

8

A FEW BOLD INSTITUTIONS:

Interinstitutional Cooperation and the Larger Community

Another opportunity lies in much greater interinstitutional cooperation. . . . Voluntary arrangements should be encouraged to go farther than they have as yet. . . . [No] single university can any longer hope to be a universal university, and . . . all must group themselves into communities of universities and colleges. Within such a community each institution could take pride in the accomplishments of the whole and in its contribution to that whole.

DAEL WOLFLE
Science, November, 1965

The Northeastern seaboard of the United States is today . . . an almost continuous stretch of urban and suburban areas from southern New Hampshire to northern Virginia and from the Atlantic shore to the Appalachian foothills. . . . [The] urban growth experienced here generates many contrasts, paradoxes, and apparently contradictory trends. . . . Are its results for the better or for the worse? It is not for our generation to moralize on the matter, but to strive to make the outcome be for the better, whatever obstacles may be in the way. Megalopolis stands indeed on the threshold of a new way of life, and upon solution of its problems will rest civilization's ability to survive. In the search for such solutions there will be found no easy keys to success. . . . Solutions must be thought out, ironed out, and constantly revised in the light of all the knowledge that can be acquired by all concerned.

JEAN GOTTMANN
Megalopolis

THE FORMING OF HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE occurs in a time of remarkable opportunity for higher education to strengthen itself through inter-institutional cooperation, and to renew itself through more active civic involvement in the life of the larger community. Both of these opportunities were reviewed in the first chapter, and in the second were cited as two of the specific challenges Hampshire College proposes to face. Indeed, a new private liberal arts college in the Connecticut Valley of Massachusetts has no choice but to do so. The survival of the idea of Hampshire College as a new institution of high quality ultimately depends upon cooperation with the sister institutions which brought the idea into being in the first place. The development of Hampshire College as a new institution in the relatively rural landscape of South Amherst cannot occur without affecting the social and physical environment which surrounds it, nor can Hampshire help being affected by the changing nature of that environment in the years ahead.

What is true of Hampshire College with regard to interinstitutional cooperation and interrelationships with the larger community is true in its own way of each of the older institutions in the Valley. Perhaps their survival will not absolutely depend upon cooperation, but their strength and quality in the future are certain to be influenced by the kind and quality of interinstitutional cooperation they achieve. Similarly, the future of the older institutions is bound up with the human ecology of the Valley. Urbanization is swiftly overtaking the Valley, growing, as Professor Jean Gottmann of the University of Paris has said, "amidst an irregularly colloidal mixture of rural and suburban landscapes. . . ." ¹⁷⁰ The question for all of the institutions in the Valley is not whether they will be affected by the onset of urbanization, but how they will respond to it, and whether they will seek, individually and through cooperation, to influence the process.

The founding of Hampshire College could provide a "take-off point" from which it would be possible for the institutions in the Valley to move strongly toward increased and more productive interinstitutional cooperation in academic matters, and with equal strength toward playing an active, vital part in helping shape the urban transformation of the Valley now already under way. In both instances, Hampshire College represents a moment of truth for the academic constituencies which have brought it into being. Hampshire is a symbol of the beginnings of interinstitutional

cooperation in the Valley. Without such cooperation, there would be no new college in process at all. At the same time, Hampshire is symbolic—in its need for nurture as a newborn, and in its existence as a new factor in the Valley environment—of the new era in which all of the other institutions here find themselves.

Academically and otherwise, New England has a notable and noble history of individual enterprise. In education, its tradition of independent private enterprise has been, and is, stronger than anywhere else in the country. Only in the present is public higher education emerging as an equal kind of enterprise in this important region of the nation. The virtues of individualism in enterprise and achievement are as important to maintain among institutions as they are among people. So, too, is a healthy balance of private and public education as alternatives available to American youth. But the tradition of separatism and individualism in New England education will not suffice alone for the years ahead. The New England region is ripe for a bold demonstration—by what Dacl Wolfe calls "a few bold institutions"—of the great new strength that can be found in interinstitutional cooperation, without losing the historic values of individual difference. It is important throughout the New England region for such a demonstration to be made, showing how advantageously private institutions can work with each other and with public institutions, and with what full effect, both in terms of academic improvement and active influence on the civic realities of swiftly changing community life.

I. PAST AND PRESENT: INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN THE CONNECTICUT VALLEY

In February, 1955, the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education provided a grant to Mount Holyoke, Smith, and Amherst, and the University of Massachusetts for a study of the possibilities of cooperative educational activities among the four institutions. Under this grant, a Committee on Cooperation was established to study the problem and report on it to the presidents of the four institutions; its members included leading faculty representatives from each of the colleges and the university.* The Committee understood that its function was to

*The members of the Committee were Professors Charles J. Hill, Smith College; Gail Kennedy, Amherst College; Bruce R. Morris, University of Massachusetts; and Stuart M. Stoke, Mount Holyoke College.

take into account any topic which was relevant to the joint interests of the four institutions. It is said that the members of the Committee accepted their assignment dutifully, but with misgivings: "Could anything really be done and why; after all, aren't things just about all right, as they are now?"¹⁷¹ During the course of its year of study, the Committee on Cooperation lost its misgivings and became convinced that some things could "really be done" and that the status quo was not "just about all right":

. . . as the Committee proceeded its interest in the project grew. Moreover, a thorough-going plan of cooperation among these four institutions, if it could be devised and put into effect, might be of more than local importance. It might provide an example and indicate a pattern of action which could be successfully followed by other group of colleges and universities. And, in particular, establishing an example of cooperation between public and private institutions might be of value. . . .¹⁷²

When their report was submitted to the presidents of the four institutions in June, 1956, the Committee submitted recommendations for increased cooperation in undergraduate education, in graduate work, in faculty utilization, in interchange of students, in teacher education, in campus-to-campus transportation, in area studies, in FM radio and educational television, in coordination of special events (lectures, concerts, art exhibits), in establishing a joint calendar, in studying the problem of remedial reading instruction, in providing speech therapy, in adult education, in audio-visual aids, in statistical services, and in cooperative recruitment of staff.

In its conclusions, the Committee asserted that growth toward cooperation would be stimulated by increasing pressures upon all four institutions. These pressures would arise from the expansion of the college student population and would result in drastically increased demands for more student housing, more classrooms, and more laboratories. The Committee did not advocate cooperation just for its own sake, however, nor as a response to pressures alone. Steps toward cooperation were urged "as a safeguard for the future," and to offer a long-term strengthening of educational resources and quality in the Valley.

The Committee urged that, if cooperation were to attain any considerable proportions, a separate corporation be set up. This corpora-

tion could receive and use funds from foundations and other donors. It could make agreements for the cooperating institutions with other organizations or individuals more easily than the separate institutions could handle such matters. Further, it was felt that such a new corporation could take the initiative in developing new forms of cooperation "without arousing the jealousy that might come from extensive leadership on the part of one of the member institutions."¹⁷³ A separate corporation could serve as an arbiter among the institutional members, could simplify administrative tasks for all of them, could oversee the operation of cooperative enterprises, be "free from a great deal of the institutional inertia of its constituents," and could serve as a convenient holding and operating agent for affiliated enterprises.

In retrospect, the efforts of the 1955-1956 Committee on Cooperation appear imaginative, bold, and sensible. Several of their recommendations have been implemented with considerable success.

In its spirit and work, the Committee on Cooperation was carrying forward a long tradition of cooperative activity among the Connecticut Valley institutions. On an informal basis, cooperation had existed since the beginning of the institutions.

Edward Hitchcock, President of Amherst from 1845 to 1854, was an outstanding figure in the early establishment of close and neighborly relationships among the institutions. President Hitchcock was a founding trustee of Mount Holyoke College, and served on its Board from 1836 until his death in 1864. While President of Amherst, he taught and lectured at Mount Holyoke. President Hitchcock was also a major influence in the founding of the University of Massachusetts, and in urging its location in Amherst. In the spring of 1850 he toured Europe to study agricultural schools abroad on behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He returned to submit a recommendation and plan for a publicly supported college of agriculture to be located in Amherst, so that it would be able to share instructors and equipment with Amherst College.

Throughout the years, graduates of each of the colleges have served as presidents, deans, faculty members, and trustees of the other colleges. Although the history of cooperation has not been well documented, records indicate that the first joint appointment of one professor to the faculties of two institutions in the Valley took place in the 1930's.

Five years before the report of the Committee on Cooperation, the first formal cooperative venture of all four institutions was undertaken. This was the Hampshire Inter-College Library Center (HILC), which was formed to serve specialized library needs of the faculties at the four colleges and the Forbes Library in Northampton. HILC today is a repository, housed at the University library, for monographs, journals, and periodicals, the limited use of which would not warrant duplicate accession by all of the other libraries. The HILC collection, therefore, is more complete and valuable, in terms of its special holdings, than any one of the libraries would be likely to afford alone.

After the Committee on Cooperation had made its report, one of the first of its suggestions to be carried out was the appointment in 1957 of a coordinator of cooperative activity and the establishment of a coordinator's office. Transportation among the colleges, a joint calendar, an FM radio station, and interchange of students and teachers were developed with a modicum of success. In addition, a number of cooperative activities not initially conceived of by the Committee on Cooperation have developed.*

The most widely known and significant cooperative activity at present is the interchange of students among the four institutions. This is accomplished through an agreement among the colleges by which a student, with permission of his dean and the course instructor, may elect one or more courses at one of the other institutions. The number of students enrolling in interchange courses per year has grown steadily since the program's inception in 1957-58. The interchange courses provide an admirable example of the way in which cooperation can extend educational opportunity and amplify institutional resources. The growth of the interchange enrollment program may be seen in figures from the last four years of four-college cooperation

<i>Year</i>	<i>Enrollment</i>
1962-63	253
1963-64	320
1964-65	336
1965-66	578

* The 1964-65 report of the present coordinator, Acting Dean Robert C. Whitney of Amherst College, lists 27 cooperating activities among the four institutions. A copy of Dean Whitney's report is included in the appendices of the present document.

The present status of cooperation among the four colleges may be divided for convenience between those academic activities which are essentially the sharing of one institution's resources with the others, and those activities which are creative combinations. The most significant of the shared activities are the interchange courses, the extension of library facilities, and the interchange of faculty. Cooperative activities which represent creative combinations (i.e., combinations which create results greater than any one institution could offer) are cooperative courses, joint faculty appointments, a computer center, the FM radio station, and the *Massachusetts Review*, a scholarly quarterly. In cooperative courses, the institutions combine to establish a joint course; for instance, the History of Science program is such a cooperative endeavor now, offered for students at all institutions.

Formal cooperation was given additional stimulus by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education in 1958, as this paper indicates in reviewing the consequences of the work of the four-college committee which developed *The New College Plan*.

It seems reasonable to assume that, even without Hampshire College and its needs, cooperative activities among Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Smith and the University of Massachusetts would continue at least at their present level. New activities of cooperation have not appeared in profusion, but there is a definite record of success and longevity among those cooperative innovations that have been tried. The success and longevity of innovations in cooperation can be attributed in some good part to the deliberate care with which the institutions have worked them out and assessed them. For example, evening bus service among the four colleges was discussed for several years and finally instituted on a trial basis during 1965-66. After several weeks' run and a careful analysis of the results by the coordinator, Mount Holyoke College decided that it did not wish to continue to participate in the service. The other three institutions found the service valuable and continued it until the end of that academic year.

2. FUTURE POSSIBILITIES OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

At present, the possibility clearly exists for an increase in the variety and intensity of cooperative activities. The pressures which the Com-

mittee on Cooperation noted ten years ago have indeed increased and are felt by all institutions, not only those in the Connecticut Valley. Most commentators on higher education today, like Dael Wolfle, speak of cooperation as a necessity for meeting pressures of time, expense, and complexity, and as a major way to increase the general strength of higher education.

The direct impetus for further cooperation may come most strongly from students. In the Valley, students increasingly require more variety and specialization in course work, resources, equipment, and extracurricular activities than any one institution, even the University of Massachusetts, can possibly offer.

The advent of Hampshire College provides a unique moment when the long-standing tradition of informal and formal cooperation among institutions of the Valley could be dramatically reasserted and usefully extended. If it were not for this tradition of friendly association, it might appear presumptuous for Hampshire, as the newest college in the group, to come out strongly for increased cooperative endeavor. It might simply seem that Hampshire, as the newest and neediest of the colleges, is making a case for sharing with others their hard-won resources. This is not Hampshire College's view of itself, nor is it believed to be the view taken by the older institutions of the Valley. Hampshire is the result of an act of cooperation; it represents and will seek actively to express a view of cooperation as creative collaboration, in which all concerned can find advantage.

Straight sharing can be a successful short-term solution for a problem of scarcity, stretching resources that are already normally used. But this can tend to threaten faculty, and it does not contribute to creative expansion of the aggregate educational resources of cooperating institutions. Creative collaboration is not a piece of fancy terminology designed to cloak the impositions of one college on another. The ground on which creative collaboration stands is, by definition, mutuality. The structure that can be built on this ground can enrich programs, enlarge opportunities, and extend resources for all of the partners in the collaborative endeavor. Genuine collaboration cannot be a voluntary or involuntary act of charity whose chief end is to provide a makeshift answer for conditions of scarcity. Instead, it is a new departure for higher education which can materially increase academic abundance by collective action,

while maintaining institutional autonomy, integrity, physical organization, and size among its individual partners.

Cooperation among the Valley institutions, even though supported by tradition and specific achievements, still remains much more a potentiality than an actuality. The degree of hard commitment that fully productive collaboration requires, in terms of well-supported leadership, funding, and systematic organization, is relatively slight. The current four-college coordinator, for example, has had to carry this responsibility as a part-time burden on top of his responsibilities as Acting Dean of Amherst College and professor of chemistry. A conscientious and able man, devoted to the concept of interinstitutional cooperation, he has had to define his leadership in modest terms of communication, promotion, steering, and evaluation.

The full value of creative interinstitutional cooperation in the Connecticut Valley is not likely to be realized if things continue to stand as they are at present. The tradition and its achievements are positive indeed, but a relatively slow tempo is not adequate for present and emerging conditions in higher education. It is quite possible, for example, that the superb and unique opportunity for a public university and distinguished private colleges to cooperate in a really meaningful way could be lost in the next decade unless imaginative, vigorous steps are taken with all deliberate speed. The explosive growth of the University of Massachusetts in size may tend to obscure the fact that, at the same time, the University is of necessity growing in other ways which will affect its relationships with nearby colleges. If strong collaborative efforts are not made in the near future for joint planning of the development in such resources as those of libraries, laboratories, computers, coaxial interconnection, and the like, the University will necessarily proceed on its own, and is indeed already doing so. As this happens, it is quite possible that the University, without willing it, will grow away from the other colleges, that unconsciously but irrevocably there will be a setting in of new patterns which tend to diminish the possibility of cooperation, and that one of the greatest opportunities for collaboration between public and private higher education in America will be lost. There is needed, before it is too late, a fundamental reassertion of the idea of cooperation that the four-college committees of the 1950's argued for with such conviction.

A strong extension of the principal of cooperation in the Valley may not turn out to be possible. Frederick Rudolph, the best of our historians of higher education, concluded after reviewing the whole American record that:

resistance to fundamental reform was ingrained in the American collegiate and university tradition, as over three hundred years of history demonstrated. A historian of the University of Rochester described the traditional policy of his institution as one of 'wise conservatism modified by a spirit of liberal progressivism when warranted by circumstances.' This was also, except on rare occasions, the historic policy of the American college and university: drift, reluctant accommodation, belated recognition that, while no one was looking, change had in fact taken place.¹⁷⁴

But Hampshire College, meaning its Board of Trustees and academic and administrative leadership, believes that the new College and its sister institutions must not let the moment for a vital strengthening of cooperation go by because of drift, reluctance to do more than accommodate, or unawareness of change. In the hope that the moment may be seized and greater interinstitutional collaboration gained, Hampshire puts forward a proposal for joint action, to coincide with its own establishment.

Several things are very clearly needed for the kind of interinstitutional collaboration that the times call for in the Connecticut Valley. Most of these things are comprehended under the single word *leadership*, which in turn is readily translatable into some very concrete matters.

The basic proposal that Hampshire College makes for guaranteeing that interinstitutional cooperation in the future will match both tomorrow's needs and the expectations that are inherent in the four-college tradition, is for the creation of a new instrumentality which will give strong leadership to the development of collaboration. The instrumentality proposed is a new interinstitutional Center for Cooperative Development, designed to serve the institutions of the Connecticut Valley.

Hampshire College proposes that the Connecticut Valley Center for Cooperative Development in Education should be governed by a corporation representing the administrative and academic leadership of the constituent institutions. Under the Hampshire proposal, the new Valley Center would be independently financed, would have its own professional

leadership and staff, and would be sheltered in its own physical quarters. The functions of the Center would be several:

To propose to the five colleges, or any combination thereof, or to other institutions later associated, programs of cooperation and collaboration.

To coordinate the initiation, execution, and continuous evaluation of such programs as now exist and as may be initiated in the future.

To undertake, from time to time, with the agreement of the constituent institutions, programs which none of them can or will undertake alone or in combination, and from which two or more desire the benefits.

To seek, with the agreement of member institutions, financial support for certain cooperative activities.

It will be seen that the Hampshire College proposal for a new Valley Center in many ways echoes what the 1955 Committee on Cooperation said would be necessary in order to implement the kinds of active cooperation that it recommended. The Valley Center would be autonomous in a legal, administrative, and financial sense, although in the beginning some financial priming from its constituent institutions might be necessary, along with foundation support. The Center would depend, initially, on the five colleges and their interest for its existence. In time, however, it might be appropriate for the Center, operating under policy made by its interinstitutional governing Board, to include in collaboration, if they desired it, such other institutions as the Greenfield Community College, Holyoke Junior College, Springfield College, American International College, and Western New England College. It is also possible, as one trustee of Hampshire College has further suggested, that the Center might in time develop collaboration with public and private schools of the Valley.

The Center's first concern, however, would be to provide initiative, support, and service for the further development of collaboration among the presently associated institutions. To this end, flexibility in the operation and physical location of Center facilities would be essential. For example, it might be logical for transportation services among the colleges to be administered and headquartered at the Center. On the other hand, a major computer facility, financed by and available to all of the colleges, might be at the University, at Amherst, or elsewhere in the community of institutions. The Center might have assisted in securing

funding for the computer facility, it might serve by handling administrative arrangements for the sharing of the computer among participant institutions, and it might be responsible for assisting with the funding and administration of remote facilities.

The Center would not, therefore, be one massive, centralized super-institution, but it would be essential for it to have an adequate, permanent building of its own, centrally located, and capable of expansion if needed in the future. The physical headquarters of the Center would provide offices for the full-time administrative staff, including an executive director. In addition, the Center building would provide adequate and comfortable space for interinstitutional committee meetings, for small and large conferences, and for other purposes. It would be essential for the physical headquarters of the Center to be easily accessible to personnel of the cooperating institutions, for it to have adequate maintenance, and to have suitable parking areas and other conveniences.

Hampshire College is prepared to supplement its proposal for the establishment of a Connecticut Valley Center for Cooperative Development in Education by offering to donate the land on which the physical headquarters of the Center could be built. The Hampshire College campus, as those familiar with the geography of the Connecticut Valley know, is in a central location with regard to the other four institutions. Its land uses are only now being planned, and it would be quite possible for site development to include the selection and separation of a suitable area of land for the purposes of the Center. If this offer is accepted, Hampshire College would turn title to the land so donated over to the corporation under which the Center would operate. In addition, Hampshire College wishes to demonstrate its confidence in the value of this proposal by including a request for the Center's initial physical construction and basic operating costs in, or as an item closely related to, an application by Hampshire College for major foundation support. While Hampshire College takes the initiative in making the proposal for the Center, and in offering land for its construction and assistance in securing funds for its establishment, it should be clearly understood that Hampshire College would welcome the same initiative from any other quarter in the Connecticut Valley and would plan to have no connection with the Center in any way different from that of any other cooperating institution concerned.

The possibilities for creative collaboration in the unique complex composed by the five Valley institutions are great indeed. It is not exaggerating to say that, through increased collaboration, the public and private institutions of the Valley can collectively constitute one of the most useful concentrations of higher education in the United States, far more than the several institutions could do as an only casually related group of individual entities largely going their own way alone. In 1962, Professor Stuart Stoke commented that:

there are many practical problems awaiting solution if the ultimate values of cooperation are to be reached. Among these are better coordination of scheduling, closer agreement of calendars, and improved transportation. Also needed is a reduction of the resistance on the part of faculty members who are loyally fighting rear guard action in defensive positions which are already being overrun. But the development of effective cooperation is a success of continuing effort rather than a fiat and a resting. Good will, intelligence, and persistence will produce solutions to many of the problems cited; and, in the light of current trends in higher education, cooperation should become increasingly valuable.¹⁷⁵

The Hampshire College proposal for a Center for Cooperative Development in Education is an expression of belief in what Professor Stoke calls the "process of continuing effort" that is required. The effort needed now, and in the future, will be more than it has been in the past.

3. URBANIZATION: THE COLLEGE AS A CORPORATE CITIZEN

Hampshire College is in an area of great natural beauty which has been further enhanced by the creations of man. A perimeter line drawn to connect Amherst, Smith, Mount Holyoke Colleges and the University of Massachusetts, Hampshire's four cooperating neighbors, traces a trapezoidal shape. The trapezoid is roughly two, ten, six, and seven miles on its four sides, and encloses roughly twenty-five square miles. Hampshire College is on the edge of the perimeter on the longest leg, as appendix map material shows. The trapezoid includes much of the Mount Holyoke mountain range, a five-mile stretch of the Connecticut River, and a varied and pleasing landscape, with lovely meadows, rolling hills, dense woods, and outcrops of ledge. Man has added the fragrance

and beauty of apple orchards and hay, the precise and colorful checkerboarding of bottomland tobacco fields, the strong contrasts of white frame houses, red barns, and mellowed tobacco barns. Man has added, too, the brick, stone, concrete, glass, playing fields, lawns, and trees of four leading institutions of higher education.

To the east rise the Pelham Hills, undergirded with gneiss and giving little quarter to the farmer or homebuilder. To the north and west are rural communities, back roads and abandoned mills, providing a visual, and in some cases too literal, flashback to 19th-century rural America.

The four established institutions within the trapezoid have a rich tradition of accomplishment in American education. Their tradition of accomplishment is served today by unusually extensive resources. Among the four institutions there are today 1,300 scholars, 1,600,000 books, \$134,000,000 in endowment funds, and 17,000 students. Two of the institutions are among the most distinguished women's colleges anywhere. One is one of the very best private colleges for men in this or any other country. The public university is in the midst of revolutionary growth and rapid progress toward excellence.

Over the Mount Holyoke range to the south, and through the corridors of the highways, a great wave of urbanization is coming to crest. The trapezoid itself is more a part of megalopolis than it knows, and within fifteen miles of Amherst rampant urbanization is in full view, with all of the trappings: exhaust smog, traffic jams, water pollution and water shortage, racial tension, slums, tract housing, industrial blight, and the rest—a dramatic contrast to bucolic Amherst and Hadley.

The fact is that things are not all that bucolic in Amherst and Hadley either. The Hampshire trapezoid is in a stage of incipient urbanization, catalyzed by the rapid development of land that is more available than land to the south, spurred by new roads, and nourished by the rapid, inexorable growth of the University of Massachusetts.

The result in Amherst, where there is the greatest pressure, is a large number of new home starts (many in tract housing of mediocre design), a rising tax rate (already as high as any in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts), and dramatic increases in road traffic, land costs, and the rate of commercial development. Suddenly, within a stone's-throw of the University and Amherst College are the evidences of instant Los Angeles

transplanted: large shopping centers with enormous parking areas, drive-in theatres, motels, automatic car wash establishments, and similar manifestations.

The Hampshire trapezoid is in the early stages of a cycle of urbanization which can lead to planless sprawl, ugliness, noise, and short-term profit-taking which does violence to the priceless land. But the cycle has, if men and institutions are wise enough to make it so, the potential of achieving urbanization without wanton destruction of the essential loveliness of the Valley, even as the order changes. Man here could truly be the architect of his urban environment.

It has been demonstrated in this country that uncontrolled growth results in uncontrollable problems. So, as it begins life in a dynamic and changing community, Hampshire College asks: what opportunity is there, and what responsibility does this new college have to influence the development of its environment, to preserve and maintain its natural and man-made advantages while still accommodating inevitable growth? How can we have urbanization without becoming candidates for urban renewal?

In the first chapter, the challenge for higher education to play a more active part in the urban community was described. In the second chapter, it was emphasized that Hampshire College intends to accept this challenge in every way that it sensibly can. The following instances provide two specific examples of action that Hampshire College has already taken with regard to the larger community in which it will live. Perhaps these examples will indicate the stance that Hampshire will take in the future as a citizen of the larger community of the Valley.

a. *The Mount Holyoke Range*

The Mount Holyoke Range is verdant, soft, and majestic. It dominates the landscape, even though its highest peak, Mount Norwottuck, is only a shade more than 1,000 feet above sea level. In the Far West it would be a foothill of the Sierras, but in this gentle, pleasing valley area it is sizable and important. Today, the virtually unbroken slopes of the Mount Holyoke Range are taken for granted, despite a house here or there and the merciless exploitation of gravel banks and trees by small entrepreneurs. Tomorrow it could become like the Santa Monica mountains above Los Angeles, with house piled on house, each perched higher

than its neighbor, and the natural contours of the Range cut away by tireless bulldozers. Its now clear brooks would be polluted, its woods gone, and while a private few had gained a remarkable view for their picture windows, the public would have lost a priceless asset of open country.

Hampshire College has purchased seventy acres on the Range, all the land formerly in private ownership between a one-hundred-acre tract belonging to Amherst College and 268 acres which are a watershed for the Town of Hadley. As a result, this planned buying has produced a contiguous parcel of nearly 450 acres which is now in the control of ownership with a sense of basic responsibility to the public interest. Stewardship of the watershed, the Amherst College land, and that belonging to Hampshire can include the possibility of providing public or semi-public access to the land for recreational purposes. Although the area is of some potential advantage to the educational program of Hampshire College, ownership is *primarily* justified on the ground that preservation of the Holyoke Range is in the public interest as well as in the private interest of the College.

b. *The New Roads*

The majority of the local and regional automobile traffic in the Amherst area travels east and west, using either the old Bay Road in South Amherst (once the Boston to Albany Post Road) or State Route #9 through the center of town. The great increase in automobile traffic volume in recent years has caused the Department of Public Works of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Town of Amherst to study the need for new roads. A principal question involved in the study is the problem of locating routes, particularly in east-west transit, that will facilitate automobile travel and not injure the community in doing so.

The development of Hampshire College's land holdings coincided with growing concern over the road problem. In the course of purchasing a site, Hampshire leadership kept themselves informed of the thinking of various officials responsible for road planning; the officers of Hampshire College wished to avoid locating in a place that might upset existing plans, or where new roads might bisect the College campus.

As public interest in the future of the road question intensified, the

College administration decided to assume, for the first time in its young life, a role of active corporate citizenship. The College initiated and encouraged action by others in the community on a matter of major importance to the future of the environment in which the College was to develop. Hampshire leadership proposed to the Amherst Town Manager that a study group representing the town government and its various appropriate departments and committees (Highway, Planning, Zoning), the University of Massachusetts, Amherst College, Hampshire College, and the Massachusetts Department of Public Works be invited to consider the road problem together and to work toward three objectives. These objectives were:

- (1. To assemble and organize factual evidence about the need for, and alternate routes for, new roads.
- (2. To reach a consensus as to the most desirable route or routes for new roads.
- (3. To communicate consensus to the Massachusetts Department of Public Works in Boston in an effort to influence a decision of great importance to the Town.

After an initial meeting of this study group, Hampshire College asked its planning consultants, the firm of Sasaki, Dawson and DeMay, to make an analysis of the problem. The analysis was offered to the Town Manager, who asked to have it presented to the study group. A thorough presentation was made by one of the planning consultants, and the study group had a useful discussion of data about automobile routes, neighborhood impact that various routes would have, the interests of the University, Amherst College, and Hampshire College in connection with the proposed automobile routes, etc. The presentation was reported on the front page of the local newspaper and wide discussion of factors in the selection of new automotive routes occurred within the community. Interest was aroused and information was made available publicly; the planning process was moved to a point where the matter is now under the jurisdiction of the Amherst Planning Board, with public hearings scheduled. There is a feeling in the community that a consensus can be reached, made known to authorities of the Commonwealth, and that decisions about the projected road development can be affected by the views of the local community.

This is a slight and simple example of what Hampshire College means by taking the initiative as a corporate citizen within its own community environment. The effort in this case may come to naught, but efforts often do. For the present paper, the example is important because it underlines the characteristics that will mark Hampshire's stance toward active involvement in the changing, urbanizing community around it. Hampshire's stance will be to:

Take the initiative in community affairs whenever it seems responsible and sensible to do so.

Cooperate willingly and actively with combinations of private, public, institutional, or individual interests working toward the solution of environmental problems.

Help, insofar as it is able, to contribute to the analysis of and solution of environmental problems as they arise.

The example of the new roads illustrates all three of these characteristics: Hampshire College took the initiative; Hampshire cooperated willingly and actively with a wide combination of interests in tackling the road problem; and Hampshire contributed information to the general welfare which its planning consultants had developed in connection with studies having to do with Hampshire's future.

4. A LOOK TOWARD THE FUTURE

Interinstitutional collaboration and active engagement with community life are two of the main challenges which the opening chapter discussed. The present chapter has touched briefly on the past and present of both these challenges in terms of the local conditions of the Connecticut River Valley as Hampshire sees them. Discussion also has suggested the stance that Hampshire College will take toward both interinstitutional collaboration and community involvement. In neither case will Hampshire College presume that in its innocence and youth it can add nearly as much as older institutions and interests in the area can contribute. On the other hand, Hampshire College looks toward the future in connection with these things, as in connection with its own role as a change agent in undergraduate education, with a certain freshness and vigor that are virtues of being young and relatively unencum-

bered. In this, Hampshire may be useful to the other members of the academic and general community in which it intends to live.

A long time ago, St. Benedict set as a rule for his monastery, the following:

As often as any important business has to be done in the monastery, let the abbot call together the whole community and himself set forth the matter. . . . Now the reason why we have said that *all* should be called to the council, is that God often reveals what is better to the younger. . . .

Hampshire will not confuse itself with the abbot, nor expect that being young assures revelation, but it will be very much a part of the whole community, willing to help with important business, and unafraid to pass along whatever revelation comes its way.