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The following is a journal and commentary on the events of the Duke Vigil. No claims can be made for its completeness — all the reader should not form the idea that the dramatic personae of this rather massive demonstration are to be found in these pages.

The question is whether or not the power of participation in the economic decision-making process, that power of man to function as creator and moulder of his own destiny, will be granted the blacks; if not they can exist only as half men, as creatures and as the controlled. The problem can be seen as one of not merely adding materially to the life of black America, by providing them a more pleasant environment in which to be controlled, but of reorganizing and reorienting the white-controlled economic system itself in order to allow their total participation. If this is to occur, the forces presently controlling the economic power must be overcome.

Bunny Small in Political Science Honors Essay May, 1968
INTRODUCTION

The following is a journal and commentary on the events of the Duke Vigil. No claims can be made for its completeness — all the reader should not form the idea that the dramatis personae of this rather massive demonstration are to be found in these pages. It would have been impossible to keep up with every segment of the participants. While there was one group, now called the "leaders;" who made some effort to be influential, who met to discuss certain contingencies, the real credit goes to the hundreds who sat on the quad.

There has been some criticism of this leadership group for being isolated and elitist. This may be justifiable, but for better or worse, this is the way it happened in the eyes of this participant, and as such reflects that attitude.

I want to acknowledge at this time a few people whose aid, advice, and co-operation made the Vigil as successful as it was:

Dr. John H. Strange and his wife, Diana, he for his professional advice and she for her patience;

Mr. William Griffith and Mr. Charles Heustis, two competent administrators who made it possible for the Trustees to understand what it was all about;

Mr. Oliver Harvey, a courageous man who showed us what determination really means;

All the staff of Duke Radio Station WDBS and the Duke Chronicle who helped make this journal possible;

All the girls on the food committee who kept us fed;

And finally, but most importantly, those hundreds of students, professors, and workers whose determination reshaped the direction
of the University.

A group of students including Dave Birkhead, Jim Davis, Jack Reger, Jon Staley, Tom Garrison (a UNC student and a worker for the Southern Student Organizing Committee), George Vlamis (another SSOC worker), and the editor, met in Dave Birkhead's room to discuss an appropriate action to take concerning the assassination of Martin Luther King. There was some discussion about marching to Five Points to show our solidarity.

We also heard that another group, the University Christian Movement people, were also planning some kind of activity at the Student Center. In order not to duplicate our activities we went over there. They (Bunny Small, Reed Kramer, Tami Hultman, John Kendeigh, Mike Wall, Nancy Richardson, Jorie Deane, and Helen Crotteau) had been meeting since ten o'clock and had planned a Vigil for the next day at eleven in front of the chapel. Reed and Paul had already gone to distribute flyers so that effect when we arrived.

Since they had already planned a Vigil it was decided that if we wanted to have a march it should be announced at that time.

The discussion centered on where the march was going. It was pointed out that if it were to go to Five Points that it might interfere with certain activities the black people in town might be planning. It was suggested that if we were really concerned we should take our protest to the white neighborhoods, most notably Hope Valley which is the symbol of wealthy white dominance. Someone suggested, "before the war, that we carry needles." There was some discussion
THURSDAY APRIL 4, 1968

Midnight

A group of students including Dave Birkhead, Jim Davis, Jack Fothergill, Jon Stein, Tom Garrison (a UNC student and a worker for the Southern Student Organizing Committee), George Vlasits (another SSOC worker), and the editor, met in Dave Birkhead's room to discuss an appropriate action to take concerning the assassination of Martin Luther King. There was some discussion about marching to Five Points to show our concern.

WE WERE AWARE THAT ANOTHER GROUP, THE UNIVERSITY CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT PEOPLE, WERE ALSO PLANNING SOME KIND OF ACTIVITY AT THE CAMPUS CENTER. IN ORDER NOT TO DUPLICATE OUR ACTIVITIES WE WENT OVER THERE. THEY (BUNNY SMALL, REED KRAMER, TAMi HULTMAN, JON KORNODLE, ELMER HALL, NANCY RICHARDSON, CHRIS DAME, AND HELEN CROTWELL) HAD BEEN MEETING SINCE TEN O'CLOCK AND HAD PLANNED A VIGIL FOR THE NEXT DAY AT ELEVEN IN FRONT OF THE CHAPEL. REED AND TAMi HAD ALREADY GONE TO DISTRIBUTE FLYERS TO THAT EFFECT WHEN WE ARRIVED.

Since they had already planned a Vigil it was decided that if we wanted to have a march it could be announced at that time. The discussion centered on where the march was going. It was pointed out that if it were to go to Five Points that it might interfere with certain activities the black people in town might be planning. It was suggested that if we were really concerned we should take our grievances to the white neighborhoods, most notably Hope Valley which is the symbol of wealthy white dominance. Someone suggested, consistently, that we carry candles. There was some discussion
as to whether we would simply march, distribute leaflets, or try to talk to the residents. It was decided to split into small groups to talk to the people and the march would begin at seven the next evening.

COMMENTARY ON THE DAY'S EVENTS

Throughout the discussions there was an air of shock and disgust at what happened. The more militant members of the participants repeatedly stated that it was time to "lay it on the line," and say that "we have had enough" of white racist society. As Dave Birkhead kept saying during the events that followed, the world just did not seem the same after the death of Dr. King.

As the events of the week unfolded, we looked back and laughed on numerous occasions about marching to Five Points with candles. Now the idea of talking to the inhabitants of Hope Valley seems equally ludicrous; it was learned (though unverified) a week later that the good people there, when they heard of our plans, had taken out their shotguns to protect themselves from those "rioting Duke students who were coming with Molotov Cocktails."
FRIDAY APRIL 5, 1968

Morning

Members of the group gathered on West Campus to distribute flyers announcing the march and black armbands. An information table was set up and excerpts from King's "I Have a Dream" speech were distributed.

Meanwhile Howard Fuller, local Black Power leader, was conducting a march from North Carolina College to City Hall. He had called the people at the North Carolina Fund to let them know that he was unsure of his ability to control the crowd and for them to stay away from the downtown area. When we got word that white sympathizers were invited to meet at City Hall for a rally, Dr. John Strange, Assistant Professor of Political Science and research director for the North Carolina Fund, went to City Hall to find Fuller.

Noon

The Vigil started as scheduled in front of the Chapel in the rain. By 12:30, however, Dr. Strange had returned to say that it was all right to go to the rally and most people went down there.

1:00

For over a week a rally had been planned for Charles Pratt, North Carolina Peace candidate for the Senate. At that time a group of about 150 members of the faculty, student body, and administration gathered. Dr. James Graham (History), who had planned the rally, took charge. Mr. Pratt did speak briefly, but it turned into a memorial to Dr. King and a discussion of what to do next.

It was raining steadily but there was a long discussion about
where we would go and what we would do. Dr. Strange agreed that we should do something but was afraid of going to Hope Valley because of roving bands of white hoodlums and the Klan and because he was afraid that retaliation would be against the Durham black people rather than against students. He wanted to circulate a petition drawn up by members of the Sociology Department (Appendix item 1) and an advertisement (Appendix item 2) that would appear Tuesday morning in the Morning Herald as a tribute to Dr. King.

Mr. William Griffith, Assistant to the Provost for Student Affairs, suggested that we take these petitions to the Duke Forest where most of the faculty live and even by President Knight's house. Dr. Strange agreed to this and there was some talk of taking the petition to Mayor Grabarek's house, as it would not be very far from Dr. Knight's house.

By this time it was 2:30 and the discussion was dragging on in the rain. Some of the radicals did not like the idea of going to Duke Forest because they did not feel there would be any real opposition there. Jon Kinney, President of the Associated Students of Duke University who had just arrived, objected that we had let Mr. Griffith change our plans. The feeling was that his efforts were to save the university the "embarrassment" of antagonizing the good citizens of that neighborhood. Mr. Griffith was pleased at our choice and even supplied us with a map of the area showing faculty residences.

A smaller group moved into a meeting room near Alumni Lounge to discuss further plans. There was still no general agreement. By this time Petar Brandon, organizer for Local 77 of Duke's non-
academic employees, had entered the discussions. Dr. Strange agreed with him that we should be concerned with the plight of the non-academic workers. Brandon's point was that we should be specific in our demands. With this it was decided that we would not go to the mayor's house because we had so many problems in the Duke Community. Further discussion coalesced into an approach to Knight for positive action. For about an hour Dave Birkhead, Huck Gutman, and Jon Kinney had boycotted the meeting because they said we were being too moderate. When it was agreed that we would go to Dr. Knight's house and stay until we got our demands, they agreed to cooperate with us.

After long discussions we decided on six points: 1) the advertisement that was to appear in the paper; 2) Dr. Knight's resignation from Hope Valley Country Club; 3) a $1.50 minimum wage for non-academic workers; 4) the establishment of a committee of administration, faculty, students, and workers to design a method of collective bargaining for the workers; 5) an exchange program with North Carolina College; and 6) greater faculty integration. It was also decided that our negotiators would be Jon Kinney, Bunny Small, and Dave Birkhead. They were to talk with Dr. Knight while the rest of the group sat in the living room and waited. There were about twenty people in the discussion and we thought we could get at least that many more to go with us in spite of the rain.

7:00

About 450 gathered in Alumni Lounge for the march. Right up until that time we were talking about getting a few cars to take the
group out to the house. Dr. Strange made a short talk to the group and read the list of demands. (See appendix, Item Two) Since he said nothing about staying at the house until the demands were met, some of the planners were worried that he had changed his mind. He admitted later that he had simply forgotten about it, that he did not know he was going to speak until Jon Kinney introduced him.

When we arrived at Dr. Knight's driveway, Dr. Strange announced that some of the group would stay and that he would take those who would not stay to canvass the neighborhood for signatures and contributions for the advertisement. We walked up the long driveway and met Dr. Knight waiting for us outside. He had been notified that afternoon by two of the planners, so that he would know that we were coming and be at home. He spoke for a few minutes about the tragic assassination, while many of the group drifted inside out of the rain. When he finished speaking and went inside, he was greeted by 250 students and professors.

Our spokesmen told him that they wanted to talk to him and they retired to his study to discuss the issues. They later reported that he was absolutely intransigent. Dave Birkhead had had several conversations with him before and never tried to hide his contempt for the man. Jon Kinney made an attempt to moderate between the two and Bunny Small emphasized the urgency of the situation. Dr. Knight said that he could not sign the advertisement because it said "we are all implicated" in the assassination of Dr. King. He felt that some of the trustees of the university did not feel implicated. When asked a specific question like, "Do you believe in the
right of collective bargaining?" he would reply that the question could only be answered in the "proper frame of reference."

Every fifteen minutes one of the spokesmen would report to the group from the negotiations. This was a pre-arranged signal for those who had been in the discussions that afternoon to lead the cry that we were not leaving until we got the four items. At one point we started yelling, "Hell no, we won't go!" This shook the house and Dr. Knight was reported to have been visibly shocked.

10:00

Dr. Strange returned with 108 signatures, including those of a number of professors and their wives, on the advertisement and about $700 to pay for it. This sum included the contributions of students who were conducting the operation.

11:00

Mrs. Knight interrupted the negotiations to get Dr. Knight to eat something. At that time he spoke to the crowd. (See appendix/Item 44 for excerpts from that conversation.)

12:30-1:00

Dr. Knight met in the kitchen with Professor Krantz of the History Department, Jon Kinney, and Bunny Small. He had made it clear that he did not want to talk to Dave Birkhead any more. This possibility had been discussed previously, so nobody was upset about it. Even without Birkhead, the group made no progress.

Dr. Knight finally went to bed and said that if we would not leave, we would be his guest. About 250 people spent the night.
COMMENTARY ON THE DAY'S EVENTS

It was ironic yet prophetic that Mr. Griffith should suggest our going to Dr. Knight's house, ironic in respect of his position in the administration and prophetic in respect of the role he was to play in the ensuing events. If any individual came out on top, it is probably Bill Griffith. The University is indeed blessed to have had such a man as liaison between the demonstrators and the university officials. We commented on several occasions that the university could have been physically destroyed if any number of people had been in his position.

In the discussions of the afternoon we felt that thirty or forty people at the most would be willing to sit-in at Dr. Knight's house. It is hard to assess why so many did. Undoubtedly the emotion of the assassination had quite a bit to do with it and we never hesitated to refer to it. This was without intentions of exploitation, but with the determination that whites could make white institutions work. Another factor adding to the support was that the issues were not new ones. The year before there had been two demonstrations at Hope Valley Country Club when it was used by university organizations. Also there had been a regulation passed by student government prohibiting the use of segregated facilities by student organizations. When this resolution was repealed by referendum, the black students sat-in in Dr. Knight's office and he issued a statement prohibiting the use of segregated facilities by all (i.e. student) university organizations. Yet
Dr. Knight maintained his membership. The Country Club had become a symbol of segregation and white racism. Also the spring before there had been a demonstration for a week for the right of impartial arbitration for the non-academic workers. It was thought at the time that the issue was settled, but the university had not lived up to the good faith of the participants. In other words, the emotion of the time—Dr. King's assassination—plus the fact that these were not new issues provided the framework for so many to participate. Up until that time it had been extremely difficult to organize a demonstration of any size.

A word should be inserted here about the role of Peter Brandon and his participation in the Vigil. It became obvious after two days that we needed the co-operation of the Union even though it had never been very strong. At the same time we were unsure of how much student support we could get on the strict issue of the union. The spring before saw only a handful of students in the demonstration for impartial arbitration and on the way to Dr. Knight's house many students were complaining that we had turned a "memorial procession" into a campaign for Local 77. One of the major problems of the planners was to co-ordinate our direction with that of the union's. This was not facilitated any by Mr. Brandon. We felt on several occasions that he was working against us for his own prestige with the union people. On other occasions it was obvious that he was lying to us. At times we had an extremely delicate situation in trying to hold all our factions together and were plagued with an unco-operative union organizer. One of the real achievements of the Vigil and one of the definite changes in
the institution was the new attitude many students developed towards the non-academic workers, their problems in organizing, and towards unions in general. It would be impossible to say that many students developed a real working class identity, but at least many became sympathetic.

One event of the day that was more or less incidental to the Vigil as a whole, but one that had a profound effect on some of the leaders was a conversation that took place at Dr. Strange's house after Dr. Knight had gone to bed. Dr. Strange and a few students went to get some pillows and blankets. While they were there, Mr. Dewitt Sullivan of the N.C. Fund dropped by and they talked about what was going on. He emphasized how easy it was for whites to do something like this and then go back to their regular lives, but that black men could not quit. This made an indelible impression on the students there and if there was any doubt about what they were doing before the conversation, there was none after.

It should be emphasized at this point that the two demands concerning the workers were that fund-raising be re-directed towards raising salaries and that a committee be established to consider collective bargaining. These points were subsequently escalated.

Throughout the morning the students cleaned up the house.
SATURDAY APRIL 6, 1968

7:30 AM

As Dr. Knight and Jon Kinney were eating breakfast in the Knight's kitchen, discussing the events of the day before and the matter of the Memorial Service to be held in the Chapel that day, Mr. Griffith went to campus for breakfast and found out from the Chronicle people about the events of the night before. He called Provost Cole and they decided to meet with other members of the administration at 10:00 in the Development Office.

After Dr. Knight finished breakfast he spoke to the group with the understanding that there would be no questions or comments from the group. He spoke for about twenty minutes and said among other things that he had not realized how important a symbol his membership in Hope Valley had been to us. He said he would do something about it, "not today, but certainly not in eighteen months."

(It had been about that long since the issue had been made public.) He commented on the fact that Duke was the first institution to prohibit its groups the use of segregated facilities, without mentioning that it had done so only under pressure or that few other major universities in the country needed to. He emphasized that he could not respond under pressure but that a committee would be set up consisting of administrators, faculty, students, and trustees to discuss the labor situation. (At that time he did not mention workers on the committee.) As for the advertisement, he said he could sign it with a slight wording change, but was not specific.

He then left to prepare his talk for the chapel service.

Throughout the morning the students cleaned up the house,
some studied, and others went to campus to make provisions for food and to organize a sympathy march to the house following the chapel service.

Dr. Strange was added to the negotiating group and called Mr. Griffith to tell him that when Dr. Knight spoke that morning he did not mention having workers on the committee. He also suggested that Dr. Knight make a more forceful speech than usual and in doing so make a real commitment for the university.

1:00

The assembled group listened to the memorial service over the radio. In his address Dr. Knight mentioned that the committee would include workers. He made several references to us as his "guests" and criticized us for the narrowness of our accusations of guilt. During the collection in the chapel, over $100 was collected at the house to be sent to Mrs. King. After the service Dr. Knight went to Provost Cole's house and other members of the administration (Provost Cole, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Charles Heustis--Vice-President for Business and Finance, Mr. Frank Ashmore--Vice President for Institutional Advancement, and Mr. Edwin Bryson--University Counsel) went to the Development office to work on a statement for Dr. Knight to present the demonstrators.

A group of about 350 students, faculty, and workers marched to the house after the service to show their sympathy for the cause. When they arrived we met them in the driveway and Dr. Strange read parts of Dr. King's "I Have a Dream" speech, and afterwards they returned to campus.
At this time Dr. W. G. Anlyan, Dean of the Medical School and Dr. Knight's personal physician, arrived back in town and went to the Development Office when he heard what had happened. He immediately went to Provost Cole's house to see Dr. Knight who had never completely recovered from a serious case of hepatitis. He returned about an hour later with word that Dr. Knight could not be contacted until four o'clock Monday afternoon.

8:00

Mr. Griffith and Dr. Anlyan went to Dr. Knight's house to tell the negotiators that Dr. Knight was exhausted and perhaps having a relapse and would not be available for consultation until Monday afternoon if then. Dr. Anlyan left, but Mr. Griffith stayed until one o'clock.

The negotiators did not know what to do so they asked the group to send in six more representatives for consultation. The group sent Jack Boger, Dave Birkhead, Allen Ray, Jeff Van Pelt, Reed Kramer, Dr. Tom Rainey (History), and David Henderson. After some discussion we decided that the best move would be to move to the quad the next morning. We thought we could make a selling point of getting greater university-wide support. We asked Mr. Griffith, who was in the downstairs study, about the girls checking out for the quad. He immediately jumped at the idea and called the deans to tell them about it. (He was also in constant contact with other members of the administration.)

The idea had not been fully delivered to the group before dissension spread. Many people felt that the group would not stay together on the quad and others did not want to leave the
position of strength of the house. Others said they wanted national publicity which would come if we stayed. Most of the house was up all night arguing about leaving.

COMMENTARY ON THE DAY'S EVENTS

It is a testimony to the competence and sensitivity of Dr. Knight and the administration that we were not thrown out of the house. Dr. Knight came under severe criticism for not doing so, but in all probability, if he had done so, the results would have been catastrophic; witness the events at Columbia a few weeks later.

At the same time it must be said that Dr. Knight made a drastic mistake, from an administrative point of view, of not taking an immediate, forceful stand on the issues which were subsequently legitimized by the university Board of Trustees. If he had responded quickly the night before or even this morning we would have undoubtedly left the house feeling somewhat satisfied with the results. There must be many factors that went into his indecision but the major one is undoubtedly his relationship with the Board of Trustees and the political and social viewpoints of many of those people.

As with most private Universities of this nature, the power of governing it rests with the trustees. Ours have never been known for their liberal views. In fact, the list reads like who's who in conservative southern anti-union big business. Besides the posture of the trustees many of the big donors to the university, not to mention the alumni, are generally southern conservative with
all the implications that carries. For Dr. Knight to respond favorably to the demands would mean that the university would be taking an unprecedented stand on race relations and unionism in the South. Apparently he did not feel that he could assume responsibility for such a radical venture.

Three factors contributed to the determination of the participants: the first was the attitude Dr. Knight presented in his comments in the morning and at the chapel service. The second was the emotionalism of the assassination and the ensuing riots. And finally the radicalizing effect of occupying the president's house added greatly to the fervor of the group.

For whatever reason, Dr. Knight did not take as definite a stand as was required. He has a way of talking down to students that can be most antagonistic. This did not endear him any. After both talks the students resigned themselves to a long wait.

A sociological study is being done of the Vigil that is not complete at this time, but a preliminary report showed a strong feeling on the part of the participants that they had to make a dramatic stand at this time of national crisis. The assassination obviously hit the liberal sensitivity of many, but it radicalized others into action. It is the opinion of this student and shared by many that the most significant point we were making was simply that institutions had to respond in times like these. The effect of watching the nation's capital burn intensified our determination to make the "system" work. If liberal, white institutions would not or could not respond to the pressure of the people within them, then we felt no alternative but to endorse the actions of the black
It must be admitted that many students were psychologically radicalized without a complete understanding of the political implications of it. Others seemed genuinely baffled. (This at least was true throughout the night.) This probably attests to the effect of liberating an oppressed people without giving them an understanding of what was happening. It can safely be said that most of the participants had never been with us in a demonstration before. One of the professors present called them "Cynthia Sweet Things" and added that he was most pleasantly surprised at their participation. At any rate a number of people who had never questioned the authority of the university before suddenly found themselves in an occupying force in the house of the university president. They were pleased with their boldness, and many did not want to give up the position of power.

When word came that Dr. Knight would be out of touch at least until Monday afternoon, we were faced with the first real crisis. Not only did we not know where to direct the demonstration, we did not know if we could hold the demonstration together. We had a real Jacobin movement on our hands with the new radicals and did not know where it would lead. The leaders were criticized for their "democratic centralism" in the midst of the reigning confusion. To many of us this seemed like something of a contradiction.

In all due fairness to the faction that wanted to stay at the house, they were not all naive militants. Most of the students who had been radical for years were in this faction. (We had,
however, asked all the non-student radicals, those with the Southern Student Organizing Committee, to leave that morning.

None of us were sure that we could hold the group together if we went to the quad, and none of us expected the kind of support we got when we got there. Huck Gutman, one of the long-time radicals who early in the evening wanted to stay, at some time in the wee hours of the morning suggested that if we did go back we would have to get the union to strike, get support from the faculty and black Durham community, and national press coverage.

would not be returning to the house because of illness. This was disturbing because we had been notified the night before and the reporter had been at the house the afternoon before. Mr. Griffith was called out to the house. He said that he had not known about the illness until the night before himself and called the rest of the administration to confer on it. Mr. Strang called Ann Colarussa, the reporter, to find out how to get in. The Duke news bureau had called it in and it had been edited after she turned in the article.

Mr. Griffith stayed at the house until we left, but was in touch with the administration meeting with the deans on campus.

It was made clear with him that we were dealing with some transgression.

Rennie Howard, one of the black students with us, had complained about our lack of discipline—there was somewhat of a party atmosphere while we were at the house. She was afraid that if we went to the quad with such attitude, we would be ridiculed for being so poorly disciplined. At her suggestion a group of monitors was called for who were instructed in keeping the group together.
At this time the Committee of Ten met to discuss what action to take. By this time the sentiment generally seemed to favor going to the quad. We decided to try it again with the group. 

Dr. Strange spoke and described Dr. Knight's physical condition which seemed to convince the group which was concerned about our support on campus. They agreed to move to the quad.

An article in the Morning Herald mentioned that Dr. Knight would not be returning to the house because of illness. This was disturbing because we had been notified the night before and the reporter had been at the house the afternoon before. Mr. Griffith was called out to the house. He swore that he had not known about the illness until the night before himself and called the rest of the administration to confirm it. Dr. Strange called Ann Colarusso, the reporter, to find out how it got in. The Duke news bureau had called it in and it had been added after she turned in the article.

Mr. Griffith stayed at the house until we left, but was in touch with the administration meeting with the deans on campus. It was made clear with him that we were leaving with some trepidation.

Bertie Howard, one of the black students with us, had complained about our lack of discipline--there was somewhat of a party atmosphere while we were at the house. She was afraid that if we went to the quad with that attitude, we would be ridiculed for being so poorly disciplined. At her suggestion a group of monitors was called for who were instructed in keeping the group together.
Bertie spoke to the group to emphasize the need for discipline and it was decided that it would be a silent Vigil except for breaks and meal time.

10:30

At the suggestion of Jon Kinney we left a "clean-up" crew and marched back to campus with a police escort. We had wanted to get back before the chapel service, but were late getting everything together. The group assembled on the main campus in rows in front of the chapel. The church-goers were somewhat surprised at the reception waiting for them when chapel was over.

12:45

At this time the negotiators were invited to go to Dean Harold Lewis' (Dean of Arts and Sciences) house to discuss the issues. During the afternoon members of the administration met in the Development office to discuss what action Provost Cole should take in President Knight's absence. They called Mr. Wright Tisdale, chairman of the board of trustees, to tell him what was happening. He wanted to follow the administration's advice and at first it was decided that he would not fly to Durham. Later, because of pressure and racial strife in Durham, he was called back and agreed to come.

He arrived in town early in the evening.

4:00

There was a rally with songs and speeches to send the negotiators off. They met with Mr. Heustis, Mr. Griffith, and Dean Lewis. Mr. Heustis talked about a manpower development program, summer recreation, and a combined curriculum with North Carolina College.
Dean Lewis was quiet as usual. Dr. Strange tried to educate them briefly about the problems of contemporary urban politics and the responsibilities of universities. Mr. Griffith was the only really optimistic one in the group.

6:00

There was a six o’clock curfew imposed on the city as a result of racial strife. The negotiators returned to campus by that time in poor spirits.

The Vigil had grown to about 500 during the day and at least that many slept on the quad. There had been rumors of trouble from some of the reactionary elements including some of the football players. The Vigil was well protected by the campus security force and there were no incidents except for a few firecrackers set off during the night.

COMMENTARY ON THE DAY’S EVENTS

Mrs. Bertie Howard’s contribution to the movement is indeed significant. During the time we were at the Knights’ house we were careful not to destroy the property, but there was a generally festive atmosphere. This contributed to some people’s concern that we could never stay together if we moved to the quad. She had been a participant in the sit-in by the Afro-Americans in Dr. Knight’s office and was quick to point out the difference in the organization and discipline. Her point was well made that whites put so much store in individuality that they were almost incapable of self-enforced unity and discipline.
The order that we were able to maintain as a result of her suggestion undoubtedly contributed to much of the support we got from faculty and other students. At the same time however, it brought severe criticism from some of the more radical elements in the community, most notably the students affiliated with SSOC. From them we got scorn and cries of "fascism." Much of the criticism was heaped on our system of monitors assigned to each row. Some of these tended to be authoritarian, but for the most part seemed to be generally co-operative. With objective hindsight it must be admitted that we were not very democratic about the order that was imposed, especially on those who joined us after we went to the quad. The newcomers never had a chance to express an opinion on the kind of organization that was operated. In strict New Left terms, it was nothing but a moderate, and perhaps a centrally-authoritarian demonstration. It must be added though, that none of the participants made a collective attempt to change the orientation of the demonstration. That is, no change was attempted until we were openly considering escalation later in the week.

The long-range effect of the type of order displayed remains unseen. It is highly doubtful that we could have involved the kind of faculty support we got without it. This is highly significant in that many of the faculty who were gradually moved to action were put in a new frame of mind and should not be hard to mobilize the next time a power move is made. A more militant action or even a less smoothly-operated one would undoubtedly pre-empted support from the senior (i.e. conservative) faculty members.
Another strategic move was to leave the "clean-up" crew at the house. It became obvious that having them there was a thorn in the side of the administration. We were never told to move them, but when we did, it considerably facilitated negotiations and demonstrated the "good faith" of the students.

At this point pressure on the university was beginning to build. The determination of the Vigil participants was obvious and had to be coped with. That Mr. Tisdale was called in clearly demonstrates that in a crisis situation the power structure cannot refuse to act. His presence also dramatized the problem that had been facing the university for a long time—there was no clear-cut chain-of-command in administrative procedures. Nobody knew exactly what to do in a crisis as long as power rested with the trustees. This also marks the point of origin of the most serious mistake we made:

A real power push as was made a few weeks later at Columbia would have been out of the question. The main reason is that the faculty had not been sufficiently mobilized to support such a move. But when administrative procedures broke down with Dr. Knight out of the picture, we should have emphasized the powerlessness of the faculty. And it should have begun with real determination on this day.
MONDAY APRIL 8, 1968

7:00

There was a brief conversation between Dr. Strange and Mr. Griffith who suggested that the people be removed from the house.

12:30

Dr. Strange, Bunny Small, and Jon Kinney held a press conference.

1:30-2:00

Dr. Woodall, Dr. Anlyan, and Dean Lewis met with the negotiators to tell them that Dr. Knight would not be available that afternoon. Dr. Anlyan indicated that he would be willing to speak to the Vigil, but the negotiators convinced him that that would probably arouse more doubt than already existed. They also let it be known that Mr. Tisdale was in town.

3:00

The Committee of Ten met to discuss strategy. The first thing that was decided was to bring back the "clean-up" crew before they were forced to leave. Further discussion centered on Dr. Knight's health and who was in charge of the university. It was decided that the demand for the formation of the committee and higher wages would be made of Mr. Tisdale as Chairman of the Board. There was some discussion about Peter Brandon, whether he could be trusted and how far he would push. Jack Boger insisted that he be kept away from the microphone because we were still essentially two movements and there was some fear that Mr. Brandon would try to criticize ours for his own benefit. Another fear was whether or
not the Vigil would fall in behind the union in its demands for collective bargaining.

The two problems here were the nature of the movement up to this time and the specifics of union demands.

4:00

There was a "send-off" rally for the negotiators to go talk to the administration. At this time it was announced that Dr. Knight was out of the picture and we were dealing with the trustees.

DR. JÜRGEN KOLTMANN, VISITING PROFESSOR FROM GERMANY, SPOKE, AND DR. HARMON SMITH READ THE RESOLUTION FROM THE FACULTY OF THE QUINN SCHOOL. (SEE APPENDIX ONE, ITEM FOUR.)

The negotiators went to Allen Building. Bunny called Mr. Griffith from his secretary's phone (which is in the second floor lobby). Otherwise, there was no official communication.

Later in the afternoon Mr. Brandon told Dr. Strange that the Union was out on strike. Brandon was not the most effective person to relate to the students. The person most responsible for drawing student support for the union, and in fact, responsible for politicking many of the students in Mr. Oliver Harvey. Mr. Harvey, a junior in the university, was the first organizer of the black-student resistance to the draft in particular. This disturbed many of the participants who did not want to be identified with draft resistance. This night 1046 people slept on the Quad, by actual body count early the next morning.

COMMENTARY ON THE DAY'S EVENTS

It was obvious from the beginning of the day that support for the Vigil was growing. Besides the growing numbers on the quad, even those back in the dorms were affected. Nobody could avoid taking a stand on it. Even those who took no public stand knew they were considered to be opposing it. The campus was indeed polarized, mostly in favor of the movement.

The fact that Dr. Knight was out of the picture posed quite
a problem. Most of the emotion of the movement was directed at the four points. Shifting to two meant re-aligning with the union. The two problems here were the nature of the movement up to this time and the specifics of union demands.

While two of the demands were for the workers, the movement was essentially student oriented. The feeling was that this was our university and we were taking a hand in shaping the future of it. In the past there had never been a great deal of support for Local 77 and there was no assurance that the movement could be channeled in that direction. There is no empirical data at this time to explain that, but one of the most important reasons is undoubtedly the previously apolitical nature of the student body. As previously stated, Mr. Brandon was not the most effective person to relate to the students. The person most responsible for drawing student support for the union, and in fact, responsible for politicizing many of the students was Mr. Oliver Harvey. Mr. Harvey, a janitor in the university, was the first organizer of the black labor movement at Duke. From the first time he spoke to the Vigil he won the hearts of the participants. He was the past president of the union and is still considered the leader.

The participation of the union, after it went on strike, meant that the demands for collective bargaining would have to be more specific. (While Mr. Brandon told Dr. Strange in the afternoon that the union had gone on strike, in fact the afternoon shift simply left work an hour early. The night shift came on and voted to strike. Picket lines were to go up the next morning.) Dr.
Strange felt in the afternoon that the Vigil would not fall in behind
the union, but when the announcement was made that the union was
striking for collective bargaining and $1.60 minimum wage, the
participants took up the cause.

The speakers for the evening had previously been arranged
for a national draft-resistance week. The fact that they were so
poorly received says something about the nature of the Duke Student
body. While some reference was made to the necessity of resistance
in general, the students did not feel that there was any relation
in the two movements.

Throughout the morning there was no contact with the
administration. While there is no public information at this
time concerning the activities of the administration and the
trustees, there understood that discussions began immediately
concerning the course of action they would take.

Bunny Seall and John Strange called Mr. Griffiths at the
Development Office to tell him of the growing national publicity
and to urge them to take advantage of it for the good civil
rights coverage the university could get if they handled it
properly. Mr. Frank Ashmore, Vice-President for institutional
advancement, talked to Dr. Strange and told him that there would
be a statement but added that he "didn't think there would be
time for a question and answer period." He did say that the
statement would be a compromise of the parties drafting it.

Dr. Strange was furious with this attitude and told him that
the students had to see it before it was released and that the
committee drafting it should be ready to rewrite it.
TUESDAY APRIL 9, 1968

6:00

Rumors were flying that Mr. Tisdale was running the university and that students were going to be removed from the union, the east union, and the graduate center, with the house and chapel. Dr. Strange got word from Mr.

7:00

Jon Kinney, Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook, and Chaplin Wilkenson flew to Atlanta for Dr. King's funeral. In Jon's absence, Jack Boger was elected to serve as a negotiator.

Throughout the morning there was no contact with the administration. While there is no public information at this time concerning the activities of the administration and the trustees, it is understood that discussions began immediately concerning the course of action they would take.

At this time Peter Brandon was asked what he would settle for to end the strike. He said he would take $1.40 as a minimum wage and the strike. The university could get if they handled it properly. Mr. Frank Ashmore, Vice-President for institutional advancement, talked to Dr. Strange and told him that there would be a statement but added that he "didn't think there would be time for a question and answer period." He did say that the statement would be a compromise of the parties drafting it. Dr. Strange was furious with this attitude and told him that the students had to see it before it was released and that the committee drafting it should be ready to rewrite it.
3:30

Rumors were flying that Mr. Tisdale was running the university and that students were going to be removed from the quad with fire hoses and police. Dr. Strange got word from Mr. Griffith that there would be no statement that day. Later, however, Dr. Strange was told by one of the Allen Building messengers that Mr. Tisdale was coming to campus and that Dean Lewis was locking up the administration building and sending everyone home early.

6:00

Dr. Strange called Mr. Griffith to confirm that there would be no statement until the next day.

At this time Peter Brandon was asked what he would settle for to end the strike. He said he would take $1.40 as a minimum wage a collective bargaining in some kind of a credit union. He was afraid that a wage hike would kill the strike.

8:00

Mr. Griffith met with the negotiators outside Allen Building to tell them that the statement would be issued the next day and that they could read it before it was made public.

He doubted that it could be modified and saw little hope for collective bargaining. He also had two boxes of food in his car for the Vigil, but would no say who they were from.

Later in the evening the students were told by a professor,
Dr. Buettn-Janusch, that the trustees had in fact considered using fire hoses to clear the quad. There was a short rally in the evening and by actual body count early the next morning 1427 people slept on the quad.

COMMENTARY ON THE DAY'S EVENTS

As Mr. Griffith was told, national publicity was steadily growing, which is indeed surprising considering the perverted desire for violence on the part of the news media and the peaceful nature of the demonstration. One reporter, from CBS, actually told us that when there was violence, they would bring the cameras down. A number of telegrams came in from friends, alumni, and national political figures such as Robert Kennedy, Eugene McCarthy, and Nelson Rockefeller (See Appendix One, Item Five), even though a few weeks later a notice came from Gov. Rockefeller's office to the local press that he had not sent the telegram and that they had no knowledge of it. (It was later confirmed that the telegram came from the Governor's office.)

Most of the students, along with Dr. Strange, were dismayed with Mr. Ashmore's attitude and that segment of the administration. The participants sincerely felt that the university had a great opportunity to take significant steps forward in race relations and in progressive labor practices in the South. It is perhaps unfair to be so highly critical of Mr. Ashmore even though he again infuriated a number of people the next night and again when a speech was released that he made to the Greens-
boro Alumni Association (See Appendix One, Item 1).

Mr. Asmore's attitude should have given us some hint of the nature of the attitudes of many of the trustees. In hindsight it seems rather naive to think that we could appeal to the moral consciences of men, on the issue of collective bargaining, who had been fighting unions and organized labor all their lives. This is not to disparage our trustees but simply to comment on the politics of the situation. This was the first indication we had since we left the house that we would not be successful.

It is to the credit of members of the administration, most notably Mr. Griffith, who knows the students so well, and Mr. Heustis, a highly competent business man and a good friend of the students, that the trustees were prevailed upon to take even the course of action they did. Quite a bit of intense education must have taken place in the sessions, and undoubtedly this had to be repeated with many of the trustees who came in for the Executive Council meeting the next day. Most had to be persuaded not to use force to clear the quad, not to get rid of the leaders, to speak to the issues, to answer them positively, and for Mr. Tisdale to make his statement directly to the Vigil.

While the statement was far from satisfactory, the course of action taken could not have been wiser. If the trustees had chosen to use force, there is no doubt that the university would have been destroyed, possibly with violence, undoubtedly with instant attrition by professors and students. There were many
students and some professors wanted to use more militant tactics all along. The radicalization of students and professors, as happened a few weeks later at Columbia when the police were turned loose, would have been uncontrollable. Most of the black students said all along that these tactics would not work and refused to participate (Appendix B). This made it necessary for the more militant radicals to urge stronger action immediately. This faction became harder and harder to control as time went on as is evident from the notes from strategy sessions later in the week and throughout the next week.

An interesting footnote to these events is the mysterious food contribution that Mr. Griffith brought late this evening. He would not tell anyone at the time and it became a topic for speculation. As it turned out, it was from Mrs. James Semans, one of the members of the Board of Trustees. This, of course, destroys, of course, the myth that many believe of the monolithic structure of the board. The students, who know Mrs. Semans, feel that the university would be a better place if the board were totally composed of people like her.
The West Campus Operations Department (maids and janitors) went out on strike and joined the dining hall workers in their picketing. After his statement Mr. Tisdale and members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees began a meeting early in the morning that was to last all day to discuss the issues raised by the Vigil. Minutes from this meeting and other meetings of the trustees and administration are not available at this time but are on file in the archives of the university in the library.

While Mr. Tisdale was addressing the Vigil, the Academic Council, in an open meeting of the faculty, received the statement. Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook, Associate Professor of Political Science, addressed the Vigil after his return from the funeral.

In Page Auditorium there was unanimous discontent with the statement from the trustees. There was no unanimity about the course of action to pursue. Many wanted to escalate the tactics. Everyone was so tired there was little tolerance to the comments. It was generally accepted that the Vigil would move off the quad because it was raining too hard.

Howard Fuller, and Ben Ruffin, two local Black Power organizers, marched to campus with about 100 leaders of the black community for a rally.

The negotiators went to the development office to receive
the statement from Mr. Tisdale. He was reportedly cordial but would offer no interpretations.

5:30

Mr. Tisdale delivered his statement to the Vigil. (See Appendix One, Item Seven.) After his statement Mr. Tisdale and members of the administration joined the Vigil in singing "We Shall Overcome." Dr. Strange then spoke (See Appendix One, Item Right.) and there was a replay of Dr. Cook's speech made earlier in the afternoon. Following Dr. Cook's speech, the Vigil moved into Page Auditorium to discuss the next course of action.

While Mr. Tisdale was addressing the Vigil, the Academic Council, in an open meeting of the faculty, received the statement. (See Appendix One, Item Nine.)

6:30

In Page Auditorium there was unanimous discontent with the statement from the trustees. There was no unanimity about the course of action to pursue. Many wanted to escalate the tactics. Everyone was so tired there was little coherance to the comments. It was generally accepted that the Vigil would move off the quad because of exhaustion and the cold, wet weather.

At one point in the discussion a number of people moved into the balcony. Someone downstairs under the balcony asked who it was. Bunny Small remarked rather prophetically, "I'm
not sure, but I think the faculty is coming in."

Professor Van Alstyne of the Law School spoke of conciliation but then left.

Professor Cartwright read the statement endorsed by the Academic Council. (See Appendix One, Item TEN.)

Mr. Oliver Harvey spoke about the plight of the union, how hard they had fought all along, and how we had to keep on fighting. He offered some comic relief by saying how much information he had picked up over the years out of wastebaskets, and in fact he had never heard of Tisdale until he found him in a wastebasket.

The meeting broke for dinner at 8:00.

8:45

The Committee of Ten met with the executive committee of the Academic Council, along with Mr. Harvey, Mr. Kenneth, current President of Local 77, and Pete Brandon, to discuss confrontation, reconciliation, and student-faculty power.

9:30

The Vigil met again in Page Auditorium. Jon Kinney tried to act as moderator but was terribly ineffective. For about three hours people argued back and forth as to what action to take. With so many people involved, there was no way to get a conclusive idea of sentiment as sentiment changed with each speaker. Many, however, pushed hard for more militant action.
Finally, by process of exhaustion as much as any, the group decided to adopt Dr. Strange's proposal to select a strategy group of students, faculty members and workers to plan future moves, to organize students to man picket lines, organize food and rides to honor the dining hall boycott, and raise funds for the strike fund.

The meeting adjourned and students slept in the Union, Page, and the Chapel.

2:00 AM

Mr. Tisdale appeared in the Chapel with Mr. Ashmore and two or three others. He probably did not expect his reception. He was absolutely adamstant that Duke would never have collective bargaining. Mr. Ashmore was antagonistic to the demonstrators and the theme of the demonstration. This nearly touched off the powder keg and later in the morning students were again ready to sit-in Allen Building.

COMMENTARY ON THE DAY'S EVENTS

It is impossible at this time to analyze the exact effect of the Vigil on the Durham community, black or white; but as Dr. Strange commented after Mr. Tisdale read his statement, there was a surprising and encouraging response from the militant blacks. Unaccustomed to white, middle-class students taking this kind of action, many showed their encouragement in the march to campus this afternoon. After sitting all day in the
rain, the participants were greatly cheered-up by the appearance of Howard Fuller, who is quite popular with the students, and his colleagues. Mr. Fuller's only fear was, as he expressed the next week in an address to students in the Divinity School, that these students would feel that this was all the action they ever need take. For some, he felt, this experience had absolved them of all guilt and responsibility. He also had some reservations, paradoxically enough, about the possibility of success with this moderate action. Whatever his qualms, his appearance did quite a bit to bolster morale.

The meeting of the Academic Council, held while Mr. Tisdale was reading his statement, represented for many members of the faculty, the impotency of that body. As one full professor commented, they were simply academic employees. Some students feel that the faculty could properly be called the white trash and students the niggers in the institution, not only in their roles in it, but in their relationship to each other. At any rate, this situation finally became obvious and some of the more indignant members formed a Concerned Faculty Committee under the direction of Dr. John Buettner-Janusch. This group began regular meetings to discuss the strategy they would employ. They also circulated a petition signed by many of the senior members of the faculty endorsing the aims of the Vigil. (See Appendix One, Item Two) (See Appendix One, Item Eleven and Appendix Two)

The real crisis of the Vigil occurred this night in Page
Auditorium. All along there had been criticisms of "democratic centralism" on the part of the "leaders." Wednesday night proved conclusively that this was not the case. The dissention Saturday night at Dr. Knight's house was nothing compared with this.

The blame for this must rest with the "leadership." Throughout the course of events there was no individual who could be identified as the leader. It was generally concluded that none of the people on what has been called the Committee of Ten could have exerted the kind of leadership that Mario Savio did during the Berkeley revolt or that Mark Rudd evidently did during the ones at Columbia later in the spring. One reason for this could be that none of the people in this group would have stood for it—there was simply too much friendly rivalry. Another reason is probably that the only direction a charismatic figure could have carried the group this evening would have been to a militant act such as occupying Allen Building and none of the "leaders" were willing to do that. The reason was that there was still a certain amount of what could be called naive optimism. By the end of the semester some of the members of the committee agreed that an escalation should have been attempted when it was possible to get massive support. There is still some question, however, as to what effect this would have had on the issue of collective bargaining, which was still the goal of the movement.
With perfect hindsight it can be said that a movement should have begun at this point to restructure the university. This is not to say necessarily that it would have been profitable to have moved on Allen Building with that goal in mind. It may well be that the repressive, reactionary forces of the university would have simply been too massive for such an attempt to have been successful. And it is probably true that the professors had to be given a chance to become mobilized, which had never really happened before, before they could be radicalized. On the other hand, the germinal idea should have been planted then instead of a month later when it was finally discussed with the Concerned Faculty group.

The crisis of the evening lay in the lack of direction. It could have crumbled or escalated. The fact that it took the direction it did is probably because the people who wanted to escalate could not hold out against the liberal co-option and did not have the support of the "leaders." It did not crumble because the movement simply had too much momentum.

Something should probably be said in analysis of Mr. Tisdale and Mr. Ashmore's appearance in the Chapel. But their incompetency speaks for itself.

Three thousand people gathered on the main quad for the largest rally of this kind in the history of the school. Dr. Burstyn-Jamesch spoke of his concerned faculty group. Other professors, Dr. Tanford, Dr. Mahoney, and Dr. Harmon Smith...
THURSDAY APRIL 12, 1968

8:30
There was another meeting in Page Auditorium which started out with the same dissent of the one the night before. Howard Fuller spoke and talked about supporting Local 77 and said to stop worrying about what the blacks would think and to give them support. Dr. Strange reviewed his proposal from the night before. This was generally supported even though some still wanted more militant action.

The Vigil moved to the quad then marched to East Campus with the understanding that they would reassemble again that night for a rally.

2:00
The first strategy session of students, faculty, and workers met all afternoon to discuss the relation of the student movement to the Union's. It took most of that time to convince Peter Brandon that the issue had to be collective bargaining and not Local 77 recognition.

7:00
Three thousand people gathered on the main quad for the largest rally of this kind in the history of the school. Dr. Bretteur-Janusch spoke of his concerned faculty group. Other professors, Dr. Tanford, Dr. Mahoney, and Dr. Harmon Smith,
added their support. Dr. Cartwright discussed the Academic Council statement. Dr. Strange discussed the strategy to be followed during the ten day moratorium, and read the State.—

neur of the Strategy Committee (Committee of Ten). (See Appendix ON E— Item Two)

COMMENTARY ON THE DAY'S EVENTS

This marks the last day of the Vigil in the form it took after leaving Dr. Knight's house. The next nine days consisted of rallies, strategy meetings and planning sessions.

There are four significant groups that met during this period:

The special committee of the Academic Council, consisting of Professor Blackburn (Economics), Chairman, Professor Van Alstyne (Law), Professor Whelan (Medical School), Professor Alexander (Psychology), and Professor Colton (History), met regularly with students to discuss methods of implementing collective bargaining to suggest to the trustees.

The general strategy sessions consisting of students, professors, and workers met daily to formulate plans for the food committee (the dining hall boycott was about seventy-five per cent effective throughout the strike), finance committee to raise money for the strike fund and the Vigil expenses, and of course tactics in the event of future direct action.

The Concerned Faculty group met regularly to formulate their own plans for further action. (See Appendix—See Item Two)

For the first time in the history of the university, the
graduate students organized into a representative body, with representatives from every department. Before the week was over they had accumulated a petition with over five hundred names supporting the aims of the Vigil.

To say that there were four "significant" groups meeting during this period is not to discount the importance of the administration. For all practical purposes, all other matters were dropped so that full attention could be focused on the issues at stake.

Committee of Ten (R. A. Strong, J. P. Stack, J. H. Hensley, C. S., Mr. R. E. Adams, Mr. Seacrest, Mr. Griffith, and Dean Lewis) met Saturday afternoon with members of the administration. The meeting was unproductive. The members of the administration were obviously exhausted and were unwilling to discuss the substantive issues. Mr. Griffith asked that we prepare a packet of information on the events and issues of the Vigil.

There was an extended discussion with Peter Brandon Saturday evening. He had had a flyer printed announcing a rally for Local 77 the following Monday. This was after the agreement Thursday that the issue was collective bargaining as a principle, the implementation of which might not include Local 77. He denied the rally, but everyone knew he was lying. It was made clear to him that this kind of action would not be tolerated in the future.

On Sunday, Easter, the Vigil convened on the quad in front
PART II
Friday, April 12 -- Saturday, April 20

The Strategy Sessions held Friday and Saturday were for the most part open-ended and rambling. Discussions centered for the most part on how to deal with the militant faction and how to bolster faculty support. Dr. Cell emphasized the need for the faculty to work on the issues and suggested that it was a bigger movement than the Gross-Edens crisis of 1959-60.

There was a meeting Saturday afternoon with members of the Committee of Ten (Mrs. Strange, Mrs. Small, Mrs. Henderson, Mr. Rogers, and Mr. Vinal) and Mr. Heustis, Mr. Griffith, and Dean Lewis. It was for the most part an unproductive session. The members of the administration were obviously exhausted and were unwilling to discuss the substantive issues. Mr. Griffith asked that we prepare a packet of information on the events and issues of the Vigil.

There was an extended discussion with Peter Brandon Saturday evening. He had had a flier printed announcing a rally for Local 77 the following Monday. This was after the agreement Thursday that the issue was collective bargaining as a principle, the implementation of which might not include Local 77. He denied the rally, but everyone knew he was lying. It was made clear to him that this kind of action would not be tolerated in the future.

On Sunday, Easter, the Vigil convened on the quad in front
of the Chapel. Loud speakers had been set up so the participants could hear the service. (See Appendix One, Item Thirteen.)

The Blackburn Committee met in lengthy session to discuss various methods of collective bargaining. The students meeting with them were Jack Boger, Jon Kinney, Jon Kernodle (Law), Bertie Howard, and Huck Gutman.

Mr. Griffith notified Miss Small, Mr. Boger, and Mr. Henderson that the trustees would be meeting the next day and asked for at least thirty of the packets of information. This took all Sunday night. The packets consisted of back issues of the Chronicle, statements from various organizations, speeches, and a statement from the leaders drafted that night by Mr. Strange and Mr. Henderson. (See Appendix One, Item Fourteen) This was signed for the Committee of Ten, but many of the members of that group never saw the statement.

Twenty-five members of the Board of Trustees met all day Monday to discuss their course of action. (Information concerning that meeting should be found in the Archives with the other items from this period. As previously stated, they are not available at this time.) It is a reasonable presumption that the members of the Board had to be "educated" to the issues by the administration just as the executive committee had been. It is understood that their first reaction was, naturally enough, frighteningly negative.

The statement from the Board (See Appendix One, Item Fifteen)
was presented to Miss Small, Mr. Boger, Mr. Kinney, Mr. Gutman, and
Mr. Henderson at 5:00 Tuesday afternoon at Mr. Griffith's house.
Mr. Heustis and Mr. Griffith felt that it was issued in good
faith and was not simply a stall. Mr. Heustis added that he
thought it was the beginning of a meaningful dialogue, because
they obviously could have come out with something much worse.

When it was learned that the statement would be issued
on Tuesday, fliers were sent out to reconvene the Vigil at
9:00 for the statement to be read. An hour before the meeting,
the strategy group met and drafted a statement in response.
(See Appendix One, Item Sixteen.) Both statements were read
at the meeting of the Vigil, but it had been decided to continue
to honor the moratorium.

By the time of the Wednesday afternoon strategy session
there was a considerable amount of sentiment for escalation.
This ranged from a return to the quad and a hunger strike to
an occupation of Allen Building. It was also suggested that
the dining halls be closed totally. Less drastic measures
included having several hundred people request transcripts,
which would sufficiently hamper administrative operations.
At least one person at the meeting felt that we should go out-
side the university for publicity. One suggestion along this
line was to picket in front of the homes of the Trustees who live
nearby. Another was that we buy advertisements in major news-
papers.
Wednesday night on main quad about two thousand people gathered for a rally featuring Pete Seeger. Mr. Seeger has sung on campus several times and is quite popular. He usually is very calm and rarely gets worked up. On this night, however, he was vehemently critical of the press' reaction to the Vigil. (Coverage had been less than usual for a college demonstration of this size because it was orderly and peaceful.)

During the Thursday afternoon strategy session the "leaders" were raked over the coals for their "conservatism." The point was made that the university was being given an opportunity to respond to the pressure that had mounted and it was felt that any increased action would result in repression. This generated a discussion as to whether repression would be a bad thing. Most people seemed to feel at the time that it would. At least, the militants were convinced that this was true. It was announced that $1000 had been collected the night before for the strike fund. Dr. Blackburn reported that he was not the least bit optimistic about the Trustee Committee that was scheduled to meet Saturday. The students decided that if the workers were not represented at that meeting, they would walk out.

The entire faculty met Friday afternoon (See Appendix One, Item Seventeen) and endorsed the Blackburn Committee and collective bargaining.

Dr. Blackburn reported this to the Friday evening strategy session and said there was no chance for collective bargaining
at that time. He did feel, though, that there was a seventy-five percent chance of major damage to the University. This, he felt would come in the form of massive faculty resignation and student transfers. He did urge low-visibility, high pressure tactics such as having hundreds of students requesting transcripts. The members of his committee were there and echoed his opinions. Dr. Whelen added that the faculty felt that they had taken a giant step that day by endorsing collective bargaining. Dr. Colton felt that a boycott of classes would mean a severe loss of faculty support. The committee felt that the Trustees were bargaining in good faith and were not simply stalling. They added that they would resign from their positions on the committee if it became evident that the trustees were stalling.

All day Saturday the Trustees met with members of the faculty, workers, and students. At 7:00 (April 20) the statement from the Trustees was released. (See Appendix One, Item Eighteen) There was an atmosphere of general elation in the strategy session following the release of the statement, engendered most likely by the fact that there had been so little optimism. Everyone seemed to feel that we had won a significant victory. The statement issued by the group was the first one to reflect any cheer. (See Appendix One, Item Nineteen.)

As that statement says, the participants felt that the
University was finally moving in the right direction. Our methods had worked; we had proven that people with concern could effect rapid, progressive change. This attitude was reflected in the rally the next night which was actually a victory celebration. It was not too several weeks that we
realized that our election was somewhat premature and over-

Friday, May 10, there was a meeting of the student body to let us know that we were still there and it was mighty pleasant effective.

Throughout this time the Blackboard officers were as well, but
ey displayed no optimism. On Wednesday, May 15, while the
trustees were meeting, about three hundred people were gathered
on the quad. Again the board failed to come up with any

Plans were being made for a solo out during graduation exercises.
at the last minute, the day before graduation, the chancellor
announced that the Trustees had come up with a method whereby
campus policies affecting non-academic employees could not be
changed unless a special committee on which the employees were
represented agreed to it. We felt that this was a good step for the
and as it got in the idea of union agreements. There was no
indication, however, that the workers would accept this, in even more

swept into the summer with some progress made, with considerable
takes made in the attitudes in the University, but without any

infinite policy of collective bargaining.
From the time of the final statement of the trustees included her, until the end of school, it looked like they were simply stalling for summer when the majority of students would be scattered all over the world and could take no action against the University. On Friday, May 10, there was a boycott of the dining halls to let them know that we were still there. It was eighty percent effective. Throughout this time the Blackburn committee was at work, but they displayed no optimism. On Wednesday, May 15, while the Trustees were meeting, about three hundred people once more gathered on the quad. Again the Board failed to come up with a system of collective bargaining.

Plans were being made for a walk-out during graduation exercises, but at the last minute, the day before graduation, Dr. Blackburn announced that the Trustees had agreed to a method whereby policies hiring policies affecting non-academic employees could not be changed unless a special committee on which the employees were represented agreed to it. He felt that this was a good step forward as it got in the idea of binding agreements. There was no indication, however, that the workers would accept this, so events slipped into the summer with some progress made, with considerable changes made in the attitudes in the University, but without any definite policy of collective bargaining.
Appendix One

Luther King has been unjustly persecuted. The cause is between the promise of justice and the denial of freedom. His life and ministry are a testament to the power of love over hate. His teachings are as relevant today as they were then. Let us honor his memory and work towards a world where all of God's children are treated with respect and dignity.

We are all implicated in the racial conflict in the United States. It is a conflict that has been going on for generations. We must take responsibility for our actions and work towards a more just society. The life of a man who died only because he stood up for what is right is not in vain.

Not one man, woman, or child in the country should be deprived of any goal, denied dignity. A man's or woman's skin color or God made his skin does not make him separate.

We can redefine our nation's liberty, using the same principles that have guided our nation in the past. We can give Black citizens equal rights and dignity for Black citizens. We can do this every time we write a new citizen who believes in the principles of America, to move towards the following steps:

1. Observe the call for a national mourning in respect to Mr. King.

2. Write to your State's Members of Congress, such that we give the recognition due of the King's service. Enact legislation in Congress. Implement more advancements.

3. Write to your Senators, Members of Congress, that we recognize that the time for action is now, and that open housing legislation requires immediate passage.

4. Call city officials in the cities that they have greater demand for the advancements and principles of Dr. King's ministry.
SHALL DEMOCRACY ALSO DIE AT OUR HANDS

Dr. Martin Luther King has been murdered. Now we must choose between the promise of America the Free or a harvest of death and inhumanity which is the result of continued oppression of black Americans.

We are all implicated. We have allowed to flourish a society so disturbed by the idea of racial equality that it could take the life of a man who asked only freedom for his people, for humanity from his white brothers.

Not one man, woman, or child in the country should be kept from any goal, denied dignity, forced to go hungry because the color God made his skin does not please some of us.

We can refuse no longer. We ask that our fellow white citizens citizens save their own freedom by insisting upon absolute equality and dignity for black citizens now. We ask that every white citizen who believes in the promise of the American dream take the following steps:

1. Observe the call for a day of national mourning in respect for Dr. King;

2. Write or wire the President of the United States insisting that he give the recommendations of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders immediate priority by sending legislation to congress implementing those recommendations:

3. Write or wire your Senators and Congressmen saying that you recognize that the time for equality is now, and that open housing legislation requires immediate passage;

4. Call city officials insisting that they show greater concern for the grievances and problems of the black community.
Tonight we are gathered in this assembly to join together in a march as a memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. who spent his life advocating and [practicing] non-violence. Starting when he was twenty-five years old in Montgomery, Alabama, and for the next fourteen years until he was shot down by an assassin's bullet in Memphis, Tennessee just yesterday he [employed] this technique... to bring about specific objectives for the betterment of his community and for the community at large. Over and over again he make the point that what he was doing and what he was calling on all men to do was in fact... to change this country for the benefit of both black and white.

He said that the black man cannot be free until the white man is free. And so he fought the fight for us as well.

He said that those who are moderate are often times the most reluctant, and writing from the Birmingham jail he [said] "I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negroes' great stumbling block in his strive towards freedom is not the white citizen's council or the KKK but the white moderate who is more devoted to order than to justice." He prefers the negative peace which is the absence of tension to the positive peace which is the presence of justice." Martin Luther King called for justice and he called for you and me who probably are moderate... to walk in the rain for a long distance past dark woods to present a list of
grievances to the president of the university.

He spoke of his dream of freedom and refused to believe that the bank of justice was bankrupt. "We are gathered here tonight to express our conviction that he shall not have died in vain, that in fact the goals that he sought to achieve will be achieved, and that they will be achieved more rapidly that they were being achieved before his death.

Today a group of students met and after much discussion it was decided that we would march together to Dr. Knight's house to present him with a list of problems that he can deal with immediately. We ask him to act now in order that we can live up to the promises that this nation and this university have made. We must stand and let this moment be a witness to the fact that we are concerned that we take every step possible to end discrimination at Duke University and in this country.

Tonight we will ask President Knight to sign an advertisement to be placed in the Durham Morning Herald. Let me read this advertisement... We shall also ask President Knight to establish a committee of students, faculty, and workers to closely examine the situation as it effects the workers at Duke so that we can end discrimination here once and for all. We are also asking that President Knight establish as a first priority ahead of any building program the upgrading of our employee's salaries so that they receive what has been established as the national minimum wage for the vast majority of the jobs in
We are asking Dr. Knight to do this in order that the university can show in this time in history that in fact we are concerned and that the time is now for us to act. We have a responsibility to see in this community and in this city and in this country that the changes that are necessary are brought about so that John F. Kennedy's words in August 1963 will not be an epitaph: those who make peaceful revolutions impossible make violent revolutions inevitable. We have an opportunity to make the revolution which is necessary peaceful. This may be our last chance. Let us stand and act now.

Knight: "Yes, and you are invited to join us in the struggle. Ask of me, anything of you."

I ask some very specific questions.

Yes. Some of them are very specific questions. I ask to add there is a chance to have together at one time with all the people, in all the community, to speak. And that community's one way or another should have a chance to speak.

All of us are talking. I don't think it is quite fair for just one side to listen. Each of you need to speak, and each of you need to hear. And each of you need to think about how you can solve it. It can be done. Thank you, Dr. Knight, for your kind introduction.

I wish you all the very best. Thank you.
Dr. Knight speaking with group in his living room.

Friday April 5, 1968

(JOHN KINNEY INTRODUCED DR. KNIGHT OVER SHOUTS OF "HELL NO, WE WON'T GO!") "I BELIEVE DR. KNIGHT WOULD LIKE TO SAY SOMETHING."

Dr. Knight: "I do, but not in that atmosphere. And I assure you I've got no wish at all to be combative with you because I meant what I said outside [that he was just as upset as we were.] The same questions that torment us and tear us apart [will not be solved] by your operating as though you were a mob which I don't believe you are.

Shouts from the crowd: "But we're concerned...."

Dr. Knight: "Yes, and I'm concerned too. Here's what I'd like to ask of you. You came. You've expressed your concern this evening about some very specific things. I've got some concerns about those. Some of them I agree with; some of them I don't. But I want to add there is a chance to start articulating the concerns we have together at the memorial service tomorrow, where I am going to speak. And that doesn't mean one-way articulation....

All of us are...trying to find ways to keep our society together, [and] I don't think pushing one another is the answer to it even though you see a society where you feel all the horror of people who have pushed one another in the most brutal way. I don't think we can solve it here by pushing one another. I'm not setting out to push you. I don't want to feel that I myself am pushed and there-
fore say yes to this, this, this, and this. And I can tell you that I wouldn't be of any use to you or anybody else for very long.

What I should like to do is to speak tomorrow not only a little bit to the meaning of the abyss that we're all in -- I can't call it anything else. I'd like to suggest some of the concrete things that I feel that we have been doing in the university. I'd like to suggest some of the things we can do beyond it, if we don't try to meet the frustrations of this world with violence, either the pressure of numbers or the pressure of violent acts. I still believe there are some things we can do. I think they're crucial, but I think we've got to have enough order so that we can accomplish them.

And I'm asking you for the privilege of working those out together. The idea of a combined group to work on certain of them as hard as we can is a crucial idea. The idea of salaries for our employees that are as good as we can make them is a crucial idea.

I don't think you can deliver it to me as a mandate, however, an order, a demand. I think you have to understand how we try to do our best in the light of the other things we have to do in the university. And I'm not trying to pussyfoot with you. I'm just really feel that

I'd like a chance to work on these, but also I'd like the chance to include some other things that weren't on your list this evening, because I think there are some positive things in this community -- this inner community and this regional community -- that we can do,
that we can't ever do just by expressing our frustrations with what is.

I have felt that frustration and have felt it as much as you feel it. I did try to do something. I'm not saying this to justify myself, but I tried hard enough to do some of that in the Vietnamese puzzle. [He had signed a moderate "Negotiate Now" statement in the New York Times.] I finally went and talked with, had the privilege really, if you will let me put it that way, of talking with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense about some of the things you were feeling. And I don't think I'm one small person as you are, but I don't think it was useless talk because I was talking about what you and I felt and why we felt it.

I pray that some of the same things can be done with the fearful internal problems. I don't think they'll be done if we feel so violently toward one another that we can't either communicate or accomplish anything together."

Jack Boger: "Dr. Knight, we've come here tonight in non-violence. If I may be allowed to say one or two things to you in response.

I really feel that an old order has changed in the United States of America. I think that the tanks that are right now rumbling down the streets of Washington witness this change. And one of the things that we as young people will not allow in the future are institutions that...remain in a sense immoral.

Good men involved in all levels of Duke University somehow cannot take moral stands because of various forces seemingly beyond
anyone's control. This is what has put the violence in the streets tonight.

In this new order we have to stand up morally as institutions. We have to make stands that meet the situation at hand. We cannot face a situation in which the country is falling apart with 'maybes,' 'might happens in the future,' and 'we're very concerned.'

I have no doubt of your deep concern, but we have come here non-violently, as students of this university, to say we must do something important now. Duke University, we must do it now. We are non-violent, but we will not be moved."

[This was followed by wild applause and comments to the effect that we are asking no more of Dr. Knight than we were willing to give, and that we must make a "dramatic" stand.]

Dr. Knight: "I'd have to use a word out of my own generation to say that maybe a dramatic stand isn't as important as a determined and wise one that will in itself stand."

Jack Boger: "In the midst of great crises men of morality cannot afford to be bound by institutions that claim to be amoral."

Dr. Knight: "If I may, I'm simply trying to say to you that the way to take our action is not under this kind of pressure. I don't care whether you call it non-violent or not; it's pressure of the sort that makes it impossible to accomplish those things that you ask me to accomplish. And you must know that.

[Jon Kinney tried to intervene for Dr. Knight, but the group wanted to continue with the discussion. The question was raised]
about his membership in the country club.

"I'd have to say to you that I hadn't looked upon that as the important issue, nearly as important as the chance to work with members of my community who may not see the matter of country club membership as you do. To cut myself off from that I haven't seen and don't see as a wise thing.

[A question was raised about the wages and whether or not they were more important than buildings.]

"To get quite specific, those salaries have gone up fifty percent in the last five years.... The money does not come from the same source [as buildings.] The money for faculty salaries does, and I don't think that's an immoral or an amoral position to take. We not only have worked at it, we intend to go on working at it. It's perfectly clear to me that this has to be as high a priority as anything in the university. I can't say to you that this is the one thing we do to the exclusion of everything else. It would not be true, and it would not be fair to the whole place...."

[Jon Kinney reversed his previous stand and intervened for Dr. Knight, but talked about staying and letting Dr. Knight go to bed.]

Bob Conroy, announcer for WDBS asked Dr. Knight as he was leaving, "Would you comment on your course of action should the students decide to stay?"

Dr. Knight: "I certainly don't feel that removing them by force is an answer to our problem. Yes, they may stay."

Dr. Knight was asked if the coeds could sign out for his house. [Many had signed out by phone which is legal, but one of the East
Campus deans had stated that they could not do that.] and replied, I assume if you signed out properly you signed out properly."

1968, after extensive discussion.

Moved:

1. That the precedent of an annual increment to the faculty salary be suspended for the forthcoming fiscal year, 1968-69, that the resultant saving be considered to the budget of the non-academic employees for the raising of their minimum wage to a more equitable sum than the present remuneration.

Further, that the Divinity School faculty is prepared to be advised by the central administration officers concerning alternative fiscal ways to achieve the purpose above stated in the interest of the largest benefit to the causes in question. Each member of the Divinity School faculty should individually, give notice to the Dean of his willingness or unwillingness to participate.

That, further, the Divinity School faculty requests the Dean to give notice of this action to the President and Provost of the University, and to inform the Chairman and Executive Committee of the Academic Council, the Deans of the other faculties, and chairmen of departments of the University of this action.

That, further, the Dean is requested to form an Ad Hoc committee of the faculty to assist him in determining wise and feasible procedures for proper notice to the persons above named.
The following action was unanimously adopted by the faculty of the Divinity School at its regular monthly meeting April 8, 1968, after extensive discussion.

Moved:

1. That the precedent of an annual increment to the faculty salary be suspended for the forthcoming fiscal year, 1968-69, that the resultant saving be transferred to the budget of the non-academic employees for the raising of their minimum wage to a more equitable sum than the present remuneration. Further, that the Divinity School faculty is prepared to be advised by the central administration officers concerning alternative fiscal ways to achieve the purpose above stated in the interest of the largest benefit to the cause in question. Each member of the Divinity School faculty should, individually, give notice to the Dean of his willingness or unwillingness to participate.

2. That, further, the Divinity School faculty requests the Dean to give notice of this action to the President and Provost of the University, and to inform the Chairman and Executive Committee of the Academic Council, the Deans of the other faculties, and chairmen of departments of the University of this action.

a. That, further, the Dean is requested to form an ad hoc committee of the faculty to assist him in determining wise and feasible procedures for proper notice to the persons above named.

Hans. J. Hillerbrand
Secretary to the Faculty
The Divinity School
I join you in your sorrow at the loss of a great American, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King dedicated his life to the cause of human dignity. His death must serve to reaffirm the moral commitment of all Americans to achieve that end.

Eugene J. McCarthy

I join with you in mourning Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and I applaud your efforts to honor him by personal commitment in the Durham community. With the tragic death of Dr. King our nation has suffered a terrible loss. It is now our common responsibility to demonstrate the justice to stand up for fair treatment for all Americans. By your action in support of the employees of the university who seek recognition for their bargaining rights you set a standard that all should emulate. By your action now you worked to improve the lives of those employees. By our common efforts we will work to improve the lives of all Americans.

Robert F. Kennedy

Your sensitive and well conceived effort in behalf of human rights has lead to a growing awareness of the problems
which confront many communities in our nation. It is only through
such commitments as yours, along with the dedication to finding
solutions to these problems, that they can and will be resolved.

Nelson A. Rockefeller

Robert L. Lovett

The Divinity School
Yale University

[ A statement appeared in regional papers a few weeks later,
claiming that no one in Governor Rockefeller's office knew
anything about this telegram. After some investigation with the
cooperation of Western Union, it was found that the telegram
had in fact come from the governor's New York office.]
An Address on Occasion of a Memorial Service

In Duke University Chapel

April 9, 1968

By

Robert E. Cushman, Dean

The Divinity School, Duke University

Members of the University Community:

It is now nine score and seven years ago that "our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." So Lincoln pointed to the corner-stone of American democracy.

Was not the anguish of Lincoln's years that he lived in a time when a perilous contradiction had become acute between the dedication of the nation and its actual practice? But is it not true that, in an altered form and context, a like contradiction has become both our vexation and our anguish? Is not this the real reason for our assembly today? Do we resort to this place today to confess that this is so? What is the power of this recent event to galvanize with almost unprecedented strength the emotions (albeit contrary ones) of a whole people? Is it that in various and sundry ways we have been at odds with ourselves and that the murder of a wholly dedicated man has proved it beyond any power of ours to deceive ourselves longer? Is this the reason why a noted local citizen is reported this morning to have said we can no longer endure a "dual society"?

This is Holy Week! What a passing strange coincidence! Ever since last Thursday night I have been haunted by the words: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." And there is added: "Ye are my friends, if you do whatsoever I command you!" Is it possible that Martin Luther King accepted the friendship of Christ and, thereby, became a friend to all? Is it possible, by some strange providence, that there is a cruciform character in his life and death and that this Holy Week is hallowed by Martin Luther King's valiant effort to resolve the contradiction in American life between the principle of its dedication and maxims of its practice? I do not claim to know. I would not venture to prove it. But I am deeply impressed by the visible signs of an upwelling response of a great people and a suddenly galvanized re-commitment to the principle of dedication on which Lincoln said the nation is founded.

If I am not mistaken, this is the underlying ground of current student and faculty action, this re-commitment. It takes almost complete shock at times to jar us awake to the contrariety in our lives and our manner of
living. The resolution of the contrariety releases powers, slumbering and unsuspected, and devotes us to causes previously viewed with indifference or disdain. And one of the questions before Americans in this hour is whether they will allow themselves really to be converted.

But, withal the admirable qualities of "the expulsive power of a new affection," there is a great need for us to see to it that the newly released powers are properly mated to the ends they may advance and serve. Powers not governed by ends, and consonant with them, may easily be harmful and actually obstructive to the vision that has lately dawned and the ends that have been crystallized. Yet, the newly engendered resolve is to be honored and cherished. It is to be respected and nurtured. Yet the implementation of vision requires both patience and a willingness to let the healing powers of the new motivation alter the conditions of our life without willfulness, vengeance, or anarchy. Healthful change requires, in a society so complex as ours, or in a university so complex as ours, time for a nest of negotiations. And peaceful negotiation is the way of democracy, for it makes way for change while it preserves freedom.

So I think that no small part of the greatness of Martin Luther King was this: In him the vision and the end were properly mated with the use of powers - powers suited to the ends he had in view. He affirmed means and, quite recently, stubbornly reaffirmed those means that comported well with the democratic principle he affirmed. He was a man of vision. He was a young man who dreamed dreams. Not long ago he said:

"I HAVE A DREAM THAT ONE DAY THIS NATION WILL RISE UP AND LIVE OUT THE TRUE MEANING OF ITS CREED: 'WE HOLD THESE TRUTHS TO BE SELF EVIDENT, THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL.' I HAVE A DREAM THAT MY FOUR LITTLE CHILDREN WILL ONE DAY LIVE IN A NATION WHERE THEY WILL NOT BE JUDGED BY THE COLOR OF THEIR SKIN BUT BY THE CONTENT OF THEIR CHARACTER. I HAVE A DREAM THAT ONE DAY EVERY VALLEY SHALL BE EXALTED, EVERY HILL AND MOUNTAIN SHALL BE MADE LOW, THE ROUGH PLACES WILL BE MADE PLAIN, AND THE CROOKED PLACES WILL BE MADE STRAIGHT, AND THE GLORY OF THE LORD SHALL BE REVEALED AND ALL FLESH SHALL SEE IT TOGETHER. THIS IS OUR HOPE."

In commentary, the Editor of the Divinity School Response wrote last Friday these words:

"Martin Luther King led his people in search of their promised land. It is a tribute to democracy that he believed he could find it here, and it is a tragedy that for many of us his dream became our nightmare . . . . but he was one of those men of vision who demanded of democracy its potential."
The Editor of *Response* is right: Martin Luther King had a *dream*. He was "one of those men of vision who demanded of democracy its potential." If so, then indeed he stood in the tradition of Lincoln. He saw clearly that the issue confronting American life was contradiction with its own heart and core. It was founded on equality of humanity and opportunity, but it has paid lip service to and withheld full commitment to its own creed.

Dr. Neal Hughley was wholly right the other day when he urged that it was the American dream, the struggle for American justice, for human justice throughout the world, that impelled Dr. King's crusade. It was not the struggle of blacks versus whites that animated his campaign but the integrity and agreement of the American spirit with itself. He called upon America to be at one with itself. He sought a reconciliation between the principle and the practice of American life. So he takes his place, I believe, among the seers and prophets of moral integrity. He calls upon all men to be no more at odds with themselves, but to realize and fulfill their true humanity. In this respect, it is surely true that Martin Luther King "demanded of democracy its potential."

Perhaps it is true, as the Editor of *Response* said, "it is a tragedy that for many of us his dream became our nightmare." For some it may be so, for some it may continue to remain only a nightmare, the nightmare of a tortured conscience. For others it has already been a restoration. For some it has been a rebirth of conscience, and this rebirth is the hope of America. The resurrection of conscience is the hope of the fulfillment of the American dream, the wedding of principle and practice. If America is sick, it is not for want of material resources but of a moribund conscience and a divided soul. Let us pray that, passing through this Good Friday of the spirit, the Easter that is upon us may be the resurrection of the American dream.

Martin Luther King - as I understand his faith, his dream, and his gospel-beckons America to a recovery of its inner concord, of unanimity between the principle to which it was dedicated and the practice to which it must be committed. "I have a dream," he said, "that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed."

This can become a truly Holy Week for us if we will unite ourselves to his dream and claim his vision for our own. If our lives can be galvanized by this cause, we will have done something more than "emote" with the time. We will have participated in a rebirth of conscience and a resurrection of the American spirit. Then we shall keep faith with the dream of Lincoln and of Martin Luther King.

Nine score and seven years ago "our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Of this master statement Martin Luther King's words will probably remain the greatest interpretation of the 20th century - written in his own blood: "I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed."

Men and women: it is up to us with God's help! Amen.
The Interfraternity Council of Duke University, representing over 45% of the West Campus student body, supports the spirit of the silent vigil for Dr. Martin Luther King. Last night we promised that, "the individual fraternities would consider immediately the specific demands of the student vigil in their fraternity meetings."

We have voted in our individual fraternities and can now openly support and seek the resolutions of the following goals:

1. We support the Durham Morning Herald advertisement to publicly reassure our commitment to the community.

2. That Dr. Knight press for $1.60 minimum wage for Duke employees.

3. We support the establishment of a committee with representatives from all sectors of the University community to seek a democratic solution to Duke's labor problems.

Furthermore, the Council of Presidents advocates that Dr. Knight reconcile his membership in Hope Valley Country Club to be consistent with his previous statement on segregated facilities.

The Interfraternity Council, as a representative political body, through its President will exert its influence in every channel to press for the accomplishment of these goals.

We also donate $250.00 to the strike fund, and recommend that this donation be continued each year for a need in the Durham community.
I went to the funeral of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., yesterday as an official representative of the University, and I have been asked to say a word or two about my experience. That I am delighted to do.

Just as it is hard to believe that Martin Luther King is dead, it is equally difficult to believe that a movement for social justice and equality, a movement to create the beloved community, is alive at Duke. The light from your candle, I can assure you, is reducing the darkness in the world. This is a great moment! Like Martin Luther King, my eyes, physically now, have some vision of the glory of the coming of social justice to this University and country, because of you. Martin Luther King would call you drum majors and majorettes for justice and humanity, and great witnesses for the beloved community.

I do not know if you fully realize the ultimate significance of what you are doing. I haven’t seen anything like it. I have been involved in quite a few civil rights activities in my life, but I haven’t seen anything anywhere comparable to this. You would expect of course the victims of oppression to sacrifice, to take the hot sun, to take the rain, to sleep at night in the open and cold air, to expose their health, to do everything possible to remove the yoke of oppression and injustice. But you do not expect people born of privilege to undergo this kind of harsh treatment.
This is one of the things I think will help to redeem this country and help to create the beloved community. This is magnificent. You are making profound history.

Congratulations on your intelligence, your determination, your total commitment, your dignity, your good faith. Your methods are as noble as your goals. When 15, 20, 25 years from now you see your life pass in review, when you see a play-back of your existence, you are going to be mighty proud of what you are doing now. You are going to know in your hearts that you make a profound contribution to the transformation of the institutions and quality of American culture. Sacrifice yourself for humanity—that is what the greatest ethical teachers of all ages and cultures have exhorted. Herein is the supreme significance of what you are doing: you are sacrificing for humanity. You are finding yourselves by losing yourselves in the needs, aspirations, and just demands of your fellows.

Our cause is right. Make no mistake and have no doubts about it. The University Administration has taken the wrong side of a great moral issue. In so doing, it is compromising its leadership—moral in intellectual—in education and the community, locally, regionally, nationally. You are standing for the highest good and the public’s interest. Duke’s interest cannot be different from that of justice and equality and freedom—the best in the American tradition.

The intransigence of whoever is running this University is typical of the insensitivity, pretension, and moral arrogance of
men of power. Somehow, they are blind to the deeper dimensions of the problem. But this in an old story of the struggle of men to be free in opposition to the existing structure. Men of power are rarely men of great ethical and humanistic vision.

The only thing I have to say about my experience at Dr. King's funeral is that your commitment and behavior have made the occasion more bearable, ethically meaningful, and less tragic. As I saw, from afar, the casket containing his lifeless body, I was sustained by the knowledge of a thousand or more bodies, full of life, vision, and integrity, here carrying on his legacy in the spirit and in conformity with his ideals and methods. I was uplifted by the fact that you had made his mission your very own. And I am sure that Martin Luther King would be proud of you—mighty proud of you. Your vigil wiped my tears and helped to sustain me. You provided, at a tragic moment, roses for my soul.

What is involved in this movement is the character of America's future, the quality and kind of society we are to have. Are we to have a free and open society or are we to have chaos and confusion and continuous social disorders? What we are witnessing with reference to the curfew is something of police state methods, and they are going to increase unless America solves the race problem.

A few minutes after the assassination of Dr. King the other night a great soul, Dr. John Strange, came to our house. "Sam," inquired John, "how much more can you take? Can you take any more? Haven't you had enough?" I reflected. In a split second, my
mind roamed over the tragic pilgrimage of my people since 1619. I wanted to give a religious answer—in the tradition of the faith of my fathers. I couldn't. How could I say anything in the name of God, when Martin Luther King, a good man and great soul, had been assassinated? I struggled over alternatives. But that did not satisfy me. I have been haunted by John's probing question.

John Strange, I think I have the answer now. I can go on affirming life; I and other Negroes can go on hoping and believing in the promise of America. We can go on believing that we are going to be free someday because of people like you and all other members of this magnificent vigil. This provides hope and succor for my spirit. You are helping to create that kind of community, where, in the days ahead after this long and tragic night of racial separation and misunderstanding you and I, white and black together, can shout from the mountain top and the valleys of our innermost being and way what is inscribed on Martin Luther King's grave: "We all are free at last. Free at last. Thank God Almighty, we are Free at last."

[Additional text not fully transcribed]
STATEMENT TO STUDENTS OF DUKE UNIVERSITY

By Wright Tisdale,
Chairman, Board of Trustees

April 10, 1968

Good afternoon. I am Wright Tisdale, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of this University. I am here because Dr. Knight's health is such as to make it strongly inadvisable for him to be present.

I think you all know that he suffered a case of hepatitis last fall. His schedule in recent weeks has exceeded any reasonable limits for anyone recovering from that illness. I understand that the normal recovery period continues for at least one year, and sometimes much longer. During that period both fatigue and stress must be avoided. Failure to do this involves serious risk. Dr. Knight is crucially important to this University. He is now in the Duke Hospital. His condition is a matter of deep concern to his doctors as well as ourselves. I am sure that you, too, must share this feeling.

This is a time of great national concern over many long-existing problems in our society—a time of national turmoil.

I realize your deep concern with respect to the human issues which have now so intensely been brought into focus, both here and elsewhere. I personally share this concern with you. Our nation is in the throes of great trouble and we who care must work much harder than we have in the past to solve the problems we face. Duke University has its own responsibilities in this effort. Now let me comment on the requests you have made of President Knight. I think the central and most important issue with which we are faced and one to which we must respond is the financial situation of our non-academic employees.

We recognized in 1965 that we should move forward with our non-academic employees. Since 1966 we have increased wages an average of nearly 20 percent, shortened work weeks, improved fringe benefits, liberalized overtime provisions, and implemented training programs to upgrade employee skills, thereby increasing individual opportunity. I cite these as evidence of our own desire to improve the well-being and financial status of our non-academic employees.

One of your requests to Dr. Knight was that he press for the $1.60 minimum wage for Duke employees. I know that he is just as interested in such a wage as you are. And so am I.

The present Federal minimum wage for most business and commercial organizations is $1.60. For universities and colleges, however, it is $1.15 and will not go to the $1.60 figure until 1971—almost three years from now. We will be at the $1.60 minimum rate by July 1, 1969 and we shall make a significant step toward this by July 1, 1968. This is going to cost a great amount of money. As a practical matter this will require increased income and a re-examination of many of our operations.
President Knight in his Chapel address on last Saturday spoke of the ap-
pointment of a Committee to consider--and I quote--"those developments
which will serve us best in this great University." The membership and scope
of that committee will be determined by President Knight upon his return to
his office.

The other requests you presented to Dr. Knight are of a personal nature, and
can be answered only by him.

Now let me return briefly to my earlier comments. I am sure that at this
time of personal anguish and national turmoil, Duke University has a special
role to play. I want it to fulfill this role, and to realize its capacities
for leadership. This, I am sure, is also your hope. We cannot achieve this
promise divided among ourselves. But we can together. I am confident that
we can find ways to work together with mutual confidence and respect.
Six days ago four hundred gathered together for the first time in an attempt to express their sorrow at the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and to take some action [that would] show this community and this nation that indeed there still was hope that men could live in racial harmony. Many things have been wrought in this past week — things not believed possible one week ago today. Today the Congress of the United States passed a fair housing law. Second, this group has been assembled ... and has grown steadily larger as a witness to our concern for our university and for our country. We have also spurred to action those employees of the university who have not received what they feel to be adequate payment for their labor.

We have seen gathered together on this quadrangle representatives from the black community in Durham who have said it is no longer possible to work with whitey, and yet they have come to say [that] even though [they] are proud to be black, [they] are also proud of you.

We have seen a movement, a fellowship of students, start here on this campus, a movement that must not end, for there are many more things to be accomplished, many more injustices to be corrected. There is the matter of open housing in Durham. There is the matter of registration of voters and ... of legislative votes....

Also seen take place on this campus is a true education,
an education of the student body, of the faculty, of the workers, and of the trustees — an education which will long remain with [us]...

And I think that the most important thing that has happened here at Duke is that this student body assembled in a [demonstration] unlike any others which have occurred on campuses throughout this country. [We] have taken a stand on the moral issues of our time rather than on some selfish interest.... on some...

I think... We have [also] seen a commitment made by this university to meet the federal minimum wage some nineteen months before they would have to according to federal law — even at great cost to the university.

So we have accomplished much in these last days, and yet there is much still to be accomplished, and we must work, study, and [discuss] how best to achieve the goals set forward, and the larger goals for which we are gathered, the goals of true equality, not just financial, but equality in all senses for all mankind.
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ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Minutes of the Called Meeting

April 10, 1968

A called meeting of the Academic Council was held in the Auditorium of the Engineering School Building at 4:00 p.m. on April 10. Professor Cartwright called the meeting to order at 4:00, a quorum of 31 members then being present. In the next few minutes, between 50 and 55 of the Academic Council assembled in the first three rows of the Auditorium. The meeting was attended by some 350-400 members of the faculty. The Council voted to dispense with the minutes of the last meeting.

Mr. Cartwright apologized for the short notice of this meeting. He then announced that the meeting had been called in connection with the current crisis on campus, and he reviewed the events of the last few days. The crisis began, he said, when a group of students moved into University House and refused to leave, having been invited by President Knight to be his guests. Friday and Saturday were occupied with the delicate negotiations of getting the students out of the house. In these negotiations, the Executive Committee of the Council was not involved. Mr. Cartwright did not attempt to get in touch with the Administration in this matter, because he felt that there was no useful service that the Council could render. This year—unhappily always in time of crisis—he has been called many times by the President or his representative, and he was indeed telephoned mid-morning Sunday April 7 at his residence. He went across the street to a meeting of the Provost, Vice- Presidents Huestis and Ashmore, and the deans of the undergraduate colleges. He talked with this group for about an hour and a half and then spent an equal time assembling the members of the Executive Committee, who met from 3:30 to 6:00 in session with this body.

The deliberations of the session, he felt, should be kept in confidence. The Executive Committee met immediately thereafter to consider whether or not to call an emergency session of the Council. We were convinced at that time that the crisis was on its way to solution and that only details of housekeeping were now left to do. We expected the President to be back at his desk Monday afternoon; we expected a statement from him at that time. Any advance action taken by the Council, we felt, could not be helpful. Mr. Cartwright added that he had not been involved in discussions with the Administration since Monday.

Since Monday, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and other trustees have been in Durham. Mr. Cartwright talked with the Provost several times on Tuesday; he believed then that a statement would be made that day. When he discovered that a statement would not be made, he resolved to call a meeting of the Council. On conferring with the members of the Executive Committee, it was decided that it
should be a meeting open to the faculty. He reminded the members of the faculty that in accordance with long-standing custom of the Council, faculty members do not vote but may speak after Council members have spoken.

On Tuesday evening, Mr. Cartwright had a long conversation with the Provost. Mr. Cartwright was informed a little less than an hour ago that Mr. Tisdale would read a statement at 4:00. He was then informed that the statement had been prepared and would be read at 4:30. He was given a copy of that statement, but it could not be read in this Council before it was read before the student body. He had talked also with Mr. Ashmore, and the following arrangements had been made. The President's secretary is now standing in the window. Mrs. Mims will call as soon as she sees Mr. Tisdale begin to speak, and the Council will hear the statement at the same time as do the students. Mr. Cartwright added that he had heard a rumor just a moment ago that there would be a change in plans.

Mr. Cartwright was then interrupted by a messenger, and withdrew, Professor Hobbs taking the chair.

Professor Ferguson asked if it could be confirmed that the curfew would be set at 12:00 tonight instead of 7:00. Professor Horn (Zoology) replied that he had indeed heard such an official notice and that the curfew would be lifted at 5:00 a.m. He added that the liquor stores would be open tomorrow. The Secretary asked Professor Bradley (Religion) if he had an announcement to make; Mr. Bradley replied that he just heard that the Civil Rights Bill had been passed in Washington. [Applause.]

Professor Hamilton (History) expressed his solicitude as to the health of the President and requested a member of the medical staff to make a report. Professor Anlyan rose to reply that the President had been hospitalized today and that his condition was worse. The President's calendar had been cleared for six months following his August illness, and it is only fair to say, the Dean continued, that the President had returned to work prematurely in October. As many of you know, it is highly unlikely that you ever get rid entirely of the illness that he has had. After the President returned to work, he was within a month back on a full schedule. On examination of his schedule for the eight days prior to the student demonstration, it was observed that the President had had a killer schedule of 18-19 hours a day. After these eight arduous days, he was near collapse. For medical reasons we felt that he should not participate further in the deliberations. Despite seclusion and total rest, it became necessary to hospitalize the President today.

Mr. Cartwright resumed the Chair and thanked Professor Anlyan, assuring him that he spoke for the Council when he said that our hearts and thoughts were with the President in his illness. Mr. Cartwright then announced that changes were still being made in the statement and that it would be read between 4:45 and 5:15. He
had therefore no longer a valid statement in his pocket.

Mr. Cartwright continued that he felt an obligation to the members of the Council to have done as much thinking as possible on this matter, and he thought and re-thought a draft resolution—what I thought a professor should write. This draft has been submitted to members of the Executive Committee and various changes have been made in it by them. If there would be no objection to distributing this resolution (which is very hastily mimeographed and in insufficient quantity I regret) I would like to distribute it. There was no objection. After the distribution of the statement, Mr. Cartwright read his resolution for the benefit of those who had not received one.

A university is often defined as a community of scholars, and it must be such a community if it is to carry out its purposes in learning and research. But a university cannot carry out those purposes if it disregards justice and morality in the larger community in which it operates or in the non-academic community within its own bounds. It is recognized that President Knight and his associates have made great contributions toward achieving fairness in many matters relating to the University community, but to the extent that Duke University has neglected some of its responsibility in these matters, it must improve its practice.

In his remarks at the memorial services for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., on April 6, President Knight made statements indicating that actions directed toward such improvement would be taken very soon. We are deeply appreciative to him for making these statements. One said that Duke University and North Carolina College might be brought together for mutual support, understanding, and furtherance of common duty. We ask that the University take immediate steps toward this end, and we pledge our support to the endeavor.

The President also expressed the hope that Duke University might work with our community as never before in urgent common concern for the solution of pressing, persistent, long-standing problems that affect the lives of each of us. We ask that the University take action to convert this hope into reality. The University already contributes much to the larger community through activities in medicine. It is seeking to do more. We wish to see that seeking intensified. It contributes some through education and is seeking to contribute more. We wish to see that seeking intensified. It is studying the possibility of cooperation in the area of recreation. We wish to see such cooperation established. We wish for exploration of additional ways in which the University can contribute to the larger community as it carries out its unique functions as a university. It contributes much to the community in an economic sense but there are inequities within the University. We ask that the University correct the inequities among its non-academic employees as soon as possible.
There is a specific matter of community relationship that we want to emphasize. The time has passed, if it ever existed, when a true university could practice, much less condone, racial discrimination. We recognize and appreciate the progress that has been made in this regard. The University eliminated race as a consideration for admission several years ago. More recently, it forbade campus organizations to use segregated facilities. But more needs to be done. While we recognize that there are many aspects of private life that a university cannot and should not control, we express the hope that all members of the University community, having searched their consciences, will refuse to use segregated facilities.

It has been suggested that within the University we could bring together a group broadly representative of University interests, including faculty members, to take thought of those developments which will serve us best in this great University. We ask that the University proceed with dispatch to establish such a representative group and that one of its charges be that already made by the Academic Council to a committee mandated by it—to determine the adequacy of the relationship between the University and its non-academic employees and to report its findings together with any recommendations that it might see fit to make. If it does so, the Academic Council will suspend its activities with regard to this matter and will follow the University activities eagerly, looking to a report of both information and action.

The actions requested above are of great concern to the Academic Council. They are necessary to the University. The Council hopes and trusts that the University will carry them out through mutual effort among those in all its parts.

Carrying out the actions specified above must not prevent the University from continuing its unique functions: teaching, learning, and the pursuit of truth. The University must be a community of scholars. Teaching, learning, and research are its essential endeavors. Accordingly, the Academic Council urges all faculty members and students to resume their responsibilities: to return to their classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

Professor Hobbs moved the adoption of this resolution. It was seconded, and Mr. Cartwright announced that the matter was open for discussion.

Mr. Cartwright continued that at his request both Provost Cole and Assistant Provost Lewis were present, and he hoped that they would comment. It had seemed Mr. Cole would be unable to attend because he had been at a meeting called by the Mayor, but he was pleased to see that he had been able to join us. Mr. Cartwright reminded the members of the faculty of the long-standing rule that members of the faculty at open meetings of the Council do not vote, but participate in the discussion. He then asked for comment by members of the Council.
Professor Krueger asked if there would be any comment from individual participants in the Vigil who might be present now. He noted that one document said that students would press for $1.60 wage and another that the $1.60 wage be given first priority. He asked that there might be some clarification of what is the sense of the Vigil on this point. Professor Graham (History) announced that this had developed during the course of the Vigil, and the students would now like $1.60 to be the item of first priority.

Professor Baker (Surgery) called attention to the last two lines of the first page of the resolution; he expressed the concern that the principle of integrated facilities would invade the privacy of an individual's home. [Sounds of dissent.] Mr. Cartwright: Now look, this is not a group who hisses and boos. This is the Faculty of Duke University. [Applause.]

Provost Cole regretted that he was unequipped to answer specific questions on this matter, having been in meetings in the city this afternoon, but he could say that the Executive Committee of [The Trustees of] the University has been in session, and that the $1.60 minimum has been given and will be given particular attention.

Professor Watson observed one matter that had been of concern to him: There has not been continuous communication on the part of the Administration with the Academic Council or with the student leaders. Such communication is of tremendous significance. If communication with the faculty is not offered, this Council should make every effort to establish it. It is the only organization of the faculty that is properly equipped to do so. Such communication has been possible through the SFAC. The SFAC agenda has been overwhelmingly overburdened. If the statement of the Chairman of the Board of Trustees does not settle the matter, Mr. Watson said, he would like to see some arrangement whereby the leaders could sit down and talk together. Mr. Cartwright replied: To the extent that he had knowledge, there has been no contact between the students and the Academic Council. On Sunday afternoon there was full contact between the Executive Committee and the Administration, and while we were in session, members of the Administration were simultaneously meeting with the student leaders. Mr. Cole continued that there had been continuous contact with the student leaders on an informal basis. All of us, he continued, would have preferred more. The chief concern of the Administration during these days, however, has been that of security, and such considerations have had to take priority. He would have been willing to take other steps, but there were many threats and warnings received by telephone which had to be considered.

The Provost said that he had come straight from a meeting at the City Hall. He was not apologizing for his lack of information, but he did feel very strongly the need for maximum communication. Reasons of state have played a very important part.

Mr. Cartwright reported that he had been in continuous communication with the Provost, the chief academic officer of the University, and he did tell the Provost that whatever group was meeting to decide these matters should seek faculty consultation before any decision.
was reached. The Provost passed this message on. Mr. Cartwright observed that the Provost was a wonderful man to deal with.

Professor Blackburn asked if we might be informed of the names of the persons in the decision-making body. Mr. Cole replied all of the Administrative officers and the Academic Deans; there was enough responsibility, he said, to share in several directions. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees has been meeting since 9:00 a.m. today, and any statement to be made will be authorized by that Board. Mr. Blackburn continued that in the absence of the President the appropriate officer to make such a statement is the Provost. He was curious why the Provost was not making the statement, and he put the question specifically to Mr. Cole. Mr. Cole replied that if the statement, as he supposed, does contain a substantial attention to wage minima, there is only one body that could speak with authority on it. If the Provost were to speak on this matter, he would have to speak with the full support of the Executive Committee of the Board. Mr. Cartwright replied that he did convey to the Provost the view that the faculty believed he was the appropriate officer of the University.

Professor Alexander (Psychology) rose for a point of information. Did the Administration ask that the Trustees come to the campus and decide this matter? Mr. Cartwright: I do not know. Mr. Cole: The Chairman of the Board arrived in Durham before other members of the Executive Committee. He offered his services but did not impose them. There was a mutuality of opinion as to the advantage of the presence of the Chairman of the Board. There are now, said Mr. Cole, several unanswered calls to members of the Board on my desk. It would have been presumptuous, he continued, to take any action without having tried to get the fullest advice and consultation. The Chairman offered such consultation. His presence was a mutually acceptable arrangement.

Professor Tiryakian spoke in reference to a point in the paragraph at the top of page 2: what is the situation with regard to the Committee of the Academic Council referred to? Mr. Cartwright replied that the Committee has been able to do no work because there has been no Committee. He had spent 12 hours and talked to seven persons whom he and the Executive Committee had considered knowledgeable and unbiased. I don’t have a Chairman, he said, and I felt that I could not begin to name a Committee without first having the Chairman of it. The Executive Committee has made up a list of people whom it considers acceptable for committee membership. Some said that the job could not be done without free time and a professional staff. I have not given up. It was our intention that the Presidential Committee, when it was formed, would absorb the Council Committee. I can only report, he concluded, a lack of progress after considerable effort.

Professor Jenkins remarked that she was glad that Mr. Tiryakian had asked that question. She has already told some of her students that the Committee is in action. Miss Jenkins said that she believed in civil rights, but she believed also in the human right for a man to be in his own house without being invaded. The students' cause is good, but in certain ways the students are hurting themselves.
What they did in Mr. Knight's house—and I understand that they conducted themselves very well and orderly—but the manner in which they asked what is in effect an ultimatum smacks of fascism. [Applause.]

Professor Krantz (History) rose to reply and described the events leading to the assembly. The movement began in a memorial march to Knight's house. Those organizing the march assumed that 30 people might turn out; in fact 350 came. Their demands were formerly requests, but they have now hardened into four demands: 1) the resignation of Mr. Knight from Hope Valley Country Club as the President of the University; 2) a hope for quick action on the $1.60 minimum wage (though this point was not being presented immediately); 3) the formation of a Committee to look into the matter of collective bargaining; 4) that the University take prompt action on open housing. All of these things have to be seen in the context of the death of Martin Luther King. These are days of tremendous crisis. The demands of the students have been supported by 20 faculty members who have associated themselves with them and by the 1400 students who slept on the quadrangle; 3,000 [sic] Law School students marched in a body to the quadrangle to support those individuals. All wish to give an earnest for the creation of a just humane society. Mr. Krantz disputed the term fascist as inappropriate. The students went to Mr. Knight's house because they liked Mr. Knight. They respectfully asked him if he would consider these requests. These students are not the beardos and weirdos—these are the solid, clean Duke Students that hoped sincerely that Mr. Knight would give an earnest of his intentions to agree to these requests. After the students had been in the house many hours discussing the requests with Mr. Knight, he said he was tired and could no longer talk with them. He then invited them to stay the night. They asked a tremendous thing, and their requests became demands. Six days have now gone by since the death of Dr. King, Mr. Krantz continued. I want to give you my views on the matter. The four points are what we should be addressing ourselves to. Professor Strange, who is now with the students, has made the statement that the students will not accept Mr. Tisdale's statement until the faculty acts. What do we do as a faculty in this crisis? This is a moment when we must confront the demand to define what we are as individuals and as a faculty. A moment of great crisis, great crisis that is what I would like to communicate. [Ovation.]

Miss Jenkins rose to thank Mr. Krantz for clarification. The students are not fascists—there's is another generation. If they understood the great issue, they would understand also that they could be supported only up to a point.

Professor Colton requested some elucidation of the paragraph at the top of page 2. He raised this question because one question which he has heard recently is where has the faculty been? There is an opportunity now to transform the Academic Council into some form of body which can be heard, and through which the voice of the faculty can be heeded. [Applause.] Mr. Cartwright replied that he hardly knew what he should say; this year the Academic Council has been consulted
as never before, generally in a time of crisis. This is not the first such summons.

Professor Livingstone observed that in time of crisis it is essential not to be carried away. He sympathized with Mr. Knight's refusal to resign from the Hope Valley Country Club. He sympathized because he had himself faced a similar situation. When invited to join the faculty of Duke University, many reasons told him not to go, but he decided to come to this University because, if everybody stayed away, Duke University would never be an integrated University. He worried also about the demands for conformity. The school systems in many communities are singularly conformist and require their teachers to conform, but individuals must be allowed to make choices themselves. Mr. Knight does not belong to the Country Club as the President of the University. He is faced with the problem of securing funds to operate the University. I think, Mr. Livingstone continued, that a President who did not belong to a country club where such funds were available would be derelict in his duty. Mr. Livingstone hoped finally that the Academic Council would not insist that Mr. Knight resign. There are enough good things to be done that we do not need to do this bad one.

Professor Baker (Surgery) wished to clarify the question. Speaking as a member of the Country Club, he said that we have used soul searching. It is a fine club, and it has contributed much to Duke University. He urged that those who had not integrated their own homes should not speak and demand others to do so.

Professor Graham (History): I wish to speak to the four points that have been mentioned. In effect now two of the four are no longer so important. When the President spoke to the students he said that he recognized that Hope Valley Country Club has become a symbol. He promised that he would work to change the rules of the club, and that if he had not accomplished anything in 18 months, he would resign. We do not want to push it. We recognize the difficulty of his situation.

Professor Ferguson asked why are we told this now when two issues of the Chronicle have come out—neither mentioning this fact.

Professor Irene Brown: In a time like this there are many rumors and few facts. Situation and demands are highly fluid. We have seen in the cities that some place for communication is necessary. She would like to see an attempt made to set up an information center where facts could be examined and made available and rumors dispelled. The concerns of the faculty are decision-making and information. In decision-making, it is high time as a faculty that we make our stand known to the students. There are some that have been communicating by sitting at the Vigil. Some of us have not been communicating. One aspect has not been brought out. We have had some non-academic persons on campus who are giving advice. The students took the initiative to invite outsiders into their midst. The evidence of this is the organization of a strike under a particular union. We have a union strike in progress on campus now. This is the kind of pressure which has come from a non-academic person.
Professor Alexander (Psychology) remarked that he was becoming concerned about a latent polarization in the faculty to support or not to support. He urged a position of reason. He predicted otherwise a collision which neither can avoid. He urged the faculty to consider itself a third body of power and a negotiating force attempting to persuade both other powers to back off. At stake, he continued, is the administration of this University. We must take a stand.[Applause.]

Professor Tiryakian would like to take up where Mr. Alexander left off. He is right in pointing out that the issues in this crisis transcend the particular. They involve the future of the University. We must look at the means and the ends. The ends involve two orders: one is empirically economic, the second is broader. These issues in terms of the means have been used to bring about the ends. I am not thinking now about the weekend situation but about the events during the week. Several members of the faculty and student body have felt moral (and perhaps physical) coercion not to go to classes. If these means are not deplored officially and firmly we can have a breakdown of academic freedom. We must recognize that academic freedom includes the freedom to teach and to have deadlines and examinations when the teacher wants them. One of the aspects of the Vigil has been to concretize the moral needs and to induce a euphoria in anti-intellectual appeals.

Crisis, he continued, can always be generated, and we may look for one next year. It might take the direction of curriculum changes. Some persons might be forced to give certain courses. If the means are legitimated, we shall have more profound crises which will undermine the intellectual environment and everything we stand for as academics.[Applause.]

Professor Rainey (History) reported that he had been on the quadrangle for some time. Dean Brown has implied that a labor organizer has been influential in the disturbances. This is spurious. At every key juncture this man has not been consulted. It is misrepresentation of the actual facts.

Mr. Cartwright read a note which had been handed to him to the effect that Mr. Tisdale is now meeting with the students.

Professor Eisenberg (Physiology) observed that we are not dealing with a reasonable situation. Unless we grab the torch and lead the march, the torch will end up in our windows.[Applause.]

Professor Reynolds observed that for many years a great many people have been carrying the torch. He himself had for eleven years operated science institutes in which colored teachers enrolled. He organized joint meetings of colored teachers and white teachers. After the 1954 decision, such integration became no longer possible.

Mr. Cartwright read the statement of Mr. Tisdale (the time was 5:23):
Good afternoon. I am Wright Tisdale, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of this University. I am here because Dr. Knight's health is such as to make it strongly inadvisable to him to be present.

I think you all know that he suffered a case of hepatitis last fall. His schedule in recent weeks has exceeded any reasonable limits for anyone recovering from that illness. I understand that the normal recovery period continues for at least one year, and sometimes much longer. During that period both fatigue and stress must be avoided. Failure to do this involves serious risk. Dr. Knight is crucially important to this University. He is now in the Duke Hospital. His condition is a matter of deep concern to his doctors as well as ourselves. I am sure that you, too, must share this feeling.

This is a time of great national concern over many long-existing problems in our society—a time of national turmoil.

I realize your deep concern with respect to the human issues which have now so intensely been brought into focus, both here and elsewhere. I personally share this concern with you. Our nation is in the throes of great trouble and we who care must work much harder than we have in the past to solve the problems we face. Duke University has its own responsibilities in this effort.

Now let me comment on the requests you have made of President Knight. I think the central and most important issue with which we are faced and one to which we must respond is the financial situation of our non-academic employees.

We recognized in 1965 that we should move forward with our non-academic employees. Since 1966 we have increased wages an average of nearly 20 per cent, shortened work weeks, improved fringe benefits, liberalized overtime provisions, and implemented training programs to upgrade employee skills, thereby increasing individual opportunity. I cite these as evidence of our own desire to improve the well-being and financial status of our non-academic employees.

One of your requests to Dr. Knight was that he press for the $1.60 minimum wage for Duke employees. I know that he is just as interested in such a wage as you are. And so am I.

The present Federal minimum wage for most business and commercial organizations is $1.60. For universities and colleges, however, it is $1.15 and will not go to the $1.60 figure until 1971—almost three years from now. We will be at the $1.60 minimum rate by July 1, 1969 and we shall make a significant step toward this by July 1, 1968. This is going to cost a great amount of money. As a practical matter this will require increased income and a re-examination of many of our operations.

President Knight in his Chapel address on last Saturday spoke of the appointment of a Committee to consider—and I quote—"those developments which will serve us best in this great University."
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The membership and scope of that committee will be determined by President Knight upon his return to his office.

The other requests you presented to Dr. Knight are of a personal nature, and can be answered only by him.

Now let me return briefly to my earlier comments. I am sure that at this time of personal anguish and national turmoil, Duke University has a special role to play. I want it to fulfill this role, and to realize its capacities for leadership. This, I am sure, is also your hope. We cannot achieve this promise divided among ourselves. But we can together. I am confident that we can find ways to work together with mutual confidence and respect.

Professor Hart (Political Science) observed that he found it difficult to read this statement as anything other than a non-recognition of the entire situation. Professor Baylis (Political Science) had no idea how the students would interpret this statement. He considered that Mr. Tisdale had granted our demand, and the committee which the President had announced would in time be appointed. On the other two points of the four, President Knight had already conceded in such a way as to satisfy the students.

Professor Graham rose to agree with Mr. Baylis. He said that the Divinity School faculty has taken the lead in renouncing the anticipated salary increment next year. We should follow this lead. [Applause.]

Mr. Cartwright exercised the prerogative of the Chair to say that he could not agree that the action of the Divinity School should be imposed on the entire faculty. He was the Chairman of a large department. He could not know what financial needs there might be among the younger members of his department. It would be a terrible thing for this Council or this faculty to browbeat persons who can ill afford to make such sacrifices. Furthermore, he doubted that this generous action could be successful. He was concerned, as we are all, that the University remain in the AAUP "A" scale. Only in such a way can we be attractive to newcomers and maintain our present faculty. It would be far wiser, he thought, for such individuals as wish--with our candle under the bushel as it were--to tell the Treasurer that they will return all or part of the increment as a contribution to the University. Such contributions would not interfere with the A-scale rating, would be tax deductible, and would provide gifts that would secure matching Ford funds and so bring more money to the University. [Applause.] Some members of the faculty not in the Divinity School have already notified the Treasurer of this intention; it was his hope that the faculty would do it at large.

Professor Sullivan (Religion) would urge on the Council a resolution to the faculty recommending such an action as Mr. Cartwright suggested. He thought the decision of the Divinity School an action of moral stance rather than genuine financial relief, a symbolic gesture by which the faculty can realize its commitment.

Professor Estes called for the question on the motion.
Mr. Tiryakian rose to continue a point which Professor Alexander had raised. The faculty could serve a very crucial mediating role. Constructive actions by this body should be carefully considered. How can $1.60 be realized quickly? It is naive to think that voluntary contributions can do it. The gross amount is in the neighborhood of $5 million. He would like to propose that the Academic Council, voicing the sentiments of the faculty, give a mandate to the office in charge of budget planning to meet next week and to take into account the effect of financial requirements and specific figures. By the end of next week, he hoped that they could produce concrete recommendations. He thought that this meeting would agree with such a general sentiment.

At the same time, he continued, he would hope that the Council would request the Vigil to cease. What he was looking for was a way out of the problem by which polarization would not occur. We must have face-saving for all persons concerned. It is essential to emphasize the necessity and the urgency of making concrete budget recommendations which would emerge from the meeting he had proposed. Such concrete suggestions should be relayed to the economic officials and to the student body.

Professor Lacy rose to make one statement of clarification. The provisions suggested earlier for voluntary contributions have indeed already been made by the Divinity School resolution. These two particular points he would stress: 1) that any such arrangements would be by individual agreement or contribution; 2) and that the donors would be guided by the administration as to the most effective means of making this contribution. He was concerned not with the moral stand, but with putting to the Trustees a new awareness of the need to meet a human situation which Tisdale has promised in "a re-examination of policies." This statement is my hope and my disappointment. There was nothing in the statement to assure us that anything is being done more rapidly which may affect the present situation. He agreed with Professor Hart that it is in some ways a hopeless statement. It contains no awareness of the sincerity of the persons involved in the situation. Mr. Cartwright thanked Mr. Lacy for this clarification. Mr. Lacy continued that the statement represented, he thought, political accumen as well as a moral stand.

Mr. Cartwright observed that Mr. Tisdale's statement included the phrase "we will" (and underlined "will"). This is a step forward, and it does represent a substantial innovation in Trustees' thinking.

A member of the faculty asked Mr. Cole about the numbers of academic employees involved. Mr. Cartwright replied that it was a major research problem as persons had already pointed out to him. Mr. Cole said that he would like to underline what has been said, but even he did not have all the facts. They are now being collected. This process, he assured the Council, will be accelerated in the next two weeks. The amounts involved are very substantial. There are many questions. Your Chairman is correct that a valid commitment has been made in the statement from Mr. Tisdale and that commitment involves very substantial allocations of funds. Beyond that it is not possible to be more definitive. The legal date for this University
to adopt the $1.60 minimum wage is 1971. The Board of Trustees is now fixing the date 1969. That is two years ahead of the official schedule.

Professor Cell observed another information gap. Is there any word from the main quad where the action is? What are we to say to our students?

A member of the faculty observed that the faculty disagreed on many things, but that he sensed an agreement that the faculty should take the leadership. He suggested that without consultation with the students we should not act. The wrong thing is to slap them down and then contact them. I think we should put off voting on this resolution until we can hear their point of view. We may be committing an irreversible error. [Applause.]

Professor Hamilton: I have a great respect for the Academic Council, but I don't believe many of them are economists. I would like to return to Mr. Tiryakian's comment. We have here a movement that is accelerating; it has nearly brought the University to a halt. People are cutting their classes wholesale. The function of the faculty is to teach and to do research. We are depriving the University of its most essential characteristic. The situation has touched off a strike, and he would like to note that professional union people are using intimidation and threats to keep away from their jobs those who want to earn a living. The Academic Council should talk about something they know something about. [Applause.]

Professor Osborn (Religion) thought that one problem had been overlooked by Mr. Tisdale. There is a union on the campus. Does the Academic Council believe in collective bargaining, and the rights of the workers? It is essential that we should express our attitude to collective bargaining and the right of the workers to be represented by a union. [Applause.]

Mr. Cartwright: This matter has entered our discussion in earlier years.

A member of the faculty observed that there was a polarizing around specific issues which should be deplored. We need to speak with a united faculty voice and move now with more dispatch than has been available in the past. It is essential to convince the students that a new surge of commitment is stirring the faculty. Anything short of such an action will be insufficient to deal with the situation. We cannot allow ourselves to dissolve into disputes. We must assure those persons concerned that we will contribute.

Professor Tosteson (Physiology): The students have raised two issues: 1) the condition of the non-academic employees, 2) the leadership of the University in the civil rights movement. I agree with those who think we are spending too much time on details. The means are presented in the statements of Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Tisdale, but to resolve the situation it is essential that we communicate to the students the intensity of our commitment. We have to be clear what the University is: students and faculty. Students and faculty are individuals. We have an opportunity to lead in this democratic country. There are organizations in which each one of us can play a role. Our capacity is to communicate that leadership to the students.
The Mayor's meeting this afternoon broke up, I understand, when the Negroes walked out having been offended by the Mayor. Communications are incredibly bad in the town of Durham. I strongly urge that every emphasis be placed on formulating a statement to show the students that there are ways they can help now.

Professor Colton rose to offer another resolution which concerned the matter of economics:

This Council goes on record as expressing its sentiment that the university authorities have made a serious commitment to the university's non-academic staff; it now requests that the Executive Committee of the Council act together with the President or his deputy, the Provost, and the appropriate planning authorities of the university to reexamine those commitments of the university that would make possible a continuing elevation of living standards and working conditions for our non-academic associates in the Duke community, including the nationally accepted rights of collective bargaining for all workers.

Accordingly, the Academic Council urges all faculty members and students to resume their responsibilities: to return to their classrooms, libraries, and laboratories with the assurance that those issues that generated the demonstration will receive continuing attention of the faculty and the administrative authorities of the University.

Both paragraphs of this resolution having been applauded, Mr. Colton moved their addition to Mr. Cartwright's resolution as an amendment, the second one to follow immediately the present last paragraph. The motion was seconded by Mr. Watson.

Professor Sullivan (Religion) said that he agreed with Professor Tosteson who had touched upon the heart of the matter, with Professor Tiryakian in his abhorrence of coercion, but he was not aware of any anti-intellectual euphoria. Some press releases have seen the student demonstrations as an insurrection--others as a picnic. Both are misjudgments. A distinction must be made between the goals and the purpose of the Vigil. The purpose of the Vigil is not the $1.60. The purpose has to do with moral commitment. The students are not sun-bathing. Mr. Cartwright asked for clarification--are you saying that all four demands of the students must be supported by the faculty or do you assume that the students would like the faculty to play a role?

Miss Jenkins hoped that in the second paragraph Mr. Colton would agree to add the word "academic" before "responsibilities" and mention later the other responsibilities the students felt they had, the human and social responsibilities.

Mr. Hobbs, having moved the acceptance of the resolution, now accepted this amendment.
Mr. Watson said that he was not entirely clear about Professor Tosteson's comments. Every paragraph of the resolution indicates the commitment of the faculty. Secondly, even if the Council adopts the resolution, the students may remain in the quad. I would hope, he continued, that the Council could make known this resolution to the students.

Mr. Krantz (History) reported that the students have withdrawn to Page to discuss Mr. Tisdale's statement. He hoped that this Council would make its resolution known to them promptly.

Professor Van Alstyne remarked that he would urge the question on the amended motion, now that the omission of collective bargaining had been rectified. He considered Mr. Colton's contribution to the original resolution as most significant, and he urged that the question be called. Other voices concurred.

Professor Kerckhoff (Sociology) thought that one thing had been left out: the role of the faculty in these kinds of events in the future. He would recommend to the administration and the students that the good offices of the faculty be used.

Professor Tanford (Biochemistry) suggested that a committee of the Academic Council be appointed immediately. Another member of the faculty added if we are to have any voice in administrative affairs it is now. Mr. Colton's first paragraph makes this essential point.

Professor Lakin (Psychology) restated Mr. Van Alstyne's significant point. He would like to see the motion put, and he seconded that motion.

The amendment to the motion, being then put, carried.
The amended resolution, being then put, carried without dissent.

[Applause.]

Mr. Krueger suggested that the statement be taken to the students. Mr. Cell felt that a committee should enter Page with this statement as soon as possible.

Mr. Van Alstyne noted the difficult role of the employees now on strike. They feared economic reprisals and understandably so. He hoped that the Academic Council would express its earnest support of such a view, and he offered the following motion, seconded by several voices:

Resolved that the Academic Council earnestly recommend that no reprisals be taken against any non-academic employee for participation in the demonstrations or unauthorized work stoppages as of this date.

Mr. Cell thought that the statement of no reprisal should include other members of the Vigil also—namely the students. Mr. Van Alstyne felt that the reprisals against students were not to be contemplated in the same sense as were reprisals against the employees, and he would not recommend that the disciplining of students be mentioned in the same breath. The students may have been uncivil in the President's house, but he would not tolerate their being disciplined academically.
Dean Brown: As there are no indications that there will be reprisals to students, there should be no indication in our statement that reprisals ought not be made, but she would not recommend that this Council go on record as supporting collective bargaining or supporting Local 77. She reported that there was a large number of employees who do not want to be members of Local 77.

Mr. Cartwright asked for clarification: was it the will of the Council that we should enter negotiations? What do we know of what the Trustees might say? It is easy, he demurred, for the Council to ask, and he would agree to read the resolution as passed. Miss Jenkins hoped that that would satisfy the students, and they would leave Page. Mr. Cell posed the practical problem: How would it be possible to get them out otherwise? Tear gas? No; talk. Mr. Blackburn and Mr. Hobbs agreed that it would be a sound thing to deliver the resolution to the students in Page.

Professor Williams noted that these are critical times, and he urged that the Academic Council go in a body to support the Chairman in his presentation of this resolution. [Loud Applause.]

Mr. Tiryakian said we are blessed with an extension. We must take the cue and deliver the statement as soon as possible. Mr. Van Alstyne said that it would be his hope that this action would dissolve the student meeting. The students should feel assured by the statement of Mr. Tisdale's and reasonably assured by the strong statement of the faculty. On the other suggestion he felt that it was not practical and not especially promising, but he would sound a note of urgency. He referred to the last motion that the non-academic employees stand in fear of reprisal. They could be docked for their wages. He would reassure the non-academic employees and the students that there would be no reprisals. There would be little to be lost in passing such a motion. Mr. Van Alstyne's motion being put, carried with one dissenting voice.

Mr. Cell referred to the Secretary's suggestion that the entire Council go to Page Auditorium; it might just work. Professor Iakin (Psychology) stressed the importance of the spirit in which the statement is to be read: in harmony and peace, not acrimony and pique.

Mr. Cole voiced his sympathy with the statement, but he wanted it stated also that it must be taken for granted that we have to operate within legal limits which exist and which have been imposed.

Mr. Cartwright agreed with Mr. Cole's statement and pointed out in addition that the Council has no power to effect collective bargaining. I don't have, he continued, any idea that this motion will lead the Trustees to collective bargaining. The faculty has, however, taken a stand.

Professor Naylor moved that the Academic Council go in a body to Page Auditorium, but the Executive Committee go to the stage, and the Chairman read the resolution. Professor Kornberg seconded the motion which was carried.

The meeting then broke up at 6:25, and the Chair declared the Council meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
George W. Williams, Secretary

[The full text of the amended Resolution of this meeting, which has already been distributed to the Faculty, should be considered as an appendix to these Minutes.]
RESOLUTION APPROVED BY ACADEMIC COUNCIL

April 10, 1968

A university is often defined as a community of scholars, and it must be such a community if it is to carry out its purposes in learning and research. But a university cannot carry out those purposes if it disregards justice and morality in the larger community in which it operates or in the non-academic community within its own bounds. It is recognized that President Knight and his associates have made great contributions toward achieving fairness in many matters relating to the University community, but to the extent that Duke University has neglected some of its responsibility in these matters, it must improve its practice.

In his remarks at the memorial services for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., on April 6, President Knight made statements indicating that actions directed toward such improvement would be taken very soon. We are deeply appreciative to him for making these statements. One said that Duke University and North Carolina College might be brought together for mutual support, understanding, and furtherance of common duty. We ask that the University take immediate steps toward this end, and we pledge our support to the endeavor.

The President also expressed the hope that Duke University might work with our community as never before in urgent common concern for the solution of pressing, persistent, long-standing problems that affect the lives of each of us. We ask that the University take action to convert this hope into reality. The University already contributes much to the larger community through activities in medicine. It is seeking to do more. We wish to see that seeking intensified. It contributes some through education and is seeking to contribute more. We wish to see that seeking intensified. It is studying the possibility of cooperation in the area of recreation. We wish to see such cooperation established. We wish for exploration of additional ways in which the University can contribute to the larger community as it carries out its unique functions as a university. It contributes much to the community in an economic sense as well as in a university. We ask that the University correct the inequities among its non-academic employees as soon as possible.

There is a specific matter of community relationship that we want to emphasize. The time has passed, if it ever existed, when a true university could practice, much less condone, racial discrimination. We recognize and appreciate the progress that has been made in this regard. The University eliminated race as a consideration for admission several years ago. More recently, it forbade campus organizations to use segregated facilities. But more needs to be done. While we recognize that there are many aspects of private life that a university cannot and should not control, we express the hope that all members of the University community, having searched their consciences, will refuse to use segregated facilities.
It has been suggested that within the University we could bring together a group broadly representative of University interests, including faculty members, to take thought of those developments which will serve us best in this great University. We ask that the University proceed with dispatch to establish such a representative group and that one of its charges be that already made by the Academic Council to a committee mandated by it—to determine the adequacy of the relationship between the University and its non-academic employees and to report its findings together with any recommendations that it might see fit to make. If it does so, the Academic Council will suspend its activities with regard to this matter and will follow the University activities eagerly, looking to a report of both information and action.

This Council goes on record as expressing its sentiment that the university authorities have made a serious commitment to the university's non-academic staff; it now requests that the Executive Committee of your Council act together with the President or his deputy, the Provost, and the appropriate planning authorities of the university to reexamine those commitments of the university that would make possible a continuing elevation of living standards and working conditions for our non-academic associates in the Duke community, including the nationally accepted rights of collective bargaining for all workers.

The actions requested above are of great concern to the Academic Council. They are necessary to the University. The Council hopes and trusts that the University will carry them out through mutual effort among those in all its parts.

Carrying out the actions specified above must not prevent the University from continuing its unique functions: teaching, learning, and the pursuit of truth. The University must be a community of scholars. Teaching, learning, and research are its essential endeavors.

Accordingly, the Academic Council urges all faculty members and students to resume their academic responsibilities: to return to their classrooms, libraries, and laboratories with the assurance that those human and social issues that generated the demonstrations of this past week will receive the continued attention of the faculty, students, and administrative authorities of the University.

Transmitted to the University Faculty in advance of the regular Minutes.

April 11, 1968

G. W. Williams, Sec'y.
BOARD OF GOVERNORS

RESOLUTION

Passed April 11, 1968

The Student Union hereby resolves that no official Student Union function be held in the Duke University Dining Halls until the conclusion of the strike.

(Note: Resolution passed by vote of 4 - 3, 2 abstentions)
STUDENT UNION
BOARD OF GOVERNORS

RESOLUTION

PASSED APRIL 14, 1968

The Board of Governors recognizes the significance of the issues that have developed during recent events in the University and the nation. We commend and appreciate the commitment of those involved.

1. We wish to go on record and to devote the resources of the Student Union to support the concerns expressed by the Vigil and to work to overcome the barriers to racial equality.

2. We wish to express our concerns for the welfare of the non-academic employees of Duke University.

3. We call upon Duke University to move significantly to recognize and take the lead in meeting the overwhelming problems facing our community.

4. We request each Student Union committee chairman to consider ways in which his committee could act to serve the student body by directly or indirectly aiding the present concerns of the Vigil for Peace and Freedom.
We, concerned Faculty of Duke University, wish to express our
support for the $1.60 minimum wage and for the implementation of col-
lective bargaining here at Duke. We wish to see our labor practices
reflect, indeed even lead, those of the nation at large: a great
University can do no less. We must recognize, too, the need for Duke,
as the area's largest employer, to take a leadership role in this re-
gard within the Durham community at large.

To this end, we re-assert the principles set forth in yester-
day's statement by the Academic Council of the Faculty, and especially
those portions of it that deal with working conditions and collective
bargaining for non-academic employees. We have every reason to be-
lieve that the Committee appointed today by the Academic Council will
bring this resolution AT ONCE to the attention of the Trustees and
Administration of this University, and that it will press for an
early reply from them.

Should the process of mutual consultations encounter difficul-
ties, we are determined to do everything in our power to see that
the intent of the Academic Council's resolution is achieved.

Charles Tanford
John Buettner-Janusch
John Gates
Henry Clark
Paul Walsh
Eugene D. Day
Calvin D. Davis
Samson R. Gross
B. De L. Jeziorski
Samuel DuBois Cook
Frederick B.M. Hollyday
Montrose J. Moses
R.O. Burns
Henry Kamin
R. Bruce Nicklas
Bernard Silberman

Biochemistry
Anatomy & Zoology
Classics
Religion
Philosophy
Microbiology
History
Biochemistry
Slavic Languages
Political Science
History
Anatomy
Microbiology
Biochemistry
Zoology
History
We intend to support the Academic Council to the extent of our abilities in the exercise of their mandate from the faculty.

Joseph Jacob Blum
Weston La Barre
Cliff Wing
Norman Guttman
Michael A. Wallach

Physiology
Anthropology
Psychology
Psychology
Psychology

Saul Boyarsky
Morton D. Bogdonoff

Surgery
Medicine
Item: 'Twelve
Statement of the Strategy
Committee
Thursday, April 11, 1968

We are gravely concerned about the health of President
Knight, and wish to express our hope for his speedy recovery.

In his absence, we ask that the Administration, through
his acting representative, agree to collective bargaining, as
the proper form of negotiation with the University's non-academ-
ic employees, and that it agree to set up a committee of
faculty, students, labor, and administration within a definitely
prescribed period to implement such bargaining.

It is our earnest hope that these requests will be
received and considered in the spirit of mutual respect in
which they are offered.
THE WOUNDS OF THE RISEN CHRIST

A Meditation

Delivered in the Duke University Chapel

by

The Reverend Professor James T. Cleland
Dean of the Chapel

April 14, 1968

being Easter Day.

Although John 20: 19-31, which was read as the lesson, is one of the post-
Resurrection stories, it may seem to many of us a strange scripture passage for
Easter morning. Why was it chosen? It insisted on being selected on this particular
Easter, following the death of Martin Luther King and the student vigil on our

* * * * * *

The story begins on the first Easter evening; it ends a week later. The
disciples were gathered together, behind locked doors. You bet they were locked!
The disciples were scared—and understandably so. Suddenly Jesus appeared and gave
them the old Hebrew blessing: Shalom (peace). The disciples were filled with joy—and
understandably so. But one disciple, Thomas, was not present. When they told
him what had happened, Thomas was frankly and emphatically skeptical. His reaction
was: "Unless I see the mark of the nails on his hands, unless I put my finger into
the place where the nails were, and my hand into his side, I will not believe it
(25, N.E.B.). Thomas came from the Missouri section of Galilee; he had to be shown.
A week later, the disciples were gathered again in the room, and Thomas was with
them. Jesus reappeared, gave them the Shalom, and then offered his hands and his
side for Thomas' experiment. Thomas said: "My Lord." He added: "and my God." Then
the author of the Fourth Gospel adds his punch-line: "Jesus said, 'Because you have
seen me you have found faith. Happy are they that never saw me and yet have found
faith.'" (29, N.E.B.). Many sermons have been preached on that statement of Jesus.
But not this one. That punch-line is not ours this Easter morning. Why? Because
many of us, including me, are disciples like the doubting, questioning, incredulous
Thomas. What do I mean?

* * * * * *

Some of us come to the Resurrection faith, with raised eyebrows. We are
scientists by training, and science suggests, from the accumulated evidence, that
dead men stay dead. Resurrection may be possible in principle, but there is no
sufficient evidence of the kind we are normally used to regarding the resurrection
of Jesus. Therefore, we are skeptical, agnostic. Others of us are equally doubtful,
from a historian's point of view. We wonder about the reliability of the witnesses,
about the actual occurrence. We, too, are skeptical, agnostic. Like our scientific fellows, we also
are from the Missouri section of academia. The one fact which might make us less
doubtful is the reality of the living, continuing Christ in the experience of
others. Even this would be neither scientific nor historical proof, but it would
be a reasonable inference and the possible basis of a personal faith.

Well, there are enough folk who are exhibit A, B, C—right through the
alphabet—for our consideration. What do you think changed the disciples from
worried, frightened cowards into willing martyrs, but the confidence that Jesus was not holden of death" (Acts 2:24, K.J.V.)? Why did the Medieval Church ascribe to St. Francis of Assissi the stigmata, marks similar to the wounds of Christ, except as an affirmation of the fact that the Christ lived in him? How does one account for the steadiness of Abraham Lincoln, except that he was dominated by a conception of God and by "daily applications of Christ"? (These last words are in his own handwriting.) What maintained and marked the life of Martin Luther King but the reliving of the spirit of the Christ in the twentieth century?

It is this kind of living, down the long years which satisfies the Thomas in me. For, as Pascal, said: "The heart has its reasons, the reason doth not know." Yet, our reason does comment: If God is love and power, as Jesus taught, then the defeated, defenceless love of Good Friday had to be followed by the triumphant power of Easter, which gives the assurance of victory to love. Resurrection had to follow crucifixion, or this whole experience of living is insanity, a tale told by an idiot, full of mayhem, signifying very little that makes sense. The faith that Jesus was not holden of death is the promise of the ultimate triumph of good. Easter is the festal assurance that "we shall overcome."

How shall we recognize these Christ-men in Heaven? A cross-word puzzle gave me a hint. I was looking for a four-letter word to answer the definition: "Memento of a wound." The answer was "Scar." We shall look for their scars: crucifixion scars on Jesus, and Peter, yes, and on Francis; the marks of bullets on Lincoln and King. John Bunyan, in the second part of THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS, has put the matter in unforgettable words. The summons to cross the river of Death had come to Mr. Valiant-for-truth. He spoke his last will and testimony: "I am going to my Fathers....My Sword, I give to him that shall succeed me in my Pilgrimage, and my Courage and Skill, to him that can get it. My Marks and Scars I carry with me, to be a Witness for me, that I have fought his Battles who will now be my Rewarded.... So he passed over, and all the Trumpets sounded for him on the other side." He had overcome.

What does this say to us? Do not expect Resurrection without Crucifixion in this kind of a world. This is a word to all of us, perhaps a special word to those Vigil-antes, worshipping outside the Chapel with us, who have so successfully disrupted the timid tenor of our lives this past week. With innocence and honor, with naiveté and seriousness, with controlled passion and solemn earnestness, they have shaken us all, whether we like it or no. But let them, and us, be aware that in fact or in imagination, of a Friday that was black and brutal, and is perennial, about twenty years ago, Reinhold Niebuhr was accused of preaching a gloomy gospel. He answered his critic: "I shall be an optimist with you for eternity, if you will be a pessimist with me for the next seventy years." There are fifty years to go. And these years will be marked by bad Fridays, which become good only in the light of Easter. And, down the years, the risen, indwelling Christ will still be recognized by his wounds--the wounds which he received--his scars.

Thank God for Thomas!

Let us pray:

O God,

Who art the source of all true joy;
Grant us a vision of our risen Lord, wounds and all,
That we may know the peace which passeth understanding, which the world can neither give nor take away.
And that pure joy which shall make radiant all our duty and our toil;
Through the same Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.
A BRIEF STATEMENT FROM THE LEADERS OF THE VIGIL

The Duke Vigil was originally an immediate response to the senseless and cruel assassination of one of the most determined yet most peaceful civil rights advocates -- Martin Luther King, Jr. In an attempt to demonstrate that white America, concerned with the problems of the Black man, the students put together a list of requests to which President Knight could personally respond. These requests, if met, would be concrete assurances that Duke would take this opportunity to convert despair into rapid progress by demonstrating that change of a meaningful magnitude could be brought about quickly without resorting to the violence that was increasingly being employed in the world around us.

Upon learning of Dr. Knight's illness, the students, feeling that it was necessary for their University to respond dramatically in this time of national crisis, left his house, but continued to press their demands. Heartened by the dedication and concern of white students, black workers went on strike and black Durhamites, who had previously expressed the fear that they could never count on whites again, joined hand with white students at numerous rallies to sing "We Shall Overcome," a song which symbolizes the old faith in the Civil Rights Movement.

As the students and some faculty members stood, slept, and ate on the quadrangle, additional moral, financial, and personal support was forthcoming. Faculty groups signed support petitions, wives brought enormous amounts of food, students boycotted classes in sympathy with the movement, and administrative officials guardedly indicated their support.
Students continued to be determined to get a dramatic response to their four requests, and, after the workers struck, to achieve the goal of collective bargaining. Faculty support increased for this latter goal after Mr. Tisdale made his public response to the Vigil. Now faculty support for collective bargaining is intensive and extensive: They are determined that Duke respond in this hour of opportunity.

Today general campus support for the objective of collective bargaining continues at a very high level. The major reason for this is a feeling that they type of positive constructive actions taken here, since the ends are clearly for the benefit of others, cannot be allowed to fail. Middle class America has been telling black America for some time that it could solve the problems of race and poverty. The evidence to support this thesis is scant, but Duke can prove, to its students, to the Durham community which is closely watching us, and to the Nation as a whole that these peaceful means are right and do result in just ends.

For this reason the national press has been interested in the Duke Vigil. They see it and whatever action the University takes, or does not take, as vitally important in answering the question uppermost in our minds: Will America really respond before it is too late? The action of Duke students, faculty, and workers has taken on great symbolic meaning. It is here, in the eyes of many, that the great question of our time will be answered.
The national press is also fascinated about other aspects of the Duke Vigil. First of all, the students at every juncture have de-escalated their actions in an attempt to conform to the needs of the University. This is not an action like Berkeley's or Wisconsin's. Secondly, the ends sought are highly moral and unselfish, seeking to right the conditions of the non-academic employees of this University. Finally, the sense of community of students, faculty, and workers sitting together on the quad has been beautiful.

Thus the Vigil continues — determined that collective bargaining will be established at Duke now for three reasons:

(1) to provide real economic freedom for poor black and white employees; (2) to demonstrate that at Duke both faculty, students, workers, and the governing board are concerned enough to take dramatic action now, even at great personal cost;

(3) and to prove to Black America that White America still cares and still acts with deeds not words.

It is our sincerest hope that Duke will lead the way in making good that bad check which Dr. King spoke of that America has given her black people, a check that has become marked "insufficient funds." For like Dr. King, we also refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt, that there are insufficient funds in the great vault of opportunity of this University and this Nation. We must respond now, in this case with collective bargaining to insure the economic freedom of the poorest, that we all might be free.

The Committee of Ten:
  Dave Birkhead
  Jack Boger
  David Henderson
  Jon Kinney
  Reed Kramer
  Tom Rainey

Bunny Small
John Strange
Allan Ray
Jeff Van Pelt
Item Fifteen
Statement of the Board
of Trustees
Tuesday, April 16, 1968

It was unanimously resolved:

That a special committee of the Board of Trustees and officers of the University will be instituted to look into and report promptly to the Board on the adequacy of the relationship between the University and its non-academic employees. This will conclude the re-establishment of a liaison committee to consist of members of the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee of the Academic Council.

That employees of the University who are on strike are invited to return now to their jobs with full standing. Supervisors are to be instructed accordingly.

That the wage raise, as already announced to be effective by July 1, 1968, will be spelled out as soon as information is available on University resources for this purpose.
Item: Sixteen
Statement of the Strategy Committee
Tuesday, April 16, 1968

The student leadership of the Duke Vigil finds the April 15, 1968, action of the Board of Trustees disappointing and inadequate. We asked the University for meaningful action: first, to meet the immediate needs; but, more important, to show recognition of a University responsibility for social and economic improvement — in our own and in the larger community.

The Trustees have failed to provide significant leadership toward both our specific and toward our general goals. They have not so much as mentioned in their statement collective bargaining, the end recommended by the Academic Council and this group.

We understand it as our responsibility to keep the ten-day moratorium, which ends Sunday, April 21, at 7:00 p.m. As to effective and appropriate action after that time, we have no specific recommendations now. We think that further discussion with administrative figures, faculty representatives, and among ourselves might considerable influence our decisions. A detailed reply to the statement of the Trustees will be presented at the rally tomorrow evening.
The faculty of Duke University is deeply appreciative of the work that the Academic Council Committee on University-Employee Relationship has done. The University Faculty hereby constitutes that Committee as a Committee of the University Faculty and asks that it report its findings and its recommendations to both the Academic Council and the University Faculty.

The faculty takes note of the appointment of a trustee-administrative committee "to look into and report promptly to the Board on the adequacy of relationships between the University and its non-academic employees and make the appropriate recommendations. It has been further assured that the trustee-administrative committee will consult widely with all interested parties, and will work closely, in ways yet to be spelled out, with the Academic Council Committee. It takes note also of the establishment of the Trustee-Faculty Liaison Committee.

The faculty also understands that the action by the trustees does not preclude the early appointment of a broadly representative university committee, and now renews the request that that committee be appointed.

The faculty of Duke University affirms its deep interest in the working conditions of the University non-academic employees.
because only in a proper atmosphere can its own teaching and research activities take place effectively. That interest is strongly heightened by the present crisis on the campus. We are persuaded that relations between the University and certain of its non-academic employees have been less than satisfactory in the past and, in spite of considerable recent progress, remain so today. We cannot foresee the precise institutional form which future relations may take. We declare our view, however, that satisfactory relations can exist only when employees exercise a voice in the determination of their working conditions. There must be no barrier to the consideration of arrangements whereby the employees organize themselves into groups if they so wish and have their representatives deal with the University to reach enforceable agreements.
Notes taken by John Strange at meeting of general faculty, April 19, 1968.
(I believe it was the 19th)
Present - approximately 400
The meeting was chaired by Provost Cole.

Professor Cole and Mr. Huestis made some introductory remarks. It was noted:

1. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees had been called into Special Session Sunday, April 9.

2. The budget routine was described. It was noted expenses were exceeding expectations and revenues were lagging. A projection in December, 1967 indicated an even greater deficit in 1968-69.

3. Specific salary recommendations must be made for 1,500 academic staff members and 6,000 hourly workers. There are an additional 4,500 budget line items. Changes necessitate realignment of priorities.

4. A salary analysis begun last January had resulted in a preliminary report the Wednesday before Dr. King's assassination.

5. Hospital fees are tied to wages. Room rates are being studied.

Professor Cartwright noted that the Academic Council had, on April 10, passed a resolution asking the University to "proceed with dispatch to establish a broadly representative committee...to determine the adequacy of the relationship between the University and its non-academic employees." Cartwright noted that this was a call for the establishment of the committee President Knight said he was going to appoint. Cartwright noted that, as the
Academic Council had instructed he had asked Provost Cole to appoint the special committee President Knight had promised. Professor Cartwright indicated that Provost Cole said he was unable to appoint this special committee.

Professor Cartwright summarized the meeting that had been held:

1. Blackburn committee with Academic Council Executive Committee.

2. Provost with Academic Council Executive Committee and Blackburn Committee (Sunday evening, April 14). The Academic Council Executive Committee asked to meet with the Board.

3. Monday morning April 15, the Academic Council Executive Committee met with the Board of Trustees. At 1:30 the Blackburn Committee was asked to join the meeting. Some-time thereafter the Board adopted its resolution including point number 2 (released Monday, April 15).

4. The Academic Council Executive Committee met with the administration and decided to call this general faculty meeting rather than a meeting of the Academic Council.

Professor Blackburn indicated he saw several aspects to his task:

1. Fact finding -- what parties think.

2. Fact finding about non-academic employees at other institutions including U.N.C., N.C.C., the labor force in Durham, other schools and colleges with collective bargaining.

Professor Anlyan addressed the faculty as one who had not been involved in any of the meetings referred to except as they concerned the President's health. His topic was the disease "Universityitis."
Signs and Symptoms:

Union - cannot speak firsthand. The hospital did have a serious problem when the dietetic workers struck part of the hospital. He acknowledged his gratefulness that the hospital workers were not involved in the current strike. All non-academic workers, from maids to secretaries are underpaid -- from a few cents per hour to significant figures. This also applied to middle management.

Students - very concerned, bright, have a special interest in the world since they will be in it longer than the rest of us due to medical advances assuring them a longer life. Recently they were maligned by Sports Illustrated.

Faculty: well organized but not...[unreadable ]. Relations with trustees have been primarily through collisions.

Administration: The President is devoted to see Duke a leader. He is accused by the conservatives as being ultra-liberal. He is accused by the progressives as being ultra-conservative. There is a constant necessity for sandbagging the leaks in the dike which prevents full attention to growth.

Trustees: A conservative group concerned with the state of the national economy. They are worried about building program. They are working hard on the 5th Decade program. When compared with P.H.Y. [unable to decipher] they are more liberal in outlook but have less cash at their disposal.

The assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King has brought to this situation an emotional overtone. Universityitis is inflammatory.

What about the cure?

The trustees have gone as far as their responsibility will allow. All the elasticity has been used. They have established a Special Committee
which rescued us in 1960. By setting up this committee they have handed us a key.

There are some diseases that can be cured overnight. There are others that may show significant improvement in the short run but which must be cured over time.

We should (1) have confidence in the committee

(2) ...[missed]

(3) return to our normal activities and allow time to work out the problems at issue.

Professor Cartwright:

Moved the acceptance of resolution #1. [See resolutions passed -- essence was that Blackburn Committee was made a committee of the University Faculty as well as a committee of the Academic Council. The committee was asked to report to the Faculty as well as the Council].

Brief discussion -- passed unanimously.

Professor Blackburn:

Acceptance of resolution #2 is motion on floor. [Resolution #2 takes note of the Special Board Committee. Notes that faculty has been assured Special Committee has power to investigate all alternatives and that it will work with all interested parties. Resolution calls for establishment of committee promised by President Knight in his chapel address].

Blackburn notes that the Special Committee is to report promptly to the Board on the adequacy of employee-University relations. He notes that the Blackburn Committee has been assured that the Special Committee will look into all alternatives. Blackburn reviewed the request for a broadly based committee as outlined in Dr. Knight's comments in the chapel.
Professor Rainey:

Rainey asked whether "broadly representative," the term used in the resolutions, included non-academic employees. Rainey noted that the President had specified that non-academic employees be included but that Tisdale had not included them.

Professor Blackburn replied that the term was undefined.

Professor of Psychology (name unknown) - asked whether or not it was appropriate to specifically include non-academic employees in the resolution.

Professor Beard (Medicine)  [The following is roughly his speech.]

What are the greater implications of the action the faculty is asked to take? I have seen no such terrible things you say happen to these employees. I have no power to tell the University how to manage its finances. Never before have I had anything to say about running this University. What has happened in the last two weeks is a disgrace.

We have had a bunch of students actually lying out in the rain. They have been eating donuts and drinking coffee that comes from God knows where. I beg of you as adults, let's cut out this nonsense. Let's get our students back to the classrooms. Let's not yield to ultimatums.

Professor Hamilton (History)

What is needed? Channels of communication. We need to talk -- indefinitely if we must, we need to talk with force and candor. Therefore because the resolution encourages talk, I support it.

Professor Hendrix (Medicine) and others

Resolution voted upon (voice vote) -- passed with 3 or 4 noes.
Professor Buettner-Janusch moved the adoption of Resolution #3.

Professor Klopffer objected to the resolution because it was a "mild compromise."

Professor Buettner-Janusch said (referring to Dr. Anlyan's comments) that if this "mild resolution will kill the patient it will kill a lot more too."

Professor McIntosh moved to table the resolution for 6 months.

Professor Van Alstyne called for a ruling that Professor McIntosh's motion was out of order since a motion to table could not have a time limit. Professor Van Alstyne also noted that a two thirds vote was necessary to table.

Professor McIntosh moved to table the resolution.

The motion was defeated by voice vote (lacked 2/3 by ruling of Presiding Officer Cole).

Professor Cartwright

Said he interpreted this resolution as containing no threats. "There must be no threats." Cartwright said he would word the resolution differently—that he did not want to put any barriers in the way of discussion. Professor Cartwright said the Board felt it had moved a tremendous distance, he felt not so far. He said that he would, only because he interpreted it as containing no threats, vote for the resolution.

By a 2/3 vote, debate was closed.

The motion was passed by voice vote.

[Estimates of margin run from 2-1 (Rainey) to 6-4 (Strange)].
Statement
of
Special Committee

Today the Special Trustee-Administrative Committee was pleased to receive the cooperation and help of the faculty through the Executive Committee of the Academic Council and the Blackburn Committee, the elected officers of student organizations and employee representatives of non-academic workers. The purpose of all was to discover and develop a mechanism which will insure the continued improvement of relations with non-academic employees and achieve our mutually desired objective.

The Special Committee will continue to work in all speed with these cooperating representatives in seeking solutions to the concerns of non-academic employees, including a sense of dignity and participation.

It is clear that inadequacies in the relationship of the University and its non-academic employees do exist and we intend to work as rapidly as possible to remedy them.

As to the important matter of wages, the Special Committee will recommend to the Board of Trustees that:

On May 6, 1968 the minimum wage for non-academic employees will be increased to $1.45 per hour.

Effective June 3, 1968 additional appropriate adjustments within each wage classification will be made for employees presently earning more than $1.34 per hour.

As previously announced, we will be at the $1.60 minimum hourly rate by July 1, 1969.

April 20, 1968
Item: Twenty

Statement of the
Vigil Strategy
Committee in response
to statement by special
Trustee Committee
April 20, 1968

The Strategy Committee of the Duke Vigil welcomes the statement of the Special Trustee-Administrative Committee released at the end of Saturday's initial discussions.

We are pleased that they join us in recognizing "inadequacies in the relationship of the University and its non-academic employees" and await further action.

We look forward to the establishment of structures that will allow effective employee participation in decisions affecting their relationship to the University.

The announcement of specific wage increases and continued discussions with all segments of the University community holds promise that Duke will move rapidly to further social and economic justice.
APPENDIX TWO

"CONCERNED FACULTY"

PREPARED BY DR. JOHN BREITNER-JANUSCH

...
"Concerned Faculty"

On Wednesday, 10 April, the open meeting of the Academic Council was crowded with many faculty members. A number of the faculty who attended were irritated and distressed by two moods that manifested themselves during the meeting. First, a large number of faculty members appeared to wish to bear testimony. They treated the meeting as if it were a religious revival, a part of some evangelical movement rather than a faculty meeting. Second, it was clear that effective collective action by the faculty was going to be very difficult to achieve. As events showed, none ever was achieved.

After the meeting of the Academic Council, a number of faculty members accompanied the executive committee of the council to Page auditorium. The group wanted to see what effect the reading of the resolution of the Academic Council would have on the students.

The executive committee of the Academic Council and certain members of the faculty apparently have no conception of the tediumness of the lengthy resolution passed by the Council. It read tediously and was pedantically worded. The effect upon the students was more unfortunate than the effect had been on the faculty members.

It was quite clear to many of us that the students did not understand how strong a resolution we had indeed adopted. The delivery of the resolution was insufficiently emphatic. Furthermore, the resolution was far too long. The essential points did not come until the very end. Finally, the most important resolution, in the opinion of many of us, was not read to the students. This was the resolution stating that the Academic Council wished to go on record as being against reprisals applied to nonacademic employees who were on strike. The situation struck a number of us as being considerably less than healthy. The students were, of course, tired, irritated, and the faculty had not played its role in the vacuum of power and leadership that existed.

That evening, many of us fretted and fumed and used, within the limits of the ability of the General Telephone Company, the telephone to express to each other our distress and dismay. The following morning, three or four of us went over to see if we could follow what had happened at Page auditorium. We were afraid that the students might do something that would be not only less than constructive, but damaging to the goals of the vigil and the general goals we felt the faculty should strive to achieve. We were also curious, interested, and felt that we must in some measure indicate solidarity with the students. After all, the goals the students have set are to a large extent our goals also. By accident, several of us happened to talk to members of the student leadership at that time and one or two of them strongly suggested that some member of the faculty, who was not on one of the official faculty bodies speak to the students that evening. Three of us agreed and we did so. What we said to the students was, in effect, that the statement made by the Academic Council was a much stronger statement than the students recognized
at that time. Remember the faculty is a most fluid group, 25% academic reactionary, 25% radical and 50% neuter. We pointed out the resolution asking that no reprisals be taken was another earnest of the faculty's interest and good faith.

Thursday afternoon, 11 April, Professor Tanford, Professor Mahoney, Mr. Knottz and I discussed at length the way in which we could initiate some action that would demonstrate that the faculty took seriously the commitment by the students for goals that were in and of themselves honorable, good, decent, and proper within a university community.

We also wished to be able to say something to the students that would indicate that some segments of the faculty, at least, supported them in principle and in some of their actions. Faculty members must act individually, in the end, that is the nature of most academics. Each person has his little set of idiosyncrasies that express themselves in particular ways. The four of us drafted the statement of principle known as the "concerned faculty statement". We circulated it among a few of our colleagues and when I read it to the students on Thursday evening we had approximately ten signatures. By the following Monday, we had 85 signatures. We could have tripled the number of signatures, I believe, by asking young assistant professors and instructors at the university if they were interested in signing. We felt that it would be better to have only tenured members of the faculty express themselves. Two reasons for this, 1) the more general and abstract principle that it is the tenured faculty who has the greatest commitment and responsibility for and to the university. It is our university. 2) If the situation deteriorated and the trustees or others took the kind of deplorable action which one suspected they might, we felt it would be considerably more difficult for intolerable sanctions to be applied to the tenured faculty than to those whose positions were less secure and subject to the whims and shifts of departmental chairman, administrators, and trustees.

We also felt that it was essential that the students be told explicitly about the second resolution of the Academic Council requesting that there be no reprisals against the striking employees. I called Professor Williams, secretary of the Academic Council and asked him for the wording of the resolution because I felt that it was necessary considering the tense situation and the justifiably angry mood of the students to tell them quite frankly that the Academic Council with one negative vote, requested that there be no sanctions against employees on strike. Professor Williams said he did not have the exact wording and once I read it, it would be an official reading. He said that I was quite aware of that, would he please allow me to read it. He said he couldn't find it in his files and he would call me back in five or ten minutes. Eleven minutes later, Professor William Van Alstyne of the law school called me (he had presented the motion to the Academic Council) and read me the exact wording of the motion. He asked me to be very clear to the students that there were two things involved here. First, that the motion had indeed been passed almost simultaneously with the longer and more ponderous motion that had been read by Professor Cartwright to
the students and second, that I should be very explicit that the Academic Council went on record that there were to be no reprisals as of this felt date (10 April 1968). I believe that the Academic Council properly did not wish to give a blanket approval of non reprisals just in case of violence, threats, etc. broke out after the date of the resolution. I told Professor Van Alstyne that within the limits of my appreciation and ability to handle the grammar and syntax of the English language I would be happy to convey this to the students when I talked to them in the evening. We then went over to the rally, listened to the speeches, and each of us spoke briefly to the students. Professor Tanford provided a most crowd pleasing statement when he said the students had made a revolution. I can assure the students that Professor Tanford and the rest of us are quite clear that the process of change at Duke University has been considerably accelerated by the student action. It has indeed galvanized some of the stuffy, slow-moving faculty into action. But I do wish to point out also that in one way or another many of us on the faculty have been working and fuming and doing what we could to resolve some of the same problems. Our actions did indicate that if we were able to have any effect upon the university it always must be, from our older, more pompous, and possibly presenile point of view, constructive. What I mean by this is that we were able to demonstrate that there are indeed on this faculty a number of people who are trying to do everything they can to see that the problems that students so clearly sense are going to be solved, and solved very largely by faculty action. If we fail, of course we will have to leave for the atmosphere will then become intolerable.

After the rally at which I read the statement of the concerned faculty the students made their decision to await the meetings of the trustees. In the week that followed there were a rather large number of meetings of the so-called concerned faculty. These meetings were held in order to discuss actions we could take to ameliorate the situation, to express our own emotional difficulties in such a situation, to try to hit upon what it was that we could do. I attempted to run the meetings with a fair degree of autocratic control so that an excessive amount of conversation about trivia or incredibly complex metaphysical principles would not occur. I was not always successful but it was clear that we had two major groups within the concerned faculty. One group felt that we must demonstrate some kind of solidarity with the ace students and within ourselves and attempt some form of action that would demonstrate to the trustees and the administration that we were not going to allow this issue to die. After several meetings I finally invited undergraduate and graduate student representatives to attend for I wished them to see what kind of fiddling around adults encumbered with Ph.D.'s, books, honors and presumably intelligence engaged themselves in when we confronted with a crisis. I believe it was most salutory for both the so-called concerned faculty and the students to see this process. I am not known for my equable temper and lost it on several occasions with my more pious-footing colleagues, but the concern faculty now has a strategy or steering
The statement from the trustees then came (this was statement number one). A number of the so-called concerned faculty felt that it was a great triumph. It was clear to those of us that were not born this year that it was nothing like a triumph at all. It indicated that the trustees had moved a millimeter toward the matters of principles that were of grave concern to us. The fact that they had moved this millimeter allowed several of the faculty members to be carried away with enthusiasm and glee. Many of the rest of us recognized that this was not the case and decided that we should meet from time to time and plan various kinds of action that would make it possible for us to have an effect upon the situation that meets us here. It is difficult for me to be more precise at this time for the situations include the relative powerlessness of the faculty and the general inability of many faculty members who are concerned to see that it is necessary to maintain pressure in order to obtain results in dealing with trustees. Pressure and even threats are required.

Most of us do not believe that violence and disruption are appropriate for there is too much for all of us to lose in this particular situation. I do not merely mean our investment of grant funds, our intellectual investment, our investment of time and our commitment. I refer to the loss in moral standing that would occur should we behave in a thoroughly disruptive manner.

Nonetheless, many of us also recognize that we may have to follow the ultimate logic of our position, we might be forced to resign in the end, or we might be forced to call a general faculty strike. We have carefully pared from the concerned faculty those of our colleagues who, though concerned and indeed liberal minded, have come up with statements such as "Peter Klopfert frightens me to death". "Some of those horrible suggestions such as having a faculty strike are too terrible to contemplate." I am sorry that I cannot convey on the typewritten page the unctious tone that surrounded those words. The point I wish to make is that if we are to have a group of faculty that are going to act they must be willing to act and understand that despite the fact that the chairman of the Academic Council will "Never use a threat on the trustees" that is with the use of pressure that situations such as this become resolved. We must, of course, act with a degree of caution so that counter pressure of the wrong sort, unproductive, counter violence does not result. But in the end it is the belief of many of us it is better to have one's head broken and one's job destroyed, one's research thrown down the drain than to live in a totally intolerable situation. It is not yet wholly intolerable.

This is where the concerned faculty stands now. We have taken Professor Blackburn out of his office from time to time and asked him to report upon his view of what has happened in the negotiations with the trustees. We have requested that he tell us how he evaluates the Blackburn's committees with respect to the trustees.

The concerned faculty now has a strategy or steering
During the recent Duke Community Vigil, a number of names appeared on a statement that began "As a member of the Duke University community, I hereby commit myself to...". It has been formed largely as a matter of convenience so that there will be at least two members of the concerned faculty who will be present at all planning and strategy sessions so that there will be some continuity in the passing back and forth of information and plans.

We now stand in that position. I conclude this brief diary as of 17 May, where we are about to attempt to form a permanent group that will be committed to acting with or without the students to achieve not only collective bargaining but true university status for the faculty and the students.

I believe the undergraduates that we invited to listen to the deliberations in various rooms in the East Duke building when the tension was at its height will be quite capable of recording what concerned the faculty are like. On the other hand, I do not think it will be fruitful for this particular statement to go into the details of why it is impossible for me to believe that more than say 40 or 45 faculty members will stand together on all these matters. Here I refer to 45 tenured faculty members, conducting this as an anonymous questionnaire. We feel that many should not be afraid to take a position on this matter.

It might be of some interest to the general log to understand that in getting the original concerned faculty statement signed by tenured people we learned a great deal about our colleagues. I learned that one distinguished member of the faculty felt that it was impossible to engage in any kind of action of this sort. A university is a place that provides a refuge from the world. He stated to me that the students should be holding seminars on what is social justice, not is social justice cost $1.60 an hour. I was unable to refute his point of view but I was able to point out to him that this reminded me of the stand taken by a number of academics in Germany as the foul Nazi wave swallowed up what was once the pinnacle of academic life in the Western world. From now on the minutes, if that is what they should be called, of the concerned faculty will be a matter of record and will be available to students from time to time.

However, we feel very strongly that every person who signed either of the two statements should feel free, indeed eager, to stand up and to add some pamphlets and documents. This was dictated in some haste. I am sorry that some of the more interesting conversations held by the concerned faculty were not recorded.

A statistical report will be published showing:

- The number of questionnaires sent out.
- The proportion returned.
- The proportion of those returning who stated they supported the view that the Duke Community should pay the minimum wage.
- The proportion who did indeed pay the minimum wage.
- The proportion who did not return the questionnaire.
- The proportion who refused to answer the questionnaire.

John Buettner-Janusch
17 May 1968
During the recent Duke Community Vigil, a number of names appeared on a statement that began "As a member of the Duke University community, committed to the search for truth and its embodiment in a truly free and humane society, I hereby affirm my support in principle for the goals (as listed below) which hundreds of students and faculty are now petitioning university recognition." . . . .

Shortly after this statement appeared, a group of tenured faculty issued a statement which has become known as the "Concerned Faculty" statement. We are certain that many other members of the faculty are also concerned. Exigencies of time made it impossible to poll all of our colleagues.

We are now interested in proceeding to the next section of our "Concerned Faculty" project. We call this Operation: PUT YOUR MONEY WHERE YOUR MOUTH IS. We are petitioning each who have signed the statement of Duke Community support for the Duke Community Vigil and the Concerned Faculty statement to answer the enclosed questionnaire. We are asking you to put your name at the bottom of the questionnaire.

We are not conducting this as an anonymous questionnaire. We feel that people should not be afraid to take a position on this matter. We are quite aware that there are many arguable and even sound economic reasons why one or another person must have a domestic worker and must try to bargain for the minimum possible wage. We are also of the opinion that those persons who have the greatest difficulty with domestic workers are those persons who pay the lowest wages, and have the poorest human relations with their domestic servants. We should be willing to: 1. stand by what we said; 2. refuse to comment and be open about our refusal to comment; 3. refuse to participate or to be involved; 4. oppose sincerely and vigorously the stand some of us have taken.

Our group has pledged to publish no person's name who refused to respond if those persons who refused to respond did not participate in signing the statement of Duke Community Support or the statement of the Concerned Faculty". However, we feel very strongly that every person who signed either of the two statements should feel free, indeed eager, to stand up and be counted in this matter. We include all members of the Academic Council.

A summary statistical report will be published showing:
1. The number of questionnaires sent out
2. The proportion returned
3. The proportion of those returning who stated they supported the view that the Duke Community should pay the minimum wage.
4. The proportion who do indeed pay the minimum wage.
5. The proportion who did not return the questionnaire
6. The proportion who refused to answer the questionnaire.

John Buettner-Janusch
Gentlemen:

You supported the statement Professor Tanford and I circulated, with the aid of some of our colleagues. These three paragraphs have come to be known as the "concerned faculty" statement. Many of us feel that we should continue to demonstrate our concern, although some argue that the crisis is over. It is not over, the fundamental crisis is with us, as it has been for some time. I enclose two analytical comments, one on the Duke University problem, one on faculty-administration problems in general.

I wish to add several comments of my own for consideration and discussion by our group.

1. During the height of the crisis and now I find an unexpected (to me), almost pathological fear, in many presumably adult, mature, worldly faculty members and administrators. They are afraid of a small local union, and its paid representative. They do not appear to have an appreciation of the nature of the way workers and employers relate to each other in the latter half of the twentieth century. I believe this strange attitude must be a subject for discussion by any faculty concerned with the future of Duke University, for the immediate problem that faces the University is its relationship to its nonacademic employees. We MUST remember the union and the possibility of a reactivation of the strike is ONLY a symptom of the problems to which the faculty should be addressing itself.

2. There is a more fundamental and important problem that must be faced by those of us that have a permanent commitment to Duke University. The problem is mentioned in the enclosed statements. It comes down to a relatively simple point, does the faculty of Duke University have anything to say about the University? Does the faculty have a role in the University? Or are we employees of the Corporation? One of the graduate students in my group carried a sandwich board during the Vigil that succinctly pointed this out. It read "I thought I was going to a University not to a Corporation!" Many of us have committed ourselves and our research and teaching lives to this University. Many of us come from Universities that have a more mature perspective on the role of faculty, students, nonacademic employees, administration in this unique and peculiar institution to which we belong—the American university community. We find it difficult to adjust to a situation in which most problems and developments are finessed into inactivity. The cliche fits "Don't pay any attention and it will go away." "It" hasn't gone away and it won't go away.

I can add a personal note. I have committed the destinies of 110 prosimian primates, many of them rare and irreplaceable, all of them frightfully valuable (in economic terms), to this university. It will be difficult to move them, I do not want to move them, but I cannot allow them any more than myself to remain in an atmosphere of moral inaction and general incompetence.
3. Perhaps more fundamental than the first two points I have raised is the basic problem of M-O-N-E-Y. Are we to remain passive and inarticulate while the university goes through one financial crisis after the other? It is well and proper for us to protest the miserable wages and working conditions of the nonacademic employees, and the less than adequate salaries paid our junior colleagues. But what can we do about it? Is it not proper for us to discuss, plan, protest perhaps, the use of university resources? Should not a number of university resources be reallocated and reassessed so that we can maintain and improve educational programs of merit? Are athletic scholarships and the money spent on the football program (which does not even provide adequate entertainment for the local community or the Duke community with its three home games a year) properly spent? Does the University get a proper return from this? Must the University have a new this or that building? Would not temporary (15-year life) buildings suit some of the activities for which multi-million dollar palaces are being planned? Despite my somewhat pejorative tone, I am not at all certain about my answers to these questions. There are many questions of like nature that must be raised if we are to be able to act responsibly and effectively.

Are we ready to face the fact that if we raise the wages of all nonacademic employees to a decent level that a part of the work force will not be replaced as retirement, etc., reduces it? I believe that we must consider the consequences of demanding national wage levels for all employees. If we do that, we must also be prepared to demand competent employees, and fewer in number, for it is quite clear that the University cannot support the present work force at the wage levels envisioned. Are we prepared to support not only the workers' requests for decent treatment and a decent wage, but also the University's demand for a competent work force (with incentive as part of the contract)?

All of these are part of the question that has so stirred up the campus recently.

4. Another question that has clearly been part of the problem with respect to the students is the nature of the curriculum at Duke. The Undergraduate Faculty Council is presently working on the first stage of a "reformed" curriculum. How often have any faculty really concerned themselves with the nature of the curriculum? How often have we debated or considered the need for natural sciences, as well as the humanities as part of the required education of the students? Etc. If we are to be a Faculty we must get to work on some matters that are strictly academic.

I suggest that several immediate and perhaps effective actions can be taken. First, the small project Operation: Put your money where your mouth is, will give us some information about the real commitment of the "concerned faculty" to what it says it is concerned about. Second, I suggest that a significant number of faculty ask to attend every session of the Academic Council. It is illuminating to merely listen (despite the fatigue some complained about after the meeting of 25 April) to what goes on.
Third, I think that we should work to widen the representation on the Academic Council. This is NOT a charge against the present Council, but I believe that if representation were broadened a greater participation by the Faculty would result. There are at least five science departments with no representation, directly, on the Council.

I am certain that collective action and collective agreement on some of the issues and questions raised by my letter here and the enclosed statements may be impossible. But it is important that we act on many of these matters, for if we do not, the moral and intellectual climate will continue to deteriorate. If this is to be a great national and international university, then we must act like one.

John Buettner-Janusch
Professor
Director of Graduate Studies, Anatomy
Director, Primate Facility
The crisis which Duke University is currently undergoing should be viewed from two interrelated perspectives, one moral or ethical, the other political; and four distinct yet also interrelated groups must always be kept in mind—faculty, students, administration-trustees, and nonacademic employees.

As a result of the crisis, the power structure of the University has been laid bare for those who did not recognize it earlier. The president, even before his illness, was unable to act decisively for the University, nor could his administrative officers take effective action. The Faculty did not act as a group for six days. The inability of the faculty to act is a function of the lack of (1) a truly representative and meaningful organization to express Faculty interests within the University; and (2) of an apparent unwillingness on the part of the trustees to consult with the Faculty. The students acted, and so precipitated a crisis, yet they too lack effective means of influencing decision making. Meanwhile, the nonacademic employees, also without representation, went on strike, partially to protest terrible working conditions, partially to achieve recognition for a group which will be able to represent them. At the moment, as has become evident to all, "power", in the sense of the ability to make decisions about basic University policy, lies in the hands of the Board of Trustees.

The crisis itself is a fundamental one. It involves not so much a determination of the respective roles of the various components of the University, but rather a confrontation with the very nature and purposes of the University itself. Support for collective bargaining has become a symbol of this confrontation: can members of a great University allow their University to pay unskilled workers $1200.00 a year? Is $1.10 an hour a defensible wage in the year 1968? Can University employees continue to function within a context which permits them no rights, and which exposes them to arbitrary forms of pressure and coercion? Can the University community have its commitment to the realization of American freedom through racial and social justice be taken seriously in the black community if it allows its administration to mishandle the University's nonacademic employees, black and white.

The crisis within our University has received national publicity; it is followed closely here in the Durham area. Its resolution is a matter of both national and local import. The University Faculty through its Academic Council has supported, in principle, collective bargaining here at Duke, and thus demonstrated its support for both students and nonacademic employees. Thus, three major components of the University stand together on this issue, realizing its immediate and its symbolic importance.
This apparent solidarity must be seen within the crisis situation, particularly the context of what seems to be a confrontation between the trustees and administration on one hand, and the rest of the University on the other. The strike of the nonacademic employees was undertaken at a great personal risk and grave individual deprivation. The strikers could not stay out indefinitely. At the same time, the students sought meaningful action, fearing delays until the end of term and they are dispersed: this they were determined not to allow.

We find ourselves in the following situation: decision-making power seems to lie with the trustees, represented to some degree by the acting head of the University. Faculty and students have united in support of collective bargaining. At the same time, the situation receives continuing national coverage and close attention from the local black, as well as white, community. A tendency towards intransigence on the part of some of the trustees is matched by at least some of the students and some faculty, who are mistrustful and prone to take more rapid and more concrete action. The Faculty has acted, but it is not at all clear, given the history of this crisis, that the trustees will give serious attention to that action.

Faculty action must therefore be credible to the administration-trustees; it must be credible also to the students, who look to us for support, and to the nonacademic employees, for whom failure would involve disastrous personal consequences. The "Concerned Faculty" statement, therefore, sought (and still seeks) to obtain the signatures of tenured faculty, thus demonstrating the explicit support of the leading individuals in the University, and goes on to indicate both that these men expect concrete action from the administration-trustees within a reasonable time, and that they are prepared to press the issue further should such action not be forthcoming.

What will issue from the successful conclusion of this crisis as many-sided: most generally, it will be a commitment to the real responsibilities which national status imposes upon a University. It will see a situation in which the Faculty will have a major voice in decisions which affect it and the direction of its University. It will demonstrate to the University's students the commitment of Duke to the very real problems with which they, and we, are concerned. It will produce a University in which basic human dignity is respected and valued, and in which we all can proudly work together to realize the potential for national leadership and contribution which all of us desire Duke may fulfill.

This is an informal statement to which a number of the "concerned faculty" subscribe. We hope it will be the basis for discussion and action, starting now, by members of the faculty.

John Buettner-Janusch
"Endowment, buildings and equipment are important only as they contribute to the real wealth of a university, its faculty and students. The most important single consideration in choosing a college is the quality of the faculty, for this determines, in the long run, the quality of the whole institution, including its students." Official Register of Harvard University LXIII: 4 (1966).

A university is a peculiar institution. Most of the general public finds universities incomprehensible. A university is its faculty, its library, and its students. If the faculty is great and the library is great the university will almost inevitably attract great students. The university is a collection of scholars with facilities around them so that scholars work in the sciences, in the humanities, and the arts may go on.

The tradition followed in many European universities is for a university to be self-determined or self-governed—by the faculty. The value to the body politic, to society of a great university is so self-evident that many countries provide reasonable sums of money to support and operate universities without dictating day to day operations. It is not usual, among the great universities of Europe, such as Oxford, Cambridge, London, Edinburgh, the Sorbonne, Heidelberg, München, Zurich, Basel, to have the actions of students and faculty controlled by a small group of entrepreneurs. There are, of course, many difficulties because governments are inclined from time to time to reduce subsidies in response to political pressure. Nevertheless, the tradition of academic freedom is, to a large extent, more ingrained in the "hands off" policy by
governments in European universities than it is amongst universities in
the United States of America. The repressive quality of many European
universities lies in the fact that the faculties often consist of col-
lections of rigid old dodos. The faculties of European universities and
many American universities are somewhat alike in this respect.

The nature, the function, the utility, and the idea of a
university are subjects of argument and discussion. There are several
kinds of universities in America. Duke University, to many of us on
the faculty, has been represented as attempting to become a great national
university. It is said to be in competition with institutions such as
Stanford, Michigan, Chicago, Berkeley, Illinois, Columbia, Cornell,
Harvard, Yale, and others of that class. The universities with which
Duke wishes to classify itself are institutions of a certain kind. They
are the top, the first-class, the quality institutions in the United
States. Within these institutions faculty and students relate to each
other and to the administrative officers and to the regents, trustees,
overseers, or corporation in ways that are unlike the way in which the
faculty and students at Duke University interact with the administration
and the trustees. There is an extraordinary lack of self-determination
at Duke. This is not the case at other universities. I do not believe
that there is any less power in the hands of the trustees of the University
of Chicago or the corporation of Yale university for example, but I do not
believe they wield it in the day to day operation of the university as is
clearly the case at Duke. Several years ago there was some difficulties
with the nonacademic employees at Yale University. The director of
personnel did not wish to deal with the union that was formed by clerical staff. The grievances and working conditions were quite as intolerable to them as are the working conditions and grievances of the Duke nonacademic staff. It would be too long a story to relate all the details, but the director of personnel was replaced by one who would deal with the union and the dean of the law school assisted in the negotiations of enforceable, binding agreements between the union representing these nonacademic employees and the university. There was no need to have a student vigil, faculty unrest, a strike on the part of nonacademic employees, and a general re-examination of the nature of the university and the way the component parts of a university relate to each other. There was no need for this because the component parts of the university relate to each other at Yale, at Chicago, and similar universities of quality in ways that are sufficient for the maintenance of the equilibrium necessary for productive scholarly work. This is, of course, not true for all of them.

At universities such as Chicago, Stanford, Harvard and even at state universities such as Illinois, Michigan, the president is the first member of the faculty. He is not the representative of the board of trustees to the faculty. A well known professor at an Ivy league university when told by the president of his university that the president was about to call his faculty into meeting, turned to the president and stated "My dear sir, faculties have presidents, presidents do not have faculties."

At universities such as Harvard, Yale, Chicago, Michigan the administration has considerable power, and this is important when one
considers the problems of managing a university. The entire structure of the investment and managing of endowments at Chicago and at Yale for example, are handled by offices that report to the president of the university and to the trustees (Chicago) or corporation (Yale). These offices are handled and managed in such a way that it is not necessary to burden the trustees or the corporation with day to day problems of operation, and relatively minor matters of policy.

At the great universities, trustees, corporation, overseers, or regents focus their attention upon generating major sources of funds so that the institutions may survive, expand, and develop important scholarly and educational programs. The trustees concern themselves with the relationship of the university to the community defined in a variety of ways—the local community, the rest of the international academic community, the state, the nation, the community of mankind. The trustees take on specific projects to nourish and develop certain segments of the university. At the University of Chicago one or two trustees have been instrumental in developing the strong and glorious faculty for which that university is justly famous. Two or three others developed Chicago's role in the redevelopment of the Hyde Park Community. At Yale a member of the corporation has made it his business, for 40 years, to take the library under his wing. As a result the Yale University Library is one of the glories of the Western world. At Harvard several overseers are concerned with strengthening a segment of the sciences. etc.

I do not think that the trustees at any of the institutions with which Duke should classify itself would come to the campus and
negotiate with students over collective bargaining. That is the business of the administration and if the administration cannot come to a humane and satisfactory solution of such a problem the administration is replaced. I think it is most significant that the chairman of the board of trustees at Columbia University will not meet with the students. I do not think, as some of my student friends have claimed, that this indicates a deplorable degree of arrogance and detachment. I am convinced that this means that the trustees of Columbia University are quite aware of the role of trustees and the administration. It is the role of the administration and the faculty to deal with the problems manifest at Columbia. The trustees are giving support to the administration and to the faculty. It may be that the administration and the faculty have failed miserably in their duties to the students (it is my personal opinion that they have) but I believe that the result will not be the confrontation between the trustees of Columbia University and the students but a rearrangement of the organization of the university so that problems such as generated the uproar at Columbia will be mediated and handled in a proper and civilized manner.

Since Duke University is committed, or has been represented to significant segments of the faculty as committed to national status in the same sense as Chicago, Michigan, Harvard, Yale, Illinois, are national universities, there are certain consequences that follow if "they" renege upon this commitment. Many senior as well as junior members of the faculty were recruited to Duke University in the current "seller's market" in the Academic marketplace with the understanding that Duke
University is to become a national university. If this is not to be a national university and is to return to the parochial, regional status it once held, the likelihood of retaining a number of the more active and probably better younger members of the senior faculty as well as the junior faculty is remote. It is very well to argue that no man is irreplaceable. Duke University is particularly vulnerable to raiding by other universities, at this stage in its development. Should the atmosphere of the university continue to deteriorate it is highly probable that many of us will look elsewhere for the association and the support of our teaching and research and interactions with students that will be missing here at Duke University.

We shall not leave because collective bargaining is not granted, we shall leave because the faculty will have been dishonored by the way in which the trustees have ignored faculty petitions, requests, and questions. Our personal as well as our intellectual integrity is at stake. If we are a supine body of employees then those of us who do not wish to join the majority in a supine position will inevitably make arrangements elsewhere.

All universities today are witnessing major mobility within their faculties. Some universities such as Michigan, Illinois, Harvard, Berkeley can, to a large extent, withstand considerable raiding. Universities such as Yale, Duke, and Stanford are much more vulnerable in the expanding academic marketplace because they are not as large nor do they have quite as strong or powerful faculties in all areas as do the strongest and greatest American universities. The consequences to a
university such as Duke of the erosion of the more energetic and active
senior and junior faculty are inevitably far greater than if Duke Univer-
sity had already achieved the status and position to which many of us
were told it was attempting. The period of recovery will be long and
painful.

Let us reiterate, the functions of a university are
education and research. The people who perform these functions are the
faculty and the students. The faculty and the students are the university.
Trustees, typists, presidents, plumbers, deans, groundskeepers, technicians,
certainly perform useful and necessary functions in a university—but
they are strictly ancillary. It is legal fiction that the trustees are
the university. There is another legal fiction that the stockholders
are Chrysler Corporation, General Motors, Ford Motor Company—it would
be interesting to see if stockholders are able to build an automobile.
It is necessary in our society that legal fictions be adjusted to the
facts not the reverse. At many universities the fictions and facts have
been adjusted to each other so that the unnecessary, and even capricious
use of trustee power is not only against tradition but virtually impossible.

The faculty and students are in fact the university and they
should govern it. Naturally not on a one-man one-vote basis. This clearly
would allow students to outvote the faculty and every faculty member I
know would flip his wig. But some form of legislative and/or judicial
bodies of the faculty, elected by the faculty, and similar bodies of the
students, elected by the students should be governing bodies of the
university. Administrators should administer and trustees should
manage the university's investments and raise money for the university. These are things the latter understand better than the faculty, one hopes. But education and research is the competence of the faculty.

Universities are about as democratic as the petty kingdoms of Arabian peninsula. Within universities a collection of oligarchies, anarchic democracies, or totalitarian dictatorships, sometimes called departments, exist. Someone has to run the institution in which these exist. It is the function of the administration to run those aspects of the institution that make it possible for the oligarchs, the autocrats, the democrats, the anarchists, that is, the scholars, to function effectively.

Good administration is valued by faculties. It is quite clear from a number of surveys of the relationship between mobility of faculty and university policy that quality of administration is number one on the priority list of reasons faculty members choose to move.

Politics within the university, politics in the larger society in which the university finds itself are definitely an important activity for academics. Scholarly work is demanding, much more demanding than most other kinds of work and academics often do not have time to engage in the politics of their society. But my colleagues should remember the events in Germany during the '30's and '40's. German universities were the birthplace of much of modern physical science, biological science, sociology, psychology, anthropology. Within a very few years, the German universities were destroyed by the Nazi bestiality. And they were destroyed because a very large part of the academic community in Germany did not care to be "involved". One often wonders if some members of that academic
community recalled statements affirming the apolitical nature of academics as they mounted the chopping block or marched into the gas ovens of the SS.

The present crisis at Duke and crises in many other American universities demonstrate our failure as faculty. We have failed the students and we have failed ourselves. Many of us are in danger of losing our intellectual and personal integrity by the compromises we must make as we become members of the Academic Establishment. Our need, our greed, for larger research units, more machinery, more research funds may well have turned our attention away from our fundamental obligations. We sit in our offices and laboratories insulated from what happens on campus and what affects the students. Many of us do not even teach. Our colleagues in the professional schools wish to have, and do have, much to say about university policy yet they have little or nothing to do with one of the essential functions of the university—education of undergraduate and graduate students. Many technological and medical installations are far removed from the major and immediate concerns of the university. This is not an argument to eliminate them but it is an argument that everyone of us who becomes involved in such institutes, research groups, or projects should remember we have a major responsibility to students, to our colleagues, and to the university. That is to education and research, not merely to empire building.
Newspaper Items

DURHAM - About a month ago, there was a letter in a national magazine and article in a national newspaper criticizing Durham College and the treatment of Negro students there.

Two weeks ago, Durham Negro leaders, led by one of the Black activist leaders, went through the same procedure. The Black activist leaders also led the movement that has such support.

Last Thursday night, Negro leaders attended a rally on the campus of the same Durham Negro leader who led an attempt last spring to get them again work with whites.

Significantly, the movement has been opposed by fringe elements of the university community. It involves all student leaders, student organizations as well as those who have a great amount of self-discipline. Durham Negro students were the first to receive dignity and other protest demonstrations.

It has the support of many of the white students. There were distinguished full professors among students in support of the campus movement.
DUKE SIT-IN SPURS "ACTIVISM"

by

David Cooper
Journal and Sentinel Raleigh Bureau

DURHAM - About a month ago, Duke University was described by an article in a national magazine, Sports Illustrated, as a quiet, Joe College sort of place with an apathetic and unconcerned student body.

Two weeks ago, Durham Negro anti-poverty leaders told a Duke professor they were through trying to work with whites in Durham. The Black activist leaders said they were fed up and frustrated.

Last Thursday night, 3,000 Duke students and faculty members attended a rally on the campus to display their support for a campus movement that has such tough, gut issues as labor unionism, wage raises for Negro university employees and collective bargaining.

And, listening with amazement, pleasure and interest were some of the same Durham Negro leaders who had thought they would never again work with whites.

Significantly, the movement at Duke is not restricted to the fringe elements of the university community. It involves almost all student leaders, student conservatives as well as liberals, and a great amount of self-discipline through 24-hour sit-ins, marches and other protest demonstrations.

It has the support of much of the Duke faculty. "There were distinguished full professors taking part," said one leader of the campus movement.
There, on the Duke campus one rainy night last week, was Wright Tisdale, chairman of the Duke board of trustees, and the general counsel for Ford Motor Company, joining hands with students and singing the civil rights anthem, "We Shall Overcome."

From the university's administration came recognition and praise for the fact that the movement was not just another troublesome American college demonstration.

"It was unique among college students today," said Dr. R. Taylor Cole, Duke provost and the university's acting top officer, "because it was purposeful, peaceful and orderly throughout six days. I would like to publicly commend our students both for their self-discipline and for their high ideals, which prompted them to seek more rapid progress toward attainment of social justice and better wages for our non-academic employees."

As the campus movement continued to grow over the Easter weekend, a faculty leader said, "This thing has religious overtones; it's like the civil rights movement of old."

It was the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King in Memphis that was the catalyst for the Duke movement.

Now, the students and their goals appear to have piqued that conscience of almost all those connected with Duke, perhaps even some of its trustees, whose collective judgement is fairly conservative.
The protest has grown so fast in strength that some Duke faculty members expect dramatic action within the next five to six days by the Duke administration.

Duke has had demonstrations and student activists before, but they have been small in number and not very successful.

What has happened at Duke, and what does it mean?

The growing new student - faculty movement began Thursday, April 4 within hours after the Duke campus heard the news of Dr. King's death.

A group of 14 students, some of them student leaders, met in sorrow and began talking "about what we could do." With them was Dr. John Strange, an assistant professor of political science, who has also worked in anti-poverty programs.

Some of the students, Strange recalled, wanted direct and swift action. A few advocated marching through downtown Durham. Some wanted to march to the Hope Valley Country Club, a segregated private club in a well-heeled and conservative residential section nearby.

Strange and other students argued against such confrontations outside the Duke community, fearing that violence or at least a disturbance of some sort might be the result.

Instead, the students began thinking of what they might do on the campus itself, what sort of action they might seek that would
involve the university itself. They talked late into the night and began shaping a plan of action.

Dr. William Griffith, assistant dean of arts and sciences, and head of student affairs, said last week, in reflecting on the student move, "the fact it (the demonstration) was moved into our own community was very good."

By the next day, April 5, they had outlined a 4-point program. They planned to carry it directly to the university's president, Dr. Douglas M. Knight.

During Friday, the students, leaders began rounding up what support they could for their proposals and a march that night to Knight's home.

"I figured they might get 50 people," Strange recalled. Rain was pouring down Friday night as those students who were interested began their walk to Knight's home. But 450 students had joined the movement.

A mile away, as they began the march, stood Knight's house, built recently for the president and his family and for special guests a cost of $600,000. It has 14 bathrooms.

Douglas Knight, 47, took over the leadership at Duke in September 1963, after a distinguished career both as a scholar of the epic tradition and as president of Lawrence College.

"It will be our privilege in the years ahead," Knight said when he arrived at Duke, "to make tradition new as no university
in the South has done." In a later interview, he said Duke and North Carolina appealed to him because "it's a section where things are happening . . . where there are not many great universities and you have the excitement of trying to create one."

More recently, in a statement that may have been more prophetic than accurate at the time, Knight said Duke had "a campus tradition of activism."

Funds Sought

In the last several years, Knight has been vigorously trying to increase Duke's funds with a massive national drive. Unfortunately, his health since last summer had not been good.

Knight contracted hepatitis late last summer, was out of the president's office in August and September and did not return to fulltime duty until this past January 1.

Before his attack last summer, Knight had involved Duke in the complex racial problems of urban Durham. During a local controversy over housing for the poor, he and Duke offered to sell many units of Duke's housing to the city to aid the lack of public housing.

"Duke University," Knight said last July 27, "wants to assume responsible leadership in meeting the housing and other problems of this community . . . the age of the ghetto is past."
Segregation Hit

Last fall, Knight and the university administration ordered an end to the use of any off-campus segregated facility by organizations of the university. The action came during a student flap over segregation.

As the 450 students were walking quietly toward his house in the rain, Knight was relaxing from 10 days of long hours touring the country in search of more funds for Duke, a 44-year-old Methodist-related institution founded with the fortune of James Buchanan Duke, the Durham tobacco tycoon.

The students arrived. Knight came to the door. After hearing the students' 4-point demand, Knight stepped outside to talk to them. As he did, 250 students slipped inside the big house, where they were to remain for almost 48 hours.

Two of the student demands were directly related to King's assassination and the civil rights movement.

Made Requests

They asked Knight to join them in signing a newspaper advertisement deploring King's death and urging the Durham community to work for racial justice and equality, and to resign from the all-white Hope Valley Country Club.

The other two demands related more directly to the university community, and, significantly, to the Negro poor such as the garbage-
men King had gone to Memphis to help.

For several years at Duke, a labor movement had been slowly building among the university's non-academic, low-paid employees. Some of them, perhaps as many as 280 of the 5,000 in this category, had formed a union, Local 77 of the state, county, and municipal employees union, an affiliate of the AFL-CIO.

Most of the non-academic workers at Duke are Negroes. They were seeking pay raises to $1.60 an hour, recognition of the union by the university, and collective bargaining rights.

During the past two years, Duke's trustees steadfastly refused to recognize the fledgling union or to engage Duke in collective bargaining with its employees. The trustees gave no reason for their stand but in general most thought a university should not be involved with labor unions.

And this background formed the thrust for the student's other two demands to Knight: That Duke immediately raise non-academic wages to an average of $1.60 an hour and begin talking about union recognition and collective bargaining.

As the students later noted in a statement as their movement grew:

"Dr. King was assassinated while assisting the sanitary workers of Memphis in non-violently raising their wages. We are trying to assist the non-academic employees of Duke University to do the same."
Here was an issue that had a potential impact outside of Duke's gothic buildings, an impact that could reach into the heart of Durham's Negro ghetto, where Duke's employees live, with economic power rather than the separatism of "black power."

Talked with Leaders

As the students settled down in his house, Knight talked for hours into the night with them and their leaders. He said he would consider their demands.

The next morning, the 250 students were still camped in, all over the first floor of the house, as Knight and his family ate breakfast.

After breakfast, by most accounts, Knight spoke at morning services in Duke Chapel, where he told the student body that he could not answer all the demands himself. They involved university policy, he said, suggesting that the two demands directed at him might really be an unconscious move by students to shift white guilt for King's death from themselves to the president.

After the service, 400 students marched out to Knight's house to show their support for the 250 students who still remained there. The movement was growing.

In the afternoon, Knight's physician appeared at the house and told the sit-inners that the president was under doctor's care
and was "near exhaustion." Knight was later hospitalized and was still recovering a week later.

In the meantime, the students had become organized. Support committees were formed to bring food to those camped out at Knight's house.

Back to Campus

On Sunday, after two nights they decided to move the protest back to campus. But, they left 10 of their number behind at the president's house as clean-up squad. Administration leaders later said the house was spotless when the clean-up squad left.

With more students joining all the time, the movement became a "vigil." The students, numbering 400 to 500 at first, moved onto the broad, grassy quadrangle in front of the Duke Chapel. They intended to stay there, day and night, until the university moved to meet the demands.

By Tuesday, close to 1,000 students were taking part in the vigil. They did not look or act like some rag-tag "bonus army" rather, they resembled well-disciplined troops.

Vigil participants were spaced off in rows. Each row was assigned a student monitor who allowed no talking and no trouble at night. Sleeping bags and blankets were kept neat and folded. Food kitchens were erected nearby. Meal and washroom breaks were
carefully regulated. The student radio station moved outdoors, supporting the movement. The Duke Chronicle, the student newspaper, also supported it.

Sunbathing Out

Sunbathing was not allowed. Students studied and read, and boycotted classes and all university activities.

Duke employe members of Local 77 were amazed. Here was support coming from a source never dreamed of.

By afternoon, members of the local and non-affiliated employes had started walking off their jobs.

Dining-hall Negro workers were the first to leave. Students who would not participate in the movement were hired to replace them.

As part of their strategy, student leaders did not seek a unanimous boycott of the dining halls by those taking part in the vigil. Most female students had meal cards for specific periods. They were urged to use them up as swiftly as possible and then boycott the dining halls.

Picket Lines

The striking Negro workers established picket lines on the campus. During specified periods, they joined the students in singing civil rights songs.

"The strike," said Peter Brandon, white business manager of the union, "is going to be a model of (King's) type of struggle. We are committed to non-violence."
Last Sunday night, with President Knight sidelined, the chairman of the Duke trustees arrived. Wright Tisdale, vice-president and general counsel of Ford Motor Company, met in private with the executive committee of the Duke trustees, who were summoned and with top administration officers.

Faculty support for the movement began to grow as more and more students joined the vigil.

Last Tuesday, the entire divinity school faculty said it would give up pay raises for next year if the money would go instead to the non-academic workers.

Some faculty members joined the vigil. Many others signed petitions saying they would not penalize students who missed classes because of the movement.

Students were urged to call their families and ask them to send telegrams supporting the demands to university leaders.

Administration spokesmen said many telegrams supporting the demands came from parents, but most parents said they could not support the demand that Knight resign from the Hope Valley Country Club. That was a private matter, many implied.

Throughout, the students appeared to maintain a high regard for Knight.

"He's a good man caught in the institutional structure," one student said last week.
"Under Wraps"

"Apparently," said Dr. Strange, "he's really under tight wraps by a very conservative board of directors."

Bunny Small, a political science major, told a newsman that the student protest was a commitment by students, and the establishment reaction to it might well influence the students' future contributions to American society.

"We have played this whole vigil under the rules of the system," she said.

By Tuesday, Durham's black ghetto leaders had begun to notice that something was happening out there at Duke.

Howard Fuller, a well-known anti-poverty leader, visited the campus and was amazed. "What is happening out here on this grass is a lesson for all those people who say they believe in America," he said. "Even though I'm a black man and proud to be a black man I do admit you all look good to me today," he told the white Duke students.

Telegrams of support from around the nation rolled in, including wires from Sens. Eugene McCarthy and Robert Kennedy.

Kennedy Wire

Kennedy's wire said, "by your action in support of the employees of the university, who seek recognition for their bargaining rights, you set a standard that all should emulate. By your action now you
worked to improve the lives of these employes. By our common efforts, we will work to improve the lives of all Americans."

Wednesday, after the vigil had stayed outdoors three nights, the university broke silence.

Tisdale walked to the quadrangle and addressed the students. He told them the university would raise all wages to $1.60 by July 1, 1969 and would make a "significant" wage step by this July 1.

The other two demands to Knight, Tisdale said, "are of a personal nature and can be answered only by him."

"Time of Turmoil"

Tisdale also noted, "this is a time of great national concern over many long-existing problems in our society -- a time of national turmoil."

The response from the students on the grass was unusual, and gave some indication of their dedication.

When Tisdale finished speaking, there was absolute silence for 10 minutes as students reflected on his remarks. Then, with Tisdale joining them everyone sang, "We Shall Overcome."

Next, there was another 15 minutes of silence as everyone thought about it some more.

Wednesday night, students and many faculty members held a mass meeting to discuss Tisdale's statement and consider the next move.
Boycott Scored

Some faculty members, including liberal supporters of the movement, urged the students to end their boycott and return to class. They argued that Duke had made a substantial step.

The academic council, which represents the faculty, said the university had made "a serious commitment" to the non-academic workers.

The academic council also called on university leaders to "re-examine those commitments of the university ... including the nationally accepted right of collective bargaining for all workers."

Tisdale's speech had not specifically mentioned the collective bargaining issue, but he had hinted at it when he said Knight, upon his return to duty, would appoint a committee to study other matters.

Some students and faculty members felt they had been had by Tisdale's speech, that it contained little significant action.

The argument went on into the night. At 2:00 a.m. Thursday, Tisdale, thinking the Duke Chapel was empty, entered the Chapel, apparently seeking meditation. Much to his surprise, he encountered many students still up and talking about what their next step would be.

It rained all night. Most of the student vigil members stayed indoors, sleeping in the nearby dining hall, Chapel, or meeting rooms. A few hardy souls toughed it on the grass.
Thursday morning, no student decision had been reached, but the union had decided its members would remain on strike, in effect, rejecting Tisdale's speech.

The vigil students decided to hold a march, both for practical reasons and to marshal energies once again.

**Coeds Join In**

The girl's campus at Duke is about a mile from the men's campus and the vigil site. Many coed students took part. The marchers Thursday morning carried the girls' sleeping bags, blankets, books and other items back to the women's campus. Then the male students returned to the main campus. There were at least 800 in the march.

Vigil leaders met most of the day mapping the next move. As they did, the number of striking employes grew and striking Negro workers marched, bearing signs, "No more Duke poverty," and "We want collective bargaining -- now."

Two student vigil members who sat in the sunshine watching the strikers explained how the students felt.

"I think support will build," said Robert Conroy. "People who had the guts to sit on the ground three days aren't going to stop now.

**Decision Sought**

Kendall Palmer said the university administration "has to make a decision about the union now. It's three years old and it's come to a head."
Another student who joined the discussion said Tisdale had "tried to split the group, but it didn't work."

All three agreed that the union movement could easily fail if the university were able to hold off action until the regular school year ends in early June. Then, the students will be gone for the summer and the non-academic workers will no longer have such an impressive ally.

The vigil had ended, temporarily at least, they said, but the movement would go on. Other students said they might "escalate" action unless more steps were taken by the administration.

The escalation, they said, could involve "taking over" a major administration building, or the dining halls, or some other more drastic action.

Thursday night, the vigil leaders called a rally of students and faculty, not knowing for sure how many people might turn out.

Over 3,000 students and faculty members were on hand to support further action by the university. This was almost double the number involved in the vigil when it was at its peak. Another meeting was schedule for 10:30 a.m. Easter Sunday in the quadrangle.

One faculty member, Dr. Jack Cell, spoke of the impact of the movement on Duke this way:

"Your actions have had a profound effect on this university. I don't think it will ever be the same again. I hope it will be better."
Negro anti-poverty leaders from Durham were present and joined in the singing with the jubilant students and faculty members.

"Anything can happen now except violence," one student leader said later. A faculty committee was formed to press the administration for collective bargaining.

In the meantime, more non-academic employes walked off their jobs and joined the strikers. By late Thursday, Duke spokesmen estimated that 260 people were on strike, including 75 percent of dining hall staff, 50 percent of the groundkeepers, and 85 percent of the housekeepers. Union spokesmen said more were joining the strikers all the time.

Negroes Join In

On Friday, Dr. Strange said, "the students are using such a middle class method (in the protest), the administration is having a hard time reacting . . . . I anticipated 50 people, but this has grown to a movement of 3,000 people."

Middle class? The inter-fraternity council passed a resolution supporting the movement. During the sit-down boycott early in the week, students on the grass periodically sang, "America the Beautiful," hardly the theme song of most student protest movements, and flew the American flag.

One student supporting the movement, who is himself a conscientious objector to the draft, was distressed that folksinger Joan Baez addressed
the vigil last Monday night. Miss Baez, a foe of the war in Vietnam, expressed her sentiments about the war and the draft. The conscientious objector said her appearance almost caused a crisis and a split among supporters of the Duke goals.

In effect, the Duke movement appears to have the strong commitment of a wide spectrum and number of both faculty and students. It is not some "fringe element" protest, although Duke alumni and alumnae reading about it may be distressed.

In Raleigh, one prominent Duke alumnus told friends, "I have given my last contribution to Duke."

But Duke alumni have been disturbed before. Well-placed reports have it that President Knight heard some heavy alumni grumbling last Spring when the school's annual May queen was picked. Last year, the May queen was a Negro student.

At two other major higher education institutions in the state, there were much lesser, but possibly significant signs of new campus student commitment following Dr. King's assassination.

At the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, once a hotbed of student concern and activism, a long editorial in the Daily Tar Heel, the student newspaper, took the university's administration to task for not being more deeply involved in today's racial and urban problems.

Until the university does become involved, said the editorial, "until it really does start to do something about discrimination and
economic inequality in Chapel Hill, it is going to continue to be a bastion of the kind of aloof white liberalism that is not at all in the context of its greatness, nor in the tradition established here by Dr. Frank Porter Graham, the consolidated university's first president and foremost advocate of human rights."

In Raleigh, concerned students at North Carolina State University called on Governor Dan Moore and asked him to take immediate steps to bring about racial equality, justice and economic improvement for Negroes. Aides to the governor said Moore is highly pleased with the quality of the student proposals and the manner in which the students presented them.
DUKE VIGIL: RIPPLES SPREAD FROM PEBBLE TOSSED IN POND

by

Ann Colarusso

Most things are rarely as simple as they appear at first glance and the Duke University protest vigil is not an exception to the rule. On the surface when it began, it appeared to be fairly simple. The students wanted to bring about an improvement in the conditions of the non-academic employees at Duke and to strike a blow at racial discrimination.

But as the protest evolved, one began to hear mention more and more frequently of the phrase "participation in the decision-making process."

That is a familiar phrase. It has been used in connection with the Florida teacher strike. Salary was only one of several issues involved in that controversy; the teachers also wanted a voice in formulating the state's educational policy.

Closer to home, we have heard it used during confrontations between the Durham City Council and the United Organizations for Community Improvement, as UOCI campaigned for changes in a wide range of community services.

Some persons call it "participatory democracy." Ideally, it means that everyone affected by a decision should have a say in arriving at that decision.
In actual fact, it has proven to be an unwieldy ideal which seems not to have a workable structure. Massive participation is proving to be difficult in as complicated a society as ours. The Duke protest, which differs in some ways from student protest movements held on other campuses, is a good example of the difficulties involved.

It differs from traditional labor union efforts in that the university is not a profit-making institution, so wages cannot be pegged to a percentage of profits; the university has no "product" to sell for income (student tuition does not pay operating costs) and since Duke is a privately supported institution, even its income is not predictable from year to year.

It differs from other student protests in that the students are not protesting on issues which involve them as students -- such as rules governing social events, controversial speakers or living arrangements. They are asking for participation in a decision-making process which does not involve a decision affecting them because they feel those affected -- the workers -- do not have the power to intervene in their own behalf.

There are a number of protections built into the Duke administrative apparatus to serve both the faculty and the students. Faculty members have individual contracts with the university. In addition, salary scales approved by the American Association of University Professors set standards most good universities struggle to maintain
or surpass. The Academic Council, made up of elected representatives, may bring any matter it chooses to the attention of the president.

Students have a student government which handles disciplinary matters. There is a Student-Faculty Advisory Committee which may take up any matter with the president. Duke ascribes to the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students endorsed by the National Students Association and the AAUP.

The only element which has not been represented by some representative body or protective code has been the non-academic workers. They do not even have the protection of a seller's market, in that their skills are not in great demand, as are those of the faculty or members of the administration.

The demonstration began because some students felt a need to react to the assassination of Martin Luther King in a positive way, with deeds rather than empty words. When the workers went on strike, several days after the protests began, the students began to feel they bore a responsibility toward the workers for encouraging the strike.

They came to feel that recognition of the union and collective bargaining was the only way the employees would be certain of improved wages and protection from retaliation without constant student support in the form of demonstrations.

The Board of Trustees, which bears the legal and financial responsibility for Duke University, has many members whose experience
in business has led them to refuse to take binding actions on important decisions without thorough investigation of what those actions may bring about in the future.

There are a few colleges and universities in the country which do have union contracts. A study is being made which will include a survey of the experiences of those institutions with their union contracts.

This is why "participatory democracy" or "instant justice" is hard to bring to its ideal fruition and will continue to be elusive until some way is found to distribute the responsibility as well as the authority for decision making.

Dr. John Strange, an assistant professor of political science at Duke and a consultant to The North Carolina Fund, has been close to the movement from its beginning. He was with the students during their sit-in at President Douglas Knight's home and he is credited by some administration sources with being a constructive influence in the beginning stages before the students developed their own organizational structure.

Strange appears to take a philosophical attitude toward the demonstration, noting that the body politic has always advanced in response to "stresses and strains" put upon it by dissident groups. One gets the impression after talking with Strange that he feels the protest, whatever failure it may have to achieve all of its
desired results, has been a valuable lesson in practical political science to the students who are participating.

There is no doubt the students are learning some things. They have demonstrated an ability to organize and discipline their protest to an extent which impresses most observers on the scene. Whatever one may say about the rightness or wrongness of their actions, it is not a disorderly, anarchistic affair.

They also have learned that they do not live in a vacuum. Their action is much like a pebble tossed into a pond. The ripples now have encompassed the strikers, Dr. Knight's health (and some say his future at the university), dissension among some of the benefactors of Duke, as well as other intangible mental attitudes and relationships at Duke, Durham and in the state as a whole.

Sunday will be a crucial time. It is the last day of the moratorium which the students declared and which they hoped would allow time for more progress toward their demands. It is doubtful any additional progress will have been obtained.

Some positive results have been attained. The workers will start getting increases in salary July 1, 1968 and the minimum wage of $1.60 per hour will be complete by July 1, 1969. It is probable that some improvements in the university's personnel policies will be made.

What is not known now is whether any possible negative results from the demonstration will result -- whether the end of the demon-

stratification would mean the end of the ripples which it set in motion, not only at Duke but also within the Negro and white communities in Durham, alumni groups in cities throughout the state, and among the demonstrators themselves.
"You have wrought a revolution," one of the faculty members addressing the Vigil rally said last night.

He was right, and the mere presence of faculty members at the rally testified to the fact. But revolutions always must be followed by re-evaluation — re-evaluation of ourselves, our individual relation to our society, our University and its power structure.

In a sense, the revolution wrought by the six-day protest is symbolized by the transformation which the protest itself underwent. The demonstration began with one of the most brazen acts of any college protest, the seizure of the home of the president of the University. It ended with 1,400 people standing in the rain all day Wednesday silently demonstrating their anguish over the crisis brought about by racism and Duke's complicity in its treatment of its non-academic employees.

It began in the old Duke University, when the small minority of activist students and faculty felt that only confrontation politics could move their school to action. It ended in the new Duke University, with some of our most distinguished professors thanking the students for doing what the faculty had had neither the guts nor the unity to do.

It began in the old Duke University, when most students, finding no way to exert meaningfully their consciences, were retreating into either alienation or pursuit of self-interest. It ended in the new
Duke University, with over a thousand students having seen the simple act of standing silently to demonstrate moral outrage move an enormous institution to social action it had hardly considered before.

It began in the old Duke University, with a faculty hung-up on Concerned Faculty committees but almost never taking any sort of constructive action through its most powerful group the Academic Council, and generally disdainful of student activism. It ended in the new Duke University, with the faculty literally awed by the resolve of an unheard-of number of students pursuing irreproachable goals and strangely respectful of an element in the student body's character which no one had known existed before.

It began in the old Duke University, with a conservative Board of Trustees unconcerned about the social impact of University economic policy and feeling no pressure to become concerned. It ended in the new Duke University, with the Board and its chairman having learned a solid and much-needed lesson about the depth of student feeling and interest in the course of the University.

It began in the old Duke University, which seemed to most of the black community in Durham the very symbol of the indifference of middle-class white America to the racial crisis. It ended in the new Duke University, with the jubilant faces of a thousand non-academic employees who had seen with their own eyes as they came to work that over a thousand middle-class white students cared enough about them to spend the night in the rain and bring this educational institution to a grinding halt.

Now is the time to cry out, as Dr. Sullivan did Wednesday night,
Appendix Four
Report from the Blackburn Committee

The work of the Blackburn Committee has been to deal with institutional relations with students, faculty, and alumnus. The solution adopted was...
INTERIM REPORT TO THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
BY THE
COMMITTEE ON NON-ACADEMIC EMPLOYEES

The work of the Blackburn Committee, to determine the adequacy of institutional relations with the non-academic employees, properly derives from a resolution adopted without dissent by the Academic Council at their February meeting. Additionally, this Committee was charged at a meeting of the university faculty on April 19 to carry out this mandate and report their findings to the general faculty, as well as to the Academic Council. From both sources the intent was clear that no solution, including that of collective bargaining, be barred from consideration in elevating the living standards and working conditions of the non-academic employees.

In its short life the Committee has been engaged in both fact finding activities and in meeting with the Special Trustee-Administrative Committee, whose task it is to seek solutions to the concerns of the non-academic staff.

This preliminary report is focused on arrangements concerning participation by non-academic employees in the determination of wages, hours, and conditions of employment, though the Committee is continuing its inquiries into related matters. The necessity for confining the report stems from the fact that this issue, clearly mentioned in the Trustee-Administrative Committee statement of April 20, is critical to a more permanent resolution of our recent labor-management difficulties and is especially timely in view of the imminent close of the academic year.
Generally, the Committee has found that institutional arrangements respecting employee participation in the determination of employment conditions can be distributed among five models which provide a basis for comparison and recommendation.

The first such model, Collective Bargaining Under the NLRB, is not particularly applicable to university operations for reasons which will be made clear in the text. The second, third, and fourth, Collective Bargaining by Contract, "Stay Ahead" Policy with Collective Bargaining Possible, and "Stay Ahead" Policy with Collective Bargaining Discouraged, are all possible models employed in university settings. The fifth, Collective Bargaining Forbidden by Law, is a model in use but not appropriate in our setting. Each will be discussed in turn.

Finally, an alternative possibility generated by the Committee will be proposed.

1. Collective Bargaining Under the NLRB. Pursuant to the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, most large scale private employers in the United States are legally obliged to permit their employees to organize into appropriate bargaining units and to form either an unaffiliated union of their own or to affiliate as a local of a national or international union, as they choose. The employer must recognize the union once its majority status has been determined, and he must be willing to bargain in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other conditions of employment in the determination of term contracts enforceable in court or, as frequently provided by the contracts themselves, by a process of binding arbitration respecting all disputes arising under such contracts. The essential theory of the Wagner
Act eschews the alternatives of having government itself dictate the particular conditions of employment and the earlier tradition of sanctioning large concentrations of capital pursuant to which the relative impotence of each individual employee with few employment alternatives made it difficult for him to resist one-sided employment terms proposed on a take-it-or-leave it basis. By providing legal protection for self-organization and the demand for collective bargaining, the Wagner Act facilitated the interest of employees to join together as groups and to confront management with countervailing power over labor supply more nearly equivalent to management's power over job opportunities. Where the ensuing bargain thus takes place between labor and capital of fairly equal strength, the terms of the resulting contract allegedly are less likely than otherwise to be unfair to either side. Thus, the Wagner act protects employee interests in collective self-help within the law and obligates employers to bargain in good faith; the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 essentially makes the duty to bargain in good faith mutual. Disagreements respecting the composition of appropriate bargaining units are subject to resolution by the NLRB, breaches of the duty to bargain are subject to the NLRB which will determine whether an unfair labor practice has occurred, and the Board's authority to issue cease and desist order, orders of reinstatement with or without back pay, etc., are enforceable through the various United States courts of appeal.

Duke University (with the exception of the hospital) is subject to the national labor acts as a matter of law, but neither Duke itself nor its employees can seek the assistance or use of the processes of the NLRB as a matter of fact. This is so
simply because the Wagner Act extends NLRB jurisdiction to all employers whose operations "affect commerce" (and judicial decisions make clear that Duke's operation readily comes within this phrase), but the Board itself has elected not to exercise all of its statutory jurisdiction and specifically has declined to act with respect to educational institutions. Whatever the wisdom of this determination, its effect is to make reference to the NLRB unavailable to Duke and its employees. While a few states have established compensatory arrangements of their own, North Carolina has not done so and thus no local equivalent to the NLRB is available either.

2. Collective Bargaining by Contract. In a number of private universities (e.g., Princeton, Yale, Chicago, and Harvard) segments of the nonacademic work force organize and affiliate with conventional labor unions and freely bargain with union representatives on matters of hours, wages, and conditions of employment. This practice exists, even though these institutions are not required by federal or state law to do so and they could, in theory, discourage such measures of collective self-help by discharging any employee who joins a union or by refusing to deal with representatives to reach enforceable agreements. (In a few states, however, state law protects the interest of educational employees to organize and to bargain collectively; North Carolina is not one of these.) Once a collectively-bargained contract has been signed, it is enforceable in the same manner as any other private contract (typically by actions in state courts for injunctive relief or money damages), except that frequently such contracts contain arbitration clauses. These clauses usually provide that disagreements arising under the contract itself will be referred
to a neutral arbitrator (frequently chosen from the American Arbitration Association). If either party refuses to move to arbitration, the other party may seek enforcement of the arbitration clause through the processes of a regular court. The arbitration clause is increasingly popular in such agreements, evidently because it is felt to provide a more efficient, less costly, less time-consuming, and more expert resolution than recourse to the courts. In North Carolina, however, an arrangement of this sort may not be practical because the state courts are reluctant to enforce arbitration agreements and thus, in many circumstances, either party to such an agreement might be free to ignore his duty to have a question arbitrated without having to worry about legal sanctions. (Whether the Federal Arbitration Act will control state court decisions on this subject is a matter which has not yet been decided.)

Duke, of course, is free to adopt the practice of these other institutions in modification of its previous policy. At the present time, the University permits employees to join organizations of their own choosing but it has declined to bargain with representatives of any such organization and it declines to make any enforceable collective contract. Rather, the provisions in the Personnel Handbook are not the product of negotiation and bargain with employee representatives, they are not enforceable in courts of law, and they are subject from moment to moment to unilateral revision by the university. While employees have been permitted to have a spokesman accompany them through some stages of the grievance procedure, such a spokesman is not recognized as a representative of any group of employees as such. Similarly, while suggestions respecting the Handbook are welcome from employees accompanied by a spokesman, the discussions are essentially consultations
after which decisions are determined unilaterally; they are not collective negotiations culminating in binding agreements.

3. "Stay Ahead" Policy, Collective Bargaining Possible. Some institutions and a substantial number of industrial employers currently have little or no formal collective bargaining with their employees even while indicating a willingness to operate under arrangements described above. Their policy is to establish and maintain sufficiently attractive wages, hours, and conditions of employment in comparison with employers operating under collective bargaining that their own employees are disinclined to organize, presumably on the basis that they have no sufficient need to do so. For instance, according to its Director of Personnel, the University of Rochester attempts to operate on this model:

The University of Rochester has 6,868 campus based nonacademic employees. There is only one union in operation in the University. This is an engineering and maintenance union consisting of approximately 45 members in the Medical Center. This union deals with the University in a true collective bargaining sense. It has a contract which is negotiated by representatives of the University and representatives of the Union. The Union can use its attorney as a negotiating agent if it sees fit. Under New York Law hospital and employees may unionize; whereas University employees cannot.

There are no other unions throughout the University of Rochester system although there have been two attempts to unionize various employee groups in the hospital. The University believes it has escaped unionization because it has moved to provide as much as the union might in its employee-employer relationship. It has never attempted to block the formation of employee groups and it has stated, as a policy of the board of trustees, that it would be willing to deal with employees as a group if the employees followed certain due processes.

It is questionable whether this "model" is clearly distinguishable from the one described in 2 above but we conclude that it is -- at least in emphasis. Here,
The emphasis is on "staying ahead" by surveying unionized shops and consciously doing as well or better as a matter of planned unilateral policy which produces sufficient employee satisfaction that the incentive to unionize does not materialize. The model does not insist that employees are better off without collective bargaining, however, for the institution also maintains an announced policy that it will engage in collective bargaining if the employees themselves so desire. Thus, the wisdom and fairness of managerial strategy has a built-in check in the reserved prerogative of employees to pursue self-organization, representation, and collective bargaining if they feel its benefits would exceed its costs.

4. "Stay Ahead" Policy, Collective Bargaining Discouraged. Some institutions appear to discourage collective bargaining for their employees in varying degrees (ranging from a vaguely expressed reluctance down to clear policy statements and discriminatory practices against active union members), even while unilaterally maintaining attractive labor conditions in comparison with union competitors.

Because of incomplete reports, we are unable to specify concretely which institutions are clearly given to this model. It is clear at the present moment, however, that Duke University is not within this model although the university appears to be working in this direction. Thus, the policy at Duke is currently one of refusing collective bargaining, without, however, necessarily "staying ahead" of others in terms of actual conditions of employment. For instance, wages paid at Duke lag well behind those paid to non-academic employees in equivalent positions at the University of North Carolina. Our Personnel Office has been systematically surveying other employers in the immediate region in recent years. Their surveys
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indicate that Duke has gained some ground relative to these employees, but that it still lags well behind other major employers in Durham. UNC has no collective bargaining (Public Employee membership in unions being forbidden by North Carolina law), American Tobacco has unions, and IBM successfully follows a "stay ahead" policy. Fragmentary reports (which are subject to correction as additional information continues to be gathered) suggest that Duke University is not widely sought after as a preferred employer in this region. Thus, in spite of the fact that Duke is the largest single employer in the immediate area, it cannot be said that it has pursued a "stay ahead" policy even while it has discouraged employee self-help, long refusing to consider collective bargaining.
5. **Collective Bargaining Forbidden by Law.** A large number of public institutions are situated in states having statutes which forbid public employees either to affiliate for purposes of collective bargaining or to strike for improved wages, hours, and other conditions of employment, or both. The ban on organization per se, i.e., mere association with a labor organization even when the organization forsweares the right to strike, is currently undergoing litigation to determine whether such laws may violate First Amendment freedoms of voluntary association. The statutory restrictions forbidding strikes or collective bargaining by public employees have been explained on several different bases, including the following:

a) critical services (e.g., police and fire protection) may be imperiled as a consequence of a strike and thus the marginal economic leverage achieved by the right to strike must be subordinated to the transcendent public good;

b) public employees are also part of the body politic and thus have adequate opportunity to influence conditions of public employment by ordinary political processes—of opportunity not equally available to employees of private firms—and consequently they have less need of collective bargaining or the right to strike;

c) public employers are not profit-making enterprises to begin with and the lost-profit consequence of a prospective strike will not operate as an incentive for the public employer to negotiate improved working conditions in any case;

d) very frequently, the governmental body operating as the public employer has no control over prospective funds which are appropriated by a separate body (e.g., the larger part of a state university's budget is appropriated by the state legislature). Consequently, the public employer is himself in no position to respond to demands for a contract establishing certain wages or other conditions of employment especially since the appropriating body may decline to authorize such expenditures;

e) in some states a concept of sovereign immunity precludes government entities from making the sort of enforceable contractual arrangements ordinarily included in the processes of collective bargaining.
While the merit of these reasons is widely disputed and while a number of states do permit public employees at least to organize and to engage in collective bargaining, we have insufficient information to determine whether actual conditions of employment of public employees are generally as good as in the private sector where collective bargaining takes place. The increased frequency of illegal strikes by public employees in recent years may, however, suggest some inadequacy in the public sector. In any case, no similar legal restriction precludes Duke University from modifying its current policy in this regard. Duke has, in the past, elected to refuse collective bargaining as a matter of choice, whereas UNC, for instance, has had no choice to consider the matter because of North Carolina law. At the same time, Duke's general conditions of employment for non-academic employees appear to be less favorable than those at UNC in spite of the fact that conditions of employment for the academic staff at Duke are generally significantly more favorable than at UNC. (Thus, Duke has maintained an A rating on the annual AAUP salary survey for the last five years even as UNC has a B rating for the same period.)

Among the five models we have examined, it would appear that Duke University currently does not fit within any of them. Rather, it has neither stayed ahead of other significant employers within the same region nor has it permitted any form of labor representation and collective bargaining leading to enforceable agreements--an opportunity for the non-academic employees to pursue a measure of self-help through the establishment of countervailing power over the supply of labor competing for jobs at Duke, the area's largest employer. While internal measures were begun significantly to upgrade
employment conditions well before the recent strike, and while they have been greatly accelerated within the past month (the immediate improvement in wages is estimated to require an additional $2.2 million to next year's budget), it cannot be said that the policy has been satisfactory.

Under these circumstances, it may be appropriate to consider a number of available alternatives, even while noting that some of these are by no means mutually exclusive. The first alternative appears to be suggested by the current demand of a substantial number of the non-academic employees, the request of students participating in the Vigil, and the recommendation implied in the resolutions of the Academic Council and the University Faculty: i.e., recognition of the principle of collective bargaining and the prompt establishment of means to implement that principle. As previously reviewed here, acceptance of the principle would mean that the University would announce as policy a willingness that non-academic employees may associate with groups having common interests in their wages, hours, and conditions of employment, that they may also affiliate with outside organizations or remain independent as they choose, and select representatives of their own choosing. The University would announce as part of this same policy that it would bargain in good faith with these representatives to negotiate specific contracts mutually binding upon the employees and the University and enforceable in the manner of ordinary collective bargaining agreements, i.e., in the civil courts.

Implementation of the principle would, of course, require specific answers to several questions. Among these are the following: what standards shall be used to determine whether a particular group of employees has employment interests common to themselves and distinct enough from interests
of other employees that they would compose, as a group, a logical unit?

What standards shall be used to determine whether any organization claiming representative status does in fact represent a majority of the employees within a given unit? What subjects are appropriately subject to good faith bargaining as distinct from subjects which should be reserved to the unilateral determination of the University (e.g., endowment investment) or to the unilateral determination of the labor organization (e.g., dues) alone? What standards shall be used to determine whether the University and the employee representatives are in fact bargaining "in good faith," rather than merely stalling for time in order to build pressure for concessions? Assuming that collective bargaining contracts may be reached with representatives of employees who are members of the organization signing such contracts, how shall conditions of employment be determined for similarly situated employees who are not members of that organization? In the event that a dispute arises as to whether the University or the organization is fulfilling the terms of its contract, or whether the contract in fact supports the interpretation of one or the other party, how is the dispute to be resolved? If the contract provides for resolution by neutral arbitration, how is the arbitration clause to be enforced?

While each of these (and other) questions is not without difficulty, it is also reasonably clear that none is insurmountable in view of the fact that they have been surmounted at other institutions that long ago implemented collective bargaining.

An alternative to the implementation of collective bargaining alone would be for the University to announce its acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining as outlined above, but to proceed so to increase employment bene-
fits that employees determine to their own satisfaction that formal collective bargaining is neither necessary nor desirable under the circumstances. Still another alternative is that the University may conscientiously improve employment conditions and yet actively discourage an employee option for collective bargaining. Or it may improve employment conditions and vigorously condemn collective bargaining by discriminatory discharges, securing state court injunctions against strikes, etc. Or it may decline to improve employment conditions beyond the bare minimum essential to maintain an adequate work force against local competition and vigorously condemn collective bargaining by all legal means. We see no point in developing these latter two alternatives, however, as they have met with no enthusiasm with any of the parties with whom we have talked and are uniformly regarded as destructive of the best interests of the University.

We are aware, however, that there is reluctance to accept conventional collective bargaining in at least two of its aspects, and that this reluctance is shared by some of the employees as well as some of the Trustees. The reluctance is based upon a feeling that enforcement of collectively bargained contracts by the civil courts is often expensive, time-consuming, inefficient, and abrasive. Given the fact that arbitration clauses are generally not enforceable in North Carolina, moreover, conventional collective bargaining processes might well produce contracts which neither party would feel free to seek to enforce through the laborious process of civil litigation. Additionally, there is some doubt as to whether representation by national or international labor organizations may carry with it a degree of bureaucracy and professional self-interest somewhat in conflict with the felt needs of the
employees who would be bound by their policies.

We do not wish to consider at length the question as to whether these reservations are well founded. It appears, rather, that a set of arrangements within the University itself can be revised. These arrangements can implement the principles of organization, representation, and enforceable agreements set forth in the Faculty resolution of April 19.

We have therefore proposed to the Special Trustee-Administrative Committee a plan for employee relations at Duke, the outline of which follows. It should be understood that there are other equally acceptable plans, so that the Faculty Committee is not bound to insist on this plan and to reject all other plans. On the other hand, we feel that this plan represents the minimum set of features consistent with the previous resolutions of the Academic Council and the Faculty. We submit this plan for discussion in the Academic Council and as part of our report to the Council.

TENTATIVE PROPOSALS FOR REVISIONS IN NON-ACADEMIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS AT DUKE UNIVERSITY

The Duke University Employee Relations Commission (DUERC)

A. Size, initial formation.

1. 7 persons: 1 trustee, 1 from administration
   2 employees, 3 faculty members

2. Initial Appointments.

a. Trustee member - appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

b. Administration member - appointed by the President of the University.
c. Faculty members - elected by the Academic Council.

d. Employee members - elected by all non-academic employees of the University with suitable provisions for repeated balloting until majority votes are obtained. Election to be conducted by the Secretary of the University.

B. Term of Office: Two years, with staggered terms.

C. Method of choosing after initial appointment

1. Trustee member: - by appointment - Chairman of the Board of Trustees

2. Administration member: by appointment - President of the University

3. Employee members: - elected by the membership of whatever groups may have been formed under section III of this document. Nominations to be made by any employee. Repeated balloting among all employee group members until two employees have a clear majority. If more than one group has been formally organized only one employee from any group may be elected. If no organized groups have been formed then by ballot of all non-academic employees of Duke University.

4. Faculty members: - one appointed by the President of the University, one appointed by the employee members, and one selected by the trustee and administration members from a list of five submitted by the employee members.

D. Professional Assistance

DUERC shall be provided by the University with sufficient funds to solicit professional and impartial advice in the conduct of its affairs.

I. Groups of Employees

A. The initial grouping of employees for the purposes enumerated below shall be determined by DUERC. In specifying groups, DUERC will be guided by the following considerations:

1. All employees below the supervisory level will be included in one group or another.
2. Groups should reflect community of employee interests.

3. No groups shall consist of less than thirty persons.

B. Provisions for Separation and Mergers of Groups

This document provides for initial groupings of employees under A above. Future developments which may affect logical groups may well arise, though they cannot now be foreseen. Therefore provisions should be developed under which groups may merge or subdivide.

II. Election to determine organization within groups of employees

A. An election to determine whether employees wish to organize shall be held upon written request of 10% of employees in that group, as certified by DUERC.

B. DUERC holds election on the question as to whether employees wish to establish a formally organized group. Majority required for affirmative decision.

C. Membership in organized groups.

If the employees vote to organize those who indicate a desire in writing to join organized groups constitute the membership. Groups shall file annual report on membership to DUERC. No employee shall be required to join.

D. Member employees meet, draw up their own charter, and elect their own officers and representatives.

Meetings of group representatives: arriving at agreements with the University.

A. Elected representatives shall be certified by DUERC.

B. Elected employee representatives may have counsel of their own choice present in discussions.

C. Subject matter of discussions and agreements:

1. Wages
2. Work Schedules
3. Criteria for promotion or advancement in wage brackets.
4. Criteria for priority in summer layoffs, fall returns.
5. Fringe Benefits

6. Other conditions of employment

V. Memorandum of Agreement

A. Summarizes agreements reached under IV above.

B. Dated and signed by both parties as a supplement to the Personnel Handbook.

C. Applies only to the group represented in the discussions.

D. Binding on both parties for the period specified in the agreement.

E. Unilateral Handbook changes in conflict with signed agreements shall have no force with respect to the groups covered by agreements unless the changes are accepted by the groups.

VI. Procedure when violations of the handbook or the memorandum of agreement are alleged:

A. Individual Employee
   
   Grievance procedure as at present.

B. By organized groups
   
   DUERC investigates, renders binding decision.

C. DUERC shall function as arbitrator only when specified in written agreements.