

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY

OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

December 6-7, 1968

Pursuant to a recommendation passed at the November 15 meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences that "discussion of the report of committee no. 27 be continued at a special faculty meeting called for that purpose on December 6", a meeting was scheduled for 4 p.m. in Crow Hall, room 201 on the stated date. Due to events occurring during the twenty four hours prior to this date, however, the room in Crow Hall proved to be inadequate for the assembled crowd, and the meeting was moved to Graham Chapel where it was called to order at 4:30 p.m. In attendance were approximately 140 faculty members and, if the estimates of the mass media are correct, about 1000 students. After securing a slim majority voice vote to admit the mass media to the proceedings, Dean Kling called on Mr. Gottfried to outline the procedure for opening the meeting to considerations beyond the discussion of the report of Committee No. 27. There then followed a discussion of the seating in the auditorium, in response to which it was requested that the first fifteen rows be given to the faculty and that the students occupy (a word appropriate to the occasion) the seats in back - "a move to the rear of the bus" said the Dean. With order restored, Mr. Shaplin was called on to present, on behalf of Committee No. 27, a report concerned with the development of a detailed program for admitting to the undergraduate divisions of the University low income and minority group students who may not initially meet all of the usual entrance requirements. After his motion (seconded) to "request the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to recommend favorably to the Chancellor the Report of Committee No. 27 and urge him to implement the report at the earliest opportunity", Mr. Shaplin briefly outlined the history and details of the report and stressed the desirability of favorable faculty action. First to arise in support of the report was Mr. Commoner who, after an invocation in which he praised the committee and dwelt on the necessity for noble purpose in action in today's world, moved (seconded) that Mr. Shaplin's motion be amended by deleting the last ten words and replacing them with the statement "in order to demonstrate to the black students now in residence at the University the faculty's intention to promote a favorable environment for them at the University, that this program be established at once." Speaking critically of certain aspects of the report, Mr. Kurz questioned the apparently conflicting statements concerning "many kinds of low income students" (p. 4 of the report) and "...students in the Educational Opportunity Program..." (p. 6 of the report) which leave unclear just which students the program is directed to. Also, he asked "where is the money to support the program to come from and where are the many necessary tutors to be found?" In response, Mr. Shaplin discussed the financial exigencies and indicated that, due to the federal reduction in the Educational Opportunity Grant Program, any expansion of the program next year was unlikely; Mr. Kohl addressed himself to the question of tutors and asserted that even now no student, disadvantaged or not, who needs tutoring fails to receive it and that "the special things Mr. Kurz speaks of are already in effect". Swinging the discussion back to the positive, Mr. Commoner again preached the faculty to put a little heart into the proposal, to add ideology to the proposal, to give vitality to the proposal by adopting his amendment. A cautionary note was provided by another faculty member who asked

December 6-7, 1968

if the request for instant implementation might not hold out promises that cannot be kept. Undaunted, however, the faculty passed the Commoner ammendment by voice vote. Additional discussion of the original motion centered on the questions of displacements of present types of students, the necessity for expanded facilities, and the necessity for off-campus living. Mr. Shaplin answered that the program did not imply any increase in the size of the college, although he conceded that it would involve a certain redistribution in the types of students to be admitted. Again undaunted by any problems posed by the program, the faculty passed the Shaplin motion as ammended by Commoner.

At this point Mr. Gottfried, acting on his earlier announcement, moved that the rules governing this special meeting be suspended in order to allow discussion of additional items. This was seconded and passed by voice vote. Mr. Whitten, speaking on behalf of a group of about thirty professors present at an earlier afternoon meeting, moved that "regarding the present position of black students and in recognition of their prerequisite to negotiation, the police involved in the precipitating incident be reassigned to a desk job until adequate hearing is completed". With the aim of bringing the meeting up to date with respect to the events of the day, Chancellor Eliot stated that the Whitten motion had, in effect, already been implemented. In addition he commented on other aspects of the situation, expressing his admiration for the orderliness of the occupationers, the literateness of the document from the black students, his concern for the predicament, present and potential, of the students in Brookings Hall, and his adamant stand in favor of fair play, justice, and due process (applause). Further, he stated that a hearing was scheduled for Monday for the police and plaintiff allegedly involved in the "precipitating incident", that counsel would be provided for both, and that the members of the Board of Hearing included Professors Marshall Hall (Economics), Karl Hill (Dean of School of Business and Public Administration) and Paul Freund (Law, Harvard, and member of the Washington University Board of Trustees). The "post hoc" aspect of the question notwithstanding, the faculty passed the Whitten motion by voice vote.

Mr. Shaplin moved (seconded) that "the Faculty of Arts and Sciences establish a Black Studies Program, that the Dean appoint a committee to implement the program as soon as possible, and that said committee include as members students who have a direct interest in the program". After a brief discussion the motion was passed by voice vote.

Mr. Guarnaschelli moved that the "Faculty of Arts and Sciences recommend to the responsible body that means be devised to insure that members of the campus police force be free of racist sentiments" (applause). The motion which, said the Dean, was seconded by the applause, was passed by voice vote.

Mr. Alongi (LA sophomore), upon receiving the microphone to address the meeting, was challenged by Mr. Guarnaschelli on his right to speak, whereon it was ruled by Dean Kling to suspend the rules and allow student voices to be heard. The Dean also expressed his intention, perhaps not knowing what it portended, to keep the meeting going as long as relevance prevailed and faculty remained to vote. Duly authorized, Mr. Alongi held forth for several minutes

on matters concerning a judiciary committee, the abolition of ROTC from the campus, a minimum wage for cafeteria workers, amnesty for Mr. Holder, and the major restructuring of the government of the University. Mr. Caspary asked about the restriction on student participation as voted at the last faculty meeting. This has been answered, said the Dean, whereupon Mr. Caspary moved that "under the suspension of the rules students be allowed to make motions and that the number of student speakers be at the discretion of the Chair". The motion was seconded and passed by what sounded like a close voice vote. A count was demanded, and it showed 102 in favor and 16 opposed, suggesting that dissent is often more vociferous than assent. Thereon followed a series of dialogues between Mr. Alongi and several faculty members concerning Mr. Alongi's concept of student participation in University government which, it turned out, was somewhat ill-defined in detail but clear in its desire to share the power on an equal basis, as expressed in the motion (seconded) to establish a governmental body with 50:50 faculty-student representation. Mr. Palmer, commenting on the opportunism of one group of students in capitalizing on the situation resulting from the "precipitating incident" and asserting the impossibility of rationally considering the proposals offered by that group, moved (seconded) for adjournment. Dean Kling asked that the motion be withdrawn, his request was denied by Mr. Palmer, and the motion was defeated with 63 in favor and 74 opposed.

At this point the reader is advised that, unless he is an interested historian of Faculty Meeting Minutes, he skip to the next paragraph and the beginning of the evening session; the remainder of the afternoon session was erased by the opening motion of the evening session. For the purpose of the record, however, be it stated that the next to speak was Mr. Horowitz who apologized for the deficiencies of student rhetoric, characterized the discussion in terms of radicalisms versus conservatism, and pleaded that the meeting be continued so as to "not leave in the lurch the 200-300 students occupying Brookings Hall". Mr. Rudner acknowledged the seriousness of the situation but urged that the faculty not be coerced by the present situation. He recommended that the dissident students be reassured of the faculty's attention to their grievances and moved (seconded) to ammend Mr. Alongi's motion to state "that the Faculty of Arts and Sciences will meet at a later date to consider proposals from the students regarding their participation in University government". This was unacceptable, said Mr. Alongi. Mr. Guarnaschelli moved (seconded) an ammendment to state "Friday, Dec. 13 to be the date of the faculty meeting specified in the Rudner ammendment". Mr. Kohl moved (seconded) an ammendment to state "Monday, Dec. 9 to be the date of the faculty meeting specified in the Rudner ammendment". Neither the original Alongi motion nor its ammendments were voted on, however, so these must be relegated to the parliamentary purgatory of the unacted motion. The remainder of the afternoon session consisted of a debate on the issues of conservatism versus radicalism, instant action versus deliberative action, the "quiet student majority" alleged by Mr. Landes (LA graduate student) versus the imputed student minority represented by the North Brookings occupation forces. The moral dialectic of Mr. Commoner, the sparkling rhetoric of Mr. Levi, and the emotional intensity of Mr. Teichman, however, defy encapsulation. The afternoon session was concluded by a motion to reconvene in Graham Chapel at 10 p.m. which was seconded and passed at 7:10 p.m.

The evening session commenced at 10:30 p.m. in Graham Chapel with an estimated 140 faculty members and many hundreds of students in attendance. The meeting was called to order by Dean Kling, and Mr. Commoner, after a brief supplication that "we express our feelings for what we really believe", moved (seconded) that a new agenda be established to supersede the agenda on the floor at the end of the afternoon meeting, the motion of Mr. Alongi thereby being withdrawn from consideration. The motion was passed by voice vote.

Mr. Horowitz then moved (seconded) that "contingent on parallel student action, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences hereby withdraw academic credit for courses sponsored by the ROTC, specifically Air Science 301/401 and Military Science 302/402". Mr. Hanges (LA) moved (seconded) an ammendment to the Horowitz motion stating "That the University declare a referendum concerning the question of ROTC on campus. The ballot in this referendum shall contain the following propositions: (1) We urge the Administration and Faculty of Washington University to maintain the ROTC program as it exists now, (2) We urge the Administration and Faculty of Washington University to withdraw University funds from the ROTC program and allow the United States government to finance officer's training, (3) We urge the Administration and Faculty of Washington University to abolish the ROTC program at Washington University and not to participate in any subsequent program which replaces it, (4) We urge that credit be abolished for Military Science. We urge that this referendum be held Dec. 17, 1968". In response to the question as to who would vote in the referendum, Mr. Hanges answered that both students and faculty would be included. Seeking to separate the academic and non-academic aspects of the ROTC program, Mr. Rudner moved (seconded) an ammendment to the Horowitz motion which called for deletion of the words "parallel student action" and the addition of the clause "Since the Faculty regards the non-academic functions of the ROTC establishment as falling within the province of the wider academic community and thus being properly an appropriate matter for decision by the wider community, it would look with approval on a referendum on the question of retention of the non-academic ROTC establishment". A number of questions were then asked and answered concerning credits in ROTC and stipends in ROTC, a few voices were raised in opposition to the Rudner ammendment, and the ammendment was passed by voice vote. Questions were then directed to Mr. Hanges about the manner of options available in his referendum, Mr. Ewing moved (seconded) that the Hanges ammendment be ammended to allow a yes or no vote on any number of the four options in the referendum, and the Ewing ammendment was defeated by voice vote. Subsequently, the Hanges ammendment was defeated by voice vote, and the discussion reverted to the original motion. In the course of this extended colloquy (a) the academic character of ROTC courses was called into question, Colonel Rude responding at one point with the statement that he doubted that Mr. Commoner knew what was taught in ROTC, (b) the legitimacy of a faculty vote affecting a curriculum in a field outside of the voter's area of expertise was questioned, Mr. Lindenberger concluding that such a vote was legitimate, (c) the failure to give the students a voice in the decision of ROTC creditation was stressed, Mr. Weissman (LA senior) stating that not everyone on the campus hates the ROTC and that to vote for the Horowitz motion was to vote against the students, and Mr. Palmer commenting

on the rights of the minority desirous of enrolling in ROTC, (d) the importance of the properly trained officer in a civilian army was discussed, Mr. Hirsch saying that the military establishment will be with us for some time and that he is not yet willing to turn its leadership over to the professionals, and (e) the differentiation of the opposition to ROTC between academic grounds and moral grounds was made, Mr. Commoner and Horowitz associating with the latter and appealing to the gallery with a cry that "war is irrelevant" (thunderous applause) and "we will not purify the world tonight, but we should purify ourselves" while Mr. Chambers (and others) associated with the former and submitted that "a vote against credit for ROTC may not be pure but it is right". Colonel Rude then asked what fate awaited the students already enrolled in ROTC, and Mr. Horowitz added a qualifying clause to state that "no one beginning the program as of July 1, 1969 would be given credit". The motion was passed with 95 in favor and 26 opposed, and more thunderous applause filled the chapel. Mr. Commoner then moved (seconded) that "the Faculty of Arts and Sciences request the Administration to work to an early termination of the ROTC contract". This was seconded, again waves of applause echoed through the hall, and Mr. Gaspar arose to register a complaint to the Chair for the vociferousness of the gallery. The Dean mildly admonished the gallery but asserted his faith that the faculty was of sufficiently stern stuff as to be uninfluenced by vocal displays of approval or disapproval. The Commoner motion was passed with 64 in favor and 58 opposed.

Mr. Ledeen moved (seconded) that "the Faculty of Arts and Sciences approves in principle of equal participation of faculty and students in policy matters, relevant areas and procedures to be determined by a joint-student - faculty committee". Mr. Rudner arose to offer an ammendment consisting of four points, but only one of these was judged by the Chair to be relevant. The surviving point, moved and seconded, stated that "the Faculty invites students to come to the next meeting, especially to be called and to take place before the impending Christmas vacation. The purpose of this special meeting is to give the students the opportunity to prepare the full cases which they wish to make in favor of a new structure for decision making in academic affairs and to argue these before the faculty at that time". Questioned by Mr. Kahl as to whether or not the Ledeen motion conflicts with the activities of the Faculty Council pursuant to the charge from the Faculty at its meeting of November 15, Mr. Gottfried replied that he saw no conflict but that the Faculty Council would be pushed to swifter action. Seeking even swifter action, Mr. Teichman (LA graduate student) appealed to the faculty not to wait until Christmas and outlined a "bicameral legislative thing" in which faculty and students would have jurisdiction over various areas, some mutually inclusive and others mutually exclusive - thus, as he pointed out in a later comment, a not all inclusive parity of faculty and students. Also speaking against the Rudner ammendment and favoring the Ledeen motion were Mr. Ledeen himself and Mr. Salisbury, the latter providing a concise political scientist's summary of the proposition and pointing out the difference between the "substance of power and the symbol of power". Speaking on behalf of the Rudner ammendment were Mr. Rudner himself who expressed the desire to consider the "equal participation" clause of the Ledeen motion at greater length and Messrs. Spector and Ross, both of whom stressed the necessity of careful examination and rational debate. Mr. Shaplin

then suggested that the time for the faculty meeting called for in the Rudner amendment be stated to be Monday and succeeding days as required. In the ensuing discussion, initiated by Mr. Hall and surrounding an amendment from Mr. Chambers, however, it was pointed out that Monday would be inappropriate because of the scheduled hearing for the campus police and black student in connection with the "precipitating incident". Cognizance of this was taken in the amendment which Mr. Chambers moved (seconded) which asked "that the Faculty direct the Faculty Council to meet this Saturday and Monday and thereafter, as necessary, to shape operating proposals for student participation in policy and decision making conjointly with this Faculty and that in this procedure they continue to work with the students with whom they have been in consultation along with three additional students to be selected in consultation among the Faculty Council and students. The Council shall make an interim report to a meeting of the Faculty as soon as possible after the settlement of the issue of the black students". The Chambers amendment was passed with 103 in favor and 7 opposed.

The wording in the Chambers amendment concerning the timing of the next faculty meeting was incorporated by Mr. Rudner into his amendment, and a clarification of the status of the amendment was sought from the Chair. It was ruled to be an amendment to the Ledeen motion which, after its disposition, would bring the Ledeen motion to a vote. With this stipulation, the faculty voted 59 in favor and 47 opposed to the Rudner amendment. A recount was then requested, first by Mr. Kohl who, it turned out, had forgotten that he had voted against the amendment, and then by another faculty member of longer memory and affirmative vote. Mr. Rudner insisted that it was his intention to view his amendment as a substitute motion which, if voted affirmatively, would replace the Ledeen motion. The Chair acceded to this interpretation, and a second vote showed the Rudner substitute motion to have passed with 72 in favor and 47 opposed. The significance in the additional 13 affirmative votes the second time around is left to the reader's interpretation. The Rudner substitute motion as amended by Chambers thereby superseded the original Ledeen motion.

Mr. Hirsh moved (seconded) that "the Faculty of Arts and Sciences indorse in principle the concept of participation of students in decision-making processes, equal participation in those areas it deems appropriate". A motion to amend this by changing the end of the sentence to read "...in those areas deemed appropriate by the Faculty" was made by Mr. Ross, seconded, and passed by voice vote. The Hirsh motion as amended was passed with 118 in favor and none opposed.

Mr. Selden moved (seconded) that "the Faculty of Arts and Sciences express its awareness of the problems (listed in an appended document) which confront the black students at Washington University and that it endorse in principle the exploration of means for alleviating these difficulties. In reiteration of its earlier action, the faculty again asserts its intention to establish a Black Studies Program at Washington University". The motion was passed with 119 in favor and none opposed.

After one final declamation exhorting the faculty to consider the end of the present meeting simply the beginning of an interlude in a continuing dialogue, Mr. Commoner moved (seconded) for adjournment, and at 2:03 a.m. the meeting was concluded.

Respectfully submitted,

C. David Gutsche
Secretary

RESOLUTIONS VOTED BY THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES AT ITS

MEETING OF DECEMBER 6-7, 1968

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING ACCEPTANCE OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE NO. 27

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences recommends favorably to the Chancellor the Report of Committee No. 27 and, in order to demonstrate to the black students now in residence at the University the faculty's intention to promote a favorable environment for them at the University, it is recommended that this program be established at once.

RESOLUTION REGARDING REASSIGNMENT OF COMPUS POLICEMEN

Be it resolved that, regarding the present position of black students and in recognition of their prerequisite to negotiation, the police involved in the precipitating incident be reassigned to a desk job until adequate hearing is completed.

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A BLACK STUDIES PROGRAM

The Faculty of Arts & Sciences recommends the establishment of a Black Studies Program and instructs the Dean to appoint a committee to implement the program as soon as possible, said committee to include as members students who have a direct interest in the program.

RESOLUTION REGARDING SELECTION OF CAMPUS POLICEMEN

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences recommends to the responsible body that means be devised to insure that members of the campus police force be free from racist sentiments.

RESOLUTIONS VOTED BY THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES AT ITS

MEETING OF DECEMBER 6-7, 1968

Page 2

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING WITHDRAWAL OF CREDIT FOR ROTC

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences recommends that academic credit be hereby withdrawn for courses sponsored by the ROTC (specifically Air Science 301/401 and Military Science 302/402) this stricture to apply to students starting the program after July 1, 1969. Since the Faculty regards the non-academic functions of the ROTC establishment as falling within the province of the wider academic community and thus being properly an appropriate matter for decision by the wider community, it would look with approval on a referendum on the question of retention of the non-academic ROTC establishment.

RESOLUTION REGARDING TERMINATION OF ROTC CONTRACT

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences requests the Administration of Washington University to work to an early termination of the ROTC contract.

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING FACULTY COUNCIL-STUDENT ATTENTION TO PROPOSALS FOR THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE DECISION-MAKING APPARATUS OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES.

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences invites students to come to the next meeting, especially to be called to take place as soon as possible after the settlement of the issues of the black students. The purpose of this special meeting is to give the students the opportunity to prepare the full cases which they wish to make in favor of a new structure for decision making in academic affairs and to argue these cases before the faculty at that time. The Faculty

RESOLUTIONS VOTED BY THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES AT ITS
MEETING OF DECEMBER 6-7, 1968

Page 3

of Arts and Sciences directs the Faculty Council to meet this Saturday and Monday and thereafter, as necessary, to shape operating proposals for student participation in policy and decision making conjointly with this Faculty and that in this procedure they continue to work with the students with whom they have been in consultation along with three additional students to be selected in consultation among the Faculty Council and students. The Council shall make an interim report to a meeting of the Faculty as called for above.

RESOLUTION REGARDING STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences indorses in principle the concept of participation of students in decision-making processes, equal participation in those areas deemed appropriate by the Faculty.

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING ATTENTION TO PROBLEMS CONFRONTING BLACK STUDENTS

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences expresses its awareness of the problems, as enumerated in the Black Position Document, which confront the black students at Washington University and endorses in principle the exploration of means for alleviating these difficulties. In reiteration of its earlier action, the Faculty again asserts its intention to establish a Black Studies Program at Washington University