Second Round of Honor Code Ratification 2018
By Riley Wheaton (’20) Honor Council Librarian

After the Code failed the first round of ratification a Special Plenary was held. The following are the vote totals from that Special Plenary and a few comments originally scrawled on bits of paper and transposed here for your ease of reading.
A full transcript of the proceedings of that Special Plenary can be found here

Vote Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>% of Student Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>67.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes with Objections</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (out of 1258 possible voters)</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>71.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ratifying the Honor Code doesn’t matter if people don’t enact it
- Administration should pass all amendments that pass the student body
- Separate social and academic
- I support the Honor Code, though I believe that today showed that sometimes this campus can have a very one track mind in terms of ideology, which can be somewhat toxic
- I think the academic Honor Code serves this community well enough to vote in favor of ratification, but I think the two should be considered separately. The social Honor Code is a hypocritical document, and we aren’t prepared to to deal with these issues using a system that calls for so little accountability
- As a person who struggles with obsessive compulsive disorder, I find that the Code does not tell me how to live as an imperfect being under a system that expects me to self-report my failures. I know we cannot create a quasi -legal, semi-judicial system that creates a specific area and I would not try to do so. But it makes it hard to recommit myself when I know I am not living up to the Code and probably will not. The Code doesn’t tell me how to live with the OCD included quilt of ingoing minutia in order to survive within a structure so literal that it asks us to be our best selves, or live without Honor. Honor means a great deal to me, and I live every day wrestling with what it means to be less brave and work less hard than I could. But I do believe in living documents striving for equality, justice, and truth. So I vote yes.
- I have several, mostly relating to viewpoint diversity (VD).
  - There is not protection for VD in the academic Code
  - The protection for VD in the social Code is vague and subject to change
- Include clauses about
  a. English speaking capability
  b. Necessitating respectful political discussions in academic Code in addition to social Code
- The social code is particularly careful to stress which groups are especially marginalized. I understand why this is important, since it validates the experiences of these groups.
Nevertheless, I think it is best to leave the social Code as broad as possible, stress the underlying principles rather than the specific groups affected. This is because people who are hurt but are not included in the list of marginalized groups will feel left out and unheard. In my mind, the ideal social Code advocates for trust, concern, and respect, and leaves the specifics in the hands of Honor Council.

- I believe that the Code should contain stronger protections for political freedom, but in light of the significant improvements to the confrontation process and the academic Code, I vote to ratify. My friend who forgot to write down his objection concurs with this objection in addition to voting for ratification.

- I am concerned that the way in which many discussions took place today did not reflect the respect that fellow students deserve when presenting. While I want to hear everyone’s opinion on issues, I feel that personal attacks and accusatory discussion are unproductive and serve only to divide the community rather than help us reach mutual understanding.

- This is a good start, but we need to keep working on this from a community level.

- Should have passed CDR

- Separate academic and social Code