I interviewed newly-appointed Gaudino Scholar Robert Jackall late on a balmy summer afternoon at Henry's, a café on the Upper West Side in New York City, where we both live. Sitting at outside tables, we talked about Jackall's career at Williams, his interest in being the Gaudino Scholar, and about the Williams-in-New York Program that he has long championed. The Program was approved by the College Faculty at their May meeting. It envisions a rigorous one semester academic experience for 20 students combined with a field placement. There would be one group in the fall and one in the spring. Students would live together in a residence with Williams faculty. It is anticipated that the Program will begin within the next 2-3 years.

Jackall grew up in Baltimore, "a working class Democrat," and, alas, a Yankee fan. Nobody's perfect. He was an athlete himself, playing competitive basketball until he ripped up his heel in a game when he was 50. Bob came to Williams in 1976, just after he received his Ph. D. in sociology from the New School for Social Research.

During the past year, the most exciting of these activities was a Gaudino-sponsored Winter Study travel course, "Experiencing Guatemala: Politics and Society." Conducted in collaboration with Alberto Rivera, a Guatemalan anthropologist affiliated with the Higher Education Consortium on Urban Affairs (HECUA), the class enabled 12 Williams students to conduct in-depth study together in Guatemala for 21 days, most of them in the highlands.

The academic focus was on the politics and economic circumstances of post-Civil War Guatemala, with a secondary focus on the nature and experience of being a tourist. Students read several books on these topics prior to leaving the U.S., and read more books while traveling in the country. But the primary form of investigation was hands-on experience.

The course was structured around a series of field exercises, each of which I was involved with, along with the students. For instance, we joined with several others in a team to investigate the famous marketplace in Chichicastenango. After a day and night in the town interviewing buyers and sellers, we returned to our home base where each group made a detailed presentation analyzing how the market worked.

For all of us, however, the emotional and intellectual core of this hands-on experience was the 10-day home-stay with indigenous (Mayan) families around Lake Atitlan. We all had three or four other Williams students in our villages, but each of us was the only one in his or her household. Most of us formed strong ties with our hosts. For everyone, though, the placements involved substantial moments of discomfort, born of unfamiliarity—of being out of place, of being so obviously richer than our hosts, and of being linguistically incompetent (regardless of our level of Spanish fluency, none of us knew Kachiquel, the first language of most of the families).

Some of us found these moments to be extremely hard, as well as exhilarating. Regardless of our individual experiences, we all discovered that crucial learning could be attained during the course of the home-stay. We brought precise academic questions to these visits, but our experience deepened these questions and reshaped our answers. Once we were immersed in our family's daily lives and circumstances, our seminar conversations became more concrete and reflective. This led to a better understanding of the circumstances of Guatemala, as well as a more meaningful understanding of our own places in the world.

(con't on page 2)
In general, I am not, if truth be told, one who holds Winter Study in high regard. But this class was one of the most satisfying teaching experiences of my life. This is not a course I would have likely offered had I not come to share in the Fund's mission. And without the Fund's hefty subsidy, this course would have been unaffordable for some of those who took it.

Throughout the year, I tried in other ways to develop the opportunities for experiential learning. Given the systematic curricular review undertaken at Williams this year, this seemed like an especially important time to pursue such learning. I organized a workshop for faculty on the theory and practice of experiential education with urban studies educator Phil Sandro. Partly because of my exceptionally fruitful collaboration with HECUA in Guatemala, I launched an effort to have Williams become a member of the consortium. I submitted to the Committee on Educational Policy a modest proposal for a Williams-in-New York program, an idea pursued originally and more ambitiously by my successor, Bob Jackall.

I can already report one "completed" change that I had hoped for in the last report: the College has increased the amount of financial aid available for Winter Study travel courses, making it easier for more students to have the kind of educational experience my group enjoyed in Guatemala.

The Gaudino Forum, which I again organized and hosted, more or less weekly this year, provided important experiences of a different kind. The Forum continued to thrive as a venue for the discussion of both campus and global issues. By now, it clearly has deep roots in the campus culture. If students want to discuss an issue, the Forum is the obvious place to go. Sometimes, when the stakes were high, the Forum was packed as was the case when members of the political science department discussed the Florida election controversy in November. Yet some of our best discussions took place among a much more intimate group of people since the Forum has proved useful for a wide range of topics and styles of interaction.

Continuing another commitment from the previous year, I used some of my Gaudino funds and time to support student-generated intellectual and political projects. For example, I sponsored several student travel independent studies, and funded new campus publications on global politics. A more substantial project concerned the Williams endowment. Mike Levien '01 led a group of students who sought to create a socially screened investment fund, within the endowment, to which alumni can contribute directly. I funded and helped Mike organize a special public discussion in Brooks-Rogers on the ethics and politics of investing in the endowment. A panel comprised of several outside investment consultants and Gordon Winston of the Economics Department had a spirited conversation on the issue; student advocates of the fund are currently negotiating with the Board of Trustees.

Also this year, I ended up focusing on admissions at Williams and, specifically (though not exclusively), on the role of athletics in this process.

Twelve years of classroom teaching and two years of work as Gaudino Scholar had convinced me that intellectual life on campus is not all that it could be - at least relative to our preeminent academic position and the student body's extraordinary intellectual capacities. The campus culture is one in which the level of curiosity, the sense of intellectual adventure and risk-taking, and the commitment to taking responsibility for one's own learning are, to my mind, surprisingly low. I believe that one reason for the anti-intellectual strain in Williams culture is that we are attracting and admitting too many students who are not sufficiently committed to intellectual pursuits.

All this is, of course, relative: we get some of the top students in the country. But within that pool, and among the schools that draw from it, we seem to have gained a reputation as an elite college where intellectual concerns are kept in their appropriate place and don't "get out of hand." And, though it angers some people to hear it, I believe the limitations of campus intellectual life are partly due to the distorting role played by athletics. In practice, the "scholar-athlete" ideal often means that the College has many students committed to respectable grades but are otherwise devoted to sports. While some athletes are, of course, outstanding contributors to intellectual life on campus, it is also clear that the cultural predominance of athletics is central to anti-intellectualism at Williams. To my understanding, this is due both to the way that athletic participation constrains what I call the "life of the mind" on campus, as well as the manner in which a conference-wide athletics "arms race" has corrupted admissions to Williams.

Partly through my prodding, the issue was perhaps the most prominent subject debated in the pages of the Williams Record this year. Another reason for such prominence is the January publication of Bowen and Shulman's nationally prominent book, *The Game of Life: College Sports and Academic Values*.

One position the book makes especially clear is that opinions about the role of sports at institutions like Williams, drawn from one's own experiences, will be fundamentally misleading if those experiences took place in the fifties, sixties, or even the seventies. It's now a very different, more specialize world, one in which the gap between athletes and admissions has widened substantially.

One of my goals as Scholar was to use the controversy surrounding *The Game of Life: College Sports and Academic Values* to move the College's discussion on the subject forward in a positive way. Working with a small group of concerned faculty and students, I met first with President Schapiro, to whom we submitted our own report on the issue, and then with Provost Hill. As a consequence of these meetings, the College has now changed the process by which faculty are selected to sit on AGAFA, the committee that advises the Provost on admissions and financial aid policy; the number of faculty slots on the committee has been increased as well. We also met with AGAFA to propose that "political and social activism" be added to the College's substantial list of qualities that gain applicants scrutiny or points in the admissions process. The main goal of our interventions was to help nudge the administration toward a broader thinking of what Williams stands for and which students and student culture best fulfill its mission.

With a new administration, this seems an especially auspicious time for such a rethinking of admissions and athletic issues at Williams. I am happy to report that the Faculty Steering Committee, with the blessing of the administration, has constituted an ad hoc faculty committee charged with investigating the status and effects of athletics on campus; the committee will make recommendations to the faculty by the end of the spring 2002 semester.

Furthermore, President Schapiro has informed me that this coming academic year will be one in which the College seriously reviews its admissions profile and goals. Frankly, I doubt that the College will fully meet the challenge that it faces. On the other hand, there are more reasons for hope now than during any year since I arrived at Williams in 1989.

An occupational hazard of serving as the Gaudino Scholar is that one spends time every week thinking about what in Williams needs to be questioned. That can foster a certain peevishness. But its main result is gratitude - for those who established the Gaudino Fund and who created the Scholar's unique position. Holding this position has been one of my most rewarding experiences at Williams - one that will continue to deeply influence how and what I teach. I want to end, then, by thanking my predecessor Sam Fleishacker, the Williams Administration, and the Fund's Trustees for giving me this wonderful opportunity. My regret at moving on is tempered only by the pleasures of a sabbatical year and the knowledge that my successor, Bob Jackall, will make so much of his new position.
Research. He moved to New York City in 1980 when his wife entered graduate school at Columbia to study anthropology, and he had a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to study corporate management. In his 25 years at the College, he served as Chair of the Department of Anthropology & Sociology from 1984-1991 and again from 1993-1994. He is the Class of 1936 Professor of Sociology and Social Thought. He is widely published and received several awards for *Moral Mazes: The World of Corporate Managers*, published by Oxford University Press in 1988. His current book project is entitled *Labyrinths: The World of Police Detectives*, which will be published by Harvard University Press.

**ML: WHY WERE YOU INTERESTED IN BEING THE GAUDINO SCHOLAR AND WHY DO YOU THINK THE COLLEGE WAS INTERESTED IN YOU?**

**RJ:** For me, it's a chance to take charge of a great legacy and extend it in new directions. Why was I asked to take it on? Well, I've experimented a great deal in my teaching and scholarship in the last several years. And the current Dean of Faculty, whose office was adjacent to mine for the last ten years, saw students there all the time. When he asked me to take the job, he told me that he thought that my teaching and scholarship would continue the Gaudino legacy, if in a slightly different direction. Perhaps the curricular ideas that I have generated over the years made me a particularly appropriate choice at this time because the next few years will be crucial for Williams as we reshape the College's curriculum.

**ML: WHAT IS YOUR THOUGHTING BEHIND THE WILLIAMS-IN-NY IDEA?**

**RJ:** The program presents an opportunity to realize the liberal arts ideal: to teach young men and women the virtues of living the life of the mind while they are engaged in the work of the world. The College's historical mission has always been to educate men and women in affairs. The Williams-in-New York program can train students to think critically and reflectively while they are engaged in action.

**ML: WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAM ENVISIONS AND EDUCATING 'MEN AND WOMEN OF AFFAIRS'?**

**RJ:** I've spent my own professional life doing fieldwork so I'm part to it as a way of learning. Fieldwork requires one to encounter the world and understand it on its own terms. That kind of orientation, and the habits of mind it requires, are highly valued in the world of affairs. Fieldwork requires one to create and internalize standards for what is credible and what is not, to make judgments, and to be able to act on those judgments.

To take one example, in the world of affairs there's nothing worse than someone who gets paralyzed by fear or by an inability to recognize good ideas when they are presented. How do you train people to learn what's good, not just for themselves, but for the organization that they serve, and for the larger public good? There is a great virtue in putting students into situations where they learn to discern the interaction between the market, in the broadest sense, the institutional logic of their organizations, and their own ambitions. Men and women who learn to recognize those intersections, and act on them, become invaluable in the world of affairs.

The College doesn't produce many organization men and we don't produce many geniuses. But we do produce a great many men and women who operate at the highest levels of policymaking, leaders in their fields in a wide variety of institutional and organizational settings. The Williams-in-New York program seeks to extend and deepen the College's historical mission.

**ML: YOUR VISION OF WILLIAMS-IN-NY IS, PARDON ME, GAUDINOESQUE IN SOME RESPECTS AND NOT SO IN OTHERS. WHAT'S THE CONNECTION AND HOW DO YOU CONNECT THE DIFFERENCES?**

**RJ:** This kind of learning integrates intellectual and practical work in a way that, I think, will stay with students for a long time, perhaps longer than some of their classroom experiences will. This goes right back to Robert Gaudino's vision of the virtues of experiential learning. Fieldwork is a path to understanding the world in a different way and developing critical, reflective habits of mind that can imbue a lifetime of work in the world.

There are important differences between Gaudino's vision and the curricular goals of the Williams-in-New York program. Gaudino was principally interested in students' confrontation with the other, an extremely important part of any learning, but one that emerged out of the historical moments of the 1950s and 1960s. In the 1950s, the issue was the threat of conformity and the apprehension that a consumer society might swallow up everyone. We're half a century removed from those worries about conformity. Now our society allows maximal personal freedom in return for minimal amounts of conformity. One product of that development has been the exponential growth of self-absorption. In the 1960s, among many other concerns, a principal issue was the use of perceived illegitimate authority to coerce citizens into the acceptance of and even participation in policies that many found repugnant. We are 40 years removed from the constant open confrontation with authority that marked the 1960s, although conflicts about the use of authority still permeate our politics as they do in any age. One task facing students today is to develop the habits of mind that will enable them to understand the world that's right in front of them, without the narcissism that is the legacy of the 1970s or the moral posturing that is one of the many ghosts of the 1960s.

**ML: WHAT DO YOU EXPECT STUDENTS TO COME AWAY WITH?**

**RJ:** Well, here's the paradox of liberal arts education. In the end, there's no definitive connection between specific outcomes and the kind of training that the Williams-in-New York program, or for that matter the whole Williams curriculum, can offer students. One has to have faith in the students themselves to take the habits of mind that one helps them develop and bring them to some kind of worthwhile fruition. It's not for teachers to decide what students do with what they've learned. Many programs in various institutions assume that they know what's right for students. In my own view, shared by faculty colleagues at Williams, it's more important to stress the secular virtues of learning how to look at the world squarely and how to assess it fairly and reflectively. And then one has to let students do what they choose to do with what they've learned.

**ML: HOW HAS YOUR EXPERIENCE AS GAUDINO SCHOLAR BEEN SO FAR AND HOW DO YOU SEE IT EVOLVING?**

**RJ:** Late this spring, there was an uproar on campus that began with a debate at College Council about instituting minority representation on the Council. A student journal published a parody of this debate. Some students took umbrage at the parody and demanded that the Council rescind the publication's College funding. At a raucous meeting, complete with at least one student threatening others, the Council did indeed rescind the publication's funding. Students asked for a special Gaudino Forum to air the issue. It was standing room only and went on for hours.

This year, the Gaudino Forum will continue to sponsor some controversial speakers who will address the social centrifugality that, unfortunately, has become a hallmark of college life. And, of course, the Forum will continue to be responsive to students' interests.
One of the highlights of Mark Reinhardt's year as Gaudino Scholar during 2000-2001 was a trip he organized with 12 Williams students to Guatemala during Winter Study. The centerpiece of the trip was a 10-day homestay with a Guatemalan family along Lake Atitlan. What follows are brief accounts from three students who accompanied Mark on the trip.

**A Home Stay Along Lake Atitlan**

By Daniel N. DeMoss

Over six months have passed since my trip to Guatemala. In looking back on that time, I am struck both by what I remember and what I have forgotten. This is something I have thought about before: after a summer fighting forest fires, a good friend of mine and I both noticed how we only remembered the good times, yet we knew they didn't represent the whole story.

I remember my trip to Guatemala in the same way, and I believe the two experiences were similar in the energy I put into them. While traveling with a group of friends isn't the same as swinging a hand tool, both experiences required putting aside the difficulties inherent in such endeavors and constantly working to get the most out of the adventure. In the end, the fact that such a comparison can be made suggests that, along with the fun and the photographs, there was an intensity to the Guatemala trip that made it especially meaningful to me. This intensity started with our daily routine. It meant hauling myself out of bed early each morning, stomachache and all, and throwing myself into the day's events. After breakfast, we began most mornings by piling into the back of a pickup truck with a dozen or so indigenous Guatemalans and heading off along the winding coast of Lake Atitlan. Each day, we heard Alberto, our instructor, talk for hours about domestic and market economies. Alberto was a story in himself. He seemed to know everyone in Guatemala, and he approached everything he did with an enthusiasm that was infectious and inspiring. After a morning of Alberto, there was lunch, after which we took Spanish classes. We then had an hour of precious free time until we boarded the pickup trucks once again, to return to our host families. Walter, Pablito, Maria and Martina - the children in my family - would be eagerly waiting for me to play futbol with them or just pick them up and spin them around, over and over again.

We kept up this hectic pace away from our homestays. Our "rest" day, for example, was spent climbing a 10,000 ft. volcano. Another example was our visit to Chichicastenango. We awoke at the crack of dawn and spent the day interviewing vendors and tourists at the regional market. Something about that day exemplified the trip for me, especially the way we threw ourselves into a completely foreign situation with big smiles on our faces and realized that our good intentions would be responded to in kind. The strangers, whom we interviewed in our broken Spanish, revealed a small part of their lives to us, which we accepted with wonder and gratitude.

This combination of persistence and revelation occurred throughout the trip. In our homestays, Spanish wasn't the first language, yet our desire to know each other better existed despite the language barrier. In the evenings, the children would teach me Kaq'chikel and I would teach them English; we would translate in Spanish. This intense desire to communicate also extended to our own group. There were many revealing conversations that took place during five-hour bus rides or on top of the Mayan temples at Tikal. On some level, people within our group began holding themselves to the same standards that we followed during our homestays and in our classes; we began investing ourselves more in our interactions with each other. The energy was contagious: we fed off each other, in our conversations and experiences, and showed each other how to take risks and make the most of our time.

Ultimately, that was what struck me most about the trip: how a group of twelve students, a professor, and a gruagorous Guatemalan could put aside a language barrier and the general apathy at Williams and learn so much, so quickly. Intense experiences like these demonstrate how I want to live my life when I return home.

---

**Discovering Guatemala:**

**Bed Bugs and All**

By Diane Reis

I realized as my plane began its approach into Guatemala City that I had no idea what to expect. Though six months in Argentina during high school gave me confidence that I would understand the language, I wasn't sure whether I'd be walking onto a tiny airstrip or a multi-terminal monolith in the next half-hour. My three weeks in Guatemala were a continual adventure into the unknown. And perhaps nothing was as intense as the family stay, when we spent ten days living with native Guatemalan families in towns around Panajachel.

After a day in Guatemala City and a day of travel that included stops in Antigua and Iximché, a site with Mayan ruins, we arrived in Panajachel. Fairly large by Guatemalan standards, Pana is located on the shore of Lake Atitlán, a large inland lake prized for its beauty and ecology by visitors and for its fish, water, and value as a tourist attraction by locals. After a morning at the nature reserve where we met each day, we ate lunch in town, then gathered to meet our families. While the colorful huipiles (blouses) of the women and children who stood waiting for us were thrilling to watch, I couldn't ignore the nervousness that was tying my stomach in knots. I was introduced to Manuela López and her seven-year-old daughter, María Fidelia. Manuela beckoned me to follow her and we walked a few blocks to the "taxi" stand. We then climbed into the back of a pickup truck along with three other Williams students and their host families. We rode fifteen minutes to Santa Catarina, the small lakeside town where we spent the next ten days.

My worries about housing were quickly allayed when we arrived at the López's house. Although the house was totally different from...
any I had seen in the U.S., the plaster walls were painted aqua or whitewashed, there were several electric lights, and the dwelling looked cheerful and well cared for. A few minutes after we arrived, one of my classmates and her host-brother arrived and proposed a trip to the lakeshore to see the hot springs. We agreed, and my classmate Leah and I were amazed to see that a stream of near-boiling water flowed out of the rocks on the lakeside.

That evening at dinner, it became clear that the only person in my host family who spoke conversational Spanish was my host-father. He explained that he was a fisherman, which meant he'd be at home during the day, when I was in Panajachel, and out fishing at night, when I was at home. The only time I'd see him, and hence the only time I'd be able to ask questions of any complexity, would be on Sunday.

The real surprise, however, didn't come until that night. After several days of traveling, and an afternoon trying to understand what I should say and do in a new household and culture, I looked forward to going to bed early, with some time to read. I changed into sweatpants and a long-sleeved shirt, anticipating the cool night air I'd heard about from Mark Reinhardt and Alberto, our Guatemalan contact. The bed looked comfortable; a thick wool blanket covered a pillow and what I assumed was a mattress. It was only when I pulled back the blanket and sat down that I realized I would be sleeping on a straw mat on top of the wooden bed frame. Determined to find a comfortable spot, I laid down. My eyes then spied a line of small black dots on the bed frame. Then I realized the dots were moving. I craned my head forward and squinted to see a line of black bugs crawling across the edge of the mattress and the bed frame. This was too much for my American sensibilities. I jumped up, pulled bug spray out of my bag, and liberally coated my hands, face and neck. I then climbed back into bed and carefully positioned myself as far from the frame as I could get. I turned off the light, fervently hoping that I wouldn't wake in the morning covered with bug bites.

Over the next ten days, the house and family that had seemed so strange that first evening became familiar. I discovered that Pascual, the family's three-year-old son, didn't care if I spoke Kaq'chikel or not, as long as I was willing to play with him and his toy trucks.

The core of our trip - a week homestay with families in small villages. The strangest part of my homestay was that villagers normally speak an indigenous language called Kaq'chikel, and only speak Spanish at home to visitors like me. They have a great sense of cultural pride that we noticed everywhere we went. All women wear traditional dress, as do older generations of men; their native tongue is deliberately maintained as a link to the past. To outsiders like myself, who lament the appearance of the 'West' in all corners of the globe, this is great to witness - we value their heritage as authentic, even if it is sometimes treated as a photo opportunity. Yet we soon realized that this foreign attitude had been 'figured out' when women in local markets demanded payment for a picture taken of them.

We were delighted to live with our native hosts, of course. Since we were studying Guatemala, I methodically noted the layout of the house where I lived, the division of labor and styles of dress. And there was, of course, the inevitable class barrier. One night during a discussion of the education system, my host-father asked how much it cost for me to attend college. I shook my head and told him that he really did not want to know - something that I still believe to be true. What would that large number of dollars, converted into quetzals, mean to him? Money and material possessions represent a certain commonality between cultures, but they hinder seeing important similarities and differences. I am sure that my host family might have wished that they were more affluent. But I did not know how to tell them that I thought their way of life was much healthier and more meaningful than that of many Americans, and that they were raising their children beautifully and better than the parents of many spoiled American children.

I had unrealizable visions of bringing my host family to America, where I could be their host, show them with pride where I live, and tell them, with some sadness, about the not-so-nice aspects of our country; extend, in other words, the kind of open dialogue that they had with me about Guatemala. I wanted to show them where I came from, and make America more than just a vague concept in their minds.
Furthermore, much of the student body could be expected to avoid smaller classes where any sort of passionate class discussion could potentially arise, opting instead for large lecture courses, often attended with a group of friends with whom they could study before exams. In short, my claim was that the quest for the well-rounded Williams student had led to a de-emphasis on overtly creative, single-minded pursuits, as well as a pronounced lack of creativity and passion in the broader intellectual realm.

It was at this point that Mark Reinhardt and I began to talk. The issue of intellectualism at Williams, and its de-emphasis at the College relative to its status at comparable institutions, was (and remains) of great interest to him. In our discussion during and after the Gaudino Forum, he realized that there were students who were similarly concerned. Surprisingly, the coming together of students and faculty on this issue was a new development. Each group tends to discuss campus issues within their own sphere. I was excited to discover that there were professors who were interested in discussing the issue and pushing for change.

While the problem of the marginalization of intellectualism at Williams could be, and should be, attributed to a variety of factors, Mark and I agreed that the key question was why some clearly under-qualified students were being admitted to the College. While Williams prides itself on being a highly transparent institution that brings students into the administrative process, the door to the admissions office is firmly closed. Admissions data and decision-making processes are highly secretive and, unlike nearly every other administrative issue on campus, are never open to debate in a public forum. The reasons for this secrecy are obvious: questioning admission policy is not merely theoretical; it also questions whether certain Williams students should have been admitted to the College in the first place. As such, it is a dangerous and potentially divisive issue.

This, however, did not dissuade some students and faculty, including myself, from seeking to improve what we felt had become a flawed system. Conveniently, and quite coincidentally, we were raising questions about admissions policy at exactly the same time that The Game of Life: College Sports and Academic Values, by James L. Shulman and William G. Bowen, was published. In a study of colleges around the country, Shulman and Bowen revealed the problematic relationship between athletics and admissions, using Williams as a major example.

Bolstered by the publicity created by the book's release, Mark and I set out to bring this issue to the center of public discourse, through the Gaudino Forum (which Mark was leading at the time), as well as the Williams Record (where I was then Arts Editor). We also formed an ad hoc committee of four professors and three students to meet with President Schapiro in order to gauge his understanding of the problems we saw and his commitment to solving them. At the same time, the Gargoyle Society formed a committee to lobby for student involvement in the selection of the new Director of Admissions.

In my four years at Williams, I never saw the campus so focused on a single issue as it was around the question of admissions policy, specifically with an eye to the role of athletics. If our goal had been to create public discourse, we certainly succeeded beyond our wildest expectations, albeit with a good deal of help from outside sources.

Although the question, so to speak, was on the table, the answers we received were mixed. At first, things seemed extremely promising. President Schapiro appeared to take the issue of admissions policy seriously, and he allowed the steering committee to take over the selection of faculty to the committee that oversees admissions policy. Two students were chosen to be on the Admissions Director Selection Committee, one of whom was in the group of professors and students who had met with President Schapiro. A number of articles were written in the Record, some thoughtful and some less so, discussing the role of athletics at Williams.

As time went on, however, it became clear that there was a limit to the changes that could take place in the short term. The student involvement in selecting the Admissions Director was extremely limited, with the two seniors chosen for the committee only consulted late in the semester once the finalists had been chosen. Eventually, the interim director was selected as the permanent director, a move decided on the side of the status quo. The campus discourse that had once seemed promising turned sour, with nasty, ill-conceived letters and articles written both by supporters of athletics and by those who resented the high profile of athletics on campus.

This culminated in an anonymous leaflet left in the dining halls that contained a series of ad hominem attacks and absurd parodies on those on the anti-athletic side of the debate.

The future of the movement for admissions policy reform is now up in the air. Issues tend to die out very quickly at Williams, with students graduating and professors settling back into an attitude of quiet indifference. That is why institutions such as the Gaudino Forum are so critical on campus; only through the constant reiteration of crucial questions can change come about. I hope that there will be a return to this issue, again and again, until true change is achieved. President Schapiro seems to agree that some sort of change is necessary. In deciding on the nature of that change, I hope that all segments of the Williams community are involved, sharing perspectives and ideas. That, after all, is what Williams College is all about.
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