

To: Prof. Chappell White

From: R.A. Day, Jr., and J.H. Goldstein

Date: November 18, 1969

Thank you for your perceptive reply to our recent memorandum.

It seems to us that you have clearly defined

Emory's present dilemma: How to consider new proposals responsibly and critically without appearing to be simply obstructionist to those who are impatient, albeit sincere.

We believe that many responsible people in the Emory community have serious reservations about the implications and consequences of some of the new programs being proposed.

They are reluctant to speak out, however, because they may be made to appear as obstructionists, who are insensitive and indifferent to the underlying social issues. As a consequence, most of our deliberations so far have suffered from lack of the vigorous debate which is so badly needed for constructive change.

Dr. Clark's observations are extremely timely in that he cautions us against precisely what is happening. He says clearly that the adoption of any plan based on a system of dual standards is not only almost certain to fail, but is, in fact, inherently racist, in spite of the good intentions which motivate such a course. Certainly no one can accuse Dr. Clark of obstructionism on insensitivity to social issues.

The necessity for a unified educational experience in the

traditional pattern for all our students, black and white, has also been vigorously stated by Mr. Bayard Rustin. A few months ago Mr. Andrew Brimmer, economist and the only black member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System stated in part:

“Personally, I think it would be a tragic mistake for Negro students to waste their college years languishing in ‘black studies’ and similar sheltered workshops which do little or nothing to prepare them to meet the vigorous competition for employment....”

We all wish, of course, to avoid polarization of opinions which will only make our problems more difficult. We also wish to insure the success of whatever programs we may undertake. For this reason we feel that it is absolutely essential that we heed the kind of evaluations and warnings given by men such as Dr. Clark, Mr. Rustin and Mr. Brimmer. Those of us on the faculty and administration who have responsibilities in these areas owe it to everyone concerned to encourage free and open discussion of all points of view, while discouraging labelling as obstructionists or ultra-conservatives those who propose positive alternatives, albeit less spectacular.

We are most anxious to help in any way to insure that whatever is undertaken is in the best interests of the entire Emory Student body.