

M.A.M. —
- STUDENT HANDOUT

5 March 1979

JB.

To President Stevens:

The discussions of racism at Haverford have proved fruitless, both in content and in consequences. Over the last ten years, Haverford's expressed commitment to greater recruitment of minority students and faculty has not been met. Neither has the college altered its intrinsically racist and class-biased admissions policies and curriculum. We therefore make the following non-negotiable demands.

Admissions

1. There is a disparity between the presumed major criterion for admission to Haverford — intellectual capacity — and the actual composition of the student body. Assuming intelligence to be randomly distributed across the population, we have failed to implement this criterion of admission. There still is not a representative cross-section of race and class on campus. In order to redress this imbalance, we demand that beginning with matriculants entering in 1979, students must be selected according to intellectual ability and must include at least 20 percent minorities. Specifically, they must be at least 12.5 percent Black and at least 7.5 percent Hispanic, reflecting their proportion in the American population.

2. The admission of these students will be only the first stage of an on-going process. Beginning in 1980 and continuing in following years, 25 percent of the Haverford student body must be drawn from the poor and working class. Minorities must continue to be represented in proportion to their presence in the general population. The overlap between these two categories of the poor and racial minorities should be considerable.

3. Targetted students will be admitted with financial aid according to need. This presumes a redistribution of existing aid and/or added funding from alumni and outside sources.

4. Felmon Davis, Bill Hohenstein, Muhammed Kenyatta, and two minority students chosen by the minorities community will assist the Admissions Office in expanding the minorities applicant pool. If sufficient matriculants are not found or choose not to enter upon acceptance, this group will continue its search over the summer.

5. All incoming students must be informed of the nature of this program and the history of racial tensions on campus.

Curriculum

1. The college must institute a commitment to reform the curriculum so as to accommodate all students and to improve the general quality of education at Haverford.

2. The first phase of this institutionalization will consist in acting upon the demands presented here. By 12:00 noon today, we expect that

you will inform us either that (1) you are empowered to comply with these demands or (2) that you will call into session the body so empowered. In either instance, we will expect your written response in our hands by 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 6.

Students for Democratic Education

5 March 1979

INSTITUTIONALIZED RACISM AT HAVERFORD

Students for Democratic Education

The 'Haverford Way' didn't help. In this area, the college was the victim of its own virtues. The Honor System, so much at the heart of the Haverford experience, placed tremendous weight on individual responsibility and individual decisions, and left little room for recognition of group needs or group action.

(Greg Kannerstein, "SILENCE: the price of diversity," in Horizons, 1977, p. 5)

2

The shock of overtly racist incidents and their increasing occurrence on campus has left a considerable number of Haverfordians both concerned and confused as to the sources and rectification of racism. The current discussions appear to many to be the extraordinary response to an extraordinary situation. Some have perforce concluded that we should cease enticing or even admitting minorities until those students already here have learned not to be bigots. We believe, rather, that racism and elitism have always existed at Haverford and in the United States, and that they are best confronted by institutional means.

The parameters of the debate on racism have shifted little since 1972, when a coalition of minority students presented demands for diversifying the campus. At that time, as now, attention was largely focused on the cultural and interpersonal aspects of racism, e.g., music, language, and prejudiced attitudes. "Sometimes it was the result of ignorance: when well-meaning white students, often from all-white high schools, would tell black students, 'You guys shouldn't always sit together in the dining center'" (Kannerstein, pp. 6-7). It has been generally recognized that racism is undesirable, and that the racism on campus is largely responsible for the higher rates of attrition among Black and Puerto Rican students. However, these concerns have, till now, been largely voiced out of context.

Both racism and class bias are systems of discrimination embedded in our economic, legal, and cultural institutions (such as colleges). They involve the systematic exclusion of class and racial groups from the varied societal privileges to which white upper middle class people have greater access. This exclusive system begins at birth for people clustered in the lowest income groups, and is especially severe for minorities, who suffer the most serious discrimination throughout society. The neighborhoods where we live, the schools we attend, and our families' resources lead to the kinds of opportunities open to us in later life. Of immediate pertinence, this means that minorities and working class people are "tracked" away from colleges like Haverford. The situation is compounded here by lukewarm recruiting efforts and the implicit assumption that students require the training received at an upper middle class high school in order to succeed

academically. This assumption is false, for as Kannerstein admitted in the cited article, standardized test scores (related to educational opportunities) bear no determinate relation to academic success at Haverford. We assert that quite capable people are structurally excluded from admittance to Haverford, and thereby from realizing their intellectual potential.

To reverse this situation, we have presented a set of demands to the Haverford administration. We believe that the effort to end Haverford's racism and class bias is a multifaceted one, and that it begins with bringing more minority students to the campus. At this time, racism is the most long-standing violation of Haverford's expressed concerns and the most volatile issue on campus. As stated above, racism is being challenged institutionally in order to address the roots of the problem. Kannerstein noted that despite successful consciousness-raising in 1972, "whether the processes of the institution had changed to recognize minorities, . . . whether the college had succeeded in 'institutionalizing diversity' - those questions remained to be answered" (p. 7). Those questions have been answered by the administration's performance: consciousness-raising in isolation from institutional change does not resolve the bases of racism.

The necessary changes are of broad scope and will require a continuous commitment and the active participation of minorities and working class students. One component of the commitment will be financial aid, either through redistribution of existing aid or active solicitation of outside sources. Certain administrators have assured us that funds are indeed available and that the amount required for this program is far less than that estimated by President Stevens in his statement to the News. Compliance with our demands will obligate the administration to make a concerted effort to obtain the necessary funds. As for curricular and social reforms, a significant number of minority and working class students will be needed and will be better qualified than we are to define their needs. That numbers have been a problem historically has been expressed by Kannerstein, who observed that the "small size and homogeneity of the student body and even the faculty barred the minority student from validating his own ethnic perspective and experience" (p. 5). We might add that insufficient numbers have also hindered minority students from securing implementation of past demands. In all fairness to incoming students, we have demanded that all matriculants be informed of the history of racial tensions on campus and the nature of the present program of reforms.

These demands emerged as a student initiative because of the administration's legacy of failure to implement changes and its inertia in moving further. The concerns rest not only with the faculty, administration, and current minority students, but with the student body as a whole. We expect that it will be very difficult to have this set of demands accepted and implemented, and invite every Bryn Mawr and Haverford student to commit her/himself to fighting for them now and, most importantly, in the future. As the demands state, their institutionalization will be a continuous process, requiring the support and cooperation of all students in solidarity with minority and working class students. Unless we fight now in support of these demands, we in fact commit ourselves to the perpetuation of institutionalized racism.

The quotations from Greg Kannerstein's article have provided insight into the history of the diversity debate and struggle. However, Kannerstein has not associated himself with the SDE in any way, and

Haverford College

John

TO: R. Stevens and S. Cary FROM: M.A. Meyers
RE: SDE Demands DATE: 5 March 1979

FRIENDS: Several relevant points were made this morning which speak directly to ^{me} concern about increasing the percentage of minority and/or working class students at Haverford expressed by the Students for Democratic Education. For your benefit in talking with the press, I thought it might be useful to list them.

In the first place, the SDE's concern is very much in the Haverford tradition of social awareness and "shared responsibility for helping the College achieve its highest aims." (Statement of Purpose, 1978-79 Catalog, p. 6.)

But "non-negotiable demands" are not in the Haverford tradition, and a threat to prevent: College administrators going about their legitimate business by blocking entrance or exit from their offices or the campus is alien to the Haverford tradition of rational discussion, peaceable conduct, and the consensus method of decision-making.

Finally, the financial reality is this: Haverford will be doing very well in the foreseeable future if it is able to maintain its present level of scholarship support at about 40 per cent. The College spends 10 per cent of its annual budget on student aid, and while it is determined to continue doing so, such a commitment will be far from easy in an era of unrelenting inflation.

I also think a few statistics will help to put the group's demands in perspective. As you know, Greg Kannerstein's Horizons's article, "Silence: the Price of Diversity," is quoted, so perhaps it makes sense to take the year in which it was published (1972 NOT 1975) as a base year for computing progress or regression.

In 1972, 2.5 per cent (six students out of 242) of the freshman class was black or Hispanic. This year 9.4 per cent (25 out of 267) is black or Hispanic and 12 per cent (33 out of 267) are minority students, if you count those of Oriental descent. In 1972, 2.4 per cent of the entire Haverford student body was black or Hispanic; today minority students make up slightly over 8 per cent (8.2% or 78 out of 952 in fall and 7.9% or 72 out of 916 in spring) of the student body. Since 1972, moreover, the attrition rate of black and Hispanic students has been 11 per cent, which compares favorably to the overall College attrition rate of 10 to 15 per cent. In other words, 89 per cent of the black and Hispanic students enrolled since 1972 have graduated or are currently in good standing.

As for faculty and staff, the figures are as follows: in 1972, 9.9 per cent of the College administration was black; today black administrators number 17 per cent of the total. Slightly less than 12 per cent of the current faculty are minority persons, and while only one black person has tenure, one is now in a tenure-track position, another is being considered for a tenure-track post, and two with interim appointments have been offered another year on the Haverford faculty.

The SDE statement talks of "lukewarm recruiting efforts." But unlike 1972, Haverford now has a full time, not just a part-time minority person in the Admissions Office seeking to recruit minority students. Other admissions officers do minority recruiting as well; and, indeed, Bill Ambler estimates that more than a quarter of his office's staff time is devoted to recruiting minority students. The Admissions Office uses the Educational Testing Service's national search mailing service. It is directed at students not on the basis of the socioeconomic character of their high schools but on the basis of their college board scores.

Finally, the SDE's statement seems to allege that Haverford has made no structural changes to excise racism. The facts, however, suggest that a number of structural changes have been made in the interest of "institutionalizing diversity." These include:

- creation of an Office of Minority Affairs;
- creation of a fulltime position for a minority recruiter in the Admissions Office;
- creation of a summer program to help incoming students strengthen their academic skills;
- institutionalization of a minority voice in decision-making by inclusion of the Minority Coalition in various aspects of the decision-making process;
- creation of both faculty and administrative committees on hiring, and
- institution of a concentrated drive to raise funds for minority scholarship--successful to the tune of \$95,000 in just the past year.

It goes without saying that we must continue our efforts to seek out minority students and provide them with an educational experience which is enriching and relevant, but it is simply not true that "discussions of racism at Haverford have proved fruitless, both in content and in consequences."



Haverford College

HAVERFORD, PA. 19041 215-649-9600

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

March 7, 1979

To: Students for Democratic Education

As you requested, I am responding to your non-negotiable demands dated the 5th day of March, 1979.

As I told you when we met, I thought non-negotiable demands were inconsistent with the spirit of Haverford College. That is a position from which I have not retreated. As I told you when we first met, I think your concerns about increasing the diversity of students at Haverford College are in the very best traditions of the College. I share these concerns.

I had an opportunity of meeting with the faculty on Tuesday afternoon. I explained my position to them; they offered their advice to me. In the light of their advice, I now feel able to offer you my comments on your various demands.

While, as I say, I am sympathetic to the spirit of the demands, I have to say that most of the specific demands and the method of solution you have proposed are not acceptable, either to me or to the faculty. While I am president of the College, I trust we shall be particularly sensitive to the very concerns you have addressed; but I am equally anxious that we not make representations or commitments which the College cannot then follow through on - however politically convenient it might be at the moment of making these commitments.

In this regard, your first suggestion that we move either immediately or immediately to increase dramatically the number of minority or working class students, is one that I think Haverford cannot commit itself to either now or in the immediate future. We are an underfunded, private institution. Even well funded institutions of higher education are year-by-year becoming more tuition dependent. Our position is appreciably more perilous. The cost, for instance, of replacing one hundred middle class students who receive partial scholarship with one hundred working class students (the ethics of which itself is somewhat dubious) would require at least an incremental \$370,000 a year. This is in addition to all the grants and loans which might be available from other sources - both private and public. Since the College, two years down the road, will be running a deficit which is likely to be at least \$280,000 a year, we would need an incremental \$650,000 a year for the College to meet its obligations. For me to even hint that such a program was a possibility in the light of these figures would be as dishonest as it would be dishonorable.

Let me say again, however, that I appreciate your concerns and admire your convictions and your willingness to commit yourselves to the cause of diversity in the name of Haverford College; With that in mind, I am asking each one of you specifically to work with either the Development Office in searching for incremental funds for minority scholarships, or with the Admissions Office to search out more minority students. The need for both activities is pressing, and I hope very much that you will be prepared to donate your services during the spring vacation next week. In particular Asoka Gangadean and John Beckerman have agreed to work with Bernie Henderson in the Development Office to coordinate these efforts, while Bill Hohenstein, Felmon Davis, Muhammad Kenvatta have agreed to work with Bill Ambler in the Admissions Office to coordinate your efforts. I very much hope each and every one of you will be prepared to make this personal commitment to the cause of diversity.

Let me say in closing that I think the spirit of the faculty meeting was clear. Your concerns are shared. The faculty appreciates you underlining the need to keep the issue of diversity - especially in admissions - constantly to the fore; but at the same time, the faculty feels as I do that Haverford, as a democratic institution, has to respect its own procedures.

Mike Weinstein, Chairman of the AAC will hold open meetings on the Gould and related proposals after the vacation; Claude Wintner on behalf of EPC will be holding open hearings on the Gould proposal in due course. In the traditions of Haverford College, I trust you will appear at these meetings to make your views known so that the full implications of any such proposal can be appropriately discussed and debated in these committees and ultimately reported to the faculty.

Sincerely,



Robert Stevens

RS:am

TO: The College Community

FROM: Minority Coalition

DATE: March 6, 1979

It is the belief of the Minority Coalition at Haverford that it is a highly desirable and socially just goal that the Haverford student body equally represent a cross-section of the American population. Consequently, we now express our support for the demands presented by the Students for Democratic Education (SDE) to the Haverford administration. However, this support is conditional upon the inclusion of the following concerns in the negotiations of the SDE demands. We believe that the addition of these concerns only increase the feasibility of the successful implementation of the SDE demands.

(1) The Office of Minority Affairs appears to be overburdened with the influx of increased numbers of minority students. In light of the often hostile social environments which these students encounter at Haverford, and mindful of inadequacies in counseling and support services for them, we call for an expansion of this office. The fashion in which the expansion of this office will take place should be dealt with according to the feelings of Karla Spurlock Evans, Director of Minority Affairs, and the minority students at Haverford.

(2) We especially support the demand "to reform the curriculum so as to accommodate all students and to improve the general quality of education at Haverford" and call for immediate steps to meet these demands.

(3) Recognizing that many Haverford students come to this community from socially homogeneous life situations, we recommend cultural enrichment of the curriculum in the fashion of experiential involvement of social services in cross-cultural situations as well as in course work relative to race relations. A first step in this direction could be a continued endorsement of the Eighth Dimension Program and its incorporation into the curriculum.

(4) College Committee on Faculty Appointments -- It would be unacceptable to increase the number of minority students without concurrently meeting the College's timetable of increasing the number of minority faculty. Therefore, if after CCFA's third year in existence, it is not responsible for the addition of 3 to 4 minority faculty on tenure track positions beyond the already two tenured minority faculty (i.e., half of its share of the timetable's goal), CCFA should immediately be dissolved and the responsibility of meeting the timetable fall on the Administration or the Board of Managers as originally proposed by the Minority Coalition in its statement of March 29, 1978.

(5) We are in total agreement that the incoming students should be informed as to the past history of the racial tensions on campus. We feel that we are in the best position to relate the situation, therefore, we are willing to accept the role of informing the incoming minority students on this matter.

(6) In keeping with the Quaker witness against racism and conscious of the economic participation of our College in the enslavement of over 20 million people in South Africa, we call upon Haverford College to immediately

divest itself of all investments in multinational corporations doing business in South Africa.

(7) Finally, we as minority students are painfully aware of the personal as well as institutional dimensions of racism at Haverford. Therefore, we urge each member of the Haverford community to take it upon herself/himself to continue the struggle against racism.

In solidarity with Students for Democratic Education,

The Minority Coalition.

TO: Bi-College Community
FROM: Students for Democratic Education
SUBJECT: WHERE WE STAND

8 March 1979

In his response to our demands, President Stevens indicated that he, too, was concerned with "the need to keep the issue of diversity . . . constantly to the fore". However, in expressing his support for the "spirit of the demands," he did not address himself to past failures to institutionalize diversity nor did he make positive suggestions for dealing with the causes of those failures. Indeed, while reiterating the symbolic commitment to diversity, he concluded that "Haverford cannot commit itself . . . either now or in the immediate future" to admitting significant numbers of minority and working class students. While we appreciate his shared moral concern, we feel committed to the demands presented yesterday. They are based upon an analysis of the sources and necessary reforms of institutional racism, and developed naturally out of previous promises made by the college which have not been realized.

We hope that the faculty will reconsider these demands in their entirety and not as discrete suggestions for reform. President Stevens has invited SDE members to aid the Admissions Office in seeking minority and working class students, and to assist the Development Office in raising financial aid funds. In good conscience, we cannot do either outside the context of institutional commitments which have not yet been affirmed: increasing admissions of such students, providing them with financial assistance, and making curricular reforms adapted to their needs and directed towards improving the overall quality of a Haverford education.

We stress both the internal consistency in principle of our demands and their interdependence in implementation. The Admissions Office cannot recruit more minorities students without having the funds to assist them, and the Development Office cannot acquire adequate funds (especially from outside sources) without a mandate from the college which justifies those funds. President Stevens' estimates of the cost of diversification assume that there is no possibility of obtaining outside funding; this assumption has not been carefully tested. The financial aspect of the diversification program should not be used to rationalize the real difficulty of having to present a coherent proposal in order to obtain new funding. And for obvious reasons, significant numbers of minority and working class students, as defined in our demands, are essential to successful diversification of the community. Should the college make a full commitment to diversity, SDE members would be very happy to assist in all aspects of its implementation. In the meantime, we feel it to be irresponsible not to notify all prospective students of the racial tensions on campus.

That diversification is a multifaceted process has been articulated by the Minority Coalition, and we wish to express our dismay that the faculty neglected the Coalition's concerns at the Tuesday meeting. In addition to endorsing our demands, the Coalition emphasized that the Office of Minority Affairs must be expanded in order to be of greater assistance to minority students at Haverford. We support this request. They also emphasized the necessity of continuing the Eighth Dimension program as a foundation for the

cultural enrichment of all students. We support this request. They further urged the College's immediate divestment of all stocks in multinational corporations having dealings in South Africa. We strongly support this request. Lastly, we share the Coalition's concern with the CCFA's slow progress in hiring minority faculty. This hiring effort is essential in meeting the needs of minority students, and will be beneficial to all Haverford students.

The concerns raised by SDE and the Minority Coalition are central to Haverford's continued excellence, both socially and academically. By acting now to develop a cohesive program of diversification, Haverford can establish close relations with teachers, counselors, and community leaders in urban and rural areas not now sending students to this college. We could thus assure ourselves of a student body having high intellectual potential from diverse social backgrounds, who might not score highly on conventional class- and culturally-biased tests, but who could benefit from and contribute to a Haverford education. Alternatively, unless such fundamental changes occur in the college and its ability to attract sources of funding available for minority and working class rather than middle class students, Haverford will find itself compelled to begin accepting an increasing percentage of students able to pay the rising cost of tuition. New sources of funding would allow the college to avoid favoring financial over academic priorities in recruitment policies.

In conclusion, although we are grateful to President Stevens for recognizing merit in our demands, we cannot emphasize too strongly the need to move beyond verbal and moral commitments to diversity. The promises made in the past ten years must not be allowed to continue unfulfilled. While we regret that the faculty and administration find our methods offensive, it should be remembered that all reforms undertaken in the past have resulted directly from student pressure. Hence, we will continue to work towards institutionalized diversity. If the faculty chooses to adopt the terms of the demands raised at its last meeting on its own initiative, they will have our full support and appreciation.

March 21, 1979

Robert Stevens, President
Haverford College

Dear President Stevens:

We have reviewed your letter dated March 7. Although we appreciate your invitation to meet, we feel that two concerns preclude productive discussion of the Coalition's March 6 memorandum.

First, consideration of the March 6 memorandum in isolation from the SDE demands of March 5 is contrary to the spirit of the Coalition statement. The Coalition expressed "conditional support" of the SDE's demands, with the concerns outlined in the memorandum to be included in any negotiations. These concerns were intended only to "increase the feasibility of the successful implementation of the SDE demands." Any other reading of the memorandum would distort the statement's intention, and, therefore, Coalition's position on the issue.

Second, we are uncomfortable about your position on the overall implementation of diversity at the College. Although we are familiar with your criticisms of the various proposals that have been presented to the Haverford community, we can find no definitive statement of your ideas on how to best diversify the student body, faculty, and administration of Haverford College. Because of the

importance of your position as President of the College, we believe that your thoughts on the future of diversity at Haverford would be beneficial to any discussion between us, as well as any discussion of the subject in the Haverford community at large.

We do not wish these concerns to be a permanent block to communication between us. We await your response as a means of providing a more constructive atmosphere for discussion and decision.

The Minority Coalition

cc: Stephen Cary, Vice-President
Thomas D'Andrea, Provost
Gregory Kannerstein, Acting Dean of the College
Adolphus Williams, Dean of Student Affairs
William Ambler, Director of Admissions
Karla Spurlock-Evans, Director of Minority Affairs
Students for Democratic Education ..