



GALLEY

April 10, 1969

It seems to me that the question of whether Bennington should raise the tuition and the student number or not is no longer a real issue. In the first place, (as anyone can discover if she or he reads some of the statistics available on the subject) Bennington's financial situation is obviously impossible and cannot continue. The solution offered by the two EPC's is a temporarily and partially satisfactory solution to this problem. In the second place, no student or faculty member thus far has produced any alternative and superior solution. Finally, whatever the validity of the EPC solution, the faculty has now voted in favor of it. Unless the trustees vote against it, this will be the college's financial policy and mere disagreement with it won't change it.

For all these reasons, I find student dissatisfaction with the EPC financial proposals per se ineffective. What is justifiable, however, is a skepticism about the adequacy of the proposals in solving the financial situation, and a dissatisfaction with the rather tremendous generalities of the EPC educational proposals. The financial question is not only what we do to resolve the direness of Bennington's present financial crisis, but also how can we put Bennington in a position from which it can pay adequate (ie: higher) faculty salaries and provide money for badly needed experimental programs and student financial aid. As far as I am aware, the EPC proposal will not solve this aspect of Bennington's financial problems. Furthermore, as was evident last year, this summer, early last fall, to say nothing of years past, Bennington needs to experiment with another, educationally justifiable structure which would encourage rather than hinder curricular change and quality. We need to be thinking about our educational problems, irrespective of, and certainly as a consequence of, our financial policy changes.

However, if, as is the record of Bennington's past, the faculty and students continue to hold individuality of position more important than substantial agreement, we will be unable to agree on any one particular direction in which the college should move. We will "agree" to a policy of no change because that is the only thing we can agree to. Apparently, what we have is less obnoxious to more people than an experimental change to a different program. In other words, we will all agree that we are not an intelligently experimental college, but a somewhat pitiful, once experimental and still somewhat unusual college whose distinguishing characteristic is a remarkable ability to talk forever without reaching an effective conclusion.

Let us, therefore, stop complaining about our financial situation, stop complaining about our educational problems and find some direction to which we can consciously agree and through which we can consciously experiment towards a "better" education. We don't have to bumble along in no conscious direction.

Libby Meyers