

A  
CHRONOLOGY  
OF THE EVENTS OCCURING IN THE LOWER LOBBY,  
BETWEEN THE ENTRANCES TO THE BEAR'S  
LAIR AND THE ASUC BOOKSTORE,  
DURING THE AFTERNOON  
OF WEDNESDAY,  
DECEMBER 30,  
1966

Introduction

What follows is as complete an account as the need for haste and the available information permitted, of the event taking place in and around the Lower Lobby of the Student Union on Wednesday, November 30, 1966.

The Council of Campus Organizations commissioned a committee to prepare and publish this chronology. Since as accurate an account of the facts as was possible was desirable, it was intended that the committee obtain -- if possible -- permission to reproduce unaltered, and simultaneously, the independent chronology already prepared by four faculty members who witnessed the events. Permission was not obtained; we have since learned that faculty apparently intend to publish that document.

This report is based on the verbal and written statements of student witnesses to the events. In addition, there exist extensive tapes of the events, recorded by Radio KAL, which have served as a prime information source. These tapes are open to the public to hear or copy; they may help to clarify the course of events from 12:20 p. m. onward, which period they cover. (KPFA appears to have tapes covering the previous twenty minutes; we have been unable to consult them yet.)

Prologue

In early 1965 the United States Navy set up a recruiting table in the Student Union. Students protested the table's presence by picketing. They also registered a formal complaint with the Dean of Students Office regarding preferential treatment of government agencies. The Administration took no action.

Some weeks before November 30, 1966, Chancellor Heyns was asked on a

television broadcast how the setting-up of such a table this year could be justified in the light of this past protest. He responded that non-students were welcome on the campus, so long as they obeyed the rules set for the University community.

Wednesday, November 30

Campus SDS called a demonstration to protest the setting-up of a Navy recruiting table in the Student Union. The major purpose of the demonstration was to voice a protest against the draft and against the Vietnam war. In addition, Campus SDS had planned previously, and on Wednesday undertook, to work in conjunction with the Berkeley Draft Information Committee (BDIC), an off-campus organization, to show the moral and political inequity of the differential enforcement of the Administration's rules.

The method was to set up a table for the dissemination of literature opposing the draft and the war. This table, like the Navy recruiting table beside which it was set, was to be manned by a non-student. A 38 year old woman, Mrs. Corrine Goldstick, was chosen. It was intended that the only substantive differences between the two tables be the content of the positions which they advocated, and the fact of the sponsorship of one by (as the Administration describes it) a "cooperative governmental agency."

Wednesday morning, Mrs. Goldstick went to the Dean of Students to ask permission of the Administration to set up the anti-draft table. She was told by Miss McBernie (an assistant to Dean Hopkins) that permission could not be granted. Nonetheless, a few minutes before noon she set the table up beside the pro-draft Navy table. Shortly thereafter, the picket line organized by students in campus SDS arrived to begin their demonstration.

The presence of the picket line, and also of a number of police, reporters, and cameramen, attracted a growing crowd of passerby, including people who opposed the demonstration, people in sympathy with it, and people in variously neutral states of curiosity.

At this time, a campus policeman informed Mrs. Goldstick that he had been instructed to request that she leave. Mrs. Goldstick protested that she had as much right to stay as the non-students at the Navy recruiting table. The officer insisted again, and Mrs. Goldstick agreed to leave. During this conversation, the crowd drew around the two tables. Seeing that the anti-draft table was forced to cease handing out information while no action was taken regarding the pro-draft table, part of the crowd expressed forceful verbal disapproval as the table was being carried away by the police. There was difficulty in moving the table through

the crowd, which was by this time quite large and tightly packed. In addition, several people attempted to grasp the table, causing the police to jerk it from their hands. After this, the table was removed from the lobby without further incident.

Approximately at this time, some of the demonstrators removed the several dozen pieces of literature which were on the Navy table, so that, having no function there, it would be removed. The literature was handed back and done violence to.

As the police led Mrs. Goldstick through the crowd, a student later identified as James Phillips, former captain of the football team, began pushing people out of the way in what appeared to those present as an attempt to clear a way for the police. The crowd again expressed a forceful verbal protest, against his pushing of people. Shortly thereafter, Phillips was reported by several witnesses to have lunged at a student later identified as Willy Brandt. Brandt appears to have addressed provocative remarks to Phillips upon observing Phillips' actions. Phillips claims not to have hit Brandt; other witnesses are uncertain on this point. Brandt's shirt was torn in the scuffle. He appeared surprised but quickly recovered, and lunged in return towards Phillips. Before Brandt could reach Phillips, he was restrained by campus police, who then led him nonresisting out of the lobby. Demonstrators and others voiced immediate and loud disapproval at what appeared to be an injustice: namely, that the person attacked, and not the attacker, had been led away by the police and apparently arrested.

Amid confusion and a general feeling of resentment, some students yelled at the crowd to be seated, that there had been one arrest and that by sitting down they would reduce confusion and avoid the possibility of further violence and further arrests. Demonstrators and some observers alike responded; order was restored, and calm returned. The chairman of the Draft Committee of Campus SDS, a student, rose to chair the ensuing discussion. A three minute time limit was set on speakers and strictly enforced. The initial discussion centered around the apparent inequity of the arrest, and the Administration's granting of special privilege to the Navy.

At about 12:30, Vice-Chancellor Boyd arrived, and was given the next position on the speakers' list. He requested that the protestors disperse. They responded by explaining that they felt Willy Brandt had been treated unfairly by the police. They also expressed their opposition to the continued presence of the Navy table in the Student Union.

At this point, the protestors noted that several unidentified people -- apparently non-students -- were taking individual pictures of the demonstrators. Boyd, in speaking to the group, addressed several students and non-students by name,

indicating that he considered them leaders of the demonstration. (See Appendix A.) He then withdrew to another part of the lobby to confer with the campus police, several members of the ASUC, and the several faculty members present.

At Boyd's request to disperse, the demonstrators attempted to ascertain if they were breaking an Administration rule, and, if so, what action they could take to avoid breaking such rules. The recorded tapes disclose intermittent and inconclusive conversation with Boyd on these subjects. In Boyd's absence, the demonstrators discussed and voted unanimously demands, upon the granting of which they would disperse. The demands were:

- 1) That anti-draft protestors be allowed a table next to the Navy's table; that non-students be allowed equal treatment with Navy non-students; and that the presence itself of the Navy's table in the Student Union be subject to negotiation;
- 2) That no charges be brought against Willy Brandt or against anyone else;
- 3) That there be no Administrative disciplinary action taken against any student who organized or participated in the demonstration;
- 4) That they could return to picket the Navy recruiting table the next day, should the negotiations not be satisfactory; and
- 5) That Boyd return and discuss these issues with them.

Boyd returned, and told them that Administration rules permitted tables in the lobby and therefore that no special sanction from was needed; that he knew of no reason why SDS could not set up a table beside the Navy table, provided at least one student manned it; and that he did not know why the table had been removed. The protestors pointed out his mistake about the rules, and indicated that, although his offer did not satisfy their first demand, they would still accept it. Boyd told them he would negotiate the presence of the Navy table in the Student Union, not there and with the whole group, but in his office with a small group of the demonstration's "leaders" if they would "identify" themselves to him.

Boyd stated that he did not have Brandt arrested and could do nothing to help him. He was then asked if he would affirm that no student be disciplined for participating in or organizing the demonstration. Though the tape's testimony is confused and fragmented, the interchange appears to have been on the following order: Boyd refused; he was asked why; he stated that he could not make that kind of agreement; whereupon the precedent for demands 2 and 3 in the October 2, 1964 agreement was cited to him.

Boyd definitely responded, "I probably could say that (i. e., could grant

condition 3), but I believe it would be unwise for me to say that under these circumstances." He then stated that he would declare the assembly "unlawful" if the demonstrators did not leave within ten minutes. The demonstrators protested loudly. Quiet was restored, and he was asked why it was unlawful. He stated that it was an unlawful assembly because, in his opinion, such a decision was in the best interests of the University community. They asked how they could make the assembly "lawful", and, again, what made it "unlawful". He responded that the assembly was interfering with the functioning of the University, and added that, after all, the bookstore was part of the University. The demonstrators then pointed out that the police themselves had locked the doors, therefore obstructing the bookstore's entrance completely. Boyd responded that, even if the doors were not locked, the area was so crowded that no one could pass through.

For quite some time (approximately, since the table's removal), all doors to the area had been locked; police were about the main ones, behind which were growing crowds; egress from the lobby was permitted, though only through a group of police blocking the stairs to persons wishing to enter; and the sixty or so demonstrators were clustered at the foot of the stairs, leaving the rear part of the lobby free. Following Boyd's remark, they formed corridors which allowed clear paths from the (locked) plaza entrance to the (locked) bookstore entrance, and from the (locked) Bear's Lair entrance to and up the stairs. The demonstrators then asked if the assembly were still unlawful. Boyd answered that it was. Asked why, and how they could make it lawful, Boyd said, because he declared it so, and they should disperse. He offered no other alternative. The protestors again pointed out that they would leave if a general "amnesty" were granted, i. e. their second and third demands.

Boyd walked away to again confer with the police. The demonstrators continued their discussion. Several students appealed to Boyd to grant "amnesty", to avoid further conflict. Several faculty members also appeared to request this of him. Boyd returned to the group, said the assembly was now unlawful, and refused to participate in further discussion. In view of the unidentified photographers, the events of the past several years, and Boyd's refusal to discuss "amnesty", the students feared subsequent discipline should they have left at that point.

The organized discussion on the draft, the Administration, and the afternoon's events continued for approximately two hours. During this time Dean Arleigh Williams arrived to speak to the demonstrators. He said that he would stake his personal reputation on the fact that no participant would be disciplined,

but that he could not speak for the Administration itself. The demonstrators, although assured of Williams' sincerity, felt that his statement did not insure that no disciplinary action would be instituted after the demonstration dispersed; and they asked for a reaffirmation from Boyd or from someone who could speak for the Administration. This was of special concern to them, in view of Boyd's earlier refusal to grant "amnesty". (See Appendix B.)

At 4:15 p. m. two demonstrators and one professor went to see Professor Searle, in his administrative capacity, who said that Williams had been speaking for the Administration, and that, therefore, the "amnesty" had been refused. Searle was then told that he, Boyd, or Vice-Chancellor Cheit should go immediately to reaffirm the "amnesty", and that the demonstration would then end. However, no one arrived at the demonstration to reaffirm the "amnesty". (See Appendix C.)

At around 5:30, six football players were allowed to enter the bookstore's doors, which had been blocked by the police. When asked why they were allowed in, a policeman said, "Why do you people get excited over nothing?" He then said, "They just came to get some instructions, and they'll be going right out." When asked what instructions they sought, the officer replied, "I'm giving a party, and I'm inviting the football team."

Shortly after the football players left, cries from upstairs that police were in the basement brought the question of arrests to the immediate center of the demonstrators' attention. They felt that everyone in the lobby would be arrested; and foreign students and minors were advised to leave.

Shortly after 6:00 p. m., about twenty non-campus police entered the lobby and singled out four non-students for arrest. (See Appendix D.) The first arrest resulted in a scuffle between police, attempting to reach Mike Smith in the middle of the crowd, and demonstrators, attempting to block them. (Smith repeatedly stated that he would go quietly.) Women as well as men were hit and kicked, police fell on top of students, and several people were hit by television cameras attempting to film the incident. The other three arrests -- of Steve Hamilton, Jerry Rubin, and Stu Albert -- were made without incident. (See Appendix E.)

Immediately after these arrests, all doors were unlocked, and the campus and other police left. It was announced that there would be no more arrests. A discussion took place as to whether or not to remain in the building. A subsequent vote led the remaining protestors to join the demonstration upstairs, which by then had grown to several thousands.

\* \* \* \* \*

### Appendix A

At this point should be noted the possibility of distinguishing two demonstrations: the initial one planned by the SDS, and the spontaneous one provoked by the first arrest and the removal of the anti-draft table. The leaders of the first one were clearly defined, and not approached for arrest. Those of the second one are not so clearly defined. The chairmanship of the discussion changed several times; and it seems that the most real sense in which "leadership" could be identified was that some people spoke more frequently, and/or were listened to more attentively. Of the non-students later arrested downstairs, two spoke very little, and the other two might be termed "leaders" in this broad sense. The taped voices are identifiable, and reveal that more students than non-students were "leaders" in this sense.

### Appendix B

Immediately after Williams spoke, two members of the SDS Steering Committee and the chairman of its Anti-draft Committee tried to speak with Boyd, away from the scene of the demonstration. They felt that, by private discussion, they could get Boyd to agree to enough of the demands so that the demonstration could be disbanded. Upon being informed of Williams' remarks about "amnesty", Boyd reiterated that granting amnesty would be "unwise". Boyd did not seem interested in discussing the point further, and the discussion was terminated.

### Appendix C

At around 3:30, some twenty to thirty students forced their way past police lines and down the stairs. They were greeted with loud applause, and the discussion broke up. A period of singing followed. At this time the Navy officers left, whereupon the demonstrators sang "Anchors Aweigh". "Happy Birthday" was sung, in honor of the first birthday of Mario's son. After about a half hour the discussion reconvened, and grew heated on the topic of how long to continue the sit-in, whether to move upstairs, or whether to terminate it. Dean Lemmon then came downstairs and said that the students assembled upstairs wanted Mario Savio to address them. He was greeted by boos. After further explanations, and assurances that Mario would be allowed back down, it was agreed with Lemmon that Savio and Hal Jacobs (who had taken the opposite viewpoint from Savio in the discussion) should be allowed to go upstairs. The meeting then continued.

#### Appendix D

Alameda County Sheriff's Department officers, using clubs, pushed their way up the stairs, shoving people out of their way with their riot sticks. After clearing the stairs, they brought Bill Miller down them. Dean Lemmon came down the stairs and was subjected to some verbal abuse from demonstrators, in the mistaken belief that he had broken his word and would not allow Savio back downstairs.

#### Appendix E

ASUC President Dan Macintosh was repeatedly told, "It's your building, get the cops out." A highly emotional chant, "get the cops out of here," went up; several of the demonstrators, including Macintosh (who joined in the chanting), seemed almost in tears.

#### Appendix F: The Outside

The continued presence of campus police at the entrance to the alcove drew large numbers of spectators, and by 3:00 several hundred students were standing outside the Plaza entrance. The demonstrators inside felt that those outside could not know what had happened, nor why they were inside. A student was sent outside to explain the events which had happened. At this point the door to the alcove was guarded not only by police but also by a homogeneous group of students who attempted to shout down the delegated student and others who tried to speak. A rumor spread that police were coming, and the crowd moved into the Student Union on the main floor, where they sat down and resumed discussion. Boyd was sighted on the outside and the delegated student again stated to him that the group downstairs would disperse immediately if an amnesty would be assured. Boyd responded to the effect that, if the student had anything to do with the assembly, he should get his friends out of there. The time was 3:10. Soon after, on the main floor, discussion resumed. Attempts were made to find out what was happening downstairs in the lobby. Many of the students, who by 4:30 numbered about 500, demanded that an administrator come to discuss the situation with them. Williams and Boyd did not come, but Lemmon came around 5:15. He did not know the details of the Administration position and could not answer the questions put to him. He did, however, agree to bring Mario Savio to the group upstairs for a short while. Savio came and addressed the crowd. While he spoke, several members of the Alameda County Sheriff's Office appeared at the top of the stairs. Students urged Savio not to go back down. Savio joined a group of students who were on their way to look for the buses into which the downstairs demonstrators were expected to be placed. On his way with them to the garage, Savio was arrested.

Meanwhile, those upstairs believed that all downstairs would be arrested. The crowd grew rapidly, having inside the building over a thousand students, mostly still involved in a discussion. After sudden screams of "Police!", the crowd's attention focused on the stairs, where police were pulling Bill Miller towards the doors leading outside. Students sat down en masse, forcing the door shut; the police scuffled with them for a time, and then took Miller down the stairs. Angry commotion resulted. Hearing a shout that the downstairs demonstrators were being taken to a police bus parked in front of the Student Union, several hundred students surged into Bancroft Way and tried to block the departure of the bus. A wedge of police using clubs cleared a path for the bus. After it left, scuffles between police and students continued for five to ten minutes. Most students returned to the Student Union at that time to continue the meeting, which grew large enough to necessitate its being moved upstairs to Pauley Ballroom. At approximately 1:00 a. m., the several thousand students then present voted to go on strike the following morning.

#### Appendix G

In the course of dragging out Mike Smith and others, several students who attempted to block the police's path were set upon and beaten by the police. One Dick Campbell was thrown to the ground and repeatedly hit, kicked, and clubbed by police while lying on the floor. Angry students surged forward, screaming in protest. Three of the most badly beaten students were arrested. After this strong efforts were made to quiet down the crowd by getting them to sing and then sit down.

\* \* \* \* \*

Those who contributed evidence and work to this report were: Michael Lerner, Wayne Collins, Paul Glusman, Karen Lieberman, Alec Wisner (a reporter for the Daily Cal who took extensive notes on the scene), and Sandy.

Michael Rossman was assisted by Robert Hill in editing this Chronology.

## Why Strike

We believe that our demands are legitimate. Why do we choose a strike to effect them? Most simply put, we see no adequate system of "normal channels" existing to secure their implementation. Given this situation, the failure to employ extraordinary tactics would certainly result in the sacrifice of important goals. Experience has shown that the Administration does not move to open effective channels until faced with coercion. We strike both to effect our specific demands, and to establish as imperative the need for an adequate mechanism to resolve conflicts of interest between the Administration and students.

About our demands. First, there exists no channel through which the Administration may be convinced or compelled to abandon recourse to police action as a means of "solving" political conflicts. Surely there has been discussion of the matter. Surely our wishes, and those of the faculty, have been communicated clearly, if not forcefully, long ago. Yet policy has not changed.

Second, recent disciplinary cases show that students are subject to punishment "on the facts" (as the Administration simply phrases the matter), without regard to the legitimacy of the rule violated. Hence the only mechanism left to ensure that no disciplinary action would be visited on participants in the demonstration was direct discussion with administrators. Such discussion was sought and held (see Chronology); its results were not reassuring. No other relevant channels appeared. On the other hand, several times the threat or actuality of coercive action has proved sufficient to deter unjustifiable administrative discipline. Similarly, such action has been the only mechanism which has resulted in the Administration's opposing the pressing of charges against an arrest "non-student."

Again, a policy of non-preferential treatment of governmental organizations has been sought for some time. Protests have resulted in the withdrawal of tables, but the basic policy has not changed. Last Spring, therefore, a group of students lodged a formal complaint with the Dean of Students Office. They were told that the current policy is "traditional", and that nothing can be done about it.

Guarantees of due process have also been sought for years, with increasing concern as the frequency of political disciplinary cases has mounted. The Administration alleges variously that due process already exists or is unnecessary, and will not negotiate the matter. Nor will it even permit negotiations on the principle of judicial review in such disciplinary cases.

Finally, we have been bound since FSM to the principle that government must be by the consent of the governed; and we believe also that it must be by the action

of the governed as well. These principles are not negotiable; and their violation corrupts us and does us active harm, as persons and as a movement. And since FSM we have sought from the Administration a minimal first step in their establishment: a significant voice and a veto in the formulation of policy governing our political activity. Through what "normal channels" will flow the Administration's change of heart on these principles?

And thus we resort to the new, and imperfectly understood, phenomenon of an academic strike. We do not see it as a "solution" to any problems. We do not lightly undertake the disruption it occasions; but we find the action necessary, in the absence of meaningful channels for change. Nor do we see the action as one proper for constant use, as some have alleged. Rather, we hope that its successful use this time will result in the Administration's adoption of policies which, like our fourth and fifth demands, would make unnecessary future resort to such action.

Better administrative mechanisms of communication and change are certainly necessary; we are striking for them, and they are legislateable. But they are not sufficient; and what will be sufficient is not legislateable. For much of the difficulty we perceive springs from the spirit in which the Administration conceives and conducts its dealings with students. By virtue of the continuing crisis in the University to which this spirit so heavily contributes, it deserves a detailed public examination. We mention only the most obvious recent facts:

\* Vice-Chancellor Cheit neither spoke with students nor bothered to visit the scene of dispute, before calling police upon the campus.

\* At the time of this writing, Chancellor Heyns has been on campus for 68 hours without condescending to meet with representatives the striking students have chosen for that purpose. He has neither initiated nor permitted contact, let alone negotiation.

\* Rather, without investigating the facts of the dispute, he has made public statements completely misrepresenting its origins, its participants and dynamic, and the problems involved.

\* He has made these statements committing himself to courses of action before troubling to consult with the faculty who have asked him to speak with them.

\* There is no evidence that the Administration anticipated or was concerned with the results of its actions. And there is evidence that the Administration understands neither the nature, thoughts, nor mood of the students, but is concerned rather with explaining these away to suit its own preconceptions and its view of its own interests and the public's prejudices.

In short, the entire controversy has been handled irresponsibly, ineptly, and insincerely. This response is not accidental, nor is it peculiar to the present incident. It is part of continuing pattern of administrative action. Such an Administration merits neither respect nor obedience. It has left to it only force and manipulation as tools to relate to students. These will be called into play increasingly in the future, whatever the strikes outcome, unless some deep change occur in the Administration's nature.

The Strike Committee

### Our Demands: Some Brief Reasons

1. That policemen never be called onto the campus to "solve" campus political problems.

Clearly, the tactic is inappropriate for use within an academic community; and other institutions, such as Harvard and Chicago, have more suitable responses to unusual internal political situations. We do not mean to enjoin the use of police when, for example, lives are being attacked. Between these extremes lies an area of judgement. The Administration has each time misused its authority in calling police onto campus. A mechanism is necessary to decide when the use of police on campus is appropriate; the authority for, and establishment of, a suitable mechanism properly lies with faculty and students. We will mention that during the Black Power Conference such a mechanism existed and was used; and the student exercise of this authority prevented yet another mistake.

2. That there be no disciplinary action taken now or in the future against participants in Wednesday's demonstrations or the strike; and that the Administration seek, publicly and forcefully, to have dropped the charges against the nine people arrested.

As the Chronology makes clear, had disciplinary action been enjoined before the arrests by someone clearly empowered to do so, the arrests and subsequent strike would not have occurred. It seems imperative that the Administration now demonstrate its intentions by affirming that no students will be cited for rules violations. Vice-Chancellor Cheit, who ordered the arrests, said Wednesday night that they "may and may not have been a mistake." They were made for political purposes, and are doubly unfair by virtue of many having committed the same acts for which a few were arrested, which fact the Administration has not attempted to contest.

3. That all off-campus individuals and non-commercial groups be granted at least the privileges enjoyed by governmental agencies.

Insofar as the Administration defines a distinction between students and "non-students", all "non-students" should enjoy the same status. Given the current political situation, if governmental agencies are to be allowed on campus, those from the community with opposed viewpoints should be allowed to engage in comparable activities. There seems no reason to discriminate against viewpoints not opposed by the government; hence all viewpoints should enjoy the same privileges.

4. That University disciplinary hearings shall be open. That these hearings shall be bound by canons of due process comparable to those already published by the Council of Campus Organizations. A legitimate ground of defense shall be that regulations are incompatible with Sections 2 or 3 of the December 8, 1964 Academic Senate Resolutions, or with the United States Constitution.

The published demands of the C. C. O. explain themselves:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| a) The body holding the hearings shall be an independent body, not advisory to the Chancellor   | Past experience has shown that the Administration is not above reversing the recommendations of the faculty and students, when called for by political expediency.  |
| b) The hearings shall be open.  | A student may be intimidated at a hearing, if there is inadequate public knowledge of the details of the hearings procedures.   |
| c) The hearing shall be an adversary proceeding, including the right to counsel.  | Each side will have to make its case with arguments strong enough to sustain the attack of an attorney. Witnesses will be subject to cross-examination.   |
| d) The burden of proof shall be upon the Administration.  | The right to be regarded innocent until proven guilty is basic in our society.  |
| e) There shall be a schedule of punishments commensurate with the offenses to prevent grossly unequal punishments for the same offense. | In the past, grossly unequal punishments have indicated that the Administration sought to penalize students it considered leaders incomparably more severely for the same offense than non-leaders. The Administration has thus made a crime of leadership. |

f) The defense shall have the right to compel the testimony of University officials and employees.

Frequently the Administration's case depends upon the testimony of University officials and employees. In the past, these have not always been publicly identified, denying the defendant the opportunity to confront his accusers and challenge their statements.

g) A legitimate ground of defense shall be that regulations are incompatible with Sections 2 or 3 of the December 8th Resolutions or with the U.S. Constitution.

This is the "judicial review" clause, which allows students to challenge the University regulations in the same manner that U. S. citizens challenge laws on constitutional grounds.

5. That negotiations begin which will establish a system of just and effective student representation in the formulation of a new set of policies regulating student activity. Representatives of the organizations actively pursuing the strike must be permitted to name a majority of the student representatives. The negotiating body shall make no substantive decisions without the agreement of its student contingent.

Demands 3 and 4, if granted, cannot be defended without such representation. The present authority for the formulation and implementation of policies regulating student activity is illegitimate, residing as it does in a hierarchial Administration unresponsive to the students and faculty (with whom the authority legitimately rests). The consent of the governed is a necessary prerequisite for rules worthy of obedience. And, in the past, the Administration has tried to control the composition of the student component of joint committees. (Note that the change from the published demand -- i. e., "The strike committee must be permitted..." -- is due to a broadening of the strike's base.)

The Strike Committee