Mr. Earle B. Roberts, Coordinator
Department of Political Science
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44240

Dear Mr. Roberts:

This is to confirm our arrangement for the City of Oakland Patrolman recruitment trip on November 13th and 14th.

We are sending under separate cover application forms and announcements for this position.

We have placed an advertisement in your school paper and if it appears appropriate we will place an additional advertisement prior to our arrival.

I will be in touch by phone next week to see what interest we have generated at this point. We appreciate your assistance in working out such a close time schedule.

Sincerely,

James M. Newman
Personnel Director

by:

Lamar M. Vaughn
Sr. Personnel Analyst
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November 11, 1968
Kent SDS
Richard Skirvin
1604 Main St.
Kent, Ohio, 44240

Dear faculty friends,

Enclosed is the first issue of the yet-to-be named newspaper of Kent SDS. An attempt to articulate the concerns of Kent's cultural-social political community. This form of independent journalism seeks to provide a unique (and we believe needed) perspective on life at Kent.

As part of our rapidly growing program, the newspaper will seek to implement programs in the university, draft counseling/draft resistance, high schools, dormitories, classrooms, plans for a co-op bookstore, in addition to a developing program of publications, labor action and cultural alternatives. In the post-election vacuum, ours is a positive, constructive politics of daily participation.

Our concern are diverse, yet fundamentally rooted in a radical humanism. We seek to create a democratic university and society whose methods embody its ideals. Ours is a long range movement; moving from the campus to the communities of Akron and Kent. To expose more clearly the quality of life in America and to build creative alternatives is our task.

Your help is needed—our meetings and programs are open, our newspaper available for criticism and comment, and the publication of opinion, poetry, photography, etc. SDS members will be happy to discuss our program, our politics, and our plans in greater detail with individuals, small groups, in classes or community groups. We are serious about our politics and our lives—we ask you to share our concern. Contributions are our only financial support.

For Peace and Freedom,
Richard Skirvin
Kent SDS
SPECIAL BULLETIN

TO: All Faculty and Staff
FROM: Robert I. White, President
SUBJECT: Recent Events Involving B.U.S. and S.D.S.

The series of events and circumstances beginning with
the coercive demonstration on Wednesday, November 13, 1968 are
critical and thus of immediate concern to all faculty and staff.

Therefore, we felt it imperative to share with you a
chronological review of some of the important developments to
date and a position statement prepared yesterday.

A. CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Briefly stated, the Students for a Democratic Society and
the Black United Students blocked free access to the Placement Office
and the corridor in that section of the Student Activities Center be-
tween the hours of 2:00 p.m. and approximately 6:45 p.m. During the
time period between 1:35 and 3:00 p.m. the Dean of Students had asked
both the leaders of S.D.S. and B.U.S. to provide an open passage to
allow access through the corridor. These groups were also told that
they would be charged and brought before the Student-Faculty Judicial
Board for possible suspension or dismissal from the institution and
that they were subject to arrest. In discussion between Dean Matson
and the group, he repeatedly pointed out that he was not there to
prevent a protest demonstration nor to discuss the alleged racist
practices of the Oakland Police Department. Dean Matson did offer to
present their demands to the appropriate University Council for fair
hearing. This offer was made both verbally to the demonstrators and
in a letter to S.D.S., delivered on Wednesday, prior to the demonstration.

At 3:00 p.m. the Dean of Students left the area to consult
with President White on the demonstrator's demand that the Oakland Police
recruiters be asked to leave the campus and to give the group time to
reconsider their decision to prevent free access. It was determined
that the disorder could not be tolerated and that the Oakland Police
recruiters would remain.
After allowing the President of the Student Body some time for discussion with the demonstrators the Dean of Students told the group at 5:05 p.m. that anyone in the corridor who considered himself a bystander should leave at that time. Those students remaining were then informed that charges would be filed against them under university regulations. They were asked by Dean Matson if they would identify themselves and there was no answer. Photographs were then taken to aid in identification.

Prior to 5:00 p.m. two students had gone to President White's Office to complain that they had been prevented from meeting appointments to discuss teaching jobs. These two students were directed to the Student Conduct Programs Office where they filed written complaints against the demonstrators.

What has happened since Wednesday and what position are we in at the present time?

Dean Matson has held four discussion or clarification sessions - two with the B.U.S. representatives and two with students sent by S.D.S. Communications have also passed regularly through intermediaries.

A mass trial was requested by the students to be certain that the charges and sanctions would be applied equally. This was granted in the form of a mass trial for S.D.S. participants and one for B.U.S. participants.

Complete amnesty is the present demand according to the latest report, in order to avert a planned 6:00 p.m. Monday mass black student exodus from Kent State University. Many black students who would prefer to stay have been threatened directly and indirectly.

As of this time the Dean of Student's position is that a relatively small group of students denied others their right to free access to a university service and charges must be brought against the offenders. The alternatives to this are obvious in their effects up on this university.
B. POSITION STATEMENT

Students who participated in the demonstration outside the Placement Office last Wednesday have demanded amnesty. Obviously we can not respond favorably. To do so would constitute a pre-judgement and would destroy the internally developed procedures for due-process.

We must note that the Code of Student Conduct, under which charges are being preferred, was developed with the significant involvement of Student Government, the Faculty Senate, the Student Affairs Council, administrative officers and the University's Board of Trustees.

Abrogation of these established procedures, now or in the future, would permit grievances to be decided on the basis of threat of force. Certainly we do not want the University to be operable only under police surveillance.

The Black United Students have threatened to leave the campus en masse Monday evening if amnesty is denied. All of us would sincerely regret the departure of any students under these circumstances, and especially the Black Students because we have been pleased that Kent State University has made such real progress in matters of racial equality and justice. It has been a source of some pride to us that the percentage of Black Students enrolled is among the largest of any institution in the state.

Unfortunately, the Black United Students have presented an impossible alternative. Frankly, it appears coercive, which is most regrettable. Indeed, there have been other evidences of undue pressure placed upon individuals to join in this mass effort. Such actions can not be tolerated within the framework of freedom in an academic community.
We understand that many are deeply concerned that the procedures we are now following may result in expulsion of a large number of students. This concern may be based on certain presumptions which are not necessarily true. Hearings, conducted under due process, will examine and evaluate the nature and extent of the violations. We are not anxious to suspend any student, much less large numbers of students.

I am informed by the Dean of Students that he will charge the students with disorderly conduct, which, under the Code of Student Conduct, carries a maximum penalty of conduct probation. In addition, the Dean informs me that he will recommend that there be no loss of financial assistance to students involved.

There seems to have been considerable coercion in this entire situation. In addition to apparent threats to individuals, threats of force, violence and destruction have been heard. Such pressures ill befit a university.

These conditions also yield manufactured rumors which create anxiety detrimental to the normal and proper functions of a university. Mass walkouts are no substitute for rational and reasonable consideration of areas of concern and difference.

We must heed the orderly process described in the Code of Student Conduct which is a product of dedicated efforts on the part of representatives of all segments of the University community. Thus, we can preserve a principle to which we are deeply committed, that of an open campus.
SPECIAL BULLETIN

To: Faculty and Staff

I write this somewhat saddened by the fact that the Black Students last night (Sunday) decided to proceed with their plans for a one-week walkout despite the assurances in yesterday's statement.

We cannot evade the fact that there was a disruption. To say otherwise would be not only a falsification but an immediate destruction of the Code for Student Conduct which we have relied upon as our satisfaction of the mandatory language of state law and the subsequent implementation by the Board of Trustees.

As said before, we ought to be able to rely upon our internal procedures. Otherwise we set in motion irreversible circumstances having only one outcome.

We might as well confess some miscalculations. For well-intentioned reasons we were too slow in moving at the time of the original incident. There had been a hope that reason and appeals would prevail. The net result may have produced more confusion. I was also too slow in getting information into faculty channels.

Let me note some other points, briefly under the lack of time.

There have been some ugly aspects to the situation in the last few days. I myself have received numerous phone calls from parents of Black students reporting concerns, in one case hysteria, by their son or daughter about threatening pressures upon them to leave when they really did not want to do so.
There is also good evidence that some white students have been disorderly. The evidence has been hard to get but at least some white students are being called in today. The Dean of Students staff and residence hall staffs are vigorously attempting to find and turn in all such evidence. Anyone who can supply leads or evidence should immediately contact the Student Conduct Office. Please note the attachment.

The one student charged last Friday had that charge withdrawn because of a subsequent review of the evidence.

We have also been asked what happens to them if some students leave for a week. Of course, there is no presumption of disciplinary action against a student who absents himself. On the presumption that the room would be reoccupied before the end of the quarter, the residence hall occupancies would not be affected. Neither would financial aid be involved save I suppose in such instances as part-time employment where jobs might not be staffed. Concerning course standing, it is well understood that that rests between the instructor and student.

Again, we regret these developments.

Robert I. White
President

Attachment
The events of the last few days on the Kent campus have caused considerable anxiety and concern for all. We have all been involved some way or other as the polarization of feelings has developed.

As time progresses, it becomes more and more imperative for each of us to accept the responsibility attendant upon us as members of the University community. It is necessary that order prevail on the campus and that the rights and freedoms of all be protected. There exist built-in safeguards within the University community through the Student Conduct Code to protect individual and group rights.

As in society at large, certain guidelines have been established for both individual and group behavior. As members of the University community, we are expected to act in a responsible manner and further to abide by the rules established or be held accountable to them.

Whatever may happen in the next few hours or days, we prevail upon all members of the University community to act in a responsible and appropriate manner that identifies the majority of college students. The University will not and cannot tolerate irresponsible behavior, such as intimidation, coercion or the threat of physical violence no matter what your particular feelings on the issues may be.

We expect and anticipate the full range of feelings on the various issues. There are, however, appropriate ways to express these feelings within the established framework. The maintenance of this system is dependent upon a commitment by all to responsible action.

Confrontation leading to physical violence, the destruction of property or the threat to individual well-being will not be condoned on the Kent campus. Appropriate action to protect the rights and freedoms of all will be taken. We, therefore, call upon all staff and students to refrain from open confrontation and that all of us accept a personal commitment to responsible behavior.

Robert E. Matson
Dean of Students
To: Faculty, Department of Political Science  
From: Lou  
Subject: "University in Exile"

Mr. Charles Macklin informs me that many undergraduate Negro students will not return to campus this week. He and a few faculty members are attempting to tutor "students in exile"—including the outlining of appropriate chapters. He requests that I inform you of this action. You are, of course, at liberty to give whatever recognition this attempt deserves.
November 20, 1968

To: Faculty, Department of Political Science

From: Lou

If any faculty members miss their classes because of the present crisis on campus, I expect full compliance with the provisions of our Faculty Handbook, page 10—just as I assume that there was cooperation with this provision during the recent national campaign and election. Our contracts with the University, the State of Ohio, and the taxpayers are morally and legally binding.

LKH:blp
November 25, 1968

SPECIAL BULLETIN

TO: All Faculty and Staff

This is a full sharing with you of some of the climatic events of last week including comments upon how we stand now. It is an impossibility to describe sufficiently the manner in which the faculty, administrative, and student machineries have carried themselves, not only in justification of the fact that "the system" can be made to work, but also toward the eventual welfare of Kent State University.

As all of you have seen, we had assumed a clear policy position and were resolved for a long and vigorous stand if that had proved to be necessary. Therefore, there may perhaps have been some dismay with which we recognized a "hole in the dike," "chink in the armor," or what have you. In substance, manfully pursuing a previously announced and, apparently, fully endorsed course of action, we had to pay attention to legal advice which under continued contemplation led to an inevitable and inescapable decision.

More than anyone else, I know that many persons are disapproving, possibly on the basis of partial information. Nevertheless, I still believe that there are a number of positive outcomes mentioned later. I remain convinced also that, having done what we have done, we are now in a much better posture for going through the rest of the year without serious hurt.

We had fixed ourselves upon a policy of pursuing due process. This had been well publicized, and emphasized and reemphasized.

Within our meetings during the crisis some of us had begun to wonder about the legally effective nature of the evidence we held. We then secured able and specialized lawyers for a review. After a careful study of all the evidence on hand, they came to the conclusion that the evidence we held was insufficient to justify a conviction on the charges stated.

When we learned that the evidence was questionable we then faced a major problem: Is it better to proceed with the charges and the prospect of an eventual acquittal, or to not press charges?
The latter alternative was favored for these reasons:

1. It was the more open posture, free of any administrative "cover-up," and consistent with the due process stance;

2. It was better to cut matters cleanly than to drag them on over weeks or even months of turmoil with the prospect of no eventual benefit and, in fact, the real possibility of loss of faith in the University's sincerity in many quarters;

3. And it would prove to all students the efficacy of orderly process and would help to guarantee their allegiance to it in the future.

This leaves the situation, at least for the moment, returned to normal. Nevertheless, based upon the experience of other institutions, we can well suspect that this is but a recess.

It is probably not out of order to mention that in the days since, additional legal opinion has clearly substantiated the decision reached on the afternoon of Wednesday, November 20.

Despite what seems to be a common public opinion, one which is being thrust upon me with both forcefulness and numbers, the action was not an accession to the original demand for "amnesty." It was instead, as I see it, faithfully playing to the rules of due process.

In this connection I am also constrained to call attention to the tone of the Thursday statement issued on behalf of the BUS with particular reference to the notations on orderly process and giving the system a chance.

One could not have hoped for a more positive statement than that from the University Committee of the Faculty Senate which is now in your hands. This is doubly true because so many may have been "geared up" toward a certain outcome and may have come to feel that they had been let down.

The ultimate outcomes for Kent State University remain to be seen in what we shall be able to say at the end of this year at the time of June Commencement. In short, so much depends upon whatever extent we are able to reaffirm and enforce orderly process. It is no secret that I myself am catching a tremendous volume of pointed and sharp criticism from all over the state. Any eventual justifications are going to have to rest upon a record of what now happens upon this campus between this moment and the end of this school year.
So far as the future is concerned, we now know that we must not delay decisive and early actions. Further, our evidence-gathering procedures are even now being beefed-up under skilled supervision. We are also having to add to the staff not only in the security office but also in the personnel deans' offices.

Dean Robert Matson took tremendous punishment timewise as well as in a few abusive statements in the press. As a Beacon-Journal editorial put it, he kept his "cool." He played the man's role throughout and his forthcoming recognition will serve notice that his type of approach is needed.

Perhaps it should be repeated that we have never evaded the fact that there was a disruption against which disciplinary procedures should have been set in motion and would have been saved for the circumstances noted above. We are as firmly set as before on resisting coercive measures, or any other actions which are not orderly conduct. In that, we believe we share the opinion of faculty and students.

I also take the liberty of enclosing a copy of the editorial in the Kent-Ravenna Record Courier of last Thursday, November 21.

Sincerely,

Robert J. White
President

RIW/js
Enclosure
Walkout Ends

It's probably lucky for all concerned. And if everybody learns a little from the experience, maybe the ordeal will not have been in vain.

We're talking about the situation at Kent State University. The University, as it was advised by its attorneys, simply didn't have enough evidence to prove the "disorderly conduct" charges against those who obstructed access to the Oakland police recruiters who were on the campus some days ago.

You know the chronology of events.

There was the demonstration which became an obstruction. There were the conferences between the dean, students and the demonstrators, the agreement to a mass hearing, the demand and refusal of amnesty without hearings, the walkout of the BUS, the reduction of the charges and the guarantees that scholarships and federal aid would not be endangered, and finally, the discovery by the attorneys that there really wasn't enough evidence to bring conviction of any charge.

During all of this, the administration, while remaining firm on the necessity of maintaining due process throughout the whole experience, had sought to keep down emotions and to maintain reason.

In this, we think, the administration did a commendable job. And we must admit, too, that the statements from BUS were in the same manner. The wild ones came from those not directly concerned.

Kent has moved far ahead on racial matters, setting up a special office to handle problems of the minorities, and seeking to keep the channels of communication on such matters open at all times. Had this background been different, the problem could have been more difficult to solve. As it is, it died when the due process route revealed the lack of evidence necessary for a conviction.

This gives everybody a chance to reappraise and to think.

Law and order, which rests on due process, must prevail. The rights of all, whether they be BUS or SDS students or just ordinary college men and women without any affiliation, must prevail.

Without these rights and due process, force remains as the only method to maintain order and this would injure everybody.