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Letter from the President

The theme of this issue of The Participant strikes me as timely.

The juxtaposition of the “ideal” and the “necessary” is at the heart of many of our problems in public life. Most of us would subscribe, for example, to the proposition that public business ought to be conducted publically. Yet, persons in positions of major public responsibility will often behave covertly because it is “necessary”.

The supposed necessity may be justified in terms of those who feel otherwise on particular questions being able to stop a course of action or a project if it were “out front”, because of real or imagined questions of national security, or simply because the individual has become accustomed to a covert style of operation.

Almost all of us would concede that there are real discrepancies between the ideal of an open society and the realities of closed decision-making. Some will argue that it is not possible to operate a complex society in the open, but most of us would either differ with that proposition or regret “necessary” departures with the “ideal”.

I have long believed that one of Pitzer’s great strengths has been the openness with which it tries to conduct its business. From the beginning, the faculty has played the major role in the governance of the college. Students have always had an important role, and last year they were given a role which is equal to that of the faculty in most areas and which is substantial in all areas. It remains to be seen whether students are sufficiently interested to assume their governance responsibilities with as much commitment as the faculty.

In any event, however, we are committed to being a very open place. This does not mean that we all get together in a Town Meeting kind of forum on every college issue (though this was once the Pitzer style when it was a smaller institution) but it does mean that the faculty, students, administration, and trustees will share decision-making responsibility, and each group will have reasonably open access to the other and to all of the information on the basis of which decisions will be made. In this way, we hope to avoid those disparities between the ideal and the necessary which can breed distrust and disinterest.

A danger of democracy is paralysis in the face of disagreement, but a greater danger is the malaise and suspicion which arise when those affected by decisions have little or no voice in them.

Robert H. Atwell
To talk about education and relevance and goals seems to me to mean that we need to talk about the whole society in which we live and recognize what people have been hinting at, talking and writing about for some years now. I refer to the gradual and at times shocking emergence of a very different sense of what it means to be human. Some call it new consciousness, Consciousness III of *The Greening of America*, or the encounter movement.

Maybe the most important thing in what we are trying to do in the Capitol with respect to these kinds of questions about relevance, human potentials, and consciousness is to get a sense of the picture that is emerging, so that the experiences and the growth can be accepted by human beings rather than simply frightening them and having them react against it. I think that most people at this time have some sense of the thrust towards betterment — call it evolutionary, intellectual, or whatever you want. Obviously we are undergoing profound changes in every aspect of our society: in religion, in family, in life style, in educational experience, and in government. Many of the things through which people found security for many years in this society no longer are secure or present in the same way. And when you pull out all of the props, established church and stable family structure, and established status quo kinds of establishment schools, you suddenly have people floundering and wondering what to do with their lives, whether to despair or to hope, to reach out and express themselves or to retreat in some kind of apathy, leaving themselves totally unavailable for whatever is happening in the larger society. My sense is that it is important for people who have some awareness of these kinds of changes to attempt to make sense of them not only for their own fulfillment, but also for other people, so that the backlash and the reaction that can in too many cases move us backwards rather than forwards will be forestalled. I suppose fear is the great destructive motivator in human beings and society. But somehow it seems to me that all the experiences in terms of drugs and emerging sexuality and emerging consciousness, encounter groups and sensitivity and awareness, are part of a major picture that is compelling and frightening at the same time — particularly for those who are not involved.

One of the persons that best described the situation was Willis Harman. Harman has written papers talking about a new Copernican revolution — about how when Galileo and Copernicus discovered that the earth and the sun revolved differently around each other that everything, all the assumptions on which society had been based, had to be re-examined: religion, belief systems, and education.
Later on when Freud discovered his evolutionary theories, those again shook the foundations from the bottom. What we are going through now may be the most radical and dramatic of the new discoveries, which is how the human being views the human being, how man views himself as a person, what it means to be human, what consciousness means, what it means to have a body, express emotions, and to relate authentically. Whereas in the tradition of western culture especially, man has been conditioned to believe in experiencing himself in negative ways with much shame and guilt, this situation is radically changing. And when you radically change your self concept — or better yet, self esteem, then all the structures of society which have been built upon self-denial, repression and authority come radically into question. What we are trying to do at this time is to give some breath to those movements in which man is somehow exalted rather than put down, to give life to those efforts in which people are questioning in a much more positive way what human beings can be and become, rather than falling into the negative assumptions that people are sinful and need to be saved by someone else farther up the line who has authority and knows better than we do what's best for ourselves.

If I were to express in a single sentence the societal change that seems to emerge out of this perception of ourselves, it is that of a decreasing willingness to accept the assumption that someone else knows better than I do what's good for me. I think that throughout our society, whether it is the parent with the child, or the principal with the student, or the worshiper with the priest, we have tended to accept those kinds of statements about ourselves that indicate we need someone to guide us and to dictate how it is that we ought to be. I feel that we are seeing a major breakdown in that system for a lot of reasons, primarily because of affluence and the capacity to be more individual. Perhaps as well it is because people today are receiving a much broader education and are better informed. The result of all this is certainly that the people on top are no longer looked at with the same kind of awe and mystery as our forebears were.

The Watergate case, for all its sordidness and tragedy, is probably just one more important statement that will help us understand that there is a curious, anti-human kind of bias running through the top circles of institutions in our society, to the effect that people there know what is best for us and that they can keep it secret. If people believe this, then any end can justify any means, and people in power can undertake efforts such as Watergate, and we will be expected to go along and accept everything at face value and assume that the authority is infallible. The Pentagon Papers, I think, are the same kind of situation, in which we recognize the arrogance of those at the top in terms of their assuming that we couldn't handle the news. Thinking back in earlier times when I recall going to a church — since I was raised Roman Catholic, the authority figure faced the wall and spoke in a foreign language, and that somehow passed for communication. I think in going to school that the teacher had all the mystery, all the grades, and all the power, and the students were supposed to sit docilely and take it in and conform, and deny their experience and learn not to trust their own bodies or feelings or existence.

Many of the things through which people found security for many years in this society no longer are secure or present in the same way.

New consciousness, to me, as it speaks directly to education, means coming out of all those kinds of powerful changes in the society with a much different sense of the right of a human being to bring himself or herself totally into each situation — including the schools of California, be they public or pri-
vate. I don’t think it is realistic at this point in time for anyone to expect that all the schools are tomorrow morning going to have the goal of new consciousness or assume that human beings are basically healthy or that human nature is lovely rather than sinful in terms of its ultimate capacity. However, I think it is important that we begin to try to make clear that the very question about humanness and human nature is the most important question, without consideration of which we are not going to very well get ourselves through the kinds of problems that we are experiencing in our society. School ought to be a place where dialogue goes on about the characteristics of being human, the nature of consciousness, and assumptions about human potential.

If I were to express in a single sentence the societal change that seems to emerge out of this perception of ourselves, it is that of a decreasing willingness to accept the assumption that someone else knows better than I do what’s good for me.

Curiously, this change is beginning to take place across the State. In our goals process what we are trying to do is not to impose the same new goals upon all four million California students from the State Capitol (which would be the same old method of, “We know what’s best for all of you”). Rather, we are going out into the State and asking individual schools what they want for their children, so that people can more and more get a sense from the bottom that they have some rights to declare themselves. I suppose the old educational experience is that which comes down on the youth, so as to give them the painful sense that they have to deny their feelings, lock away their questions, and stay quiet for fear of looking stupid.

Interestingly enough, the goals process has been slow in coming, since many educators traditionally have looked down on the community and been disdainful of uneducated masses until they educated them in their own way. But, we have begun to break through this barrier and gotten more and more educators into opening up to the community and inviting people in. As the returns begin to come back across the State, there is along with reading and writing, which we could well have expected as being critical goals, one other goal that constantly comes through from conservatives and liberals, new people and old people, teachers and students and parents especially: it is self-esteem. This is a term that I hadn’t heard when I walked into the Legislature several years ago, a term I don’t think educators talked much about; but suddenly we are finding that self-esteem — feeling good about ourselves — is an important operational goal of public education in California. For me, I think it is perhaps the most important goal of any kind of human contact or institution, and insofar as I am able and willing to inform other people, and they can have a sense that it is all right to be themselves, it seems to me the whole character of human relationships and power and authority radically changes.

I believe that it is possible to go out to the communities and talk to even the most traditional people about self-esteem and responsibility and freedom and honesty and authenticity and caring and loving, all of which are very basic traditional values that have gotten lost by the ways in which we have dealt with people.

I think that the next ten to twenty years are going to provide a lot of hassles in education, most of which will have underlying them whether people are trustworthy or not. The whole area of sex education — which is so controversial — comes down to whether or not schools are places where children can have bodies, it seems to me. The whole idea of drug abuse education starts me to wondering whether you can talk to kids about feelings and being high, what that means and what its origins are. The whole idea of ethnic studies comes down to arguments and questions about
whether it is all right to have a different colored body — black or brown or red or yellow or whatever — and to recognize that somehow it is not a difference that ought to account for someone being treated differently or worse in society.

One goal that constantly comes through from conservatives and liberals, new people and old people, teachers and students and parents especially: it is self-esteem.

A subtle, and in a way profound argument that has begun to emerge in this area is about the creation versus evolution theories in the textbooks in California. I am not particularly worried about what happens, because I am more than willing to have different viewpoints expressed and given to people from which to make choices. I think that most people have not really looked into the significance of that dialogue because it seems to me that the creation theory about human-ness implies that someone else did it and someone else will do it, and that I ought to be at ease until I’m saved by some external force and power. And what the evolution theory really says about man is that human beings as living organisms have within themselves a thrust toward more life and consciousness and growth. I think that simple argument, which did not get much attention other than angry reaction from both sides, may profoundly affect the dialogue in public education as to whether schools are places where human beings are encouraged to be open and express themselves, or whether schools are places where human beings are conditioned to feel bad about themselves, to take orders and to fit in, to pursue their studies without questioning and perpetuate the old systems and stereotypes.

So new consciousness for me is a fairly simple thing, and not esoteric; it is simply a consciousness about ourselves, and it begins deep within in terms of how we feel about ourselves and how we are willing to confront ourselves and bring ourselves to one another in a friendly way, rather than in conditioned and negative ways. My very deep sense is that discovering what this means, that articulating the question and exploring alternatives is the major crisis and thrust for public education during the 70’s, and that anyone who is willing to involve himself or herself in that is doing two things that are critical: 1) making a major difference in the public dialogue and the public life of the society, and 2) making a difference in his own life and his sense of meaning and fulfillment.

My plea, I suppose, is simply for a recognition of what new consciousness means not just for individuals but for the entire life style and the quality of life for all of us human beings sharing the planet. My hope is that people who become aware of different possibilities regarding consciousness of being human and growing as persons at least keep in mind — and for me it is somewhat deeper than that — the realities of the total society and a sense of responsibility to other human beings. I guess I get somewhat turned off by the people who hold themselves aloof from the struggle for consciousness change and for evolution in our
society. My bias may be deeply political, since my life is politics — living very much in the contacts of relationships of the society at large. I tend to think that people who take themselves away from the struggle to affect the quality of life don't show a very broad consciousness about the capacities and interrelationships of human beings.

What we are going through now may be the most radical and dramatic of the new discoveries, which is how the human being views the human being.

One explanation for our efforts in Sacramento is that in terms of the need for greater self-esteem, we have been trying to discover some political ways of dealing with this need more effectively and preventively. It has come to me that the person who is taught to hate his or her body by our cultural conditioning is likely to be violently affecting someone else's body, and the person who has been taught to deny his or her own feelings, is most likely to reach for something outside in order to get the kind of high . . . e.g., drugs. Someone here talked about the complicated beings that we are. I tend to think we are fairly simple, and that we over-complicate ourselves. Our culture has so much split us off from ourselves and from our own experience, that the complications seem to be more in our heads and how we think about ourselves. Maybe we simply must rediscover our own consciousness, our capacity for knowing verbally and non-verbally, feeling and touching and relating in a lot of different kinds of ways. That's for me where new consciousness is. I guess that what I want most to see is that the schools of the State become places where teachers, administrators, trustees, parents, and students together explore what it means to be human and generate the kinds of dialogue that are necessary to begin creating alternative structures, styles and curricula that will in fact enable young human beings to respect themselves and discover their own capacities for having a future that is meaningful.

The great cry that people are beginning to speak is the sense that "I want to be myself, and I want to know if it is all right with you if I am myself." It's a cry that has a lot of power and pain, for many persons, including myself. My own upbringing was by traditional parents, traditional church and schools, all of which were very sincere and probably timely then but none of it is valuable now in the emergence of identity, of individuality, and of being a person. I think that bringing about this change is a major historical task of our times in which every one of us has an important role, not only for our society but for ourselves as well.

There's no such thing as a neutral educational process.

Schools have been in too many ways places where kids were taught to go along and fit in, in a sense to become domesticated. Schools need to become places where human beings can be liberated, or better yet, can liberate themselves. One of the most powerful writers in education is a man by the name of Paolo Friere, a Brazilian revolutionary who has been exiled to Switzerland because his country couldn't handle the disturbance to the power structure that his writing caused. In his book, The Pedagogy of the Oppressed, he talks about trying to reach people in a way so that they can take charge of their own lives, a way through which the poorest peasants in the remote areas of Brazil could begin to perceive how they can change themselves and how they might act so as to make a difference in their lives. I think that is not unlike what we can do in this country, because in so many cases people are just conditioned to be apathetic and to take orders. What we most need, it seems to me, is a sense of our own capacity to perceive relationships with institutions in society and economics and churches and everything else, and then begin to be able to move to change
things accordingly. That is the consciousness I think really critical.

The forward of Friere's book confirms much of my own current thinking about schools. It says, "There is no such thing as a neutral educational process. Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it, or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. The development of an educational methodology that facilitates this process will inevitably lead to tension and conflict within our society. But it could also contribute to the formation of a new man and mark the beginning of a new era in Western history."

That's how big the stakes are! That's how big the challenge is! That's how big the pain will be!

But I suggest to you there isn't much else around. "Education for what?" is like education for living, for being human, for making society human and being ourselves in much more human ways. Past that, it is not a matter of words; it is a matter of your own choice and your own sense of yourself and your willingness to take the kinds of risks that make your own life creative, meaningful and fulfilled!

John Vasconcellos

---

From the Pitzer Catalog

The following courses are among those offered at Pitzer College in the 1973-74 academic year.

173 — Contemporary Political Philosophy. This course will focus on the character of man and his relationship to social forces and institutions in the modern world. The readings will deal primarily with writers who are critical of the contemporary world and have some vision of the "new man" and his "new order." Readings will include Mannheim, Marcuse, McLuhan, Mao, Freud, Brown, Camus, Jonas and Chardin, among others.

119 — Congress vs. the Executive: The Paralysis of American Government. This course will examine the relationship between Congress and the President. An attempt will be made to determine the appropriate role for each body. The two institutions will be examined in the light of their Constitutional tradition, their historical evolution, and modern descriptive and prescriptive scholarship. Particular attention will be paid to the alleged decline of the Congress during the Presidency of Richard M. Nixon. There will be a number of case studies on such topics as civil rights, the involvement of the U.S. in Viet Nam and Korea, and pollution control legislation.

CGS 302/PI 194 — Psychohistory and Biography. A study of recent literature which seeks to apply findings of psychology and psychoanalysis to our understanding of public actions of statesmen and other historical figures. The seminar will explore the scope and limits of such approaches. Readings will include the Erikson biographies of Luther and Gandhi, the Wilson studies by the Georges and by Freud and Bullitt, the examinations of Hitler's personality by Erikson, Waite, Langer, and McRandle, and a variety of articles in professional journals.

146 — Cooperation, Conflict, Violence, and Aggression. Various approaches to the phenomena of violence, aggression, conflict, and cooperation will be explored with contributions from experimental gaming, bargaining, negotiation, ethological studies, and attitude formation being discussed. Prerequisite: a previous course in social psychology.
NECESSITY AS AN EXCUSE:

Or, You’re Probably Annoyed at Having Your Phone Tapped,

(But)

Since philosophy often seems discouragingly difficult and divorced from the real world, I shall begin with an easy, practical question: what to do when it is necessary to do what is wrong, or to neglect doing what is right. If it were ever genuinely necessary for someone to do something, that would mean that it is impossible for him not to do it. If any of you ever have a chance to do anything like that, go right ahead and do it, whether it is right or wrong. There is no better excuse imaginable for doing anything than its being impossible not to do it.

But William Pitt said that necessity is the plea for every infringement of human liberty. The infringement of liberty is seriously objectionable, as are some other immoral acts — murdering, torturing, stealing, or ruining an innocent person’s or people’s means of livelihood, the wanton abuse or destruction of the land, for example. Because of that, it is very important that one make absolutely certain that the evil one plans is genuinely necessary before proceeding with it.

At this point, a complication arises. Although an action would be perfectly excusable if it were genuinely necessary, it is as hard to think of anything a person literally could not fail to do as it is easy to think of immoral actions which have been called necessary. Consider recent political examples. We have been told that in many areas of foreign, and some areas of domestic policy, it is necessary to act without considering moral ques-
tions. Hard-headed versions of this claim urge us to be realistic or pragmatic, and to avoid the political naiveté which leads the less sophisticated among us to pause over moral niceties.

It is a striking fact about recent history that neither the general good nor that of nations, communities, or even smaller groups has been much promoted by so-called pragmatic policies which ignore morality.

Poignant (or liberal) pleas for pragmatism also tell us that moral considerations must be disregarded, but only after lengthy expressions of regret in which the adjective ‘tragic’ occurs frequently. What is puzzling is that what are called necessary courses of action don’t seem to be at all unavoidable. Quite the contrary; they are difficult, and in some cases practically impossible to bring off. Think of the ease with which we have all refrained not just once, but repeatedly, from subverting the governments of other countries, planning and executing illegal bombing raids, tricking welfare recipients into agreeing to be sterilized, bugging, burglarizing, etc. And think of the effort that those who thought these actions were necessary had to put into them, and of the failures which beset many of their best efforts. What is unavoidable can’t really be that hard to do.

At this point, someone will want to complain that when these acts are called necessary, something else is meant, and that I have been criticizing a view no one has ever held. I think that in public and private life, people really do try to make themselves and others believe that their more reprehensible actions were guided by genuine necessity. But the main reason I have for considering this view is that while what I have been calling genuine necessity would be an unquestionably good excuse for the performance of any action, other kinds of necessity would not. The farther from genuine necessity the meaning of ‘necessary’ turns out to be, the less justification pleas of necessity can provide for an otherwise morally objectionable action.

What could ‘necessity’ mean if not unavoidability? I think some have meant that they were morally called upon to perform immoral acts. An example is the view attributed to Archbishop Temple by G.E.M. Anscombe. She says that Temple “… was always saying such things as Christian businessmen and politicians must ‘compromise’ with their ideals because otherwise they would be driven out of their fields, which would then be left to people who had no ideals; ‘the actual purification of commerce depends upon the continuance in business of people who have ideals.’ This, he explained, means sinning. . .’ Temple’s is as mild and civilized a version of this position as I can find. Its implausibility bodes ill for any more controversial attempt to excuse moral compromise or atrocity by pleading a moral duty to do what is wrong.

Sometimes we say something is necessary when we have in mind some goal or purpose we think cannot be secured without it. If my doctor said I must diet, he wouldn’t mean that a diet is either unavoidable or morally imperative, but rather that my health requires it. That seems to be the kind of position that hard-headed and liberal claims of necessity represent. They take it for granted that something (national security, the general welfare, the balance of power, the election of a candidate) is needed or wanted, or that it is highly desirable. When they say that a course of action is necessary they presume that we all share or should share the relevant need or want.

A successful excuse makes it unreasonable to hold someone fully responsible for what would otherwise have been blameworthy. Thus my not feeling like doing what I promised is a poor excuse under which it is reasonable for you to hold me responsible, while my being unable through no fault of my own to do what I promised is a good excuse under which it would be unreasonable for you to blame me. With this in mind, a way of asking whether necessity is a good excuse is to ask if it would be unreasonable for the victim of
'necessary' wrongdoing to hold the wrongdoer fully responsible. If he did not need or desire the goal the wrongdoing was supposed to further, it would seem perfectly reasonable for him to blame the wrongdoer. That means that the cases in which necessity would have the best chance of being a good excuse would be those in which the "necessary" action furthered a goal which is universally desirable or needed. I don't know if there are any such goals, but if there are, the most likely candidates would seem to be the general welfare or happiness, or some other such good.

Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human liberty.

But it is a striking fact about recent history that neither the general good nor that of nations, communities, or even smaller groups has been much promoted by so-called pragmatic policies which ignore morality. The most obvious example is the war in Southeast Asia. I will not dwell on it except to say that one would find it hard to produce evidence that makes it even plausible to think a net gain in happiness, security, or welfare for anyone involved resulted from the actions our country took in disregard of moral considerations. I believe the same holds for welfare programs (like those Malcolm X describes in his autobiography) whose administration ignored the moral rights of the people the programs were intended to serve. There are many other such examples. If this is so, even if necessity were an excuse, these "pragmatic" actions are still not excusable because they were not necessary — they did not further the goals they were supposed to further. I want to conclude with a speculation about why this should be so, assuming that it is so.

Morality is no more perfect than any other well-developed system of human belief. Uninformed and unreasonable moral opinions are at least as common as uninformed and unreasonable scientific views. Moral authority has been invoked in support of at least as many stupid and vicious actions as authorities of other kinds. But for all that, the moral lore which has been handed down to us results from all of the thought which went into centuries of day-to-day practical decisions and more leisurely theoretical considerations of the human situation. It includes the beliefs whose preservation and application men have found most important and worthwhile in the conduct of their lives and in their attempts to secure their needs and wants in harmony with other men and with their environment. It is not surprising that the general good does not benefit from conduct which ignores even the soundest and most carefully considered judgments which can be based upon this lore. In comparison, the formal and informal "value free" political, social, psychological, and economic theories upon which hard-headed and liberal "pragmatists" try to base their policies are seriously underdeveloped. If we consider this along with the complexity of the affairs to which "pragmatic" policies are applied, and the haste and pressures which bedevil their conception and execution, it is easier to understand how they could fail to further the general good when they disregard what morally should be done.

James Bogen
AS IS

"One must have a mind of winter ...."

Wallace Stevens

Winter bears illusions. Lines harden;
trees stand just, unbroken by leaves,
in a block print against a carved grey sky.

To celebrate in winter is in this vein,
to accept contrasts. To hope in winter
is an act of will and heart, not
the idle, easy enabling of summer sun.

Only a few birds remain. Yet their song
awakens us to what we are, not
what we were, as we push back the curtains,
finding that the dead world secretly sings.

Robert Duvall

WHAT'S LEFT

Fourteen days of rain floods the mind.
Our grass is orgiastic green,
the rutted driveway primal mud.
Flinging stones, the car pulls home,
its engine grinding with our need.

We run from bogs, dirt slides,
overflow of ditches; clay breaks up,
the ground's sucking at our feet.
Wrapped in blue raincoats we look,
lower heads, flee fantasies of decay,
spilling into a structure made
of lamps, furnaces, bones and fur,
where, doors locked, a laugh fends off
this moment the monkey face of fear,
and a certain steady fall.

Robert Duvall
In his famous satire on the vagaries of Life, Voltaire's hero Candide meets at the beginning of his career the famous Doctor Pangloss who assures him that this is indeed the best of all possible worlds. Being a naive and idealistic youth, Candide is inclined to accept this doctrine; but after a long series of hapless adventures which see him and/or his associates pressed into military service or sold outright as slaves; mutilated, slaughtered and sewn together again; raped, burned and drowned, and, worst of all, his beloved sweetheart turned into a toothless old hag, Candide decides to leave unresolved the metaphysical problem of whether this is the best of all possible worlds. He abandons his quest of the perfect love and perfect society and settles down "to cultivate his garden."

Like Voltaire's Everyman, Pitzer's students, faculty and administrators started out in 1964 with a fierce determination to make their new college into the best of all possible colleges, and beyond that perhaps, into the best of all possible worlds, a total community supportive of the Good Life. And for Pitzer, as for Candide, the limitations of human existence and the realities of the outside world soon put a serious cramp on idealistic expectations.

The first and most obvious restraints were those imposed by the demands of the outside world, and particularly by the lack of money. Time and financial pressures forced us to begin the College without adequate planning. What if we could have had a year of preliminary planning by a pioneer faculty and student group to design our physical facilities; to use the same group to develop our educational program while the first buildings were under construction; to proceed building the school, its program and its facilities, using the experiences of the preceding year and each new student and faculty generation in a gradual development of the college?

What happened instead? Before the first faculty or students had set foot on campus, a Master Plan had been drawn up which took little notice of the need for closeness and relatedness that was to become so typical of Pitzer. A second dormitory was constructed as a carbon copy of the first before we had had any experience with the first one. Faculty and student input contributed to a new concept for the third dormitory: it would constitute a transition from adolescent living to an adult apartment existence. But once again, shortage of funds permitted realization of only a part of the original vision.

Yet before we condemn the speed with which Pitzer's physical facilities were put on the map or new students and faculty recruited in larger numbers than could be absorbed constructively, we must stop to ask ourselves, "What if the four years of construction had
been stretched into eight, or student recruit­
ment been cut in half,” as I seem to suggest? It
is pretty clear that some of the buildings would
never have been built, because by 1968 the tide
was turning and funds for building dormi­
tories were becoming increasingly hard to
obtain. In that event, in this second-best of all
possible worlds, Pitzer might have remained
one half its present size, even more threatened
than it is now by the financial exigencies of a
national climate that has turned against educa­
tion. So, who is to judge whether the price we
would have had to pay for a physical plant
more congenial to the Spirit of Pitzer might
not have been too high a price to pay?

But money was not the only problem,
although it seems always to lurk in the
background. From the start, administration
and faculty were very much aware of other
restraints imposed by the outside world. Right
at the start, the faculty voted to establish a
grading system, to appease alleged graduate
school demands, even though everybody
knows that grading interferes with learning;
abandoned in the first year was the project of
providing each student with an opportunity
for independent study each semester, (the so­
called fifth course); and how much energy we
spent on the long battle over “hours” (how
times do change!) when trustees and ad­
ministrators did not dare to face the obvious
(that the young cannot be restrained from do­
ing what they want to). The first faculty
recommendation that students should be
allowed to stay out until closing time for
the library was vetoed by the administration —
because of the havoc that late closing hours
would have created in the other Claremont
Colleges. And yet even that latter episode
presented us with an opportunity to learn
something about the way the world moves.
When it came to the ultimate “no hours’
policy, students discovered appropriate ways
to convince the trustees that young people
were capable of taking responsibility for their
own lives; and in this manner learned a very
useful lesson that might help them to be
politically more effective in their life after
college.

But probably the greatest restraint that
lack of money has imposed over the years is
the unfavorable teacher/student ratio. The
teaching style to which Pitzer is dedicated —
independent studies, field projects, discussion
and study groups requires a larger staff than
the college has been able to support; and the
fact that we are stretched so thinly, in turn
limits our potential for educational experi­
mentation, because all experiments are de­
manding of faculty time. And yet, here too, a
paradox emerges: Pitzer faculty on the whole
are often seen as the most available and acces­
sible of The Claremont Colleges. In some way,
students and faculty manage to relate to each
other, in the words of a recent student news­
paper article “. . . not as administrators . . .
students . . . and faculty, but as . . . human
beings.”

And that latter comment reflects a reality
which is very much Pitzer. Beyond all the
restraints imposed by the larger community, a
quality of intellectual life and personal in­
teraction has emerged at Pitzer which dis­
tinguishes us from many older institutions.
Even though traditions — even traditions that
are or were liberal for their time — have
become established and sometimes serve as
defenses against change, Pitzer programs, and
the faculty and students that implement them,
have retained a high degree of openness to
change, of flexibility, a desire to try new
things, to teach new courses, and, to listen to
encouragement and criticism. Perhaps above
all, we have retained a high degree of personal
openness and personal closeness, for many
students and faculty members.

Thus the picture remains mixed: many of
the original ideals and hopes have gone by the
board in face of the restraints of resources and
the turning tide of support for education. In
some respects the very virtues of the Pitzer
system, its high degree of democracy and
egalitarianism, have made change more dif­
ficult because it has often become impossible
to gather a sufficient majority to implement a new idea. On the other hand, much of the integral spirit of Pitzer, the desire to study, (and by study and action improve) society — all that has remained and perhaps even been intensified. And the restraints have produced some useful outcomes: from the Fifth Course evolved various systems of independent studies; from the "hours" struggle an awareness of the transitory nature of the most cherished societal values, and how people in power can be persuaded to move in needed directions; from the problems of the first two dormitories emerged the construction of a third which is closer to the needs of current student generations; from a faculty chosen largely out of graduate school primarily for financial reasons emerged a group of educators who are close to students in attitudes and values, and unusually sensitive to the latest currents of change in the wider world; and perhaps most important of all, out of an awareness of the tension between the Ideal and the demands of Reality, arose a greater student and faculty sense of responsibility for the well-being of the college as a whole than exists among institutions where that tension is less.

Yet the ultimate question remains unanswered: Will the outside constraints which a deteriorating society is imposing on educational institutions in general and on the more experimental ones such as Pitzer in particular, stimulate Pitzer to increase its creativeness and the quality of the education offered, or will a society that is turning its back on education be permitted to crush its experimental components and to move slowly from a traditional pluralism in education toward some kind of proto-totalitarian homogeneity? Or, even if such an extreme eventuality should not come to pass, will Pitzer, like Candide and his one-time sweetheart Cunégonde, grown older and sadder in this less than perfect world, simply turn inward "to cultivate its gardens," to merely survive until the dawn of a better day? At this "point-in-time," the directions in which we will find our role in America of the 1970s are far from clear. One thing, however, is certain: our vision and our will are bound to play a large and perhaps decisive part in the outcome.

Werner Warmbrunn
THE SQUIRE investigation, the plain evidence of official misconduct, and the general indifference to the revelations, all show an extraordinary and alarming condition of the public mind. Nothing is more evident than the growing conviction that fraud and wasteful extravagance of every kind are to be expected in administration, and that it is extremely amusing to suppose that municipal officers will not be rascals, and that theft of the public money is to be regarded seriously as a public outrage. This feeling that it is very "verdant" to expect official honor and honesty, and the transaction of public business upon the same principles as private business, confirms and perpetuates the evil. In the city of New York the most that can be truly said of any man intrusted with an office which commands great opportunities of handling public money is that there is a hope that his official conduct will be honest, but an expectation that it will not be. If the value of a popular system of government in securing an honest and economical conduct of public affairs were to be judged by the experience of the city during the last generation, it must be admitted to be a failure.
Supposedly founded upon ethical, moral, humane, and just principles, our nation has from its inception also foundered upon the requirements of its expressed ideals — as the institution of slavery and continued racism make very clear. Although descendants of voluntary communities professing to fear and love the Lord, enlightened pioneer groups guided by progressive and "civilized" values, nominal aristocracies sparked by the spirit of noblesse oblige, and self-proclaimed lovers of democracy, the holders of power in this society have apparently forgotten their professed early motivations by the claims of humanity. The primary mover now seems to be expediency.

The following consideration of "making choices between what is right and what is necessary" attempts to identify certain aspects of a complex problem in human relationships. Given the precepts that we say we subscribe to, we might be expected to deny any alternatives to choosing the right, and to affirm the sameness of both the right and the necessary. But human frailty forces another conclusion and the admission that humanitarian, just, and spiritually sustaining precepts are still ideals for, not achievements in, our local and national communities. For we frequently aspire to goals that have priority over our assent to noble principles for group and interpersonal relationships. These goals to aid ourselves or others whose advancement we desire fall into several categories and can be personal-private or social-public, and have psychological and emotional bases and also political significance. Moreover, all these goals cause us to do that which we think to be necessary for their realization. That is, we determine
what is necessary according to the ends we want to achieve, or whatever insures such achievement becomes necessary — albeit still only means to a desired end.

Dictionary definitions of necessary and necessity make clear that outside of situations of "natural causation or physical compulsion placed on man by nature," acts of necessity are motivated by "the compulsion or constraint of man-made circumstances, habit, custom, law, etc. [or] logical or moral conditions" that make those acts "inevitable or obligatory." The key terms here are "man-made circumstances," that is, those personal-private or social-public goals and their psychological, emotional, and political bases. A few examples make the point. (1) Despite an awareness and appreciation of congeniality as an atmosphere helpful to workers' morale and efficiency, an executive's psychologically-based goal of image-projection (possibly ego-protection) might seem to require — to make necessary — the assumption of a certain aloofness and brusqueness with peers and underlings. Whereas ordinary regard for right would govern demeanor in purely social settings, the more compelling concern with "my image" (or power, influence, prestige) makes necessary a posture or manner not consistent with respectful or congenial human relationships between co-workers. (2) A person who believes himself or herself to have had a genuine relationship of reciprocal concern, respect, and understanding with someone from "the wrong side of the tracks" or a different race, might in a certain setting deny the friendship. For what reason? Because the necessity of projecting a particular image would override the friendship and related right behavior. (3) A family member motivated more by the desire for monetary gain than by familial loyalty might maneuver to obtain all or a disproportionate share of an inheritance, thereby dispossessing other heirs. The goal of riches would have made necessary an action contrary to right behavior, behavior "in accordance with justice, law, morality" also but without the connotation of being "man-made" and thus arbitrary.

The foregoing situations are not exhaustive; some choices are of moral necessity, and the alternative "right" choices of law and custom a cruel mockery of human worth. Consider those who risked their lives by rendering aid and protection to escaping slaves in the U.S.A. and to German Jews seeking to escape Hitler's ovens. Consider the honest but destitute persons who must steal money or food or perform other socially condemned acts in order to provide for their own and their families' survival. Consider the necessary violation of our ordinarily accepted codes of right behavior when we defend ourselves from bodily harm or try to expose or hurt or kill persons whose infliction of harm would seem to be a greater evil — as in Dietrich Bonhoeffer's efforts against Hitler's life or in the Pentagon Papers case. Sometimes involved in our violation of accepted "right" standards of behavior is our pretending to support the customs while subverting them. That is, to affirm human worth we sometimes choose what is morally necessary but do so privately, while seeming to give public support to the accepted "right." (But beware. Privately chosen "right" can also mean maintenance of a "necessary" public image for other than humanitarian reasons — such as social, political, economic, or other advancement.)

Though only a beginning, these reflections suggest (1) that absolute right places greatest value on life with dignity; (2) that no chosen behavior is inherently necessary; (3) that socially accepted right action can be right absolutely or necessary as means to an end; (4) that moral necessity can be more compelling than "right" by law and custom; and (5) that an act can be both "right" and 'necessary' but not exclusively in the interest of life with dignity.

2Ibid., p. 1225.
For a new perspective on possible solutions to problems related to choosing between the right and the necessary, we might think seriously about the Bantu people's ideas of good and evil as reflected in human behavior: "All customary law . . . is inspired, animated and justified . . . by the philosophy of living forces, of growth, of influence and of the vital hierarchy. The social order may be founded only on the ontological order. . . ."3 "The vital forces are under the governance of God without human intervention. . . . All forces are in relationships of intimate interdependence . . . and can pulsate through the whole universe of forces . . .".4 With regard to damages for injury, "the sorrow, the wrong done to the man, constitutes the right to reparation"; that is, "the injured man . . . has the right to say what he considers necessary for the restoring of the fullness of his vital force."5 In addition to a cultural bias to do good, to live positively, quite clearly, a profound experience in constant community governs the lives of the Bantu; they would not choose between the right and the necessary but would view right as necessary to aid harmonious interaction of all vital forces.

Agnes Jackson

4Ibid., p. 131.
5Ibid., pp. 147-48.
Some Decisions I’ve Made: Were They

☐ Right
☐ Necessary
☐ Easier

I hate to make decisions. The more I think about it, the more I realize that some of the decisions I’ve made and called necessary were actually cop-outs for me: effective ways of not making a decision or of avoiding ownership of the ones I made.

Right decisions are those based on personal integrity and experienced on a gut level. It’s the sense of right each of us experiences when we’re alone and honest with ourselves. It’s what we have left when all rationalizations, justifications and “running-aways” are removed.

Right decisions are lonely decisions because they’re made without recourse to the norm. To choose to do something that is right is a far more difficult task than to choose to do something that is necessary. Right decisions require more personal commitment and, because they are likely to conflict with the popular choice, are subject to greater criticism. When I make a decision based on right, I alone own that decision.

A necessary decision, on the other hand, implies that one has to do something — that there is no choice involved. If one has to do something, he in a sense, loses his power not to do it. Considerably less responsibility is involved in doing something that is necessary and beyond one’s control than in doing something that is right. If one does something because it is necessary, he need not own the consequences.

Now, I’m not saying that all my necessary decisions are cop-outs. I do things everyday which have a “have to” feeling about them but which are not cop-outs. I’m in school now because it’s necessary to accumulate a certain
number of graduate units and pass a state examination in order to be the psychologist I want to be. Although I resented spending the money, it was necessary to buy tires for my car last week to avoid a blowout at 70 miles per hour, or a flat tire at 2 a.m. I had no choice when making these decisions, but unlike other necessary decisions, these were not termed necessary in order to avoid standing alone with a decision.

Thinking back over my four years of undergraduate school, I would probably have benefited more from college had I waited a year or two. As it was, I graduated from high school in June and, without allowing myself to consider any alternatives, entered college that fall. I had no particular goal in mind other than fulfilling what I saw as my parents' expectations that I complete college. Several times during my four years at Pitzer, I considered dropping out of school. But the fear of disappointing my parents, of being labeled a "college dropout" and of being different weighed so heavily on my shoulders that I opted to stay. In both instances, I told myself it was necessary for me to go to college and to finish in four years. In actuality, had I taken a year off from school, my parents would not have been unduly disappointed. Their expectations were, in fact, only an excuse for me not to do what I felt was right. The responsibility for the decision was theirs and not mine.

After I graduated from college I went to England and worked for a year. At the end of the year, I wanted to return to California and rationalized my decision by saying that it was necessary for me to start paying off some student loans. Yes, it was necessary, but I did not have to return to California to do it. The truth was that I was homesick and afraid to stray too far from home too long. I do not know at this point whether it would have been right for me to stay, but I do know that by making it seem necessary I did not have to justify my decision. It was as though I were a victim of circumstance and could, therefore, not be held accountable for the decision.

In my work at the Los Angeles Times, I occasionally encounter situations where what I feel is right conflicts with what I have to do as an employee of the company. My job at The Times is essentially that of promoting newspaper advertising, particularly Times advertising. One of the ways we do this is to survey Los Angeles residents on their usage of an advertiser's product or patronage of an advertiser's outlet and its newspaper readership. Our goal is to say that the profile of The Times reader coincides with the profile of the advertiser's customer. Therefore, the most logical place to advertise is in the Los Angeles Times. While this is often very true (fortunately), there have been occasions in my four years at the paper when the data suggest an advertising medium other than The Times. The question then is, "Shall I be straight with the advertiser and recommend that he advertise on television or in a community newspaper, or shall I present the data in such a way as to obscure the real findings?" My research background and personal integrity state that I do the former. My commitment to my employer, my sense of competitiveness with other media and in some ways the security of my position make it necessary for me to do the latter. I have not completely resolved this conflict, but at least I am not blinded to the fact that there is a conflict. There is also a limit to my loyalty.

It is easy to get caught in the trap of taking the safest alternative and calling it necessary, in a sense not owning my decisions. I'm only now beginning to understand how much this has cost me and has undermined my effectiveness. It's little wonder that I used to feel that things only happened to me, never for me nor because of me.

Robyn Olsen, '68
How do we choose between what is ‘right’ and what is ‘necessary’ in given circumstances? How do we go about deciding — not later or beforehand — but at the time?

Choosing between what we feel to be right and what seems to be required isn’t so difficult if we can remove ourselves from the situation. If that can be done, the dilemma is not apt to arise often — (perhaps at the level of the U.N., but not often in the average personal or professional life.)

Over the years there have been numerous occasions when for one reason or another I erroneously thought that I was at the summit — facing a choice based on conscience. What I perceived to be a major test turned out not to be so. Part of the time I had misunderstood the situation because I had misinterpreted or had not assembled all of the available facts. Many times personal wishes were intermingled, a situation which paralyzes, because it robs us of whatever clear thinking we can otherwise marshal. Without objectivity, we are adrift.

When a decision touches or concerns the interests of others, it is life’s challenge to us to try to think and act responsibly. While each of us is entitled to go about it in our own way, I have found the following steps helpful — at least as a beginning:

1. Decide what is the real purpose. Outline the objective. Decision-making in which people are involved requires that we identify the problem and outline a course which will realize the highest good.

2. Try to be a disciplined thinker. It’s labor and it isn’t really pleasurable, but thought is the starting point from which to proceed to good results.

3. Get all of the facts. Get all the facts that time permits. Dig them out, refraining from drawing conclusions until this has been done. Even so, the facts on which we will have to act may sometimes be incomplete. Recognize and allow for this.

4. Get out of the picture as much as possible — hurt feelings, personal hopes, and fears. Many situations which seem to be “conscience crises” on first impression are not so at all. Abstracting ourselves from the equation is the sine qua non of objectivity. It’s like learning to ride a bicycle, only it may take a lifetime.

5. Be trustful. (This is the only one that requires faith.) Don’t take the threshold position that there is probably going to be a conflict between what is believed to be right and what will be necessary, or that there are two kinds of people — those whose purpose is to help and those whose behavior amounts to selfishness. There is only one kind of person — the struggling kind — some more, some less. Think the best, not the worst, of people unless and until, objectively, something different surfaces.

All of which is to say that each of us needs a couple of fixed guideposts and the willingness to serve a life sentence at hard mental labor.

Roland R. Speers
Pitzer College has just received a ten-year accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. It is one of the first institutions to be awarded a long-term accreditation. According to the report, "Pitzer College is doing what it is generally expected to do very well; its goals are well defined and there is a clear understanding of what needs to be done to realize those goals. That Pitzer does what it claims to do is attested to by the careers developing among its alumni."

Margaret Habecker Vizio, a graduate of the charter class of Pitzer College, has returned as Alumni Coordinator. She is coordinating the activities and interests of the college's 600 alumni scattered throughout the nation and the world.

Mrs. Vizio, daughter of a pioneer family in Cucamonga, California, majored in French literature at Pitzer. She has taken graduate work at Tulane University and the University of California at Santa Barbara, where she also was a teaching assistant. She has been a volunteer hospital worker in New Orleans and Houston with a special interest in geriatrics.

Julie Graham, member of the 1970 graduating class was appointed Assistant Director of Admissions, and has already begun her recruiting travels. She came from a similar position at Loyola University in Chicago.

Eli Broad, Chairman of the Board of Kaufman and Broad, was elected Chairman of the Pitzer College Board of Trustees for 1973-74 at the annual meeting. He succeeds Howard D. Williams of West Los Angeles.

Mr. Broad, head of the nation's largest publicly-held company whose primary business is on-site housing, has been a trustee for two years and Vice-Chairman of the Board for one year.

Alan C. Harris, Lecturer in Hebrew, recently delivered a theoretical linguistics paper to the first annual North America Conference of Semitic Linguistics on the University of California, Santa Barbara campus.
. . . Patricia Kimball, recently Assistant Deputy of Social Programs in the office of the mayor, San Francisco, has been appointed Assistant to the Dean of Faculty. According to Dean of Faculty Albert Schwartz, this is a newly-created position “to assist with curricular coordination and development, conduct institutional research, and to provide technical support for faculty in securing funds for research and other professional activities.”

. . . A grant of $6,000 to study language, education, and employment in Glasgow, Scotland, has been awarded to Ronald K.S. Macaulay, Associate Professor of Linguistics, by the Social Science Research Council in London. The grant will enable him to engage in a sociolinguistic survey focusing on the speech of school children in relation to the speech and attitudes of their parents, teachers, and prospective employers.

. . . Paul H. Shepard, a scholar-teacher whose perceptions pre-date the discovery of ecology by the mass media in early 1970, has been appointed to an Avery Professorship in the field of environmental studies. The Avery Professorship is intended for “experienced persons of great scholarly distinction or younger persons of extraordinary promise.” One of his recent books is Man in the Landscape, A Historic View of the Esthetics of Nature. A new book, The Tender Carnivore and the Sacred Game will be published by Scribner’s in May.

. . . Kelvin M. Connally of Brea Olinda High School, one of 950 high school seniors in the nation to be named as winners of a National Merit Scholarship, entered Pitzer College this fall as a social science major. He was chosen from among 14,000 highly-qualified student finalists.

. . . Six carefully-selected Pitzer College students left Friday, September 14, with Dr. Sheryl F. Miller, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, for six weeks of intensive anthropological and archaeological field work in Africa (primarily Zaire) to examine the arts, architecture, and culture of African people. This field work will combine both the digging for artifactual clues to the culture in this area of 15,000 years ago with the present societal organization, as seen “in the flesh.”

In preparation for this intensive course, each of the students, selected for their personal maturity and resourcefulness as well as academic aptitude, prepared over the summer at least eight written reports from a reading list. After returning on October 29, they will spend three weeks completing work on a major research project that could entitle them to four courses of credit.

. . . Lewis J. Ellenhorn, Professor of Psychology, conducted a series of projects in Southern and Northern California this summer humanizing government agencies through a process of “team building.” Ellenhorn’s projects are the first ever attempted in each of the cities and were requested by the officials involved.

According to Ellenhorn, “Many of the younger people down in the ranks are highly educated, with expectations of free expression and participation in policy and decisions. This is a real characteristic of America and it is emerging nationally — not in a violent or capricious way, but as a conviction that this is a human right.”

. . . “Whose Law and Whose Order? (Moral Issues of Our Time)” will be the theme of the annual lecture series sponsored by The Academy, beginning October 17. The first of the five lectures is entitled, “Honesty and the Individual.”

. . . Harold S. Melcher and Robert L. Spencer were elected to the Pitzer College Board of Trustees. Melcher lives in Shawnee Mission, Kansas, and is President of Trenton Foods, a Division of Carnation Company. Spencer is with Seidman and Seidman, a national firm of Certified Public Accountants, based in Los Angeles. Nationally prominent in both his professional and civic activities, Spencer is a graduate, Summa Cum Laude, of New York University. He earned the highest scholastic average in the history of the college.

. . . Dennis Parks, Assistant Professor of Art, had work selected for “Ceramics International ’73” hosted by the Alberta College of Art Gallery, Calgary, Canada, this fall.
Dear Participant,

Upon receiving the latest Participant, I opened it eagerly and spent some time standing in the doorway reading it. My ardor was considerably dampened (indeed I put it down) when I came upon “Joan Karlin Resnick” in the Class Notes section. That is not and never has been my name; I have never filled out any form in such a way; I have pointed out to the Alumni Office that I wish to be addressed “Joan Karlin” and the magazine is addressed to me that way.

Henceforth, please be more careful in your research and think twice before drawing unwarranted conclusions, else I shall simply cease to answer your questionnaires.

Sincerely,
Joan M. Karlin

Dear Ms. Karlin:

A careful, though belated check of Alumni files did indeed reveal your specific request to be addressed as Joan Karlin. Apologies.

The Editor

Dear Editor:

The Participant of Spring 1973 left me both pleased and embarrassed. Pleased because I was curious to see what my classmates were doing — embarrassed because that which was printed about me was done so without my permission. The information was also out of date, and therefore incorrect. It is your responsibility to clear such publication with the person who wrote it... In the future, please clear all such things with me. My private life, my activities are for me and my friends. Had I wished to release a message about myself to the Pitzer community, I would have done so myself...

I apologize for the harsh words. I nonetheless feel this candidness will serve me better and you better too.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Wendy Carrell

Dear Wendy,

Your point is well-taken. In my eagerness to print interesting alumni news for the Class Notes section, I rushed to the typesetter before checking the accuracy of the information. I regret any embarrassment this oversight may have caused you.

This fall the college appointed its first Alumni Coordinator, Mrs. Maggie Vizio, class of ’68, who will receive all Alumni news before it is forwarded to the Publications Office. I hope that through her you will want to share some of your life with our readers.

The Editor
NOT TO DECIDE IS TO DECIDE