It continued, "Our purpose is not to coerce you; it is an attempt--even a desperate attempt--to make you fully aware of the situation around you. The college is now confronted with a crisis; further delay may bring catastrophe." Stressing that the message was proposed by students of widely varied political convictions, the authors called for a meet-

ing tonight to consider the faculty's actions and to plan further action.

Also at the meeting, Professor Albur Rosenberg clarified the faculty's defeat of SASS' demand for a Black assistant dean of admissions on Friday. He said the demand, in the form of an amendment, had been defeated so that a similar proposal worded differently could be passed in the future. He also voiced his views of the tone of Friday's faculty meetings. He felt that, because of high concern for and awareness of the problems involved, the faculty had moved with great speed. Professor Victor Novick disagreed, claiming that the faculty was "still reluctant to consider the problems as broadly and as quickly as it should." Rosenberg and Novick agreed not to debate the issue at that time.

Ellen announced the plans for the morning's workshops: discussion of Black admissions and SASS' actions. Students then moved on to these sessions.

BARR SPEAKS AT AFTERNOON PLENARY SESSION

Dean Robert Barr's defense of recent faculty meetings highlighted yesterday afternoon's plenary meeting in Clothier. He argued that the faculty meetings have attempted to be a compromise between wisdom and speed with the hope of SASS' agreement.

In answer to the question on general "tone" of faculty meetings, Dean Barr claimed that the faculty has decided to move as fast as possible without making decisions that it would later have to repudiate. It is necessary to explore all implications inherent in SASS' demands, he went on. At the same time, he felt that the faculty was moving in a way that students could approve.

The "wearing" nature of the current crisis led Dean Barr to hope for a settlement on Black admissions before Monday, but he noted the difficulty of prediction..

Dean Barr next explored student-faculty communications, using the example of the different stories emerging from Friday night's faculty meeting. In answer to a suggestion from the floor to bridge the communication gap by either taping or directly broadcasting faculty meetings, he pledged investigation of this and other possibilities.

Richard Schuldenfrei, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, also spoke at the plenary session. He pointed out that although there was substantial agreement among faculty members as to the faculty's progress, there were many different views on the course of action. He stated that not a single demand of SASS, per se, had been accepted.

Dean Barr acknowledged the lack of "word for word" passage of SASS' demands but denied any significance. He alleged that the goals of faculty resolutions were the same, and, hopefully, so would be the accomplishments.

To increase communication between the faculty and students, David Cowden, Secretary of the Faculty, and Helen North, secretary of the Agenda Committee, were present to inform students of faculty action. In response to a previous suggestion by President Courtney Smith, Miss North read the complete record of faculty actions since the meeting of January 9. Questions from students were then entertained.

BARR-SCHULDENFREI LETTER

Editor's note: The following letter was published and read at the beginning of the 8 p.m. plenary session.

"To the Swarthmore Community

This is to correct some impressions that may have been gained from the meeting held this afternoon in Clothier.

1. President Smith did not over-rule a faculty decision on the agenda for any faculty meeting.
2. No such suggestion has ever been made by a faculty member, to our knowledge. However:
3. The faculty "voted to base its discussion on the SASS demands." (See David Cowden's summary of the faculty meeting of 1/7)
4. David Cowden did interpret this (correctly or incorrectly) as having constituted adoption of the SASS demands as the agenda for the meeting of 1/10.
5. The faculty was presented at the meeting of 1/10 with an agenda which was prepared by a committee selected by the president and which did not contain the SASS demands as stated by SASS and it was only upon the objection of certain faculty members that this agenda was adopted by vote and not simply taken as legitimate without discussion.

WE RECOGNIZE THE EXISTENCE OF OTHER RELEVANT FACTORS AND CONSEQUENTLY OF LEGITIMATELY ALTERNATIVE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE EVENTS DESCRIBED ABOVE.

Robert A. Barr, Jr.
Richard Schuldenfrei"

EXPANDED MODERATE CAUCUS PROPOSALS

Primary conclusions of the Expanded Moderate Caucus (composed of roughly 200 students) held on Saturday afternoon in Clothier included (1) that decision upon whether students should go back to classes on Monday should be put off until a time when more information was available, and (2) that "Black power interests" and "student power interests" were separable, and that at this time the prime objective of students should be to solve the former.

The meeting opened with co-chairman Dan Nussbaum's motion to adopt a set of proposals intended to meet the "Black power interest." The first was a proposal for "an increased operating budget for the admissions office to enable it to expand its recruiting operations;" the second proposed "the inclusion of Black people at all relevant levels of decision-making process in the college." The report went on to suggest that the faculty set aside a student week early in the second semester to deal with the student power questions involved.

Discussion of some of the wording of the proposal followed, and its sponsors generally replied that the intent had been to devise a flexible plan which would not rule out future options, but which would indicate strong support for the SASS demands. At this point, Clint Etheridge and Don Mizell of SASS entered and read a three-part statement (see story on page 2). Soon after their departure, the question was called on Dan's proposal (also signed by Ron Krall and Tom Hammond) and the measure passed by a large margin.

There followed some general discussion regarding action to be taken if SASS is still in the Admissions Office on Monday morning, and although the sense of the meeting was that students should postpone decision on this matter, Barry Wohl did suggest a specific proposal which can be summarized as follows:

When a majority of the student body agrees that the faculty has considered and met the SASS demands to their (i.e., students') satisfaction, the students should return to classes unless SASS appears willing to negotiate (as symbolized, in Wohl's proposal, by SASS leaving the office). SASS would not be expected to leave the office, under this proposal, unless the Administration promised not to reoccupy it. At this point, hoped Wohl, negotiations could begin.

A few statements for and against this proposal were made, and then the meeting was adjourned.

STUDENTS AWAIT FACULTY, SASS DECISIONS

In the seventh student plenary, attended by a large majority of the student body last night, the students passed a resolution calling for a change in the philosophical basis of decision-making at the college. They also decided to hold off on any action on the problem of continuing academic business while the crisis still exists and on the general question of student power. The latter decisions were delayed in hopes of being better able to understand their implications after the faculty has met tomorrow and SASS has responded to that meeting.

The meeting opened with a statement by three members of the faculty (Urban, Wood, and Piker) as to specifically what the faculty had passed up to that time in their continuous session. They also attempted to show what SASS demands their recommendations were directed to answer. In the answer period that followed, the faculty representatives stated that the faculty did not consider the question of whether classes will be held on Monday if the faculty is still in continuous session, and that they had defeated a motion for student observers at their meetings.

Immediately following the faculty report Clint Etheridge read a third of the SASS statement that had been presented to the faculty in the afternoon (the rest being under tentative reconsideration because of subsequent faculty action). The statement pointed out that SASS felt that the questions of student power and Black power were "separate but relevant issues." In response to a question on what SASS meant by "All levels of decision-making" he said that SASS wanted Black representation in all decisions that directly impinged on the Black community (i.e., Black studies, Black counselors, but not such things as computer center hours).

Don Mizell then read a statement saying that SASS was pleased to see the faculty making progress in responding to SASS demands and that SASS hoped that they would continue in this way (and perhaps a little faster) on the issue of Black participation in decision-making. In response to a question on SASS' view of the ad hoc committee already set up by the faculty, Mizell stated that SASS hasn't "fully studied recent developments." In hopes of clarifying the question of Black participation in decision-making he stated that "there are specific critical spots where decisions are made and that*s where we want to be."

The plenary then went on to consider several proposals dealing with the question of student power. However, they at first tabled a number of proposals concerning whether or not classes should be held on Monday if the crisis is not resolved. This was done in hopes of having a clearer understanding of the faculty's position on this issue and being better able to determine whether