From Dusk till Dawn
An Honor Council Social Trial
Released Spring 2010

Introduction:

On an evening in February, Haverford Students’ Council contacted Plenary while inebriated and demanded an apology for her failure to carry herself through to completion earlier in the semester. SC blamed Plenary for her inability to keep their mutual friend Quorum in attendance. Plenary felt intimidated by SC and refused to engage in dialogue, so SC took Plenary to Honor Council. After deliberation, Honor Council came to a suspicion of violation and sent the parties to a social trial, with the condition that Quorum also be in attendance.

Fact-Finding:

Students’ Council’s Statement
Plenary and I had been planning a date for our 151st anniversary since at least October of last year. I had put a lot of time and energy into planning it, even renting a tuxedo for the occasion. On the night of our date, Plenary arrived late. I tried to make conversation, but she seemed uninterested in what I had to say, even when I brought up issues that were very important to me like the Party Policy. She kept walking out the restaurant, falling asleep, and doing other work. I was hurt and frustrated.

Our friend Quorum was supposed to meet us, as he had originally set us up all those years ago. Quorum had promised me he would be there as a surprise for Plenary. Quorum showed up about an hour late, but we both forgave him and had a good time for a while. After another hour, though, Quorum got increasingly distracted and kept leaving the restaurant to go to a bar, The Coop, across the street.

The night spiraled downwards from there. Quorum wouldn’t stay at dinner for more than 20 minutes at a time, and at midnight they both ditched me, leaving me with a substantial check.
A couple days later, I got drunk and decided to let Plenary know my feelings about how our anniversary had gone. I don’t really remember the conversation, but after we talked, Plenary seemed scared of me and refused to engage in further dialogue. I really think this is an issue we need to discuss, so I contacted our cousin, Honor Council.

*Plenary’s Statement*

Students’ Council and I have been dating for about 151 years. It’s never been an easy relationship, but we both care about each other a lot. On the night of our anniversary, I was really stressed out about my and Quorum’s Peace and Conflict Resolution ExCo class, which was starting the next night. I hadn’t really planned much for it, and was getting scared by the number of students I had signed up. SC was being really clingy and adding to my stress level. Quorum kept guilting me about our class and leaving our date to go prepare. After a while, I left with Quorum.

After a few days, I got a call from SC. He was drunk and kept yelling at me about “community standards” and the huge check I had allegedly left him with from our date. I was scared that he would hurt me, so I hung up and have avoided talking to SC ever since.

*Questions from the Jury:*

Multiple jurors were confused as to why Quorum came to Students’ Council and Plenary’s date. Plenary and SC explained that it had always been that way, though they had forgotten the origin of the tradition.

The jury was concerned as to why Students’ Council thought it was a good idea to confront Plenary while drunk. Students’ Council realized how inappropriate his actions were, but hadn’t thought it was such a big deal at the time. He said he probably should have confrontologued with Plenary the night of their anniversary, but was too upset at the time.

The Chair dismissed the confronting and confronted parties and the jury began deliberations.

*Deliberations:*

The jury deliberated for 30 hours with frequent dance parties in honor of Plenary. Though the jury was concerned by SC’s initial confrontation, most of them agreed that Plenary’s response was not in keeping with the spirit of the Code. A juror pointed out that Plenary should have contacted Honor Council if she had been scared to talk to SC by herself. Because Plenary had caused the breakdown in communication, the jury decided that she was in violation of the Honor Code.

The jury was still confused about Quorum’s role in SC’s and Plenary’s relationship, but after some conversation, they agreed that Quorum had not violated the Code, since he had no role in the confrontation and his participation in the date was minor.
Further, the jury thought that Students’ Council might also be in violation of the Code for making Plenary feel unsafe, but recognized that this was a separate issue and beyond their influence.

The jury consented to the following statement of violation with no members standing outside of consensus:

*Plenary violated the Honor Code by refusing to engage in funfrontation with Students’ Council as is expected by Section 3.05 of the Honor Code.*

**Circumstantial Portion:**

Quorum was not present for the circumstantial portion of the trial, resulting in some confusion and delays.

Plenary stated that she was not usually as dysfunctional as she had been on the night of their date, but she had been having a rough time for the last week or so. Plenary had been really worried about her ExCo class, which she hadn’t prepared for. She apologized for her and Quorum’s behavior, and felt bad they had hurt SC’s feelings (and his wallet). Plenary realized that she should have contacted Honor Council about mediating her confrontation with SC, but she explained that she had been so intimidated at the time that the idea had not occurred to her.

Students’ Council apologized for scaring Plenary, but explained that he had been very upset by her behavior. He told the jury that he understood now how a confrontation should go, and deeply regretted his drunkenness. SC was glad that Plenary had apologized to him, and felt better about their relationship.

Students’ Council, Plenary, and Quorum suggested having a mediation as their only proposed resolution.

**Deliberations:**

The jury was impressed with Plenary and SC’s apologies. They thought mediation with all three parties would be beneficial regardless, since Quorum had not attended the circumstantial portion. The jury further agreed that Plenary, Students’ Council, and Quorum should each write a letter to the community.

A member of the jury suggested that Plenary incorporate a discussion of confrontation within a long-term relationship into her ExCo class on Peace and Conflict Studies. The rest of the jury agreed.

The jury consented to the following tentative resolutions:

1. Students’ Council, Plenary, and Quorum will write letters to the community to address the difficulties of polyamorous relationships and confrontation.
2. Students’ Council, Plenary, and Quorum will have a mediation.
3. Plenary will incorporate a discussion of confrontation within a long-term relationship into her ExCo class on Peace and Conflict Studies.

Presentation of Resolutions:

Plenary, Quorum, and Students’ Council reviewed and approved of the resolutions. Quorum was not sure why his letter to the community would be beneficial. The jury explained that Quorum’s role in the initial incident warranted his writing a letter. Quorum realized that his influence on Plenary was such that his letter would have an educational benefit.

Final Deliberations:

After the standard 24-hour break, the jury reconvened. They found no issues with the tentative resolutions and consented to the following final resolutions with no jurors standing outside of consensus.

Final Resolutions:

1. Students’ Council, Plenary, and Quorum will write letters to the community to address the difficulties of polyamorous relationships and confrontation not to be released with the abstract.
2. Students’ Council, Plenary, and Quorum will have a mediation.
3. Plenary will incorporate a discussion of confrontation within a long-term relationship into her ExCo class on Peace and Conflict Studies.

Discussion Questions:

1. What are the dangers of co-dependence between two important institutions?
2. What is Quorum’s role in this confrontation?
3. What role should alcohol play in confrontations?
4. Should Honor Council be allowed to release April Fools’ abstracts?