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... Professor **Robert Albert**'s research on genius has dislodged some favorite misconceptions about the subject. For example, he says that there are no "undiscovered geniuses"; that we rarely find geniuses among "late bloomers" and that most persons of genius capabilities make a significant mark in their field by the time they reach 24 years of age.

According to Professor Albert, "This says it's a whole new ball game — we have to approach it differently. What I'd like to do if I had the money, is choose 75 families and make predictions on who will and won't evidence genius qualities when they hit their early 20's."

His article in this issue of *The Participant*, excerpted from *American Psychologist*, February 1975, is part of a larger, long-term study. He is also co-author of a book in another field, *Aging and the Aged*, to be published early next year by Glencoe Press.

... Admirers of **Nick Williams**, retired Editor of the *Los Angeles Times*, and humorist, whose articles warmed the op-ed pages of that newspaper, can enjoy him on page 18 of *The Participant*. Now Editorial Consultant to the Publisher of the *Times*, and member of the Board of Trustees of Pitzer College, Mr. Williams still occasionally shares with Times readers humorous accounts of his Laguna Beach life.

... Although **Karol Greene**'s concentration at Pitzer was in political studies, she made a significant impact with her in-depth personality profiles for *The Collegian* of The Claremont Colleges. When Stanley Kauffmann visited the Pitzer campus, Ms. Greene tuned in on the eminent theater and film critic for *The New Republic* and produced the profile on page 4.

A follower of the theatrical and political fortunes of the Smothers Brothers for several years — she is now set for an exclusive interview for a profile on the couple.

At publication date, she was job-hunting in the newspaper and magazine world, hoping to specialize in writing personality profiles.

... Professor **Bert Meyers**' poetry is from a forthcoming book, *And Still it Happens*. With his wife, Odette, a French literature scholar, he has translated *Lord of the Village*, "a bestiary of 23 animal poems." Written by Francois Dodat in French, the translated version appears in both French and English.

With a semester's sabbatical leave behind him, Professor Meyers is back at Pitzer teaching Modern American Poetry, Shorter Russian Fiction, and Creative Writing: Poetry.

... Professor **Donald Brenneis**' article is based on "You Fruithead: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Children's Dispute Settlement" co-authored with Laura Lein, and originally presented at the American Anthropological Association meeting in 1974. It is now being published in *Child Discourse* by Academic Press.

"Ms. Lein and I are presenting a follow-up paper comparing children's arguments among white Americans, black Americans, and Fiji Indian children this fall at the A.A.A. meetings in a second session on child discourse."

Professor Brenneis' major research interest is in conflict and law and in the use of language in conflict. This fall, he and Seth Kravitz, Pitzer graduate, class of '75, will read a paper at the American Folklore Society annual meeting in New Orleans. The title is "Comparative Study of Verbal Dueling."
We concluded several years ago that the beginning of the year was not the best time to try to provoke a faculty discussion of "Whither the College". I still feel that way, so what I want to do this morning is primarily give you some of my thoughts and then simply give you a chance to express yours.

Beginning with the "change versus no change" construct, I do not now favor any drastic change in direction for the College. That may partly be the conservatism which comes with age — and I do remember times when I was pushing more change than I would now advocate — but I prefer to believe that it is basically because we are quite good at what we are and what we do. With an eye to the student market, it would be easy to conclude that we need to change in the direction of some current or imagined future fads. I would confess that had we jumped in the direction of some fads which some of us have advocated in the past, we would have hurt our position and not improved it.

Rather, I think we should adopt as a kind of implicit and rather unquantifiable goal, the objective of being one of the ten or twelve best liberal arts colleges in the nation in the next 10 years and the best in one or two areas. That is a straightforwardly elitist objective and I think that the elitism of academic excellence is something we need not apologize for so long as we are making a serious effort toward equalizing the opportunity to join that elite. Those are nice words, but what does it mean and how do we get there?

It means, first, building on our pride and self-respect as professionals and as a college community. If we really want this place to improve its position in American higher education, we need believers. This would not be an excellent college simply because we have said it is; but it would not have become excellent unless some of you had wanted it to be, and it will only continue to improve its position if most of us want it to — because from here on, the going is tougher.

That moves me along rather easily into the subject of marketing. If one opts for the "no fundamental change" strategy, then, the problem is marketing. We may already be one of the top 10 liberal arts colleges in the nation, but if so, that is not generally known and understood.

Marketing must start with the students we have and their retention. The fact remains that better retention is the single most important key to the improvement of quality; if we retain a higher proportion of entering students, we can be more selective in admissions.

It is everyone's problem and requires that everyone do the myriad subtle things that will make this place more attractive to more of our students. It may be conscientious advising, including timely letters of recommendation, or simply showing those with whom you come in contact first that you are a professional with high standards that you will insist upon, and secondly that you care about this place. I think we have a responsibility to the students and their families who are shelling out $20,000 plus dollars to come here to present ourselves unapologetically as professionals with high standards, working in a serious academic atmosphere.

Finally, I think we must insist on excellence in all that we do, and reward it to a greater degree than we have. I have observed over the past several years a perceptible tightening of academic standards and have been pleased by that. The same thing has happened with faculty personnel actions and that has been a good thing, particularly as we have become more tenured. I also think that excellence needs to be pushed in at least two other respects. First, we need to do more to recognize and reward excellent academic achievements of students. We are beginning to do this in terms of honors programs, and I would urge that we do even more, including but certainly not limited to a Phi Beta Kappa chapter and other forms of recognition. Secondly, our egalitarian faculty rewards system should, I think, make more provision for rewarding superior performance. The judgments need not be made entirely or even primarily by the Dean and President, but surely we can develop more ways of recognizing superior work.

Finally, the Rooseveltian dictum about the greatest fear being fear itself is applicable to our situation. We do and must continue to live close to the brink financially and accept the fact that brilliant success with all of our marketing efforts will not change that picture much. We can and will become renowned as the premier liberal arts college we are, and will still in most of our professional lifetimes be always on the edge financially, and will always fall short of doing everything we should do for our students. We may, in short, achieve greatness without prosperity because the latter takes a lot longer than anyone realized back in 1963; and the America of the last quarter of the century will be much more inhospitable to higher education than America of the late 40's, 50's, and most of the 60's.

It may seem hard to try to end on a note of optimism given the challenges that we face, however, I prefer to believe that we have so much going for us that in just a few more years we will achieve the recognition we deserve.

Robert H. Atwell
"Modest violets don't become critics. Every critic influences; however, he shouldn't have Lord High Executioner status."

Satisfied with the impact of his assertion, Stanley Kauffmann, film and theatre critic for The New Republic magazine, settled back in his chair. It was mid-morning, with the promise of a warm and fairly clear day ahead. Turning his gaze from the San Gabriel mountains in the distance, he continued to verbalize his thoughts.

"When I was a child, the idea of studying to be a critic was preposterous, unthinkable. People in the theatre saw the critic as the failed artist — which is both true and valuable. The critic who has tried to make art is much better than one who has never stumbled."

As a child, he thought he'd become an actor and director, and from 1931-41 studied and trained with that career in mind. He fell into criticism later: "Actually," he confessed, "I have had professional training in all three fields in which I write." He had spent ten years as an actor and stage manager with the Washington Square Players and an equal number as a book publisher's editor before joining the staff of The New Republic as its film critic in 1958. He had been writing some criticism all along, since 1942, as well as a large numbers of plays and seven novels. By 1960, he observed, "I thought I had written all the novels I had to write. Criticism fit the bent at that moment."

"When I write a piece of criticism, I attempt to appeal to myself and a very few of my most demanding friends. If I am able to interest those friends and interest myself in my writing, I am pleased. There is no other way to operate," he declared.

In contrasting the criticism in his theatre collection, published last year, with selections from The New Republic, Kauffmann admitted that he has noticed some differences in tone, but he asserted that these were in tone of voice only and not in intent or standards. He made it obvious that he enjoyed his working relationship with The New Republic:

"I really have a dream job. I work at home (New York City) and send in my material. They rarely interfere with the text, and given the rarity of the editing, I do not object. I would be ungrateful if I did," he insisted. Kauffmann shifted his position in the chair.

When I write a piece of criticism, I attempt to appeal to my most demanding friends. If I am able to interest those friends and interest myself in my writing, I am pleased. There is no other way to operate.
He was dressed in a slightly-worn brown corduroy coat, dark brown cuffed pants with a blue shirt tucked in; his tie of reddish-orange print hung slightly askew. The fob of his watch dangled out of his pocket and he fingered it from time to time. His hair was that shade of grey that brings to mind a picture of the celebrated artist, the learned professor, the classic scholar. But it was his eyes that captured one’s attention; it was not that they were piercing, cutting through the object of their gaze. Rather, they suggested penetration, that kind of intensity of perception that defies direct focus in order to reach beyond surface structure to the essence beneath. When asked if he read other film critics, he responded, “There are none that interest me always and consistently, none for which I have unqualified respect.”

He preferred not to mention any names, insisting that he hates critics that knock other critics — “the practice is utterly cheap and contemptible,” he exclaimed.

Kauffmann went on however, to state that Eric Bentley, drama critic, was, in his opinion, “one of the most significant critics in the history of criticism — when I say history of criticism, I mean from the beginning. His Life of Drama is one of the best ever!”

He was questioned about his view of the relationship between film and society, and hastily countered that it was impossible to discuss:

“It’s like saying, what is the relationship of the arm to the body — film is a function of society. The two are inseparable. All film is social; it cannot be divorced from society. It influences society; it doesn’t often initiate — more often it amplifies.”

He was eager to bring the discussion around to the film and art:

“There again, the two are inseparable — film is an art. A film is nothing without art. One that exists without being art — it’s marijuana. Either it’s a drug — just a drug — or it’s art,” he declared firmly.

It seemed important to pursue the issue with him. Kauffmann was eager to explain his concept and when asked if it were possible for his vision of a truly great film to be popular with the public, he volunteered, “A few have been — take Verdi (Italian composer and the subject of an article which Kauffmann had just completed) — he was the last unquestionably great musical genius. He was a great genius and also extremely popular. Except for a few film makers of the 20th century, accepted geniuses like Proust, Joyce, Beckett, and Picasso operated for an elite. This wasn’t true of Verdi or Chaplin or D. W. Griffith. Once in a while you get a film like that. Fellini’s new one, Amarcord, is a memoir of adolescence and a very fine work of art. I can’t imagine anyone seeing it and not responding somehow.”

He added, “The last few years have produced a fragmentation in film audiences. This is a mixed curse — which means that half of it is a blessing. Film has become individualistic to the public — has forced the film industry to make a more concentrated effort at producing a work of art.”

He listed films which he claimed must be considered in any “set of equipment for the culturally-civilized person.” Included were Potemkin, L’Aventura (“a calendar-page of 20th century consciousness”), The Gold Rush, D. W. Griffith’s Way Down East, Rashomon, La Grande Illusion, and Some Like it Hot, which he called “a great farce.” Someone asked him about the critic’s impact on the public’s attitude toward film; he smiled, seemingly as much to himself as to any one of his listeners, as if the question were a part of some greater irony that he had dealt with before. He leaned forward, “The critic for the New York Times has the most powerful critical job in the world. He has no other counterpart in any other city. He wields proportionately more influence, and, unless he’s stupid, he almost always admits that power.”

In 1966, Kauffmann left The New Republic to become theatre critic for the Times; after an eight month period, he left to return as film critic for The New Republic. He continued, “Walter Kerr, critic for the Times, once tried to deny the power, then gave up a half of it, because he was afraid of it. No one assuming that position has done anything to increase that power. It was the theatre that gave the critics the amount of power by idolizing them, by hanging on every burp that the critic emits, and then complaining when the burp changes.”

It was evident that Kauffmann was becoming interested in the topic; as he continued talking, the spaces between his comments grew larger. It was as if this man of celebrated natural wit was
choosing his words most carefully, weighing each phrase in his mind before uttering it. It was almost possible to watch his mind work; one could see that mind functioning by observing his eyes perceive every inch of ground that his mind covered. He volunteered, “Film has a greater resiliency than the theatre. You can’t kill a picture like Love Story by laughing at it in New York. The critic should be able to say what he has to say freely without fearing that what he says will cut someone’s throat. He can be of immense aid to both art and the audience — that aid entails the necessity of making a negative comment — if it is needed.”

Kauffmann was asked if film had a responsibility to society. He maintained:

“It cannot help making social comment. Even “beach party” pictures make them. The more serious the film maker is the more responsibility he has to himself. A film maker like Stanley Kramer who makes a film strictly for a profit, makes a film that is generally a bore.”

He mentioned Wanda, a film which was written, and directed by Barbara Loden, wife of Elia Kazan. He said, “Now here is a good picture about a Polish-American girl who is battered into affectlessness by men — who is almost completely anaesthetized by the pounding of society, reticently...it’s unpleasant without being exciting and therefore has been unpopular.

“What the public knows of film today is only the tip of the iceberg. There are countless documentaries — social documentaries that don’t surface. There are more courageous young unrecognized film makers today in the U. S. than in any other art," he exclaimed.

This was a subject that touched him deeply; he was excited about it and it showed.

He shook his head — “There is a whole stream of films that nobody knows about. Film has not died," he insisted.

What the public knows of film today is only the tip of the iceberg. There are countless documentaries — social documentaries that don’t surface.

Kauffmann admitted that he watches little television. Every once in a while, he has turned it on to a late night talk show. “I use it as a shoehorn to get me into bed,” he chuckled, adding, “T. V. is the uranium lode of the 20th century. The major networks are making billions — when Frank Stanton makes an appearance at the Senate committee hearings — it’s like trying to stop a tank with a paper airplane. National advertising is basically interested in T. V. and the medium has become the money mill. For a while, the major networks gave some funds to public television, but public broadcasting got a little too good, and so they stopped giving. Hoping for T. V. is like hoping for Broadway. I have better things to do with my time.”

There were still so many questions left to ask, and Kauffmann appeared to have so much more to say. The sun was getting hotter, and he moved his chair into the shade of the building. The discussion moved to the area of the American Western, and Kauffmann was asked how he felt about the most recent crop of films. He began by mentioning Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid:

“Butch Cassidy is an example of what I call the New West End Avenue Western. Here is another example — Bad Company — in that one, there is a scene where several young cowboys are sitting around a campfire. It involves killing and skinning some rabbits for a meal. The film presents you with the sounds of shots and the ripping apart of the flesh. In the scene, the young members of the group get nauseous. Now, anybody that knows anything about the farm and living in the country knows that real cowboys don’t get nauseous; they like to kill the rabbit and skin it. What happened in this film is a city sensibility. It is anachronistic and all wrong. The urban sensibility has intruded on the Western movies like Butch and McCabe and Mrs. Miller... They get rid of attitudinizing without replacing it with something mythologically satisfying,” he asserted.

Films cannot help making social comments. Even “beach party” pictures make them.

Kauffmann concluded, “If you’re going to try to tell the truth about the West, don’t do it with caprice. Tell what it was really like to sweat 14 hours a day for beans. Cowboy is a good example — or Pocket Money, with Paul Newman and Lee Marvin.

He proceeded to recount a scene from the movie. From what followed it was easy to tell that he loved his craft, that it gave him
much pleasure. As he described the scene several of us who had gathered round him, burst into gales of laughter. He had carried us with him into his world and we were delighted to accompany him. Here was a man of vivacity, of considerable wit and charm, who was suggesting that there was an art form in existence that still offered proof of nobility, of eloquence, of poignancy, that continued the process of discovering those elements of existence which are essential.

The key to a great film maker is that he lets me know via his film that he knows a great deal more about life than I.

Stanley Kauffmann stated later that, "the key to a great film maker is that he lets me know via his film that he knows a great deal more about life than I — he can make a picture appealing." It would seem that the discovery of a fine film is like the discovery of a fine mind. It takes a lot of nerve to acknowledge either these days.

Karol Greene, Class of '75

Stanley Kauffmann on Film

W. W. and the Dixie Dancekings (20th Century-Fox). It’s flawed and unsatisfactory, but it does have some breeze and life and what it has of them comes from its rightness on the screen. This does not imply that the screen is limited by comparison with the stage, only that great plays on screen are limited.

Burt Reynolds is W.W., a casual, humorous Southern hold-up man in 1957 who specializes in robbing — in the friendliest way — filling stations run by the S.O.S. company, giving the attendants a small part of the stake as a private goodwill gesture. He is a Korean War veteran, a Don Juan, a staunch anti-Communist, a vigorous, unvicious, humping, country-boy hell-raiser. While fleeing the police he gets involved with a tatty little group called the Dixie Dancekings and devotes himself to helping them make it big in Nashville. His nemesis at last is a fundamentalist lawman hired by the fundamentalist head of S.O.S.; the lawman is played with his usual insufficiency by Art Carney, who never has enough power, technique or flavor but whose reputation grows because he has been around a long time and now plays different kinds of character leads and big supporting roles. For me he has not advanced much past the dullish and mechanical "feed" he was on the old Jackie Gleason show.

The picture is much nonsense and some charm, and the charm is all Reynolds. He has emerged from his beefcake persona, as in Deliverance, to become a limited but pleasant light comedian, whose forte is making some fun of his own sex appeal. I have a hunch that this evolution was made for Reynolds by the discovery of his private lightness at private parties or their new public equivalent — the TV talk show. Howard Hawks said that he made a comedian of Carole Lombard, who had not done much comedy, after he saw her at a party with a couple of drinks in her. One of the utilities of film is to be able to exploit "behavior" as against true comic acting (see Lombard vis-a-vis John Barrymore in Twentieth Century). It’s working again here, very nicely, for Reynolds, with the helping hand of the director John G. Avildsen.

This would have been a good minor piece if the scriptwriter Thomas Rickman had pulled W.W. himself into shape as an understandable character. Why did he become a criminal? Why against S.O.S.? Why does he think he can keep getting away with it? Doesn’t he understand what he’s doing to his musician friends when he enlists them in crime? Is he just a happy sexy madman? None of these questions gets answered. So a possibly flavorful regional comedy becomes a series of better and worse vaudeville acts.

Note: This makes (at least) the third film centered on Nashville and country music in two years. One of the other two I needn’t specify; the other, alas, I probably must. Payday (TNR, March 17, '73) with Rip Torn was narrower in scope than Altman’s biggie, but in resonance was for me the best of the lot. I hope it doesn’t get lost.

Published in New Republic, 1975; copyright 1975 by Stanley Kauffmann; reprinted by permission of Brandt & Brandt.
We know that genius is incomprehensible and unaccountable and it should therefore not be called upon as an explanation until every other solution has failed.

Sigmund Freud, 1939

A MARK OF GENIUS: THE NEED TO GO PUBLIC

This article discusses some of the troublesome issues involved in the concept of genius. An operational definition of genius is proposed; some of the implications for research on high achievement are presented; and supporting evidence is offered to indicate that it is possible to operationalize such an apparently global concept if one restricts its use to the behavioral, rather than to the sometimes superficially dramatic, components of high achievement. Because genius is typified by behavior that is exceptional, often unpredictable, and influential to many, it is not surprising to find genius a topic of concern for many eminent psychologists and social philosophers.

For the most part, Western views of extraordinary creative behavior have been variations of two early Greek views of genius in which genius was equated with demigods, with madness, or with both. As an act of demigods, genius came from inspiration; the source of this inspiration was the gods and to be inspired was to personify a mystical power. Socrates described this power as a "daemon," heard it "murmuring in his ears like the sound of the flute in the ears of the mystic." Centuries later, Goethe expressed much the same point when he spoke of poets as "plain children of God" and stated that his poems "made me, not I them." At other points in Western history, the Greek daemon has been spoken of as "divine spark," "divine fire." In the late Renaissance, Michelangelo was called "divino," and it is not uncommon for artists of all types and from all eras to be described as "divine" in many circles. Such a view of creativity as inspiration places the creative person within an implicit mythology, attributing his creative (inspired) moments to the intervention or the guidance of gods. Viewed this way, the major source of an individual's creative behavior lies less within him and more outside him in the realm of the supernatural or preternatural.

The second early Western view ascribes madness to extraordinary creativity, which resembles what we now speak of as severe psychopathology. For Aristotle
"there is no great genius without madness." Coupled with "madness" was "possession," for example, Plato's view of poetic inspiration as a madness "taking hold of a delicate and virgin soul, and there inspiring frenzy, awakens lyrical and all other amplitudes." In both of these accounts, we see a relationship presumed among human creation, personal or poetic madness, and demonic inspiration or possession. This view is not limited to early Greeks; Dryden's seventeenth-century axiom has come down to us as a basic belief of many: "great wits are sure to madness near allied, and thin partitions do their bounds divide." To the extent that one subscribes to such views, there are several serious implications. Extraordinary creative behavior is severely removed from scientific exploration as well as from the capacities of most persons; it is not under the control of "sane" or purposeful men.

Through the centuries, genius has been modeled after everything from demigods, heroes, prophets, martyrs, social activists, and supermen—"capable of recreating the human cosmos, or part of it, in a way that was significant and not comparable to any previous recreation—to the more mundane models such as children with very high IQ scores or persons with some inordinate "luck." Encompassing such a variety of specimens over so long a history, the idea of genius is basically an intriguing idea with a sad and overgenerous past. Most of the work on genius, or exceptional creative behavior, has been a confusion of two classes of variables: factors of motivation (the "why" questions) and statements of consequences (the "effects" questions). The common behavioral denominators to this confusion have been rarity and social, as well as intellectual, consequences that are far out of proportion to, and of greater unpredictability than, most human endeavors. Because of such characteristics, theories of genius, like theories of history, have been used frequently as a means of selective bidding for a particular model of human nature. Seen from these vantage points, creative people are heroic, mysterious, and inexplicable. But they are also not the stuff of science or, often, of this world.

**Galton and Freud**

The study of eminence and creative behavior needed the work of both Galton and Freud to get past many of the earlier, prohibitive attitudes and presumptions that bound thinking about creative behavior in such motley bundles of whole cloth.

Galton and Freud shared much of the nineteenth century's interest in biological and developmental processes; they agreed in more than principle that genius and creative behavior are primarily biological phenomena. Out of this shared perspective emerges what has become a contemporary focus on genius and creative behavior—emphasis on an individual's family as biological inheritance and as social-psychological influence. For Galton, the family was a genetic pool of talents that its progeny inherit, in different degrees, depending primarily on their biological distance from the center of the pool. For Freud, the family is a psychological reality in which conflicting, motivating processes are instigated and defensive patterns are shaped and interlocked. Out of the interrelationships between inherited talents and conflicts incited and shaped by the family, a person's capacity for creative behavior emerges. Just as important, by viewing both development and capacity as matters of degree, Galton and Freud made a monumental break from earlier views of genius that ascribed to each person distinct states of inspiration, of possession, of enthrallment, or of complete lack of genius.

Needless to say, how one defines genius is critical to how one will study it. It is the basic step. Galton's very effort to operationalize genius was itself extraordinary. Prior definitions had been remarkably varied, unanchored to observables, and almost always post hoc. Despite years of study, there had been a paucity of efforts toward agreement on what, why, or who genius was. Galton's definition was and remains one of the few detailed ones. It rests on five interlocking propositions: that a measure of an individual's genius can be derived from his degree of eminence; that on this rests a man's reputation; that this reputation, although based on contemporary critical opinion, of long term character; that critical opinion is focused on a real, extensively acknowledged achievement; and that such achievement is the product of natural abilities that are made up of a blend of intellect and disposition (or what is now termed *intelligence and personality*).

It is interesting to note that according to Galton, genius qua eminence was historically bound and a matter of revision, not a once-for-all-time phenomenon. There are several crucial implications to this definition. It deals in observable influences, not supposed...
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and his primary groups, even if paradoxically it jeopardizes his reputation. Galton's creative individuals are not the potential enemies of society, that is, the "detonators of change" that Freud's are. Galton's world is more rewarding and
"faster," and less destructively critical than Freud's. Galton's social environment is Darwinian, judging the adaptive
abilities and endurances of
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Although he made a lifelong practice of studying men of genius — Freud never believed that he understood genius.

A person of genius is anyone who, regardless of other characteristics he may possess or have attributed to him, produces over a long period of time, a large body of work that has a significant influence on many persons for many years.

Drawing a general conclusion at this point, one must confess that there is little that specifically helps in the understanding of genius or exceptional creative behavior. Pooling the work of Galton and Freud, we see genius as the esteemed product of high general abilities and continuous, energetic, highly personal effort over most of a lifetime. Implied in this conclusion are several aspects of interest. One does not have genius, one does genius-level work. High general abilities and prolonged, personal motivations are dispositional conditions to this level of performance. When we say a person has genius it is much like saying they have the flu — at best a descriptive label, superficial and begging questions. Genius is inferred from behavior having protracted influence; equally important, it is behavior that is eventually recognized as influential and esteemed by many of the influenced. We know that such behavior is itself considerably influenced by situational and environmental conditions, conditions which if left unacknowledged and unanalyzed give the
appearance of luck or of genius to extraordinary achievement. Yet if one wishes to go beyond this general statement more is called for. Since historical eminence occurs in many different kinds of behavior, we need first to determine if there is a set of discriminating attributes common to this diversity of activities.

Definition of Genius

One should look to persons of recognized eminence for genius, since genius is evidenced in a consensus of peers and is operationalized through the various reward procedures that every society and profession has for acknowledging members' contributions. This statement follows Galton's wish to do away with the word genius. Furthermore, we should accept the fact that there is no one criterion, person, or group that can determine who has genius and who does not. Freud and others dealt with the motivational and personality correlates to creative behavior at levels and complexity deeper than Galton's "qualities of intellect and disposition." From them we take the idea that for the attainment of a great, enduring reputation, along with gifted cognitive abilities, there must be deep-seated, strongly persistent personality determinants operating, which are essentially developmental in nature, longitudinal in occurrence (rather than situationally determined and sporadic), and conducive to behavior of influence and consequence. These determinants urge men and women "to perform acts that lead to reputation" or eminence. Influence is a continuous phenomenon in every sense and is comparative and judgmental in part. Eminence is built on influence and is social, as well as individual, in origin and behavioral in nature. For these reasons, eminence is built only on public acts.

Therefore, a person of genius is anyone who, regardless of other characteristics he may possess or have attributed to him, produces, over a long period of time, a large body of work that has a significant influence on many persons for many years; requiring these people, as well as the individual in question, to come to terms with a different set of attitudes, ideas, viewpoints, or techniques before all can have "peace of mind," that is, a sense of resolution and closure.

The work associated with this person must be presented to others, for their use and evaluation; it is a public work and takes other talented men and women years to understand, to implement, and equally important, to surpass. It is others' necessary effort that makes up the basic thrust of this person's impact. Others often spend their own careers working out the implications of this work, for in the end they must come to terms with it. It is this aspect that is so important, whether it is wanted by others or predictable.

The key ingredient to genius is productivity — large in volume, extraordinary in longevity, more or less unpredictable in content. The impact of the work is dislocation or sudden reorganization constituting a major shift, that is, productions of "originality" rather than of reasonable extension. The basis of long-term influence, extraordinary productivity, can be observed for many persons of extraordinary influence in a variety of areas: Bach's 46 volumes of compositions; Binet's 277 publications; Darwin's 119; Einstein's 248; Freud's 330; Galton's 227; Maslow's 165; and William James, who complained most of his life of work inhibition, produced 307 publications. H. Zuckerman noted even more prolific eminent mathematicians — Poincaré's 500 papers and 30 books over 34 years and the 995 papers of Arthur Cayley (who published a paper every two or three weeks).
So far we have spent a good deal of time discussing influence as one of the critical independent variables in the achievement of eminence. Yet, it would be misleading to suggest that the attainment of great influence, or impact, is what extraordinary creative behavior is all about, the aim of it all. It is not; it is the need to work on problems considered significant and troublesome by the individual. Influence is a highly personal, varied, and unpredictable adjunct to a man’s work; man’s specific aim for influence is erratic and its attainment out of his control. Influence and recognition may be sought, as they were with Freud or they may be explicitly repudiated, as they were by Wittgenstein whose voluminous work, both publications and lectures, has had an impact equal to few other men’s in generating two major schools of philosophy, logical positivism and linguistic philosophy. Influence might be unintended, being the “spin-off” of a more immediate set of interests and activities, as in the case of Sir Walter Scott, who thought of himself primarily as a novelist but who, in the process of research for his historical novels, radically changed the aim and some of the techniques in the study of history.

Consequences of the Definition

The above definition, therefore, helps to clear up several misconceptions linked to the extraordinary influences which in the past have attracted somewhat romantic and even heroic explanations. “Undiscovered genius” is one common misconception. If our definition is valid, then one knows of persons of extraordinary abilities by the use of these abilities and by the subsequent influence they have. The proposed definition does not attempt in any way to second-guess history, for clearly there are no “might-have-beens,” no undiscovered geniuses, no potential geniuses cruelly snuffed out or mysteriously prohibited (usually by an equally ill-defined fate). As we have seen, genius is, at best, a judgment placed on the degree of influence of a person’s work and cannot be meaningfully placed on the origins or the style of that work, regardless of its appeal. Nor are there particular political, religious, social-economic groups, nationalities, races, or sexes with more genius than others, as others tried to demonstrate.

Who has more “genius,” the first men to harness fire or those who split the atom; those who developed the alphabet or those who used it to produce Oedipus Rex, Hamlet or War and Peace?

Some works are spoken of as being “ahead of their time” — a natural enough but not conclusive attribute to potentially significant work. This is not only post hoc but begs the question of what the merits are and for whom. Less dramatically stated, to call work “ahead of its time” means it was produced before it was well understood, as in the case of Mendel; before it could be technically confirmed, as in the case of Einstein; or before it could be appreciated and accommodated, as in the case of some major composers. If anything, these examples point to another facet of the generative capacity of influential work. Important work, like all behavior, is transactive. Its capacity for developing and being significant over decades is necessary; by doing so, it attracts new generations of adherents. If endurance tests the validity of a person’s work, then the ability to attract and hold new students attests to its educative and its intellectual significance as well as its more technical importance. The significance of the products of long-term creative behavior is on several levels: cognitive, cultural, educational, as well as political suggesting a variety of areas or levels of influence as indexes of significance.

Contemporary Issues and Evidence

Until now we have discussed the problems involved in defining genius. Within our concern for a proper definition has been a more basic, if implicit, concern: Can one predict who might become an eminent person? The importance of this question cannot be underestimated; related to its answer is our understanding of what the major facilitative variables and experiences are that contribute to the works that are underlying in the achievement of eminence. The essential issue is not eminence per se but the clues that indicate how we might increase the type of behavior that eminence results from.

Research on eminent persons has been conducted off and on over the many years since Freud’s and Galton’s pioneer efforts. The bulk of this research shows that persons who do achieve extraordinary eminence generally begin their productive careers significantly earlier than their less productive peers. More recent evidence on productive careers suggests that early starts are a solid index by which to estimate a person’s productive ability. B. S. Bloom concluded that “while pro-
ductivity is clearly not synonymous with creativity, it seems quite likely that unless there is some minimum or threshold of productivity there is little probability or likelihood that the individual is creative. Bloom's second study extends this point. It indicates once again that higher productivity characterizes the more creative person among chemists and mathematicians.

We know that genius is not a function of differences in measured intelligence: Many researchers have found that once the IQ is higher than 120, other variables become increasingly important although it would be absurd to argue that more "intelligence" would make no difference!

To call a major segment of a science or art Darwinian biology, Picasso-like, etc, is to state for the record that a discernible historical development has occurred.

There are also interesting data pertaining to the "age of ascent" in productive careers. A number of studies have independently reported almost identical ages of "creative" subjects' first productions. E. A. Raskin noted 25.2 years and 24.2 years for her select groups of nineteenth-century subjects; R. Helson and R. S. Crutchfield noted 24.8 years for their subjects. Like Bloom's and L. R. Harmon's creative subjects, Helson and Crutchfield's creative subjects published more, as well as earlier, than their controls. Even more telling was the fact that Raskin was able to determine that as far back as 1735 the average age for first publication was 25 years. When she separated her samples into the 25 highest ranking scientists and the 25 highest ranking men of letters (lists included Darwin, Faraday, Gauss, Maxwell, and Pasteur; Balzac, Coleridge, Goethe, Poe, Tolstoi, and Wordsworth), the average age for first productions was reduced only to 22 years. The present study shows that Freud was 21 years old at the time of his first professional publication, and Darwin and Einstein each were 22 years old at the time of their first papers, ages almost identical to Raskin's most eminent samples. Across a variety of fields and a two-century time span, there is a stable age at which eminent persons begin to be actively and publicly influential.

Final Observations

The above evidence provides strong support for the basic contention in this article: Long-term creative behavior, as evidenced in influential productivity, is the "carrier" of genius qua eminence. The earlier a person starts and the more he does, the more likely will his impact on others be significant and, eventually, the higher his eminence will be. This does not say what, if any, special cognitive, cultural, personality, racial, religious, or social attributes are necessary or involved in such behavior. For the time being, we can say that injecting additional words like genius or unique into our thoughts on the matter does not appear at all necessary or helpful.

One aspect needs further consideration; in many respects it may be the most important; it is certainly the least understood. For creative behavior, or any behavior, to continue, there must be close congruence between some of the processes a person uses and some of the characteristics of the phenomenon dealt with. It would be difficult, if not impossible, at present to characterize such a "fit" as antecedent or consequence.

There are no "might-have-beens," no undiscovered geniuses, no potential geniuses cruelly snuffed out or mysteriously prohibited.

What begins as a vague correspondence between process and phenomenon becomes progressively closer the more intensively and the longer a person does his work. Artists and scientists alike often speak of a dimly conceived, intuited, "reality" to their early efforts, one that appears early in life and seems to guide much of their behavior as a concerted effort to apprehend, to symbolize, and to control such a reality. L. Hollingsworth has shown that the interests and questions of the exceptionally gifted child are remarkably accelerated and border on the profound very early in childhood. With the "precocious" questioning and interest often comes an intense involvement with selected materials, problems, and cognitive processes that are consonant with later-discovered adult professions and life work. If one identifies his interests and special capacities early in life and discovers the existence of such possible enterprises, it follows that he is on his way earlier than most other persons.

The "realities" that make up the content of long-term creative behavior occur noticeably early and more or less independently. These parallels are not explicit and are far from exact.
Conclusion
The above arguments suggest that genius is not a blessing, a danger, or a fortuitous occurrence; it is not a trait, an event, or a thing.

When we say a person has genius, it is much like saying they have the flu— at best a descriptive label, superficial and begging questions.

Rather, it is, and always has been, a judgment overlaid with shifting values. What genius has often been based on is far more solid— behavior. What it must be based on is creative behavior, which, although highly personalized, is made public and is eventually influential over many years and often in unpredictable ways. By being both productive and influential, this behavior can be measured, its influence traced, and the factors and events underlying it better understood. Of all the qualities attributed to persons of genius the most remarkable, along with perceptiveness, are continuity, endurance, productivity, and influence. Men and women with such attributes are usually esteemed and often honored. They are almost always eminent in comparison to others. But they do not have genius.

The following two concentrations are new to the Pitzer College curriculum this year:

Organizational Studies
Organizational Studies is an interdisciplinary program which focuses on cultural, social, economic, historical, and psychological factors as they interact within complex social systems. A concentration in Organizational Studies is intended to facilitate an understanding of organizations and provide an opportunity to study organizational change.

Students who are interested in Public Administration, Business Administration, Public Health Administration, Organizational Studies, Organizational Psychology or Sociology may find this program an appropriate preparation for either graduate school or careers in these areas.

Concentrators will be expected to complete the core interdisciplinary course (Organizational Studies 100), demonstrate a proficiency in the theory and application of statistics (courses that will meet this requirement are Sociology 100, Research Methods and Statistics; Political Studies 100, Statistics; Psychology 91, Psychological Statistics), and participate in a one year practicum. The latter requirement may be met by participation in the Program of Public Policy Studies (Political Studies 100CC), Fieldwork in Psychology (186,187), or by specially arranged internships.

In addition, concentrators will be expected to complete a seven-course program of study dealing with three of the following concepts:

A. Individuals and Organizations
B. The Group and Organizations
C. Interactions among Organizations
D. Society and Organizations
E. Governments and Organizations

The Study of Woman
The study of woman focuses on the nature and scope of feminine achievement. The concentration explores such areas as the changing role and conception of women; women in cross cultural perspective; and the participation of women in the major institutions of society. By challenging existing assumptions and models in the social and life sciences and the humanities, this concentration proposes to correct the imbalance created by centuries of the study of man. Interested students may combine the study of woman with another concentration. See an advisor in the Study of Woman program to plan the best concentration for your needs.

The concentration requires a minimum of eleven courses. Concentrators should complete six courses directly related to woman, at least one from each of the following broad areas:
A. Natural and Life Sciences
B. Social Sciences
C. Arts and Humanities

Finally, the student is asked to focus on one of these areas by taking four additional relevant courses and completing a senior project in the selected area. Included in these four (and by the end of the junior year) should be such courses in methods or theory as are necessary to the satisfactory handling of the senior project. This project is to consist of an independent study, of one or two semesters' duration, which may take the form of either library or field research directly related to woman.

Other concentrations are American Studies, Anthropology, Art, Asian Studies, Biology, Chemistry, Classics, Economics, English, Environmental Studies, European Studies, Folklore, French, German, History, Human Biology, Latin American Studies, Linguistics, Mathematics, Philosophy, Physics, Political Studies, (including International Relations), Psychology, Sociology, Spanish, and the Study of Man.
ALL AROUND ME

All around me, butterflies,
ecstatic hinges,
hunt for the ideal door.
A cicada's ratchet
tightens a place in the yard.
Everything's warmed
by a wave from the tree.

A bird trickles like the tap.
And the dog just stands there,
looking down.
To run, to sleep, she can't remember.
It's true, it's hard to be conscious.

From here, I can watch the freeway -
ants on a windowsill.
The skyline doodles,
an airplane floats like a fish.

Nearby, a factory smokes.
I'm one of its little ash-trays.

Suddenly, a dinosaur,
or Rome, will rise,
then crumble
in the cracks
on a ragged wall.

We do marvelous things
without knowing how,
like the chicken whose bronze shit
builds a shrine under its coop.

But, even so,
one gets depressed.
This morning, a field,
a flock of stones
asleep in its mist . . .
This world's painted
on a glass that has
to break.

I can still
pay the rent
and the roads aren't lined
with corpses yet.

OLD

Their children are gone;
almost everyone
they loved and half
of what they understood,
has disappeared.

But the door's still open,
the porch light's on;
a little wind at night
and they hear footsteps
when a few leaves fall.

Bert Meyers
Communication Breakdown:

In describing an argument, we often use the phrase "no holds barred" to imply that tempers were so inflamed that there were no limits on the insults, accusations and threats exchanged. It may also have "degenerated into a shouting match," in which the participants forsook the conventions of civil conversation altogether and relied upon volume to make their points. We often consider such arguments to be "out of control" and to continue without "rhyme or reason." They not only threaten to disrupt friendships, marriages and collegial relationships; they also just don't make sense.

Despite the apparent disorder, irrationality, and confusion of many of our arguments, however, they represent not communication breakdowns but a special type of communication, one with its own rules and regularities and which is, indeed, often overly efficient in conveying our feelings. Parties to an argument are arguing with each other, not by themselves; they listen to what their opponents are saying and to how they say it and use this information in determining their own responses. Many holds are indeed barred or would at least be useless or incongruous; in carrying on an argument, the aggravated participants have implicitly agreed upon how they will disagree. Such conventions for arguing are different from those for other types of communication; a stinging rejoinder, for example, would be out of place in a friendly conversation, as a gesture like thumbing one's nose would generally be inappropriate in a scholarly discussion.

Rules for argument also vary cross-culturally; even in the United States various ethnic groups have considerably different standards for what is to be taken seriously as insulting language, which often leads to misinterpretation and overreaction in multicultural classrooms.

To investigate characteristic patterns and strategies in white, middle-class American arguments, Laura Lein, a fellow anthropologist, and I studied arguments of first, third and fourth graders in western Massachusetts. We chose to study children's arguments for several reasons. The ability to argue well requires considerable linguistic and social skills which must be learned by children. A child must not only speak English reasonably well; he must also be able to use it appropriately and effectively. He must also know what "matters" in an argument; many children's insults, for example, seem ridiculous to adults not because they are grammatically incorrect, but because they reflect the child's confusion about what types of accusation are socially meaningful and therefore effective. We were interested in looking at developmental changes in ways children of different ages argued and in comparing children's arguments with our less formal observations of adult arguments.

Both children's and adults' arguments are distinguished from other types of communication by what is said and how it is said. Arguments sound different; even if we cannot hear the words, we often know, guided by such stylistic cues as increased volume or speed, that two people are arguing. Some children's arguments seem indeed to be merely shouting matches; even in such instances there are some rules. First, the shouting match rarely continues once maximum volume is reached, as the goal is to shout louder than one's opponent. Rather than determining a winner in the argument, attainment of maximum volume usually leaves a somewhat embarrassed silence, followed by a new line of attack. Such shouting matches are more common among younger children. Older children more frequently resort to acceleration as a stylistic strategy, with each child responding more rapidly to his opponent. These contests of speed end abruptly when both children speak at the same time; simultaneous talking appears to violate an underlying rule among white American children that turns should be taken, even in arguments.

Even young children seem aware of subtler stylistic features as well. In some arguments, rhythm is particularly important; a rhythmic pattern is set for one segment of the argument, and the other child must respond in a similar rhythm or lose that part of the argument. This example from a fourth grade argument demonstrates such awareness:

Bob : You're skinny.
Tom : You're slimmy.
Bob : You're scrawny.
Tom : You're skinny.
Bob : You're weakling.
Tom : You're baloney... (etc.)

What does this say about the children's ability? First, by stres-
Making Sense of Arguments

sing "you're" and leaving the rest of his statement unaccented, Bob has set a strong dactylic metric pattern. Tom recognized this and responded with a dactylic insult of his own. "Slimmy" is a neologism, a word he coined for the occasion, but one which is recognizably an adjective with a fairly apparent meaning. Bob's later use of the noun "weakling" as an adjective and his attempt to create a superlative for it fell flat; both the children recognized that it is an ungrammatical usage. A second point is that, when Tom said he didn't know, he had failed to come up with another dactylic insult implying physical weakness; by failing to continue in the rhythmic pattern and concern with scrawniness that hold this part of the argument together, Tom momentarily lost. Tom and Bob thus revealed considerable sensitivity to rhythm and an ability to distinguish ungrammatical and inappropriate responses.

Another aspect of arguments that often strikes listeners is their repetitiveness. Children, and occasionally, adults may continue for several minutes saying nothing more than, "me," "me," "me," "mine," "mine," "mine," back and forth. Such repetitive patterns are evident to participants as well as to the audience, and occasionally children, being able to anticipate their opponent's response, can play strategically upon these patterns, as in this example from a first grade argument about who is smarter.

Ann: You are dumb. John: I am.

John was hung upon his own allegiance to the repetitive pattern and stood self-accused.

Although many children's arguments consist of such relatively short, simple statements, they often are considerably more complex and suggest that the children are capable of remarkable invention and logic. In semantically simple arguments, children appear to concentrate upon style to make their points; style is subordinated to content in more complex contests. Often victory hangs not upon proving your own original claim or disproving your opponent's but upon winning a fairly minor and often tangential logical point; because your opponent is defeated on one point, he loses the entire argument. This is often embarrassingly reminiscent of adult arguments. It is important to note that, while the winning point may have little to do with the external circumstances which engendered the argument, it necessarily makes good sense within the argument itself. This example is from a first grade argument about who is stronger; Joey had just claimed that he can touch the sun, and Ann has responded that he would burn up.

Joey: No. I'd be fine. I'm a magic man.
Ann: Oh, you're not a magic man. Why don't you be quiet about that? You don't even have a magic hat or a magic book like all magic men have.
Joey: Yes, I do. You never saw it before when you came over.
Ann: I sneaked over to your house yesterday, and I sneaked through your whole house and closets and everything, and I couldn't find that magic hat.

Joey: Well, I gave it to my friend.

Joey and Ann then continued to discuss Joey's allegations that he gave the magical equipment to his friend because he knew Ann was coming over and that his mother had warned him that Ann was coming, which she knew because she was magic as well. At that point, Ann assured Joey that she had checked out his friend's house as well and found no magical gear; therefore Joey was clearly lying, was not magic, certainly could not touch the sun and was not as strong as she was. Once both have accepted the admittedly improbable premise that magic men exist and the necessary criteria for being a magic man, Ann drove Joey to the wall in a relentlessly logical manner, defeating him on his own claims.

Arguments, whether children's or adults' have their own sense and sound. They are not random collections of outraged exclamations or inarticulate bel lows. They are, rather, a special type of communication in which people pay close attention to each other, explore various stylistic and semantic strategies and try to avoid their opponents' strong points and capitalize upon their weaknesses. Viewed from the outside, the most apparently trivial argument can be a considerable display of linguistic, logical and social ability.

Donald Brenneis
THROUGH THE BOOB TUBE

Of course I remembered what happened to Alice when she went through the looking glass, but I didn’t expect everything that happened to me when I took a flyer in television.

I'd always been a written-word person. Not since my last year in high school, half a century or thereabouts ago, had I risked spontaneous remarks in public. If I was compelled to say anything in front of people I wrote it out, after carefully choosing each word, and then read it verbatim. No interpolation, no addenda — just what I'd written.

And here I suddenly was, conscious of cameras and recording devices, in front of KCET’s unseen audience, and trying to remember what I was supposed to say — all of it, that is, that wasn’t written in huge letters for me on the idiot cards.

It might amaze you to discover what you’re not permitted to do under those circumstances. You can’t scratch your chest — the mikes pick that up and make it sound like thunder. You ought not to smoke — the man across from you will disappear in a filmy cloud. You must not cough — it comes out like an artillery barrage or the rumble of an approaching earthquake. And you must — this IS a must, they told me — relax, be casual, be aggressive, be witty, eschew esoteric words. And watch the clock!

My stock in trade has always been esoteric words. No smoking bugged me — I’m a three-packer — and sometimes I do scratch, not because I itch particularly. It's a mannerism that seems to intensify my capability for thinking. I’m a scalp-rubber, an ear-puller, a chin-squeezer, and sometimes when in very deep thought I’m a chest scratcher. That no-no was one of the worst for me while I was on television — that, and the no-smoking, and watching the clock while trying to be casual, witty, aggressive, and aware of the topic.

I felt a little self-conscious, too, about having my face made up with various powders that were supposed to deaden the reflection of the lights. When I returned home, after that first showing, my wife immediately supposed that I had fallen victim to galloping jaundice. I would have settled for jaundice, for the fact is that I was suffering from the kind of fatigue that often follows combat. I may have been walking on my toes, doddering a little, and darting my head this way and that as if I was still watching that fellow with the cards that were supposed to tell me how many minutes we had left. The worst of those cards is the one that says 30 SECONDS. Meaning, wind it up. And be casual, aggressive and witty while you’re doing it.

The fun, of course, lay in talking to newspaper people once again. I’m always awed by how much they know about their separate topics. Editors — and I was one of those — aren’t expected to know details, and they develop a way of talking in broad generalities that sounds sententious. Or they rub their scalps, which is even more effective. I recommend scalp rubbing as a method of covering up a lack of information. Owls, you know, got their reputations for wisdom simply by blinking their eyes.

None of this seems to bother most of the panelists on Los Angeles News Review — live on Fridays at 7:30 p.m., pre-recorded on Sundays at 5 p.m. and Mondays at 12:30 p.m., just after lunch. But it bothered me — I didn’t realize I looked as old as I am, and I didn’t like my voice, and I was shocked by my lack of wit and aggressiveness. It bothered me until the day when I walked into a grocery store in Laguna Beach and an old gentleman, obviously about my age, spoke up and said:

"Hello, Mr. Williams!"

I’d never seen him before, or not that I knew of. I suppose I looked baffled.

"I watched you on KCET," he then added. "And I sort of like the program."

You know, I’d been with The Los Angeles Times for more than forty years, watching it grow from about 250,000 subscribers to considerably more than a million, and nothing like that had ever happened to me before. By George, at last I’d made it — I was a sort of celebrity, recognized in Laguna grocery stores!

"Thank you," I beamed. "Thank you very much."

Which was spontaneous, if a little short on wit, just as my TV career was a little short.

Nick B. Williams
On Campus

Professor Light, background, adjusts tachistoscope for Cynthia Merton, junior. Machine tests subject's memory and attention. The apparatus is used during semester for Psychology 102, Memory and Attention.

The annual Flea Market, held the first week of classes, offered Pitzer students a variety of used furnishings with which to personalize their rooms.

Janice Berg and Phillip Bear, sophomores, test polygraph in Social Science Lab. Device records simultaneous changes in blood pressure, respiration, and pulse.
COMMUNICATING WITH PEOPLE WHO HELP PAY THE BILLS — PARENTS

It is obvious that the continued existence of independent colleges depends on having a sufficient number of tuition-paying students plus regular gifts for the instructional budget and scholarships and income-producing endowment. Consequently, a most important dimension of our outreach, our development and public relations program, is or ought to be addressed to parents — of prospective students, of present, and of past students.

As their associations widen out in concentric circles from the college, the parents, relatives, friends of our students and graduates are tremendously important in articulating our case to the public, including potential donors (who like to hear from someone other than the staff about the merits of the college’s program), legislators, and the various media.

Like our graduates themselves, the parents should have a sense of confidence in and a sense of concern for the college.

In the first place, confidence. Shelley wrote somewhere that “man is in love, and loves what is passing.” That may be true for romantic poets always, and for most of us at times, but it is not a viable outlook for an educational enterprise. Somehow, without sounding sanguine, without appearing to be economic fools, without exaggerated rhetoric, we have got to find ways to say that we are in business, a profoundly significant business, and we mean to stay in business — for good reasons.

Vis-a-vis pessimistic predictions and opportunistic legislators, let us try to be thoughtfully bold about our public service and our future premise. Even in these times, or perhaps especially in these times, we need to be careful about accentuating the negative, the problems of high-quality education.

I fear that we may occasionally resemble the fellow who said one evening to his girlfriend: “I don’t have a boat, or a sports car, or a beach house or any of the other fine things that John Brown has; but I love you.” To which protestation came her reply, “I love you too — but tell me more about John Brown.”

I am at least partly persuaded by what one of our economists at Pitzer calls the “Johnny Walker Black Label school of thought” — if you are costly, say so, boldly, because you are good; and that boldness (supported by evidence, of course) encourages belief and support. Let us not neglect to spread the word about achievements of faculty and of students, particularly where students and faculty have worked together on a research problem, a paper, a presentation.

And that thought points to concern. The families of students and graduates may well be encouraged to gain a deeper concern for the college; after all, they have a substantial investment in it. So they ought to be more than modestly “kept informed”; they should be continuously educated, not only about our college, but generally about the importance of quality and diversity and the needs of private higher education.

At Pitzer, we intend not merely to confront parents with an annual fund brochure or letter, or merely to entertain a small fraction of them at an annual parents day. We are thinking of new ways to share the successes and needs of Pitzer’s distinctive enterprise with them, and to hear from them more openly, frequently, and fully in return.

All of this is based on the fundamental assumption that people give to what they care about.

I do not think that parents, even of prospective students, will be dismayed by direct presentations and publications addressed to them, when they are tastefully and thoughtfully done. Parents are a special audience, one of our most important “publics,” genuinely interested in the issues of leadership, quality, and diversity in higher education. We can and must inform and continue to educate them — this vital “support” group — our allies, potentially our elite troops, in the trying, testing times which surely lie ahead. That is and will be creative communication in the best Pitzer spirit.
SCHOLARSHIPS

One of the most vital areas for the life of the college continues to be scholarships for able, needy students. In this area, philanthropy clearly helps persons while helping the college. Deserving students who receive scholarships would not otherwise be able to attend; as they enter, they bring much to Pitzer in self-help and in continuing loyalty and achievements.

In order to stimulate student recruitment, Trustees Elise Mead gave $15,000 and Harold Melcher $6,000 in the late spring. Consequently, eleven students have just entered Pitzer with financial aid. A great result of vision and action!

The Avery Foundation has pledged $36,000 over a three-year period for an endowed scholarship. This was arranged through Trustee Judith Newkirk. The gift was made as part of Pitzer's Leadership Campaign.

The Pitzer College Parents Association, representing the generosity of numerous parents, contributed $6,500 last year for student financial aid.

SUPPORT GROUPS

New leaders for Pitzer's support groups have been announced by President Robert Atwell.

The Academy, which contributes to teaching excellence and the instructional program and which sponsors the Pitzer College Lecture Series on campus, will be headed by Phyllis Wayne of Newport Beach.

The Alliance, which brings persons from the business and professional communities into the academic community as resource people, will be led by William Guthner, Jr., partner of Nossaman, Waters, Scott, Krueger & Riordan law firm in Los Angeles.

The Alumni Association, including all former Pitzer students in a nation wide effort to continue to build the college, has a new president, Ann Lawson Bilodeau '68, of Palo Alto.

The Parents Association, including all parents of present Pitzer students in a program of mutual information and supportive activities, will be chaired by Nata McGreevey of Hollywood.

GLASSWORKS AT PITZER

Through the generosity of Hamden M. Swift of Chicago, a new course of study was offered this spring at Pitzer. Mr. Swift is the father of Jessica '74.

Students enrolled in the "Development of Glassworks" class this spring helped to build the facilities and equipment. They are fabricating the blowpipes for the actual blowing of glass, and building the furnaces and annealing ovens.

David Furman, Assistant Professor of Art, says that many hours have been put into this project, both by students and himself. The project would have taken much longer had it not been for the generosity and help of Pyro Engineering, Interpace Company, and Jorgensen Steel. These companies have donated materials for the glassworks and have been generous with personnel time in helping to work out details and types of materials needed.

Professor Furman stated that the new facilities are ready this fall semester to start blowing glass and a new art area is now available to Pitzer College. The dedication of the glassworks will be Monday, November 17.

Robert F. Duvall
Three members of the 1975 senior class were among only seven Chicano undergraduates throughout the country to be awarded four-year graduate fellowships by the Ford Foundation. Rebeca Barron, Jesus Salazar, and Lupe Serna began their graduate work this fall at Stanford, U.C. Santa Cruz, and the University of Chicago respectively. The grants include full tuition, fees, and stipends to cover books and monthly living expenses.

Ms. Barron is an anthropologist. She conducted a cross-cultural study of folk healing in Mexico and in East Los Angeles; investigated attitudes toward death and practices regarding death in Mexican society; and studied machismo in East Los Angeles. She submitted a paper to the California Folklore Society and read it at the Society's annual meeting, and was invited to read a paper at the annual meeting of the Southwest Anthropological Conference in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Additionally, she will read her paper on machismo at the December meeting of the American Anthropological Association. Her essay, "Folk Concepts of Illness in Rural and Urban Mexico" will appear in a forthcoming book to be published by the University of Arizona press.

Ms. Serna read her essay on Gestalt psychology at a meeting of the Western Psychological Association; she was invited to chair a session on physiological psychology at that meeting, the only undergraduate student so designated. Mr. Salazar was invited to read his paper on "Psychopathology and Demonology at the Western Psychological Association of Christian Psychologists.

A Fulbright Research Grant from the Council on International Exchange of Scholars has been awarded to Professor Harry Senn to study Romanian folk narratives. Two articles relating to his research will appear this year: "Dracula Doesn’t Live Here Anymore: Aspects of Romanian Popular Myth", and "Melusine: French Popular Mythology in French Literature". Professor Senn will make a presentation on "Romanian Folk Mythology" at a spring meeting of the Western Folklore Society to be held on the west coast.

Professor Seymour, appears in the fall issue of American Ethnologist. Through the support of the Pitzer College Research and Development fund, she is studying Asian Indians in Los Angeles, focusing on parent-child behavior, changing values, and adaptation to urban United States.

Sally Schurr, class of ’73, is in her second year at Harvard Graduate School of Education, working on her Ed.D. in Human Development.

Professor Albert Wachtel’s article, “Ripe for Peaching: Stephen Dedalus and the Chain of Command”, has been accepted by The James Joyce Quarterly for publication next spring. The article about Joyce’s A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, is part of Professor Wachtel’s extended study of the writer’s fiction manuscripts, notes, and letters.

The September issue of Nature magazine featured “Auxin, Carbon Dioxide, and Hydrogen Ions”, co-authored by Professor David Sadava. Sadava, whose research in biochemical genetics of thoroughbred horses is funded by the California Thoroughbred Breeders Association, is Assistant Professor of Biology.

Kirsten Gronbjerg, class of ’68, is in her second year as Assistant Professor of Sociology at State University of New York at Stony Brook. Ms. Gronbjerg holds a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago.
Four persons were added to the Pitzer College Board of Trustees at its October 7 meeting. The self-perpetuating governing Board of the College unanimously accepted four names nominated by Dr. Robert J. Bernard, Chairman of the Composition Committee. The new members are Manuel Aragon, Jr., Edmund G. Brown, Stanley Ross, and Roland Speers.

Manuel Aragon is President and Chief Executive of Mariscal and Company, management consultants of Los Angeles and Washington, D.C. He recently retired as Deputy Mayor of Los Angeles after two years of distinguished public service with Mayor Tom Bradley.

The Honorable Edmund G. "Pat" Brown is the former governor of California. He is presently a law partner in Ball, Hunt, Hart, Brown, and Baerwitz of Beverly Hills. Brown has a widely known reputation for achievement in public higher education, and is now turning his interest to quality private education.

Stanley Ross, investor, retired in 1972 after successfully serving for nine years as Chairman of the Board of California Investors. He has since traveled widely. A graduate of UCLA, Ross resides in Los Angeles.

Roland Speers is President of Amcord, Inc. of Newport Beach. He graduated cum laude from UCLA, where he obtained his J.D. He is a member of the California Bar. He is also active in several Los Angeles area clubs. Speers was a founding member of the Pitzer College Alliance.

Six National Merit Scholars are enrolled in Pitzer College this fall; two freshmen, Cynthia Tanner of New Jersey, and Monika Johnson of Alaska; two sophomores, Julie Stern of Chicago, and Gail Mautner of Los Angeles; and two juniors, Jeff Book of Arcadia, and Kelvin Connally of Brea.

Dr. Kenneth S. Pitzer, member of the Board of Trustees and son of the founder of Pitzer College, was awarded the National Medal of Science by President Gerald Ford. The Medal of Science award is the government's highest award for outstanding achievement in science and engineering development and was bestowed upon 13 U.S. scientists. Dr. Pitzer is Professor of Chemistry at University of California, Berkeley.

For the second consecutive year, the Henry G. Steele Foundation of Newport Beach, California, has awarded scholarship funds to Pitzer College. A gift of $23,000 was received this fall.

With the primary assignment of increasing visibility of Pitzer College, Martha Taschereau has been appointed Director of Information Services. She comes from a similar position at Florida State University.

Professors Robert L. Munroe and Ruth H. Munroe are authors of a book published in August. Cross-Cultural Human Development was published by Brooks/Cole.

Professor Jane Arnault's research on rent control is compiled in an article for the American Real Estate and Urban Economic Association Journal. The title is "Optimal Maintenance Under Rent Control with Quality Constraints", and is a portion of a larger study on housing policies which will eventually be published as a book.

Professor Arnault was a consultant to the Rand Corporation this summer for project development on California's water resources. She also participated in a session on housing policies at the San Diego meeting of the Western Economic Association.

Maurice Gibson Calistro, class of '74, is Director of Social Services at the Indian Center, Inc. at Los Angeles. Among her responsibilities at the federally-funded center are arranging for temporary housing, food, employment, health care, and legal aid primarily on civil matters, and counseling for Indians from all tribes. She is a full-blooded Chocktaw Indian from the Mississippi band of Chocktaw Indians.
... The Western Political Quarterly, journal of the Western Political Science Association, has appointed Professor John R. Rodman Associate Editor for political theory. The summer 1975 issue of Inquiry, an inter-disciplinary journal of philosophy and the social sciences, contains an essay by Professor Rodman. "On the Human Question" written in the satiric tradition of Samuel Butler, is a report of the Erewhonian High Commission to Evaluate Technological Society.

... Education in Tudor and Stuart England, written by Professor David Cressy, will be published by Edward Arnold publishing house in England and St. Martin's Press in the United States in the fall of 1975. Professor Cressy will read a paper on "Educational Opportunity in Tudor and Stuart England" at the conference of the History of Education Society in Berkeley in November.

... Four new full-time faculty appointments bring Pitzer's total to 56: Professor Jack Sullivan, political studies; Professor Peter Nardi, sociology; Professor Michael Goldstein, political studies; and Professor Roy Gordon, philosophy. Part-time positions are being filled by Professors Stephanie DeLange and Dennis Farber in art; Professor Shimshon Zelniker, on leave from Tel Aviv University, will teach Political Philosophy and Comparative Government this fall. The Joint Science Program, in which Pitzer participates, will offer courses taught by three new faculty members: Representing the fields of biology, chemistry, and physics respectively are Professors Robert Enns, Andrew Zanella, and James Edmonds.

... Robin Hagler Kramer, class of '75, was named a Coro Foundation Fellow and began her nine-month, post-graduate training in public leadership in September. From an applicant pool of 1,000, she was among 12 in the Los Angeles area to be selected. The Foundation also sponsors 12 interns in both the San Francisco and St. Louis areas.

... Professor Ann Yates has been invited to serve on the newly-formed Committee on Population Education of the Population Association of America, which is the national professional organization of demographers. The committee's initial efforts will focus on undergraduate education in population studies.

... Professor David Furman has been awarded a $5,000 fellowship from the National Endowment for the Arts to further his activities and career as an artist. Professor Furman is introducing a course in glassworks this semester which will involve students in constructing and maintaining a glass studio.

... Professor Peter Nardi, newly-appointed member of the teaching staff, led a round table discussion on "Moral Socialization and Deviant Behavior" at the San Francisco meeting of the American Sociological Association in August.

... Nancy Martin Hinkley, class of '70, received her Ph.D. from Harvard University in 1974 in biology and is doing post-doctoral biological research at Billings Hospital in Chicago. She is an American Cancer Society Fellow with the Society supporting her research.

... The faculty of Pitzer College took the occasion of Pitzer's 11th commencement to confer upon President Robert H. Atwell an award commemorating his fifth year as president. Cited among other qualities, were his candor, forthrightness, pursuit of excellence for the college; for being a "supporter of education rather than fiscal adversary".

At a July meeting of the Society for College and University Planning in Minnesota, President Atwell was a panelist reacting to a paper on "Alternative Futures for Higher Education."

... Professor Laud Humphreys, former winner of the C. Wright Mills Award, presented "Deviance Then and Now — But Not Tomorrow" at a special session in San Francisco for other winners of the award. At a conference of the International Academy of Sex Research held at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, Professor Humphreys presented a preliminary analysis of killings involving homosexuals. According to an account in the New York Times, his study of more than 111 homicide cases conducted over a period of two years, indicated that murders of homosexuals are most likely to be heterosexuals, at least outwardly, who have a great fear or hatred of homosexuality, or who may themselves be fighting homosexual tendencies. Professor Humphreys has been elected a Member of the Committee on Standards and Freedom of Research, Publication, and Teaching, by the Society for the Study of Social Problems.