

Dartmouth Classmates and Friends:

I suspect if there's one thing we're in unanimous agreement on it's that we've had just about enough of Dartmouth alumni politics. Speaking as someone who put in three years creating and trying (sadly unsuccessfully) to sell a new alumni governance constitution, I know I have.

Frankly, I'm pretty close to "wore out", but the election our College is now holding is important, so important that I feel compelled to give it one more shot. I respectfully ask that you bear with me.

ALUMNI TRUSTEE ELECTION

I am voting for all three nominated candidates: Sandy Alderson, Sherri Oberg and John Wolf. I urge you to do the same. Here's why:

1 - Each of the nominated candidates is extremely well qualified in terms of proven success as a leader and long-term commitment to Dartmouth. Each would bring fresh, truly independent thinking to the Board, and each is capable of making an important positive contribution to its deliberative process.

2 - I'm voting for all three, rather than just one, because, under the Approval Voting System we're unfortunately stuck with, to do otherwise is to run the serious risk that a poorly-qualified petition candidate will be elected by a plurality vote, even though a majority of alumni may well be opposed to his serving on the Board. (Also, as stated above, I truly DO believe each of the three nominated candidates would make an excellent Trustee.) Is this "gaming the system"? Perhaps, but no more than putting up a single petition candidate to run against three nominated candidates who are certain to split the "mainstream" vote.

3 - I do NOT believe the petition candidate, Stephen Smith, would make a good Trustee:

- Smith has clearly demonstrated he is either completely out of touch with Dartmouth or running a "straw man" campaign that would make Karl Rove blush. His campaign "issues" are either non-existent (de-emphasis on athletics; desire to de-emphasize teaching and turn Dartmouth into a research university), or already very well resolved (threat to fraternity life; freedom of speech on campus), or already being pro-actively addressed to the extent necessary (class size and accessibility).

- Unlike all three nominated candidates, until just a couple of months ago Smith had shown no interest whatsoever in his alma mater. He has contributed no time and no money whatsoever to supporting any aspect of the College he now claims he wishes to serve. I'm sorry, but I believe this calls his motivation into serious question.

- Unlike all three nominated candidates, who have accepted no money and owe no allegiances, Smith has accepted major (\$75,000+) outside funding for his heavily financed, well-orchestrated campaign. He tells us he is the "independent" candidate. Perhaps, but I see evidence to the contrary.

- Finally, if diversity of views is an important asset for the Board to have (and I believe it is), why do we need another Class of '88, Virginia-based law school professor with clear conservative-cum-libertarian political preferences when we already have Stephen Smith's close friend and ally Todd Zywicki '88 serving as a Trustee?

Note: To read two excellent commentaries that ran in the Daily "D" this past week, click on the following links:

A Better Board by Rick Routhier '73

<http://www.thedartmouth.com/article.php?aid=20070402022>

Smith's College Ties by John Engelman '68

<http://www.thedartmouth.com/article.php?aid=2007040602060>

ASSOCIATION OF ALUMNI (AoA) ELECTION

Unlike the Trustee election, we are being asked to vote for just ONE person for each AoA office and each of the seven additional Executive Committee Member positions. I am voting for the NOMINATED officer slate (Bill Hutchinson - pres., Kate Aiken - 1st VP, Mal Robinson - 2nd VP and David Spalding - sec.-treas.) and for seven of the NOMINATED EC members. I urge you to do the same. Here's why:

1 - This time around, the sitting AoA EC got it right. They named a Nominating Committee that included several out-spoken critics of past AoA slates for the express purpose of coming up with a slate of nominated candidates reflecting a wide range of alumni views. And this year's Nominating Committee succeeded brilliantly well! They came up with a list of independent candidates committed to working together to make the AoA responsive to both College and alumni body needs. Many (Bill Hutchinson, Mal Robinson, John Harrington, Alex Wilson) are themselves recent past AoA petition candidates. (It should be noted that the Nominating Committee made a sincere effort to work with John MacGovern, founder and president of the Hanover Institute, in selecting a slate, only to be rebuffed. MacGovern's apparent unwillingness to pursue harmony in alumni governance matters may be influenced by the fact that he accepts a \$48,000 per year "stipend" from the monies he collects in Hanover Institute contributions.)

2 - I know most of the nominated candidates personally and know of the others by reputation. Each is a bright, thoughtful person who will serve us well.

3 - Now is the time for all alumni to put aside past differences and come together in service to the College we love. To those of you who've been sending a "message" with your votes in recent elections that you're unhappy, that you want the Trustees, administration and so-called alumni "insiders" to listen more carefully, that you want candidates with diverse views running for alumni elected positions - CONGRATULATIONS! YOU'VE WON!! The nominated slates you're being offered - for both AoA officers and EC members and for Alumni Trustee - reflect the diversity and independence of thinking you've rightly been demanding. There should always be an

opportunity for petition candidacy in order to provide a "safety net", but this year that net is NOT needed. TO VOTE FOR PETITION CANDIDATES THIS YEAR WOULD TRULY BE TO SNATCH DEFEAT FROM THE JAWS OF VICTORY!

Please vote. Please vote for nominated candidates. Thank you for listening.

Wah Hoo Wah,

Jim