

NOTE: Even as MC2.1 circulates ever more widely, in many ways it remains a work in progress. I look to the community for corrections, suggestions for improvements, feedback – in other words, responses of all sorts. I have already profited from discussions at the Board of Trustees retreat and October faculty meeting, from small meetings with students and staff, and from written comments by a number of faculty. I anticipate additional rewarding discussion sessions involving members of the Hampshire family both on- and off-campus. Comments and suggestions will always be welcome, because the development and refinement of MC 2.1 will continue through the year even after this document is released formally at Family, Alumni and Friends. A web site to carry on the conversation on-line will soon be up, but in the meantime responses are best received via rhexter@hampshire.edu or at the President's Office. -- Ralph Hexter

Making of the College 2.1
(Version of October 9, 2007, 5 p.m.)

I am more than ever mindful that in sending into the public realm documents with titles like “Making of the College 2.0” or “2.1,” I am guilty of no little overreaching. Twenty months ago I shared with the community “Making of the College 2.0,”¹ referring in the title to Franklin Patterson and Charles R. Longworth’s *The Making of a College. A New Departure in Higher Education*,² and the world of successive software releases. The latter has suggestive value, for we have embarked on a journey of ongoing improvement that may be virtually without end, but the analogy is not perfect. “Making of the College 2.1” or MC 2.1 (as I will refer to it in short form) is not in any real sense a revised version of MC 2.0.³ That was an opening salvo, a white paper, a starting point, wide ranging and asking more questions than it suggested specific paths, and never intended to be any kind of “software” or game plan. I will have more to say as I go along about how the one became the other, but in MC 2.1 I am going to be more specific. It is still not going to be a concrete plan for how all parts of Hampshire should henceforth function – as if! -- although I will suggest in the course of this document the kind of planning processes on which I now see us, in a variety of groupings, embarking. But unlike *The Making of a College*, it will not lay out a curriculum or describe how ninety faculty are best arrayed to collaborate with 1440 students (to use figures from the Patterson-Longworth document, uncannily prescient of our actual student population today) in their learning process.

This series of white papers falls far short of *The Making of a College* in many other, significant ways. As I prepared to gather my thoughts into MC2.1, I read in both *The*

¹Strictly speaking, the original title was “Making of the College II,” but inspired by the genial suggestion of a Hampshire alumna now living in Los Angeles, I changed “II” to “2.0.” It is available on-line at <http://www.hampshire.edu/cms/index.php?id=8863> where you can scroll down and click on Making of the College 2.

²Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1966.

³ But even though the two are independent and MC 2.0 still bears reading as an independent historic document (or so I would like to think), some passages of the earlier resurface, the fact noted only when it is of special significance.

Making of the College and “The New College Plan,” the drafting of which was taking place precisely fifty years ago.⁴ Patterson and Longworth created a notable book, understandably reprinted and given a second edition, for it is a landmark in American higher education. It leads the reader through an analysis not only of trends in higher education but in American culture and society at large. The authors interrogate contemporary scholarship as they at times interrogated individual scholars. Every time I had occasion to refer to this original, I came away with greater respect. I can still turn to it and find myself being surprised at how relevant, how amazingly modern many passages sound.⁵ At some moments I almost felt as if I could transcribe large swatches, and though I will cite Patterson and Longworth now and then, I could have cited it considerably more.⁶

Since MC 2.0 began to circulate, I have profited from many discussions, with students, faculty, staff, and alumni. In the spring semester of 2007, a campus committee co-chaired by Professors Elly Donkin and Lee Spector solicited commentary and hosted a series of discussion groups. The body of comments and suggestions, concerns and aspirations they assembled has been very helpful, as was a rich vein of student commentary on a much narrower question (i.e., the first-year program). All this material was valuable for the insights it offered, and a careful philologist might discover that in MC 2.1 I incorporate some important details, especially from the transcription of the group meetings.

All these discussions established the fact that there is an extraordinary consensus about the fundamentals of Hampshire College, fundamentals that individuals might want perfected or tweaked but that few want to see changed in any significant way. As I anticipated in MC 2.0 and as I have now seen and heard confirmed, virtually universal is the conviction that certain elements that have served us well, and which are taken to be definitional, should not be changed. One could start with the organization of faculty not in disciplinary-based departments but in interdisciplinary groupings or schools. There are no off-the-shelf majors to be selected; rather, students develop in negotiation or collaborative creation with faculty first a 3- or 4-semester concentration (Div II), often interdisciplinary in nature, and then their final year’s project (Div III). This student-powered and –empowered program is held to be our ideal, and the power of the ideal is evident not least in the griping at what are taken to be elements that short-circuit it or render it more difficult to achieve.

⁴It was issued November 14, 1958.

⁵To point to one aspect only, the authors’ prescience of the revolutionary impact of “intellectual technology,” including computers, and how language and the structuring of knowledge are intimately linked to this technology. They called for the addition of the school -- in their schema the fourth -- of Cognitive Science *avant la lettre*. They called it “Language Studies,” but terms one does find in their pages are hardware, software, and digital, among others I imagine not too many educators were using in the mid-1960s.

⁶I am not here writing a book, although as I hope readers will agree by the time they reach the end of this document, a book detailing Hampshire and its new vision will have to be written at some point.

But let me stay with the positives no one (least of all I) is suggesting need changing. Instead of a system of credits we have a system of successive curricular phases. Students must complete these sequentially, and their performance in each is judged -- as a coherent totality against at least notional criteria -- by faculty on the basis of a portfolio the students have created. There are no letter grades, and for course work as well as for the divisional portfolios the students receive narrative evaluations. Again, the degree of agreement on the fundamentals is reflected by the range and intensity of concerns raised about issues of implementation. The evaluations require an immense amount of time; could they be streamlined while still retaining their value? Does the Hub, devised to make a whole host of processes more efficient and consistent, get in the way of, and even tend to replace the best sorts of faculty-student interaction? Does each of the first two divisions really prepare the student for the next?

All these questions, the last especially, open onto topics that can arouse intense debate and move us decidedly from the “what” to the “how.” It will soon be time for the college to take up these “how” questions, which is not what MC 2.1 is designed to do. Instead, it is intended to offer a vision. And even if, compared to MC 2.0, it is more declarative than interrogative in tone, as a “vision” it is meant to be very open-ended, very – dare I say? – inspirational, in the hope that it can serve as the basis for a collective vision.

* * *

In MC 2.0, I referred to “the inconvenient fact of history” and pointed to the multiple layerings of history embedded in the relatively short life of the idea that became Hampshire.⁷ This year that full span attains a neat half-century, for, as I have noted, 2007 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the start of the faculty consultations that led to the “New College Plan.”⁸ Although many elements of the Hampshire you and I know today are surprisingly recognizable in the 1958 document, Hampshire has never been static in its

⁷“The world,” I wrote, “is never not changing; change has been inexorable since – here I pick only Hampshire milestones -- 1958, 1966, and 1970, and the pace and scale of change seems now to accelerate yearly....”

⁸One imagines, of course, that informal discussions predated the formal panel that issued the 1958 “New College Plan.” It might be valuable for more of us today to be cognizant of the details of the process as well as of the background of the committee members: Professor of English and Shakespearean C. L. (“Joe”) Barber of Amherst College, Professor of American History Donald Sheehan of Smith College, Professor of Psychology and Education Stuart M. Stoke of Mount Holyoke College, and Professor of Geography and Asian Studies and Provost Shannon McCune of the University of Massachusetts, who chaired the committee. Accessible starting points are *Five Colleges: Five Histories* edited by Ronald Story (University of Massachusetts Press, 1992) and the “Documentary History of Hampshire College” volumes available on-line at <http://www.hampshire.edu/library/archives/> -- Also easily accessible now are such things as this window on reception of the plan: Craig K. Comstock’s review of “The New College Plan” in the *Harvard Crimson* for February 20, 1959, now at <http://www.thecrimson.com/article.aspx?ref=115612>

goals or modes of operation. Many are the revisions between the proposal of 1958 and the plan of 1966, nor did the first president imagine what he and the future second president described in that latter document would be prescriptive, even necessarily predictive. Anything but. In President Patterson's preface, he describes what readers are about to encounter in the pages to follow thus:

What emerges is as accurate an approximation of Hampshire College as its present leadership can manage. I regard the word *approximation* as essential to emphasize, since the report is not a precise blueprint, but one in a series of successive approximations of what Hampshire will be and do. Other approximations will follow, as the faculty and staff of the College grow, and as experience further informs its planning. The College cannot be given a static definition, since it will embody, as well as speak for, change (p. xii original emphasis).

As Patterson and Longworth anticipated and experienced, by the time the college hired its first faculty and opened its doors to our first students in 1970, the pressures of reality were, well, real. Much of what we regard as foundational goes back, to be sure, to that founding generation of faculty, staff, and students, but along with intention and theory there were other contingent factors at play, necessity and opportunity perhaps chief among them. Not for nothing is necessity called the mother of invention, and we can be grateful for the genial improvisations that made it possible for a college that existed in plans to become a college in reality.

Let me generalize. I believe that Hampshire needs to study and to honor the multiple phases of its founding. We must be not merely grateful for but also deeply steeped in the thinking that lies behind and beneath the institution to which we have pledged our allegiance in one way or another and in which we are privileged to participate. It is a singular creation within the great tradition of American higher education, itself a noble branch of the longer history of higher learning. For our own sake, and to do proper justice to the serious intent of all those who contributed to Hampshire's coming to be, we must not merely cite these and other founding documents and instance early practices as if they were scripture or sacred rites, respectively. We should respect them, and ourselves, enough to seek to understand them in their particular contexts, in the richness of their historical contingency. Dean Berman, as part of his annual remarks welcoming new students and their parents, begins to set up a contrast between the aims that he invites his audience to imagine American educators in 1957-58 wanting to see in a new college and the aims and values one might imagine being uppermost in the mind of educators eight years later. Instead of memories of WW II and the Korean War, the GI Bill, Senator McCarthy, and, most freshly, Sputnik, the American imaginary was challenged by the assassination of John F. Kennedy and increasingly troublesome involvement in Vietnam. Though Dean Berman does not take the next step and encourage speculation about the *Zeitgeist* of 1969 and 1970, when so much of Hampshire took real shape, had he more time, he might well. In his hands it could become history, not the assemblage of a few

anecdotes and select synchronies.⁹ It is a deep historical approach that we need, and just as I would recommend repeated readings in the history of Hampshire and its founding documents, so I would heartily encourage serious interpretation with an eye to historical context.

We can best honor our beginnings and the serious aims of those involved in the various stages of our founding if we understand that, by means of the Hampshire they were trying to bring into being, they sought to make a difference in the world *as it was in their time*. Many aspects of our world are, in the long view, the same as or similar to aspects of theirs, but many aspects are different. My firm belief is that to the extent we set ourselves the task of preserving our foundational vision, we must translate the founders' vision and intentions with a keen eye for the particular challenges of our own day. And, like them, we must be prepared to revise earlier "approximations," to use the word President Patterson chose to emphasize, even revise them radically or up-end them if we can thereby better attain the totality of our aims as we will come to articulate them.

This is not a prolegomenon to my suggestion we do so, although I have already hinted that we may need to be brave enough to take on some "sacred cows" of our own making, and I will have more to say about renewed institutional experimenting further on. Indeed, the first arena one would think of looking at, since Hampshire is a college, is how we are translating Hampshire's mission of being innovative as an institution of higher education. The subtitle of "The New College Plan" ran, after all, "A Proposal for a Major Departure in Higher Education," consciously echoed by the subtitle "A New Departure in Higher Education" of *The Making of a College*. Hampshire College was intended to be an experiment in post-secondary pedagogy, an alternative not only to the other four Pioneer Valley institutions involved in our founding but also to the then standard modes of delivering a liberal arts education.

In some ways, we have succeeded beyond our wildest dreams. It has often been pointed out, at times as a criticism of Hampshire today, that we have lost our edge, at least our defining distinctiveness, now that so many other colleges and liberal arts courses within universities have, variously, reduced requirements, embraced interdisciplinarity, created capstone experiences, and devised ways for students to work on research projects with faculty and even opportunities for them to create customized majors. In the meantime, so it is alleged, our Division I has become more restrictive than the first-year programs of many "traditional" liberal arts. In their first year, Hampshire students are now expected to complete eight courses, five of which must fall in each of the college's five interdisciplinary schools (Cognitive Science; Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies; Interdisciplinary Arts; Natural Science; Social Science). These same individuals will invariably point out the degree to which Hampshire is rapidly becoming course-based, and not only in Div I.

⁹Does it mean anything, for example, that on September 25, 1957, federal forces, under the president's direct orders, desegregated Central High School in Little Rock, or that October 12, 1957, saw the publication of Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged*? It would be the task of the historian to tell us what, if any, is the relevance of such simultaneities.

Again, I leave discussion of details for careful consideration in the planning stages to come and then, in greater detail, to the governance bodies and/or appointed committees who would be involved in implementation. Instead, I want here to argue that whatever adjustments we want to make in our own program, claims of its traditional nature, and of the disappearance of difference from other colleges, are greatly exaggerated. Yes, Div I may appear to be a variant on the breadth requirement in other colleges, but it is not exactly that and certainly not a “general education” requirement. The difference lies both in the constitution of our five interdisciplinary schools and the nature of first-year courses, which are anything but conventional. Neither introductory courses nor breadth courses, they tend to be tightly focused and issue- or project-oriented. From the outset faculty draw students into serious and often advanced topics, emphasizing methodological questions. And moving to the broader issues, the hardwiring of our disciplinarity into schools rather than discipline-based departments and the intellectual expectations we have for the *entire* student body for independently managed concentrations make the educational experience at Hampshire different in kind, not just in degree, from what I have observed even at institutions which have adopted some innovations similar to ours, or have adopted all but not for all students (as in, for example, an Honors College). This is not to say that other institutions do not offer experiences that are equally distinctive, say a Berea College or St. Johns. Again, while there is reason to weigh every part of our program and consider whether major or minor revisions are called for, and while I indeed believe that as an institution we need to step up and once again shoulder our burden to be newly exemplary, and new in exemplary ways, I do not believe that it is at the level of curriculum – courses, divisional requirements, and such like – that first-order adjustments are called for.

To get at what I feel is called for, let me shift my consideration of history to a larger field, and to deeper trends. Already in MC 2.0, I offered a list of some of the trends I see as characterizing our age, a list I do not think our predecessors in the America of 1957-58 would have been so quick to sense and enumerate:

Far and wide there is a retreat from the enlightenment goals of reason, tolerance, and free speech; temporizing on civil liberties and human rights; and the deauthorization even of the scientific method. Threats to the maintenance of a vibrant democracy are real, and one senses already insufficient wariness, if not yet a downright embrace, of authoritarianism. Did I mention the challenges of unequal development globally (and ever more unequal distribution of wealth in our own country), the exhaustion of many traditional natural resources, the growing danger of severe ecological damage to the environment, and further potential health risks?

Twenty months have not changed my perceptions on the dangers we face, although I feel less alone in the awareness of such fears than I did in early 2006. And deeper familiarity with the Hampshire community, our students especially, has both given me reasons for hope and helped me see how a number of strands woven deep into the fabric of Hampshire can be combined with thematic threads into a design that is both old and new.

Remaining with the historical for a moment longer, and reflecting on the distance I have traversed since I drafted MC 2.0, I see that I did not then yet understand sufficiently the ramifications of some of my own pronouncements. “The challenges we face in 2006 and beyond are great,” I wrote. “We need to orient ourselves to the present and future.” Indeed, we must. The step I took next did not yet go far enough. I claimed that the “fundamental question” for us all was: “What kind of an education does Hampshire College want to stand for and want to offer in 2006, for today’s students in today’s world?” Since, I said, this would become “the core of Hampshire College’s mission,” I posed as the next question, “What do young people seventeen or eighteen and finishing high school need to do over the next four or so years?”¹⁰ I also made a tactical restriction: “And although I would very much like to see more international students in Hampshire as soon as possible – and more international perspectives in the Hampshire experience -- let us restrict our purview, as far as students go and for the purposes of this immediate exercise, to American students.”

How foolish! What I have come to realize is that there is only one frame of reference for Hampshire College going forward, and that is the entire globe. And that realization itself follows on the deeper insight that I got the time frame all wrong. I now believe that we must shape Hampshire for the needs of students who are now 15 and who will enter in 2010 or 2011. They – most of them, that is – will graduate by 2015. Their cohort will celebrate their fortieth birthdays round about 2032 and spend the bulk of their retirements in the 2060s and 2070s – if there is such a thing as retirement in those distant days. And presuming humankind has not actually destroyed itself by then, thanks to advances in medicine some of these Hampshire alumni will live to see the 22nd century. How can we plan for them?

I am not so naïve as to imagine that any array of specific predictions I might advance would prove to be accurate or – more immediately relevant -- credible. Much of the genre of predictive literature, at least those books that seek strong sales by appealing to a broad public, involves a rhetoric of catastrophe and impending doom that – and I say this without judging whether such alarmism is justified or not – drives discussion into generally fruitless position-taking. “Yes, it is that bad.” “No, in fact things are worse and getting worse much faster.” “Not at all. Your predictions are over-blown.” “We don’t know enough.” “There are bound to be correcting mechanisms, whether nature’s great power to heal itself or new technological break-throughs.” Even worse, the rhetoric turns *ad hominem*. The one side is impugned by its opponents as “tree-hugging, politically correct anti-capitalists,” and if the adherents of the first side are not so good at returning a volley of names and zingers, they disparage their attackers nonetheless, discounting them as not merely complacent but self-serving, insensitive, and blind.

¹⁰I continued, “What educational experience do we at Hampshire wish annually to make available to roughly 400 high-school leavers (and a small number of transfer students) that (1) is valuable for them; (2) is valuable to all of us to the extent that it will shape for years to come the impact that this small but powerful group of leaders can have on society; and (3) we can provide better than any other institution of higher education?”

I'm not here to be an umpire, and the matters at stake are much too serious for us to think of it as a game or even a debate. And for us all, and especially those who are going to become Hampshire students and then alumni over the coming decades, it will really matter. Fortunately (in a certain sense), there is a lot about the future, say the next fifty years, one can say that is pretty safe. And, fortunately again, at least for my argument here, it doesn't much matter which "side" of the argument you fall on, nor does it in most cases and within broad parameters even matter what outcome you favor, or whether you think that the goal is to stop, reverse, slow or "ride" a particular trend, because our twenty-first-century students and graduates are going to have to decide what they want to study and pursue, and organize what and how they learn in the context of these trends.

Rather than indulging in exaggeration, I will strive for understatement, the least-common-denominator approach, as I look ahead. Few if any would, I think, disagree with the statement that scarcity of resources will be an important issue worldwide. These include not only traditional fossil fuels but also absolute basics, like fresh water. Even harder to come by, or at least relatively more expensive, will be clean water and clean air, if those continue to be thought goods worth having. Most people can grasp that the two are not disconnected. The search for and burning of fossil fuels impact air and water. Most of the above have an impact on the health of individuals and whole populations. And do you want food? Do you want it safe? How much do you want of it? How cheap do you want it, or, conversely, how much are you willing to pay for safe, healthful and possibly even tasty versions of it? Will you be able to pay for such food at any price, if you can get it?

As I said, I wish here to stay this side of the line and not pose any questions that might be thought to have political overtones, for example: Do you care if you and your friends can buy sufficient clean air, unpolluted water, and safe foodstuffs but others can't? How many others? How much are you willing to pay for the forces (local and/or national) that would preserve your peaceful consumption of these goods when others do not have comparable access? Those are the questions I will not ask.

Of course, water and air have the pesky habit of crossing national borders without stopping for a document check, and just as pollution in one place within the United States impacts others, so pollution crosses national borders, even oceans. You don't even need to evoke global warming,¹¹ but obviously, if you do, that raises environmental issues to the next level.

¹¹Of course, I think climate change is a real issue, one to which human activity is contributing in significant ways and one that Hampshire must do its part to address. Last year, what had been the board committee "Buildings and Grounds" became "Buildings, Grounds, and Environmental Sustainability." And to cite a more recent instance, I have recently signed the American College & University Presidents Climate Commitment. For the news story on our website, consult <http://www.hampshire.edu/cms/index.php?id=10884>

It is the way natural impacts are crossing borders that I want to underscore and make serve as the stepping-stone to my next set of observations. I think it is hardly controversial to assert that we now realize that we are in a period of global interconnectedness, where events of all sorts can impact – sometimes surprisingly from the view of older perspectives – other parts of the globe. Infectious diseases do not stay conveniently in one place, but travel at the speed of trucks and airplanes. Political, military, and paramilitary actors cross national frontiers and oceans, and other borders as well, e.g., between civilian and combatant (to use a current term). A political speech, a sermon, a religious school, a video or audiotape can spark a newsworthy event five thousand miles away.

No thinking sentient being today can overlook the fact that in today's world, cultures press upon one another ever more insistently. I have just alluded to some of the more violent examples with which the news is all-too-frequently filled. But of course, much of this international exchange is peaceful and productive. Products circulate widely and relatively freely. We purchase goods, toys, for example, manufactured in China, wine from France, Italy, Chile and Australia, and mobile phones from Finland. Consumers around the world buy tickets for American movies and recordings of American musicians, overseas airlines buy passenger jets, and their governments buy military planes and weapons systems. Labor circulates somewhat less freely, but still circulates. Workers are guests for a time or immigrate. To say that there are unresolved issues here, issues that Hampshire students and alumni will have to face, one way or another, over the next 20, 40, 60 years, is an understatement.

Now, there have been long-distance economic effects involving goods and humans for some time, documentable with notable examples since the early modern period at least. Consider the “triangular trade” in which our own national history is deeply implicated. There are easily at least three obvious ways in which the impacts are now stronger (or are perceived by us to be stronger) than before, ways that are likely only to intensify, with corresponding impact on both reality and perception, over the coming decades. One is speed and immediacy. Not only are capital and other markets “24-7,” they are linked electronically. Information travels at the speed of light, and anyone can watch how a shift in interest rates in the United States or Germany can impact currency rates around the world. A second is the degree to which interconnectedness has penetrated, even saturated, the individual markets and systems of the world. Whether or not resources are near exhaustion or output in various sectors near capacity, economists, business people, and governments are already calculating and thinking in terms of global supply and global demand. Not that they are perfect, but estimates exist of the world's petroleum reserves, and calculations are made on the basis of those estimates, with impacts that reach us at the gasoline pump, drive our thinking when it is time to buy a new car, and ricochet thence around national and international economies in myriad ways. Now that food and fuel markets are becoming linked via the diversion (or creation) of arable land for the purpose of growing plants that can be turned into biofuels, the web grows ever more intertwined and tangled, with ramifications in hundreds of new directions.

The third way is most significant for us as Americans, and it has a massive impact on our perceptions, in some ways bringing it into line with the sense of reality some of our fellow global citizens have had for some time. Now, for the first time in our memory, ours is not the single economy that dwarfs all others. For the first time in the experience of most of us alive today, there are other economies that can really impact our own. To be sure, OPEC gave us a shock in the early 70s, but most of us didn't see that as a sign of things to come. At that time, a major shift in our rates of oil consumption could have impacted the market. Today, if we reduce our own consumption of fossil fuels, certainly it will lessen costs for us, since we won't have to pay for what we don't use, but it will have a much more muted impact on the world market.¹² There are now other nations that alone can impact the world market, can impact – gasp – us. China needs so much steel and concrete and so many cranes that it is driving up the costs of construction and slowing projects in the United States. Nor is the rapid growth of other economies, each demanding fuel and other resources, having mere market effects, and again, I am holding back from emphasizing environmental impacts. China's need to secure sources for oil is driving its relationship with Russia and other adjacent nations, not to mention its Africa strategy.¹³ China's need for resources gives regimes far and wide new means of leverage, with real impact on issues from humanitarian concerns in Africa to NATO policy in Europe, which now depends on a fuel-rich Russia. In sum, we may still be a 500-pound gorilla, but there is another big gorilla and other gorilla families out there, and we may soon be on an enforced diet.¹⁴

I have wandered onto terrain that is, in a certain sense, not my own. I am neither economist nor political or environmental scientist. In another sense, this terrain belongs to every one of us, or it should, for we are citizens, literally of a nation and figuratively of the world. I will not attempt to fill out other dimensions of change that we might now surmise will define the world in which the next generation of Hampshire will make their way – for example, a host of “second-order” changes such as acute and chronic public health risks, poverty, migration of groups and the dislocation of entire populations, and increased conflict.

¹²There seems to be general assent to these propositions, even though it is important to register that the muting of which I speak is relative. “The United States still accounts for nearly a quarter of the world oil market...[and] China still uses less than 9 percent of the world's oil” (*The New York Times*, October 5, 2007, p. C4). The trend, however, is unmistakable.

¹³China is not the only or first nation to calculate access to oil and other fuel supplies in their diplomatic or military strategies. – There are of course many works I could cite (and I would need to cite were my mode in any sense scholarly) for views, supporting and oppositional, on these matters. One might well begin with the work of Hampshire's own Michael T. Klare, for example, his 2002 book *Resource Wars*, and numerous recent articles.

¹⁴I feel compelled to add that the arc of change was certain and these adjustments in relative influence in the world were predictable for some time and have nothing to do with the events of the last decade, though the actions of governments and individuals can in many cases alter the rate and pitch of some arcs.

And Hampshire students and graduates will not simply “make their way” in that world, if Hampshire is to remain Hampshire in another way that I identified in MC 2.0. There I described “[an]other significant strand to the web Hampshire has woven”:

More than even the sum total of all its service-learning or community involvement activities...Hampshire has stood for a commitment to social action, to getting involved in the world and making it better. ...At Hampshire, the “liberal arts” have never been an escape from the contemporary world. Craft and interpretation may be sharpened in the studio and study, respectively, but students, faculty, and staff have always brought their sharpened skills, enhanced artistry, and deeper and more sophisticated insight, in whatever field, back to the world. Students’ projects and the careers of so many of our alumni are about getting things done in the world. It is clarity about Hampshire’s commitment to preparing its students to “get things done in the world” that strikes me as offering the best way to understand and describe how Hampshire connects the academic with the social.

I remain convinced that impacting the world must remain an essential element of our mission, indeed, ever more explicitly so. What I want to add immediately¹⁵ is the idea that we need to be intentional and focused about the *future* orientation of our impact. Of course, it is not merely the trivial point that any and all impacts will occur in the future. Much more than that. My vision is that we should understand and intend everything we study and do at Hampshire during the next phase of the college’s development in the context of a future into which we are rapidly hurtling or -- as I put it in a phrase in my “welcome back” letter to the community only a few weeks ago that puzzled not a few readers -- are being hurtled. “There will be a lot of talk about the future this year,” I wrote there,

and, if I have any say in it, forever after at Hampshire, since it is into the future that we hurtle. All of us. Those of us who are students will be hurtled farthest, and it is for their future that we must make most concerted preparations.

As promised in that letter, MC 2.1 not only calls for a focus on the future but also seeks to capture a future mode that would in turn permit and promote a continuous future. In many areas, “sustainable” is the term in common use to describe the future continuous. Clearly, environmental sustainability is more than merely an area of interest for students and college planners. Faculty in Natural Science particularly have long taught courses on the environment. The question I would ask: what might it mean for the School of Natural Sciences, and for students studying in the natural sciences, whether one or two courses or devising Div II’s or III’s largely in the natural sciences, if the school were more overtly focused on sustainability? Not just environmental sustainability – though little escapes that in a certain sense – but interrelated areas such as sustainability in biological systems;

¹⁵I treat below the significance of this mission on our understanding of the term “liberal arts.”

health of plants, non-human animals, and humans; evolution, evolutionary development and genetic sustainability; sustainability of food supplies; planetary sustainability. This would not imply that every activity in the school, or the primary fields of every faculty member, would need be focused directly in this realm, but a great deal would flow in and out of it.

Sustainability is a theme, a catchphrase at many institutions, but imagine Hampshire thinking about sustainability across a broader spectrum, even metaphorically, precisely as a mode of futurity that permits future futures. Clearly, “sustainable” is not a synonym for “unchanging,” nor does merely evoking it in any way restrict what those futures might be. I referred above to the more insistent pressure of cultures and belief systems across the globe on one another, with impacts at every level. What are the issues for the sustainability of human institutions, of politics altogether? Of individual freedoms, of individual psyches? How does our thinking about future, and an imaginable future continuous as I have called it, intersect with the study of history? Many of these questions are ones many faculty in the School of Social Science already take up. Would it be of interest and value – I can only speculate -- if an orientation to the future were yet more explicit and the question of sustainability be applied to human institutions.

Just as president Patterson and then president-to-be Longworth sensed already in the 1960s that recent changes in telecommunications and associated technology as well as the rapid development of new media not only enabled new modes of instructions (e.g., distance learning) but also called for a fourth interdisciplinary school – the School of Language Studies -- that would seek to understand the intellectual ramifications of these developments, so today its successor, the School of Cognitive Science, is already deeply engaged in studying the interactions between ever-more-rapidly evolving media and the human mind. It is observable in the successive generations of incoming students (as I noted briefly in MC 2.0) that our students are “adept at taking in ... simultaneous streams of information on multiple disparate topics” and are increasingly sophisticated in visual fields. I risk being out of my depth here, but it is to Cognitive Science that I would look for projections of future developments in this quarter.

The arts, visual and other, have a rich future, and Hampshire must ensure that creativity is sustained and sustainable. What will be the questions that need asking, what the answers? Even more, what will be the music, the dance, the painting, the design, the film, video and photography, and what the tangible objects that we need to be creating and sharing to guarantee the future of these and yet undiscovered media? The arts, visual or verbal, can address the sustainability of the future by exploring new media and new genres. A Hampshire student – who, believe it or not, was completely unaware that I was in the throes of writing paragraphs like this one – recently shared with me his belief that “beauty and sustainability must go together,” an idea he is seeking to embody in his Div II. As a credo it contains within it the seeds of many questions.¹⁶ Students and faculty

¹⁶Increasing support for the arts and study of the arts constituted a strand of comment in the discussion sessions led last spring by members of the MC 2.0 oversight committee. I

already see that these are the questions that count. I believe we could make the context we offer for such interrogations just that much more visible to the world.

“The challenge of the twenty-first century,” I proposed in my fall, 2007, welcome letter, “will be to understand, adapt to, and if possible guide changes in multiple, interactive sectors across a globe that is already one. What would optimization look like? How could we as responsible global citizens decide? How best act when certainty is unattainable? No wonder,” I continued, “some of humanity’s oldest thought practices are called for – ethics, hermeneutics, logic – alongside sciences natural and cognitive.” The past, then, has a future, not only history, but literature and the interpretive arts that have developed over thousands of years of transmitting and deriving instruction and inspiration from texts both sacred and secular, as well as philosophy in all its incarnations. Perhaps because it is my own area, I think about some hermeneutic practices I would like to see revived for the sake of sustainability, for example, what is known by the quaint name of “interpretive charity.” Debates might give way to dialogue if there was more such charity in evidence and we turned the most severe criticism initially on our own positions. Could we, in fact, think in terms of an ethics of sustainability, or rather – since the preceding phrase suggests the ethical demands a sense of shared stewardship of the environment might place on us – sustainable ethics or morals? Could we find a way to shift thinking away from the zero-sum gamesmanship of so much “moral” thinking, whether it be so-called “moral hazard theory,” or the gamesmanship that subtends so much of the “victory seeking” in so many walks of life? Entirely different modes of behavior might offer improved sustainability, and it will be up to future ethicists and other scholars to develop them.

So far I have suggested how an overarching orientation toward the future and a broadened sense of sustainability might, together, provide new impulses of energy and thematic webs to our existing schools, in some cases (and to a large extent) doing little more than making explicit what is going on already. Now I turn to the key arena in which I see Hampshire serving as the innovative model all our founders claimed it could and should be.

Above, I cited the passage of MC 2.0 where I wrote, “At Hampshire, the ‘liberal arts’ have never been an escape from the contemporary world.” That is very true. Indeed, there are times that I, with my no doubt overly literal approach to most everything, have wondered in exactly what ways and to what degree Hampshire is a liberal arts institution at all. I spilled no little ink worrying about the term in MC 2.0. Permit me to cite that earlier document somewhat extensively on this point, albeit with liberal use of ellipses:

One is used to offering up the “liberal arts” as a sufficient nostrum, as colleges have done in recognizably the same form and often the same verbiage for decades, in some cases, centuries. This is not the place to rehearse the history of the concept in detail, but it is clear the Romans understood the *artes liberales* to

could add here that these sessions also included very clear support for the natural sciences.

be “liberal” virtually by definition: these were the non-mechanical pursuits that befitted free citizens (*liber[i]*) in Roman society. But as Martha Nussbaum notes, ... Stoic thinkers had already repositioned the sense of the term “free” in this context: “an education... is ‘liberal’ in the sense that it liberates the mind from the bondage of habit and custom, producing people who can function with sensitivity and alertness as citizens of the whole world.”¹⁷

So many colleges fly under the banner of the “liberal arts,” and with so many different approaches, that one might well ask if the phrase has any real significance today. Now there is, I suppose, no cosmic necessity that it be more than a rallying cry, ... but... to the extent that we in colleges and universities pride ourselves on precise definitions and language, that the term’s field of reference is so capacious strikes me as something of a scandal, and at least an embarrassment. I suppose at its core today it is, like the original concept, non-vocational, and while it does not offer the traditional disciplines of the medieval *septem artes* ...¹⁸ it does offer, in most forms, a “general education” whether arrived at via a set of “great books,” a core of required courses, or guided choice among a myriad of electives.

I did take one further step, continuing at that point:

Hampshire has quite frequently employed the language of “liberal arts,” and appropriately so given current understandings of the term, but Hampshire does not march to the same drummer as the vast majority of institutions that claim the label. The issue ... is not “What is the right way to be a ‘liberal arts’ institution?” but, rather, as I have said, “What is the kind of education ... we wish to offer to a select set of young people ... ?”

Elsewhere in MC 2.0 I simply had no choice but to face the contradiction at work when the tradition of the liberal arts, which is avowedly non-vocational, well-nigh otherworldly, is combined with the strain I had identified as the deepest layer of Hampshire’s essence, that commitment to making a difference in the world:

Now, “getting things done in the world” can be construed in many ways, and one way I do not see it leading Hampshire would be away from one of the relatively few constants of the liberal arts tradition and towards strong “vocationalism.” I certainly would not recommend it. It is not that we want to pretend, with those who cling to the original sense of “liberal arts,” that we are preparing gentlemen [sic] for lives of cultured leisure or, thanks to such cultivation, expedited access to

¹⁷Martha Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity. A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1997), p. 8.

¹⁸The “seven arts” were divided into a first stage, the *trivium* (“the three-fold path”) of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic, and a second stage, the *quadrivium* (“the four-fold path”) of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. This is just one of many examples where an age as turned what were initially ‘pursuits’ of the leisured into ‘tools.’

managerial and imperial cadres. The reality is this: virtually every one of our students is going to have to provide for him- or herself for four or more decades after leaving Hampshire by engaging in activities for which he or she will be compensated. Our alumni exemplify this, with as many significant representatives, and successes, in the for-profit as in the not-for-profit sectors.

MC 2.0 could not do more to resolve the contradiction. The dialectic was intense. Can MC 2.1 do better?

There have been times, even before I came to Hampshire and despite the fact that given my own specialty, I work more directly with many of the original “artes” than most of my colleagues, that I have felt a strong temptation to jettison the phrase “liberal arts.” Many educators – Patterson and Longworth among them -- prefer “liberal education,” but as far as I can see they mean thereby the very same thing. Certainly, there is no accepted distinction of meaning between the two usages.

Now I can tell a history of liberal or liberal arts education – it may be the only one that makes sense, and it’s a pretty compelling one – that “saves” the phenomenon itself by describing how, after many steps (not all leading in one direction) the original “freedom” from having to work at all enjoyed by those rich male Roman citizens was replaced by the “freedom” of scholars in a post-sectarian modern world to pursue their fields free of doctrinal dictates, even link it with Kantian purposelessness,¹⁹ which it surely followed. But what have I saved the phenomenon for?

It is the contradiction itself, the intractability of the search for a meaningful resolution to the dilemma that suggests the ultimate goal of MC 2.1. The task I lay upon Hampshire College, then, at this point still early in its history but very late in the history of “liberal arts,” is nothing short of redefining the liberal arts for the twenty-first century.

Let me repeat that: **redefine the liberal arts for the twenty-first century.**²⁰ To be sure, the liberal arts, via the many notable institutions that proudly sail under their flag, have accrued tremendous weight and prestige, “cultural capital” as it has come to be called. For generations, colleges and universities in the Anglo-American tradition (where the

¹⁹Purposelessness (*Zwecklosigkeit*) is properly the property of the aesthetic realm; I might do better to refer to *Interesselosigkeit*. In any event, what I mean to convey here is that the pure researcher, the theoretical scientist, embodies the liberal arts aspect of sciences, as opposed to the applied scientist, who is always seeking intermediate ends, not the ultimate end of truth itself.

²⁰It is hard to believe that this phrase has not been uttered before, a fact it will be important to establish if we are to give it longer legs at Hampshire. A quick on-line search netted no precise example; I did learn, in casual conversation and after I had started using the phrase myself, that the unpublished strategic plan at a liberal arts college in upstate New York is titled “Defining the Liberal Arts in the Twenty-first Century,” but “defining” is not “redefining” and – more significantly – “in” is not “for.” The latter preposition makes a much stronger claim.

term “liberal arts” has retained currency in modern times) have offered young men and women strong educational experiences via four-year liberal arts B.A. programs. There is significant variation at the level of detail, but most combine the two axes of general studies and concentration. There seems to be an observable advantage, according to most commentators at least, to a system in which young people do *not* specialize too early, where they are free to consider multiple areas of studies at the point that their intellectual capacities are quite developed, and free to choose among fields, in some instances combining them.

Hampshire College was launched very much as an experiment within this tradition of Anglo-American liberal (arts) education, intended to fulfill in new ways the promise of freedom that always inhered in the ideal of the modern liberal arts education but that had, for whatever set of reasons, not been permitted to bloom fully in existing structures. Indeed, it is interesting, even uncanny, to cite at this juncture two of the four challenges Patterson and Longworth describe in their Preface as facing them and their contemporaries as educators in the 1960s:

[1] To reconstruct liberal education so that young men and women may find acceptable meaning in social order and acceptable order in the freedom of an increasingly subjective culture...

[3] To reconstitute the context of liberal education to include greater attention to the language of knowledge, both in terms of processes of inquiry and technologies of information transfer. (p. xiii)

I am less concerned with the details of these challenges as articulated by Patterson and Longworth than with the evident fact that Hampshire has always been “re”-somethinging liberal education. My argument here is that our world, our globally interconnected world that is hurtling itself and all its inhabitants into a shared future that will either be sustainable or not, needs a redefinition of liberal education.

It needs that redefinition – and here I can quote Patterson and Longworth yet again, in their very next paragraph – so that “Hampshire College will...be an agent of change, both an undergraduate institution of excellence and a laboratory for experimenting with ways the private liberal arts college can be a more effective intellectual and moral force in a changing culture” (*ibid.*)

Now over the long history of such institutions, the liberal arts have also been primarily oriented to the past, to the disciplines that still constitute many of the departments in modern universities and colleges. Hampshire has done without departments since its first creation, a bold step the brilliance of which has been celebrated in each decade of our existence and still inspires awe today. Now I say nothing against disciplinary training; it is an indispensable foundation. I honor the masters, and virtually all our own faculty hold final degrees in their fields, usually the Ph.D. This, too, is as it should be.

What I have argued for at Hampshire, however, and what I argue should be a central element of a redefined liberal education is a shift of perspective, a new and intentional focus on the future, the future of a world that we must think of ourselves as actively bringing into being. For who else can define the future and make it the reality we want in synchrony with the other forces also working to shape our world? I use bold language here and risk, I suppose, being accused of raving. Of course, I am not so mad as to think we can create a world that cannot be. We cannot reverse physical forces or the laws of nature. But I use precisely this language to make the point that the reverse of freedom – the fundamental freedom claimed as the definitional root of and as the finest fruit of a liberal education – the other side of that coin, then, is responsibility. This aspect of freedom has never found its necessary place in the liberal arts. If Hampshire will orient itself as I argue it should, on the basis of its history and on the basis of the state of the world today and its needs tomorrow, if, in sum, it will understand liberal arts or liberal education to involve responsibility as well as freedom, then it will in fact have redefined the liberal arts for the twenty-first century. Indeed, by this very redefinition and reorientation rendering it sustainable for a much longer time.

It follows, too, from all the above, that we must promulgate this redefinition internationally. Even as it is clear that Hampshire College has been a model nationally (and was early on: the first “New College” fashioned after the plan was in Florida, before Hampshire itself was funded and opened), it is interesting to read that the horizons of Patterson and Longworth were primarily the Valley and New England. How the nation and the world have changed, rendering these aspirations quaintly provincial! Today the only possible horizon for Hampshire College is the world, many-nationed, polyglot, interconnected, rife with inequities and injustices but also rich with possibility and potential. In every area, from science and environment, economics and health, religion and politics, film and music, literature and philosophy, global exchange is the norm. I would not speak of inevitable convergence, and certainly homogeneity is neither likely nor looked for. This is the world in which, and for which, Hampshire College must redefine liberal education, both its freedoms and the responsibilities – our responsibilities – that will make freedom sustainable. Both freedoms and responsibilities will emerge with particular contours on the world stage I have described, where we must attend to sustainability in environmental, social, economic, creative and spiritual dimensions. I feel I have reached the limits of my prophetic powers for the moment, but I have a deep conviction that sustainability taken globally, and in extended senses, will be the master that teaches us some of the next steps that must be taken.

As I have said, it is not my role, or the aim of MC 2.1, to mandate any specific changes of either organization or curriculum. These are topics for committees and working groups to take up in the context of a planning processes yet to be fully articulated and of course the relevant governing bodies of Hampshire College. I would, however, like to highlight a few areas of substance that, to my mind, seem to emerge as corollaries to the principles of sustainability as a principle, international horizons, and responsibility.

I have insisted on sustainability as a theme across all fields, interpreting it as the key to the future continuous, the possibility, in other words, of future futures. We must all take

seriously responsibility for the narrower sense of sustainability as it is most commonly currently applied, to resources. For me it follows in this context that, insofar as the issues of resources and environmental impacts involve science and economics along with, of course, a host of other disciplines, the quantitative skills learning goal today becomes a *responsibility*, one that no one should seek to avoid or meet in a minimal way. I cannot say whether the current form or standard of the learning goal itself needs revision, but it seems fair to suggest that the college needs to do a better job impressing upon students the rationale for the goal itself. It is important that each student meets the goal upon his or her own terms, but when I think about students' deep commitment to issues of environmental sustainability, I have hope that this can be a strong motivator to overcome the aversion to science and mathematics that some of our students evince, and that student culture, and at times Hampshire College culture, lets go unquestioned.

Likewise, the need for us to take another look at the study of foreign languages would seem to follow upon the realization that our students will need, and want, to understand cultures and have positive impacts internationally. It is interesting to reflect that Patterson and Longworth set the demonstration of “competence in understanding and speaking a language other than English” by means of “a foreign language examination” as one of five “absolute requirements for graduation from the College” (xv-xvi). I cannot at this moment say with authority when it fell from the table, and while I have no intention of suggesting a new requirement, I believe we need to motivate a desire, on the part of students and faculty, to incorporate work with non-English material in their study programs and creative work.²¹ It is my hope that this, too, will be taken up as a responsibility, as part of a commitment to inhabit an international polity without assuming we are, or expecting to be, at its center. English may well be an important world language for a very long time, but it not for us to insist upon the fact. We have a responsibility to meet other cultures and people on their ground, and that means taking on some linguistic tasks. To my mind, this is an essential element of an orientation towards a truly inclusive global future and the responsible inclusive sustainability I envision.

When I refer to a “truly inclusive global future” and “inclusive sustainability,” I intentionally access the register of a number of efforts that set out not merely to reverse the exclusions that, over time, have separated and disadvantaged people belonging to one

²¹The college recently submitted the draft of a proposal entitled “Developing Hampshire College into a Language Learning Community” to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. If funded, the various programs for course and career development, among others, would open opportunities for us to move in this direction. Permit me to cite the conclusion of the proposal’s Executive Summary: “If we achieve progress in the desired direction during the initial three years, and if we can build on that success, we will make Hampshire College into a community more reflective of the world in which we live and make our students, faculty, and future graduates all the more able to have positive impacts in that world. Hampshire College will also fulfill its mission to be a source of innovation for higher education by presenting a highly adoptable and adaptable model for world language engagement.” – I note as well that among comments heard in the MC 2.0 discussion groups were at least one or two that mentioned foreign languages.

group or another but also to undo the cumulative and persistent after-effects of prior exclusions. This has direct relevance to the diversity initiative that emerged as an essential program within my administration, with a Special Presidential Assistant (Professor Jaime Dávila) tasked to help me bring everyone on board with the active promotion of diversity. “Diversity” is a word that is sometimes felt to be unhelpfully vague, a word that can sometimes lead to misunderstanding; it may be more helpful to use different and more specific vocabularies along the way. For example, one of our most pressing responsibilities is to be actively anti-racist. The full dimensions of our commitment must emerge in time, by means of repeated work with and across the entire Hampshire community. But I see no strain at all in linking active anti-racism to the kind of sustainability of human communities I describe in MC 2.1. Both within nations and between them racism has been at the root of and has enabled so much injustice over centuries. It may – I emphasize that: *may* – not be the cause of the gross inequalities in development (and all that entails: health, environmental safety, educational opportunities) that now hove into view and impress themselves upon us in ways that cannot really be compared with the past, for the very reasons I described above, but undoing racism will have to be a part of any solutions we hope to achieve to make the global polity sustainable for Hampshire graduates of the twenty-first century.²²

* * *

What are the next concrete steps that I envisage being taken here at Hampshire? First, I expect questions about and reactions to MC 2.1 from all quarters. I hope that the commentary and discussion it inspires will offer significant corrections, suggest ways these ideas can be extended, and, above all, help clarify the terms of the argument and permit a formulation of the vision that is at once complete, compelling, and succinct. I will not apologize for its boldness. As I noted above, I do not think that we can be too bold in laying out our aspirations for Hampshire in the coming years, which will be decisive for the future of the college. I am firmly convinced that it will be by boldness that we will inspire our own best efforts and inspire friends, old and new, to support us with the kinds of resources we will need to translate this vision into reality.

²²The diversity initiative we have launched has multiple parameters, some clear to us now, others no doubt to emerge in due course. One can already imagine how inclusive sustainability would intersect with issues of sex and gender or differential ability. As we move forward, these need to be not merely studied on the global stage but faced in the workings of our own campus. How, for example, should awareness of class and/or economic background inform our own strategic planning about tuition, total cost, and financial aid? These are difficult questions. That they exist and will challenge us for years to come should not deter us from the vision of what can be. The bolder the vision, the easier it may become to surmount even great difficulties, if we can, that is, by boldness inspire that much more support.

The steps beyond will involve not just elaboration and refining of this vision. I foresee guiding, in close cooperation with the Board, a process of institution-wide, issue-based²³ strategic planning – in which the entire community will participate -- so that, together, we can think through the steps that we will need to take to make this vision a reality. Many of us will be involved in a new, more vibrant articulation of Hampshire's message and mission, a message that we must guarantee carries clearly to interested ears and eyes, not only in the United States but around the world. For it is my belief that there are not only great opportunities for Hampshire College, its faculty, students, staff and alumni, in foreign countries, but that there are populations of students and educators who very much need to hear, and will be eager to hear, what we have to say about the liberal arts in the twenty-first century.

I have referred to resources. Our new vision will be the cornerstone of our fundraising activities henceforth. I will leave discussion of details of the planning for the coming campaign to another time, but I want to let you know that my immediate goal is to share my vision with individuals whom I hope will be inspired by it, and by the very first stages of planning that follow upon it, to offer support for a full program to renew our physical plant. The full-scale physical renewal of our campus that is required for us to realize our vision will involve not only significant renovations and upgrades of existing structures but a series of entirely new buildings as well. Among the most immediate projects for which I will seek support are a new residence hall built to the highest energy-efficient standards; a student center -- or, rather, in line with the advice I gleaned from more than one of the MC 2.0 discussion groups, a *community* center; and new academic facilities so that we can at once accommodate more full-time, permanent faculty and have the appropriate spaces (in the appropriate locations) to put faculty together with one another and with students in a more practicable and rational proximity for interdisciplinary collaborations, teaching, and learning. The ultimate goal will be, of course, the richest and most flexible framework for faculty-student interaction, in classroom and advising contexts, that has always been fundamental to the experience of Hampshire and must remain so – even more so – in the future.

I will ask that the boldness of this vision and of our plans be matched by boldness, even fearlessness, on the part of every member of the community. Staff, students, and faculty – we must all be prepared to take up our roles in this process of transformation. Many elements that were original, or are of such long-standing that they seem original, may need to change. We should not tremble to look calmly at such things as school boundaries and other issues that – I am aware – have been fraught at junctures in the past. Nothing should be off the table. This is a new day, and we have new opportunities to reconnect with the great traditions of Hampshire's pedagogy. We must have new resources but we must also apportion the resources we have with the greatest of care. I will be working with Dean Berman to see how, within the context of our strategic budgeting process, we can create more slots for permanent faculty. I want to do everything I can, in fact, to increase opportunities for faculty and students to work together particularly in the ways

²³A possible set of five: sustainability as a principle; international horizons; responsibility; new pedagogies; facilities.

that have been and are most central to Hampshire's pedagogy, the advising of students in Div II's and Div III's.

As we reflect on the ways Hampshire can fulfill its mission in the ever-more interconnected, and electronically linked, world of the twenty-first century, and in the original spirit of experimenting with forms of education, we should not hesitate to think of new ways for students to access knowledge, whether it be individualized learning via technology or other formats, for example, the occasional lecture class.²⁴ Indeed, in ways that might be new to Hampshire in some regards but which resonate with its deepest lived traditions, students will likely have new roles to play in helping us understand the new potentialities of the digital age. The pace of change in hard- and software has reached a rate I daresay was unimaginable to the founders of the college, far-sighted though they were. Each new "generation" of students now has a significantly different relation to rapidly changing digital modalities and capacities, and given the ferocious speed of innovation, the span of such generations is five or perhaps only three years. Faculty will, of course, play a key role, especially (but not only) those whose research is centered on the areas of education, psychology, neuroscience, computer science, serious gaming, and the arts, but it will be the youngest members of our Hampshire community who will have the keys to unlock access to these potentialities. If we can plug into their – in these matters – more advanced expertise and sensibilities, and if our structures permit us to develop new modes of learning and incorporate them into our curriculum (and the relative lability of structure at Hampshire ought to support this), we could innovate in remarkably new ways and in this way, too, serve as a model and inspiration to other colleges and universities as we create the Hampshire that will redefine the liberal arts for the twenty-first century, and for the world.²⁵

²⁴Please note that I am not necessarily advocating the one or the other. I am just making it clear that in order to maximize our own impact, we should think broadly and boldly, and be prepared to try very new, or very old, things. Not that one needs scriptural authority, but it might be worth recalling that "The New College Plan" envisaged classes of very different sizes, including large lecture classes. That was, of course, before class-size became fetishized almost everywhere and for every type of instruction, though such experiences are available for Hampshire students in some fields at the other Five College institutions.

²⁵The Five College Center for the Study of World Languages, with which Hampshire is affiliated as a member of the consortium, is making very innovative use of technology, and in the proposal "Developing Hampshire College into a Language Learning Community," discussed above in note 21, the possibility of using proprietary software or other on-line resources is raised. We should never shy from taking full advantage of our "experimenting" tradition for the sake of our goals, for this will only add to our value as a model and leader among institutions of higher education.