

Suggestions to the Council:

We will probably say nothing that you don't already know, but perhaps it would help you to know that some of us realize the problems of the community with you. Please remember the following criticisms are not made with malicious motives.

We, as a community, are complacent, passive, indifferent, small-minded, as is evident in evening, community and house-meetings, as well as in classes. We fail to see the broader significance of issues. We are too ready to avoid facing these issues by taking the course of least resistance and excusing ourselves for our failure. We lack the frankness to face out problems squarely.

We feel it is your responsibility and in your power to create this frankness.

You have over-emphasized, in theory, consideration of the individual, at the expense of this frankness. By publishing the facts of significant cases, you can create public opinion, which we feel is a valuable and just factor in "dealing with" or "punishing an offender". You have not employed public opinion, which should and could be your most valuable support and weapon. It ceases to be valuable, however, and is a destructive force when facts of a case are half-known and distorted by gossip. In rare cases publication of an "offense" might be harmful to the individual involved. But the uncertainty of having offended and not knowing who knows and who doesn't, who is whispering behind your back and who isn't, - this uncertainty produces a guilty, suspicious, rebellious state of mind that is powerfully destructive.

Since we have no precedents to guide our conduct, it would fairer to the potential offenders, which we all are, if you published facts to show us how you would handle such and such a situation.

We have elected you to represent us. We still have confidence in you but how have you proven we have placed our confidence in the right people? How can you truly represent us if you function so apparently independent of our opinions?

You object to that very lack of opinion. So do we but it is your responsibility to create it. You have felt your way too gently. If your statements of opinion were more positive the reactions would be more positive. Eliminate the "suggestion" policy. You over-emphasize the value of initial agreement, and seem afraid of disagreement. Through disagreement we could come to a positive conclusion, instead of the present passive, half-hearted acceptance.

The most emphatic criticism we have of you, is that you are making too many concessions to public opinion for the sake of the Reputation of The College. You should have stronger courage of your convictions to carry out what the college stands for. Making rules is an admission of defeat on your part. Any body can function as a council with a set of laws to reinforce it. It takes courage, strength and persistence to function without laws. It is your job, as well as the faculty's, to show us, as individuals, our proper relationship to the community, with a success that makes rules superfluous.

The rule about men in the rooms is humiliation and degrading. If any "immoral" actions are going to take place, keeping men out of the rooms before 12 and after 6 won't prevent it. The excuse about the danger of nudity in the halls is absurd. This rule is a weak form of protection against outside opinion. The fact that we have excluded men from our rooms at certain hours won't stop criticism. It is taking away responsibility from the individual and is inconsistent with our theory.

What we need is cooperation. The only way to get this in a genuine form is to be straightforward in acknowledging and dealing with the fundamental issues before us. Without this frankness we will soon find ourselves drifting into a state of compromise which will be a distorted realization of our original ideals.

(s.)

Asho Ingersoll
Janet Summers