



ARNOLD



SMITH

Editorial Thoughts On The Smith Affair

The Smith tenure affair has moved to the back burner this week, giving a respite to all the Senate, and Cabinet members, Smith partisans, and faculty members who spent the last two weeks shuttling about from meeting to meeting as the situation degenerated into a no win status.

If sifting through the mountain of rumors, charges, questions and replies that have swirled around the case, the following observations seem to us to accurately state the facts.

1. From a strictly procedural viewpoint there do not appear to have been any improper steps taken by the Dean or the President. While a final verdict upon this will be given by the Faculty Personnel Committee, there is no evidence to support accusations floating about that Mr. Smith was denied due process.

2. There is no evidence to suggest the Dean is using the Smith case to wrench a shift in the direction of the art department away from studio art. Such a major change in emphasis would require a lengthy procession through the labyrinthine mazes of faculty committees. The Dean's authority does not extend so far as to allow personal curriculum reform on his part.

3. As for the reason or reasons Mr. Smith was denied tenure, we can offer no comment. All we have is the word of the Dean and the President that the decision was based solely upon professional considerations. More specific comment has not and will not be forthcoming because of ethical considerations and the college counsel's admonition that specific comment could cause problems if the matter finds its way into the courts. This embargo has prevented us from ferreting out the facts, and we cannot therefore suggest who should not be believed. Decide for yourself.

4. There is no evidence that the wall was painted over to stifle criticism of the administration. The President has told THE LANCE and several students that he did not order the painting and would have stopped it if he had been told sooner. The paintings of the wall is supposed to take place every few months during holidays to clear off the old graffiti to make room for the new. The first painting took place just before fall term began; the next was supposed to have occurred over Christmas. A combination of factors - a major one being weather, - another maintenance's tendency to lose assignments periodically - delayed the job until Thursday, when, in an unfortunate coincidence Business Manager Julian Davis ordered the overdue paint job carried out. There is no evidence, either, to support perhaps the most paranoid claim of the entire affair - that Davis is covering up for the President.

Changes Called For

Several needs have come out of this affair. One is the need for greater student input in the tenure process. The Dean admitted at his Wednesday night appearance before the Senate that the tenure "deck is stacked" in the professor's favor, and it is. He can choose which classes will evaluate his performance, and can prepare the results for his file himself. There the student role, such as it is, ends. A larger role is warranted. The students, present and future, are the ones who will be the real judge of a professor's realization of "potential for academic growth," as the Dean put it.

Another need is a clear definition of the Dean's newfound veto. How far does it extend? Suppose the Tenure Committee refused to recommend a professor and the Dean did? What then? At least one professor has suggested that if the Dean's veto goes beyond tenure to all committees which pass recommendations through him all committees should just be abolished (an idea that has a certain appeal in and of itself).

Boycott The Boycott

As a final observation, we urge the Senate and Cabinet to repudiate talk of a boycott of classes to force a reversal of the Smith decision. A boycott would be nothing but negative. It would bring hordes of newpeople on campus, hurting St. Andrews' image. It would hurt the college's recruiting efforts just as they begin to show promise of good results this year. It would divide the Student Association. It would not change the decision. St. Andrews and its future are bigger than one person's particular problem. It deserves better from us than this. The Smith case should be chalked up to experience and efforts made to ensure that it never occurs again.

Letters . . .

2

Ron Bayes on St. Andrews' literary support

To The Editor

I wish to make a public expression of thanks to writers Marion Cannon and Dick Bakken for helping St. Andrews maintain writing as a "live tradition" this year. It is the first time that we have had persons give so liberally of their time and talent over an extended period—at honoraria that would make Scrooge blush. Mrs. Cannon spent a week, Mr. Bakken the month of January here. Both were active in the public schools and guest lectured on campus on request, in addition to being available to students with manuscripts at virtually all times. As you know, that is a

rewarding but a very, very demanding sort of thing.

We all are proud that St. Andrews has such friends and that our student body and community commands such affection in a fairly hard and

brutal age. "One village in order, one valley may reach the four streams," as Mr. Ezra Pound said.

Sincerely,
Ron Bayes
Writer in Residence

Julian Smith on behavior at basketball games

To The Editor:

Through THE LANCE, I want to take this opportunity to thank the students of St. Andrews for their support of our basketball teams this year. I hope that their enthusiasm will continue and grow. The players need the support of their fellow students.

It has, however, come to my attention that on occasion our actions have been less than sporting in respect to the officials and teams visiting our campus. This has been quite evident when the visitors are shooting fouls. We certainly do not wish to dampen any

(continued below)

