

RIPON EXTRA
COLLEGE DAYS

Extra- Tuesday, March 16, 1965- EXTRA
CRISIS AT RIPON-THE SELMA TRIP

THE SENATE MEETING

On Monday, March 15, a special "emergency" meeting of the Student Senate was called for 7:00 p.m. in the Crimson Lounge. This proved to be the triggering event for a flurry of activity and protest that has taken place ever since. The meeting was called in response to a meeting of a group of students interested in the recent demonstrations and protest marches in Selma, Alabama. This group was petitioning the Student Senate for \$400 to make a trip to Selma.

After President Schwartz explained the nature of the meeting, Robert Fagan made the motion that the Senate should allocate \$400 to any people wishing to represent Ripon College in Selma, Alabama. He then turned the floor over to Chaplain Thompson, who explained that the demonstrations in Selma have centered around the right to vote; he went on to say that Dr. Breithaupt said that unless the original enthusiasm of the demonstrations was sustained, the program legislation proposed by President Johnson before the United States Congress would not pass. He expressed that he felt that it was necessary for some people to go to Selma first hand.

The Treasurer of the Senate, David Rockwell, was then queried as to the condition of the Senate funds. He explained that the Senate could afford the \$400 since the contingency fund of the Senate had \$550 in it and there was a possibility that some accounts, such as NSA, People to People, and International Relations Club, might have their budget cut, since they were nearly inoperative.

A question was then directed to Dean Hunt, asking him what his role was. He explained that he was acting in a personal capacity, and that he had received a call the night before from Don Friedlander, the NSA co-ordinator at the University of Wisconsin, asking him if there were interested participants from Ripon who would join a Wisconsin delegation to Selma. He said that he personally wanted to protest this violence against United States citizens by his presence there.

Tom Hudson, the Senator from Theta Chi, said that he thought this protest should be directed toward Washington, and that the \$400 could be put to better use, e.g. the NAACP treasury. Mike Shroeder, the Senator from Sigma Chi, said that the people of Alabama must realize that, as a part of the Federal union, they are obligated to the people of 49 other states.

Marvin Arrow then inquired as to the reaction of the administration to the proposed project. He was told that Dean Harris was in favor of this orderly type of participation, but that Dr. Pinkham was not in favor. Dr. Pinkham, it was explained, felt that Ripon was doing its share through the Tougaloo exchange and that the College would not provide any funds for it; students also would not be excused from classes, but he would not personally prevent any students from going.

When the question was asked why it was necessary that we go in person, Dr. Breithaupt rose to explain. He first gave his credentials, saying that he had lived in the South for over fifteen years and that he had deeply engaged in the civil rights movement, particularly with the NAACP. He said that the problem throughout the South was not basically voting rights, etc. , but rather a problem of doctoral fascism; he went on to explain the situation as he saw it, and said that humanity needs some backing in this affair. The problem is whether these people in office in the South will be allowed to "get away" with this type of terrorism any longer; he stresses that [. . .]

(continued)

Senate (cont.)

[. . .]The [the] only way to end the situation is to constantly remind the South that the rest of the world is concerned.

Byron Sagunsky, the Vice-President of the Senate, asked if a reform in the voting rights wouldn't solve the problem of dictatorship. The answer was that it would not; he then asked what would, to which it was replied, the pressure of, and the effort of, those of us who have been raised in a more humane society.

Jim Hess, the representative from Delta Upsilon, stated that the Senate represents the entire student body, and therefore the Senate should decide who goes. Chaplain Thompson explained that the meeting of interested students had been announced at lunch and approximately fifteen people had shown up at the 4:30 meeting; of these, only four had said they would go.

Dean Pape, the Senator from Sigma Alpha Epsilon, replied that he felt it was foolish to send such a small number, and if a larger number went, the Senate couldn't afford it. Dean Hunt then commented that Friedlander had asked that those who could provide \$100 in bail be selected to go; he also advised parental permission for those under twenty-one.

Marvin Arrow said that the men of South Hall felt that this was the wrong way to go about showing concern. Chip Julin said that he felt we should show the interest of the students to the people of the South.

Tom Hudson said that he felt that with \$400 we could better have a speaker come here and lecture on the problem; Byron Sagunsky said that

this was not practical. Dr. Bowditch then remarked that he felt it was the most inhumane thing in the world to do to just send a check; the presence of other people who care makes all the difference in the world.

Dean Pape then moved for cloture, which was passed by a vote of 17 to 3. The question was then read to the Senate, and, in a hand vote, it was passed by a vote of 13 to 9.

David Schwarz then made Chaplain Thompson the executor of the fund. The Chaplain then announced that all who wished to go should see him by 11 p.m. to make the necessary arrangements. The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

THE DEMONSTRATION

At 10 o'clock Tuesday morning, a demonstration was held by Ripon College students on the campus. The demonstrators assembled in the Student Union Rotunda in protest against the Student Senate action the night before. The demonstrators then moved to Smith Hall where a meeting was being held in President Pinkham's office to discuss the events of the previous twenty-four hours. Present at this meeting was President Pinkham, David Schwarz, Byron Sagunsky, Dean Ashley and Chaplain Thompson. By the time the demonstrators had reached Smith Hall the crowd had grown from around 75 to close to 250 people. The students moved from Smith Hall back down to the Union where cars were loading to go to Madison. At this time Byron Sagunsky reported the minutes of the meeting at President Pinkham's office. Chaplain Thompson then talked to the demonstrators stating that it was his feeling that the trip should continue and not be stopped. The crowd then dispersed, allowing the cars to continue on their way to Madison.

The demonstration was called for on the radio Monday night around midnight by Richard Singer. A sign appeared in the Commons this morning announcing the demonstration that was to be held at ten in the morning. The sign was made by Ann Triffoli and Sue Carle. Signs also appeared in Ingram on the bulletin boards. During the demonstration the Alma Mater and We Shall Overcome were sung by the students. Also appearing in among the demonstrators were signs that stated "Selma Yes." Estimates of the crowds size vary from 175 to 400. This reporter observed about 200 students outside Smith Hall. Members of the demonstration have made claims that there were as many as 350-400 at Smith Hall.

WHO'S GOING?

The following people are going to Selma; Mr. and Mrs. Pat Hunt, Dr. James Bowditch, Chaplain Jerry Thompson, Richard Grimsrud, Gary Yerkey, Noel Carota, Alexandra Corson, Nancy Cox, Ruth Lake.

THE STUDENTS

We asked the students the following three questions to obtain a general opinion of what has happened on the campus within the last twenty-four hours:

1) What is the general opinion in your living group about the allocation of funds by the Senate for those who went to Selma, Alabama? 2) What was the house reaction to the demonstration that took place this morning here on campus? 3) What is the over-all opinion to people going to Selma, on an individual basis? The opinions expressed are not necessarily the opinion of the houses's these people belong to, unless states as such.

Sigma Nu- Larry Wilkes- The manner in which the Senate allocated the funds was wrong, but the idea behind it was fine. There should have been a campus poll to find out the feelings of everyone.

2) Rabble-rousing has never resulted in anything positive, and therefore, the actions of this morning were of no avail.

3) The Northerners should let the Southerners handle the situation as they see it. The Northerners have not been living with this problem as the Southerners have been.

Phi Delta Theta-Doug Ankerson- the entire house was against the way in which the funds were obtained. 2) He felt that the demonstration was a farce and did not amount to much. 3) There was no reason for a person not to be able to go to Selma on his own.

Delta Upsilon- Roger Gereau- They were against the allocation of funds in the way that it was done. 2) No comment. 3) It is a person's own business to do as he wishes, but he should take into account the plea made by President Johnson to stay out of Selma.

Merriman- Tom Fischer- The house was not in favor of the way that the funds were appropriated. 2) No comment. 3) He felt that it was "ridiculous" to go.

Sigma Alpha Epsilon- Jim Thorsen- The house was very much against the manner in which the Student Senate went about appropriating the funds. 2) The demonstration seemed to achieve its point. 3) One should keep in mind the plea made by our President to keep out of Selma.

Sigma Chi- Fred Rueger- A house vote of 22-7 against the allocations of funds was obtained. 2) The demonstration seemed to be effective. 3) If a person wants to go to Selma on an individual basis, fine.

Theta Chi-Bob Lennox- The house was against the fact that people were going as individuals, and not as a group from the College. 2) He felt that the demonstration served its propose, as it showed that there is something wrong in the Student Senate Constitution if it is possible to pass

a bill as it did, when the majority of the school was against it. 3.) Keeping in mind the plea of The President, he felt that no one should go to Selma.

Beta Sigma Pi-Bruce Bubacz- It was felt that funds could have been put to much better use in the area of Human Rights. He was thinking specifically of the N.A.A.C.P scholarship fund or the summer project. 2) No comment. 3) He approved of the general concept of demonstrating. The demonstrations have proven to be one of the more far reaching devices of the Civil Rights movement.

Independent Men of South Hall-1) A vote of 22-1 disapproved the manner in which the funds were appropriated by the Senate. 2) A majority of the men felt that the demonstration was in order. 3) No comment.

Independent Men of North Hall- Dave Smith 1) The idea of going to Selma was right, but the manner in which the funds were raised was out of order. 2) He felt that the demonstration was sensible as the funds were not used to represent us, but a group of individuals. 3) He was all in favor of a person going to Selma.

Kappa Delta- Judi Gonia- The manner in which the Senate went about obtaining the funds was what the girls objected to. 2) The demonstration was a farce. "Nothing like money to bring out people's emotions." 3) Going to Selma should be left up to the individual.

Alpha Chi Omega-Terry Krikorian- The majority of the girls were against the manner in which the funds were appropriated. 2) The demonstration was unnecessary and was pointless. 3) Going to Selma on an individual basis is fine. [continued on page 10]

PRESIDENT SCHWARTZ REPLIES

Now that tempers have somewhat cooled, I would like to present to the Ripon student body an explanation of my recent actions as their Student Senate President. To begin with, let me state my position. In taking office as Student Senate President I have sworn to uphold the Senate constitution and to further, to the best of my abilities, the interest of student government at Ripon. This is my commitment of office; failure to meet this commitment would be grounds, legitimate grounds, for my removal from that office. This is stated, I believe that I can show that my action has been in harmony with both the constitution and the interests of our government.

Constitutionally the matter is quite plain. Seeing the necessity, Monday night, for the Senate to make a financial decision I convened the Senate in accordance with the Constitution clause: "the Student Senate shall meet at least twice a month and when the president shall deem it necessary." (V, A, 1) The Senate met and, a majority being present (22 out of 27), a decision was reached, the financial allocation passed by the sizable margin of 13 to 9. It is true that the Senators acted without prior

consultation of their constituents, but this is, in fact, usual practice provided for in the Constitution, as follows: "Each Student Senator is able to act, if necessary, without prior reference to his electorate." (III,D) As the motion passed did not specify to details of the execution of the funds allocated, I act on my duties as Senate executive, naming the Chaplain the executor of these funds. Thus, the Senate action of Monday night was duly in accord with all Constitutional requirements.

This being the case, it should next be noted that the overruling of the action of such legality, either by executive order or by the calling of a special Senate meeting for the expressed purpose of rescinding this action, requires extra-ordinarily good cause. The cause must be good because my overruling of Senate action would do great injury to the Senate, and hence to student government, in at least two ways. The first is a destruction of the self-confidence of the Senate. The setting of a precedent in which the President "pulls the rug out" from under a Senate decision would make it very difficult for the Senate to feel itself able to act decisively in the future. It would be denying the Senators the responsibility of their decisions and hence of their legitimate power in the student government as a responsible body. If a precedent is established in which the Senate reneges on a commitment, especially a financial commitment, because of outside pressures, then for all practical purposes we do not have student government which can act, whenever called upon, on behalf of our student body.

It has been argued, of course, that in [that in] this case the Senate's action in allocating the funds was not "on behalf" of the student body, lacking majority consensus and thus, that the action should be overruled. To this I answer that if, in fact, there was majority student opinion against the Senate action then there would have to be grounds for the risking of the welfare of the Senate. But, in fact, the existence of such majority opinion was never demonstrated to me by any tangible evidence. If the majority of the living groups did nearly unanimously oppose the Senate action, I was never informed of this, either by voice or in writing, by the living group presidents, the responsible student government agents at that level. Further, if there was a simply numerical majority of students in opposition, this was never shown by the number, of signatures of the petitions (there were about 300 signatures), which, incidentally, contained many names signed twice or more, making questionable the whole petitioning procedure. And, as a responsible Senate executive, I cannot act on any other bias than tangible evidence. Rumor and the volume of noise generated by a vociferous minority do not constitute consensus.

This brings me to the fact of the demonstrations themselves. In themselves, as they were conducted, they operated as a legitimate and effective expression of the dissatisfaction of the 200-300 students

participating. But the mere expression of dissatisfaction does not any stretch of the imagination articulate policy. From [continued on page 10]

THE DEANS VIEW THE SITUATION

To get an overall administrative view of the Selma trip we interviewed the Deans of the College late Tuesday afternoon. We asked them for their opinions of the Senate proposal, the Tuesday morning demonstration, and their overall view of the trip.

Dean Ashley felt that criticism of the Senate's action was unjustified. "I feel that the Senate was within its rights as a legislative body to appropriate funds in this manner. I don't feel it's necessary for a legislative body to go trotting back to its constituency every time a matter arises. I do have mixed feelings about the trip. I question whether or not any good will be accomplished by the people who went. However the people who [wh o] went do have a right to go. I respect their convictions."

When asked for his views of the morning protests, Dean Ashley said, "Of course, you could argue that the use of funds by the Senate wasn't appropriate, but they do have a right, which is granted by the College and through student elections, to allocate funds. I found the protest legitimate and orderly."

We next interviewed Dean van Hengel, who echoed Ashley's view of the Senate. "It is my impression that the action of the Senate was both legal and proper, perfectly within their [t heir] jurisdiction. This is not, however, an evaluation of their decision. There are times when I both agree and disagree with the Senate, but I do feel that they had a right to make this decision and that this move was justified. Others, of course, are also free to agree or disagree."

When asked about the morning demonstration, Dean van Hengel had this to say: "The unfortunate thing about the morning demonstration was that whether or not the students agree or disagree, I don't think that the answer to the problem is a hasty and emotional demonstration. I'm not sure that it accomplished anything. We weren't certain whether participants were pro or con, and if they were against the trip, what their reasons were."

"There is certainly much room for a difference of opinion on many aspects of a move like this, but I would hope that the biggest area of disagreement would not be on motives or ends, but rather sincere disagreement on methods. There well may be good, sound arguments both for and against making this kind of trip at this time. People could arrive at either conclusion with sincerity and the conviction that they were right. I hope that the question that we are all asking is not whether we are for or against the movement for human rights, but whether or not we feel

this trip at this time is the best way to advance and contribute to this movement. For my part, I respect the answer that those making the trip have reached and their right to make it."

"It seems to me that President Johnson acknowledged the fact last night that while this is not a battle for the streets, but rather a battle to be fought and decided in the courts and in Congress, this kind of demonstration has played an important role in arousing people's interest and concern, and forcing attention upon the seriousness of the problem. I am not sure whether continuation of the Selma demonstrations is still needed, but the problems dramatized in Selma certainly should be given a great deal of our time and attention. One problem, of course, is that of how to demonstrate effectively without doing harm to others or interfering with their rights. I am certainly confident that the Ripon contingent will use good judgment on such problems while they are down there."

When asked about the Senate action, Dean van Hengel disagreed with opponents of the Senate who felt that the action didn't clearly reflect the opinion of the student body. "I think representatives have to be given responsibility to act without consulting their constituents when they feel it proper and necessary. I don't think it is practically possible to go back to the old Town Hall concept of direct democracy. Of course, we don't have a pure democracy on the campus, we have a representative form. The constituency has a right to express concern for their interests and opinions, but this does not mean that representatives need check with them on every specific issue.

(continued)

THE DEANS- (continued)

["]Student groups should elect carefully and have enough confidence in the judgment of people they elect so that they can allow for a degree of personal decision. If over a period of time the students feel that their elected representatives are not doing the job as they feel it should be done, then they should take steps to remove these people. It is not reasonable to evaluate their performance issue by issue."

"If there had been time, if the situation had permitted [permitted] checking with the students, postponing of the meeting until they could explore that matter further, certainly the Senate might well have considered doing this. In this matter this would, in effect, have been a negative decision, however, since this particular situation didn't allow that much time."

Next we visited Dean Harris in his office. Harris was in the process of writing a letter to the Senate President Dave Schwartz, commending the Senate's decision. When the morning demonstration had been mentioned, Harris said, "Wouldn't you know that once they got up off their apathy it would be for the wrong reasons?"

"I would like to congratulate the Senate on this move. While there can be many differences of opinion, it seems to me that the Senate has taken a courageous stand. It has at last concerned itself with something of significance - - something of vital significance to all Americans. One thing that I found most encouraging was that the senators voted on the basis of their own judgments and didn't just offer to 'take it back to the houses'."

"This body should be made up of people capable of acting in matters like this. The reaction of the student body has had a beneficial effect in that it will cause many to look more deeply at the Senate and its function. I, for one, have always resented the idea that members of the Senate are merely errand boys."

When asked for his opinion of the morning demonstration, Harris said, "Personally, I was appalled by the demonstration; I was glad, of course, that the people were concerned, but with all the coverage that was given to the demonstration, Ripon College may well be seen by the country as a kind of school that doesn't believe in Civil Rights. At one point, I was actually ashamed at the unseemliness of the whole incident. The people that were going on the trip were members of the Ripon Family. We should have been there to shake their hands and see them off. This way, they left with memories of a screaming crowd, with few people knowing precisely what they were concerned about. They didn't protest indignantly when the Senate established its loan fund, even though the College had a similar fund; they didn't protest money appropriated for the jazz concert either. It would seem to me that in this most recent Senate action there was something of real significance."

"There is a great educational opportunity here also; we can go down to Selma and learn something. Do the people really want another jazz concert, or do they want a complete, well-rounded education? In my opinion, this was a worthwhile, legitimate way to spend money, even though many might well oppose it in all good conscience."

"I can understand that there might be arguments within the Senate itself, but to organize a demonstration with all of the hullabaloo seems to me rather unfortunate."

"After all, it is money under the budgetary control of the Senate. There are times when I don't agree with their action either, but they do have a right to allocate their funds as they see fit."

"Recourse can be had through the ballot box. The only way to change the Senate is with new representatives. To march around is inappropriate."

"It seems almost humorous that many of these people apparently oppose active demonstrations in Alabama, but they express this opposition with demonstrations up here. At least this whole affair will create new interest in the Senate."

SCHWARZ- (continued)

The [the] rumbling of the crowd, I could detect both a great variety of conceptions of what the issues involved really were (or should be) and a concomitant sense of confusion. This is surely no basis on which overrule a Senate decision itself based on an hour of serious debate and discussion. Had I made this a basis, I would have taken a great step toward student government by mob rule, which is no student government, or any government, at all.

Having given my reasons for disregarding seemingly widespread sentiment in this case, let me hasten to assure those concerned that my disregard is confined to this case only. If the dissatisfaction expressed in the sentiment is a dissatisfaction with the Student Senate itself, either with its membership and officers or with its Constitution and by-laws, then I urge the attempt to change the Senate by all legal means, to bring it into accord with majority student opinion. The machinery for change if the student government itself and I am always happy to entertain its use. But, as I am committed to uphold student government at Ripon, I will not entertain its destruction.

(continued from page five)

Alpha Xi Delta-1) They were against the manner the Senate used to obtain the funds. 2) No comment. 3) Going to Selma on an individual basis is fine.

Alpha Phi-Kay Lindstrom- 1) The main objection was to the way the money was appropriated. 2) No comment. 3) If a person wants to go Selma on his own time and funds, fine.

Alpha Delta Pi- Pam Beinar- 1) Ninety-five percent of the girls were against the Senate appropriating funds without a vote of the entire student body. 2) No comment. 3) If a person is to go to Selma on his own time and [anf] funds, they could see no objection.

RIPON COLLEGE DAYS

"Extra" Staff

Editor- Bruce Bubacz

Associates- M. David Rockwell,
Steve Twining,
David Gerard