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ABSTRACT

CASE STUDY OF A LIBERAL ARTS AND DIVESTMENT CRISIS AT HAMPDEN COLLEGE: EXAMINING THE ROLE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENTS
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M.Ed., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
Directed by: Professor David F. Schuman

For eighteen months in 1982 and 1983, members of the Hampshire College community struggled with this question: Were Hampshire's principles of liberal arts education being compromised by profits the college derived from investments in companies producing weapons for the United States government? A group of students believed this to be the case. A proposal was submitted to the board of trustees requiring the college to divest any securities held in the seventy-five companies with the largest United State government defense contracts.

After much consideration by trustee committees, the proposal was not approved. A crisis occurred when students, dissatisfied with the decision not to divest, occupied the administration building for five days. Hampshire's Dean of Student played a leading role in
shaping events before, during and after the crisis. The dissertation focuses on the questions surrounding the issue of divestment and how members of a liberal arts college addressed them; particularly how the experiences of one dean of students presents lessons for other administrators faced with the circumstances of a divestiture struggle.

The case study and interview methods of analysis are combined as an approach to investigating and explaining the events and their meaning. The interview method offers a critical approach to examining the way the Dean of Students understood his job, the situations he encountered, and why he made certain decisions and not others.

The results indicate that the actions of participants are typically informed by either the "traditionalist" view, opposing divestment or the "activist" view which favors it. The events illustrate that either extreme is inadequate because both lack an evaluation of the educational issues at stake for all members of the college.

The conclusions stress that divestment struggles provide an opportunity for educational learning to occur. Therefore, it is necessary to develop another perspective, one that is neither automatically for or against divestment. This alternative view is one where individuals and/or the institution would be willing, when appropriate,
to take positions that uphold the college's liberal arts principles, its financial well being and its obligation to serve society.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The subject of nuclear war also provides an excellent vehicle to accomplish the purposes of liberal education: exploring new areas of knowledge, understanding diverse interpretations of complex issues, and becoming active rather than passive learners.¹

Adele Simmons, President Hampshire College

Why shouldn't they oppose our proposal, our ridiculous hubristic propositions and ludicrous counter-assumptions? After all, in terms of present day assumptions, everything we are talking about is outside the realm of "rationality." In essence, we are asking Hampshire College to take the first step--a possibly suicidal step--and challenge the tenants of our liberal social order.²

Chuck Collins, student

The Subject Studied

This dissertation is a case study about the manner in which the issue of divestment was handled by one liberal arts institution, Hampshire College, in 1982. It contains a detailed account of the significant events surrounding the institution's decision about whether or not to divest, and an analysis of what the ethical investment tension has to tell us about the nature of liberal arts learning.

It is typically the case, (which will be explained in more detail later), that when a divestment action is proposed, two extreme perspectives regarding the eventual
decision arise within the institution. These are usually described as the "traditionalist" and "activist" positions, the former dictating non-divestment and the latter approving of it enthusiastically. The case study is written for higher education administrators. The central argument I want administrators to consider is that neither view, "traditionalist" or "activist," takes into account the educational issues that exist for all members of the academic community when a struggle for divestment ensues. Consequently, by not understanding the "educational experience" questions, the administrator does not realize that there exists a third perspective on the nature of divestment. To state briefly, this alternative perspective is one which establishes the continued education of students, teachers, trustees and fellow administrators, along with the welfare of the institution, as the foremost issues for which to be mindful.

Chapters of the case study discuss more general topics such as higher education history as it relates to the development of "institutional neutrality," the principle from which the "traditionalist" and "activist" views arise; aspects of Hampshire College history that explain why divestment efforts are seemingly inevitable there (Hampshire was the first college in the United States to divest its stocks in companies operating in South Africa);
and, a review of how the South African divestment movement to end apartheid developed plus contrasting views concerning its results.

The primary focus of events is a five month period in spring, 1982. During this time members of the Hampshire College community, including students, faculty, administrators, and trustees, struggled with how to resolve the question of the ethical nature of the profits earned from the institution's investments. A proposal initiated by students and endorsed by a majority of the faculty was presented to the Hampshire Board of Trustees. In short, the proposal forced the following question: are the actions of companies in which the college held stocks, companies specifically engaged in contracts with the department of defense to produce weapons, actually causing "social injury" to citizens both in this and other countries by virtue of their products and practices? And if so, would the college then divest its stocks from those companies deemed to be causing "social injury," thereby upholding Hampshire's educational mission and the ideals of the liberal arts institution?

These were difficult questions for members of the Hampshire community to resolve. A crisis occurred in May 1982, when students who wished to express their dissatisfaction and repeal the decision not to divest made by the
finance committee of the board of trustees chose to occupy the college's administrative offices. The institution's normal schedule of educational activities, such as classes, appointments, and committee meetings, came to a halt throughout the four and one-half day occupation. Out of a series of negotiations between representatives of the administration and student occupiers, along with other developments that occurred throughout the campus at large, came a peaceful conclusion to the occupation and a quick return to the routine activities of the college.

How the Subject Is Studied

I have chosen the case study method of research for examining the liberal arts/investment policy issue at Hampshire for a number of important reasons, not the least of which is that it has been used on many occasions for studying problems in higher education. A particularly beneficial aspect of this method of study as it applies to the situation at Hampshire is that it encourages a multifaceted approach to investigation and analysis of the problem. Peter Blau writes that "the major advantage of the case method is that it lends itself to interlocking various research procedures." Among other things, the proposed project requires the researcher to undertake historical analysis, conduct lengthy interviews, analyze higher education research studies, and examine the legal
foundation of liberal arts institutions and boards of trustees.

Regarding the crisis at Hampshire, the case method enables us to examine the history of the college, its liberal arts philosophy, the origins of the investment problem, and the actions of individual students, faculty, administrators, and trustees as well as the interrelationship between individuals and groups. As well, the liberal arts philosophy and investment policy of other institutions of higher education can also be examined, particularly those which have recently changed their investment policies. Further, the case methodology makes possible the evaluation of the preceding issues in the context of American society. Because many of the arguments made for changing the investment policy at Hampshire were based upon an interpretation of policies of the United States government, it will be necessary to include some analysis of those policies and the political ideology of American society in general, in order to assure that the case study gives a full account of the problem.  

Another reason for my choice of the case study method is that it allows the appropriate means by which we can examine human actions and their various and/or potential consequences. As Ruth Barry, writing in Case Studies in College Student-Staff Relationships, explains:
Case studies are designed to develop a method of approaching situations that will facilitate maximum understanding of those situations, of the people in them, and of the several outcomes that might result when one or another of the people emphasizes certain values rather than others.7

In one sense, building a case study is similar to doing historical reconstruction and examination.8 The researcher must create the events once again, including the circumstances from which they arose and their eventual outcome. When doing historical reconstruction, the researcher inevitably finds that the past events occurred unpredictably, happening from one moment to the next, lacking in either blueprint or plan. From the beginning to end the individual and spontaneous actions undertaken by participants directly affected what would or would not occur next.

To gain an understanding of the numerous events that occurred, I have sought to understand them by concentrating primarily on the experiences of one person, the Dean of Students at Hampshire, instead of simply reviewing those of many. By undertaking the single person, in-depth interview approach to building the case-study story, I will be able to present an accurate view of what the individual contends with in the midst of an institutional problem.9 The Dean of Students is the most appropriate person within the Hampshire community to interview because of his specific responsibilities: he is the college's senior
administrator directly responsible for student life, he
serves as a faculty member in the school of social science,
and he works closely with the trustees on issues affecting
the welfare of the entire institution. In short,
Hampshire's Dean of Students is expected to act responsibly
in the three areas critical to the entire educational
enterprise: student development, teaching, and the main¬
tenance of institutional excellence.

In the case at hand, the Dean played the critical
role in resolving the crisis as well as in the events
leading up to it and those which followed. His stories
will tell us a great deal about what happened at Hampshire--
who the protagonists were, their words and deeds, and how
they illuminate the liberal arts/investment policy tension.
Then too, he will present a realistic picture of the
problems and choices facing not only the individual admin¬
istrator but also the institution, as well as higher educa¬
tion in general. 10  This kind of approach is well sum¬
marized by Cohen and Manion in Research Methods in
Education:

... the case study researcher typically observes the
characteristics of an individual unit--a child, a cli¬
que, a class, a school or a community. The purpose of
such observation is to probe deeply and to analyze
intensively the multifarious phenomena that constitute
the life cycle of the unit with a view to establishing
generalizations about the wider population to which
that unit belongs. 11
Also, by offering the accounts of one administrator with the rest of the case study's analysis, the opportunity arises to make a uniquely meaningful qualitative, as opposed to quantitative, contribution to the field of higher education research.\textsuperscript{12}

As a research methodology, storytelling is frequently used in higher education. Even in the investigation of financial planning, quantitative analysis is no longer adequate. In \textit{Academic Strategy--The Management Revolution in American Higher Education}, George Keller writes:

\begin{quote}
Storytelling supplies the unique to complement the general condition supplied by numerical analysis. Even the language of storytelling offers a sense of the peculiar, a feeling for the richly complex, a recognition of the role of character and the special interplay within one group of people, an inkling of the crocodiles beneath the surface of any firm's [school's] apparent situation or immediate problem.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

The storytelling approach is especially valued in the examination of events involving passionate conflicts and which every so often evolve into institution-wide dissension. Therefore, it is even more important that the research methods take into consideration the non-quantitative aspects of the subjects being studied, for it is often, writes the economist Benjamin Ward, that there is a "gentlemen's agreement to ignore interpersonal comparisons."\textsuperscript{14} But regardless of the degree to which
Interpersonal conflicts are a part of the particular higher education investigation, George Keller reminds us that:

. . . each college and university has a unique history, collection of persons, and set of hopes . . . Though storytelling is viewed by most social scientists as a "prescientific remnant," it adds something indispensable to our view of reality.  

The piecing-together of the story is accomplished primarily by reviewing the experiences of Hampshire's Dean of Students, Michael Ford, a critical actor in the events, supplemented by essays, memoranda, newspaper reports and other kinds of written documents by students, faculty, administrators, trustees and related others. Ford was also chosen because his participation was valued and respected by not only the president of Hampshire and the chairman of the board of trustees, but also by many of the students and faculty who participated in the effort. Because his role was so influential in the events, and because he was respected by those who were in extreme opposition to one another, his perspective on the events should prove particularly insightful.

**Why It Is Important to Know More About What Happens on a College Campus During a Divestment Struggle**

Efforts on behalf of the higher education community to end South African apartheid have established the act of divestiture as a more acceptable means of exerting social
responsibility than it was three years ago. What is now needed is an examination of what a divestment struggle looks and sounds like within one institution. This section makes the case for why a different kind of analysis is necessary. It does so by demonstrating how higher education literature and media coverage has until now concentrated on whether or not institutional actions would coalesce into a nationwide movement as opposed to understanding the particular experiences of a single college or individual. Professor Phillip Altbach typifies the kind of analysis usually presented about divestment by institutions of higher education.

Contributing to the "Point of View" section on the last page of The Chronicle of Higher Education, Professor Altbach wrote, in 1985, a lengthy editorial titled, "The New Wave of Student Activism: Why Now?" His article typifies an overly general approach to the issue of apartheid protests on campus, treating them as part of the larger phenomenon of student activism rather than as a specific reaction to a specific educational and political conflict. Altbach is principally concerned with diagnosing the possible factors which may or may not come together to cause activism. He postulates that students, whether conscious of it or not, interpret protest as a "rite of spring;" that in 1985 the increased competition for good
grades and entry into professional schools "could cause frustration, which can lead to rebellion;" and finally, that perhaps today's college students are the children of parents who were protesters in the 1960s. Professor Altbach contends that the "raw materials" necessary for large-scale activism to occur in the future presently exists.

This article indicates why not much research exists on the liberal arts/investment issue when it builds into a crisis. The more volatile the situation becomes the less we know about the circumstances we are most interested in understanding. It seems that as more institutions of higher education and/or related organizations initiate actions to bring about divestment, the reporting of the incidents is more inclined to concern itself with student activism in general than the treatment of events at a specific campus, thus obscuring discussion of the very issue itself. Perhaps the point is best illustrated in Altbach's concluding paragraph:

If, however, protests do occur, and academic administrators are able to respond calmly and engage in a dialogue with students, it may be possible to limit the militancy and perhaps help shape the future development of the movement.

By speculating about the "future . . . movement" he has necessarily lumped together all of the colleges and universities across the country and the activities in which
they are engaged. For example, while he acknowledges that a nationwide coordinating committee for anti-apartheid actions exist, it is only in passing, lacking any mention of the coordinating committee's objectives and means of accomplishing them, or how different institutions react to them. Altbach's treatment of the issue is not unlike that undertaken by many other observers of the higher education scene. They seem to skirt the serious content, in short, the ethical meaning of these activities. When Altbach writes, "there is a moral as well as political element in student protest," he hints at the critical, or underlying factors of the apartheid/higher education tension, however, that is as far as the analysis goes. There is no examination of the "movement's" origins. The particular nature and objective of the protests, (who are the participants and what are their words and deeds), remains unexplored. In short, we do not know what the "elements" are. His summary does not fully explain what the South African divestment debate may sound like on a college or university campus:

Clearly, these protests are symbolic acts. Few seriously argue that the divestiture of a modest amount of stock in companies that do business in South Africa will have much influence on that country's policies. Students are, nonetheless, taking a moral stand on a foreign-policy issue, and their demonstrations are attracting media attention.

The media, like Altbach, usually glosses over the political debates within the institution which typically
inform the campus unrest. However, media coverage does keep the issue in public view and has increased the momentum of divestment's ultimate goals. In spring, 1985, in the American media reports about divestment, we find individuals from all walks of life--politics, business, sports and the children of nationally recognized celebrities--and members of many different groups, organizations, and institutions participated in public protests against the system of apartheid which exists in South Africa. A review reveals that an overarching theme running throughout the reporting was that the public protest and/or actions not only made other citizens more aware but inspired the members of Congress to change their attitudes and predispositions regarding the issue of neutrality vis-a-vis our government and business community towards that of South Africa. This cause, however, is not absolute proof of why change occurred, only a possibility. What is known is that previously held views were altered and that some kind of a new influence was beginning to exert itself.

The value of the case study in describing what occurs at a particular school will illuminate the eventual effects of the media. For example, if the question were asked about how the conflict over apartheid in South Africa arose here in the United States, an answer, although cursory, would reveal the long-term involvement of higher
education. Due to the number of protests over South African investments that arose on college and university campuses throughout 1985 and 1986, research which illumines the liberal arts/investment issue is especially valuable at this time.

For somewhat different reasons, the case study investigation is particularly appropriate to educators now because of diminishing enrollments, loss of federal and state funding, government-sponsored scientific research (particularly "Star Wars" related research), and developing strategies for linking higher education and the corporate sector. And because the crisis places the financial problems facing a liberal arts college in the context of the institution's educational ideals, the student of higher education may become more knowledgeable about one of the vital problems facing all those involved with college and university education today. Indeed, one of the central problems addressed by the study is: how does a college or university, in this case Hampshire, a financially struggling institution, both invest and profit from its endowment while simultaneously upholding its own special educational philosophy and active commitment to liberal arts ideals; ones stated not only in the college's charter but understood as the ethos of the institutional environment.
Outlining What Is to Follow

A brief explanation of what will be discussed in each chapter follows.

Chapter Two reviews higher education history, exploring ideas and events as they relate to the development of institutional neutrality and the responsibility of colleges and universities to ethical investing.

Chapter Three examines Hampshire College as a particular type of liberal arts college. The following topics are explored: What were its origins? Acting in an organizational context, what kind of institution did trustees, administrators, faculty and students create? How was the college influenced by the values of American society? And, what are some of the characteristics of Hampshire students?

The first half of Chapter Four traces the history of South African divestment in the United States. The second half begins the story of how the proposal to divest from weapons makers began. Also discussed is the proposal itself.

Chapter Five explains the structure of trustee committees the divestment proposal must pass through before being implemented. Also explained are activities leading up to the meetings, the discussions which ensued at them and other events influencing the passage process.
Chapter Six sets out the philosophical arguments for and against divestment being waged by the students and trustees. Divestment related literature is used to further illuminate the conflicting views.

Chapter Seven reviews the discussion in the Finance Committee meeting in May where a decision about the proposal was made. The turmoil occurring at the conclusion of the meeting is also explained.

Chapter Eight is concerned with the takeover by students of the administrative offices at the college, the responses undertaken by various groups and individuals to this situation and what eventually occurred whereby the occupation was resolved.

Chapter Nine concludes the story by reviewing the results of the task force on socially responsible investing. Explained next are the Dean of Student's views concerning what was learned or not learned by: the institution, trustees, faculty, and students.

Chapter Ten explores what the lessons are which can be drawn from the case study to assist higher education administrators when facing circumstances similar to those at Hampshire.

Conclusion

Most citizens concerned with the welfare of American society, its politics, institutions of higher
learning and education in general, have some kind of attitude or belief about these issues. The nature of the subject is controversial enough to cause strong reactions, and is enormously value laden, often challenging the reader's own predispositions about a range of issues. These may include: questions of educational philosophy, particularly in the area of citizenship education; determining the relationship colleges and universities should have with society and how they are to be financially supported; and approaches to solving international problems concerning war and peace.

As a student, administrator, researcher and citizen, each perspective pulls my sympathies in a different direction. I can only do my best to be as honest as I can about my own personal predilections and guard against their biasing me in one direction at the exclusion of another. For the reader, I would only ask that he or she try and do the same.

I should note part of my educational past because of its direct bearing on the dissertation. I worked at Hampshire College in the department of student services for four years. In this capacity, I worked closely with the Dean of Students throughout the period covered in the study. Because my working relationship with Hampshire has ceased, I am better able to maintain the perspective of
researcher rather than that of participant-observer. My hope is to try and learn and explain to others. The strength of this study will rest with the thoroughness in which all possible views have been considered.
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CHAPTER II

ANTECEDENTS OF NEUTRALITY AND PARTISANSHIP: THEIR DEVELOPMENT IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

The history of American education is, in part, the history of a struggle to allow the student and the scholar freedom of inquiry, when their search for knowledge has led to conclusions incompatible with the orthodoxies of the school's founders, administrators, or supporting constituencies.¹

Simon, Powers, and Gunnemann
The Ethical Investor

Chapter Two reviews higher education history, exploring ideas and events as they relate to the development of institutional neutrality and the response of colleges and universities to issues of social responsibility. The first half of Part One traces the university's historical roots in Europe as they relate to a partisan or non-neutral approach to society. While the origins of the American university lie with the European model, we will see that a different philosophy developed in the United States. The second half of Part One explains how this philosophy developed.

Part Two examines the two opposing philosophies that developed in the United States on the matter of what is the best way for a college or university to help society
solve its problems. It is the "traditionalist" view which argues that institutions should remain neutral. The "activist," on the other hand, believes that institutions should involve themselves with the local community and society. Their struggle is over the "Academic Context," which is also explained.

Part Three explores a study of ethical responsibility of university investing undertaken in 1972. The results do not necessarily resolve the differences between "traditionalist" and "activist" views, but instead, offer guidelines for making appropriate decisions when institutions are faced with reconciling the conflicting philosophies of a college's educational, ethical and financial responsibilities.

Part One: European Partisanship and American Neutrality

Whenever the issue of divestment arises, it presumes the question: "Who" speaks for a college or university? Is the listener outside the university persuaded more if students, faculty, president, trustees or the entire academic community declare a specific position as that of the institution? Which is more "real?" What has greater meaning or impact upon others? Historians of higher education explain that the history of universities has developed in a happenstance fashion rather than by a universal plan.
to which all institutions ascribed. Therefore, what has been difficult to comprehend and explain, particularly when change occurred, is who or what governing body makes the decision that is eventually translated into "university" policy. Historically speaking, the "who" has been many and varied. From Rectors, the Senate, and the Dikan of the Faculty in German universities, to the Chancellor, Head of the College, Mastor or Provost in the English system, these individuals were often required to act on behalf of either a king, royal court, Pope or parliament. The instruction to act was not neutral, but rather, ideological; it stemmed from some kind of partisanship. Partisanship has thus figured prominently in the history of higher education. Examples abound, ranging from the University of Toulouse's suppression of Albigensianism by papal charter in 1229, considered heretical by Roman standards, to the University of Paris' judgment of Joan of Arc as a witch in the 15th century. \(^2\) "Universities," writes Fritz Machlup, "were founded with the mission to propagate a religious faith or to combat infidelity and heresy."\(^3\) They possessed an outlook on the world in which they existed and they sought to change it in ways they considered appropriate.

Conventional thinking to the contrary, colleges and universities have not always been environments of academic freedom and institutional neutrality. Such an environment
is actually a twentieth century, post World War Two development rather than a long-standing historical tradition. The greatest example of this common misperception in the twentieth century exists with regard to the history of German universities prior to and during the second World War. The question is often asked, "Why did the universities, the 'educated' of society, not speak out against the cruel ideology and actions of the Nazi regime?" The misleading assumption is that they maintained their neutrality and did nothing. Regrettably, however, they maintained their traditional partisanship, so that it was often the case that faculties of the German universities spoke out in support of Hitler's vision of society and Germany's role in the future of Europe.

The history of American higher education, as it concerns the nature of authority within the university is much the same as that of Europe. The origins of its institutions derive from the efforts of individuals, the organization of different religious faiths, states or the federal government. Each contributor to this history possessed certain biases or interests. Given those partisan biases with the economic support institutions required of their corporate board, legislature or parental overseer, a state of academic freedom and institutional neutrality was not
considered fundamental to the university's calling or earliest beginnings.

It is important to recall the 1915 case of University of Pennsylvania professor, Scott Nearing, a member of the economics department considered at the time to be an instructor of "radical economics." His story illustrates the little regard given to principles of academic freedom in the early twentieth century and why traditional assumptions regarding partisanship began to change. Because Nearing's intellectual leanings were socialist, he was fired after being at the university only a short while. It was soon learned that the trustees, who did not appreciate his point of view, ordered the action. One trustee explained the rational for his decision this way: "If I am dissatisfied with my secretary, I suppose that I would be within my rights in terminating his employment."^4

The conflicts that arose within the higher education community over the case of Professor Nearing led directly to the founding of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). This action, write Walter Metzger, "served to crystallize opposition to doctrinal commitments by universities."^5 This struggle to create a standard of academic freedom by which all of higher education could abide, particularly those controlling the purse
strings, was the intellectual precursor of the non-partisan or what is referred to today as institutional neutrality.

The American philosopher Arthur O. Lovejoy, in defending objections to the founding of the AAUP and its protection of academic freedom, composed, in 1915, a rationale for institutional neutrality which resulted in a document considered to be the cornerstone of the reasoning which forbids institutions from taking positions on society's issues. Lovejoy reasoned that a supreme virtue of colleges and universities is that they serve the "whole society" instead of special interests. Therefore, the governing body of an institution as well as those to whom their authority has been delegated, must assume, in Lovejoy's terms, a "transcendental stewardship." It is best explained by the commandment: "thou shalt treat thy patron's money as though it were neither his nor thine."

For Lovejoy, it was a philosophy dictating that stewards of colleges and universities "are the servants of constituencies they have never seen." Metzger explains Lovejoy's principle of neutrality as a "powerful injunction . . . aimed at America's possessive tribes."6

It is important to understand the American historical context at the time Lovejoy set forth his thesis reversing the commonly accepted norms of institutional authority. He composed it when a teacher who was critical
of anything the trustees found objectionable could be summarily fired. Whether conducting research or lecturing in the classroom, the teacher could not exhibit free thought or inquiry without feeling threatened. Lovejoy believed that the "opinionless" institution existing as an "intellectual experiment station" would serve better the contributions that the Nearings of society might make than if they only spoke as "members of a mission, a propaganda apparatus, or a party cell . . . ." Concommitant with the AAUP solidifying itself as the governing body of university faculties, so too was Lovejoy's vision of the "opinionless" or neutral institution becoming realized. As university governing bodies (trustees) began keeping their distance from making decisions concerning the internal affairs of the institution, the faculties and administrators adopted the policy of not involving the institution with social issues residing outside the campus.

Try as the AAUP and Lovejoy did to instill the practice of nonpartisanship, it was also the case that "every university, even one not given to truth-pronouncements, internalizes the values of the social order and exhibits, through a multitude of value-preferences, an unneutrality it cannot escape." The history of American higher education has included partisan activity both for and against the established order of the day, from protest
over our nation's involvement in the Spanish Civil War to the Department of Army's brief nationalization of colleges and universities during World War One. 

Designed to protect the voice out of step with society through the establishment of a non-intervening university, Lovejoy's reasoning during the period of the mid-sixties and mid-seventies, was critically viewed as accomplishing just the opposite of its original intention. The conflict arose out of America's involvement in civil rights, the Vietnam War and the role higher education played. The fifty-year old notion of institutional neutrality, established to preserve the freedom of individuals to say what they truly thought without fear of reprisals, was now "perceived by commentators on the left as a way of insulating the established social order from the reach of the dissenting academy." By the 1960s there was a far different reaction to this newly established higher education tradition of neutrality than the response in 1915.

Since the mid-seventies the principle of neutrality has been often challenged. The exercise of students and faculty in the pursuit of knowledge has inevitably involved them in both domestic and international affairs. Some of the contested incidents include: the expropriation of real estate by the university in order to expand its size, which has meant the displacement of citizens living near the
university; the morality of certain kinds of research undertaken for corporations, particularly chemical companies doing both consumer and defense department related work; and any number of international development projects or business contracts involving the United States with other countries, Iran and South Africa, to cite two recent examples.\(^\text{11}\) The most recent conflict has arisen over whether academicians should accept funding from the Department of Defense to conduct Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI or "Star Wars") research.\(^\text{12}\) In every example, compelling reasons are presented which argue that if the institution does nothing and remains neutral, it sacrifices the very standards it was established to uphold. On the other hand, persuasive arguments can be mustered which make plain the fact that an institution is primarily designed to carry out activities of teaching and learning as opposed to correcting social problems.

**Part Two: Opposing Philosophies of the Traditionalist and Activist**

The primary intent in this section is to establish an understanding of the liberal arts/investment context in which the Hampshire events became a part. Although it is critical to gain a perspective on the actions taken and decisions made solely within the institution of Hampshire itself, it is also important to realize the intellectual
benchmarks that guided action taken by Hampshire people both for and against the proposal.

The most sensible way to begin the explanation of higher education's investment-related past is to divide the history into the traditionalist versus activist schools of thought. These are terms used by Derek Bok in the recently published, *Beyond the Ivory Tower*. (His work is a major contribution to the topic studied and will be examined throughout the case study.) The traditionalist view will be examined first because it is the view which is rooted in Lovejoy's interpretation of the issue and is what is most commonly accepted today by higher education, generally speaking, as the correct posture when faced with a difficult situation.

The traditionalist view, represented by those who oppose divestment, interpret activities undertaken by the members of a college or university, particularly in regard to the notion of the institution itself, to be essentially that of pursuing knowledge in an unencumbered, neutral fashion. The faculty instructs and conducts research in hopes of making new contributions to scholarship, students learn from this activity, while the administration maintains the necessary personnel and logistical requirements to make the enterprise possible. In addition, the trustees
ensure that the undertaking will be financially possible for the years to come.

Of utmost importance to the traditionalist position is the preservation of a sacrosanct concept termed: the Academic Context. This context exists as the environment in which the vital activities of the higher education enterprise are carried out; the preeminent qualities which are freedom of thought and inquiry. It is the environment in which teaching, learning and research occurs that is the primary concern of the traditionalist. The objective of the tradition is rather simple. It is that interference with these essential activities cannot be tolerated. A narrow, or extreme, definition of the traditionalist position calls for the institution to remain as cloistered as possible from society's influences.

The activitist view of the institution starts from a perspective of objecting to the traditionalist's assumptions. That is, the college is seen as being acquiescent to the requests and controls placed on it by wealthy and powerful individuals, usually inferred to mean the trustees. The institution, therefore, does little more than preserve society's status quo economic, social and political relationships. A thinker who is often called upon by activists to justify historically their contentions
is Thorstein Veblen, who wrote extensively on the relationship between education and American society during the late 19th century and early 20th century. Veblen argued that the majority of higher education was utilitarian in its design, trying to do no more than "... train young men for proficiency in some gainful employment."\textsuperscript{15}

The activist position therefore believes that the role of colleges and universities is to set forth aggressively the standards and activities by which individual members and the society in general will exist. Espousing the activist view of the traditionalist's shortcomings, Zella and Salvador Luria, write, "Passive acceptance of the goals and values of society deprives the university of the claim to intellectual leadership and encourages its involvement in ventures of dubious ethical and intellectual value."\textsuperscript{16} The essential role of the college, argue the activists, is to serve as the bellwether example for the students and faculty within the institution as well as others outside it regarding the standard of human thought and action which will make society better. Whereas the traditionalist believes uninvolve with the community is the most successful means to see society eventually become better, the activist view promotes involvement with all facets of everyday life in society. An example of how teachers, researchers, and students would interact more
with the community around them is offered by Jerald Johnson. He writes in "The University as Problem Solver: Creativity and the Ghetto:"

One needs very little imagination to envisage teams of teachers upgrading inner-city schools, physical education and theatre and dance personnel designing programs suited to spaces with little grass, sociologist teams creating new, more compassionate ways to enforce laws, biologists inventing easy-to-use methods of doing away with rodents, and home economists creating inexpensive accouterments for home decorating.  

Whereas the activist position criticizes the uninvolved institution for maintaining the status quo, the traditionalist believes that by involving oneself in issues and affairs outside the Academic Context the necessary freedom to study and question the society and its problems is compromised. Choosing to use the essential educational activities of the school to improve society is to politicize the Academic Context. (Here, "politicized" means that orthodoxy of one kind or another has entered the Academic Context.) The traditionalist has two major fears when this occurs. First, preferences will develop from within the institution, thereby influencing such decisions as faculty hiring or student admissions. Second, that the institution has nothing protecting it externally and is therefore subject to economic or other kinds of reprisals from government, corporations, individual trustees, alumni and friends of the institution--who, while in the past served as benevolent partners in the institution's undertakings, are now
encouraged, by the philosophy of involvement, to make their contributions, often financial, with "strings attached." To do this would be to reverse history prior to 1915 and allow, among other things, the governing body (trustees) to dictate hiring and firing throughout the institution based upon personal preference.

The contested terrain between Activist and Traditionalist views is over an interpretation of the nature of the Academic Context (the condition affecting teaching, learning and research), and how the context may or may not be changed and the future. While the Activist position subscribes to the traditionalist's belief in the principle of free thought and inquiry as sacred to the Academic Context, it also assumes that biases, prejudices and varieties of political views are naturally possessed by individuals and thus, institutions, and therefore influence their actions on an everyday basis anyway. In other words, the activist reasons, absolute free thought and inquiry has never existed in the first place. The activist reasons that scholarship and teaching shall remain independently strong. This is grounded in a faith that is placed in the future good will and intentions of members of the academy to preserve the conditions of a healthy Academic Context. The traditionalist, on the other hand, grants the importance of social and political issues taken up by the
activist, although the ability to affect the changes which would make society better will be served by those institutions, groups and specialists entrusted to do the specific tasks rather than members of the academy.

The reasoning of traditionalists and activists end up diametrically opposed to one another. These are the two dominant ideologies pitted against one another throughout the divestment movement at Hampshire and which led to the ensuing crisis.

Part Three: What Higher Education Research Tells Us About Reconciling the Traditions of Liberal Arts Colleges While Maintaining a Policy of Ethical Investing

Beginning in the mid-sixties and lasting through the late seventies, a number of conflicts occurred at institutions over civil rights and the Vietnam War. While the two issues were different from each other, they were often woven together when students and faculty called upon administrations to distance themselves from any activities or policies that supported the war or segregation.\(^{18}\)

Although the pressure on administrators and trustees to alter an institution's practices could be intense, it did not usually focus on investment practices. The incident in the recent past which had the more profound
effect on the investment practices of universities and colleges occurred in 1970. Commonly referred to as "Campaign GM," the incident centered around a nonprofit, GM shareholder group engaged in the "Project on Corporate Responsibility." The small, socially responsible shareholder group presented to the voting body of other GM shareholders, which included many institutions of higher education, numerous proposals designed to change the business practices and organizational structure of the company. Proposals pertained to issues such as the expansion of the GM board of directors, the means of selecting the board's members, and mandatory disclosure of information concerning minorities, the environment and manufacturing safety.

As corporate shareholders, a number of higher education institutions were cast together into this new and complicated situation. Obviously, such decisions would affect the economic, social and organizational fabric of the GM Corporation, as well as all of its employees. More importantly, however, for higher education, the potential choice for colleges and universities tested the neutrality of the liberal arts endeavor. The events at General Motors occasioned an in-depth study of the ethical nature of investment policy management in colleges and universities.

The study, undertaken by Yale University in 1971, is entitled The Ethical Investor--Universities and
Corporate Responsibility, and existed as the benchmark work until Derek Bok's *Beyond the Ivory Tower* was published in 1982. The Yale study, conducted by professors Simon, Powers and Gunnerman, has contributed an invaluable body of knowledge to the understanding of problems associated with the liberal arts college as a corporate investor. Some major points were made in *The Ethical Investor* which directly relate to the basic question facing those whose participated in events at Hampshire: namely, would institutional divestiture of its stock holdings in companies engaged in weapons contracts either enhance or detract from the college's liberal arts academic program and institutional ethos? While not examining a situation exactly the same as that of Hampshire, Simon et al. constructed hypothetical case study problems which were similar in nature to Hampshire's. The value of their work is not that they arrived at an exact formula because they did not. Rather, they identified issues that affect the considerations which must be made when making decisions. Their contribution was to establish a base of knowledge upon which understanding and future decisions may be framed and contrasted.

The closest Simon comes to offering conclusions is describing an institutional process whereby investment options can be scrutinized fairly. His argument is that
the process of determining whether or not an ethical investment issue even exists is as important as the eventual action taken concerning the investment. It is not surprising that the fundamental proposition from which they begin their investigation states that:

... we could not discuss the responsibility of corporations—or, for that matter, the responsibility of investors or universities-as-investors—without attempting to set forth some major premises about the responsibilities which all of us should be willing to accept as individuals in our daily lives.¹⁹

Realizing that individuals possess varying degrees of commitment in their quest for "affirmative action for social improvement," Simon argues that the point of departure shared by every member of society is a moral obligation "not to inflict harm upon others."²⁰ And while acknowledging that what is called social injury "is easier to state in the abstract than to translate into workaday rules," the individual who acts both as citizen and member of an institution which carries out its activities in a complex society, cannot "obviate" an "honest effort to (the) prohibition" of actions which may cause social injury.²¹ To summarize, Simon maintains that social injury can occur and that citizens have a responsibility to investigate whether it exists and then form an appropriate response.

An argument is frequently raised that a college or university is not particularly well organized as an insti-
tution to render social and moral judgments and to act upon them. To such an objection, Simon's study reconciles the tension in the following way:

... the purposes and goals for which the university is organized— the criticism and transmission of ideas and methods—do make it an institution within which individuals constantly make implicit and explicit judgments about normative issues with unusual care and precision and, thus presumable, competence.22

Responding further to the objection that the institution is inherently unable to decide social injury questions, the Report states that "resources are available to the university which should make it at least as 'competent' in exercising its shareholder responsibilities as any other investing institution or group."23

The Report places great value on taking an approach to the problem as if the college or university were like any other stockholding group; this perspective, however, is contrary to that espoused by the activist position which declares the educational institution to be society's beacon for moral thought and action and thus more responsible than the average shareholder. In order to clarify the obligation of the shareholder to avoid social injury, the authors adopted the "Kew Gardens principle." (An often discussed event occurring in the mid-sixties where 38 persons witnessed the murder of a young woman in the Kew Gardens section of New York City.) The authors wanted to determine
what the responsibilities of these thirty-eight people were.

The study concludes that the individuals did bear responsibility to come to the woman's aid. In order to establish degrees of responsibility, a range of standards were established; ones which could be equally applied to institutions if found in similar circumstances. From this example Simon suggests that the critical factors necessary to weigh as a shareholder are: need, proximity, capability and absence of other assistance, or last resort. The reasoning for shareholder involvement proceeds as follows: Need: by the occurrence of corporate social injury there exists an assumed need to help. Proximity: the shareholder is a part, albeit a potentially small one, of the corporation and is therefore a presence. Capability: the shareholder has information about the activities of the corporation at his or her disposal and is therefore informed. Last Resort: the shareholder may be the final party capable of averting the harm being done. The authors summarize the position the shareholder finds him or herself in by stating that if:

... the individual shareholder fails to do what he or it reasonably can do to seek to bring about corrective action by the shareholders as a group, that individual shareholder contributes—however fractionally—to the continuation of the corporate wrong.
Although the authors of the "Report to Yale" make it clear that in their estimation it is within the authority of the liberal arts college to diligently pursue investments that do not cause social injury, they do not consider whether or not it is in keeping with the institution to also provide "investment venture capital for housing, business development or other socially beneficial projects in the area which it inhabits . . ."; what is referred to as socially responsible investing. The reason for this omission is because socially responsible investing establishes the activities of some companies as better than others. Two lists, therefore, are made. Those companies which are responsible and others which are not. The traditionalist interprets such list making, and rightly so, as the institution passing judgment on aspects of the society outside the academic context. I will discuss this issue later on in more detail.

It is too soon in the case study to begin evaluating the different decisions made at Hampshire by comparing them to the findings arrived at by others who have either researched the liberal arts/investment tension or who are proponents of one theory or another. There are, however, a few natural conditions which seem to exist when the essential arguments of the traditionalist and activist positions are combined with Simon's findings in The Ethical
Investor. Knowing them, however, does not make the task of understanding them any easier. As a member of the Hampshire community charged with making a decision in this kind of matter, one might feel somewhat alarmed facing such contradictions as these:

Do not profit from immortality.
Do not support corporate immorality.
Do not abandon fiscal and legal responsibilities.
Do not bother, for the ownership interest is too tiny.
Do not bother, for the information is too hard to get.
Do not jeopardize academic freedom by taking political or social positions.27

In order not to leave the individual completely at a loss without knowing how to proceed, Simon encourages the decision maker to assess first the particular origins and nature of the institution that he/she represents. Taking this advice, our ability to judge what happened at Hampshire is enhanced by understanding the college's founding ideals and educational philosophy, along with its peculiar development and the persons who choose to belong to the college. These issues are explained in the third chapter.
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CHAPTER III

HAMPShIRE COLLEGE HISTORY AND THE
CONTEXT OF DIVESTMENT

It seems to us that it is individualism, and not
equality, as Tocqueville thought, that has marched
inexorably throughout our history.\(^1\)

Robert Bellah
Habits of the Heart

The planning of Hampshire College was shaped by two
types of restraints: the context imposed from without
and the vision of those within.\(^2\)

Mark Whittow, student

The third chapter explains what kind of liberal
arts college Hampshire is. The central argument I want to
make in this chapter is that: (1) The educational philo-
sophy informing the college's beginning and the individuals
who created the new institution, were (2) influenced by the
context of American society, all of which (3) directly
contributed to why divestment was not only initiated in
1982 but included the pattern of response to it as well.

The chapter begins by discussing the origins of the
college as an experiment in educational reform. The educa-
tional program is explained next followed by an outline of
how the institution planned to sustain itself financially;
attention is paid to the kind of student Hampshire hoped to
attract. While planning was exhaustive, it could never completely account for what would happen when the college began to build buildings and hire faculty. This affect is explored by focusing on the idea of the college as an instrument of change in society. Contrasting views regarding what kind of change and how to make it happen occur between the original planners and the faculty hired along with the students choosing to attend. Defining this tension and how it is reflective of greater tensions within the political ideology of American society is also explained. Finally, a profile characterizing the interests and attitudes of Hampshire students is presented.

Part One: Origins of a Liberal Arts Experiment

The divestment events at Hampshire will, with the advantage of hindsight, come as no surprise once certain tensions inherent within its history are understood. Tensions (and these serve as guideposts throughout the chapter) have centered around the following themes: the educational malaise of American higher education as interpreted by the original planners who desired that college education would be "something more;" the primary benefactor of the college and the foundations and governmental agencies which were willing to invest millions of dollars in the endeavor; and the founding trustees,
administrators, faculty and students who began and have been associated with the institution up to the present.

Hampshire College opened its doors in 1970, a brand new liberal arts college with new buildings, faculty, administration, trustees and students. Long before it acquired a name it existed as an idea. During a period in the mid-fifties there was concern at the Amherst area colleges over the educational methodology being practiced in higher education. Specifically, critics charged that a college education neither inspired, nor tested the imagination or critical faculties of individual students. While leaders in business, government and education believed that continued "progress" and the "technological change of the future" were the greatest guarantors of success, educational theory and practice seemed to remain rooted in the past, relying on seemingly antiquated notions and century-old habits. Acting on these concerns, the Ford Foundation created a funding agency called "The Fund for the Advancement of Education" to encourage the development of innovative ideas in education. It was at the initiative of the President of Amherst College that a proposal from the four colleges be submitted to Ford's educational advancement fund to study how the four institutions might cooperate in a more organized and interdependent fashion with each other. The grant was funded for $20,000. The year was 1955.
A faculty member from each of the four schools was given leave time to participate in the project. Starting with few preconceptions, the group concluded that a completely different kind of college was needed in the Pioneer Valley, one that primarily concerned itself with an approach to education that encouraged and nurtured students who were engaged in more independent and critical work than that usually pursued by students. Soon after the project was completed, the funding agency of the Ford Foundation awarded the four colleges a second grant of the same amount in order for them to further refine the ideas of a new liberal arts college. The result of this project was called "The New College Plan."

The Ford Foundation valued the work done by the four colleges. Ideas presented in the New College proposal received high praise from many educators as precisely the kind of innovations higher education needed; the initial start-up costs of such a venture, however, were estimated to be between ten and thirteen million dollars, thus making the project infeasible for either the four colleges or the Ford Foundation to fund. Between 1958 and 1964 the document got little attention in and around the Amherst area colleges. However, other colleges and universities across the nation used it in making innovations on their own campuses, as well as in the creation of other brand new
colleges, including such places as New College in Florida, the University of California at Santa Cruz, Evergreen State College in Washington and New College at the University of Alabama.

In 1964, Harold Johnson, an investment banker, Amherst College alumnus and a friend of Charles Cole, then president of Amherst College, wanted, initially, to make a major philanthropic contribution towards solving the problem of over population. However, with guidance from Charles Cole, he became convinced that founding an educational institution would be a more longstanding use of his financial gift. Thus Harold Johnson pledged $6,000,000 to see that the New College Plan became the fifth institution of higher learning in the Pioneer Valley.

Soon after Johnson pledged the initial sum of money and the college was legally incorporated, he made himself Chairman of the Board of Trustees and appointed the presidents of the four other area institutions as fellow trustees. The assistant to the president of Amherst College, Charles Longsworth, was appointed coordinator of the project and secretary for the search committee to find a President for the new college. Longsworth was also charged with the incorporation of the college and the purchase of a site of land where buildings would eventually be built. A "dummy" corporation was initially founded
called the Tinker Hill Land Development. Later, after farm land was purchased from the Stiles family, it was announced that Tinker Hill was actually Hampshire College.

It as not long before Franklin Patterson was selected Hampshire's first president. Patterson, a native Californian in his mid-forties, had spent his entire career involved in education. He was chosen for his innovative ideas regarding college education in a changing society. Soon after arriving in Amherst, Patterson and Longsworth, using the New College Plan as a basis from which to work, wrote The Making of a College, the credo--philosophically and in actual design--of what Hampshire was to become.

They first considered the kind of education to be created. The authors state that "The college expects its students to wrestle most with questions of the human condition. What does it mean to be human? How can men become more human? What are human beings for?" Quoting the social historian, Daniel Bell, the authors admitted that "The university cannot remake the world" nor "even remake men." Yet, they did expect Hampshire to "liberate young people by making them aware of the forces that impel them from within and constrict them from without." The task of education, therefore, became the study of "metapsychology, metaphysics, metasociology, metaphilosophy and metalinguage;" these areas of knowledge were critical for
students to master. The unique standard established by Patterson and Longsworth for which students would strive was: "the creation of self-consciousness in relation to tradition." It was their view that this goal extended beyond traditional notions of liberal arts education previously accepted by educational theorists. The educational undertaking would be one that "... goes further, that liberal education should give the student a greater sense of himself in a society whose meaningfulness and quality depend in significant degree on him."8

As general as these principles of action are in their approach to laying out a liberal arts education, the authors still believed that "the curriculum needs an underlying structural coherence so that there is a chance such gains can be approached with a degree of order."9 They believed that it was possible for all students to develop an understanding of such "complex sets of things" as the "nature of man, social order, power, culture, ideas, creative and aesthetic experience, growth and change, the interconnectedness of things, and the problem of value."10 Repeatedly, Longsworth and Patterson address the highest calling of a Hampshire education as: "an ability to understand and act on the ultimate moral questions presented to a person in his or her life. This, surely was the central task of a liberal education."11
Part Two: The Educational Program

One of the ways in which the college attempted to alter the approach to liberal arts education was by setting up a new kind of academic program. This program is divided into four schools which correspond to the traditional subject matter disciplines: Social Science, Humanities and Art, Natural Science and Language and Communication. Instead of accumulating a prescribed number of grades and credit hours, students must pass a series of divisional exams. A division I exam must be taken in each of the four schools and is designed to teach the student the methodology or mode of inquiry employed by a professional working in that particular field. That a student knows how a scientist practices doing research or how an artist approaches the creative process, for instance, is the educational objective of the divisional exam. The student accomplishes the requirements by designing his or her original work with the assistance of faculty. The division II exam is similar to what is traditionally referred to as a subject major. The successful division II will usually include a significant number of courses in a particular field of study and other related experiences such as internships or division I projects. The division III is similar to what is known traditionally as the senior thesis. A topic is chosen or a particular set of questions is
set forth and the student then undertakes a piece of original work.

The evaluation of exam work is another example of how Hampshire students might come to think of themselves as engaged in a college education of a different kind. Divisional exams are evaluated by faculty who have agreed to serve on a student's committee. Usually, a student submits work to members of the committee, comments are made, and the student continues to refine the work until the members, particularly the chairperson, thinks the work is ready for the final divisional exam meeting, at that point an oral defense of the work is undertaken. The classic means of evaluating students, the grade and/or the grade point average, is an anathema at Hampshire.

Mastering the integration and interdependence of knowledge related to one's specific interest area is another important component of the educational process at Hampshire. The four academic schools do not remain isolated from one another as is sometimes the case in colleges and universities. Faculty teams teach courses from different schools and emphasize the integration of various fields of knowledge and their intimate interconnections.

Quite clearly, the student must assume the burden of responsibility for his or her education. The precepts are very important. First, with no requirements, the
student must take the initiative to develop exam topics and find three faculty members willing to serve as committee members. While faculty and staff are available to offer help, the individual student shoulders the bulk of the work.

In its early years, students, faculty and administrators perceived this academic program as something entirely different from the norm; that the educational process approached the pursuit of knowledge in a manner different than the majority of other liberal arts colleges cannot be disputed. Not suprisingly, students and others--faculty and administrators--believed that a different approach was somehow "better" than the conventional educational philosophy associated with liberal arts curricular requirements.

But how different really was Hampshire's educational plan? By knowing what was expected of faculty we can see that much of what the liberal arts institution was to concern itself with was decidedly conventional in its acceptance of higher education norms. The concept of professionalism in the ranks of the faculty demonstrates how the college could not stray too far from long established traditions of the liberal arts college. In the article, "Professionalism and Educational Reform," Richard Alpert states that Hampshire:
... has tried to build its faculty reward system mainly on teaching ... [But] there is an increasing pressure for faculty to be engaged in some form of professional development that has meaning in a broader professional community. The nature of the academic profession leaves little other choice if an institution wants to continue to recruit a high-quality faculty and students. Hampshire could not recruit a high-quality faculty, talented students, and gain institutional prestige while at the same time preserving a definition of faculty performance and student achievement radically at odds with the definition that dominates the rest of American higher education.15

Judging from what Alpert writes, one can perhaps see how there are actually two sides to Hampshire's identity and that the college is neither wholly different as an institution nor completely the same as every other. The version of Hampshire cast throughout the higher education community contends that Hampshire is entirely unique and an altogether novel experiment in liberal arts education. This view is established by college guides which describe different colleges, the members of the Hampshire community, particularly its leaders, as well as various publications, especially those of admissions. The other interpretation, that Hampshire's inextricable relationship with the other four institutions dictates that the college act as a part of the financial and academic mainstream of higher education, goes unacknowledged. The expression of one and not the other ultimately has an impact on what become the "habits and prejudices"16 of individuals belonging to the Hampshire community, particularly students and to a lesser
degree, the faculty. This is the case throughout events in spring, 1982.

Part Three: Developing a Financial Plan
Which Will Sustain the Institution;
Necessitating an Appeal to a
Certain Type of Student

As already noted, between the years of 1958 and 1964, steps to implement the New College Plan could not be made due to a lack of funding. Fully considered and stated in the New College Plan, the scale of financial support necessary to make a go of it would need to be grand. "To succeed, New College (that is, Hampshire) . . . will require large initial resources, and backing of a kind which is clearly national."¹⁷ Initially, Hampshire was conceived as a tuition-supported institution. The founders assumed that with the cooperation of the other four institutions in the Valley the cost of a Hampshire education could be kept at a minimum.

The authors of The Making of a College explained that the college was going to be primarily concerned with training the nation's "elite." Although the University of Massachusetts had a vital role in the creation of the college, comparisons were rarely drawn to it because it was a state institution and markedly different from Hampshire and the other area colleges. Smith, Amherst and Mount
Holyoke colleges were the model institutions out of which Hampshire would evolve. These schools were considered to be a part of American higher education's oldest, most distinguished and wealthiest institutions (particularly when considering endowment relative to size). The vast majority of students attending these institutions, then and now, are raised in privileged backgrounds. General characteristics of the student bodies, including Hampshire's are: mostly white, backgrounds of socio-economic privilege, with the expectation of developing a career interest after graduation. The graduates of these institutions are looked upon, by themselves as well as others, as the future leaders of the country. Given their economic privilege, they are also able to pay high tuition, room and board costs relative to what other students in higher education pay.

Another important aspect of Hampshire's financial origins, which influence circumstances at the college in 1982, is the much larger sum of money beyond Harold Johnson's $6,000,000 required to simply get the enterprise off the ground. Twenty-four million dollars was eventually needed to actually develop, build, staff and operate Hampshire in its first year. Sizeable loans were taken out from the federal government as well as securing numerous foundation grants and private donations in order to fulfill
the construction needs. Although many programs initially proposed in the New College Plan were disposed of or put on hold to cut start-up costs, it was also true that because the institution modeled itself after some of the nation's most prestigious colleges, it had to incur significant expenses to become and maintain itself as an institution of equally high rank.\textsuperscript{18}

Even before the college officially opened, its leaders realized that the institution would remain in a relatively strapped financial condition for years to come. This situation in and of itself caused the college to adopt from its beginning approaches similar to those practiced by other mainstream liberal arts institutions. For example, the administrative support staff, departments of admissions, development, foundations and corporate giving, grant writing, alumni affairs, and college relations began to solidify themselves within the organization in a fashion similar to other institutions. While the revenues needed to staff and maintain these offices were great, their resultant activities were designed to ensure the longevity of the college: the recruitment of students and the raising of money. Two things the college could not afford to lose.
Part Four: Envisioning the College as an Instrument of Change in Society

The economic circumstances did not deter the college's leaders from setting high ideals for what the institution could accomplish as an educational enterprise. The title of chapter two in *The Making of a College* is "Hampshire College as an Instrument of Change," with a epigraph by American historian Henry Steele Commager. Patterson and Longsworth believed Commager's message contained certain philosophical guidelines for Hampshire's potential identity. Commager writes:

Because we are, inevitably, creatures of the past, our tendency is to use each additional year of schooling as a mere quantitative extension of previous years, and to fit our schools into existing and familiar patterns. That habit was not unjustified in the nineteenth century, but the justification for it has disappeared. We are confronted, in planning for the next generation, with a demand for more radical reforms. We are required to reconsider the functioning of our whole educational enterprise . . . to look at it not so much in historical context as in the context of present and future requirements. 

Distressed by higher education's failure to assume the role society bestowed upon it, Patterson and Longsworth expected Hampshire to reformulate the definition of the liberal arts college. Of particular importance, wrote Patterson, was the articulation of "ideas worth transforming into reality." It was an analysis that translated into ". . . radical reforms arising out of a reconsideration of the whole educational enterprise."
founders attempted to accomplish these goals in almost every aspect of college life; in a restructuring of the educational program; a re-emphasis on the value of undergraduate teaching; the establishment of a decentralized and participatory approach to the college's organizational and decision-making capacities, which included a redefinition of a specific kind of institutional culture; and the development of an integrated community life where students and faculty would associate in outside classroom learning.  

The founders felt that it was possible to achieve a unique cultural setting which would continually foster the "radical reforms" they sought. Establishing a specific kind of identity and/or reputation of the institution (that it would always be on the educational "cutting edge"), was thought to be of utmost important. Patterson and Longsworth believed that critical to the college's success was promoting its identity as an institution that would first serve the intellectual undertakings of Hampshire's students and faculty, and then respect those individuals and constituencies outside the college to which Hampshire would always be looking for financial and student support. This was their hope.

Patterson and Longsworth state in Chapter Two that "the College regards it students, their intellectual,
moral, and aesthetic education, as its overriding commitment. The College exists first for them,"\(^22\) and in doing so, "proposes to be an undergraduate institution of excellence," and "an innovative force in higher education generally." In a nutshell, "Hampshire College will be bold enough to make no small plans."\(^23\) In their plans, the founders were concerned with defining the nature of the institution because they believed it could have the most lasting influence on students. The Making of a College set down the aspirations of Hampshire, which were essentially threefold: (1) higher education has sold itself short in the past by taking a limited approach, (2) we intend to be an active institution both within our own campus as well as a participant in the field of higher education and in society, and (3) "Our institution is to be taken seriously in these matters because we mean what we say."\(^24\) The first two presidents of Hampshire (Longsworth was to follow Patterson in 1972 and remain in the position for five years) said the following about the kind of place Hampshire would be:

The College intends to be an experimenting one, not tied to a narrow or doctrinaire experimental orthodoxy. It intends to innovate and experiment, in every dimension of collegiate education where it appears promising to do so. It plans to sustain an experimental mood as far forward in time as it can. It will regard no cows, academic or of other breed, as sacred. And it intends to have an impact on all of education. Hampshire College may be new and far from abounding in menas, but it intends to make a difference.\(^25\)
Perhaps the last sentence best describes the overall impression the planners wanted to make on others. It was an impression that stuck, for during the struggle to achieve South African divestment in 1977 and the attempt to divest from weapons makers in 1982, students called upon ideas articulated by Patterson and Longsworth as the most important rationale for why the institution should divest. The passages in *The Making of a College* which led students to believe in the appropriateness of divestment proposals explains that Hampshire should become:

A laboratory for experimenting with economically feasible ways that the private liberal arts college can be a more effective intellectual and moral force in a changing culture. [And], A corporate citizen actively involved in community development, joining the life and welfare of the academic community with that of the world around it.26

By now, from the viewpoint of the school's first leaders, the aims of the college should be clear. Hampshire would see itself as an active institution willing to critically examine life both inside and outside its campus, make judgments of right versus wrong, and then act accordingly, that is, to be a place willing to make toughminded decisions whenever possible. From its inception, Hampshire wanted to set enormously demanding standards for itself. Yet, its founders would not shrink from them, for it was their belief that the college's institutional affairs and intellectual activity must be conducted virtuously. They
believed that these sorts of aspirations had been lost at some of the country's most prestigious colleges and universities for some time.

**Part Five: Implementing the Plan; the Development of Institutional Tension Within the Character of the College**

Unrelated to any proposed methodological concept of the curriculum for the college, but nevertheless having a tremendous influence on its eventual shape, was Patterson's and other's decision to allow the newly hired faculty, administration and staff to design a great deal of the educational program. This decision was not happenstance but considered the appropriate means by which the reformed liberal arts college and new ways of knowing would arise. Consequently, the particular mix of individuals who came to Hampshire to work had a tremendous amount to do not only with the college's curriculum but also with its future character. For reasons too numerous to list or even possible to completely explain, faculty and students interested in the potential impact of Hampshire College espoused a different analysis of society's problems than the original founding group. The tensions centered around the kinds of knowledge which were to be imparted to the students. The differences did not end with an analysis of society but included fundamental differences when
interpreting America's past and how it influences the future. How to achieve the amelioration of education and society was also viewed differently by the two groups. These differences would surface again within the conflicts between pro and anti-divestment groups in 1982.

At the same time that Patterson and the trustees proposed ideas and methods from their position of ultimate authority, particularly regarding how the institution was perceived externally, the faculty pushed their own set of interpretations and proposals from the equally strong position of internal authority, that is, by being able to define how things would be daily structured. Mark Whittow, a Hampshire graduate whose division III analyzes the college's historical origins, refers to this decision making tension as "top-down" versus "bottom-up." His division III work offers insight into what was, from its inception, a peculiar kind of institutional tension. Part of his research included interviews with Hampshire's original faculty members who actually planned and implemented the program. Whittow discovered through his interviews that many of Hampshire's founding faculty had an orientation towards "what should be done" regarding the development of a new liberal arts philosophy that was quite different from that of the trustees and the original administration, including the president. One way to see the differences is
by exploring the different ways the top and bottom viewed American society. As we will see, society's future needs, from the perspective of the former, are the causes of the current problems as perceived by the latter.

On the one hand, Hampshires founders, beginning with Charles Cole and Harold Johnson, and the foundations that offered to support the venture, had a vision that Hampshire ought to be a model institution for the future where efficiency and the most modern applications of knowledge would be provided at the lowest cost possible.\textsuperscript{27} The "knowledge" these men had in mind accepted the status quo forms, arrangements and myths of America's economic and political life.\textsuperscript{28} They understood the future to be one of rapidly changing fields of knowledge, computers, and technology. Accepting these premises, the educated person should be able to adapt to the shifting conditions that arise when the processes of a technologically oriented world are constantly changing. This modern liberal arts graduate would be considered an "elite technocrat" serving as a manager of other worker-laborers who lacked such a "specialized and expert" education.\textsuperscript{29}

While those on the "top," trustees and administrators, assumed much about the nature of the American society without question, many of the founding faculty believed the nation needed to undergo revolutionary change to solve the
inherent problems associated with corporate capitalism, an impotent political system, and the alienating experiences associated with work life in massive, institutional bureaucracies. Whittow explains that Hampshire's founding faculty argued that a new liberal arts knowledge must first analyze the American status quo and the various myths which shaped society and its members, then illustrate their harmfulness, and finally articulate different standards and means by which to live.

From their position, the faculty proposed to organize knowledge around the creation of a greater political participation for citizens, the establishment of a more socially just society, and the conversion of the economy from a commercialist, profit-minded society to one more socialist. Furthermore, the faculty disputed the dichotomy between workers and managers, one presumed to exist by the trustees, and espoused a philosophy of cooperative enterprises. Once having addressed these issues, they maintained, it would then make sense, or even be possible, to solve the problems associated with technology.

The faculty simply did not worry about whether graduates would take up positions as elite managers in the rapidly changing, ever more technically sophisticated society. As far as professional careers went, faculty generally assumed that if someone graduated from Hampshire
he or she would be quite capable of finding employment to meet the basic requirements for food, home, and expenses. They were concerned that lives be made meaningful through socially redeeming work, and authentic contributions to the world.

Once the original planning had been completed and the college opened its doors, Whittow argues that the newly created liberal arts program reflected neither a strictly top-down nor a bottom-up definition of things. Rather, those all-important concepts, along with others, existed in a state of unresolved tension and paradox. In his division III exam Whittow inquired into the elements informing this tension. His investigation revealed that the most fundamental kind of conflict arises between top-down and bottom-up approaches over an interpretation of the meaning of politics. Two prominent social scientists during the period of Hampshire's founding are used to illustrate the special tension which developed. It is one between the value of experts versus that of participation.

... it is not who rules, but how one rules that counts.30

Daniel Bell

It is impossible to become engaged or usefully to identify when one cannot initiate and have a say in deciding.31

Paul Goodman
Whittow argues that Bell's thesis, assumed by Patterson and the trustees, places greatest importance on the results of rulership, that is, on what gets decided. Bell is more interested in the role played by experts who are "... taught the proper technique through the study of method, or conceptual inquiry, so as to be able to meet the crises and changes that will occur in the polity."32

Goodman, whose view is representative of faculty and students, believes that prior to the evaluation of what constitutes successful results, an informing question arises over who participated in the formulation of decisions. While the two views are not directly opposed to one another, each tends to view the role of decision making in a different manner. Politically speaking, the differences are irreconcilable. What is incorporated into the Hampshire identity (and what will be made clear later) is a conflict between these two different political aesthetics. In part, the country's turbulent social milieu during the late sixties and early seventies made this possible. Those who wanted to make the college the most politically critical institution possible were often met by a "liberal tolerance" from the administrative decision makers who gave final approval. And, while Hampshire's institutional leaders often granted more than what any other trustees and administrators were willing to allow at other institutions,
from the students' and faculty's perception, it was never enough. 33

It had been an assumption of the original New College Plan that faculty and students would participate in proposing ideas and deciding, along with trustees and administration, who were ultimately responsible, new guidelines and procedures for operating a liberal arts college that would remain on the "cutting edge." However, this special liberal arts pursuit, one originally set forth by the planners and then put into practice by the faculty and students, could not occur because of a peculiar tension unforeseen by both groups. The tension is accurately described by Mark Whittow when he writes: "The planning of Hampshire College was shaped by two kinds of restraints: the context imposed from without and the vision of those within." 34

What Hampshire became was a peculiarly American college, one possessing all the extremes--good and bad--that that implies. The work of Louis Hartz, author of The Liberal Tradition in America, is helpful when identifying the dominant characteristics of the society from which Hampshire was created, ones which affected how it was shaped.
Part Six: The Influence of Liberalism on the Creation of Educational Context

As a culture, the United States was founded upon the liberal ideals of the individual and society espoused by John Locke in the seventeenth century; it is a political ideology defined as liberalism. The hallmark of liberalism, Hartz argues, is a belief in individualism, the axle upon which everything else turns. This was no less true at Hampshire than within the whole of American life. Hartz shows that critical among liberalism's effects in the United States is an inability to conceptualize ways of thinking other than liberalism. The creators of Hampshire, nurtured in American society, could not help but stamp Hampshire with aspects of liberalism. For example, at the center of the Hampshire design is the autonomous individual. Robert Birney, Hampshire's first dean of the school of social science, posits the fundamental principle of Hampshire College:

> It is that responsibility for the educational program and accomplishments of the student [that] must be dramatically shifted from the faculty member and the institution to the student, who must learn the arts of exercising such responsibility.35

The cornerstone of the Lockian liberal model is the autonomous individual. From this foundation, liberalism then posits that society is best served by isolated individuals competing in the economic free market place; wherein
innate desires are satisfied and thus the social good as well. The glue which holds the parts of society together is the legally binding contractual relationships established between individuals. The multitudinous interactions between individuals are regulated by a politics more akin to the administration of government than by individuals participating democratically, such as the New England Town Meeting model. To summarize: most Americans believe, Hartz argues, that the philosophy of self-interest is the most beneficial to all.

The founders were also committed to creating a community of closely knit and lasting relationships, however, it too had Lockian underpinnings. The Lockian form of community which developed at Hampshire was grounded in the individual student, one left alone with his/her own mind in the pursuit of an education mediated by faculty in a contractual relationship. Whittow describes the context.

It was a system based on the liberal model of relationships; the students were seen as isolated beings in terms of their academic progress. They negotiated contracts with faculty, who would judge their performance. Those judges would be managed by the administration to provide the optimum education.36

This liberal model does not foster a social structure of community where learning can be collaborative. Competition over faculty's time calls for aggressiveness rather than cooperation. In terms other than the student's education, community was generally discouraged. A common space where
a large body of people could meet was eliminated early on in design of the college's buildings. In the residential houses where, in the New College Plan, learning and living was to be fostered through a meeting of faculty and students in a community, such activities were not encouraged very much. Plans for an idealistic community, noble in theory, had difficulty getting realized when they were undercut by so many individuals acting as advocates for their own interests.

To a certain extent, the founders did accomplish educational innovations that furthered lifelong learning, enabling undergraduates to ask their own questions about what was most important to learn and integrating fields of knowledge in new ways. These achievements notwithstanding, the college could not transplant its educational innovations out of the liberal context, where individualism and social atomism became dominant ways of thinking. Instead of creating a climate which fostered individual uniqueness as well as the rich social variety, Hampshire discovered what Hartz claimed was America's preeminent condition, that of social atomism. He explains it this way:

Here, then, is the master of assumption of American political thought: the reality of atomistic social freedom. It is instinctive to the American mind, as in a sense the concept of the polis was instinctive to Platonic Athens or the concept of the church to the mind of the middle ages.
Another way of interpreting the influence of liberalism on Hampshire is by addressing the means and ends of a student's educational purpose. Recall that one of the most important aspects of Hampshire's mission was to change American higher education. *The Making of a College* is the summary of the New College Plan as well as the educational philosophy designed to achieve that goal. Both documents, however, are a treatment of educational means and not ends. The means were always discussed in terms of process. The ends of that process, on the other hand, were simply taken for granted. Similar to the liberal ideal of a philosophy based upon a "state of nature," Hampshire simply presumed the fact of autonomous students and the individual's future career in society. Whittow argues that the liberal Hampshire assumption was that an individual's ends are given; in the societal sense that every person desires the same thing, to be an "elite technocrat." Consequently, the goals of what a Hampshire educational experience would be were not raised as an issue of importance. Instead, they were to be realized in a personal or idiosyncratic way. Just as Patterson and Longsworth failed to critically address the causes of society's problems, (for example, assuming that all technology was fine, simply make it humanistic), the ends of what is to be learned and taught at Hampshire also remain presumed. Therefore, the
institution's educational process, the means, become the ends of what is sought. Rather than evaluate the critical content of what it is they will do, Whittow explains that:

... what they say or do is decided by the role they hold. Although they may refer to themselves as "economists," "biologists," or "political scientists," they become speech writers, market researchers, program designers and interpreters.38

What is important to understand about the tensions that arose within the institution, ones which have continued to appear throughout its history, is that from its beginning, Hampshire has attracted faculty, students, administrators and trustees who have come to the school in order to specifically examine idealistic ends rather than process oriented means. That is, some individuals understood the dominance of means and have anxiously awaited any opportunity to go beyond them seeking to redefine and change the ends.

Two aspects of Hampshire's founding are worth repeating because of their influence has set a definite tone for students attending the institution. First, the social climate during the time Hampshire was created was one of great civil turmoil, particularly in higher education. The years between 1965-1970, when the planning of Hampshire was being carried out, were years of constant campus unrest and protest--sometimes violent--waged by students with some support of faculty. Demands were usually
directed at the administration and trustees to change certain educational practices or to join with other institutions to pressure the American government to change its domestic or foreign policy.

In some respects, the design of Hampshire can be interpreted as a response to these difficult times. Establishing an educational institution that would enable and allow students to act and express themselves in a supportive, as opposed to a strife-ridden, or even violent, environment was a chief aim of the founders. Reduced to its critical elements, the context of the college was one born out of a dissatisfaction with the present set of arrangements; it was assumed that through a different form of liberal arts education the desired changes could be arrived at without having to endure so much campus unrest.

The faculty created an educational program which encouraged students to critique the systemic structure of society, forward a new vision and plan, and then set about taking the steps needed to change it. The faculty and students assumed that the college's idealism would be equal to the institution explained by Patterson in *The Making of a College*. As an "Activist" institution, it was also assumed that the institution would fall into step in support of the plan originating from the critique. (In fact, the college
should reform itself first, so argued the pro-divestment positions in 1977 and 1982.)

The second principle combining with the preceding that established Hampshire's special brand of educational mission was the emphasis placed on individual initiative, responsibility for learning, and the expectation to continue applying oneself to this activity throughout life. To quote Patterson, writing in The Making of a College, Hampshire's "constant intellectual goal is to enlarge the capability of each student to conduct his own education." The philosophy constituted at Hampshire then is that the two aspects of its unique, liberal arts mission would dovetail with one another. Call it "lifelong activism." Hampshire would be the place to practice it.

Part Seven: Characteristics of a Particular Kind of Student

The final part of the chapter shifts from the identifying characteristics of the institution to that of the students who attended the college. To begin, no one or two character traits can be attributed to all Hampshire students. Hampshire students are not unlike the majority of upper middle class, white American youth who are at college, away from home, living on their own for the first time. The general campus environment promotes intellectual ideas and opportunities for personal growth and change.
The institution usually provides food service, housing, and a pleasant environment in which to live. More often than not, the parents of students manage to pay the majority of the costs of a college education.

A great many influences outside the academic experience of college encourage students to take on adult responsibilities. This is especially true at Hampshire. The institution itself makes such a claim on the future development of students by setting forth these kinds of expectations in the admissions literature: the message is do not come if you do not think you can handle being an adult or assume your own personal responsibility. Along with being pushed to take on these new responsibilities of adulthood, students are being exposed, usually for the first time, to intellectual issues that they are expected to grasp quickly and take as seriously as other adults supposedly do. In this regard, Hampshire declared itself to be noteworthy, stating that a living space and academic program organized around the principle of freedom was available, but only for the exceptionally mature student, one prepared to accept full responsibility for his or her own education and personal life.

Realistically speaking, young people twenty years of age are not fully mature adults by the standards of American society. While the rhetoric may presume
adulthood, there remains a few years before a seasoned maturity develops. This situation is influenced by the particular backgrounds of students, which also play a part in their relationship to the school. Tuition and expenses are high at Hampshire, over $10,000 a year in 1982, and almost $14,000 in 1985. The background is a privileged one where job security, income, housing, medicine, food, vacations, automobiles and personal conveniences are usually assumed rather than being struggled to achieve.

Another characteristic of the Hampshire student body is that slightly more than half of the students come from families of divorced parents. This generalization explains that even though many privileged youngsters do not lack material wants, their life experiences are not always happy, or well adjusted. At Hampshire, which is not unlike many other schools in this instance, the psychological services staff are kept very busy with students having difficulty maintaining a healthy self-image.

The Hampshire student is influenced by a blend of factors which undoubtedly contributed to the events of spring, 1982. In the first place, with such a privileged background, the student had the financial means to have a variety of choices at his/her disposal; this informs a certain inclination to exercise independent thought and action while not having to be fully responsible. Next, take away
any parental authority that existed and add instead a new living environment, one that promotes self-definition of any and all choices to be made concerning appropriate versus inappropriate behavior. The majority of Hampshire students live in apartments and therefore cook, clean, organize and define their private lives on their own or along with other students with whom they live. The point is that much of their time and activities remain unstructured. The academic component, as already noted, places the student largely on his or her own concerning questions such as the matter and means of study. In conclusion, two examples are offered as reflective of how family background, a campus environment, academic program and the context of individualism may periodically manifest themselves. These examples prepare us to understand the extremes to which the actions of Hampshire students could range during the divestment events in 1982.

In spring, 1978, the Amherst Police Department had reason to believe that cocaine was being used and distributed to a small number of students at Hampshire. An undercover investigation was conducted and late one Sunday evening the police made a surprise visit onto the campus, raiding a number of apartments where suspected drug-related activity was taking place. Cocaine was found and individuals were arrested; trials were held, some were found
innocent, others guilty and some students even served jail sentences. Not surprisingly, in response to this incident, most Hampshire students protested the abuse of students' rights by the police. Many students believed that under no circumstances did the police have the legal right to be able to enter either the campus or their apartments in search of anything considered to be against the law. In short, the place was simply off limits because it was: "Hampshire and all the things which that stands for."

Their assumption was that Hampshire existed as a totally separate entity from the rest of society. Though not all students believed this, many expressed anger and dismay that the police had such power to make the arrests.

The year before, a different kind of incident arose at the college. The issue pertained to stock investments in companies with ties to South Africa. With support from the majority of the faculty, a group of students proposed that the trustees divest $44,000 worth of stock from American companies conducting business in South Africa. The trustees initially decided against divesting, so approximately twenty students occupied the administration building for a few days. After a series of negotiations, it was agreed that stocks would be sold. The students soon departed and heralded the event as the first achievement of
South African stock divestment on a college or university campus.

Hampshire is an institution dominated by a peculiar set of conflicting tensions; in a sense, they crystallize the larger tensions that periodically appear in society. At Hampshire, the founding trustees and administrators pushed the college to educate students to become tomorrow's leaders in a technologically oriented society where new knowledge about what the future would be rapidly occurring: to grasp the future was to grasp success. However, the faculty and students resisted this push desiring instead to pull the college back to the present in order to understand the past and thus successfully solve present problems. Given the degree to which the pushing and pulling over ideas and practices conflicted within the institutional context, it was inevitable that an issue such as apartheid and divestment would be taken up and struggled over by Hampshire. Likewise, five years later, it was inevitable that the disturbing and difficult to solve problem of nuclear weapons and spiraling militarism would also become an all consuming issue within the college. The strains within Hampshire are such that they will always find, before others, the issues of ethical complexity either within the institution or the society.
Unlike other institutions of higher education, what is especially peculiar about what transpires on the Hampshire campus is the way in which people of opposing views interact with each other. Because the community embodies the extreme nature of the American spirit, there exists the possibility for actions that are extraordinarily good, or thoughtful, as well as those which may be mean spirited, or thoughtless. It is a condition, I believe, that is informed more by coincidence of historical circumstances (establishing a mainstream liberal arts college during a cultural period that embraced the liberal ideals and liberating mores of the sixties), rather than by a specific design undertaken by certain types of people. To comprehend what can potentially happen at Hampshire, which will become clear in the case study, is to understand certain aspects of the student culture during the 1960s.

The attitudes of the sixties that inform events occurring at Hampshire include a political idealism concerning a commitment to make the world better, as well as believing that certain actions within one's reach will accomplish whatever the goal is. That aside, it is the approach individuals take to see those idealistic goals realized where matters differ most. For the sake of generalizing, at Hampshire and during the sixties, there are two approaches taken to achieve this idealism. On the
one hand there are individuals who are willing to "work within the system," as it is often said, and try the best they can to lead noble lives. Kind-hearted, hard-working, sensitive to the feelings of others and interested in serving the public good, these persons bring much happiness and constructive contributions to a troubled world by their efforts at social change. On the other hand, there is another approach that believes one's efforts at social change must be distrustful of authority and always "attacking the system from the outside." However, what causes events at Hampshire to sometimes reach extraordinarily ugly extremes is the pervasive amount of self-indulgent individualism that often accompanies that aspect of the protest-oriented, sixties culture.

The social context of the sixties was also perpetuated in the general interests of the Hampshire community. If the average college student body gets excited over how well their sports teams are doing, at Hampshire, it is the protest-to-the-administration banner that marks a student's rite of passage. And, given the faculty's tendency to uninvolve itself and the administration's noncommittal response, it has been the accepted norm that militant confrontation is the only appropriate means by which to approach those administrators and trustees holding positions of authority. Subsequently, both on and off campus,
Hampshire students often involved themselves in thoughtful and thoughtless kinds of protest talk, movements and actions. Perhaps one of the clearest ways to imagine what the Hampshire student community is like arises out of a suggestion a friend once made to me concerning actions the trustees could take if the college ever really got into dire straights financially. Along with being a college, the campus could, for an admission fee, open itself to the public as a sixties amusement park. In the late 1980s one could drive through and see people wearing long hair and going barefooted in below freezing weather, observe a variety of protests and occupations of the president's office along with an overabundant experimentation with sex and drugs.

As explained earlier in the chapter, the liberal arts ideology formed at Hampshire is an intensely individualistic one. There is an exceptional, at times unhealthy, toleration for individuals to make their own statements. What has compounded this condition and its potential for irrational, self-indulgent actions, is the fact that in the 1980s cultural norms exist that are far different than those of the 1960s. Hence, there can sometimes be an unreal sense of trying to reverse time which results in an added sense of frustration. Perhaps this was somewhat the case during the 1982 spring semester. It is
perhaps more than simply coincidence that the ten students who became the most militant antagonists during the divestment crisis were also the writers, directors and actors in the school's spring dramatic production of "The 1968 Chicago Seven Conspiracy Trial." It is a story filled with the abuses of power by a judge as well as numerous forms of militant and self-indulgent actions committed by political "revolutionaires."

The posture both of these kinds of actions take were in evidence during the ensuing crisis over the attempt to achieve weapons divestment. Events will demonstrate that at Hampshire there still exists an overwhelming urge by those pushing for social change to adopt certain character traits from the sixties, ones which are usually unreasonably distrustful of people in positions of authority, and, ultimately self-destructive to the proposed agenda for social action. This is not to say, however, that noble and thoughtful deeds were not in the play or are not to be found throughout the case study events being studied. They not only are present but they make a meaningful difference in the outcome.

The next chapter takes up in more detail the development of the South African divestment movement, conflicting views on its effects, and then, explains the most recent attempt by Hampshire students to begin another
societal divestment movement on college campuses, one that would hopefully change not only the institution but the nation in which it exists.
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A phrase borrowed from Hannah Arendt used to describe the way in which we live our daily lives. Central to what informs all of our actions are the "habits and prejudices" we possess. Hannah Arendt, The Life of the Mind, Volume Two--Willing (New York: Harcourt Brace Janovitch, 1977), p. 166.


Evidence of a college's stature, and where prestigious colleges take great interest, is typically found in college guides. During its first few years Hampshire was ranked "Highly Selective." Since then, however, it has been redefined as "Moderately Selective."


Ibid., pp. 33-34.

Ibid., p. 34.

Ibid.
Besides the desire to add an experimenting institution to the four already present, there was also interest in exploring new ways to finance a liberal arts education. This interest was due to the research of an Amherst College economics professor who explained to Charles Cole that the coming decade would not allow for the necessary financial growth of higher education and therefore more efficient expenditures of money would be required of institutions. The New College was envisioned as the institution which would pioneer novel approaches to greater economic efficiency. Whittow, "The Social, Political and Intellectual Origins of Hampshire College: A Study in Education and History," p. 28.


30 Ibid., p. 76.

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid.

33 Ibid., see Whittow's discussion of the administration's failure to support a Women's Program after considerable financial and organizational planning had been done, pp. 79-98.

34 Ibid., p. 32.

35 Patterson and Longsworth, The Making of a College, p. 95, n. 67.


There are two aspects to the founding of Hampshire which corroborate the point. First, one of the reasons for the initial interest in founding a new college in the Amherst area was due to faculty dissatisfaction and protest over existing educational practices. The attempt was to solve conflicts that were detrimental to the already existing institutions. Second, there was a conflict during the very first days of the college, in 1965, when Longsworth was coordinating the activities of the newly formed institution. The example offers illumination of the ideological conflicts that were at the root of the institutional nature of Hampshire. A student advisory group was formed and asked to submit ideas and plans for the future college. Comprised of many from the local SDS chapter, the students offered a critique of the present educational forms being practiced in the Amherst area and suggested ways the new college could redefine the purposes of a college education. The response from the faculty advisory committee was shock and outrage. This incident sparked the first conflict and protest of Hampshire's history. The institution was literally only a few months old. For more details, see Whittow, "The Social, Political and Intellectual Origins of Hampshire College: A Study in Education and History," p. 32.

David Schuman deserves recognition for such a humorous and insightful idea.

For example, an exorcist was once hired by the college to drive the demons out of a new building; this was done because two faculty members were not getting along with each other and one of them believed the reason for this had to do with the building being possessed by spirits. A male student once "gave" his girlfriend to another male friend for a night as a birthday present; complications from this event led to a violent fight a week later. On another occasion mice were killed during a television show produced by students on the school's cable television network; this was done "for the sake of art," the dean of students was told later. And most recently, spring, 1986, an already accepted freshman for the coming fall who had dropped out of high school and was living with...
his brother, a presently enrolled student, killed himself in front of a viewing audience on the same cable television show. This sad, bizarre and extreme act was accomplished by drinking strychnin as the final statement in a performance that consisted of a ten minute monologue ranting about how awful life, society and the Hampshire administration were. These examples are offered not as a statement of what the college's student norm is, but rather, as an indication of the outrageous extremes to which the community is accustomed. This is why, regrettably, that people both within and outside the college, upon hearing of these bizarre occurrences, simply say, "Oh, that's typical Hampshire."
CHAPTER IV

THE NATURE DIVESTMENT

Why disengage? U.S. banks and corporations maintain a total $14.6 billion investment in South Africa. Foreign investment has been the glue that has held apartheid intact.¹

Jean Sindab

The social and cultural as well as economic dynamism that accompanies capitalism is the surest solvent of superstitions and irrationalities like apartheid. South Africa needs more of what sanctions would diminish. It needs foreign capital operating under rules of racial justice written in the nations from which the capital comes.²

George F. Will

The first half of Chapter Four examines the development of the divestment movement concerning American companies or governments engaged in economic activity in South Africa. The chapter's purpose is not to settle the debate about whether or not divestment is the best way for Americans to help solve the apartheid problem. Rather, I am more interested in identifying characteristics about the movement: its history, the strategies employed by those seeking and opposing divestment, and particular accomplishments and how they have been perceived by the higher education community. Having done this, we will be better able to judge how the 1982 divestment effort at Hampshire fits into a larger history. The second half of the chapter begins to tell that story.
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Part One: South African Divestment: What It Is and How It Began

The most well known divestment issue in the United States, both historically and currently, concerns American government and business interests in the nation of South Africa. In a Time magazine article, the pro-divestment position was articulated by Reverend Joseph Lowery, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. He explains the matter this way: "People who own stock in companies that do business in South Africa become indirect participants in the repression."3 His is a position based upon moral reasoning which, strictly interpreted, leaves no other recourse but divestment. Those opposed to stock divestment, the article explains, believe that "stock divestiture might salve the consciences of many Americans but would do nothing to help South African blacks."4 Speaking on behalf of the anti-divestment position, the President of Harvard University, Derek Bok, comments that the "advocates of stock divestiture are counseling us to run from evil rather than work to overcome it."5 Bok's reasoning stems from a pragmatic respect for the practical realities affecting South African blacks and whites alike. If you leave entirely, you relinquish all opportunity to improve the situation.
American higher education has played the leading role in the divestment issue since the beginning of the anti-apartheid movement in the United States. The origins of the movement in this country are found in the creation of the American Committee on Africa (ACOA), which was instituted in 1953. The ACOA declared thirty-three years ago that development loans and invested capital in South Africa made by the American government and business interests were supporting a way of life beneficial to the minority of whites and debilitating to the black majority. Their proclamation called for the American government and United States business interests to cease their South African involvement; individuals and other institutions were also expected to withdraw support from corporations that continued operating in South Africa. Although a few churches originally acted upon the ideas forwarded by the American Committee on Africa, it was not until the early 1960s that students and the educational community became involved. The history of the movement's development in higher education is understood by tracing certain historical events which occurred in South Africa itself.

The Sharpesville massacre occurred in 1960 when South African police killed sixty-nine people protesting regulations (called pass laws) that restrict freedom of movement. In a few places across the United States this
event inspired community, church and student actions in protest of the massacre. The most substantial event, when considering the extent of organization and numbers of participants, took place when Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) organized a protest on Wall Street against Chase Manhattan Bank for loans it had made to the South African government. After 1960, all remained relatively quiet regarding divestment until 1976. In the wake of the Soweto uprising, a black township in which protest turned into riots leaving many blacks either killed, injured or arrested by South African police, there began to occur a few successful divestment actions on college and university campuses. Student groups both in the United States and in South Africa formed alliances of one kind or another; from that point on the locus of the divestment campaign in the United States remained primarily on the campuses of colleges and universities.

An article published by The Africa Fund, "Economic Action Against Apartheid," traces the origins of the divestment movement up to the present. Closely associated with ACOA, and existing as one of their umbrella groups, the African Fund explains this history from the pro-divestment perspective. Regarding divestment and higher education, the Report states that:
The first college divestment, in April of 1977, followed a building occupation by students at Hampshire College. That Hampshire was first is not surprising, for innovative actions in a social movement are frequently accomplished under propitious political and social circumstances, where minimum resistance is anticipated and encountered. Hampshire is a small college in a rural section of western Massachusetts known as the Five College Area. Set in a region noted for the special atmosphere generated by the proximity of several liberal schools, Hampshire was in its first decade of existence as a progressive educational alternative [when divestment occurred]. And the amount of money at stake was only $40,000.6

In 1977 there were only three colleges in the United States that divested some or all of their investments from companies with ties to South Africa. All three were located in the Five College Amherst area.7 At Hampshire, the components for divestment were: good conditions regarding sympathies of the members of the community and surrounding environment, little financial risk and a willingness to take extraordinary steps to achieve the desired ends. By 1981 all five of the institutions had accomplished some form of divestment. The report states that, "Successful actions provide impetus for future divestments, especially among neighboring or closely related institutions."8 Outside of the five college area the divestment movement was not as successful, and total divestment from South African related firms became increasingly difficult even at Smith and Amherst where only partial divestment has been accomplished to this date.9
Out of the approximately 3,000 institutions of higher education in the United States, by 1985 only 52 had engaged in some form of divestment related to South Africa, or 1.7%. Sixteen have chosen total divestment, while the remaining thirty-six have only partially divested.

Part Two: Strategies Used in the Development of Divestment as a Means of Social Change

While assessing the historical achievements of the divestment movement and lauding the vigorous leadership efforts on the part of students, the report concludes that the divestment objective has eluded most. The interpretation is summarized in the following:

This reflects the resistance of fiscally conservative trustees. Despite evidence to the contrary, trustee arguments presented against divestment express the fear of increased transaction costs or losses due to the purchase of volatile investments in a restricted universe of potential stocks. Trustees are also concerned over the potential loss of endowments from corporate donors and alumni donors who have close ties to companies which would be affected by adoption of a divestment policy. Indeed, many trustees themselves are on the boards of such companies.10

With these difficulties in mind, the report concentrates on student strategies used to overcome the imbalance of authority between themselves and the trustees of an institution. Proceeding undeterred, students on those campuses where divestment efforts were made established a
two-step approach to raising the divestment issue and then proposing it to the trustees.

First, a well researched look at the institution's investment portfolio and the companies involved in South Africa was undertaken; special emphasis was placed upon explaining how South African Invested stocks could be sold while maintaining fiduciary responsibility, that is, without sustaining a loss in revenue; (a law, "fiduciary responsibility," trustees are legally bound to uphold). Also, students entered into negotiations with college or university officials and became skilled at refuting the standard arguments made by trustees that American companies are a progressive influence in South Africa and that withdrawal would be detrimental to the black population.\(^1\)

The second approach, one that occurs concomitantly with the first, is staged outside the administrative setting, that is, throughout the campus at large. The report explains that students "learned that since trustees do not feel answerable to students, they had to conduct campaigns aimed at bringing trustee decisions before public scrutiny and into public question."\(^2\) Therefore, demonstrations were organized to "induce" administrators and trustees to change their previously held positions. To summarize, students became adroit at presenting carefully documented proposals while achieving the kind of public
support that encouraged trustees to vote for some form of divestment, either partial or total.

It was during a period in the early 1980s when there was little international outcry or campus protests against apartheid that the divestment effort, so argues the report's findings, changed from being primarily a membership made up of students to one that included faculty association and involvement. The divestment struggle at Western Michigan University illuminates this change in strategy. WMU was one of the few schools to accomplish divestment between the years of 1981-83. Their efforts are illustrative of the divestment methods that have been employed since then and including, in part, those at Hampshire in 1982. Persons involved with the initial divestment efforts at WMU began by lobbying the trustees. They learned soon enough, however, that any change would take a great deal of persistence. The trustees, initially unsympathetic to the divestment act for all the standard reasons, principally those of financial risk and the compromise of academic neutrality, had changed their minds by 1983, eventually voting for total divestment.

The two critical factors contributing to this change of view were: 1) Faculty involvement, which was relatively more stable than the transient entering and exiting of the student population, and thus more able to
sustain the organized efforts required to accomplish tasks from year to year; and 2) the use of media as a form of leverage against those opposing divestment. Media manipulation is an even more potent tool for social change than faculty participation, states the African report. The following example illustrates the creation of a situation in which trustees were moved from a position of intransigence to one receptive to divestment. The report states that:

In the spring of 1981, the students again insisted on presenting their position to a reluctant trustees' meeting, this time followed by TV cameras and armed with a resolution condemning apartheid. A Black trustee supported their demand that the board pass the resolution, and, with TV cameras rolling, there was little else they could do.13

In the telling of the WMU history, it was that incident which fundamentally shifted the divestment movement there from one of potential failure to success. Momentum began to build. Faculty who supported divestment called upon the WMU faculty senate to vote for divestment, which it did. The academic community was now behind the movement. The trustees felt "pushed" enough to pass a partial divestment policy in 1981 and 1982. The report concludes that what finally pushed WMU to total divestment was a successful effort being waged simultaneously by other groups at the state government level that would require all state institutions of higher education to divest. The effect
brought about by groups unified into one large lobbying block from across the state was overwhelming. In 1982 the state bill was signed into law. With little else to lose, WMU trustees consented to total divestiture the following year.

This concept of "linkage" between all kinds of investment groups is, after faculty involvement and use of the media, the third step in a developing strategy for achieving divestment. "Linkage" may at times include other institutions of higher education, such as religious organizations, social action lobbying groups affiliated with the various levels of government, or private citizens. In the past, campus reactions would occur only after violence broke out in South Africa. In 1983, however, there were virtually no incidents of the kind which in the past had become the focus of the international media, and consequently raised the divestment crescendo.

The American Committee on Africa, drawing on what they perceived were divestment actions "spontaneously generated by consolidating and connecting campus groups," took what appeared to be a naturally, although unconnected, coalition one step further by nationally organizing divestment efforts among campus groups. This achievement is one of the reasons (along with continued atrocities in South Africa) why divestment against apartheid has remained on the agenda of colleges and universities and why the
increase in dollars divested has skyrocketed since 1984. It is also why divestment has gained greater acceptance as a means of promoting change.\textsuperscript{15}

The report maintains that the ACOA accomplished this change by first sponsoring organizational conferences intended to establish a national network for research and strategy. At the fall 1983 conference, plans were laid to hold national rallies in 1984 on the anniversay dates of the Sharpeville Massacre and the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Since the fall of 1983, and especially after the events initiated that year reached their fruition in 1984, apartheid and divestment have become an ever increasing issue on college and university campuses.

\textbf{Part Three: What Have Been the Effects of Divestment?}

Yet, what evidence is there that the South African divestment movement, once implemented, will assist in the eventual collapse of the economy that made apartheid possible in the first place? In other words, is the South African divestment movement achieving its desired effect?

The African Fund report contends that the answer to the question is an unqualified yes. The most recent analysis, published in the early summer, 1985, suggests that the strategy of divestment has applied pressure on the South African government, particularly financially, that has
brought about social change. The report offers as evidence many examples of the extent to which South African and American businesses are willing to expend both financial and political lobbying resources to dissuade American businesses, churches, educational institutions and individuals from adopting the divestment approach. The words of John Chettle, a South African citizen registered in the United States as a "foreign agent" with the South African Foundation, an anti-divestment organization, substantiates this claim by the African Fund. In 1983, Chettle predicted the impossibility of any successful American divestment legislation. However, in an interview with Financial Mail in February of 1985, Chettle said the following:

In one respect at least, the divestment forces have already won. They have prevented, discouraged, dissuaded, whatever you call it, billions of dollars of new U.S. investments in South Africa. They have discouraged new companies, new investors who were looking for foreign opportunities from coming to South Africa.

The report augments Chettle's statement concluding that his views are borne out by financial analysis. The Financial Mail commented that trade has stagnated in South Africa since 1980, with fully twenty to thirty U.S. companies abandoning the South African market and only eleven new firms moving in. Further corroboration of this point is made in the financial forecast made by the Business Environment Risk Information (BERRI SA). The report
summarizes the recent appraisal of BERRI concerning South African investing, "... recommending against long commitments in a country which it sees as approaching high operational risk and prohibitive political risk."\(^2^0\)

The report successfully argues that divestment works, at least in the sense of undermining longstanding economic foundations of the economy. However, it continues, one simply does not know the state of the future. Given the unpredictability of matters, the report contends that only the connected efforts of higher education, pension funds, and state and federal government spell success to the overall divestment campaign.

In summary then, participants in the pro-divestment movement believe that their efforts are having their intended effect. "Significant changes" have recently occurred, such as the repeal of "laws against racial intermarriage, recognized black labor unions, suspended forced resettlement of blacks to so-called native homelands and [legislation that] is now considering giving them the right to settle legally in white areas."\(^2^1\) Debate continues over whether "constructive engagement" or the imposition of economic sanctions, which can be interpreted as a mild form of divestment legislation, have been the leverage that has pressured the South African government to liberalize apartheid policies.
There is another view, however, which posits that divestment is only exacerbating the situation in South Africa. This position maintains that by businesses and government remaining in South Africa they are able to perform actions that help blacks. The Reagan Administration favors this view, termed "constructive engagement," and continues to press the South African government to reform its policy of apartheid.22

Evidence does exist indicating that the South African government responds to this approach. First, they have declared publicly that the policy of apartheid is oppressive, vowing to make reforms, in stages, until it is entirely dismantled. Second, some reforms have already been made while others are scheduled.

Between the two views, divestment and non-divestment, there exists a third alternative, the Sullivan Principles. Leon Sullivan, a Philadelphia minister, designed the principles in 1975 as a means for businesses to play a more constructive role in South African society. As a signatory of the Principles, the company (supposedly, for it does not always happen) endorses a set of four guidelines affecting rules and practices governing the workplace: equal wage scales between white and black workers, supervisory and management training for blacks, integration of all work facilities, and company actions
which aggressively oppose apartheid laws. In higher education, for example, Harvard University uses its $565 million worth of stock in companies operating in South Africa as leverage to induce companies to be signatories to the Sullivan Principles. Companies that adhere to the Sullivan Principles by their socially progressive practices of paying blacks and whites equal salaries for the same work, or training blacks for management positions, are technically in violation of apartheid laws. Corporations feel that by making this kind of positive contribution to the quality of life for South African blacks, they play a positive role by their presence in the country.

Educational programs, including scholarships to attend college in the United States, teacher training projects, and development of better housing programs, have significantly enhanced the conditions for some of the population. The adoption of the Sullivan Principles by American companies have made these and other changes possible.

The African Fund report, however, argues that on the whole, the Sullivan Principle serve more in the capacity of being an "antidote" for corporations not to have to disinvest, hence maintaining high profits, instead of actively opposing apartheid. The Fund report states that adherence to the Principles "allegedly qualifies U.S. companies to proclaim themselves a progressive influence in
countering apartheid. The Reverend Leon Sullivan, founder of the Sullivan Principles, states that his anti-apartheid goals are "actually in conjunction with" those proposing divestment legislation and action, and that the combination of the two pressures, divestment and companies adhering to the Sullivan Principles, together will "dismantle the system of apartheid."

It is difficult to draw conclusions about divestment and its effects. As a theory which posits a methodology for total economic change, I do not think divestment, alone, will succeed. However, when combined with a variety of other measures being pressed on the South African government, stock divestment from college or university endowments is proving to be an effective approach. What happens is not surprising: liberal arts colleges, by their investments in certain companies, receive publicity casting them in the same light with the companies who profit from contracts with an oppressive government. It is a government that on a regular basis is either responsible for, or allows, atrocities to occur on a massive scale. Perhaps the South African divestment struggle has worked like this: colleges get tired of the bad publicity surrounding trouble on their campuses as well as associations with an oppressive government. They announce their decision to cease investments in certain companies. The corporations,
sensitive to the publicity they are receiving in the news, eventually decide that they, too, are no longer interested in enduring an association within some cases, pictures of dying children. Companies decide to either curtail production, sign the Sullivan Principles, or pull out entirely. Increasingly, an exodus occurs: first the colleges then the corporations. Bad publicity is bad for business, no matter what kind it is.

Part Four: The Origins of an Anti-Weapons Divestment Movement in 1982

When storytelling, it is the particular, in a sense, that is paramount. An appropriate place then to begin is with particulars that lay the groundwork for what came later. By identifying the original participants in the story and knowing their concerns as well as actions, we can later evaluate the merits of the divestment act and, when possible, demystify its nature.

Since October of 1977, the college had divested its South Africa related stocks and had adopted the "Hampshire College Investment Policy," which included the creation of CHOIR (a trustee subcommittee which stands for Committee at Hampshire On Investment Responsibility) whose pledge was:

... not to make "investments which support activities whose impact is contrary to fundamental moral and ethical principles" as well as early definition of "social injury" by companies to be avoided in the portfolio.26
The story begins with one trustee, Cora Weiss, writing to another trustee, John Watts, who had previously sent Weiss and other members of CHOIR a *Michigan Law Review* article that argued against the use of socially responsible guidelines when managing investments. On March 10, 1981, trustee Weiss responds to Watts, beginning her letter with a touch of playful sarcasm—"I haven't forgotten you (how could I?) ..." Addressing the article sent by him, she then says,

I have asked someone, more expert than I, to read and comment on the article, and generally to comment on the discussion we've been having about the right of Trustees to act vis a vis our investments and corporate management. "I'd like to share Tim Smith's comments with you and the other members of the Committee and hope that we can ask the students who sit with us in CHOIR to consider what interests the students have at this moment in history in considering the role of investment and the military, perhaps specifically the nuclear military industry from research to testing to manufacture. That question is now before many Trustees of universities as well as churches as the threat of war looms with greater reality and the defense budget chokes the majority of social programs ... I would prefer to encourage students participation and initiative on this rather than our taking the lead. I can't believe that they don't care."

Although the point is obvious, it bears stating that at Hampshire, in March, 1981, the discussion of weapons related divestment as an institutional means of addressing their inherent social danger, was treated seriously. However, this was not the case, nor is it today, at other colleges. Other comments made in Cora Weiss' letter may be thought of as setting the stage for
later developments, specifically, her intention to ask the students on CHOIR the dramatic question concerning their "interests ... at this moment in history," particularly the matter of the nuclear military industry. In her conclusion, Weiss wonders about the degree to which students cared about the issue. This question is answered two trustee meetings later on October 23, 1981, when the CHOIR committee met again to discuss a motion made by Tom Stoner, the student representative to the board of trustees.28

The trustee minutes of that meeting do not record verbatim Stoner's proposed motion, yet it is possible to piece things together by citing the comments made by others. Seemingly, Stoner made a very general motion that CHOIR concern itself with evaluating a variety of investments and consider divesting in a number of areas--including government securities. The secretary of CHOIR, Allen Torrey, who also serves as Hampshire's treasurer, writes, "Discussion of the proposal and definition of terms ensued among several committee members."29 From the minutes of the meeting a wide-ranging discussion resulted with members attempting to classify the kinds of investments which they found potentially objectionable. It was suggested that four areas should be studied. These included nuclear power and weapons; securities of the United States government; companies operating in countries
considered to be in serious violation of basic human rights; and new directions for investment. Torrey, however, explained to everyone that the foundation to most endowment planning was government securities. He writes that Weiss eventually

... urged the proponents of the motion to prepare a statement containing a description of the social injury caused by these investments and suggested that they should include suggestions for providing equivalent income to offset any change in investments.30

At the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed that a proposal on at least two of the above issues be submitted for consideration at the January meeting.

Part Five: The Development of a Proposal to Divest the College's Investment Portfolio of Companies with Contracts with the Department of Defense to Make or Development Weapons; the Initial Involvement of the Dean of Students

The first formal divestment proposal regarding weapons contractors was submitted at the next trustees meeting, January 13, 1982. Tom Stoner explained that the research done by students supported, from their perspective, divestment from companies fulfilling weapons related defense contracts with the U.S. government. The list would consist of the 100 largest contractors; size being
determined by dollar volume. This rationale was based on
the fact that two-thirds of all weapons contracts are
carried out by the top one-hundred companies. The proposal
is prefaced by a review of campus activities the previous
spring concerning the college community's overwhelming
endorsement of the nuclear weapons freeze. The proposal
argues that the top one-hundred weapons companies "cause
enormous domestic and international social injury . . ."31
Divestment from those companies

. . . would signal to others our commitment to peace,
social justice and progress. Instead of pretending
that there is such a thing as a neutral institution, it
is necessary for academic institutions to maintain
their integrity by speaking out against the per¬
petuation of a militarized society.32

The dean of student's story begins with asking the
most basic kind of question. When did Michael Ford first
hear about a proposal to divest the college's investments
from weapons contractors?33 Ford recalls:

I guess my first involvement was a trustees meeting in
October a couple of years ago, when Tom Stoner pre¬
sented to the trustees a proposal that would have them
divest our moneys from all United States securities;
which would have meant student loans. It was a politi¬
cally disastrous proposal; it was met with derision
more than anything . . . I think that Tom simply
didn't understand that we couldn't tell the government
they're all messed up and then keep student's loans.
[As if to say], We don't want to buy into a kind of
militaristic set of government policies. It had, I
think, a genuine sort of concern for world peace and
for demilitarization, but it was illframed . . . I
talked to Tom at that meeting about ways he could revise
and reframe his proposal and present it anew. [Such
as] getting in touch with individuals both in the
college and on the board who'd be likely to help ... Well, that really was the first time I got involved with it.

The dean could have chosen not to encourage the students to pursue the case of proving social injury. In his position of responsibility he was well aware of the controversial nature of colleges taking political positions which violate the tradition of institutional neutrality. It is important to note then that the first decision he made concerned the choice of encouraging or discouraging the students to pursue the issue.

The minutes of the January CHOIR committee meeting, state that prior to this January meeting three community members attended a public meeting called to discuss the upcoming proposal. The exact number is recorded to indicate the small response at the time. In the discussion that ensued, trustee Watts reminded the committee that the "guidelines require the committee to make a finding of social injury and he suggested a motion to that effect." A vote on the proposal was taken and it failed to pass, two in favor and three opposed. After that vote students expressed a willingness to alter the proposal to one that called for divesting from only nuclear weapons contractors. That proposal also failed to pass.

While the students were disappointed that their proposal failed to pass at the January meeting, they were
not deterred. Within a couple of weeks after the January meeting, Tom Stoner had informed the secretary to the board of trustees that another proposal would be submitted to CHOIR at the March meeting. Mike Ford recalls the events of this period:

I'm not sure of what went on between January and March. I think probably a fair amount of research and work. I remember some conversations and I remember a couple of student meetings on the issue. It was not at that point a big hot topic. I don't think there were that many students involved.

One might gather from this quote that the dean was fairly uninformed about a potentially controversial activity involving some of his students. It was, however, as he explained, that divestment simply was not at that time an issue of concern for a majority of students, faculty or others.

The proposal considered by the CHOIR committee at their upcoming March meeting remains the focal point of divestment-related events occurring throughout the spring semester. This document illustrates the students' abiding belief in the socially injurious nature of Hampshire's investment policies and their commitment to doing something about it.

The proposal's title reads: "Social Injury and the Production of Weaponry--A Proposal to Divest the Endowment of Hampshire College from the Top 75 Weapons Manufacturers." The title page consists of three quotations. The first is
from a Hampshire student's Social Science Division I exam passed in spring, 1979. The writer explains that the military-industrial complex "... is a tremendous political and economic machine, upon which thousands of bureaucrats and millions of workers are supported ..."). 36 Further, converting this technology to peaceful purposes is a realistic alternative. Next is a quote from the noted English philosopher E. P. Thompson who proposes that "... we kill each other in euphemisms and abstractions long before the first missiles have been launched." 37 Last, and most importantly, there is an excerpt from Hampshire's own investment policy statement. Under "Definition of Social Injury" the text reads:

For the purpose of these guidelines, SOCIAL INJURY will be interpreted to mean: the injurious impact which the activities of a company are found to have on consumers, employees, or other persons, or the environment, particularly including activities which violate or frustrate the enforcement of rules of domestic or international law intended to protect individuals against deprivation of health, safety, or basic freedom. 38

The document begins with an explanation of CHOIR's founding in 1977; that it was created in response to concerns over investment in companies doing business in South Africa. Social injury was proven to have existed by those investments and was established as the standard for deciding ethical questions raised about investments. 39

Discussed next are events pertaining to the militarism
issue that occurred on campus during the preceding two years. Hampshire was the first college to pass the US-USSR Nuclear Weapons Freeze in April, 1981; this was explained as a springboard to the events that transpired in 1982. During that two year period, students, faculty, study groups and campus organizations considered a variety of issues relating to weapons productions, militarism, American involvement in Central American conflicts and students refusing to register for the draft. Moreover, the proposal would address the

... injurious impact the top 75 [companies] have upon the United States economy and citizens, the ways in which the top 75 have violated domestic policies and international law, the impact weapons production has on our environment, and the threat the top 75 have imposed on world peace ... In this proposal, we have singled out the top 75 corporations which receive contracts solely for weapons manufacture, rather than the broader issue of defense work per se. For example, this proposal does not target companies involved in the production of either oil, or uniforms for the Pentagon.40

Investment counselors will claim that a perfectly "clean" portfolio cannot exist. The question facing any investor is how "dirty" (the term used in investment jargon) can one's portfolio investments afford to be? The Hampshire proposal simply makes a judgment call at the number seventy-five. In short, there was no specific formula. Quite possibly, it may have been purely a pragmatic decision since the previous proposal, calling for the divestiture from one-hundred companies, did not pass. The collective thinking may have been that seventy-five
companies might appease those originally opposed to the idea of the proposal.

In the conclusion of the Introduction, the students declare their ultimate reasons for coming forth with such a proposal and for the necessity of the institution to take a stand, for example, to "... scrutinize what our own institution is doing to promote or retard fundamental human rights." The next ten pages of the proposal seek to establish evidence and/or proof of social injury. The reasons are framed around the following:

**Military Spending and Social Programs:** The argument is made that "defense spending in its present form is socially injurious because of its negative effect on domestic spending." The argument is made that "defense spending in its present form is socially injurious because of its negative effect on domestic spending."

**International Violations:** Arms sales by the United States are to countries with repressive governments, such as "Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran (under the Shah), Morocco, the Philippines, Taiwan and Thailand." These governments have "engaged in government sanctioned tortures and assassinations" and used their "security agencies for systematic terrorism against dissident groups."

**Domestic Influence of the Top 75:** The authors allege that the top seventy-five weapons manufacturers have an enormous influence on many of the country's democratic
institutions, such as Congress, the Pentagon, and individual government officials.

**Environmental Effects:** In each of the categories of weapons systems, (nuclear, chemical, biological and conventional), the authors argue that there is ample proof that products of the top seventy-five corporations violate Hampshire's investment guidelines by presently causing environmental harm while possible inflicting total destruction upon the environment.

**The Threat to Peace:** A comparison is made between nuclear stockpiles of the United States and USSR. In addition the extreme overkill power of Mirv missiles (multiple independently targetable warheads), and theories of tactical maneuvering or first strike versus second strike, all exemplify the bombast of the two governments; a diplomacy that is strikingly similar to the bluffs and threats of statesmen prior to World War One.

Dean Ford, who had counseled the students after the January meeting about their course of action, had this to say about the work the students did between January and March:

Basically, I think what happened is that the students went back and tried to wisely utilize the structures and procedures, as they had been told to, that already existed ... What the student proposal did was, it refined the issue carefully so that the guidelines that existed could be utilized to examine the firms that were presumed to be causing social injury. And lead us to an investment policy that would have us get rid of
our holdings in those firms. It was much better done than the first because it paid attention to definitions of social injury, to an examination of the backgrounds and operations of those firms, related those operations to the definitions of social injury and made a fairly persuasive case for divestment using the existing procedures. It was a relatively detailed proposal but basically what it said was that the top defense contractors were engaged in business operations whose aims in and of themselves produced social injury. All the way from those firms that were engaged in the production of nuclear warheads, whose sole objective is the destruction and annihilation of large populations, to those producing war helicopters and the like. I think they made quite a persuasive case.

Part Six: The Dean Interprets the Proposal:

The Divestment Group Tries to Rally

Support from the Community

As dean, Michael Ford necessarily viewed matters from a variety of responsibilities and interests. In this capacity, he had a number of "hats" to wear which included representing the concerns of each student; teaching and acting as a member of the social science department; working as a senior administrator closely affiliated with the president, and assisting in the overall development of the institution. As well as having the "dean of students" viewpoint, Michael Ford had his own personal feelings about the divestment issue itself, college-wide events and the actions of individuals. When asked to explain what the proposal meant to him away from his Hampshire roles, as an American citizen, Ford replied:
Well, I agreed with most of the thrust of it. I certainly did not agree with every single element of it. As I thought about it, it seemed important to me that students were making statements against war, [something that] which is just patently absurd. They were saying, which is something I felt very deeply, that as reasonable people in charge of an incredibly powerful government, we ought to be able to conduct ourselves in such a way that the killing of other people was not a central element in our planning and the execution of our foreign policy. That the existence of large firms dedicated to the production of materials which would kill other people perverted the political process in addition to being sort of directly involved in producing stuff that was going to cause social injury. It perverted the political process because, given the profitability of this stuff, they obviously wanted people and policies in place that would keep the profits flowing. So they could be expected, in a very real sense, to try to influence policy, to try to get to people; to, in a sense, get active in the political process in a way that shaped and colored our entire society. I accepted that. Certainly from my own academic study of the Third World, I understood a great deal about our links to other parts of the world and about some very, very shameful aspects of our foreign policy. I felt that they were largely right.

However, some aspects of the student's proposal were not agreeable to Ford. He explains that:

Some of the things I had trouble with were the seeming call for unilateral disarmament that was inherent in the proposal. That is to say, if you were in effect to describe all those activities [defined as weapons related], as producing social injury, you were in effect saying those should be stopped; and you were in effect saying, it seemed to me, that we should disarm. While I accept the depiction of war as just something that should be outside of the human experience, I was not sure, practically, that it made sense to talk in terms that were so global that they would have had us disarm. When I read the proposal, I wish more careful distinctions were made so that the nuclear industry and other parts of the munitions industry [that which concentrates on large amounts of offensive weapons versus smaller, and less destructive defensive weapons, were the focus], instead of all weapons as I perceived them. So, my basic problem was that.\(^{46}\)
As mentioned, the students amended their proposal to limit the number of companies on the divestment list form one-hundred to seventy-five. In addition, a substantial amount of rewriting was done since the January proposal; the supporting evidence in the March proposal is more thorough in its explanation and analysis than the one composed in January. Proposal writing was not the only strategy for developing a different divestment plan; much work remained to be done in mobilizing campus-wide support. For example, every member of the Hampshire community received in their mailbox a one-page article entitled "Not Just Your Average Junk Mail." The document begins by saying:

Within the bylaws of the Hampshire College investment policy, we are encouraged to present our evidence to the college community. Did you know that this college has investments in corporations which are major producers of military hardware.47

Following is a list of the five stocks and the weapons work those companies provide the government.

Reiterating the sentiments expressed by Cora Weiss in her speech to the January graduates, the message reads:

It is difficult for many people to come to grips with the fact that where you invest your money is where you place your support. It takes a lot of effort to alter a system, to speak out against a "social injury," and to reevaluate past mistakes and put them into positive action. We believe it can be done.48
The last half of the page outlines the arguments made in the six sections of the proposal, followed by a historical review of South African divestment and how social change strategies developed to the point where trustees felt either pressured or genuinely compelled to make concessions on the issue of neutrality and the social responsibility of the institution. Specifically, this was due to "... the joined efforts of students and faculty that these views were acted upon." Finally, the reader is encouraged to attend the Saturday morning meeting when the next CHOIR vote will be cast.

Two days before the March trustees meeting, Thursday, March 11, 1982, an issue of the Hampshire newspaper, Apostrophe, was published. By reviewing what the articles conveyed, we are able to understand the extent to which the community was knowledgeable of the issues. Also, the authors of the articles were members of the divestment group. Knowing more about their views is helpful, too. The lead article, "Divestment: Putting Our Money Where Our Mouth Is," by Matthew Goodman, attacks myths typically associated with divestment. After stating the classic definition of the neutral institution, "where the pure and unconstrained search for truth flourished," he argues that:
... the university has adapted to the so-called "norms" of the society. MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology] can receive so many research contracts from the Pentagon that it is actually classified as one of the top American defense contractors, and still call itself a "neutral institution."\textsuperscript{51}

Concerning the second of the three myths, "The Myth of Change Through Inside Leverage," Goodman compared the degree to which a college can have an impact by using proxy votes, that is, to "work within the system to change it,"\textsuperscript{52} versus pulling investments out of the company altogether, which has the effect of "attracting attention to our disagreement with their policies, and encouraging other institutions to do the same." Goodman offers an analysis of Hampshire's influence on the Boeing company as evidence for choosing the divestment option. He asks:

Does anyone really imagine that, say, Boeing, a huge and enormously influential corporation that has almost entirely staked its multi-billion dollar business on weapons contracts, is going to listen to some flaky, obscure New England college that has all of $19,000 invested in it? The answer of course is no. For 1979, Boeing posted profits of $505 million. $19,000 is exactly .0038 of that.\textsuperscript{53}

If a person and/or institution, depending upon the situation, chooses to believe in the idea of the neutral institution and work within investment norms, Goodman charges that such a "policy is simply politically naive, a strategy fraught with delusions of Hampshire grandeur."\textsuperscript{54}

Last, there is "The Myth of No Alternatives."

Goodman says "Look: where we put our money is where we put
our support. There really is no way around it."55 And that when Hampshire maintains investments that cause the different kinds of harm, the college is "not-so-tacitly giving lie to the claim that Hampshire is a 'progressive institution.'"56 He recognizes that the proposal will not "make a dent" in changing the military-industrial complex, however, it should be passed for symbolic reasons.

Chuck Collins, one of the proposal writers, and along with Goodman, a student leader of the divestment movement, contributed a relatively short article entitled "A Word About Investment." Collins seeks to explain why CHOIR is carrying out its mandate not only to scrutinize individual investments as it has done in the past but to develop an overall ethical investment policy that would support companies which provide basic human needs, for example, food, housing and medicine, while "bringing an acceptable return."57 As evidence of this possibility, Collins explains that Tufts University has accomplished socially responsible investing for years. Tufts has "... not alienated donors, but in fact, [has] brought respect and attracted donations for the institution."58

Heidi Gulick contributes "Perspectives on Divestment," a different kind of article than the preceding two. She interviews three individuals who are either associated with the CHOIR committee or a member of CHOIR.
Allen Torrey, (recall that he is the treasurer of the college and voting secretary of CHOIR), believes that the proposal's "weakness is that it is such a huge and sweeping condemnation of a very large segment of our total economic industry." For Torrey, the issue is straightforward: "I've got to really see and be convinced that the number seventy-five is really raising hell with opportunities for peace in the world." He also is concerned with employees of a company who produce domestic products but who would be effected by divestment.

Specifically, Torrey presents the example of the Chrysler corporation which until two weeks earlier had owned a tank factory, amounting to 10% of its total sales which would have meant that it was a company causing social injury. In short, by the "brush" of the proposal, "they (Chrysler) were condemned." Pretending for a moment that the tank company had not been sold, Torrey goes on to say: "And yet I want Chrysler to make it. It's too bad but that's the way I feel. You've got to remember, I'm older; I'm an awful lot older and I look at it with a lot different eyes."

Woody Wickham, administrative assistant to the president and secretary of the trustees, tells the readers that "personally" he would not invest his own money in companies on the list because the "reversal of the arms
buildup [is] the most important work we have to do as human beings right now." If he were a trustee he would "by law" have to weigh the amount of social injury caused by the weapons producers with the economic injury the college would sustain by divestment. Or, "Perhaps more grave is the impact that this move would have on the readiness of potential benefactors--including private donors, foundations, corporate donors--to support a college that uses its investments to make political statements." Finally, Merle Bruno, a faculty-trustee, like Torrey, has not read the proposal, but "support[s] the idea of divesting ourselves of corporations that are involved in weapons and what companies call 'defense.'" For her, the "important thing" is that a "statement be made." Of this time, Michael Ford recalls the mood of the trustees:

It's hard for me to characterize the trustees. I did not have a lot of direct conversations, but certainly my memory from other board meetings and all the conversations I had had with them indicated that there was not a hell of a lot of support. Not a lot of people on the board were attracted to the proposal let us say. Some were vehemently opposed to it, others wanted, [pause] were more concerned about the campus and the state of the campus than the proposal, and wanted to be sure that nothing was done that would, in effect, rip the campus asunder. But, I think it's fair to say that only one or two board members were at all receptive to the proposal.

Clearly, tension was increasing throughout the Hampshire community. Of all the positions of responsibility
at the college, the dean of student's job, more than anyone else's, was to have a role in influencing events. Should he let events run their course, taking more of a reactive position, or initiate direction? His decisions at this stage were leading him towards taking an active role later on. Dean Ford recalls this period in the following:

My own decision, sometime after January, was to learn as much as I could about what was going on. To try to make clear those things that I felt were important. One, that the students should be accorded respect; they should be encouraged to pursue their interests wherever they lay but they should also be mindful of the fact that there were some bedrock kinds of rules and things that they weren't going to ride roughshod over. And that, if the trustees didn't accept it, I mean, that was too bad, but what I was going to do was to be sure they were treated decently and with respect, and got a hearing... So one of things I tried to do was involve someone from my staff with them, in an honest way; not, not as a spy. I recall, recall very clearly the sort of decision to say yes (about you becoming involved with the students) and what it might mean. I thought that it was a good thing. I also knew that there'd be some tension because to the extent that it was successful some people would view it as a real nice ploy, you know, we have an insider, and I knew that I would face some pressures to put [you] in a position to be an informer, a manipulator, and for me to act in that same fashion, and I knew I wouldn't do it... So my decision was to encourage your involvement because one, I felt that you were respected, and also, I felt you had a well developed sense of integrity so that you would do some teaching through your involvement. And I felt it was critically important at that point to do a whole hell of a lot of teaching; about what could be done, how it could be done, how, within the sort of constraints of a civil community, one could really press for change on the part of other members of the community. And I encouraged, I think, every single effort to bring that change about, even as I sort of remained extremely pessimistic, as I say, because I felt that the board members were not going to vote against their own interests.
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CHAPTER V

INITIAL PASSAGE OF A DIVESTMENT PROPOSAL:
MARCH 15TH THROUGH MAY 7TH

A special Hampshire College committee has asked the college's trustees to sell all stocks held in companies that manufacture weapons—a proposal that is already proving awkward for trustees who have business ties to the firms involved.¹

The Hampshire Gazette

This chapter begins with the CHOIR committee's reconsideration of a newly revised divestment proposal at their March trustees meeting. The passage of the proposal is then discussed and the reaction of people to it; included is an explanation of the trustee committees that still must approve the proposal before divestment is actually achieved.² Given the strong opposition to the proposal on the part of the trustees, a meeting in New York City between students and trustees is organized to discuss the proposal. The result of this meeting is the exploration of an alternative proposal which will satisfy both sides. A period of political posturing occurs. The chapter concludes with the appearance of a faculty petition which generates both support and enthusiasm.
Part One: The March Trustees Meeting and the Tension Preceding It

As stated before, in early March 1982, the CHOIR committee was presented with a second divestment proposal, which differed from the first in these ways: the students decreased the number of potential companies from which to divest to seventy-five rather than one hundred, and they argued more thoroughly and persuasively about the social injury perpetrated by weapons manufacturing.

The committee was scheduled to meet with students to discuss the proposal at 7:30 a.m. In the two weeks prior to the meeting many students speculated that the president and trustees scheduled the meeting at such an early hour to discourage participation by the larger community. A representative of the student divestment group, which had increased in numbers to approximately thirty-five students, made a request to Dean Ford that students be allowed to spend the night in the Red Barn, where the meeting was to begin the following morning. Although President Simmons was originally hesitant to permit this request, Dean Ford convinced her that by granting the students their request (and asking me to accompany them), fewer problems were likely to arise and the permission would be interpreted as an administrative gesture of openness and accommodation. Simmons consented to Ford's suggestion and the request was granted.
Late Friday evening, the night before the 7:30 a.m. CHOIR meeting, student trustee, Tom Stoner, came to the Red Barn from a dinner at the president's home. He reported to fellow divestment supporters preparing to spend the night that one trustee, Vanessa Gamble, would not vote for the proposal because it lacked any provision for the establishment of a socially responsible investment policy. Upon hearing Stoner's report, the students immediately recalled Allen Torrey's earlier instructions to them. Torrey, had acted as the liaison between the students and committee since the January trustee meeting, especially in the interpretation of CHOIR guidelines. Before submitting the March proposal, students had earlier asked Torrey if they should include in their proposal the very same provision which trustee Gamble was requesting. Torrey told them that their primary responsibility was to try and prove social injury, not to propose guidelines for an alternative investment policy.

Not surprisingly, the immediate reaction of students was anger at the message that Vanessa Gamble would not vote for the proposal without an additional section. The previously calm and pleasant atmosphere suddenly became a room tense with expressions of betrayal and outrage. The students' displeasure and frustration was not directed at any one individual, but to the unfair and impenetrable
"system." After awhile, disappointment was transmitted into a more constructive discussion of the possibility of meeting Gamble's request with an accompanying document which would satisfy her qualms. By midnight it was decided that Gamble's requests should be included in the proposal being presented the following morning. The larger group decided to break down into small groups of between four and six people to draft different sections of a socially responsible investment policy. Their work was completed by 3:00 a.m.

The CHOIR meeting was convened at 7:40 a.m., March 13th. Eight voting members were in attendance. These included trustee and chairperson, Vanessa Gamble; student trustee to the board, Tom Stoner; trustee, Henry Morgan; student representatives, Mary Ellen Schloss and Chuck Collins; faculty representatives, Kurt Gordon and Alan Krass; and school treasurer, Allen Torrey. Other trustees who were present included Nick Ney, Cora Weiss and Richard Ullman, as well as a group of students numbering "over ninety."

The CHOIR meeting was conducted in the middle of the Red Barn, a large open space where the students had slept. Observers stood around the table and quietly listened to the participants. Quotations from the minutes of the meeting give a sense of the issues and viewpoints discussed.
[Trustee] Morgan asked the students if it was their intention to have the College make a symbolic gesture by divesting the weapons stocks or if they wanted the College to alter its investment policies by adoption of so-called "positive investment" guidelines. Krass stated that a vote on this proposal would constitute a symbolic act and that we should not quibble about details... Krass stated that the percentage of [a company's] business done with the defense department should not be a factor, and that the important thing was to send the message.8

There was further discussion, which included a student, Chuck Collins, challenging the administration to explain why stock held in a company on the South African divestment list, Boeing, could be held by Hampshire. The treasurer responded that he was not aware of Boeing's standing on the list and that he would investigate immediately. Towards the end of the meeting, Chairperson Gamble also explained that she believed CHOIR had the capability to make recommendations on ethical investments; it was therefore decided that a special meeting of the two subcommittees to the Finance Committee, CHOIR and Investment, be held at the May trustee meeting.9 Thus, after an hour and a half of discussion, the proposal was seconded, followed by a call for votes. The recorded tally was: six in favor and two opposed; Gamble and Torrey the two dissenting votes.10 The motion passed, which meant that it would next be considered by the Finance Committee at the May meeting. It read:

VOTED: That the committee therefore recommend that the College instruct its investment managers to commence
divestment of the College's holdings in any of the
aforementioned corporations [top seventy-five weapons
manufacturers] at such a rate and in such a manner as
will not substantively endanger the College's financial
security. CHOIR further recommends that the College
henceforth not invest in any of the aforementioned cor-
porations. In addition, CHOIR recommends that the
Investment Committee consider reinvesting this money in
corporations that produce goods and services which are
both socially and economically useful.11

Part Two: Trustee Committees Which Must
Either Review or Pass the Proposal
Before Divestment Is Enacted

Because it is often the norm that students find
themselves on the opposite side of an issue with the
trustees, it is easy to understand then the exuberance that
filled the room at the conclusion of the meeting. Although
the first hurdle had been successfully achieved, other com-
mittees would have to entertain the proposal and cast their
votes before actual divestment could occur.

At the bottom of the organizational ladder is the
CHOIR committee, which is actually a subcommittee of the
Finance Committee. The other committees which figure into
the organizational procedures for divestment are Finance
and the full Board of Trustees. The steps the proposal has
to take after CHOIR are: 1) a vote by the Finance Committee
and 2) if passed by Finance, a vote by the full Board of
Trustees. It should also be noted, however, (because of
its importance later) that regardless of the outcome of the
vote by Finance, either party, students making the proposal or trustees on Finance, can call for a vote on the issue by the full board.

There are two other Finance subcommittees which play a part in coming events, the Resources and the Investment subcommittees. The purpose of the Investment committee is to work with the investment firm hired by the college to manage the endowment. The Resource committee oversees the financial planning of the institution, particularly gifts to the college from either foundations or corporations. All three, then, CHOIR, Investment and Resources each provide Finance with different kinds of financial knowledge and information, which is why additional assignments were made by Finance to Investment and Resources relative to the future divestment decision.

On the Saturday afternoon following the early morning CHOIR meeting, when Vanessa Gamble reported to Finance about the passage of the divestment proposal, it was the recommendation of Finance that the Resources subcommittee undertake a study of how divestment may affect Hampshire's ability to secure gifts from foundations and corporations. (The chairman of the Resources committee later directed the college's vice-president for development to research this question and submit a report; this would be presented to the Resources meeting prior to the Finance Committee in May so that the recommendation would be
available for consideration by Finance.) This same kind of task would be undertaken by Investment, which would call upon Hampshire's investment counselors, Standard, Irving and Boyd, to report on the potential effect divestment might have.

To summarize: there are now three different committees within the organization of trustees studying the question. Their efforts will culminate in presentations made at the Finance Committee meeting in May.

Part Three: Reactions to the Divestment Proposal Passed by CHOIR

The explanation of the story begins again with an analysis by Dean Ford of what had been accomplished by the CHOIR committee's passage of the proposal.

I wasn't surprised at the CHOIR vote because I knew who was on CHOIR. Their membership has always been such that they're likely to be sympathetic. Finance, on the other hand, is almost diametrically opposed to CHOIR. Finance is usually people who are investment experts and bankers and the like, and who are just the people who are going to oppose it.12

An article in the local paper, The Hampshire Gazette, summarizing the events of the March trustees weekend, reveals the reaction of the Hampshire trustees to the vote, as well as the beginnings of the conflict that would build and eventually erupt later in the spring. The article, "Hampshire Group Wants Sale of Stock in Arms Firms," was written by a Hampshire student, Sarah
Russell's article captures the institutional conflicts which immediately arose after CHOIR declared the top seventy-five weapons manufacturers to be committing social injury.

In the article, speaking for the pro-divestment side, Chuck Collins claims that the goal of the proposal is to make "... a political statement against the production of weapons, and another goal is to push the board of trustees toward investing in socially useful stock ...". Collins added that what those proposing divestment had foremost in mind were "socially useful" investments oriented towards "constructive" versus "destructive production."

Russell's article aptly summarizes the pro-divestment position without adding any new insights.

Her presentation of the administration's and trustees' views, based upon interviews conducted during the recent March trustees' meeting, begin to foretell deeply rooted opposition to divestment. The most optimistic outlook is offered by Paul Dodyk, a trustee and member of the finance committee, who explained the reaction of trustees to the proposal as "mixed." Russell adds that Dodyk said, "... many of the trustees have business connections in the firms targeted for divestiture." She continues by describing two Hampshire trustees who also sit on the board of directors of General Telephone and
Electronics (GTE) as being ". . . in a potentially awkward position . . ." The trustee, Howard Blauvelt and Sandra Moose, each stated that they "disagreed" with CHOIR's categorization of GTE as a "socially injurious" company. Sandra Moose even stated that she was "contemplating resigning" from the Hampshire board of trustees given the actions taken by CHOIR. The president's administrative assistant, Woodward Wickham, felt that "there is no knowing how it [divestment] would affect Hampshire College."

Concern, however, must be exercised regarding the effect "political divestment" will have on "potential donors." Wickham summarizes the essential task facing the trustees: "It is the consideration of a trustee to weigh the merits of this proposal against the merits of preserving the college."16

In Russell's article, the two faculty representatives on CHOIR each offer divergent viewpoints on what may be the best course of action. "Philosophically," Kurt Gordon favors the adoption of ". . . a policy that would invest in socially responsible companies . . . ."17 On the other hand, Alan Krass believes the college can accomplish both ends, preserving the college while acting symbolically. "There is a risk, but I feel comfortable in taking it. Just as Hampshire College was a leader among the colleges in divestiture of South African stocks,
perhaps it can be a leader in this issue." The article concludes by listing the stocks in question and a statement by the news director of the college, Peter Gluckler, that the book value of Hampshire's portfolio totaled $1,442,446.

The conflicts at Hampshire, as summarized by Russell, were: (1) whether to preserve the tradition of neutrality or override its established norms to bring about political change, which includes risking the financial well being of the college; and (2) deciding amongst conflicting views the interpretation and/or proof of social injury, especially in light of the fact that some trustees were also officers of corporations charged as performing social injury. Additionally, there existed a potential course of action that would be less confrontative, the development of a socially responsible investment policy.

Beyond the conflicts already mentioned, there were other events that had a bearing on the developing situation. Although Russell surely must have been aware, given her extensive knowledge of the opinions held by participants, she chose not to report an incident (wisely, perhaps) that occurred late Saturday afternoon at the closing trustee meeting, when the Finance Committee reported to the full board on the divestment resolution passed earlier in the day by the CHOIR subcommittee. When the minutes of the CHOIR meeting were reported, trustee
Blauvelt vehemently opposed the proposal and threatened to resign if anything like it were passed. While Blauvelt's anger was particularly intense, he was not alone: other trustees joined in a chorus of opposition.

Calm was restored, however, when trustee Dodyk eloquently spoke of the role of an educational institution to seek answers to questions about knowledge and truth openly and freely. Answers should be sought to policy questions without intimidating threats hanging in the balance. Using himself as an example, Dodyk explained that the law firm in which he was a partner (Cravath, Swain and Moore) represented a company (IBM) on the proposed divestiture list. While Dodyk recognized the conflict of interest, he would wait to hear the determination of the finance committee before making any statements about his future actions. Threats, Dodyk repeated, were inimical to the meaning of the liberal arts enterprise.

(It is perhaps regrettable that more people were not aware of the incident because it offers a rare glimpse at the heartfelt views of some trustees, particularly those of voting members, and thus what they are thinking. For the most part, their roles as trustees require that they carry out certain institutional duties which require little face to face, personal exchange with students and faculty. While I am not agreeing with Blauvelt's
threatening approach, expressing his views did present an opportunity for others to engage in discussion with him over the coming two months before the May meeting. It is unfortunate that such a discussion never occurred. Blauvelt's feelings were kept quiet, therefore an opportunity was lost for understanding to develop between himself and students. 19

Present at this concluding board meeting, Ford understood the protest by Blauvelt and Moose in this way:

Knowing that many of the trustees worked directly or indirectly for the very firms that we were in essence going to disassociate ourselves from, it seemed clear to me their interests were powerfully involved. I don't believe people generally vote against their own interests. Some people were directors of boards of the very firms named. Others worked for firms that had lucrative relationships with them and as I suggest, people tend not to [vote against what they have most at stake. Therefore,] . . . the March meeting crystallized things. The crystallization occurred because people said things and made threats and made it absolutely clear that the proposal, no matter how it was changed, as long as, in essence, it had the effect of saying [that] some of those corporate entities were bad guys, it simply wasn't going to fly. 20

Ford, of course, did not exist in an administrative vacuum. His colleagues were worried about the proposal, especially with regard to prominent trustee, Howard Blauvelt. There were, said Ford, . . . discussions which focused on the importance of not alienating people like Howard Blauvelt. He was . . . a very highly thought of trustee having been chairman of Conoco Oil. There were a lot of hopes vested in the man, hopes that he should be our entre to the corporate coffers. And it was also clear that these sentiments would strike him, of all people, most
deeply. So the Blauvelt strategy was one that nobody wanted to offend the guy; and it was very clear that they [the students], would be running straight head on at Blauvelt. So these worries were voiced all the time by other administrators, particularly after the March meeting.

What had begun as an intellectual issue of minor concern and involving only a small number of people had developed into an institutional problem from the perspective of the administration and trustees. Ford understood that the problem "... was in my lap because the students were the ones who were creating the problem." While he was expected to handle the problem there was no discussion or definition about how he was to accomplish that. Ford believes that this lack of formulating a solution by the senior administrative staff was "... because had they defined it, it really might have run afoul of what I felt I was about."\(^21\) It was simply assumed that "I was expected to handle the problem."

Part Four: The Circumstances of the College (Enrollment and Finances) Are Not Encouraging; a Meeting in New York Between Trustees and Students; Seeking Compromise Between Opposing Views

In the midst of this divestment issue, and certainly influencing trustee reactions to the proposal was another problem for Hampshire College; its self image. At
the March trustees' meeting a decision was made to spend $250,000 to hire Krukowski and Associates, a New York higher education consulting firm, to undertake an analysis of Hampshire's admissions situation (translated: enrollment equals financial well being) compared to similar institutions. It had been no secret that Hampshire's admissions pool had steadily decreased during the previous few years, which caused a financial deficit at the year's end. That is, the principal of the endowment was used to pay expenses, thereby limiting further the amount of profits realized from the endowment. Knowing, as others in higher education did, that demographic reports indicated there would be fewer students going to college in the future, the leadership at Hampshire was especially interested in making sure that the institution would endure the difficult years ahead.22

The point that is important to note is that the president, her senior administrative staff and trustees were worried about the viability of Hampshire in the coming years.23 In dollar terms, the college had run well over a million dollar deficit the previous two years with a forecast of increased deficits. The research undertaken by Krukowski was begun during the spring semester, 1982. Although findings were not at that time anywhere near completion, Krukowski and President Simmons informally
discussed the college's problem; one of these concerned the decision the college should make regarding divestment and how it would either enhance or detract from Hampshire's standing within the national higher education community. From a public relations view, Hampshire would be ill advised to pursue divestment.

When considering the sentiments of Blauvelt and Krukowski together, it is not surprising that Ford perceived the development of an impasse between the "institution" and students. Soon, it would be necessary for him to make a choice. At this stage of the divestment story, Ford explained:

My decision was to try and utilize your good sense and from this office I decided to try to guide them [students] but not manipulate them. Guide them into actions that made sense, into self-examination, and into commitment. Not into foolish acts. And then at the same time I had to allay those people who were really worried: other administrators.

Believing Michael Ford's assessment of Blauvelt's intransigence on the issue as the chief obstacle to the ratification of the student's proposal accurate, and knowing the equally strong commitment of students, I began to be pessimistic about the passage of the divestment proposal if events remained as they were. Therefore, I proposed to both the students and the president's assistant, Woodward Wickham, that a meeting with a small group of
students and trustees might be beneficial in breaking up what promised to be a clash.

I did this because trustee Henry Morgan had once expressed an interest in holding informal conversations with students if that would help matters. Against initial opposition from President Simmons, Ford supported the meeting of students and trustees and helped convince her it was something worth doing. It was mid-April, then, when a group of five students and I met with three trustees, Paul Dodyk, Cora Weiss and John Watts, in New York (at the law firm office of Paul Dodyk), to talk about the proposal and discuss people's positions on the issues and their reasons for them.

There was no formal agenda for the meeting. The agreed upon plan was that everyone would simply come and talk. Within the trustee and student groups, there were a range of views regarding the use of divestment and its potential effects. The discussion lasted well over two hours and was characterized first, by each participant speaking personally about what he/she thought about the issue at hand and second, stating what was possible or best for Hampshire given the views held by members of the college community.

The discussion was characterized by individuals offering a genuine expression of their views and what
informed them. Although a specific agreement was never reached, the participants felt a sense of relief and excitement at the meeting’s conclusion. This was because a long and friendly discussion had at least occurred between the two factions. In summary, the following items were generally agreed upon: first, the standing divestment proposal would not be presented at the May trustees meeting, that is, the divestment demand was being rescinded; second, students would again draft a statement concerning weapons, the arms race and investing. The trustees would sign this statement which would be made public after the May trustees meeting.26 Third, the students would begin to outline a socially responsible investment policy to satisfy the goal of investing Hampshire funds in companies engaging only in constructive activities, as they conformed with the Hampshire college ethos.

During the next two weeks, however, it became apparent that the individuals attending the New York meeting had difficulty convincing others in their constituencies, who were not in attendance, that the trade-offs were worthwhile or appropriate. Michael Ford relates the situation:

I remember that there was going to be a commitment to try to create a positive investment policy, and a statement was going to be made by the board that spoke to the issues and it looked like some very good things had resulted. [However], I remained pessimistic. I remained highly pessimistic.
The involvement of Hampshire's president, Adele Simmons, must be included into the story at this time. When she was informed of the possible collaboration between students and trustees on a public document, she opposed such a plan. The dean explains that:

Part of the agreement was that trustees would sign a statement of concern about militarism. And the argument got raised [by the president] about the board taking political positions or partisan positions, so it wasn't clear at that point just what Watts [and others] had agreed to.27

The following is a brief review of what happened. When the students began composing the joint paper or the "new alternative proposal," which would encompass the statement signed by trustees as well as outlining a socially responsible investment policy, it differed specifically from the earlier proposal because it would not request the institution to divest from its stock holdings. Some of the students who did not attend the New York City meeting took issue with this approach, and objected to any document which excluded the call to divest stocks from the seventy-five top weapons contractors. This particular item soon became the major bone of contention among students, along with signals being sent from Hampshire's president
(through her administrative assistant), that trustees would not sign anything marked by political positions regardless of the viewpoint.

The divestment proposal and the movement were at a crossroads. Different perspectives and/or interests of the two groups were jockeying for position as the date of the May trustees meeting approached. Two alternatives existed: one, the presentation by students of a different proposal to the trustees at their May meeting. This would mean the achievement of compromise between students and trustees and the establishment of a unified position, as seen in a bilateral statement signed by trustees; also included would be the creation of a socially responsible investment policy. Or two, the submission of the same proposal passed by CHOIR at the March meeting, one which, at the time, lacked a socially responsible investment proposal.

Given the tremendous amount of confusion over what different individuals, students as well as trustees, either said in New York or would eventually say at the May meeting, Michael Ford sensed that the recently established understanding between trustees and students was beginning to erode. He suggested that a telephone conversation take place between the various parties to at least clarify what everyone's position was.
There were about six of us all on different phones [talking to John Watts] trying to zero in on what had been agreed to and what was going to be done. And I think that telephone conversation made it clear that all was not sweetness and life, that there were outstanding issues that some of the people who had been there thought were resolved but were not quite that resolved in the minds of the trustees.28

The time of these events is the last two weeks in April and the first week in May. It was a period of confusion and apprehension. The results of the phone conversation seemed to put the situation back to the time prior to the New York meeting. Finally, a vote was taken by the divestment group clarifying once and for all the nature of the proposal soon to be submitted to Finance. The critical factor was whether or not the proposal would demand divestment. After much discussion at an afternoon meeting, the results of the vote were: eighteen in favor of continuing to request divestment and eight for further development and submission of an alternative proposal. Thus, with only two weeks left before the May 14th trustees meeting, the consensus again formed around the proposal calling for divestment from the top seventy-five weapons contractors. In a sense, nothing had changed.

One of the results of this period of exploring different options and struggling to finalize what the collective voice would say, was that some students chose to disinvolve themselves from the group advocating divestment. In other words, some individuals dropped out. The
relationships among students during this period was not always amiable. Passions were rising and conversations that were once more easy going could now become strained as individuals tried to persuade one another what the right course of action should be. The half dozen people who sporadically (as opposed to a mass exodus) broke ranks, generally felt that they were being verbally put down in meetings as "political wimps," or as Matt Goodman, a student who believed in the more confrontational, pro-divestment approach, said: "They're just good liberals, that's all."

The group advocating an alternative proposal believed that since the divestment proposal was doomed, the next best alternative should be proposed; they felt that to continue to push divestment would only cause unnecessary tension within the community and simultaneously squander the opportunity to achieve some results. The pro-divestment group interpreted an alternative proposal as more that just "giving up" but "playing into the hands" of the trustees, (or the dominant ideology of the American liberal/capitalist/bureaucratic system, as it would sometimes be put). This group, which carried the consensus, adopted a more aggressive stance which they believed necessary to overcome the authority wielded by the trustees and the administration.
Much has been said about the alternative proposal and what it would or would not include. During the three weeks of debating, students did compose a new document that was used in the upcoming trustee meetings. In its concluding form the seven-page document serves as a primer at the special joint meeting of the CHOIR and Investment subcommittees, where the plan for a socially responsible investment policy will be the focus, and at the finance committee meeting where the divestment proposal vote would be cast.

The document makes four major points:

1. That higher education has in the past been an active agent in social change, furthering, for example, integration throughout the nation by nondiscriminatory enrollment policies

2. That the philosophy of Hampshire College as an institutional entity is founded upon principles of moral activism as evidenced by Patterson and Longsworth's declarations in *The Making of a College* and the decision in 1977 to divest the college's stock in companies doing business in South Africa

3. That the Hampshire faculty "exemplify these concerns both as individuals and scholars;" stating further that "the faculty is a unique combination of specialists
who are dedicated to combining academics and social responsibility."\(^{29}\)

4. That CHOIR establish a policy of socially responsible investing instead of social injury having to be proven on a case by case basis. New investment criteria might include: "labor-intensive industries, companies which are converting from military to non-military production, mass transit, housing [and] energy conservation."\(^ {30}\)

**Part Six: A Faculty Petition Generates Support and Enthusiasm**

With the trustees meeting only two weeks away, Michael Ford tells us:

> There were a lot of activities in the meantime. The faculty was circulating a petition and people were beginning to talk about [divestment] throughout the campus; it was just clear that it was a major issue now, an all-consuming issue.

During this active period the students were buoyed by the faculty who had signed a letter supporting the divestment proposal. The letter's author, Professor Alan Krass of the Natural Science department, would present the petition of signatures to the finance committee. The students interpreted the support by faculty as the crucial factor, along with their aggressive stance, that would change the minds of Finance Committee members to favor divestment. This newfound faith was based upon the historical tradition at Hampshire that college-wide decisions had to have the
necessary support of community sentiment. Therefore, achieving divestiture seemed a logical conclusion.

The majority of faculty involvement throughout the spring's divestment events is limited to the signing of the petition. It is entitled "Faculty Endorsement of Divestment Proposal." The opening statement declares how pleased faculty are with the students' proposal and "urge its acceptance." Following a review of the arguments made by the students, divestiture is viewed as being beneficial for two reasons. One, that Hampshire "... does not benefit from socially injurious activities nor become dependent on their continuation..." and that by making the kind of "clear statement" that divestiture makes, Hampshire acts "... as an example for other institutions which might also wish to make such a statement."31

Krass's petition and the overwhelming endorsement (86%) of the faculty was precisely the support the students were seeking. However, regardless of how optimistic the students could feel, Michael Ford remained doubtful. He explains in the following what the general state of affairs was two weeks prior to the May 14th trustee's meeting:

There wasn't a lot to do except to keep talking, to do as much as we could to try to influence it [the future] as much as we would. But it was clear to me that when the trustees rejected [the proposal], that ultimately the students were going to decide on some purely confrontational tactic.
The vision is not a very pleasant one; although in Ford's many conversations with students, rather than telling them his predictions or giving them advice, he instead explained to them that they should think long and hard about the personal and ethical ramifications of their actions, and fundamental beliefs. In no way did he encourage them to compromise their values or the positions in which they believed. Although the students' spirits were on the rise given the overwhelming support of the faculty, Ford felt that they were actually misguided.

Students didn't know that the trustees would never accept their proposal. They seemed to be laboring under the unfortunate belief that all they had to do is come up with some persuasive proposals; to do, in essence, a paper assigned of the sort that they learned in the classroom: Do your analysis; write it out. Make it persuasive. Make it articulate and you'll win the day. And of course that wasn't going to be.
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It is in this meeting that the decision is made to form the task force on investigating the possibilities of establishing a policy of socially responsible investing, which is where the actual results of the original proposal are realized. It is worth giving away some of the story now in order to show which events really ended up determining the course taken by the institution.

The reader may wonder, "Well, what were the significant issues discussed during the ninety minute meeting?" This meeting was not unlike others, which is to say, there is rarely anything monumentally original expressed. Rather, participants come with their opinions already firmly set, thus the exchange is more often that of a debate instead of a group teaching each other in hopes of arriving at the best possible decision. It is also characteristic of the discussions that individuals do not speak from the first person "I," but rather, from the stereotypical roles assigned to each interest group. This also contributes to an impersonal discussion.

Subcommittees tend to draw people to them who have special interests and/or abilities in the particular subject matter.

The newspaper selects one student from each of the five colleges to report on campus events. Russell, incidentally, was not directly involved in the divestment movement.
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For trustees, these were the self-interest roots of individualism; see Hartz, The Liberal Tradition in America, pp. 59-62.

The presumption here is that, if desired, certain actions could be taken by the administration, carried out by the Dean of Students, to thwart the efforts of students.

In retrospect, the concern was legitimate. In 1982, the college made its plans based on the assumption that it was a school of 1,200 students. Today, plans are made based upon only 800 students.

These worries were legitimate, for a year later contingency plans were begun to redesign Hampshire to be a college for 800 students instead of 1,200. After not filling faculty and staff positions in 1984 and 1985, the college is finding it necessary to cut positions (permanent layoffs) in 1986. In 1982 there was discussion of this kind of eventual set of circumstances arising, which is to say, the fear of financially lean times was an influencing factor for administrators and trustees.

The recommendations made by Krukowski the following year encouraged the college to steer away from political or ideological stances concentrating instead on academic accomplishments and the fostering of a community environment tolerant of all viewpoints.

Simmons' negative reaction was predominantly due to the fact that Hampshire business was eating up a lot of the time of these particular trustees. She was relieved when learning that the trustees were enthusiastic about meeting.

Here was the tradeoff: the trustees got no demand for divestment and the students received a document signed by trustees of the college signaling their opposition to the spiraling arms race and a militarism that seemed out of control. It was well understood by everyone that this document would be publicized by the students to indicate that members of the establishment had finally spoken out.

I think it was clear, it simply was not preferable. Both sides were initially receptive to attempting something new, however, once each side returned to discuss the situation with their own constituencies, the momentum was lost and the positions remained the same as before.
28 While the events do not clearly show what happened, I became persuaded after listening to everything said both then and later that the positions held by the two sides previous to the New York meeting were too entrenched to change. The extremes on both sides dominated: the President would settle for nothing other than a socially responsible investment proposal and a small group of students within the larger divestment, (those able to influence the larger group), for nothing less than attempting to divest.
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CHAPTER VI

FINAL ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST
DIVESTMENT; ESTABLISHING A
MIDDLE GROUND

My starting point is a conundrum that we might all ponder: Given the widespread agreement among so many of us on the basic values—the dignity of each human being, a revulsion at repression and violence, a commitment to building relationships among people that transcend race—why are many of us nonetheless at such an impasse on the issue of divestiture?

William Bowen, President
Princeton University

Chapter Six concentrates on the week prior to the trustees' meeting. The first section is a review of the last meeting prior to the Finance Committee meeting between those for and against divestiture. The second section summarizes final written arguments presented to the community by both sides about what the institution should do. These views are then contrasted with the established positions most often associated with divestment struggles; the "traditionalist" (against divestment) and "activist" (for divestment), as explained by Derek Bok in Beyond the Ivory Tower. Having set forth the habitual conflicts over divestment, in the third section I will explore Bok's description of how the institutional leader may be able to chart an alternative course of action between the polarized
positions of the "traditionalists" and "activists." Once familiar with the characteristics of this different course, or standard of action, the story resumes by reviewing how Dean Ford began to forge a position between the two extremes. The final section reviews a proposal to trustees, drafted just prior to the Finance meeting, requesting the creation of a task force to examine and make recommendations regarding the establishment of a socially responsible investment policy.

Part One: How the Two Sides of the Divestment Issue Lined up Against One Another and Where the Dean of Students Placed Himself in Between the Two

A week before the trustees meeting there was one last meeting between the parties in the developing controversy. It included the President, the student group sponsoring the proposal, Professor Krass, the Dean of Students, and myself. Initiated and organized by Dean Ford, the meeting had no specific agenda other than for each side to understand the other's positions plus exploring ways to avoid reaching an impasse. In general, the meeting was not particularly conciliatory in its tone. President Simmons, speaking on behalf of the trustees, who she represented, and Alan Krass, the students' mentor and forceful advocate
of their position, would often come to irreconcilable disagreements after a series of exchanges. The points of contention were those typically associated with pro and anti positions regarding divestment and institutions of higher education. On the pro side, it was argued that weapons use inflicted a severe cost to humanity and that liberal arts colleges had a moral obligation to instruct society by their intellectual and financial examples, not to support its continuation. Opponents to divestment raised questions about the effects on the institution when it takes such an overtly political position. For example, instituting the divestment proposal would violate the pursuit of free inquiry throughout the campus as well as influence those with opposing views not to attend, teach or become involved with the college. Divestment would also diminish Hampshire's reputation throughout the larger higher education community; as well, the degree of financial risk to the college could be great. Most of the two hour meeting was spent rehashing general rather than specific issues that had been previously discussed.

The Dean of Students, however, did not really speak to those issues. (He rarely discussed publicly what his own preferences were regarding divestment.) Rather, in this meeting he was more interested in discussing the way in which individuals would be treating one another in the
near future, for it was clear that the two sides were at loggerheads with one another and that conflict would arise at the Finance meeting. (At this point Ford has assumed that compromise is impossible.) He explains that he tried "... to let students know that as far as I was concerned it was important to go through this kind of stuff, vitally important, and that I wouldn't brook anybody's sort of interference." It is clear, then, that Ford supports the intentions of students to pursue institutional divestment. Ford makes clear, however, that when

... deciding what tactics to use, [students] really had to be wise and concerned about the impact on the school and what the response might be. I mean civil disobedience is an important tactic, but civil disobedience, philosophically, always contains within it the assured knowledge that there is going to be some punishment.

During the meeting Ford was very clear about what the nature of consequences meant to him and how, as the Dean, he planned on handling a discipline situation if it were to arise. "What I did not want to happen is for students to say, 'Ah, we can do any goddam thing we want. We can shut down the college, but don't bother us, don't talk about punishment.'" It was clear by what he said that he wanted individuals on both sides of the issue to know what principles he valued and the actions he was therefore willing to take.
What I wanted students to understand was that they were still engaged in an important process and that the process is one that was just very beneficial educationally. They had to think through what it was they were after, how they could achieve it, what actions seemed likely, and then choose those actions on the basis of a moral and ethical decision. And say, I accept these consequences. I'm willing to risk these consequences because this is right. And I wanted them to know it and I wanted the other administrators to know it, that I was not ever going to be put in a position where I had to compromise.

There were two new developments that emerged at this juncture. The first occurred at the meeting just discussed. It is a development that is more of a sign of the future than the occurrence of a specific event. It became obvious as students gathered for the final meeting in the president's office. Of the ten students present, all but one of the representatives were first year rather than fourth year students, that is to say, most were newcomers to the divestment cause and not the leaders. This signaled that a different attitude, one that had existed as a minority view within the student ranks for awhile, was beginning to characterize or dominate the student group. It is most easily expressed as: "We are tired of talking; different actions are now called for."²

Ford realized this shift and went further to make his points clear:

I said to them: If students imprison the trustees, that is simply wrong and unacceptable and I'll deal with that . . . no matter what your political aims, there are some things you cannot do. And I was willing to be the disciplinarian in some cases.
By this point, the mood of Ford's fellow administrators had become even more adamantly opposed to divestment. Just prior to the Finance meeting, Ford explains that his colleagues

... still hated the whole idea because Blauvelt was at risk. One or two thought discussion of the issues worthwhile, but for the most part it was a disruption; it was something that was very much unwanted ...

While realizing the unanimous view of his colleagues, Ford said to them:

I was not willing to, in a sense, depict this whole thing as sheer childish nonsense and to come down on the whole movement. As long as students were not violating relatively important codes [of behavior], I could not think of any particular punishment that was necessary.

The second development provides further evidence about why many administrators remained opposed to divestiture. President Simmons had in the previous two weeks visited representatives of the Carnegie and Ford Foundations to seek funding for special academic projects. Soon after returning, the president and other administrators reported to those taking the pro-divestment position that her inquiries were met with disfavor for reasons other than the merit of the particular proposals. Foundation staff members were aware of the recent divestment proposal passed by CHOIR, and while realizing that at this stage it was not binding, they interpreted the position taken by CHOIR (thus Hampshire) as too ideological in its directive.
The foundations, therefore, would find other institutions to grant funding to, ones which subscribed to norms of institutional neutrality, which would ensure the objectivity called for in the research. Another point made by Simmons pertained to how quickly the actions taken by CHOIR were communicated to the foundations and others working in community. In short, the "word" going around about Hampshire's new investment approach carried a negative connotation; this was another reason why the administration and trustees not support the proposal. The president's assistant reported the foundation's response to the students in hopes of persuading those supporting divestment to change their minds.

Part Two: Derek Bok Explains Why the "Traditionalists" at Hampshire Were Opposed to Divestiture and the "Activists" Embraced the Opportunity

On Tuesday, May 11, three days before the Finance Committee meeting, the final exchange, in the form of letters to the community, occurred between representatives for and against divestment. This exchange, along with the meeting previously discussed, offers an opportunity to contrast the divestiture positions at Hampshire with the
historical overview of divergent views regarding divestiture as a means of social change. The work done by Derek Bok in *Beyond the Ivory Tower* offers a well researched explanation of how divestment struggles have been waged.

In the final days before the Finance Committee meeting, President Simmons sent a letter addressed to "The Faculty" which explained not only her own position on the issue but asks for a specific kind of support. In her letter Mrs. Simmons acknowledges the recent awakening of the American public to the nuclear arms issue, stating, too, that as Hampshire's President she speaks out nationally about making issues of war and peace a central part of the undergraduate curriculum.  However, regardless of her personal attempts, she cannot support the presentation of the divestment proposal to the board of trustees. Rather than explain her own reasons for disagreement, she describes in the letter the stance of the board in this matter:

In a short preliminary discussion of the proposal last March, members of the board expressed uneasiness with the first part of the motion (that which calls for the selling of the three stocks the college holds in the top 75 weapons contractors). They were concerned about the impact of such a divestment policy on the financial health of the college, for which they are ultimately responsible. They were concerned that Hampshire not become so strongly identified with a particular political view that free inquiry would be compromised. They voiced concern, too, that the policy might imply that even a rational policy of national self-defense is socially injurious.
The three reasons cited for opposition: financial risk, jeopardizing the free inquiry of the academic pursuit, and taking a political position relative to the United States government, are the three principle reasons why the traditionalist view adheres to the position of institutional neutrality, or non-divestiture.

Explaining what is important to the traditionalist position, Derek Bok argues that preserving the financial well-being of the institution is of paramount concern to any trustee. It is a concern rooted in the law of fiduciary responsibility a trustee is sworn to uphold. Further, he explains that there can be no doubt that divestment exposes an institution to an unknown financial risk. When stocks are bought and sold in the marketplace, no absolutely accurate way exists to predict potential profits and losses. Because of this unknown risk, and the shares of stock which may have to be sold, there is a real possibility of economic loss to the institution. Accompanying the unpredictability of the market value are brokerage charges incurred when selling or liquidation occurs. A different form of potential loss in profit occurs when institutions are not allowed to invest in companies on the divested list, commonly referred to as a "blacklist." Over and above the potential economic loss is
the principle of financial management that is also at risk.

That is to say,

It is a very different matter for trustees to use institutional funds to help redress an injustice in the outside world for which the university is not directly responsible. The resources of the institution have been given in trust for educational purposes and not for political and social causes, however worthy they may be.4

Of perhaps greater significance to the traditionalist position is the nature of the institution as an independent institution; this issue is of similar importance to President Simmons and the Hampshire trustees. For the traditionalist, to divest is to sacrifice academic freedom and institutional independence. The activist views divestment "chiefly as a means of applying pressure to change corporate behavior by the generation of unfavorable publicity."5 Divestment seeks by this public condemnation and encouragement of disassociation, economic leverage on other institutions in society through the manipulation of public sentiment. The informing motivations of such actions are opposed to the traditional liberal arts, "no strings attached" notions of teaching, scholarship and the creation of new knowledge. The traditionalists (and Bok) are unwavering in their belief that:

Society respects the autonomy of academic institutions because it assumes that they will devote themselves to the academic tasks that they were established to pursue . . . . Universities that violate this social compact do so at their peril.6
Further, the traditionalist argues, there is simply no evidence which indicates that an institution can, by the selling of its stock, attain any degree of "commercial pressure" over a company. If unfavorable publicity is the only means by which leverage is derived, it is doubtful that one or two days of media coverage will achieve its desired effect. "At best, divestment may be unusual enough to attract temporary publicity that will call attention to the disputed practices of the firms involved."  

While Simmons does not mention in her letter the "procedural" argument against divestment, it was often included in discussions between those for and against divestment. What does an institution do procedurally when each company charged with some kind of social injury has to be evaluated, along with the particular company charged then being given ample opportunity to respond? How does a small, advisory investment staff manage all of the information as well as analyze it? Almost any aspect of company operations could be subject to charges of ethical malfeasance. Charges of social injury could be applied to not only weapons and human rights abuses but to issues of job discrimination, pollution, unsafe working conditions, consumer fraud and others. Moreover, the university or college would be in a position of having to make a decision it was not designed to make. Colleges and universities are
established to forward new knowledge and foster learning, not to render judgments about the practices of companies. For example, how is the member of a college community supposed to be able to accurately judge whether the workers in a chemical plant are being properly protected from toxic materials in the workplace? This is but one of the many kinds of questions those in higher education would be required to decide. And beyond individual cases, writes Derek Bok,

... a university would also have to monitor the actions of other companies in its portfolio to ensure that its standards were applied in a consistent manner. The cumulative burdens of embarking on this policy could be extremely onerous.8

Citing the evidence of "a few progressive foundations, pension funds, religious organizations, and private citizens," which are able to accomplish the goal of positive investing, President Simmons states that:

I would like to see the board work towards such a policy. Some members of the Hampshire community feel that divestment is the best way for the college to act on this matter, but I believe that an alternative policy of selecting investments especially congenial to Hampshire's missions and values would serve the interests of peace and the college. It might also show the way for other institutions.9

The President concludes her letter by saying "... I will support a motion to authorize prompt and serious study of a new investment policy." When Simmons encourages the development of a new investment policy, one that would serve specific interests, she deviates from
taking a purely traditionalist approach and begins to initiate what the traditionalist would term, activists actions.

The letter opposing President Simmons was written by Chuck Collins and distributed to every member of the college community. In Bok's terms, it is an activist position. In hopes of refuting President Simmon's arguments, Collins first discounts her assertion that the proposal implies that a national self-defense is socially injurious. Instead, Collins contends that present weapons producers contribute to social injury in the present context of the nation's "foreign policy and national objectives." He also believes that the proposal showed the variety of social ills inflicted upon citizens.

Collins challenges the President's assertion that by divesting the college identifies too closely with "... a particular political view" and "that free inquiry would be compromised," by stating:

The College is making a political statement by its economic support of the weapons industry. It is myopic to consider divestment as an action which might compromise free inquiry: while not considering tacit consent and collusion with major weapons producers a political statement in itself.10

Both traditionalist and activist perspectives agree that "universities have an obligation to use their academic resources to respond to public needs."11 The question then becomes: who defines the particular issues to be addressed
and in what manner are they to be acted upon by the college or university? More than on any other point of difference, the positions are most extreme here. The traditionalist hold that any actions should first respect academic freedom and institutional neutrality. The activist view holds that assuming strict neutrality relegates the administration of a university to little more than "brokers" between the faculty's interests and that of outside funding agencies such as governments and foundations. As brokers, the administration will, supposedly, always play it safe, not allowing the institution to commit itself to anything that is not already accepted by the higher education community at large. Therefore, Collins argues:

... the university may be attacked for clinging to a specious neutrality that amounts to little more than a tacit endorsement of the status quo and a willingness to support initiatives defined by the wealthy and the powerful.12

Collins next takes up the President's criticism that divestiture would place the financial health of the college at risk. While he grants that such "a legitimate concern" exists, he dismisses the argument quickly by reiterating the proposal's guidelines that all stocks and securities be sold "... in such a manner as not to financially endanger the College."13 Going one step further, Collins explains that the total number of companies to be excluded would total only forty rather than seventy-five.
The reason for this stems from the non-investment list already in existence regarding companies operating in South Africa. Asking the question: "Will choosing not to invest in these forty more corporations substantively jeopardize corporate gift-giving?" Collins cites the example of churches and foundations, explaining that their average return on profit proves that excluding forty more companies will not have a detrimental effect.

The remainder of Collins' letter tries to persuade the reader to realize that the arms race is not an "aberration" but a fact of life deeply rooted in our culture. Generally speaking, the divestment proposal presented by students and argued for by Collins fit easily within the definition of the activists intentions as set forth by Derek Bok. However, when describing other attributes of the activist position, Bok specifically refers to divestment as it relates to South Africa. Although somewhat different in circumstances, it is possible to make comparisons between South Africa and weapons divestment to the degree that each follows an activist approach.

First, Bok accurately summarizes the intentions of the pro-divestment movement: "They believe that divestment will result in widespread publicity, lead to other acts of protest, and help create a climate of moral indignation that may eventually force such [American] companies to
withdraw."\(^{17}\) He correctly argues that pro-divestment activists believe that after enough divestment occurs (an undefined amount), this will trigger events in South Africa, such as massive unemployment, or internal strife, which will force the government to lift apartheid rule or face total collapse. By corporations disassociating themselves from South Africa, the United States government could more easily apply sanctions. Clearly, Bok understands the ultimate goal of divestment when he explains that it "may set in motion a chain of events that will ultimately help destroy a flagrant system of injustice and oppression."\(^{18}\)

Bok, a critic of divestment, does concede that a case can be made for social change accomplished by means of divestment, but only when:

1. The withdrawal of American companies will impose pressures on the South African government that will help materially to overcome apartheid

2. Corporate withdrawal will contribute more to the defeat of apartheid than an effort on the part of American companies to improve the wages, employment opportunities, and social conditions of black workers

3. Selling university stock is likely to succeed, directly or indirectly, in causing many companies to leave South Africa. (If this is not true, it will be difficult to justify the heavy cost and other disadvantages of divestiture.)

4. Divestment is a substantially more effective way of inducing companies to withdraw than voting on shareholder resolutions.\(^ {19}\)

Bok, however, believes that the chance of all of these events coming to pass is "extraordinarily slight." And
even if they did, that they would necessarily lead to a better life for blacks is highly doubtful. It is believed that when a company decides to pull out for reasons of disagreement with the government's policy, that another company, in all likelihood one predisposed to be in agreement with the government, will immediately fill the exiting company's place. One must wonder, what is accomplished by the company's leaving.

Bok also stresses that for a long time black South Africans, including knowledgeable people in the United States, have remained "sharply divided on whether insurrections would occur and whether they would do more to overcome apartheid than the gradual improvement of employment and social conditions." Moreover, according to the anti-divestment position, officials of American colleges and universities are simply too far removed from this situation to correctly predict future events, or, to know how to steer them once they begin to occur. In his concluding objections, Bok argues that "a decision to divest would open the trustees to the risk of liability while costing the university substantial sums of money and exposing it to all the burdens and hazards of using investment decisions as a weapon to influence corporate behavior." To allow an institution to sustain financial cost, either small or large, would be an unwarranted "abuse of trust" by higher
education officials for the extremely small chance of pro-
ducing positive ends. Finally, for all of the above men-
tioned reasons,

A policy of systematic divestment must be regarded as an extraordinary step that would hardly receive serious consideration were it not for the passions so understandably aroused by apartheid and all its atten-
dant injustices.22

Spiraling militarism, particularly the Strategic Defense Initiative ("Star Wars") and the potential for nuclear war or accidents, are, along with apartheid, other issues that stir the emotions of socially concerned people.23 Although Bok argues against the activist approach as a means of inducing responsible social change, he does not believe members of colleges and universities should do nothing. He argues that shareholder resolutions are a dif-
ferent and better means for institutions of higher educa-
tion to express themselves. "The use of shareholder reso-
lutions has several advantages over selling stock."24 The real value in the shareholder resolution is that it requires the company to defend and explain its actions in a public forum.25 If, as a shareholder, one is concerned with the company's practices in South Africa, what sense does it make to cut ties while allowing someone else, who has no such compunctions, to assume your previous part ownership? Bok believes shareholder resolutions are far from being empty gestures. If used wisely, he argues,
"groups can readily take steps to place a resolution on the corporation ballot and have their views communicated to other stockholders at the company's expense." Yet, believes Bok, those groups which initiate socially responsible resolutions, or any other resolutions for that matter, must never be colleges or universities; such actions would compromise the tradition of neutrality. It is, however, perfectly within the institution's perogative, as a responsible investor, to vote in support of the resolution if its claims are deemed as legitimate.

Part Three: Charting a Course Between "Traditionalist" and "Activist" Extremes; The Role of the Administrative Leader

Although it may seem as if no other position exists aside from that of the traditionalist or activist, this is not the case. Bok believes that when institutions face issues of social responsibility to society, "academic leaders must actively seek to find neglected opportunities and important new initiatives for valuable work." In the following I will review what Bok explains is the alternative course of action administrators may take. He refers to these decisions as the "Role of Leadership in the University."
Bok first recognizes that the nature of authority within the university is shared. Faculty, students, alumni and the federal government all exert different but affective influences on the direction taken by an institution. In short, each constituency competes for the fulfillment of its own interests. And because authority is shared, each interest checks the other's ability to totally dominate the institution. Consequently, it is the leadership role of presidents and deans that may (or must) make, in Bok's view, the deciding difference concerning higher education's ability to responsibly promote social change. While they have a limited authority, it is one that can block or initiate programs. The individuals in these positions are not only supposed to serve all of the constituencies but more importantly to uphold the two most fundamental principles: institutional neutrality and academic freedom.

By the university's very nature as a place where new knowledge and its application is developed, it is necessarily an experimenting place where new endeavors are routinely attempted. Bok assumes, therefore, that to make this happen the leadership of an institution must periodically intervene (to do good) into the activities of teaching and research carried out by the faculty and students. The added responsibility deans and presidents have is to block, stymie or counter efforts by any of the
constituencies to violate principles fundamental to their institution. When doing so, however, they must not abuse their office by allowing their personal political views to dictate when and how intervention occurs. An individual must make sure he/she remain neutral and not promote any particular ideology.\textsuperscript{29} If Bok believes presidents and deans should intervene to stop movements that violate neutrality and academic freedom, he also argues that their positions of responsibility afford them the opportunity to initiate proposals that stretch the institution to accomplish its highest calling: to help make society a better place for its citizens to live. It is necessary that institutional leaders do so because:

What is true . . . is that no unseen hand exists to ensure that every important opportunity for education and research is automatically recognized and supported by society. As a result, if universities are to discharge their responsibilities to the public, academic leaders must actively seek to find neglected opportunities and important new initiatives for valuable work.\textsuperscript{30}

Referring specifically to social programs, Bok believes colleges and universities, within the scope of what the institution can afford to do while not repeating something already being done elsewhere, "can still find room to search for promising new ventures without overburdening their institutions for asking them to take on inappropriate tasks."\textsuperscript{31} Perhaps it is at this juncture that Bok's explanation of what responsible leaders do and
the specific situation at Hampshire can be discussed together. Of singular importance, Bok recognizes that any attempt to identify and address social problems is to seek out opportunities which have "undeniable political overtones." In Bok's view, distinguishing the fine line between ideological leanings and neutrality is the most critical decision the dean or president must make. When making this distinction, Bok believes that it is the nature of the institutional activity that matters most. For example, "It is one thing to encourage research on poverty and quite another to take an institutional position on appropriate government policies toward the poor." Consideration of the particular identity of a college or university must also occur. At Hampshire, President Simmons' endorsement of developing a socially responsible investment policy was decisive leadership but in a context historically rooted in a more activist tradition.

In keeping with traditional higher education practices, Bok maintains that there are primarily three standards by which an institution can measure whether or not it is successful at both pursuing socially responsible programs while maintaining principles of neutrality. First, that proposed programs be debated by the faculty. Second, that scholars be selected to work for the institution on the basis of academic merit rather than ideological
belief. And third, that "curricula and research projects remain a prerogative of the professors." When these things are all done it is doubtful that presidents or deans will have been able to use the institution for predetermined political ends.34

Bok declares finally that "a form of social responsibility exists quite distinct from the vision produced either by traditionalists or by social activists."35 While he is persuasive that those in positions of responsibility must see that the college or university carry out "an obligation to serve society by making the contributions they are uniquely able to provide," Bok is unable to offer precise guidance regarding potential circumstances and decisions one may face and have to make. Instead, he presents a summary of the challenges facing the academic leaders when guiding their institution and its members through complex circumstances. He writes:

In carrying out this duty, everyone concerned must try to take account of many different values--the preservation of academic freedom, the maintenance of high intellectual standards, the protection of academic pursuits from outside interference, the rights of individuals affected by the university not to be harmed in their legitimate interests, [and] the needs of those who stand to benefit from the intellectual services that a vigorous university can perform. The difficult task that confronts all academic leaders is to decide how their institution can respond to important social problems in a manner that respects all of these important interests.36
Returning now to the events a Hampshire, Ford, in his position as the Dean of Students, had to make decisions in an environment of administrative peers who were generally hostile to divestment. Personally, he believed that the issue was not only worthy of consideration, but that students should pursue it with the courage of their convictions. At another level, this encouragement was not looked upon with support by his direct supervisor, the president, who adamantly opposed any attempt of divestment as unproductive for the welfare of the institution. In the midst of these conditions, which had developed into an emotionally charged state by the week of the Finance Committee meeting, Ford's situation is similar to the unique position of Bok's hypothetical administrative dean whose decisions may affect the direction of the institution vis-a-vis social change. Continuing with the story, keep in mind Bok's notion of the unique administrative leadership role and the distinction between "active" versus "prescriptive" decisions. In the following, Ford explains both how he interpreted the increasing tensions and how he would fashion his decisions.

My concern was to try and keep things clear and sensible and to try to keep people from ending up in this silly position where anything nuts would happen. Now my own guess as that ultimately they would end up with a sit-in or something of that sort. I couldn't foresee anything worse, and I wasn't too worried about that, I mean, because the very history of events wasn't terribly dangerous . . . But I also felt that a lot of
my effort was going to have to be directed at keeping other people calm. And one, to let them [other administrators] know that I was in charge, and secondly, nothing terrible was happening. My fear was that panic would push people, [mostly administrators], into doing something that would make things worse than it was because of the real concern for the trustees. So a lot of my own activities were designed to one, reassure, to calm and to try and enunciate in advance a sort of preference for dealing with stuff: to try to get everybody in the same sort of context. So, for example, my plan was that if the meeting had been disrupted in May, call the meeting off and move it. It's very difficult to disrupt the meeting when it's off campus. And do not, under any circumstances, call in the authorities. [The idea of moving the meeting] was vigorously opposed by some people because they didn't want to feel chased off, but my ideas still held sway.

Part Four: Establishing an Alternative:

Initiating the Task Force Proposal on Socially Responsible Investing

On the two consecutive evenings prior to the decisive Friday afternoon meeting, May 12th and 13th, the initiation of a new chain of events began. Myself and three students, with encouragement from the Dean of Students, and the President, as expressed through her administrative assistant, drafted a proposal that would be presented to the special meeting of the CHOIR and Investment Subcommittees to the board of trustees at the specially called meeting during the morning on Friday. The hope was to present a proposal calling for the creation of a Task Force on Socially Responsible Investing that would investigate the feasibility of redefining the investment criteria
for the college's portfolio. The three students who collaborated with me interpreted this proposal as the next best solution after divestment. And, given the administrative sign as, particularly statements made by the president, proposing the creation of a task force seemed likely to meet with trustee approval whereas divestment did not. The following day, Thursday, I met with the President's assistant and a final draft was agreed upon.

On Thursday evening the student group proposing divestment met for the last time before the Finance Committee meeting the following day. Two decisions were made at the meeting. First, I presented the proposal for the development of a task force on socially responsible investments to be given the following morning at the specially convened meeting. With very little discussion, everyone agreed on this proposal, which was almost anti-climatic given the more urgent concerns regarding the divestment proposal.

Although it is to move ahead in the story quite a bit, I think it is important to point out now that it is within the context of events initiated by the task force proposal that change in the investment program at Hampshire later occurred. This illustrates how a relatively simple document created in a short period of time can have significant effect on an institution's future. (A fuller
discussion of the accomplishments of the task force occurs in the final chapter.)

The one page proposal is straightforward and to the point. It first acknowledges the importance of statements made in the document (discussed earlier) that began as a possible alternative proposal and ended up as a supporting piece to the divestment proposal. Recognized next are the two accompanying documents, investment guidelines used by the American Friends Service Committee and the United States Trust of Boston. "We believe these institutions demonstrate the economic feasibility of an investment policy different from the one Hampshire presently has." Finally, a call for the creation of a task force whose membership would include CHOIR committee members and any others they chose to add. The four objectives would include:

a. Have our present investments reviewed by at least two "socially responsible" investment firms or analysts. [It is believed that this has already begun.]

b. Review the performance of "socially responsible" investment firms and make recommendations as to what firms should invest Hampshire's endowment

c. Review the present CHOIR guidelines and make recommendations regarding its relationship to a "socially responsible" investment firm

d. Propose socially responsible criteria to be used in future investment.
The divestment story continues with the students preparing for the Finance Committee meeting on the following afternoon.
REFERENCES


2 This argument becomes even more persuasive when another incident is added, one that took place two days prior to the meeting in the president's office. At a general meeting of students interested in divestment, one of the more strident leaders, Dean Hubbard, tended to dominate the meeting in a way that no one individual had ever done. For a lengthy period of time (10-15 minutes), he read passages from Jerry Rubin's, Do It, and dismissed any and all trustees as being completely unsympathetic to anything the students were interested in achieving. In particular, Cora Weiss, the trustee who had time and time again spoken in favor of the proposal and its informing ideas, was maligned by Hubbard for being a "capitalist" at heart no matter what she or others might say. During this monologue I sensed that the extremes were beginning to reveal themselves. There were many who thought Hubbard was issuing a "right on" declaration. He argued that the real issue was a fight over what the dominant ideology of the college would be: capitalist oppression by trustees or instituting democratic freedom by students.

3 President Simmons was a leader in the establishment of the Five College Peace Studies Program.

4 Bok, Beyond the Ivory Tower, p. 289.

5 Ibid., p. 287.

6 Ibid., p. 289.

7 Ibid., p. 290.

8 Ibid., p. 288.

9 Adele Simmons, Memorandum to the "Hampshire Faculty," May 11, 1982, p. 2.

10 Chuck Collins, Memorandum to the "Faculty, Students and the Board of Trustee," May 13, 1982, p. 1.

11 Bok, Beyond the Ivory Tower, p. 78.

12 Ibid., p. 79.
Collins, Memorandum to the "Faculty, Students and the Board of Trustees," p. 1.

Ibid.

When identifying with more socially progressive investors, neither side pointed out that although positive industries are identified as better investments, it is equally true that bad industries are named and a list established, which is the same effect as having a divestment list. This dilemma is realized a year later.

In Collins' concluding remarks he argues that there should be no "collusion" with any form of militarism. Although Collins has invested his own trust fund stocks in socially responsible investments, he argues that non-collusion is a task financially borne out more by the institution than by individuals. The primary responsibility of individuals is to simply speak out. He writes: "As individuals we need to speak out against the arms race. We also must pressure our institutions and demand that they do not collude with the arms race, not profit from the manufacture of weapons, and not condone with silence the policies of our government. At this moment in history it is very easy to speak out against the arms race. What is difficult is to divest oneself, one's institutions and one's country of the privileges . . . [and] profit . . . we derive from that which we abhor." Memorandum to the "Faculty, Students and the Board of Trustees," p. 2.

This concluding point is especially interesting because during the week preceding the trustees meeting a number of exchanges took place between students regarding scholarship funding. In particular, one of the student leaders, Matt Goodman, was the recipient of a RCA scholarship, one of the companies on the top seventy-five list. When asked whether he intended to divest himself of his scholarship, Goodman explained that the institution was better able to sustain the financial risks. While many students found the logic absurd which asks that students divest in a manner equal to what the institution does, another student leader, Tom Stoner, did not. He immediately began investigating how he could alter his trust fund holdings to reflect socially responsible choices rather than achieving the highest possible yield. These discussions were very tense. Michael Ford first raised the contradiction to me and I followed by raising the same question with the students.
There has been a minimal amount of campus protest of Star Wars from students while a surprising amount from the faculty ranks. Physicists at institutions engaged in defense funded Star Wars research have signed petitions to no longer engage in such research.

This is not possible to do in any real sense. Biases inform everything we say and do.

In this regard, Bok specifically refers to college scholarships for black South African students, establishing a preferential admissions policy for minority students in the United States and research centers for nuclear arms control as examples of social responsibility taken by institutions that are by nature political in their scope.
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CHAPTER VII

EVENTS INFORMING THE FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING; THE MEETING ITSELF: AND REACTION TO ITS OUTCOME

The administration was anxious not to exclude us from the process . . . Tension built as we heard the same arguments . . . As it became apparent that they were going to vote against us, more and more students slipped into the room . . . The action went beyond what we had planned almost immediately.¹

Tasha Harmon, student

The primary events explained in Chapter Seven cover a period of four days, Thursday through Sunday. The topics covered are divided into four parts. Part One discusses student planning for actions at the Finance meeting and a review of the Finance subcommittee meetings. Part Two concentrates on the Finance Committee meeting and events relating to it. Part Three explores the immediate reaction of students to the decision made by the Finance Committee, and Part Four explains how the decision by students to take over the administration's offices evolved.
Part One: The Community Is Mobilized to Support Divestment; A Plan of Action Is Adopted by Students in the Case that the Proposal Fails; and, the Findings of Finance Subcommittees Influence the Divestment Proposal

Part One begins by conveying a sense of how the entire campus was becoming involved in the divestiture issue. The mobilization efforts of the divestment group was effective. In the days before the Friday meeting, the students used a variety of publicity to rally other members of the community to their cause. Numerous newspaper articles were devoted to the issue and student outreach groups contacted other student groups for support. In every student's mailbox, a one-page handout was distributed entitled "Invest in the Future! Divest from Weapons Producers!" Included in the exhortation was a particularly challenging statement that read:

It is easy to be against the arms race, to pass a resolution as we did last year against our nation's growing militarism. It is quite another statement, one which is infinitely more meaningful, to divest oneself of the privileges and profits which one derives from that which one abhors.²

The one page, eight by eleven posters, could be seen everywhere around campus. The text included a brief history of the divestment of weapons issue and the announcement of a: "Rally--In Front of the Library--Noon--Be
There, scheduled to get everyone excited and organized before the meeting. The boldest lettering, easily readable from a distance, proclaimed: "All Power to the Imagination."

Thursday Evening

The final topic of concern for students prior to the Finance Committee meeting was establishing a plan for what to do in the event that the proposal either passed or was voted down. The issue was discussed and voted on by students the evening before the Finance Committee meeting, at the same meeting where the task force proposal was submitted and approved. It took two minutes to decide to propose the task force proposal and over an hour to decide how to respond to the trustees on the Finance Committee if they failed to vote for divestment. The conclusions reached were: if divestment passed, then everyone would be elated. If it failed, then all the students would sit down where they were and remain silent as a sign of protest.

Although it was mentioned every now and then amongst students outside the meeting that some of the more strident members of the group had been meeting separately, in order to plan a more confrontational reaction to the trustees, I did not place any great stock in this possibility since all students were agreeing to comply with one kind of action; one that was not overly confrontational.
Two meetings occurred on Friday morning, May 14, 1982, that affected the afternoon meeting. First, at 10:00 a.m. the specially called combination meeting of CHOIR and the Investment Subcommittee discussed the proposal to establish a task force to investigate the feasibility of the college adopting a socially responsible investment policy. The discussion was quite amiable and the participant's spoke optimistically about its feasibility. Everyone departed the meeting elated, for when the vote was taken the result was seven in favor and zero opposed. (There was even greater cause for optimism because these were some of the same trustees, notably John Watts, who were on the Finance Committee and would be voting on the divestment proposal later in the day.)

The second meeting of consequence was the Resources and Investment Subcommittees of the Board. Hampshire's Vice-President for Development, Jerry Patrick, had been asked by the Finance Committee at their March meeting to prepare a report concerning the potential effect of the weapons divestment proposal in the area of financial giving to the college. Mr. Patrick's findings regarding divestiture are summarized in his conclusion: "... my judgment is that the more [divestment initiatives] proposed would certainly have a net negative impact on giving to Hampshire
College, a significant and quite possibly substantial proportions."

Friday Afternoon

The early afternoon of May 14, 1982 was for the most part a sunny and clear day; the kind of New England spring day that alone can raise the spirit. These weather conditions furthered campus excitement now that the special day had finally arrived. While trustee meetings took place during the morning, many students began setting up a stage and sound system for the "Noon Rally." The stage and gathering place was located directly in the center of campus. Activities started around 11:00 a.m., with various Hampshire musicians taking turns at performing. At noon, student and faculty speakers began to give a number of short speeches. The program also included the locally renowned protest activist, Francis Crowe, who encouraged those pushing for divestment from weapons makers to realize they were making an unprecedented attempt to have great faith in themselves. Shortly before 1:00 p.m., with banners waving and horns and drums beating protest cadences, those attending the rally marched en masse down to the Red Barn where the meeting was about to begin. From the divestment planning group's perspective, seeing the large turn out of student support seemed to inspire even bolder optimism than had been granted during the previous few days.
regarding the proposal's chances of passing. All the factors counted on to ensure success had been achieved: supporting documents to the divestment proposal, faculty and student support in the form of petitions and a public demonstration of commitment on the part of the community.

Part Two: The Finance Committee Meeting

At 1:00 p.m. the chairman of the committee began the meeting, not with the fanfare expected after two months of anticipation, but with the calm and deliberate authority of parliamentary procedure, which included a proviso of those permitted to speak at the meeting. Chairman Watts made it clear that the discussion would be orderly. Students, numbering at least two hundred strong, sat on a porch outside the conference room, listening to the discussion both through a screen door and a sound system that had been set up beforehand to handle the overflow crowd. By Hampshire standards this crowd was considered large; of those present there was only a sprinkling of faculty and staff members. Approximately eighteen students sat inside the conference room; this group was comprised of representatives on the Finance and CHOIR committees and members of the Students for Responsible Investing (SRI was the acronym now used by the student divestment group.)

Chairman Watts began by recognizing the student and faculty members on the Finance Committee. They, along with
the students and faculty on CHOIR, acted as spokespersons for the proposal. First, the students and faculty presented their petitions, explaining that the constituencies they represented overwhelmingly supported divestment. Each gave a short presentation of the reasons for the proposal's passage. Two arguments were of most concern to the students. First, and of unique importance and different from weapons-related issues, was the inherent meaning of Hampshire's founding principles, as set forth in the motto: "To know is not enough." One student, Chuck Collins, argued that gaining in knowledge and understanding is only half the educational calling; acting on one's interpretation and understanding of knowledge is the other. Second, because the college's present investment activities, he argued, were in support of corporations proven to be violators of laws, and because this constituted a political position in and of itself, the college consequently was not a neutral actor in the context of institutions taking positions on political issues. These two themes—Hampshire's motto and the implied political meaning, were the basis on which those favoring the proposal built their arguments. Time and time again during the discussion the students would quote or paraphrase from their proposal and the recently added supporting document.
The trustees, on the other hand, felt that the college, in its capacity to remain first and foremost an institution of higher learning, must respect a variety of political views—"conservative as well as liberal"—and not bias the learning environment which would mean affecting educational policy and free inquiry. It was argued that such positions are properly made by the different branches of American government. And, there exists numerous avenues for political participation available to citizens. Although many trustees agreed that there were terrible problems regarding the escalating arms race, it was not the corporations that were establishing our foreign policy. Thus it was an unreasonable request, the trustees argued, to divest stocks in companies that were serving the society in humane ways by manufacturing products used by all citizens on a daily basis. Many trustees expressed opposition to divestment because by doing so the act presumes a moral condemnation of all the company's activities, as well as all persons associated with the organization. In short, it was simply an unfair request to publicly condemn so many individuals and business organizations. Also, argued Howard Blauvelt, because a college is concerned with education, which requires adequately equipped facilities, the institution's endowment should reap as much return as possible, so the money can be invested back into the
college ensuring that a Hampshire student receive the best possible education. Instead of trying to achieve political change, trustees believed society's greater progress would be realized through educational means: namely, that an individual will be better able and suited to contribute to society if properly educated. And finally, because the Investment Subcommittee Report (based upon the study conducted by Vice-President Patrick) found that the college's corporate and foundation fund raising efforts would be made more difficult, it was felt that divestment—even if it were agreed upon in principle—would be an unwise choice for the college to make at the present time. Therefore, the quality of education, which trustees are sworn to uphold by virtue of their position, would suffer.

It was this, the prohibitive financial risk, that brought out the greatest amount of objections from trustees. As the meeting progressed the debate centered around the effect divestiture would have on fund raising efforts. After Patrick presented his conclusion that as Development Director his ability to fund raise would be deterred, trustee Weiss asked him if there had been any negative financial consequences since 1977 when the college divested from South African investments? Patrick "stated he had no concrete evidence but he noted that the college had never received a repeat grant from Xerox after adoption
of the policy."⁴ Krass contributed the view that no evidence exists regarding anti-Hampshire feelings on the part of donors and "the College should not allow itself to be held hostage for potential future gifts and grants."⁵ Blauvelt, however, expressed the view that in the future corporations are going to contribute significantly more to higher education and this proposal would be read by the corporate community as antagonistic. Chairman Watts added that the opinion of the college's investment managers had been sought and they expressed the view that "a weapons or defense industry ban plus the existing South African policy together would make it more difficult to attain our investment goals."⁶ Further, Watts pointed out that the Investment subcommittee voted not to adopt the divestment proposal passed by CHOIR.

Throughout most of the meeting a passionate--though restrained--discussion occurred between all participants. Towards the end, however, the student trustee on CHOIR, Chuck Collins, adamantly charged the trustees with failure to refute, or even address, the proposal's fundamental argument: that present investments are in and of themselves political statements. Furthermore, because investments are therefore non-neutral, how can the trustees present them as if they were? This, he went on to say, was the perpetuation of the myth of institutional neutrality. And
although Collins' impassioned plea was received by applause (the first sign of which since the meeting began), his questions were never addressed by anyone.

At this point the discussion had lasted almost an hour and a half, the usual limit of trustee meetings. It was clear that irreconcilable differences existed between the two views and that Chairman Watts wanted to bring the meeting to a close. Allen Torrey, recorded in the meetings minutes what occurred next.

After several others present spoke, Chairman Watts called for a vote on the CHOIR resolution of March 12. The vote was three in favor, six opposed with two abstentions; the motion was declared lost.?

Part Three: The Reaction of Students to the Vote of No Divestment

Late Friday Afternoon

Instead of hearing an outcry from students as one might expect, there was simply a gasp and then quiet discussion between individuals. Outside the meeting room in the Red Barn, a few students began venting their anger while pacing around; most simply remained seated still listening to the remainder of the meeting. The last few minutes of the meeting were spent reviewing the work of Finance's subcommittees, specifically, the motion to establish a task force on socially responsible investing that was passed earlier in the day at the specially called
joint CHOIR and Investment Subcommittee meeting. Torrey's notes explain that: "President Simmons spoke in favor but recommended an increase in the size of the task force and Weiss added the admonition that the task force proceed with all deliberate speed." The motion was passed unanimously by the Finance Committee, seven in favor and zero opposed. Last, Chuck Collins asked that representatives of the student group be given time at the Board's closing session to address the full Board about the defeated proposal. The Treasurer's minutes indicate that the meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m. The events immediately following the adjournment of the meeting are explained by the Dean of Students.

The one time we almost lost it was during the end of the Finance meeting. Finance voted down the proposal and students flooded into the room and sat down. We almost lost it there. One, because it wasn't something I thought would happen from everything that I had heard. [Ford was confided in by many because he was trusted.] And it's also clear to me, from everything I know, that it wasn't planned. In fact, it was contrary to what had been agreed on. Nobody, even amongst the students, knew what was going to happen, so that the action was one that could have had some disastrous consequences. If it hadn't ended I might have had to do something. It was very clear that people were beginning to panic.

At first, Ford expected that the students would simply sit down and sing a couple of songs "ala the old civil rights days ... people would leave and that would be it." However, it was almost immediate when students "began to close the exists, and I began to sort of see both anger
and the sense of panic on the part of people you didn't expect it of, trustees and administrators."

The circumstances were worrying Ford; he also knew it was primarily his responsibility to get the students to stop blocking the exits and leave. A variety of responses began occurring to him:

... get everybody's attention and announce suspensions of everybody. And if you don't move by the time I count to five or ten, then I'm going to escalate the suspensions. For every time, ... (so forth and so on); you know, I was thinking about this while it was going on.

After months of discussion and debate on the issue of divestment, the Dean of Students was now left in a room filled with angry students who were blocking the trustees from exiting. With the sense of panic increasing, Ford was particularly concerned that "all of the kind of advance preparation that I had done was out the window." Along with the suspensions, he considered other responses, one of which included law enforcement officials; although, "there was no way I could get the cops there in time." Had there even been enough time, Ford was committed not to use the police. To do so, he reasoned, is to say:

... in essence, this is not a cloistered sort of intellectual community; that you're a part of the world and if you fuck up, I'm going to call the cops. And I think that changes the nature of the relationship.

Although the task at hand was easily identifiable: to get people out of the room, Ford states:
I really couldn't get control of it because of the panic. If all the students had agreed and if it had been a disciplined thing, we probably could've handled it better other than the fact that some students were surprised, and that made the panic and the confusion worse.

If someone were outside the three different entrances to the conference room and trying to see what was occurring, he or she would have seen an entanglement of people bunched up together on the floor, with men and women trying to grope their way through the mass, constantly needing to shift their weight in order to maintain balance. A multitude of cacophonous sounds was loudly heard, originating for the most part from the beating of drums and the clanging of homemade instruments. But there was also a number of individuals chanting political slogans: "Up with this, down with that . . . so and so trustee is a murderer . . . and on and on." A few people had moved but only after Ford threatened them with potential punishment. The critical moment in all of the confusion occurred when the majority in the room witnessed the Treasurer, Allen Torrey, fall to the floor into a pile of students. Mike Ford remembered the moment this way:

That, I guess, was the tensest part. He [Torrey], was bullying his way through the crowd and they weren't moving and he sort of stepped, he either stepped on somebody or somebody moved in such a way that he tripped and fell. And in a way, I think that that broke it up. People saw, Oh Lord, this was about to become violent. Torrey and a couple of students were about to hit each other. Then people thought, I don't think we're going to go through with this.
Chuck Collins contributed greatly to students leaving when, in the midst of the mayhem, he yelled to other students from the center of the room: "Please stop, we said we were not going to do this." He remained there continuing to assist the Dean of Students in encouraging people to get up and go. All of the students left once the trustees had vacated the room.

Although the official meeting was over, a new kind of meeting, one much more informal, began between a few of the trustees who chose to stay behind and talk to the many disgruntled students. According to Mike Ford, the scene developed in this fashion:

Cora Weiss wisely stayed behind and said, "Let's talk about this. I'm willing to stay here and talk." And so she, in essence, ended up hosting a session that involved a group of students, and maybe one other trustee, [there were actually two, Ralph Gomery and Sandra Moose] ... So that was how it ended, with Cora talking and helping them to vent, which was very shrewd on her part.

What had transpired was unsettling to Ford. "It sort of left me wondering: just what was next." Given the hostility expressed by students, Ford expected further actions but not immediately.

I felt that they [the students] were sort of worried enough [that] some discipline would reassert itself. And I also tried to send out the word that any fucking up and I was going to start kicking people out of school.
Saturday Morning

The next day's concluding trustee meeting occurred without incident. Tom Stoner, the student elected to serve as a member of the board of trustees, (and also one of the founders of the divestment proposal, but one who had also become recently uninvolved due to the uncompromising stridency which began to dominate the group prior to the Finance Meeting), did address the trustees at their general session on Saturday. The points he made were simply a reiteration of arguments made before. Minutes of the meeting read that Tom Stoner "... noted that Hampshire College had taken a lead nationally in expressing opposition to the arms race, and that they [the students] hoped that the board of trustees would find means of expressing itself in keeping with the concerned students." Professor Kurtiss Gordon, a representative of CHOIR, also spoke saying that "... the faculty was deeply sympathetic with the proposal..."..

The minutes of the general board meeting also indicate that more than a few trustees committed themselves to following through with plans to devise socially sensitive investment criteria, even before the task force had convened its first meeting. While the chairwoman of CHOIR, Vanessa Gamble, and the President of the college both expressed a desire to see the immediate creation of the
task force, it was even more striking that trustees expressed the following:

Mr. Gomory endorsed the idea of a constructive investment policy and urged that areas of consensus be the first focus of the task force. He expressed optimism that consensus could be achieved among reasonable people, but he also noted that respectable schools of thought existed for and against certain areas of investment. Mr. Truman asked that it be noted that the trustees shared the concern of the other members of the Hampshire community about the threat of nuclear war.

Viewing the Finance meeting in retrospect, the two parties, students and trustees, could not agree on anything. For example, on Saturday, there began to arise from the student ranks resentment of the discussion that took place during the Friday Finance meeting. They felt that the chairman of the committee, John Watts, "ran" the meeting in an autocratic manner, sticking to all the rules of parliamentary procedure and conducting the discussion on a completely procedural basis.

In the minutes of the general trustee meeting the following day, "Mr. Gomery observed that it would have been helpful for the board of trustees if there had been more dialogue between the trustees and the students before the issue came to a head, a remark in which Trustee Cohen strongly concurred."13 Yet, when Mike Ford was asked if he felt that there was little understanding between the two sides, he replied:
That's right. I don't understand, if it were to come up again, how to help understanding. I don't have any idea about a strategy that would have made communication better. No, I really don't. I think that it just was an inevitable clash.

Part Four: The Origins of an Occupation of Administrative Offices by Students

When reviewing the events that precipitated the occupation, it is worthwhile to explore the perspective of one student, Tasha Harmon, who was involved. Her story begins with the period of time just after the Friday afternoon Finance Committee meeting. Harmon's reaction to this meeting conveys both the felt emotion and beliefs held by students interested in the enactment of divestment. Tasha Harmon writes in "The Making of an Occupation:"

Some trustees remained to talk with us, but emotions were running high making a useful dialogue impossible. We all left the meeting feeling very angry and very frightened by what we had seen. I think that most of us, realistically or not, had really believed that we were going to win. Seeing a group of middle aged, mostly white, mostly male, corporate "execs" and academicians (Cora Weiss and a few other semi-executives) overruling the documented wishes of the majority of the Hampshire community, on an issue which we saw as having life and death implications, was an incredible shock. I was also very frightened by the dynamics that I had seen in the meeting--the disrespect of the trustees for us as people and for our position, the fear of the trustees when they were confronted with what was, initially, a completely peaceful demonstration, and the rapidity with which the whole situation became completely reactionary.¹⁴

When interpreting Harmon's account, much of Ford's argument, that students actually believed in the real
possibility of divestment and would be shocked and hurt if it did not happen, is confirmed. In a separate issue, however, it is interesting to note a difference in views between Ford and Harmon. Whereas Ford saw the role of Weiss and other trustees who stayed to talk with students after the Finance meeting as valuable, Harmon thought the dialogue essentially meaningless. With the advantage of hindsight, one may wonder if a more meaningful discussion among the students and trustees at this juncture could have helped, or was even possible. If so, perhaps some of the tensions may have been resolved enough to have neutralized the momentum to occupy.

Before the conclusion of the trustee meeting on Saturday morning, sometime during the early evening on Friday, students interested in divestment announced that a general meeting would be held in the Community Center on Saturday afternoon. The purpose of the meeting was to decide what their reaction would be to the Trustee's decision at Friday's Finance Committee meeting. Harmon writes:

We met the next afternoon to decide what to do. Emotions were still running high and there was an incredible amount of energy in the people present which needed an outlet . . . about 70 people attended (40-45 of whom had just entered the process at the board of trustee meeting). It [the meeting] lasted nearly seven hours.
Saturday Afternoon

Gaining insights into just how the divestment effort evolved into an occupation are revealed by reviewing the nature of the topics and discussion of this long meeting. The meeting began at approximately 4:00 p.m., Saturday, when seventy-five people gathered in a large circle; most were sitting on the floor while others stood around. Chuck Collins writes that "Tom Stoner opened the meeting by discussing what he felt was a student victory at the trustee meeting, an increased consciousness on the part of trustees, and an enormous potential for fruitful dialogue as action in the future." Very quickly though, the discussion moved from Tom's evenhanded commentary on the education of the trustees by the ordeal, to the more aggressive question: "What should we do now in response to the trustees' decision?" Another student, however, asked if there could be some discussion of what happened at the conclusion of the Finance Committee meeting. More specifically, a first-year student who was new to the issue asked, "How did the more militant kind of confrontation arise when agreements, more peaceful ones, had been established by the group beforehand?" Not surprisingly, because the principle of trust between individuals was at issue, this topic inspired a number of opinions. Some people felt that they
could not continue to participate if agreements made by the group could be secretly co-opted by others.\textsuperscript{17}

The disagreement over the issue resolved itself easily though. Along with myself, other students who shared the view that decisions and actions should remain consistent with one another also left the meeting and/or the group.\textsuperscript{18} Contributing to this exodus was the increasingly expressed belief that the occupation of the administration building was the mandatory next step in the divestment cause. Tasha Harmon writes:

Many of the people who did not agree that this was the time to take militant action, and all of those who did not believe in militant action as a way to solve political problems, left the meeting as it became clear to them that no matter how many people disagreed, that some kind of action was going to take place.\textsuperscript{19}

The urgency to occupy was not a development that particularly surprised anyone. Ever since the Finance meeting numerous spontaneous meetings occurred between students. Of those discussions, Collins reports that "the dominant sentiment supported an occupation of Cole Science Center [the administrative offices which occupy the first floor]."\textsuperscript{20} The development of this momentum prior to Saturday's meeting "effectively squelched any voices of opposition that attempted to object to the tactics of the occupation."\textsuperscript{21}

Adding to the inability of an occupation opposition to articulate itself and making the collective decision to
occupy even easier, was a distinctive shift in the decision making process used by students. Until now, throughout the seven month effort to bring about divestiture, all decisions but one (whether or not to submit an alternative proposal to the Finance Committee), had been made by a process of consensus. A student, Catherine Jolly, writing in a Division I Social Science exam in May, 1983, explains what happened:

A particularly striking moment for me was the point in the Saturday meeting when it was decided that, because of the time pressure (it was just after classes had ended), decisions could no longer be made by consensus, and a voting system was set up.22

Had there even been minutes taken of this seven hour meeting it would still be impossible to accurately report the details and recount what happened. Especially difficult is the task of accurately conveying how a large group of generally well-behaved students could decide to formulate and adopt a policy of occupation. It is one that assaults every norm of liberal arts civility and, for all intents and purposes, constitutes a breaking of the law. How such extreme actions could be taken in such a short period of time is explained by Tasha Harmon. She argues that the same group who engineered the confrontational actions towards trustees at the Finance Committee meeting, seemed, at Saturday's meeting,
determined to do some kind of fairly militant action and kept discussing the occupation of the first floor of Cole Science Center, which took place in 1976, and resulted in a policy of complete non-investment in corporations doing business in South Africa. The major spokespersons (all male) for this group were very charismatic and very articulate, particularly about the importance of taking an active role in the worldwide struggle against injustice, and about how safe and easy an occupation at Hampshire would be compared to what so many others who were fighting for justice, or who are victims of injustice go through because of U.S. militarism. They argued that the decision about whether or not to occupy a building was essentially a "motherhood" issue, (an issue which is impossible to oppose), effectively cutting off almost all debate.

Only one other proposal was presented that afternoon which was contrary to the occupation sentiment and taken seriously enough to necessitate a vote. Chuck Collins proposed "that we consider occupying for a day, disrupting the normal flow of business to make a political point, because a sustained action might have more negative effects than positive." Tasha Harmon describes Collins' proposal and the manner in which it was discussed. Her comments trace not only the growing authority wielded by those students desiring a sustained occupation, a group she labels "faction one," but of more importance, the inability of those opposing the former view to voice a difference of opinion. Harmon states:

The power of the charisma of the leadership of faction one became even more evident as discussion of a limited, one day occupation without demands for the purpose of a press blitz and consciousness raising, an option favored by myself and a number of others, was rejected with almost no discussion.
Harmon goes on to explain that Collins' proposal was presented five hours into the meeting. Perhaps "exhaustion was playing a part . . .," which may explain why the proposal was given little consideration. More critical than exhaustion, however, Harmon, able to reflect on what had already transpired, argues that other reasons existed for the lack of seriousness paid to Collins' proposal. She tells us that:

... it is also much easier to argue forcefully for a position which comes out of a clear, well-defined ideological position than for one which grows out of uncertainty, or is basically a questioning of the ideologies and positions of others.

Saturday Evening

At approximately 9:30 p.m., five and one-half hours into the meeting, a motion was made that an occupation of the Cole Science Center be undertaken. The content of the motion stated that students would enter Hampshire's administration building at 2:00 a.m. Monday morning, chain and lock the doors, with the intention of remaining in the building until certain articulated requests were satisfactorily met. The motion carried by an overwhelming majority of those present. The meeting ended around 11:00 p.m. with the agreement to meet again early in the afternoon the following day to begin formalizing plans to occupy.
Part Five: Reactions to the Momentum to
Occupy and Preparations Made by the
Administration for Such Actions

Hampshire's Community Center is a space centrally located on campus with coffee and snack shops situated in adjoining rooms. As the one hundred or so people openly discussed the possibility of an occupation, other students who chose not to become involved could easily hear the discussion while either walking by or stopping to listen. Dean Ford received telephone calls throughout the evening from bystanders at the divestment meeting warning him that an occupation was a real possibility. Consequently, the Dean was in constant communication with President Simmons about the news.

Late into the night on Saturday small groups of people gathered across the campus to discuss the events of the preceding few days and the appropriateness of an occupation. For example, in my apartment individuals representing very different perspectives on the divestment movement began discussing these matters at around 11:30 p.m. and finally stopped at 5:00 a.m. A diverse gathering of viewpoints were present. There were some who were very much associated with the pro-occupation, or the "faction one" group, others who thought a one-day occupation was best, and still others who had been originally involved
with the writing of the divestment proposal and had participated in the meeting with trustees in New York City, but who eventually decided that they had to disassociate themselves from the group continuing to propose divestment. Also present were a few who were undecided on the issues.

For the most part, the conversation focused upon this last group, for they were individuals who could still be persuaded to act one way or another. Among these individuals of various inclinations, the discussion of issues was often antagonistic, constantly testing the strength of personal relationships and friendships. At times, it was necessary for others to enter the dialogue-turned-argument between two persons to mitigate strained tensions.

This particular late-night meeting highlights the emotional friction in the developing divestment crisis. One of the major contributors was physical exhaustion. This should not be surprising when participants walked out of a meeting that lasted seven hours and immediately began another one which lasted six hours. Most members of the campus community who were directly involved in the events were able to get only a fraction of the rest that they needed; and to a slightly lesser degree, the same exhaustion affected the remainder of the community. This increased tension arose because students campus-wide were pressing each other to define their position on any and all
matters related to divestment. It is doubtful that any college community consumed by a divestment or similar type of crisis could remain typically calm for an extended period of time.

Sunday Morning

A meeting was called by President Simmons early on Sunday morning. She asked the Dean of Students and his two assistants, myself and Sue Alexander, the Associate Dean of Students, along with the other senior administrators of the college, to meet at her home later in the morning to discuss potential events and the preventative steps that could be taken. At the beginning of this meeting it was a unanimous recommendation of the Dean of Students' staff that students would carry through with their decision of the day before and there would be an occupation. Moreover, I related many of the statements made by persons discussing divestment in my apartment only a few hours earlier as evidence of the imminent occupation.28

It was presumed that the takeover would take place sometime between late Sunday night and early Monday morning. Knowing, however, that students were going to be formulating their plans later that day at another community center meeting, it was decided, as a last ditch effort, that Mike Ford and Dean of the Faculty, Penina Glazer, would call two student leaders on the telephone and offer
to talk to the entire group at any time during the day with the hope of agreeing on a course of events other than an occupation. Leaving nothing to chance, it was also argued that every possible preparation for the closing of administrative offices should be concluded by Sunday evening. Therefore, telephones were turned off, xerox machines were made inoperable, confidential files were removed from the building, and all immediate work that was critically important to the life of the institution was removed.

The student planning meeting on Sunday afternoon offered no new developments. As expected, the students chose not to take up the administration's offer to discuss the situation with the Deans of Faculty and Students. Proceeding with their expressed intentions, Tasha Harmon explains what was accomplished: "We formed an official coalition with other campus groups, held a strategy meeting and drew up an initial (badly defined) list of demands . . ."29 This coalition or multi-interest group, Harmon tells us,

. . . included people at all different stages of understanding about divestment and about the process that the original divestment group had gone through with the board. It included many people who were politically active on campus fighting for money for day care, the women's center, a counselor advocacy program for women, space for the alternative high school, which used our campus, the Third World Organization, etc."30

Plans continued to be made throughout Sunday evening. At approximately 3:00 a.m. a small number of
students, referred to as the "security group," entered Cole Science Center with a key that allowed entrance into the science lab area on the second floor. Using what is often characterized as typical Hampshire student resourcefulness, the group found a way to enter the first floor administration offices by coming down through the ceiling. The occupation was now underway.
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CHAPTER VIII

THE MAKING AND UNMAKING OF AN OCCUPATION

There were a number of us who had decided an occupation was the right response, and I think most of the others too. We couldn't have done most of what we did without agreeing . . . but we did effectively silence an opposition of four or five people, through parliamentary procedures and other ways.¹

Matt Goodman, student

It was really just a frustrated act . . . they said different things all the time . . . For divestment, to make our presence known; this is the solution. Then, to politicize people. They didn't know what else to do--it was the end to the year. It was really more a personal act than a public one, because it didn't work for them more than anyone else.²

Julie Ozydin, student

Chapter Eight examines the four day occupation of the administrative offices focusing on the demands made by students, the response of the administration, the negotiations between students and administration and the related events which led to the eventual end of the crisis. The chapter is divided into five parts, each one corresponding to the days of the week, Monday through Friday.
Part One: Monday; Each Side Adjusts to a New Situation; The Administration Alters Their Organizational Structure; Students Present a List of Demands; Ford Seeks to Avoid Conflicts and Leads the Administrative Efforts

Monday Morning

I remember very vividly that Monday morning, knowing full well that the occupation was going to occur. It was as predictable as the night following the day . . . I found out later that everybody was running around looking and asking and wondering where everybody was. Rich and Woody [Associate Dean of the Faculty and Assistant to the President] had gotten on to campus early and had found the doors padlocked and were trying to find cable cutters. All kinds of silliness was going on throughout the campus, and while there was a feeling of excitement, there was a lot of confusion.

In some respects, certain basic functions maintained at the college--serving meals, keeping the library open and end of the year exam meetings between faculty and students continued to take place. On the other hand, the act of keeping essential administration and staff personnel out of their offices, which included the Central Records Office where student transcripts and evaluations (exam results) were recorded, effectively halted much of the college's routine activities. Since it was the end of the year and most students needed to use the Central Records Office, an atmosphere of both confusion and concern was created by the action. One could often hear throughout the
duration of the occupation the apprehensive question: "How can we have graduation if academic exam records remain locked up in Central Records?"

Many of the institution's primary activities were curtailed because most administrators and staff were either displaced from their offices and had to simply wait around with nothing to do, or the work they did shifted to occupation related matters. Although President Simmons was ultimately responsible for the institution's overall academic and non-academic activities, she and other administrators would in the days ahead turn to the Dean of Students for guidance and leadership. This "administrative group" (as it was sometimes referred to) would include the Dean's two assistants, the Dean of Faculty and the four School Deans representing the different disciplines, the President, including the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, and other members of the staff and administration. Ford interpreted the circumstances of his new roles this way:

It became clear to me that I was going to be in the middle; in the sense that there were just a large number of factions. On the one hand there were students who were inside; on the other hand there was the rest of the student body, some of whom were sympathetic, and some of whom could be sure not to be. There was the faculty; there were the administrators. And obviously, there were members of the board of trustees who were concerned; and at that juncture we still did not want to get into a position to lose or alienate significant members of the board. And the handling of the occupation itself was sort of going to be at the center of all these swirling interests. So there was a lot of tension. Hell, I remember vividly
that my stomach started to continually jump; I subsisted mostly on quick sandwiches and Rolaids.

Given these circumstances, Ford adopted a "set the stage" strategy "so that we could sort of handle events." He realized neither he nor his staff "were capable of manipulating events to the full." However, it would be possible to try and direct events within a certain framework. Ford explains:

It was clear that there was going to have to be a lot of calming actions and we would have to have some people thinking straight and keeping them [students and other administrators] from making what might be a disastrous mistake on either side . . . making matters a lot worse. That was my greatest worry.

While the Dean was developing a strategy for solving a crisis, it is important to keep in mind that throughout the occupation he could not know what either the occupiers' situation or plans were.

From the occupiers' perspective, the initial entering and commandeering of the building was accomplished with great excitement. Having once claimed the space, however, the students were suddenly faced with numerous responsibilities, previously unforeseen, requiring their time and attention. Chuck Collins explains: "Once the occupation was started it became apparent that maintaining the security of the building and dealing with obstacles like telephones being cut, central records and elevator repair men--was a full-time job."
Students associated with the occupation of the Cole Science Center (those inside the building, as well as others who remained outside performing support help) began contacting television, radio and newspapers early on Monday morning. A press statement was prepared by students working through the night and released to all media sources who were interested; particular emphasis was given to contacting the wire services, Associated Press and United Press International. The document released was titled "Hampshire College Students Occupy Administration Building Over Arms Race." Much of what was publicized is stated in the following:

(Amherst, MA) Early Monday morning, over 30 Hampshire students occupied the main administration building in protest of the college's continuing investment in major American weapons producers . . . This is the first time that students on a college campus have occupied a building over the issue of an institution's responsibility towards ending the arms race . . . In summary, one student stated, "It is not enough to make a verbal statement of support and be unwilling to take the necessary risks. We do not accept the verdict of our trustees; that to ensure Hampshire's existence we must continue to support the corporations which threaten the existence of the planet."4

Fifty feet outside the front entrance to Cole Science Center was a table behind which sat three representatives of the occupiers. Along with distributing a copy of the press release to interested passersby, the representatives were happy to relay any requests or messages to members of the group inside. During the morning hours the
representatives at the table handed out another statement which said that a list of demands were being drawn up, ones that must be met before the group leaves the building.

When Michael Ford arrived on campus at approximately 9:45 a.m. he found that most administrators and staff were already setting up makeshift offices in the Red Barn--Blair House complex of offices. He explains that:

There was a kind of expectancy and uncertainty in the air. It was a little bit exciting even for those people who were worried; but it was certainly a wrenching change from the normal routine.

By 11:00 a.m. President Simmons called together all those who were now housed in the newly established administrative headquarters for a general meeting. It was necessary for the administration to get itself organized.

... we quickly began a kind of routine of meeting inside the Red Barn during the morning. We would meet together to talk over events and try to make sense of what was going on, and that made a good deal of sense, although the meetings were a little bit full. The meetings served a couple of purposes. One, [as] just a sounding board, but also as a place to exchange information.

The administrative group gathered in the Red Barn had little information by the time the meeting got underway at 11:00 a.m. The institution's senior administrative body called Adcom had now changed to one of an open forum where administration and staff at all levels participated. The change was an invaluable one because it allowed more ideas to be explored. Mike Ford remembers that:
It was fairly quickly decided that we would first issue a memo decrying the occupation and that we would never negotiate under the gun. And as soon as we issued the memo we set about trying to begin negotiations, of course.

During the meeting another agreement was reached, that

Penina [Glazer, Dean of the Faculty], and I were the sort of ones who were designated as the principal go betweens. The first order of business was to try to get stuff set up so we could figure out what it was they wanted.

The meeting in Blair House was not very long, perhaps forty-five minutes. President Simmons nor anyone else presented a strategy to follow. Moreover, no one actually knew what the status of the situation was, therefore everyone would go about doing their normal jobs and learn what they could, particularly what the demands would be.

It was also at the 11:00 a.m. meeting of the administrative group that Mike Ford began to reiterate something he said the day before at the Sunday morning meeting at the President's home. At that meeting the question of the police was raised as a possibility; having them enter the campus to break the chains and escort the students out of the building. In statements similar to those he made at the Sunday morning meeting, Ford did not shirk from making his views known in the Red Barn gathering. In the following he describes the message he
wanted broadcasted around campus and the eventual effect it was to have on the occupiers.

One of the principle things we did is let it be known throughout the campus that there would be no police brought in, (and that was important; more than I thought. I knew it was right ... Tasha [Harmon, an occupier], was telling me this just a few days ago, that according to people who were in the building, they were gratified to hear it because they were uncertain.) Once you sort of go inside the building and stage an occupation and cut yourself off, crazy things do happen. You're in a siege and you don't quite know what to expect. (Apparently, they were very gratified to hear that because they knew, obviously, that the police were one among a number of things that could potentially happen.)

Shortly before noon, copies of the occupiers' demands were distributed around campus. The document argues the legitimacy of the occupation and sets forth the specific demands to be negotiated. It explained that the decision by the Finance Committee indicates "... that Hampshire is now faced with the dissolution of its founding ideals" and that "... the Trustees have again responded with derision, evasion, and appeals to withdraw the proposal." Finally, the claim is made that for the preceding reasons as well as the demands articulated on the following pages, "... we feel it necessary to defy the authority of the Board of Trustees and reassert the spirit of the founding ideals of Hampshire College."7

The demand statement also reiterates the general arguments made in the divestment proposal, that
"Militaristic spending policies and attitudes deprive historically and presently oppressed groups of resources, civil rights and life." In particular, there are a variety of campus programs seeking demands, ones which are considered "... crucial to the quality of life at Hampshire as well as to the development of a feminist, anti-racist curriculum." The ultimate rationale for the occupation reads: "In taking this action and making the following demands we are honoring our commitment to a truly alternative, responsible, and progressive institution.

The following is a paraphrased statement of the demands:

Negotiable Demands (to be bargained in good faith, of course):

1. To divest according to the proposal passed by CHOIR.

2. To renegotiate "the composition, (50% students), expediency and process" of the task force and announce that the first meeting be opened to the campus community.

3. "The administration must draft and release a press statement addressing" all of the social issues presented in the divestment proposal: militarization of society, government cuts in social services and others along with a concise explanation of how Hampshire plans on addressing these problems.

4. The commitment to a feminist and anti-racist curriculum including campus support services.

5. More awareness of environmental issues.

6. The guarantee that no one will be penalized by the occupation; specifically, that employees will not have their pay docked and that students not be disciplined.
7. Finding a new campus location for the alternative high school program; (the administration had recently terminated their support).

8. The exploration of new forms of institutional organization which would make the board of trustees more accountable to what the student body wanted the institution to do.12

For Michael Ford, it was only a matter of fifteen minutes after the first Blair House meeting adjourned that he was presented with a situation which required some kind of decision. The occupying students were calling the makeshift office of President Simmons requesting that more phone lines be opened which would allow calls to be made out of the Cole Science Center. It was argued that one operating line was insufficient when trying to handle all of the media calls, both coming in and going out. Many participants from the meeting were still milling about when Adele Simmons apprised Ford of the situation and request. Looking back, he recalls that there was more to the situation than simply the students' request:

One or two administrators didn't want them to have another phone line. That kind of stuff had to be handled at all times. It should have been clear that we would want to facilitate communication rather than frustrate them because then you sort of insure that crazy stuff happens when people are cut off altogether. So there were little problems of that sort. Making sure that people understood what it was we were about; what we were all involved in. It was almost like being a general and sort of setting the stage for the battle. One had to enunciate our objectives over and over and over so that people knew, and bought into it. [Ford's judgment prevailed and another phone line was cleared.]
Monday Afternoon

For the administration, the afternoon was spent simply trying to ascertain the basic elements of the situation. Who exactly was in the building and what were they doing and saying? Ford, staying close to the Red Barn, continued to try and establish a link, a way to talk to the individuals inside. (Sue Alexander worked closely with him.) Once that was done, Ford explains that next he 
"... tried to stabilize the situation; by stabilize, I mean make sure no one is doing anything nuts, to make it worse than it was."

By the end of the day, Mike Ford had become the center of information and the person charged with articulating strategies. Those in the administrative group were soon aware of his special role. Therefore, actions initiated by administration related people were only undertaken after first checking with Ford.

The first day for Ford was not without its lessons for the likelihood of what would follow. What Ford most remembers about that day is explained in the following:

The students put out their predictable press releases; there were two or three of them at first. And ultimately, a sort of set of demands came Monday afternoon. The demands were particular in many ways in that they didn't really seem to be asking for anything with any real clarity. So it became clear that part of our task was going to have to be to continue to work to define issues, needs and demands, so we would have something to talk about, something to horse-trade.
Perhaps the most significant issue talked about the first day pertained to media and publicity. We know that the students were very interested in creating as much public exposure as possible about the occupation and the reasons for it. The rationale for requesting phone lines out of Cole Science was for the express purpose of calling people in the media. When reviewing the local and regional newspapers from that day, May 17, 1982, we find that the incident was covered widely around the Western Massachusetts region and only slightly outside the area.

Mike Ford recalls how some individuals reacted to the publicity being generated by students.

... there were administrators at the college, who, how shall I say, were getting pretty excited because, obviously, this was going to generate publicity and that was one of the thoughts uppermost in some of the students' minds who were occupiers. And obviously they [the students] were going to take every opportunity they could to squeeze this thing for every bit of publicity. And administrators were terribly worried about that.
Part Two: Tuesday; The Administration Adopts a Wait Them Out Strategy; Negotiations Begin and Access to the Central Records Office Becomes the Pivotal Issue; A Petition Calling for the Occupation to End Is Initiated; A Small Group Tries to Force Their Way into the Administration Building,
Conflicts Over Commitment to the Takeover Arise within the Occupation Group

Tuesday Morning

Like the day before, administrators met in the Red Barn at approximately 9:00 a.m. The events of the preceding day were reviewed. The central question being asked was: how strongly do the occupying students feel about the stated demands and the overall position they have taken? Only a half hour long, the meeting ended with the President indicating that she wanted to meet with occupiers that morning, make concessions if necessary, with the intention of ending the occupation later that day. Her rationale was that much more publicity would be too damaging to the college.

Fortunately, it was not long before Ford arrived. After being briefed of the President's potential action,
action, a second meeting was convened between three people, President Simmons, Glazer and Ford. It was decided that instead of sending the President to the first meeting, the administration would retain her as a bargaining chip, sending the two Deans as originally planned. A call was made to the occupying students to schedule a meeting. It was agreed that the first negotiation session would meet at 11:00 a.m. at a neutral site, the small conference room in Franklin Patterson Hall.

At the morning session, the occupiers officially presented their list of demands; most of their efforts were spent trying to convince Ford and Glazer of the absolute necessity of divestment. By the conclusion of the session, however, "... it was pretty clear, frankly, to most people, that the occupation could have no effect whatsoever on the issue of divestment." The nature of the negotiations themselves were somewhat muddled because the demands "had little to do with divestment."13 The process by which students sent negotiators did not help matters either. While a group of six students represented the occupiers at each negotiation session, they were never empowered to actually negotiate or bargain in any absolute manner: that is, the six could never actually make a decision that was binding on the others. Rather, the role of the six was to explore various possibilities.
with the administration and then bring those possible scenarios back to the larger group for further discussion, whereupon a definite decision would be made. At the next negotiation session it would be the responsibility of the six students to convey to Ford and Glazer what the occupiers would agree to. Once everyone was in agreement about the specific issue, new negotiations could resume. What also made this process cumbersome and confusing was that with each new negotiation session only two students from the previous session carried over. In other words, two-thirds of the student negotiating team was new at each session.

Afternoon

Early Tuesday afternoon, I was approached by two students (non-occupiers), Bram Levin and Julie Ozydin, who had the idea of establishing an alternative means of expression for students not supporting the occupation. Levin proposed that a petition be drafted and circulated which would acknowledge divestment as an institutional ideal, but an end that did not require the means of occupation.

It was also during this period that Adele Simmons left campus to keep a previously made commitment in Boston; she would return on Wednesday evening. Ford and Glazer encouraged Simmons to make this trip to give the impression
that the occupation was not serious enough to keep her from fulfilling her other responsibilities as president.

On Tuesday afternoon Ford and Glazer held a second negotiation meeting with a representative group of occupiers. With the passing of almost two full school days, the issue of access to Central Records became the dominant topic of this session. Although the occupiers were more than willing to allow the workers to enter the building and perform their regular duties for students, who also could enter, the administration told the Central Records staff that they did not have to come to work.

The occupiers tried to persuade Ford and Glazer that the working conditions would be perfectly safe, even enjoyable: movies would be shown during their lunch or at breaks, and the staff could carry on with their daily routines without interruptions! The two Deans reiterated their belief that the working conditions of a building under occupation were not satisfactory and so they would not instruct the employees to return to the office.

After the session was over, a late afternoon meeting of the administrative group was convened. Everyone realized that the occupiers were vulnerable concerning the issue of Central Records and that we would try and exploit this weakness. A memorandum was immediately drafted by a small group and distributed throughout campus.
It stated that the chaining the doors created "abnormally trying psychological conditions" for working. Therefore, the administration could not assure workers that the new, occupied circumstances were completely safe.

That evening the students distributed their own positions on the issue, a statement that would "... clarify ... the several misconceptions issued to the Hampshire community regarding our stand on Central Records." They argued that:

Despite recent rumors to this effect, it is not true that we are all graduating Division III students who no longer need the services of Central Records. It is also absurd to imagine that we are all wealthy students who need not worry about meeting deadlines, upholding jobs, or receiving financial aid. Numbers of us are putting ourselves at risk in participating in this occupation ... Finally, we would like to assert that we are not taking this occupation out of any antagonism toward the college as an institution or toward its faculty and students. We are outraged that the Administration is manipulating the Central Records issue against the best interests of the community, rather than negotiating in good faith with us. Your support would be greatly appreciated.

Also occurring late Tuesday afternoon was the first meeting of the task force on developing a socially responsible investment policy. All members of the committee were in attendance except Chuck Collins, who, as the student representative from CHOIR, chose to boycott the meeting due to his participation in the occupation. The agenda of the meeting was general; most of the discussion pertained to formulating a tentative schedule for meetings during the
summer and the next fall, proposing the addition of others to be appointed members of the task force, and drafting a job description for two student positions for summer research on task force related issues.

Although there were individuals present who held different opinions about the appropriateness of the occupation, that subject was never discussed and the meeting was quite positive in its outcome. It was decided that the job descriptions for student researchers would be posted immediately and that anyone interested in applying should send a letter of intent to the President's assistant. It was important to the administration to demonstrate that the task force was engaging its responsibilities in an expeditious manner. That the task force would in all likelihood proceed sluggishly, concluding its work with nothing original or meaningful regarding investment criteria, was a criticism of the trustees and administration often made by the most strident leaders of the occupation. Thus, one of the administration's goals was to demonstrate to the community that these charges were ill-founded.

Evening

After dinner on Tuesday, Bram Levin, Julie Ozaydin and I met together and finalized a petition statement. Five other students who had originally been involved with the divestment effort but had recently disassociated
themselves agreed to contribute their names to the petition statement under which a request for community support would be made. The statement read:

We hope however that an end to the occupation of Cole Science Center will begin immediately. We feel the occupation is unsettling to the community, particularly at this time of the year, and therefore hurting the community support of the divestment movement. Our hope is that the task force on developing a more socially responsible investment policy is able to take up its charge and do the necessary work with the full cooperation and participation of the entire community.¹⁹

The petition asks those interested in the ultimate goal of divestiture, but who believe the occupation to be unduly disruptive, to please sign. In closing, the petition reads "We appreciate your efforts at helping this situation come to an amicable conclusion."²⁰

By late Tuesday evening the level of concern, debate and confusion over "what should be done?" "what will happen?" had greatly increased from the previous day. Outreach groups of occupation supporters were making constant rounds to the different living areas throughout the campus, stating the reasons for the occupation and trying to enlist support from other students. Simultaneously, the petition calling for an end to the occupation was now being circulated. There were also quite a few students who, for a variety of reasons (from worry over graduation to philosophical objections regarding the take over approach to social change), were becoming
increasingly intent upon opening the Central Records Office regardless of the costs.

At approximately 10:00 p.m., two individuals tried to force their way into the Cole Science Center through one of the building's side doors. The two persons were able to get just inside the door before occupiers standing security forcibly pushed them back out the door. A few punches were exchanged and threats were made that further violence would continue if the occupiers did not leave soon. Occupiers and other concerned students called the Dean of Students asking for help in maintaining the peace. Michael Ford called me and suggested that I spend the night outside the entrance to the building.

So far, the administration's strategy has been to stall for time in the hope that campus support in opposition to the occupation could be established and that eventually the occupiers would tire. It was virtually impossible, however, for members of the administrative group to know what the conditions and discussions were inside the Cole Science Center.

The Late Hours of Tuesday Night and Early Morning Hours of Wednesday

We turn now to an examination of the complex problems beginning to erode the initial unity of the occupiers. Before doing so, however, the views of one student,
Chuck Collins, provide the observer with some inkling of what students inside Cole Science were experiencing. Collins writes:

By the second day of the occupation, I was beginning to think that I should no longer be there. I felt in an extreme minority as far as my analysis of outside reaction, our purpose for being there and the effectiveness of any sustained action . . My feeling at the time was one of violation, even oppression—by the group process . . . Fortunately, I found others who shared some of my feelings. Tuesday afternoon I ran into Barbara, who with tears in her eyes, told me that she thought we were making a serious mistake in being there. Elizabeth, Kathy, Michael . . . each of us expressed a feeling of being violated by the process of decisions—and not so much by the decision to occupy but by the non-decision to stay. We believed that other people shared these concerns and sought to create a forum in which these questions might have been asked. We even called our caucus the G.U.T.F.O.O.H. Task Force, meaning Get Us The Fuck Out Of Here! At least we kept our sense of humor.21

There were other reasons why occupiers were becoming somewhat distracted from their objectives. More effort was exerted on how to manage the building than establishing "what it would take for us to agree and leave the building."22 Collins regrets that the group never actually examined, or thought out clearly the reasons for taking such bold action. From Collins' perspective, it was not forgetfulness that caused the lack of critical examination; rather, it was an undefined collective fear which caused the group to avoid any discussion that would reveal individual views about the present circumstances and what should be the appropriate course of action.
Wednesday, the small subgroup described by Collins as "GUTFOOH," began to influence the larger group of occupiers. Unbeknownst to the majority of occupiers, GUTFOOH was able to place on the agenda of the general meeting the topic: "evaluation of the occupation up to the present." Chuck Collins explains that "It was partly our assumption that one of the problems the group faced was an absence of critical thinking due to the fact that certain questions and issues had not been dealt with in the entire group." Collins states that the eventual evaluation process, where everyone had an opportunity to discuss his or her own views, yielded three results. First, a realization that there "was the need to call an all-college meeting to discuss the problems and issue." This realization came about as the group "... brainstormed what had been the negative and positive effects of the action." The second development was the "need for us to re-articulate and sharpen our demands." The third issue arising out of the evaluation, one that "... certainly played an important part in the whole action, were questions around gender politics and sexism within the group process." This evaluation process crystallized the nature of the conflicts within the occupiers at a critical juncture. How it happened is instructive; by knowing how collective dialogue
Collins explains that the meeting:

... allowed people to express their varying commitments and concerns—whereas before no such opportunity existed. What became apparent was the enormous diversity of people's commitment and understanding of the implications of civil disobedience. A number of people who worked as outside supporters expressed their serious concern over the negative reactions within our community.

This was not the only view, however, for "several people within the occupying group were of the opinion that we should not be overly concerned with opposition opinion" from the community. Many of the individuals expressing commitment to maintain the occupation were part of the group Harmon labels "faction one." There were others present who also believed the occupation should continue; they were known throughout the campus as: the "cowboys." (The definition of a "cowboy" was someone who had not participated in the preceding five months of divestment activities but who showed up "just in the nick of time" for the Finance meeting and the events which followed. A "cowboy" was considered militant regarding tactics in dealing with the administration and willing to hold out until demands were met.)

By the early morning hours of Wednesday, it was apparent that the major struggle within the occupation was between students aligning themselves either with GUTFOOH on one extreme and "faction one" and the "cowboys" on the
other. The events of Wednesday would settle which group would prevail.

Part Three: Wednesday; Negotiations Continue;
Krasn Tries to Help Students; Occupiers Examine Their Own Sexism; A Community Meeting Begins to Turn the Tide;
Occupiers Disagree Amongst Themselves on How to Proceed

Wednesday Morning

On Wednesday, the third day of the occupation, it was apparent that the campus had changed into a very different kind of environment. Through much of that day it was unclear whether the occupiers or administration was winning the struggle. By day's end, however, a distinct shift in momentum to the side of the administration would occur.

The administration and student occupiers began with meetings among their respective groups. The entire morning negotiation meeting concerned Central Records. The students objected to the administration's manipulation of the issue. Ford and Glazer argued that it was crazy for staff to work there given the circumstances. Late in the meeting the occupiers expressed a desire to have an all-campus meeting to explain their positions to the community. The meeting adjourned when Ford and Glazer said they needed to
return to discuss the matter with the fellow administrative team. Before departing, a second negotiation session was scheduled for the afternoon.

During the morning, Alan Krass authored and began circulating a faculty petition supporting the opening of Central Records. An action, Ford argues, that was ". . . in essence, backing the student position." The petition was designed to complement the public forum staged by occupiers at the center of campus. That morning faculty and students held a rally to influence the Central Records issue. Although a few faculty gave speeches criticizing the administration and calling for the workers to return, the story of what happened to Krass' petition explains, in a more telling way, the nature of faculty involvement in the crisis. Ford explains that Krass-

. . . started the petition around and while it was in the school of Social Science a couple of faculty members signed it--some of the radical faculty members. [Nearby was] Fred Weaver, who was dean of the school and who had been meeting with us during these morning meetings at the Red Barn, (so he knew the vehemence that was felt by the women who worked in Central Records; he knew that they really didn't want to go in the building.) Well, Fred scotched the petition in [the school of] Social Science by accusing these two radical faculty members of being worse than the worse union shop steward! Suggesting that they would stick people in working conditions that, in the classroom, they would deprecate. So one little plump fellow, feeling duly chastened and recognizing that all of a sudden his name might be on a petition that could be cast in the light of some kind of southern satrap, ran after the petition, grabbed it, and erased his name off of it right then and there. So that petition didn't get anywhere. In fact, it simply died.
At the second negotiating meeting in the early afternoon, the administration agreed to the request for an all-campus meeting that evening. It was a short meeting because there was nothing else new to discuss.

Wednesday Afternoon

At this point the students lost their focus on divestment and other institutional issues they had been pressing for months, such as institutional neutrality and conflict of interest among board members. Instead, they turned inward to argue over sexual politics. In their meetings, matters had progressed to the point where a male and female moderator would alternate calling on people of opposite sexes one after the other.

At the scheduled meeting to discuss the elements of sexism occurring within Cole Science, Harmon states that: "I am convinced that this meeting was vital to the realization of the group to our internal contradictions." Although Tasha Harmon participated in the women's group, she was "... very much opposed to this idea when the decision to do it was being made;" for she worried that separating according to gender would create an "us against them" attitude between the men and the women. There were essentially two general topics discussed by women during their meeting. First, that the leaders of the occupation, particularly those who had contact with the media,
consisted of all men. It was concluded that this was a problem which needed some form of redressing. Second, it was made public that one woman "... felt that she had been sexually harassed by one of the men ... the unnamed man took what was supposed to be a back rub between fellow occupiers a bit too far." The idea that the occupiers themselves were not the ideally enlightened, nonsexist types they presumed themselves to be, had been made clear to the women by these two examples.

While the occupiers were spending their afternoon discussing sexism and making presentations for the all-campus meeting later that evening, the Dean of Students was also laying plans for what he hoped would be accomplished:

I worked to ensure that the meeting ran in such a fashion that the aftermath would be that they would come out. In doing that, what we wanted to do was, just insure that lots of students who were there would be honest in their opinions and would show the people who were occupying that they did not have anywhere near unanimous agreement. At the same time I also wanted to be sure that they didn't get out of hand because there were some people who were terribly, terribly pissed off; some because of Central Records but others simply because they disagreed violently both with the motives and with the particular action itself. So this meeting was a turning point and we knew it beforehand. This was going to matter more than anything else in resolving the thing.

The Dean's two assistants, myself and Sue Alexander, along with a small group of students who were sponsors of the petition asking the occupiers to leave, spent the afternoon and early evening hours speaking with
as many people as possible about attending the meeting. If
the person was inclined to be opposed to the occupation,
he/she was encouraged to come and make that view known.

Wednesday Evening

The community meeting began at 7:30 p.m. in a capa-
city filled Main Lecture Hall. One of the women occupiers,
after asking for quiet several times (the atmosphere was
frenzied), proposed to the audience that the entire lecture
hall, over four hundred people, break into small discussion
groups whereupon a student-occupier would explain why the
building was being held and answer any questions. "When we
suggested this," Harmon explains, in order "to facilitate
dialogue and because we wanted the other students to get a
feel for our group process, we were accused of trying 'the
old divide and conquer technique.'" 35

Almost a half an hour went by before everyone could
agree upon a woman faculty member to act as moderator.
Once that was established, a freewheeling kind of
discussion ensued where individuals from the audience
either asked the occupiers questions or stated their opi-
ions, which included both pro and anti-occupation views.
Tash Harmon recalls that--

The tension in the meeting was so thick it was suf-
focating . . . I was afraid of my fellow students. The
whole campus was pretty shaken up by our action, and
the most reactionary elements showed up at the meeting
with the intention of causing a confrontation between
the occupiers and the rest of the student body. I was afraid through the whole meeting that the verbal attacks (which included an attack on the fact that none of the men involved had come!) would become physical attacks.

The discussion was so rambunctious that it is impossible to explain fully all of the views expressed. There were, however, three critical periods, or junctures in the meeting which stand out. The first important moment came a half an hour into the discussion, when, after the more rash statements had been aired, Tom Stoner stood up and presented the occupiers with the pro-divestment, anti-occupation petition, signed by approximately 250 people. Stoner, after delivering an eloquent appeal to the occupiers that they reconsider their commitment to remaining in the building, received resounding applause indicating overwhelming support from the audience. That Stoner was able to say with conviction that he was a founding member of the group of students who wrote the proposal and that he represented a small group of other signatories who were long-standing participants in the divestment struggle but chose not to occupy, proved decisive.

Although the women continuously tried to explain their actions and respond to challenges, their task was not an easy one. Mike Ford recalls that:

It became clear that what we were headed towards was some sort of assessment of how people felt both about the occupation and about divestment; but along the way
an awful lot of stuff got talked about and I think the women were shaken. One, they were shaken at the sort of intensity and sincerity with which people advanced their views, but also I think they were made to feel very isolated.

Midway through the meeting the second issue of consequence arose. Two students who were bitterly opposed to the occupation told the dean of students that it was his responsibility to go into the building and throw the trespassers out. They demanded that Ford take disciplinary action against the occupiers. Further, if Ford could not remove them, then some of their friends would do it themselves. Regarding those challenges, Mike Ford reflects on his response and its effect:

I remember that a couple of times during the meeting one or two of the things I did, which I did spontaneously, I guess, impressed the women no end. One exchange between me and Danny McGill, where Danny was sort of bullyragging the women and insisting that I announce their punishment in advance. And someone else suggested that a stalwart group of people were ready to go over and drag them out. I simply interrupted things and shouted: "As long as I was Dean of Students, any vigilante like violence would be met by immediate explosion."

At a calmer moment, Ford explained to everyone that while he did not agree with the occupation, the occupiers were taking a stand based upon principles and values in which they believed. Therefore, as long as they were not "destroying property or threatening anybody physically . . . we [the administration] were going to deal with it through negotiation and discussions . . ."37
Although he believed that most of the threats made by the angrier students were "chicken shit . . . and nonsense," he felt that it was "necessary to enunciate, very clearly" what his actions would be. Ford's explanation about why he thought this was necessary bespeaks his philosophy of leadership throughout the crisis:

... part of the way that I operate is to be clear as early as possible, so people know just what to expect. And I think in so doing you can channel events. And if I had waffled or had not said anything, it's possible it [vigilanteism] might have built up a head of steam. People knew from that moment that they'd have me to deal with and that I was probably going to be pretty tough.

The third and final critical period occurred as the discussion shifted away from one dwelling on the negative aspects of the occupation's past three days, to a positive emphasis on the future of ethical investing. Moreover, the meeting suddenly seemed to resemble a New England Town Meeting in the sense that individuals began making proposals to be voted on by the assemblage. After all was said and done, votes were taken on two "statements of declarations." The first pertained to the occupation as a means to bring about divestment. The result was approximately 250 opposed to the occupation while 110 were in favor. The second proposal concerned whether Hampshire should eventually divest from weapons contractors and invest instead in socially responsible firms. The vote
tally was approximately 353 for, three against, and four abstentions.

Fulfilling the aspirations embodied within the ideal of the town meeting, (as a political form of organization), the votes themselves served as cathartic releases for everyone present and diffused much of the community's original anger. Tasha Harmon said about the meeting:

The relief of the vast majority of the students, who were both frightened by the reactionaries [angry students] and, I think, impressed with our calmness and our willingness to listen, was tangible. Many of the students were a lot less angry, if not more supportive of us when we left . . .”39

Mike Ford discusses his perceptions of the meeting and its outcome:

" . . . it was clear to me as soon as the meeting ended: I knew the occupation was over . . . because the culmination of the thing was a vote, an overwhelming vote against the occupation. But at the same time, a damn near unanimous vote in favor of divestment. That, I think, made it possible for the group [of women] to leave with some dignity.

Late Wednesday Night and Into the Early Morning Hours of Thursday

Chuck Collins writes that "when the women returned from the all campus meeting, it was evident that they had met tremendous anger and challenge."40 Upon returning, the women recommended that a general meeting begin immediately to discuss what had happened. The emotional intensity of
the all campus meeting carried over into the conversations between occupiers. Instead of the typical discussion about negotiation tactics and Central Records, "people talked about their personal commitments and perception."\(^1\)

The student meeting continued on into the early morning hours. Much of the discussion was between "faction one" and the "cowboys" versus GUTFOOH. The former argued that the occupation was actually going to have a significant impact on the future of the arms race. GUTFOOH, on the other hand, thought it unrealistic to expect that take over actions by students could have any lasting impact. Persons holding this view urged others to be realistic and understand that the usefulness of the occupation was past. The following views expressed by Collins during this emotional period must have been quite sobering to some.

Regarding the occupation, he said that:

I talked in this meeting about the history of radical groups which, though good intentioned, lacked perspective on their action and its relationship to change. They misjudged their circumstances, became isolated, and proved to be ultimately destructive to themselves and to the cause they attempted to speak to. Such miscalculations, I said, were often rooted in our sense of urgency, our fragmented culture which denies us any sense of meaning and time, and our simplistic analysis of change and society.\(^2\)
On Thursday morning there was a mood of guarded optimism on the Hampshire campus. President Simmons returned the night before and chaired the meeting of the administrative group, which focused on the all campus meeting of the night before. Calls were made between the Dean of Students and occupiers and it was decided that Ford and Glazer would again negotiate with a group of occupiers later that morning.

The result of the late night meeting of students (and the struggle between the two groups) was a proposal to be brought to the next negotiation session; it was drafted "essentially by GUTFOH," and presented to the thirty people who were still awake at 4:00 a.m. The proposal:

... did not include the divestment demand (adding, sort of in its place a demand that our group be allowed to run fall orientation and that the topic be American militarism; this had been suggested by the administration at a previous negotiation session.)

In the morning negotiation session (most of the students representing the occupiers were members of
GUTFOOH; this becomes important later one), agreement was quickly reached on all points. That:

1. A statement be sent to students by the administration addressing the spending policies of the Reagan Administration; specifically, the relationship between less financial aid and more funding for the military

2. That more efforts and change are necessary to make the Hampshire faculty multi-cultural

3. That the administration recognize the importance of women’s programs on campus and work to maintain them

4. That the alternative high school learning program will be given space to continue operating after Hampshire's needs have been met. And,

5. That Orientation Week next fall focus on the subject of global militarization and that a student intern be employed to help plan programs.44

The students also wanted Adele Simmons to attend the final meeting and sign the negotiated settlement as well as issue a statement to be used by the occupiers as their final press release. The statement must concern itself with divestment, militarism, socially responsible investing and the occupation of the administration building. The Dean of Students explains his and Glazer's response to this last demand:

It was terribly important for them to get Adele to meet [and] we knew that. It became clear that they wanted to sort of force the President to negotiate. Essentially, we used that, too. We used that to get something from them; [when they would leave the building]. We recognized that it would be no loss, at this point, to have her meet with them.
The only real tension regarding the settlement process occurred fifteen minutes later when one of the student negotiators, John Diamond (considered to be a leading "cowboy"), showed up suddenly at the Red Barn wanting a copy of the press statement so he and others on the negotiating team could review it before the final meeting. Michael Ford, with controlled anger, simply got up and gently escorted Diamond away from the table and out of the building, explaining that "if you screw this up" there would be significantly negative consequences.

The final meeting between President Simmons and occupiers occurred without issue. Ford spoke for many students, staff and faculty alike, when he says,

... at the final negotiating session everybody was just incredibly tired and pleased that it was over. I recall that I hadn't had much sleep that whole previous week. I damn near slept through the last negotiating session I was so weak. And I went home as soon thereafter as I could to get some sleep, with a sense of relief knowing that they would be out.

Thursday Afternoon

Although by early afternoon Ford and others on the administrative staff could finally relax, believing the crisis to be over, the situation unfolding inside the Cole Science Center was far different in tone. When the negotiators returned and announced the agreements, those believing everyone should stay objected strongly claiming that the negotiators failed to have the final agreements
passed by the entire group beforehand. During this period of hesitancy the Dean of Students was notified. His statement and advice combines a flexible understanding of the students' situation while still maintaining a very clear and direct message. Ford tells us that:

I got home and was asleep sometime during the late afternoon when I got a call from Glen Fagan [a student occupier], saying that all hell had broken out inside and the agreement had broken down. He sounded like he was damn near in tears, and he was asking if the group could take a little more time because they had to discuss stuff. I said, "Look, we agreed to a variety of things. And the chief thing you agreed to was to get out. I'm not going to tell you when you should be out. I'm going to tell you to uphold your agreement. Now, if you can't come out, but you think a little talk is going to help you, you ought to use your own judgment, but I'm not going to release you from what I thought was a genuinely arrived at agreement. I kept a little pressure on him because I really didn't know what was going on.

The developing differences between the aims of "faction one" and the "cowboys" versus GUTFOOH were not only being confronted but would now have to be resolved. The former argued that everyone should "stay in the building until all of our demands are met." The latter believed that from the beginning the occupation had only been a "tactic for consciousness-raising, press coverage, and an assertion of our power and determination as a group, and never expected that our divestment demand would be met."46

At first it seemed as if the split between the two views would be solved by those remaining in the building
who believed in holding out for divestment. All others would abandon the cause; (two-thirds would leave and one-third remain). Relationships between individuals were growing increasingly strained after eight hours of discussion; it was proposed that the group break for an hour simply to relax, rest and then meet again to talk more. Alan Krass was called and informed of the potential split. He came right over and entered the building to speak with students.

Informal conversations during the break proved beneficial. When the students reconvened, a decision was reached with relative ease, that everyone would depart together. Harmon explains that the decision was reached--

. . . basically because everyone recognized that if we did not [abide by] the original consensus agreement to leave, that the group would really split, that half or more of the people would leave, and that all of the work that we had done in terms of building this group of people would be totally destroyed. [Which] was the most important thing that could come out of the occupation . . . 47

So finally, at one minute after midnight, Friday morning, May 21, 1982, Michael Ford and others on his staff, along with many of those who had acted as a support group, gathered outside the main entrance to Cole Science to watch the occupation end. Although everyone would leave, two individuals had to be physically carried out by their fellow students. These two were brought out first; once let go, each ran from the building screaming. Minutes
later everyone else filed out. Ford recalls that the entire group "stage-managed" their exit "in such a fashion that there was a certain amount of drama to it. They came out and had a sort of candlelight march around the campus. It was a triumphant exist."

Part Five: Friday; The Community Meeting.

A Different Relationship Between President Simmons and Students Is Established; The Week's Events Draw to a Close; The Reporting of Events

The final aspect of the agreement to end the occupation occurred on Friday morning at 10:00 a.m., when an all-campus meeting took place. Its intent was to provide the occupiers with a forum to explain why they had taken their actions and review with the community what the negotiated agreements were. It was designed to be, explains Ford, "a very public show; in a sense, that it had been an important action." Now that the circumstances were different, his primary concern "... was to simply help Adele [President Simmons] make it through that meeting without getting trashed, or without breaking down, without committing any sort of serious errors."

The meeting began on time and there was a large audience. It had been agreed to at the final negotiation session that Michael Ford's two assistants during the
divestment crisis would moderate the meeting. The discussion began shortly after the occupiers entered the lecture hall and seated themselves together in the front center section.

Opening the dialogue, a spokesperson for the occupiers explained why they had taken over the building: to have Hampshire lead in the global effort presently underway to end militarism. Another student explained the merits of each negotiated issue. Two things repeatedly occurred from this point onward. First, some members of the audience would challenge the assertions made by occupiers while others would support their arguments. Second, because all of the issues were directly concerned with institutional policy, it was not long before the majority of questions... ended up being directed at Adele." She was seated in the rear of the lecture hall and because "nobody could much see her or hear her, the request was issued that she come down front, and she did." Given his concern over how students would treat the President, Dean Ford tells us that: "I then sat down there beside her during the whole meeting."

It was not long before Ford's anticipation of conflict between the President and students began to materialize. In the following Ford explains the nature of
the conflict by comparing the Friday morning meeting to the one held Wednesday night:

There were some strained points but it was nothing like the meeting on Wednesday; . . . now, the object of hostility had switched. The [occupying] students were out, and, in a sense, they had rejoined their fellow students, so there was at least a modicum of solidarity. And as is traditional, the bad guy is the administration, personified by Adele.

Granted, the conflict between students and administration is timeless, almost "natural." To believe that it can be only that would, in this case, be a shortsighted analysis. What becomes interesting in the exchanges between students and Adele Simmons is how each were somewhat changed or transformed by the events of the last few days. Mike Ford explains what happened in the meeting and how the President's changed style had a different affect on students:

A lot of the hostility got directed at her . . . And what I could sense as it was happening, was that she was doing better in that meeting than she had ever done before. One of the reasons was that she was being direct; she was being honest. I can recall a couple of times when people were talking about her failure to communicate and the like. She got very personal and told them that it was really very disheartening to issue invitations to students to come [to her home], to talk about issues with faculty, and to find that not only did they not come, but they didn't even have the courtesy to say they were not going to come, so that all the preparations that had been made by people, all their efforts, were really being sneezed at. And I could hear her telling that and I, sort of, watched the students, and they responded to her as a human being for the first time. They could see that that was enough to piss you off, and I think they felt a little embarrassed. Here they were screaming and yelling about opportunities to communicate when, in effect, she
was telling them that she had had dozens of meetings where nobody would show up. And I felt that, in general, she came off during that meeting more sympathetic and more human than at any other meeting I've seen.

After each point of the negotiation had been discussed and Simmons questioned about her and/or the institution's stance on a particular issue, a more central question was asked (in an antagonistic manner by a student, Danny McGill, who opposed the occupation). "What in fact was gained by the entire occupation affair, given that none of the agreements pertained to divestment and militarism?"

The student's deprecating style had the inevitable effect of putting the occupiers on the defensive. Instead of waiting for a student from the occupation group to respond, the Dean of Students stood and addressed McGill's questions. He recalls the moment this way:

Well, I gave a very general answer. (I think it was a satisfying answer.) What I tried to do, (I didn't expect the question, so it was an ad-lib answer to be sure), I tried to set up in my answer a situation which suggested that while there weren't dozens of tangible things that were terrific, it was our nature, at a college of individuals like ours, to join these issues every now and then; to revitalize, to renew our commitments, to think things through. And while, for example, in the area of Third World issues it was nothing new, it was simply good that we reminded ourselves forcefully that it was a commitment and that we had to stay on top of it because these things can slip. So that was sort of the tenor of the answer. I really couldn't point to anything, you know, that was terrific. I wanted to because it was embarrassing. I tried to suggest in my answer that it was very obvious that the issue of divestment had been thoroughly aired, that a lot of people had come to be involved who would not have been, and that, in effect, we were going to have
this task force that is going to be working all summer. And try, practically, to come up with something that no other college had, which was an investment policy that was a model for avoiding firms that committed social injury. That we might well emerge with something that might teach other institutions like ours.

In conclusion, Michael Ford felt that Friday's meeting "was anticlimactic." Because the experiences of the preceding days had been like a "battle, the camaraderie that developed, the necessity to stay up, to react quickly on your feet, to develop strategy, sometimes on the spur of the moment," left everyone tired "and glad that it was done."
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CHAPTER IX

OUTCOME OF THE DIVESTMENT MOVEMENT AND
ITS IMPLICATIONS

In the end, human judgments will prevail, for nothing else is available, and men will differ as to the degree of wisdom applied and justice secured.1

Richard H. Sullivan
"The Socially Involved University"

Chapter Nine is divided into two parts. Part One continues to tell the evolving story of what the task force on socially responsible investing accomplished and the reaction of community members. A summary of the lessons drawn about divestment from the case study is presented at the conclusion of Part One. The central focus of Part Two explores an alternative approach to viewing divestment and its associated problems. The alternative view posits that the educational issues and/or experiences of the participants should be considered on an equal basis with that of the institution's interests. I will also show how the extreme approach of the "traditionalist" and "activist" is inadequate.

The preceding is accomplished by exploring Michael Ford's reflections on the various lessons learned and not learned by case study participants. Some of the themes
Ford addresses concern: the liberal arts institution; the role of students, trustees, faculty and administrators; and broader issues such as citizenship and teaching. I will also argue that the events at Hampshire present a strong case for reconsidering the principle of institutional neutrality as it is presently defined.

Part One: Accomplishments of the Task Force; Examining the Assumptions Usually with Divestment Struggles

The purpose of Part One is to provide the reader with a complete view of the entire story. Because there is a transition from the divestment proposal to the mandate of the task force, it is necessary to know the highlights of what happened in order to understand the conclusions reached in Part Two. The following explains the stages of task force recommendations and the final results.

After thrashing the issues out amongst themselves, the task force would present proposals to the Finance Committee. There are two trustee meetings where investment guidelines are changed, October, 1982 and March, 1983. In October, the Finance Committee and full board adopted a preliminary list of socially responsible investment criteria. They were thought of as non-controversial investment standards and included:
Socially beneficial goods and services
-- Fair labor practices
-- Health and safety of products and the workplace
-- Fair treatment of minorities
-- Environmental protection and conservation

Practically speaking, the new guidelines required the college's investment managers to invest in those companies maintaining a positive record in these areas. The task force had not been able to reach a consensus about weapons related investment criteria, so their consideration was postponed until the March meeting.

In March the task force proposed five additional investment guidelines. They were:

-- Proliferation of weapons against law and treaties
-- Chemical and biological weapons producers
-- Companies complicit in severe human rights violations
-- Nuclear warheads and delivery systems
-- General weapons-makers

The Finance Committee adopted the first three and voted down the last two. However, the following day at the full board meeting, the two investment criteria were reintroduced. After lengthy debate, it was decided that if "delivery systems" was dropped from the nuclear weapons criteria that it too could be included in the list. An amendment was proposed and passed. The new vote meant that investing in makers of nuclear warheads was not socially responsible. Therefore, the only criteria not to pass was that of general weapons contractors.
The following passage was amended to the investment guidelines of the college. It would precede the list of new investment criteria and was the kind of statement, one with "teeth" in it, that students envisioned being added to the bylaws of the college eighteen months earlier when the first efforts were initiated.

... the investment Committee is directed to instruct the College's investment managers that, subject to any necessary donor restrictions and within the College's guidelines for maximizing expected return at a prudent level of risk, they should AVOID investing in or holding equities of corporations which cause social injury, more particularly those corporations which . . . [continued with those guidelines passed in October and March.]

The newly established investment guidelines were the most ethically stringent of any college or university in the United States. And while the results were substantial, the occasion was far from celebratory as might have been expected. This sentiment is reflected in the spring, 1983 issue of Hampshire Reports. "The closeness of the March 12 vote indicates that there is still considerable disagreement on the right course for the college." There are a few incidents that occurred which make this even clearer.

The first thing to occur concerned Alan Krass and happened during the aforementioned March, 1983 Finance Committee meeting. Krass simply walked out of the meeting in an abrupt manner when it was clear that the committee
was voting against all weapons related investment criteria. Thirty minutes later he submitted his resignation from the committee to the president.

Krass was not alone in his dissatisfaction. A few days after the trustees' meeting, Howard Blauvelt, "The trustee with primary responsibility for fund raising . . .," resigned his position with the college due to opposition to the decision made by the full board the previous Saturday. What angered Blauvelt was the vote on Saturday by the full board to delete "delivery systems" and include nuclear weapons makers. This vote overturned the Finance Committee's decision which Blauvelt had had a part in casting. Blauvelt explained his reasons for resigning in a letter to Simmons, the contents of which appeared in The Hampshire Gazette. The four reasons for his resignation are summarized in the following:

His belief that the policy would hurt the college financially, that the vote was inappropriate for an educational institution, that the college did not approach the matter seriously and soberly, and that the policy was not approved by a majority of the trustees. Blauvelt stated that he found particularly objectionable the campus activities from the preceding spring, that is, the demonstrations and occupation. He goes on to say: "If my resignation serves any purpose, I hope it will induce students, administrators and faculty to pursue their laudable objectives in a more serious, sober and thoughtful
He also invokes the traditionalist position for maintaining neutrality at all costs in order to preserve freedom of academic inquiry and educational learning. And, regarding Hampshire's future fund raising potential, Blauvelt asserts that a real possibility exists that companies not on the list may reconsider their giving because of "the resolution and the manner in which it was done."  

President Simmons, who is also quoted in the article, disagrees with Blauvelt's view believing instead that many corporations exist that would be interested in the college's special approach to education. Concerning the potential "blacklist" warned about by Blauvelt, Simmons is paraphrased as saying that the college:

\[\ldots\text{ has not developed a list of the corporations in which it will not buy stock and added that the trustee vote was really "advice" to the college's investment managers which could be overruled if financial need or donor restrictions necessitated it.}\]

The debate continued the following week when Alan Krass, writing in "Letters to the Editor," responded to the four reasons cited by Blauvelt for resigning, Krass writes:

I believe that every one of these reasons is either totally false or highly misleading, and if I had the space I would answer them all. But one stands out as so outrageously wrongheaded and irresponsible that it must be answered as clearly and directly as possible. That is that the college did not consider this action "seriously and soberly." Nothing could be further from the truth.
Krass explains that it was actually the trustees who "stonewalled" on the issue, refusing "to take seriously all the arguments, analyses and expressions of campus opinion which were marshalled over a two-year period."\(^{15}\) He contends that this was based on ideological rigidity and resolute unwillingness to listen to arguments he [Blauvelt] could not understand and did not want to hear."\(^{16}\) Krass goes on to say that the two most important proposals, nuclear warhead and weapons-makers in general, "... were rejected virtually without discussion."\(^{17}\)

Professor Krass, in contrast to Blauvelt, is the voice of the archetypal "activist." One of the most obvious reasons for reconsidering the standard "traditionalist-activist" approach to divestment situations is made clear by the relationship between Blauvelt and Krass. It seems that after almost two years of working on the same topic there remains bitter disagreement between the two views as well as a fundamental inability to understand (respect and appreciate) how each goes about his work.\(^{18}\)

At the trustee meetings in spring, 1983, including the Finance Committee and the full board meetings, there were no active demonstrations or threats of any kind being made. The approach on the part of everyone was rather reserved. Although calm prevailed among the students, all
was not the case with the trustees. During the period soon after the March trustees meeting, three more persons resigned their positions on the Hampshire board. This brought to a close what is perhaps one of the most controversial divestiture struggles in American higher education.

**Re-examining the Assumptions Usually Associated with Divestment Struggles**

The case study of the divestment crisis presents the opportunity to review some of the standard assumptions associated with the debate and struggle over whether or not an institution should divest, assumptions that are part of the traditionalist and activist context. First, it is usually assumed that members of each group will always hold to the same view, that is, trustees are always opposed to divestiture whereas faculty and students are for it. While these generalizations may be by and large representative, there are enough contrasting views held by individuals, (especially by those who were influential such as Cora Weiss and Chuck Collins) which makes sticking to generalizations about individuals and their constituencies somewhat shortsighted.

Second, accompanying this perceived conflict are other assumptions. Students, for example, assume that all trustees are extremely wealthy and therefore uninterested in anything students may say that is critical of society
(because trustees, being "capitalists," only want to "get richer"), and are thus opposed to anything they may propose. On the other hand, trustees may tend to view all students and/or their proposals as idealistically naive, perhaps even self-indulgent and therefore uncaring about the institution's welfare. At Hampshire these kinds of views often dominated the opinions of participants, and while there may be some individuals who acted according to the role types, there were many others who simply did not fit the mold. To cast everyone into either one or two types (administrators get lumped in with trustees and faculty with students), is also shortsighted.

A third assumption, one that is also held to by the traditionalist/activist dichotomy, is that trustees and administrators assume that they are always preserving the institution's standard of neutrality while students seek to spoil its purity. Students, on the other hand, see themselves as the champions of democratic participation (defined as good education) as opposed to the trustee's form of bureaucratic (or bad) education. Each extreme seems to believe that they have the moral high ground in the struggle. The events at Hampshire demonstrate that this is not the case. On occasion, trustees are not above trying to influence institutional policy by exerting
personal preference while students may employ undemocratic principles to justify the pursuit of desired ends.

Other aspects of the case study that seem contrary to the typical assumptions pertain to the faculty as well as the assumed influence the media will always have on events. Although the discussion in the Finance Committee meeting would seem to indicate that the faculty played an active role in support of the divestment movement, the fact of the matter is that the overwhelming majority of the faculty gave little more thought about or involvement with the issue than the few seconds it took to sign their name to the petition. They simply were not involved. Regarding the role of media, it is usually assumed that reporting enhances the position of those seeking divestment. This was not the case concerning daily newspaper and television coverage during the occupation.\textsuperscript{19}

I have attempted to demonstrate in the preceding that the assumptions usually espoused by traditionalists and activists are not always accurate. Next, I will begin setting forth the reasons why an alternative view of divestment is necessary if participants, particularly administrators, are going to make wise decisions. The alternative view is one which argues that decisions be based upon what will enhance the educational experience of those involved, students as well as trustees and faculty.
Reflecting on the events at Hampshire, I also want to argue that when enough participants subscribed to the traditionalist and activist assumptions, they diminished their own opportunity to act or shape events in ways other than what the prescribed roles allowed. In part, what occurred was a self-fulfilling prophecy. Those whose actions did accurately represent the traditionalist and activist extremes were enabled by others, who were assuming everyone was bound by certain roles, to set the agenda and dominate events. While the extremes were in evidence throughout the case study, they did not prevail, however; this was due largely to the leadership of the Dean of Students. In the following I will explain how Ford sought to make his decisions based upon what, in his mind, were the "educationally" right things to do as opposed to favoring any particular interest. Therefore, a reconsideration of the "educational experience" is what is most important.

Part Two: Consisting of a Number of Subsections, The First of Which Is:

Reconsidering Higher Education's Standard Approach to the Social Responsibility Problem

Michael Ford looks upon the divestiture struggle at Hampshire in an optimistic manner. In the following he
explains how the issue pertains to the educational experience of all members of the institution.

Crises in large organizations can be opportunities to examine your values and again, articulate those ends you think are worth pursuing . . . There is a kind of renewal. Institutions have a way of becoming very rigid and mechanical, in a sense. People come and they go and they become worried, essentially, about their jobs; they don't have an understanding of the sort of vision that infuses the institution. These kinds of crises, can, I think, if the opportunity is seized, allow you to say: Wait a minute, what are we about? What the hell are we doing? What is important? What should we be doing here? I think it allowed us that opportunity and I think that some of us learned from it.

While Ford's assertions may sound reasonable enough, and I think he is correct, the prevailing norm throughout higher education (and this includes Hampshire) is that efforts to formulate an institutional or community-wide expression of opinion about social, political, economic or moral issues stray too far from the college's educational purpose. The traditionalist argues that divestment and the occupation of offices are activities which need never be tolerated in the college or university setting. This is largely due to an interpretation of institutional neutrality that, in my view, is too restrictive. Although I will explain more later, one of the lessons is that if given the opportunity, there are greater educational benefits to be realized by institutions engaging in these problematic issues than by erecting an artificial wall of neutrality, which causes an avoidance at all costs attitude
on the part of the college's leaders. This will become clearer once the different educational topics have been explored next.

An Example of Why the Educational Experiences of Some Students Who Participated in the Divestment Effort Were Not Particularly Enhanced

Before it is possible to establish what an alternative view of divestment would be, it is necessary to discuss why conventional assumptions about divestment movements and reactions to them are unsatisfactory. For example, when Michael Ford was asked the questions: "What kind and how much learning occurred concerning the divestment events?" He explained that:

I don't think a lot of people learned a lot. I think those of us who were the closest to events learned the most. That includes two or three faculty, student affairs staff and one or two other administrators, and the students who were most involved. You're talking about seventy people, maybe. And if you take away the fools that were part of the occupation and who never really should have even been in it, who didn't learn anything, maybe thirty or forty people learned some valuable lessons. But is that a sign that it wasn't worthwhile? I don't think so.

If Hannah Pitkin is correct when she writes, "Understanding is not merely a state or activity to be labeled, but a commitment about performance to come," then Ford is correct in his assessment that there were not
many positive lessons learned by members of the Hampshire community. The following serves as an example of how the educational issues were not realized by some students.

During the six months after the spring, 1982 occupation, a small group of students and administrators (Ford and his staff along with support from President Simmons) organized a community-wide town meeting for the college (referred to as the Community Meeting), designed to foster more communication and understanding between all members of the college community. The pro-divestment student group, now officially known as Students for a Responsible Institution (SRI), were again interested and organized. They presented petitions requesting that the town meeting force administrators and trustees to fundamentally change the bylaws governing the institution. For example, there was a proposal to redefine the authority of the trustees as well as a vote of no confidence in President Simmons. It is interesting to know how Michael Ford interpreted these actions and contrasted them to divestment efforts of the preceding year:

> The group that now wants to democratize Hampshire, I do not accept their aims . . . making it a place where more extensive participation by students is possible in making important decisions . . . It's different than the divestment issue. Really, what's being sought, it seems to me, is an attempt to exercise authority without responsibility.21
Ford, however, interprets the efforts of SRI occurring in a vacuum. It is the involvement of other teachers and administrators that is necessary and, unfortunately, lacking. Ford explains:

We have a community meeting in a couple of weeks and I really think the students should be challenged intellectually. To deal with the issues that are before us: the looming deficits, a tremendous drop in enrollment and the vital role of the board of trustees in bringing us in some money . . . I would challenge students in a way that I do not think we are doing now.

After acrimonious debate between the organizing committee and members of SRI, concerning the nature of SRI's proposals, the first Community Meeting was cancelled by the organizing committee because it was learned that members of SRI planned to take over the stage and the moderator's microphone in order to put forward their own agenda.

The preceding discussion shows that if established habits of interaction over community-wide social issues are not reconsidered, then much of the present interactions between students, faculty and administrators will remain, for the most part, unchanged. It seems that the same general beliefs have been perpetuated: students in a bitter conflict with a president who chooses to remain uninvolved; a continued attempt to usurp the authority of trustees; the manipulation of media for certain ends; and faculty uninvolvement. Unfortunately, it seems that the active
students on the Hampshire campus, the ones who are genuinely interested in working towards the public good, will continue to frame their proposals poorly and conduct themselves in an unproductive manner. This does not, however, have to be the case.

An Example of Two Students Who Did Learn Positive Lessons from the Experience

The opinions of two students, Chuck Collins and Tasha Harmon, about the preceding spring's divestment movement and crisis, are examples of how educational lessons of value can be learned. Each wrote an essay evaluating the events in which they participated. I have selected from their essays the single issue each determined to be the most meaningful. Exploring the experiences of Harmon and Collins is also worthwhile because, as citizens, it reveals the kinds of learning in which students are in need.

For Tasha Harmon, the telling event occurred after the final negotiation session on the last day of the occupation, when the student negotiators returned to the Cole Science Center to inform the other occupiers and work out when everyone would exit. Because the event concerns Mike Ford, it is necessary to know what Harmon thinks of the Dean of Students, for that has a bearing on what follows. About Dean Ford she writes:
Michael is often stuck in the middle between the students and the rest of the administrators (especially President Adele Simmons), but he handles that amazingly well, and he cares about and genuinely respects the students, particularly those of us who really care about the school and are willing to put ourselves on the line to make changes that we believe are important. Michael worked incredibly hard to reach a settlement with us, and he always treated us with respect.  

There was an agreement between students and the administration at the final negotiation session that if the students were to leave early enough that day then the all campus meeting might be scheduled for later that evening. If that were going to be the case, then a student would call Michael Ford at home so he could publicize the meeting and get it organized. However, as we learned in the preceding chapter, there was not a unanimous agreement that students should even leave. It became obvious to everyone that the all campus meeting would not occur. Realizing this, Harmon explains: "I proposed formally (thinking it a formality) that someone call Michael right away and tell him about our decision" not to leave early enough for the meeting.  

To Harmon's surprise, her proposal to call Ford was met by the sentiment that "... we need not call ... he would figure out that we did not want to have the meeting that afternoon when we didn't call." This view was presented by individuals in "faction one" and the "cowboys." Harmon says, "I was shocked, and stated that I thought that
we owed Michael, out of common courtesy if nothing else, a phone call."25 A debate over the decision occurred. One individual said, "We were in power, and Michael was part of the administration which we were fighting and hence we owed him nothing, and that it was a good show of our power if we did not call him."26 Harmon explains that at first she expected other students to "side with me." Regrettably, when the vote was taken, "everyone else in the fairly small meeting just sort of went along with the view opposed to calling."27 Harmon's reaction is to leave the building both angry and disheartened; however, with prodding from a friend, she eventually returns. When someone asked her what was wrong, she began crying again. Fortunately, it was not long before "some people (almost all women) woke up at least a little to the significance of this event, and a few people decided to reverse the group decision. Without re-forming a meeting, because nobody was around, they called Michael."28

Summarizing the impact of this experience, Harmon explains that she now distrusts "power" and is skeptical about the possibility of "real dialogue" between individuals engaged in these kinds of struggles. Harmon defines "real dialogue" as "the vital ingredient to real growth and real revolution."29 One hopes that Tasha Harmon's skepticism does not last long.
For Chuck Collins, the ordeal was significant for it raised important issues to the level of serious debate as well as initiated "uncomfortable propositions" that must be considered if the future is to be made better, especially regarding weapons and peace. The majority of Collins' essay explains how the divestment movement at Hampshire has demystified the concept of institutional neutrality and revealed how the interactions of corporations in the free-market economy are "ideological protectors" of the status quo. Collins argues that the effect is educationally devastating. The student is taught to ignore issues vital to society's well being.

He presents eight recommendations in his conclusion and asks only that people consider them. While the first seven are strategies to promote divestment efforts outside of Hampshire, the last idea concentrates solely on what persons involved with the issues may do in their own lives. He writes:

We should also begin to explore, on an individual level, the personal implications of divesting oneself of privileges derived from the arms race. Until the present, we have made demands on our institution which many of us have not made on ourselves and our families. Talking to friends, relatives and family about the arms race and privilege is not as "sexy" as pointing a moralizing finger at our college's endowment, but it is just as important. It would be hypocritical of us not to consider the implications to us as individuals of the questions and demands we make on our college. We, too, have some uncomfortable propositions ahead.
The lesson Collins encourages others to learn is one that he came to after reflecting upon students actions throughout the divestment events. Challenging students first to consider the ethics of their own circumstances was not something he advocated during spring, 1982. In the future, their is less likelihood that he would thoughtlessly dismiss either the views or circumstances of others before weighing his own. Harmon, on the other hand, will be less likely to treat other persons in a callous or mean-spirited manner. If similar circumstances arise again, perhaps she will try and persuade others that the way in which individuals are treated is as important, if not more so, as the sought after goals. In different ways, both Collins and Harmon seem to have benefited educationally from their involvement in the divestment movement.

The Role of the Faculty and the Effects of Professionalism

Either as individuals or as a collective body, the faculty was by and large absent from all of the events. By reviewing the one occasion when their presence, or lack of it, was raised as an issue for consideration, one is better able to see how far removed they were from the entire affair. Ford explains when the situation arose and what the results were:
I remember during one of the negotiation sessions the student had with them a copy of The Chronicle of Higher Education that was just out that week. While we were talking all about divestment, I said, "You know, one of the things you really ought to do is, in addition to getting after the administration, look at this article in The Chronicle and figure out what you are going to do about your faculty." The article was about Tiaa-Creff and where their money was. It [Tiaa-Creff investments], was in every single one of those companies that they wanted the college to divest from.

Ford believes that had students been willing to ask faculty to invest or divest their own retirement investments in a manner similar to what was being asked of the college, the majority would say they were not interested in taking such a risk: "That is my retirement. Do not touch that!" Although Ford "challenged the students to get into it" with the faculty over the issue, "nothing ever became of it . . . we never had the discussion." 31 Regrettably, the students lacked the input their teachers may have been able to provide. Speaking optimistically, had they done so, their teachers may have assessed the divestment question in terms broader than what the students were able to initiate on their own; such as antagonizing trustees into making major policy decisions. 32

The contribution teachers make to the understanding of complex social issues and the difficult choices individuals in a college community make when considering divestment, is immensely critical when judging the educational relationship between student and teacher. Given the
educational opportunity of the faculty to contribute in these matters, it is unfortunate that Ford views the ini-
tiative and involvement of faculty in the divestment move-
ment as insignificant. He explains that:

There is not much story to tell because there is not much in the story about them. They are not there, they simply were not. Outside of Alan Krass and Eqbal Ahmad [who remained uninvolved the last two days of the occu-
pation due to a mild heart attack], no faculty member was involved.33

Perhaps the most critical problem occurred when the faculty "opted out" of any interaction with students other than making symbolic statements such as signing petitions; which, Ford believes, was done primarily to demonstrate to students that faculty were not on the side of the admi-
nistration. Addressing the causes of this problem, Ford explains that: "... faculty members as well as admi-
nistrators seem to have given up their roles of intellec-
tual and ethical leadership in favor of professional career roles."

Professionalism affects matters of everyday teaching in the sense that professional educators (teachers and administrators), are "looking over their shoulder at the next opportunity"34 whether it be a position of more responsibility at another institution or a more lucrative job in government or the private sector. Understandably, faculty members become concerned with the multiple ways they are evaluated: tenure, research and publications.
What is generally most important is the enhancement of the institution's reputation by the work of the faculty member. Ford concludes that for this reason institutions "are not places where ideas are grappled with and values are sort of tested, enthusiastically." At Hampshire, the "rewards system for faculty lacked any incentive for teachers to engage students in dialogue about their proposal, reaction to its not passing and the eventual decision to take over the administrative offices.\[^{35}\]

The lesson of the faculty's lack of involvement in the divestment case at Hampshire is not a surprising one. Although there are indications that the liberal arts faculty is capable of establishing a collective opinion on social issues, for example, scientists at colleges and universities have recently refused to perform work on "Star Wars" related research, we can assume that the majority of teachers will continue to respond first to those aspects of college or university teaching which further their own professional development. Therefore, when issues of social responsibility and divestiture arise on campus, it will not be the teachers, (as it should be), who will interact with students to address and resolve the issues. Rather, the initiative and effort to solve problems, when and if they arise, will come from the administration.
The Impact of Institutional Responsibility and Professionalism on Senior Administrators

It is also helpful, in order to better understand arguments made in the final part, to review Ford's interpretation of how Hampshire's senior administrative leader, the President, chose to deal with events. While not singling her out by name, Ford characterizes Simmons' leadership style (which is typically thought of as synonymous with that of the institution's) throughout the spring. He tells us:

Had things been different, had there been more direction, less waffling, I think some events would have been different because when you waffle and you are indirect, you do not shape events at all.

The way to better understand what Ford means in this quote is to ask a different question. How often in the course of events did Simmons seem actively involved in events? The answer is: not very often. Throughout, her response was to communicate little, and when she did, the statement was in message form delivered by her administrative assistant. Simmons' approach, however, is not all that different from other college presidents with similar administrative responsibilities. If the faculty's self-interest is concentrated on tenure and publishing, one wonders what it is about the nature of college presidents or senior administrators that encourages the person to avoid
involvement in issues which arise out of the social responsibility question. In the following, Ford explains how this is possible:

We are each intricate and complex people; but to some extent we are also prey to the kind of pressures our work roles place on us and we're shaped by them. I remember telling Chuck Collins this: administrators are fairly conservative. They are, in their own minds eye, and by definition, supposed to seek the smooth functioning and the continued existence of the institution. That means, in essence, that they are conservators. A conservator is going to be conservative. It means that they would rather not face problems. They would rather not face challenges. And that's going to hold, I think, in most administrative roles. It does not mean that the president, treasurer, or dean of faculty are bad people. It means being an administrator requires you to deal with the unpleasant issues in such a fashion that you do not welcome change. I am as guilty of that at times as anyone else. I recognize the very real tendency that we have as administrators to hope that it goes away, that's right, to avoid it. To define it as a problem. You want to say: it [the social responsibility issue] becomes a sort of intrusion into their schedules, particularly if it involves financial risk.

The Role of Teaching During the Events and the Example of the Dean of Students

Administrators and teachers can begin to change the prevailing norms associated with divestiture struggles by thinking anew about the role "teaching" may play; that is, enhancing the educational experience. Ford believes that throughout the ordeal it was the element of "teaching" that enabled Harmon, Collins and others (not just students) to have learned positive lessons. About the administrative group he led, Ford said:
When we acted, we acted with integrity and with intelligence. We made very few mistakes, I thought. And most of all we did a whole lot of teaching, and that's what it's about. That's exactly what it's about. You teach people.

The following incident is an example of how "teaching" can inform a new appreciation of the educational issues which may result in some kind of change. It is an incident, as yet undiscussed, which pertained to trustees and the conflict of interest principle. To preface, the issue was often raised by students throughout the spring, 1982 events. Specifically, was there a conflict of interest when trustee Blauvelt cast a divestment related vote in the Finance meeting when the decision had a direct effect on the company with which he was associated?

The occasion was Thursday afternoon after the final negotiation session, when everyone began feeling a sense of relief that the crisis was over. Everyone in the administrative group had gathered in the Red Barn to hear Adele Simmons report on the outcome of the final meeting with students. The Chairman of the Board, Colby Hewitt, was also there. After the short meeting, in a small group discussion between Hewitt, Ford, Simmons and administrative staff members, Mike Ford (paraphrasing), said to Colby Hewitt: "Although the issue got lost in the negotiations, that is, the students quit pressing it, conflict of interest among board members is nevertheless a real
Ford added that "this is not only a legitimate complaint the students had, but it is an issue that the college should study and resolve as soon as possible."

Hewitt acknowledged that the issue Ford raised was indeed, one with merit. (As an observer, it was obvious to everyone that Ford was raising a critical question about the policy of the institution.)

The incident is not only an example of Ford's effectiveness as a teacher of fellow administrators, but Derek Bok's characterization of how conflicts between traditionalists and activists are overcome as well. As an administrator he took the initiative to act in the role of institutional leader. Recall Bok's argument that when the opportunity arises, a dean or president can encourage positive change. Ford's words were calmly delivered in a manner much like that of a teacher posing a philosophical problem to students; pushing the listeners in an encouraging way (not threatening), to seriously think about the question. "Isn't there a problem here?" Ford inquired of Hewitt. "Do not the students have a legitimate point?" "And if so, might we want to entertain the idea of discussing and considering it, and then, if consideration proves enlightening, to do something about it?"

While it may be easy to understand Ford's argument to Hewitt, that acting on the conflict of interest issue
would seem sensible and not in any manner undermining fundamental principles of liberal arts learning, a related question must also be asked: If the conflict of interest problem was so obvious, and if students had repeatedly raised the point over the past two months in discussions with administrators and trustees (Hewitt and Simmons knew of it), why had there never been acknowledgment of the problem by the college's leaders, (aside from Ford), much less any corrective action taken? (It is interesting to know that a conflict of interest policy was added to the college's trustee charter at the following October trustees' meeting. Hewitt led the Executive Committee of the board to draft and propose a policy. It conformed entirely to the ideas originally proposed by students; that board members could no longer vote on issues in which they have a financial interest and must, when coming onto the board, state their financial holdings.)

The Dean of Students Explains How He Would Have Handled the Situation Had He Been the President

By examining how Ford would have responded to the circumstances had he been president, the reader is able to see how an alternative approach may be established. When asked if he would have addressed the divestment issue in a
manner different from that of President Simmons, Ford replied:

I would have. I would have been as clear, as direct and as honest, as contentious or agreeable with students, as my values dictated. I would not have avoided it. If I felt that the support of the board of trustees was of paramount importance to the college at that point, and that the divestment issue was one that I did not believe a major sort of concern, I would have said that. And I would have made clear just how important the board of trustees are.38

On the other hand, as president, Ford would not have automatically supported the trustee's position at the expense of sacrificing what students, faculty and the circumstances (that is, the financial situation of the college) revealed to him. Regarding the weapons divestment case study, Ford states: "... there does seem to me that there probably are ways to invest in more beneficial kinds of firms, and I would have been in favor of doing that ..." Similar to the way in which Ford would engage students to understand the reasons why divesting was not in the college's best interest, had divestment and/or socially responsible investing been a realistic possibility, Ford would have treated the challenge of persuading the trustees in an identical fashion. Had the occasion arose, I would have told people what the stakes were [regarding weapons, war, and ethical investing] and I would have tried to lead the board of trustees into devising a policy that would have us place our funds in places that are tremendously important educationally, regarding the ethical and moral values that we are supposed to be discoursing about; and that this would not
be compromised. I think you can do that by being direct, by being clear and by being honest.

**Establishing an Alternative Approach to Maintaining Institutional Neutrality**

Whether or not Ford was in favor of or opposed to divestiture is not what is most important. Rather, it is what he said in the last sentence of the preceding quote, that his approach would have been characterized by clarity, directness and honesty. The argument I want to put forward is that, when facing circumstances presented by Hampshire students, Ford and Simmons relied on contrary ideas. First, concerning how to think about and analyze the situation; and second, to make decisions which therefore lead the institution and shape the educational experience. Those differences are critical when considering their effects on the educational experiences of the participants, as well as higher education's ability to have an impact on resolving society's complex social problems.

Simmons, adhering to the prevailing forms of administrative behavior, made decisions based upon the traditionalists two most important standards, preserving institutional neutrality and freedom of inquiry. Ford, on the other hand, relied on his understanding of, (1) the situation and the people in it, (2) the education and institutional ideas, and (3) established principles of
action to undertake. To generalize, Ford follows his instincts in all situations and is engaged with others even if there is disagreement; Simmons adheres to an approach that forbids the consideration of divestment and remains isolated. And although Ford's example informs an alternative approach to divestment issues, it is not to say that a gifted "traditionalist" or "activist" administrator could not successfully handle circumstances that may arise. Most administrators, however, are ordinary persons whereas the gifted leader possesses extraordinary abilities.

During the entire ordeal, President Simmons' approach was one patterned after the central thesis in Derek Bok's, *Beyond the Ivory Tower*. Bok argues that divestiture, boycotts or any form of institutional action relative to social responsibility should be highly discouraged. To do any of the three means committing the institution to subscribe to one position at the exclusion of others. To review Bok's central arguments, making such commitments is problematic for primarily three reasons:

1. That unencumbered free inquiry is necessary in order to preserve the academic tradition of higher education

2. Since the tradition of free inquiry can be maintained only within the institutional context, it is
mandatory that the context remain as neutral as possible, and

3. "Administrative nightmares" would be the result if attempts to take institutional positions on social issues were made. 39

Thomas Bender, in a review of Bok's book, takes issue with Bok's arguments, raising instead a different set of concerns pertaining to maintaining the philosophy of absolute neutrality. What I want to show is that Ford's actions and the reflections of his experiences illuminate the problems Bender raises with Bok's prescription of the traditionalist's approach. Moreover, Ford's approach to administrative leadership answers the questions Bender raises concerning the kind of higher education that will be worthwhile to students, teachers and the society it seeks to serve.

Thomas Bender's primary objections to the "neutralist's," (that is, traditionalist) approach is that it is a philosophy of educational action grounded in "pragmatism rather than principle." 40 It is a position, he believes, that does not adequately consider the place of the curriculum within the institution. A meaningful curriculum and a totally neutral institution are not compatible. Bender believes that a curriculum worth something "... requires discrimination. It involves judgments that
give different values to particular disciplines and courses." The domination of institutional neutrality inspires a curriculum best described by "general education and distribution requirements." This approach reflects ". . . the distribution of departmental power rather than core curriculums that articulate a vision of an educated person." Regrettably, this is the educational ideology dominating higher education today. It is philosophically rooted in an anti-political, maintain neutrality at all costs stance; one that Bok beautifully prescribes the rationale for while Simmons skillfully administered. Unfortunately, however, the prescription and behavior exemplifies, Bender writes:

... the worrisome weakness of current liberal institutions and thought in America. Rightly aware of the diversity of our society and fearful of establishing orthodoxy, liberalism has reacted by standing for nothing. Neutral on the matter of substance, unwilling to embrace a moral or intellectual tradition, the American university, the repository of liberal values, becomes an incarnation of the civil-libertarian protections and procedures enshrined in the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution.

Given this emphasis on "procedures rather than substantive values," Bender fears that the modern college or university is "denying itself a role in setting higher aspirations and standards for society." The challenge facing the liberal arts college has been and will continue to be: finding the ground "... between the imposition of orthodoxy and a moral and intellectual vacuum," and/or
maintaining a "healthy relativism" [taking stands], while continually affirming the purposes and activities of education. To fail at this challenge is to offer society a form of higher education more in keeping with a public utility, or the "public-access channels of cable television." If this occurs, higher education's contribution to society will be little more than: "a response to effective market demand as opposed to collective moral and intellectual judgment."

The Relationship Between How the Institution Chooses to Resolve Its Social Responsibility to Society and the Effect on the Educational Development of Students

The first, and perhaps the most important decision Ford made pertained to his initial reaction to students when, in October, 1981, they presented trustees with a proposal to expand the definition of social injury regarding the school's investments. Instead of trying to thwart the students' efforts, which is what the "neutrality" principle would have him do, he gave Tom Stoner advice on how to improve the proposal in order that its essential issue, the consistency between weapons investments and the liberal arts ethos, could receive a second hearing from trustees. In a sense, his decision to encourage the potential for divestment to occur pertained less to the weapons issue
itself than it did to the liberal arts principle that the college's first concern be with educating students. Tom Stoner and others needed to get smarter about what they were doing. Ford explains the developmental activity in which Tom Stoner and others needed to engage.

There is a potential at Hampshire for lively intellectual interchange and development, and that's a very positive value. When people can sort of grapple with an issue and try to make sense of it, and debate it, something just very, very good happens. And the good is, that people learn that ideas are important, that discourse is important; and change is only likely, positive social change, is only likely when you really have grappled with good ideas and gotten people together to talk things through and tried to make sense of them, to try to refine their ideas.

There are differences, however, in each set of circumstances. For example, when the occupation arose Dean Ford did not stand idly by and let events run their course. As opposed to what a strictly activist administrator may have done, Ford worked against the occupation because "we [the student services staff], could see it was not going to achieve anything," whereas the investment task force would. In all cases, Ford seems most interested in the development of the persons in his charge. Had he upheld the traditionalist's approach, his response to Tom Stoner may have been the following:

This question is a completely inappropriate issue for the college to be either discussing or acting upon. You are asking the institution to adopt a position which tries to influence public policy. This we cannot do.
Ford, however, did not choose this approach. His reasons for taking the actions that he did speak to the fundamental nature of the institution. Ford describes the purpose of a liberal arts college in the following:

A university has to, I think, maintain a critical stance vis-a-vis its society. A university ought to be somewhat separate, somewhat uninvolved financially, which is why I think the divestment issue was an important issue. Because if you do not get that kind of corrective critical view . . . a continuing kind of examination of who we are and what we are doing, and how we could be doing it better, if we do not get that from the universities, where will it come from? It will not come from anywhere.

In the preceding, Ford's interpretation of the university's mission is that which constantly evaluates three topics: (1) the social problems of society; (2) what the school is doing vis-a-vis those problems; and (3) what is being educationally imparted to students by the interaction of the two preceding activities. These were the three components which interacted during the divestment struggle at Hampshire. Considering the outcome of that three way interaction, Ford believes that although divestment was not instituted, Hampshire's "posture" regarding the ethical nature of investing changed because there was a rigorous examination of the issues. Subsequently, the college "adopted a set of definitions [socially responsible guidelines], that serve to guide our investments now and should make things at least marginally better." Moreover, perhaps the greater value for the institution is:
We participated in something. And our participation in it made it more important and more visible. . . about responsible investments. I think we may have contributed to a climate where socially responsible investing, doing good with money, is one of the things people now think about.

Students and the Development of Citizens

The third activity of the college, paying attention to the individual development of students as they learn from how the institution debates and acts regarding questions of social responsibility, is the most difficult to evaluate. It is this active evaluation, however, that is most fundamental to the college's traditional mission: to educate students with the intention that upon graduation they have become thoughtful citizens able to contribute to society for the rest of their lives.

Ford's divestment experiences demonstrate that it is worthwhile for the leadership of an institution to engage in the internal struggle necessary to arrive at an institutional position in hopes of nurturing the development of citizens. I think it is important to see the benefit of such struggles as a counterbalance to the principle of economic-individualism that dominates the conditions from which students came and where they will return. Hampshire students, while engaging in a different educational process, are not unlike any other ordinary American
student-citizen. In the following, Ford illuminates the perspective from which students start from and describes how the engagement with "struggle," of a "public" kind, can impart something of value.

The thing about students is that they are often geared to instant gratification. They do not understand or see this kind of thing [awareness of and critical thought about a social issue], that it is just enormous in its complexity. It is the sort of thing where they think: you just clap your hands and have things change, which is an immature kind of response and is why I think struggle is good, because it is good to learn that sudden change is not going to occur. What I would rather do is have people engaged in struggle, refine and dedicate themselves to specific commitments.

The above quote is a view that sees struggle (learning how to "think it through") as inextricably woven into the fabric of what a liberal arts institution is supposed to inculcate in its students. When asked if what occurred at Hampshire during the eighteen month divestment period was the "struggle" he is in favor of? And, was he proud of what had occurred?, Ford stated: "Absolutely, there is no question." His view is one where the liberal arts institution is at its best when it provides an educational forum or context where human lives can interact, and be educated through that interaction.
Reconsidering the Meaning of "Politics"
as It Is Presently Defined by the
Principle of Institutional Neutrality

The educational process which helps students develop into citizens focuses on how persons think, interpret and act in personal as well as public ways. It is a "shaping" process that is both educational and political. Whether or not the divestment issue should have passed is a question that requires the consideration of matters that are political. Although Bok espouses that upholding the traditionalist principle is best, in order to keep politics isolated away from the educational process, he also argues, contradictorily, that "political judgments" are required of administrative leaders to decide what the institution should do when taking socially responsible actions.48

What I want to argue is that rather than keeping "political judgments" preserved for the deans and presidents, the process should invite all to participate in an organized and thoughtful manner. It is not as if the present form of neutrality has kept politics isolated from deliberations and decisions as it is supposed to. For example, events occurring at Hampshire reveal that trustees Blauvelt and Watts, the two who argued most strenuously
against divestment (because divesting was political and thus destroyed Hampshire's neutrality), were the two persons whose own actions, more than any other trustees, subverted principles of neutrality by the use of political manipulation.\(^{49}\) (Blauvelt threatening to resign and encouraging others to do the same if divestment occurred, and Watts, attempting in a trustees Executive Committee meeting, to keep Alan Krass off the task force because of his pro-divestment views.\(^{50}\)

The actions of the two trustees did not go undiscussed by others. Although indirect, they had their educational effect on what student's learned. For example, if trustees can manipulate the process, so can students. The members of "faction one" and the "cowboys" complained the loudest about the trustees and their authority, however, they conducted themselves in a manner most similar to that which they criticized: manipulation and disregard for the opinions of others. Recall that a collective decision was sacrificed because a small group believed a "political opportunity should be capitalized upon."\(^{51}\)

To summarize, even in what is supposedly a neutral institution, the existence of politics is abundant. Part of what I want to argue is that throughout the entire case study the actions undertaken by all of the participants have in some way been political. The kind of political
meaning I am referring to pertains to the nature of the participant's words and deeds. At some level the activities of everyday life, be it in a college, work or neighborhood environment, are political. Regrettably, the traditionalist approach tends to ignore what is political whereas the activist extreme may consider nothing but achieving so called political ends. Thus, an interesting question arises regarding the interwoven relationship between cultivating the individual's educational experiences as well as the development of political awareness about one's actions. What kind of politics will it be? A politics defined as honor and trust, or one of manipulation? And, once an understanding of political matters has been introduced into the higher education context, will education still hold its rightful position as the primary mission of a college?

One of the many lessons from Hampshire's divestment crises is that the infusion of teaching ought to be, rather than an avoidance of, an education concerning the nature of politics as it relates to citizenship. That is, how to live a meaningful life individually and collectively. Ultimately, the result would be a wiser citizen who has a greater sense of words and deeds instead of materialism and status. Inherent within doing politics is the assumption that mistakes are made; much of the goal is to learn
lessons from those mistakes. The context of the liberal arts college offers students a place to practice. As an example, Ford expresses how an individual's political view is able to fit within the context of public struggle and the role of the institution.

I think my political views are important to me, and, in my view, are more correct than some others, but I'm not infallible; I'm not God. My ideas ought to be as subject to scrutiny and critique as anybody's. That's the beauty of the university, because that potentially is possible. I do not believe the university should be captured by any faction, either right or left. But the university should be a staging ground for continuing examination of the state and of its relationship to its citizens. And it should be a place where ideas are developed that speak to improving the lot of the citizen and critiquing society, whether that society be dominated at the moment by the left or by the right. I would not want quiescent universities, even if we had a socialist government. I believe universities ought to be active, they ought to be critical in the best sense of that, and engaged, because otherwise, all you have is just arid academic nonsense that's irrelevant. Because if you are not attending to the development of citizens, then I don't think you can claim to be doing any educating. People got to live in the world. And they can either live in the world having developed their faculties and better instincts, or we can send them through four years of bullshit. You know, just a catalog of ideas that they can toss around at parties, and really let the larger society shape them. And just admit that the university has no place in that. You know, you're going to be what your family and your job more or less dictate.

Maintaining Neutrality or Taking Stands

That an institution, individual, department or program is in some fashion political and therefore capable of subverting free inquiry and neutrality, is a fact that in all likelihood will continue to confuse the issues and
muddle the judgment of administrators, students and trustees alike into the foreseeable future. That is, unless there is a change in the meaning we apply to the terms we use. The term "politics," that which we apply to governmental decisions, is slightly misleading when used in the higher education context. While the case study took up political issues of the society and its government and citizenry, the most important issues concerning higher education, the development of students, were not at all political. We must change our interpretation of politics in the educational setting because it is stifling education's primary task: to teach well. In short, citizens cannot flourish because their educational development in this regard is misunderstood. In the following, Thomas Bender explains why a reconsideration of our present definition is in order. He writes:

Institutional purposes and commitments do not limit freedom or diversity; indeed, they provide the motive for a genuine discussion of differences both in internal dialogue and in dialogue with the larger society.52

What seems most important about the nature of "internal dialogue" is its influence on not only what kind of citizen we become but what kind of person we are: our character, integrity, sense of purpose and commitment to both ourselves and our fellow citizens. These are the ingredients which make for wise citizens. Although a college is not a government or democracy (the proper home
of politics), the struggle at Hampshire over divestment and social responsibility was more often than not confined to these pre-political, or issues of personal development. When administrators have these concerns in mind and are able to shape their actions accordingly, the result for the student as well as the institution will be different. Instead of the mistrust that characterized many of the situations throughout the events at Hampshire, Ford explains what could occur once administrators have chosen to interact with students differently, when educational issues are given the same importance as preserving the institution's reputation or maximizing its financial circumstances:

Out of that relationship that you have created [between students and trustees and/or administrators], you say: "Okay, I'm going to try to meet your objections." Then if you're real honest in the first place, you say, "I can live with this, I agree with this." And, that's the way to teach them: "Look, compromise is possible, maybe we can find a ground where we can all agree." And that's why I think we should be honest. We should say [when appropriate], "No, this is not something I can buy; I don't like it."

When the kind of interaction described by Ford occurs, the institution and its members are likely to benefit. Towards this end, when colleges and universities become more willing to engage the problematic issues facing society, eventually taking a stand on them and thereby teaching students, the role of administrative leadership will provide the critical difference. There will not be
easily identifiable responses to the unforeseen situations which will certainly occur. More specifically, perhaps the manner in which Mike Ford engages Hampshire students will be typical of an administrator. In the following, Ford explains how he interacts with students. It is a successful approach for him and one that may be necessary if institutions begin to debate and eventually take more formal positions on complex social issues.

If I think they're wrong, I tell them. If I get pissed, I let them know. And if I get violently angry [pausing] ... (I'm not afraid of hurting anyone), but if Matt Goodman is screwing up in my eyes I call him in and I tell him. And he can talk to me about it. I'm not going to let Matt think that I don't feel that way. That's wrong; he should know. I disagreed with a variety of people. I will not sign any petition that comes along if I don't believe it. Students deserve to know that; they deserve to be challenged; they deserve to know why. They don't deserve to be galled.53

Thomas Bender summarizes well the present course of higher education and its influence on society when he writes: "the university's obligation is simply to be a well-meaning and law-abiding citizen, observing the basic obligations of civilized society--something, incidentally, appropriate to almost any other organization."54 And, because we are a society rooted in the entrepreneurial tradition, Ford explains that the manifestation for the liberal arts student becomes "... mastering skills to get a good job." Combine the two aforementioned points and the result is not surprising. Ford explains: "I do not believe
there are many opportunities provided for current students to think about their roles as citizens."

While the goal of lifelong learning is often championed as one of the great virtues of the liberal arts experience, regrettably, institutions also instill a sense of lifelong neutrality relative to citizenship. The experiences of Hampshire's Dean of Students and the entire case study present a compelling case to students, administrators, faculty and trustees that a reconsideration of neutrality's hold over the thinking and acting of individuals is in order. If colleges and universities were to become more daring in their willingness to engage the more difficult questions and face up to tough decisions, the result may be not only better institutions but better education and better citizens. Obviously, there will be risks, as the case study at Hampshire revealed. But is it worth it? I think so. On this final note, the words of Michael Ford are especially instructive:

It seems to me that you're never better than when you're engaged passionately in something you believe in and are willing to talk about it, exchange views, grow and learn. That is the height of human development. And I think that some of those young people who were involved are almost certainly going to be affected in a very positive way... My own hope is that some of the people, like Chuck Collins, will look back and say, "We did not get a divestment policy, but we did some good things here."
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CHAPTER X

CONCLUSIONS

In 1986, the role of higher education as an instrument of social change remains a contested issue. On university and college campuses during the fall semester of this year, divestment remains the strategy most often used to employ the South African government to end apartheid. An increasing number of trustees continue to divest either some or all of their institution's endowment so that profits are not earned from socially injurious investing, an action that would violate at least the spirit if not the letter of the liberal arts mission. Moreover, American businesses, the likes of IBM, Coca Cola, General Motors and Kodak, have themselves decided to disinvest their economic activities in South Africa; in some cases selling their holdings to either their managers, as was the case with GM and IBM, or to black South Africans as Coke did. Kodak has taken the most extreme step of total disinvestment whereby the company's products will no longer be sold anywhere in the country. The chief executive officers of these companies explained that significant economic losses have been sustained and that the policy of apartheid remains the
primary cause of the country's mounting financial and political problems.

The potential effect of these developments, the most recent in the longstanding struggle to end apartheid, are as controversial today as the debate during the seventies and early eighties about whether or not divestment was an action colleges would ever consider taking. It remains the case that little consensus exists about whether the divestiture strategy is ultimately a help or a hindrance to social change in South Africa. Be that as it may, regardless of whether one views the increasing volume of divestiture related actions as positive or negative, a new perspective has been cast over the way in which divestment will be considered in the future. In 1982, the president of Harvard University, Derek Bok, thought it remote that a large scale, organized divestment movement would ever occur. In short, higher education leaders would not be willing to do that because divestment would compromise the fundamental integrity of the educational enterprise. The events of the last three years, however, show that under certain circumstances divestment is something institutions are willing to undertake and still be taken seriously as legitimate environments where liberal arts learning can exist. It is no longer appropriate, when the question arises, to dismiss divestment by invoking the previously
used traditionalist/activist dichotomy. That analysis has become anachronistic given the degree to which the inhumanity of apartheid has been fused with higher education's interdependency with corporate America.

The case study of Hampshire College teaches us that the central question arising out of future divestiture campaigns, boycotts and other activities used as a means by which higher education seeks to affect social change, is going to be: Will the students, faculty, administrators and trustees make the most of the situation when it arises, that is, regarding the educational purposes and the other principles for which the institution exists?

Concerning that question, when academic and moral issues mix with the financial and ethical policy of the institution, a "percolation" process should be allowed to occur throughout the intellectual as well as organizational framework of the institution. It is important to understand that this "percolation" arises first out of the curriculum or classroom context. Teachers, who have studied their subject matter and understand how it relates to the world, instruct students about what it is that is most important to learn. Next, students may choose to apply what it is they have learned and begin discussing amongst themselves how this newly developed knowledge may be integrated into the affairs of the public world. The
third step occurs when those initial stirrings have developed into concrete proposals which are presented to administrators and trustee committees of the institution. This process has stretched from ideas presented by faculty which are then taken up by students, who invite, by their proposals, members of the community who have a long-term stake in the institution to join in what was originally an exercise in learning something meaningful about the world in which they live.

This natural "percolation," however, cannot be nor should it be institutionalized, as if it were possible to create a particular kind of bureaucratic structure which would ensure that certain kinds of social responsibility issues periodically arise for consideration by trustee committees. In other words, it should be understood by trustees and administrators that it is not their role to establish a mandate for social change and carry it out, nor is it the faculty's responsibility either. However, the faculty's role is central regarding two points. First, to ensure that the student's knowledge about the issue is well researched and that their proposal is well developed. Second, that the faculty challenge students to be as thoughtful in their chosen means of persuasion as they have in establishing a proposal for change.
The principal role in this "percolation" process is that played by students. Because a liberal arts college is essentially the educational work done by faculty and students, a proposal that asks the institution to pass judgment on an issue affecting either the college or the greater community should come from their charge. And because so much responsibility in this regard is expected of students, who will sometimes coalesce around an important issue and at other times not (for no predictable reason, although it helps if students believe that those in positions of institutional authority are receptive to change when it is appropriate), faculty, administrators and trustees should welcome this unpredictable percolation as an inevitable part of higher education's agenda. And, more importantly, by acknowledging this process, seize the opportunity to teach students that certain standards of conduct employed when pressing for change must be observed, standards that are as important, for educational reasons, as the particular issue. Needless to say, it is incumbent upon those teachers, administrators, and trustees to ensure that their own actions are in keeping with those being expected of students.

The degree to which institutionalization should occur is the assurance that the views of students and/or their proposals receive a hearing and full consideration
within the institutional context. This is easily done by having student positions represented on various administrative and trustee committees within the school's organizational structure. Along with reflecting on their own actions, students should carefully consider the situations and perspectives held by others associated with the institution. These may include the well being of the institution itself, keeping in mind the school's traditional values and reputation throughout higher education, the potential financial impact, and the viewpoints of alumni and parents.

There are numerous social responsibility issues presently facing the higher education community. For example, the relationship between research scientists and the government's development of "Star Wars" technology, or, the mutual benefits to corporations and universities when the former derives exclusive rights to what is developed from university research that is undertaken for and subsidized by corporations. Although each constituency (students, faculty, administration and trustees) have different responsibilities in sorting out the potential problems associated with these issues, this is not to suggest that each group cannot see the other as allies rather than adversaries. When persons in all groups imagine beyond the views associated with their own perspective
and approach the problems honestly, with an open-mind and a commitment to achieve the best possible results, then there is a real opportunity for a unique form of a collective wisdom to manifest itself. Although rare, when it does occur everyone is better off for it, the individuals involved, the college community itself, and finally society.
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