

G A L L E Y

I would like to register a degree of dissent from the Report of the Faculty Committee on Student Government. I feel that the student proposal, though far from perfect, and stressing only one aspect of a much broader issue, is deserving of serious and sympathetic consideration, beyond that offered in the Report. It is my belief that the student proposal--whether or not its authors now endorse it--was presented in good faith, with an adequate sense of responsibility, i.e. the resolve to enforce strict self-regulation, as the other face of the coin autonomy, and that therefore it deserves to be tried out, in the belief that any defects would soon become apparent and remedies could then be sought in a democratic manner. Or even, put to the pragmatic test, that it might prove unexpectedly successful. Clearly the Committee has thought otherwise.

I do not consider the Report of the Faculty Committee devoid of merit or lacking in earnest concern for the issue. I do disagree with much of its tone and emphasis, and specifically with Recommendation B that the faculty vote against the student proposal.

Since I find myself in a minority among my colleagues, I have taken this means of letting my views be known.

Also, since it is not clear what degree of student support for the student proposal, per se, is still to be found, I would submit the following points as a basis for widening the discussion at tonight's Community Meeting:

1. That the principle of complete house-by-house self-regulation should be established.
2. That certain standards of conduct should be agreed upon by all three constituencies, but that these standards should be interpreted as points of orientation, rather than as a set of regulations.
3. In agreement with the sense of point 5 of the Faculty Report, that the Administration should make itself more energetically responsible for the enforcement of such basic regulations as are necessary to protect the legal position of the college.

Francis Golfing

March 25, 1968