

Special Edition Published by the students of New College, March 24, 1965

TO THE NEW COLLEGE COMMUNITY

During the past two months, it has become evident that the college is increasingly involved in a conflict concerning the distribution of power. It has been perhaps most evident to, first, the faculty, and, second, the members of the long-range and praeceptorial committees, as well as other students. But the progress of the conflict has been obscured by a series of symptoms which have as often as not been mistaken for the disease. Yet the problem remains, and it must now be recognized for what it is.

The members of the praeceptorial and student-faculty committees feel that the situation has gotten so far out of their hands that their activities are meaningless; that this is one crisis which has not faded, like so many other flash-in-the-pan issues, or dimmed in our memories. Nor should it be allowed to do so.

The question is, then, who shall make decision about campus life? Shall it be the administration and trustees, or will it be the faculty and students?

In the praeceptorial committee, we were told by then Dean Gustad that we would have "however much power we liked." When we began to meet with Dean Norwine, he appeared to concur. In fact, he continued to concur for the next two months, with everyone who voiced any opinion. He insisted that he was in favor of student freedom; he repeatedly told us that we, as a committee, should make the decisions. It appeared to be a favorable context for the functioning of

the committee, and we began to operate on that basis. Then both the long-range committee and the praeceptorial committee began to meet together regularly, for the problems with which they were set up to deal had begun to overlap. Dean Norwine told us that we should "step in and fill the void," by creating whatever framework we felt necessary for the conduct of student affairs on the east campus. We designed such a framework. This was the so-called "Code of Considerations." We were advised by Dean Norwine that faculty approval of this document was unnecessary; that we designed it meant it was finalized. The student-faculty committee re-issued the code with additional suggestions for the maintenance of the rooms on the east campus. The following afternoon, Mr. Miller, acting for Dean Norwine, put forward a set of rules which in certain important respects contradicted the suggestions of the committee. It was designated "official"; yet neither of the committees had previously been consulted concerning its contents. We set about, the following week, to construct a new draft, which was to go into effect immediately, subject to ratification by the students and faculty. Today's meeting was originally intended for this ratification, but events up till now have made it unnecessary; to go through the motions would be a travesty. How did this reversal come about?

To the New College Community-from P.1

On Friday morning, President Baughman called Dean Norwine and Captain Styles to meet with him. Friday afternoon the two committees met with Dean Norwine, Dean Sonnenberg, Captain Styles, and Mr. Helgeson. At this time we were informed that all our work was of no consequence. The "official" status of the committees was made quite clear--they had none. We were told that the authority for student conduct rests with Dean Norwine, and the same authority for housing rests with Captain Styles. Captain Styles handed us a list of housing regulations, which he had drawn up without looking at what we had issued before. He informed us that if we wished to modify his regulations we would have to go to a "higher authority." At the same time, Dean Norwine said he was taking certain issues regarding student conduct to the Board of Trustees.

The progress of these events indicates to us many things, but of most importance is the now obvious fact that neither committee has any authority in the area of student affairs, and that this authority rests primarily with the administration. We do not think that the administration is a group of tyrants; we only wish to ask by whom the decisions concerning the structure of campus life should be made.

The administration and the Board of Trustees seem to feel it is their duty, for we have been delinquent, they assert, in fulfilling ours. Yet it remains our view that the faculty and students are the ones with whom that power should rest. It is they, after all, who are most intimately concerned with

the life of the college, for it is they who make the college what it is. President Baughman may stand for the college in the community at large, but within the college community itself we must not allow an individual to become a generalizing figure to lead us to an apocalyptic vision:

From one point of view the whole of history, and very particularly our own American History, can be seen as a struggle between those who seek a utopia here on earth and those who feel that the life of man is made better by ever-changing institutions carefully shaped and daily renewed by human effort. These are history-old, these alternations and conflicts between the proponents of apocalyptic cults, who deny the need for continuous, partial human effort and for a supernatural event ushered in by prophet or party, and those who feel it is the duty of priest and prophet, statesman, artist and scientist, to "cherish and protect the lives of men and the life of the world."

---Margaret Mead

We believe that the opportunity to work out our own concepts of what the college should be has been denied to the faculty and students in favor of simpler and more instantly realized solutions to our problems. Throughout the meetings of the past few months, it has become clear that such

To the New College Community-from P.2

solutions are in the minds of the administration" stratification, rigidification, and an externally imposed system of regulations, rules and Thou-shalt-nots which may be suited to our needs, but come, without due process, from the wrong source.

We are so out of touch with the real work in the field, that in America, a Dean is superior to a Professor, and a Board of Trustees or Regents is superior to a faculty...If the university is controlled by its Board of Trustees, the student, the pick of the youth in his final period of training, is left high and dry with no contact with responsible men.

---Paul Goodman

Are we a bunch of spoiled children? Whether we are or not, we are aware that in order to grow as individuals, an atmosphere centered upon out-growth must be established. Can anything be more clear that in order to grow, we must first have the opportunity for growth? It is legitimate to treat us as mature adults, for through that means we may become adults.

Therefore, after two months which have resulted in nothing but an increase of tension and frustration, we have finally come to our senses. The praeceptorial committee will not agree to enforce someone else's codification; the student-faculty committee refuses to continue making plans that will not be realized. The student body should recognize that the authority of the authorities ultimately rests on our willingness to obey them.

Shall we as students, sit passively by while a structure is cast into rigidity before our very eyes, from which there is no escape, or will we act?

The first action is being taken. We, the undersigned hereby submit our collective resignations from the two committees, for we cannot in conscience remain on committees which cannot function. At the same time, we make certain recommendations, in which we need the help of the whole student group, for the next step.

Signed:

Ray Enslow
David Rollow
Jill Chamberlin
John Cranor
Paul Hansma
Ken Hammond
Anna Navarro
Karen Fryklund
Jeanne Rosenberg
Richard Kainz

This is a special issue of THE CATALYST to report the happenings of the student meeting held Monday and to publish the student opinion which has been given to us. There will be a regular issue Friday.

THE STAFF

For a free subscription to the CATALYST: Submit a statement to the Editor in twenty-five words or more; "What I like about New College."

EDITORIAL

Whether or not the Praeceptors and members of the Student-Faculty Committee were justified in what they did is a moot question. But the action has been taken, so we must make the best we can of the situation as it is. If we reject the structure given to us by the administration, we must govern ourselves, and govern ourselves effectively. This means not only making rules, but also enforcing them.

I would like to suggest that the students meet with their five new representatives and ratify the Code of Consideration; making offenders responsible to the "Committee of Five" with the possibility of referring incorrigibles to Dean Norwine. Matters concerning room care can be worked out with Captain Styles beforehand.

However, if this is to be successful, all of the students must accept the responsibility not only for the following the Code, but also for enforcing it with those who do not. This includes the time limit on intervisitation and the prohibition of drinking. If we are to govern ourselves, every student must accept the responsibility for reporting to the "Committee of Five" any offense against the Code that he witnesses anywhere on the campus.

The above is just a suggestion and I realize that following it would cost us our "freedom" to break the law and our "freedom" to ignore the rules. However, the only alternative I can see at present, is for the administration to be forced to step in and govern us regardless of our objections. If that should happen, then I'm afraid it would cost us far more Freedom.

-TH-

COLLEGE COMMUNITY MEETING

--Ed. Note--

The following is not just a news article, it is also an editorial--where it speaks of what happens, this is the objective report at work; where it speaks of "I think," this is an active mind at work.

Monday at 4:00 p.m. an all-school meeting was held in the music room, purportedly to ratify the sheet on regulations distributed by the Student-Faculty Committee the previous Wednesday. As scheduled, this meeting would have been like most of its predecessors, merely a matter of form.

However, when Paul Hansma stood up to face the large group of students, faculty, and administrators, a radical change in procedure had already taken place. In a quiet, resolute tone, Paul recounted some of the events that had led both the Student-Faculty and Preceptorial committees to feel a frustrating sense of superfluity in the decisions concerning student life. A few minutes later Ray Enslow was given the floor. He continued: "...neither committee has any authority in student affairs. This authority rests with the administration." Both committees were acting as advisory bodies whose advice was never taken and often seemingly unconsidered.

The suggestions for room maintenance on the third and fourth pages of the "Code of Consideration" had been replaced with a set of official rules to be issued--rules with which the committee had not previously been confronted, much less consulted in their formation.

It was almost as though the whole system were set up to give the students the illusion of a maximum of power while keeping it, in actuality, at a minimum. At any rate, the statement read--representing the views of both Preceptorial and Student-Faculty committees--ended with a jarring finality--"we submit our resignations." The committees refused to enforce decisions they had had no part in making.

This statement was met with complete silence. If possible, the already quiet room became even more hushed. Few students evidenced any surprise at this statement. However, beneath the silence strong feelings had been aroused. There were expressions of relief, satisfaction, curiosity, anger. Some expressions hardened, and faces grew grim.

Anna Navarro was made temporary chairman. Recognizing that the student body needed some form of representation, the committees suggested election of a five man committee. This committee, while having no official standing in relation to the administration, would nonetheless serve as a means of communication. This suggestion was voted on and accepted by a majority of the over seventy students who were present. A written ballot was taken, and Tim Dunsworth, Ray Enslow, Karen Fryklund, Ray McClain, and Richard Waller were elected. Dr. Smith and Dr. Sanford had previously agreed to meet unofficially with this committee.

The rest of the meeting, which lasted until 5:30 p.m., consisted in an open discussion of the steps taken and those which now appeared necessary. The problem seemed

mainly to involve the inability and unwillingness of the students to accept externally decreed and imposed regulations. Further discussion revealed that there had been misunderstandings on all sides. Dr. Stearns suggested that the committees were trying to line up faculty and students against the Board of Trustees and Administration, and also that the statement concerning the obeying of all public laws was only to soothe student consciences. Both of these statements were emphatically denied. "We are not," Karen Fryklund responded, "lining up faculty and students against trustees--we are trying to hold together our college community. We are not demanding power;...however, we do want a voice."

Earlier, Dr. Berggren suggested that there was an analogy between the present situation and the position of the faculty of a college in recommending to the administration that certain professors be hired. Ray McClain replied that the analogy seemed appropriate; nonetheless there was a distinction in that the recommendations of faculty members were generally accepted.

One student, Betsy Ash, made an unfortunately valid complaint about student behavior. She stated that when students had been allowed to make their own regulations about conduct, there were flagrant violations of even student-imposed conditions. The only possible objection to this statement has been made: that the "expectations" students proposed for themselves were not what they actually wanted, but only what they thought they could get.

College Community Meeting--from p.5

During the meeting there appeared to be a change in feeling--or perhaps merely the delayed expression of an opposing viewpoint. Some students apparently did not want the Student-Faculty Committee to be dissolved. Mary O'Keefe stated that the people on the five-man communication committee were the same ones who had failed to communicate previously. Esther Lynn Barazzone advocated that we "consider previous committee members to have failed." There seemed to be some desire to reinstate the committee with new members replacing those who had resigned.

Twice motions were made for adjournment. Twice these motions failed. Possibly these motions were intended to block further discussion of reinstatement of the Student-Faculty Committee. At any rate, a motion was made and seconded to hold a second meeting within a week, presumably to resume the discussion.

It seemed to me that this meeting followed an increasingly evident pattern in concluding without any real conclusion and resolving without any true resolution. We have only succeeded in making ourselves look rather silly again and in confusing the issues. The 'dramatic coup' at the beginning of the meeting seemed to degenerate after an hour and a half of useless arguing into a sheepish, "well, maybe this wasn't such a hot idea after all." It seems that the only thing everyone agrees on is that everyone disagrees, and that the 'obviously right thing' (i.e., what the person speaking wants done at that particular moment) must be

carried out as soon as possible. It seems the diversity of which New College is so proud is the very element that is pulling it apart. Nevertheless, when taking positive, constructive action, the student body seems uniformly composed of would-be Hamlets.

Perhaps Monday's meeting will have some positive results. What, if anything, this new unofficial committee will accomplish remains to be seen. Part of the problem seems to be that neither the ultra-liberals nor the ultra-conservatives are willing to give in an inch--the former are obsessed with the idea of absolute freedom ("nobody's gonna tell me what I can or can't do!"), the latter with imposing their own personal standards on everyone else ("why don't the people around here straighten up and do what's right!"). Neither of the views is very tolerant or considerate of others, and neither will work at New College.

Compromise is not necessarily a dirty word, nor does it mean a dull, grey uniformity with which no one is truly happy. We will have to accept some universal standards of behavior, hopefully standards with a great deal of room for individual variation. Unfortunately, there seem to be some people who will rebel against anything merely for the sake of rebelling, who will try to go beyond any limit that is set, no matter how lenient. This anarchic element can hardly have anything other than a disintegrative effect.

Anarchy has never been synonymous with individual freedom, any more than strict regimentation and regulation have been. Tearing

College Community Meeting--from p.6

things down is not in itself enough. Criticizing violently anything and anyone who deviates from your own personal philosophy is only an uneasy defense and a block to unity. of any sort.

After all, we are here to build a college, rather than to destroy : one.

G. Cimino

A COMMON COMMITMENT

All through the year, during any discussion of rules, regulations and enforcement, the question has come up: would such be consistent with the "philosophy of the college"? Just what is the philosophy of this college? At the final meeting of the Student-Faculty and Praeceptorial committees we were informed that there was no definitely formulated philosophy to which we could refer as justification for the students having a determining voice in deciding rules for their own conduct.

I agree that before we came we were not promised license and no rules. However, I feel that there was a very definite commitment expressed- and that this is the "philosophy" that everyone has been referring to. It is this: students, faculty and administration alike were invited to join together in a common risk to create a new institution. The promise that we as students would have a voice in formulating policy which affects us is what brought many of us here. We were invited to join in creating something; we were not invited to sit around until someone else de-

cided what to do with us.

This does not mean that students demand and expect the right to hold all power over student conduct. This does not mean that we want to see uncompromising lines drawn between administration-trustees and students-faculty. Rather we wish to see that the original commitment- that students should be assumed to have the right to a voice in their own affairs- is honored.

Karen Inge Fryklund

THE CATALYST

Published weekly by the students of New College

Editor

Laura Rawson

Staff Reporters

Linda Benua

Glenda Cimino

Chuck Hamilton

Dennis Kezar

George Monoson

Charles Raeburn

Tom Todd

Typists

Esther Lynn Barrazone

Liz Caldwell

Cookie Hoigne

Diana Shiphorst

Sam Treynor

Betsy Yocher

Business Manager

Richard Kainz