

June 18, 2013

Mr. Giles K. Kemp Chair, Board of Managers Swarthmore College 38 Lockwood Road Scarsdale, NY 10583

Dear Mr. Kemp:

I know the disturbance at the May 4 meeting of the Board of Managers was deeply distressing to many in the Swarthmore College community. A free society depends upon the right to voice – and hear – dissenting views on any topic of discussion.

The disruption of the meeting by a group of student demonstrators violated those principles. The students pressed their demands on university leaders in thoughtless ways, drowning out students who wanted to voice other perspectives, and shutting down a reasoned discussion of the university's investment policies.

Academic freedom and the free exchange of ideas are at stake. I am sure you recognize the danger: what happened at the May meeting could encourage others to resort to similar coercive tactics, or worse. To prevent such a likely outcome, the board must make it a top priority to ensure an environment of constructive dialogue.

When faced with similar challenges in the 1970s, then Yale president Kingman Brewster convened a panel of distinguished scholars who produced a seminal statement on academic freedom, now known as the C. Vann Woodward Report. The report, which is included in the enclosed volume, *Free to Teach*, *Free to Learn*, outlines procedures for ensuring that the campus environment fosters an open debate and respects the right to dissent. We urge you to call upon your president to ensure that Swarthmore has in place a similar framework, and to clarify that coercive disruptions violate the Swarthmore community's values.

We also urge you to examine the enclosed report of the Kalven Committee convened by then University of Chicago president George W. Beadle to prepare "a statement on the University's role in political and social action." It was prompted by circumstances not altogether unlike those at Swarthmore, where individuals on campus opposed various actions by the university in the context of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

After lengthy deliberation, the Committee reached a "deep consensus" on the appropriate role of the university as a neutral forum for the purposes of teaching and research: "The neutrality of the university as an institution arises then not from a lack of courage nor out of indifference and insensitivity.... It arises out of respect for free inquiry and the obligation to cherish a diversity of viewpoints."

Mr. Giles K. Kemp June 18, 2013 Page 2

While the report allowed for "extraordinary circumstances" where students, faculty and others could question "through existing channels" whether the university was behaving responsibly, it concluded that there was a "heavy presumption against the university taking collective action or expressing opinions on the political and social issues of the day, or modifying its corporate activities to foster social or political values, however compelling and appealing they may be."

In glosses written especially for the enclosed volume, both former Harvard University president Lawrence Summers and Boston attorney Harvey Silverglate call upon administrators and trustees to respond vigorously when students or others seek to use the university to advance their ideological agenda. Otherwise, Silverglate opines, "the university simply cannot perform the functions demanded of it in a free society."

The recent events at Swarthmore necessitate brave and thoughtful action. You, the Board of Managers, can take action as fiduciaries. When students use force or intimidation to disrupt the free exchange of ideas, the president and trustees should be clear, through their pronouncements and policies, that they will act firmly to hold those students accountable.

We urge you to call upon your president to ensure that similar disruptions will not take place in the future. And we encourage your board publicly to affirm its commitment to institutional neutrality and to acknowledge the right of all members of the Swarthmore community to participate in campus dialogue without fear of coercion.

We are eager to help the Board in any way we can and welcome a response. Thank you for your service to American higher education.

Warm regards,

Anne D. Neal President

Enclosure

cc: Neil R. Grabois, Vice Chair, Swarthmore Board of Managers Jorge L. Aguilar, Swarthmore Board of Managers Richard Barasch, Swarthmore Board of Managers Dulany Ogden Bennett, Swarthmore Board of Managers Mr. Giles K. Kemp June 18, 2013 Page 3

> James C. Hormel, III, Swarthmore Board of Managers Frederick W. Kyle, Swarthmore Board of Managers Susan Levine, Swarthmore Board of Managers Jorge Munoz, Swarthmore Board of Managers John A. Riggs, Swarthmore Board of Managers Carl R. Russo, Swarthmore Board of Managers Robin Shapiro, Swarthmore Board of Managers David W. Singleton, Swarthmore Board of Managers Thomas E. Spock, Swarthmore Board of Managers Danielle Toaltoan, Swarthmore Board of Managers Joseph Turner, Swarthmore Board of Managers Rhonda Cohen, Swarthmore Board of Managers Janet S. Dickerson, Swarthmore Board of Managers Jenny Hourihan Bailin, Swarthmore Board of Managers Lewis H. Lazarus, Swarthmore Board of Managers Sibella Clark Pedder, Swarthmore Board of Managers Gustavo R. Schwed, Swarthmore Board of Managers Sohail Bengali, Swarthmore Board of Managers Nathaniel Erskine, Swarthmore Board of Managers Thomas Hartnett, Swarthmore Board of Managers Jane Lang, Swarthmore Board of Managers Lucinda Lewis, Swarthmore Board of Managers Bennett Lorber, Swarthmore Board of Managers James Lovelace, Swarthmore Board of Managers Christopher Niemczewski, Swarthmore Board of Managers Delvin Dinkins, Swarthmore Board of Managers J. David Gelber, Swarthmore Board of Managers Marilyn Holifield, Swarthmore Board of Managers Barbara Mather, Swarthmore Board of Managers Ann Reichelderfer, Swarthmore Board of Managers Elizabeth H. Scheuer, Swarthmore Board of Managers Sujatha Srinivasan, Swarthmore Board of Managers Ruth Shoemaker Wood, Swarthmore Board of Managers Rebecca Chopp, Ph.D., President, Swarthmore College