

ND

An Open Letter to the Swarthmore Faculty
From: Frederic L. Pryor

In the Friday faculty meeting we are to discuss a policy statement condemning the use of direct action to solve college disputes. Since we have already passed two such statements, I think it advisable to ask the Student Activity Committee to initiate such a statement and to spend our time (and our breathing spell may be relatively short) on the following more constructive actions:

1. In our faculty actions last week we committed ourselves to supply a description of "the decision making processes" of the college. I suggest that Courtney Smith's speech on "the anatomy of the college" be dusted off and published as an agenda for detailed research by a joint student/faculty committee.

Such a committee would look deeply into all decision and policy making processes within the administration, faculty, Board of Managers, and the student body. It would send out questionnaires to participants in decision making, interview people engaged in policy making, determine the legal responsibilities of various college organs, and present a detailed report to the entire college community.

There are a number of important reasons to favor such action:

a. By publishing Courtney's speech on the anatomy of the college, we are fulfilling one of our obligations and, at the same time, committing ourselves to even more intensive self study.

b. There is a "crisis of legitimacy" in this college, most of which can probably be dispelled by a fuller understanding of the actual duties, powers, and responsibilities (both formal and informal) of the various groups within the administration, faculty, student body, and Board. Much of the inchoate discussion of "who is the college" is based on considerable misunderstanding about the actual situation.

c. Such a document would give the students a much clearer idea of the actual powers that they have but do not exercise. And it would aid students to channel their grievances within, rather than outside, the regular "decision making" structure. The document would also aid the faculty in making decisions constructively to change the system.

d. The proposed "super week" or "student week" could be postponed until the faculty/student committee has issued its report. Student emotions are still too high to have a fruitful "student week" in the next few months.

e. The final document would be invaluable to the man who is appointed our new permanent President.

g. (Least important) Such a project has considerable theoretical interest to economists, sociologists, and political scientists and could be quite educational to the participants on the committee drawing up the report.

2. We still have the recommendations of the Student Life Committee and ExSAC to act upon. We've dawdled over these matters for a full semester and can rightfully be accused of footdragging. I may be misreading a consensus but it seems as though most of these matters have been talked to death and that most faculty members have very firm opinions on the pros and cons of dormitory autonomy. So we should get these old matters out of the way. (etc?)

3. We must begin to implement our resolutions on Black admissions and to continue our discussions on the way in which "opportunity" (risk) students can be supported academically while they are "closing the gap." The formation of the AdHoc Black Admission Committee can be done quickly. Rather than pass or reject SASSes "clarified demands". I think we should let the administration make informal arrangements with the Black students. It should be clear to all that the specifics of their demands are not as important as the substance that more Black students should be admitted. Faculty action on these demands is also complicated by the necessity to follow certain state regulations concerning quotas. Maximum flexibility is imperative and policy making on detailed matters is not the way to achieve such flexibility.

4. We must take some sort of action on the Black studies report. Since the Black students repudiated their signatures, we have three alternatives:

a. To debate the report as it stands;
b. To send the report back to committee until a consensus is reached;
c. Or to send the report back to committee until majority and minority positions can be presented to the faculty.

I favor the last alternative. I think it would be a useful precedent to have actually, with repudiation present, this is the only "due" course.

of Harvard's new program, which complicates matters because it will be shared with Black.

majority and minority reports presented to the faculty, rather than a watered down consensus. This is especially true since all the issues will be raised again in our own meetings and such majority and minority reports could serve to structure our own debate.

5. We must begin working on ways in which the faculty can formally and informally reestablish contacts with our Black students. (i.e. not just the mal contents)

6. We must submit names of qualified Blacks to the administration so that the search for Black administrators can be speeded up. (*)

7. After we have done all this, we can then pass another resolution condemning direct action and reaffirming the power of the President to expel students who are engaged in disruptive activities. Constructive faculty action on the measures I've proposed above would be much more effective in reducing the possibility of disruptive activities than spending a great deal of time debating another law and order resolution, at least in the next few weeks.

Frederic J. Pryor

What can be done on reciprocal bases? For instance with Lincoln, so close? This interim sort of thing should be thoroughly explored as presenting possibilities a) more important, for implementing our actions viz a viz 1969/70 and b) less important, for establishing, now, modus operandi with our present black students.