

Williams-at-Home

A Preliminary Reckoning

August, 1972

"Nowhere at present is there such a measureless loathing of this country by educated people as in America. It is hard to believe that this savage revulsion derives from specific experience with persons and places."

Eric Hoffer

Come home, America

George McGovern

Introduction: Williams vs. Home

This is a first assessment of the Williams-at-Home program. Through it we seek to encourage a campus dialogue about the place of experience in education at Williams. This report is written for the students of the program, their parents, the Committee on Educational Policy, and interested faculty and students of Williams College.

A report, even when termed a preliminary reckoning, has a tendency to appear complete. It is not surprising, for that is the way reports are written and received. Reports seem definitive even if they try not to be. Williams-at-Home is not done with, finished, ended. It goes on. But this judgment and criticism assumes the program has been completed, and thus is subject to review. This is not only written with parents, faculty, and students in mind; it is written as well for the institution. WAH is a Williams program. That means we must make some kind of order for our colleagues out of what happened to us, out of all that we saw, experienced, talked about. We try for perspective on things in motion. This is the start on assessment. Suggestions of change.

The judgments made here are not those of the students, except as I interpret them. The students will deliver their own judgments in the fall. I cannot write for them, even as I write of them. My concerns are much more abstract than are theirs. I write about the program as it has to be reported back to the College. It has to be made visible to the college, seen in light of the tradition and present activities of the College. I write for the institution, not for the home. It was the students

who stayed in the homes, not I. They must write for themselves, out of the experience as it affected them, out of their insights and discoveries. They will report back in the fall, a composite report of what happened to them, a report not qualified by any institutional needs. This preliminary reckoning will be the sober report. Theirs will be the more challenging. Both, we hope, will move the understanding into new ways of thinking about education.

First, let us take a look at our own premises. Let us make clear the grounds on which we make our judgments about success and failure. Williams-at-Home is the latest part of several years of effort in experimenting with the uses of experience in educating. There have been other projects, most recently Williams-in-India. Our purpose is not just to have experience. It is to use it. It is to reflect upon it, to let it enhance or inhibit our sense of self. It is both to put us inside experience and to move us beyond it. It is true that just having experience is important for the Williams student. His formal education has not provided for it. Experience has been left to times off. "Do it during summer vacations!", which means have experience without reflection, without the use of the mind.

What is experience anyway? Definitions run off in all directions. Confusion and misunderstanding increase when it is asked: what are the proper uses of experience in education? In this program, experience is direct touch with something different. It is an up-close, face-to-face look at that which is other, strange, hard to see. It is not something the student is likely to seek on his own. One can expect resistance. It may have to be forced. There is little in it that is spontaneous and natural. Seeing by experience is not easy. It takes competence and intelligence, and some degree of self control. Experience is not just found. It is used. It is particular, of course, but not those familiar particulars close to home which reenforce and make secure. One must be alert, tiringly so. One must live in the present without apology.

If experience is growth, then it is an uncomfortable, limiting, bumpy kind of growth. It may stretch, but it also compresses. As it increases, it diminishes. It opens out into variety, difference, confusion, even loss. It reduces the chances for making reality over like oneself.

Practically, it connects with people and situations that the student does not ordinarily meet at home or in college, and would not seek out on his own. It is not what he would set up for a profitable summer. It is not so pleasant, for it involves testing on grounds which the student does not originate or create. He does not make experience. Others do. Therefore, in its immediate impact, it does not reenforce or confirm. Control is difficult, robbing experience of a certified future, of an assured use. In the end, of course, quite a bit of it is lost, cut

out by our uneven memories, selected and shaped to our own visions of reality. In the interest of making sense out of it, some clipping it down to our size is inevitable, some reduction through forgetting is appropriate.

The aim of WAH is not experience for its own sake. The aim is education, an education which uses experience for its own ends. The intention is to see as particularly as possible, and to move toward perspective on what is seen. It is to use experience for reflection. Reflection on persons, on their family situation, on their work, on their existence in a real world. Reflection requires, both as an approach to learning and as a method of living, not just a distance from self, but some reduction in the sense of self. This lessening of self was not a continuous process through these five months. Not at all. But it was there at the most painful and perhaps insightful moments. Discomfort interrupts the steady, routine line of ordinary learning. It breaks the line, and so makes it visible. One sees the line and oneself on it. This is not sudden release, not free floating, not unqualified joy. There is a kind of pleasure in the checking of one's expression, of holding back the self in order to see others, to see both their individuality and their situation. In the beginning of experimental learning, and perhaps always at the base of it, this holding back of self is not for the purposes of a more general or theoretical understanding, not for disciplined knowledge. The student reduces his own sense of self in the interest of understanding and responding to the particular person and situation before him. All of this assumes, of course, a strong and confident sense of self to begin with which can put up with the reduction. Thus, the first step in learning through experience is not the achievement of articulated knowledge, but direct engagement with what is in front of one. To make use of and to sustain this kind of seeing and engagement, the student needs quite formidable qualities and skills: curiosity, openness, some workable definition of who he is, strong will, an ability to ask questions and to make distinctions, an ability to know when questions are not appropriate or won't work, sensitivity to the way people communicate, patience, a sense of humor. Probably, an unmanageable list! It is a lot to expect of any human being, and especially of a young person who has not been educated according to these qualities. We teach the student to question books, not other human beings or situations. This particular combination of qualities is not what activates our curriculum. Our model is more reserved, impersonal, bifurcated. WAH demands that the student be able to reach and touch people "at home", to be with them there in silence as much as in talk, yet his formal education insists that he inhabit a wholly different place than the home. In this program, the student is expected to be at home with people who don't know or really care that Williams College exists. The College has nothing to teach them that is useful to their lives at home.

What is this "at-homeness" anyway? It's necessary to make clear right now that there's something subversive about it. Subversive of the college! It undermines the institution in its most civilized, vulnerable, serious, conventional tasks. Given the purposes of the college, Williams-at-Home is a kind of impossibility. It is, for the institution, not a very promising experiment. If it succeeds, all the worse. Too much of particulars, looseness, things best kept private. Not enough of professional observation, coherent method, disciplined theory.

People "at home" are more likely to be relaxed, to be themselves without apology or rational explanation. They are among their own kind, among the more durable things. Things that they have selected for themselves. It is a casual environment in which they can be complex, inconsistent, angry, trusting. If they become tense and resentful, it is because of a stranger's presence, his invasion of their home ground, his insensitivity to the rules and the place. It takes an open patience, a receptiveness, a willingness to be silent, a reduction of self to get beyond this tension. For some students, this comes naturally and easily. It is their style, a style usually hidden or unnoticed in the Williams classroom. It is preserved, in tact, underneath. Some students are ill at ease in the homes of others, but these same students do well in the Williams classroom. In general, the WAH student did well "at home." They were very well received, even asked to come back. Where they weren't responsive, they were at least polite. There were exceptions, of course, but generally living with a family on the family's terms and in its manner was not a difficulty. Williams' students, if this group is at all indicative, can enter the homes of others with a minimum of tension. This is our first success, and an important one. It is the base we build from. We are lucky, for it's nothing we prepare for at Williams. Students come with it. It is the foundation, the necessary starting point, not the end or purpose or completion of WAH. It is not the main thing we learn.

In their own home, people have the right to make the rules, to enforce them, and to break them according to their own wishes and needs. Inside the home there are no impersonal criteria to determine right and wrong, although these judgments are constantly made. There are no guaranteed modes of prediction; you simply have to know the members of the family. Arguments certainly occur, but they are resolved as they arise, by personality and presence. Too many deeply felt arguments about living together suggest a failure of trust, a collision of sensitivities, a breakup of the home. The visitor has no rights or claims; he is the intruder. Whatever rights and actions the visitor makes possible for himself are gifts or concessions from the family. This place in the family is a condition of but not the purpose of this program. The student has to be more than a family member. In this, he is subversive of the home relation. The student has to see more than his hosts see. He has

to remain quiet longer. He has to be a good listener. He is not in control of the home; it's not like his real home. Nor is at all like Williams College. Yet it is the College which has put him there.

Home is the prime location of wholeness. It is where a person is as he is. Logic and consistency have no special status or attraction. One is not thoroughly questioned at home. It is a place of loyalty, not rationality. At home, one has a chance to be complete, full, sufficient. No explanation has to be given for what one is. No involved reasons. They are not asked for. The fundamental reason is accepted without question: "You are our own." It is a forum in which one can whine, howl, let loose, be silent. One's style fits one's unique individuality.

The home tolerates withdrawal, even welcomes it, without feelings of guilt. There are times when we need the darkness. Where it is cool and a bit damp. At home, there is no concern for working out the consequences. Which means there is little sense of a future. It is a place of feelings, of love, of sudden unembarrassed shifts of mood and attitude. It resists objectivity, distinction, analysis, generalization. It is suspicious of categories, of precise definitions, of articulated insight, of most things made possible by words and concepts. There is no need for honesty, too much is known right from the beginning. The home provides security, confidence, support. Permanence is important: things last, they are not thrown away. Their durability supports a settled unselfconscious life. Nothing is broken down into its parts; no parts are put together to form rationales or causes.

The home is a place of protection, the foremost and first private space. A shared family-filled private space. Its members love blindly, regardless of skills or performance. Their loyalties are concrete and evident, clearly based on the accepted and celebrated distinction between we and they. There are no regular and dependable procedures to order social life. Those are public things, best for handling strangers, outsiders. Home is a place for reenforcement: love, friendship, being together uncritically. Acceptance under the pressure of necessity, not free choice. There is very little searching or concern for premises, and not much desire to question them.

The home is a good place for early growth and old age. It is the beginning point, and a pleasant place to rest toward the end. We all need it, respond to it, use it in our own ways. Evidently, it is not the best place for testing reality. It has its own reality. That is the challenge to the visitor.

Williams is something else. It is more removed, wary, skeptical. Perhaps even suspicious. It tries to take the student out of the home. That is its peculiar accomplishment, its particular task, its conscious

intention. It seeks to put aside the narrowness and prejudice of the home place. The work of the college assumes that the home endows the student with no rights and no serious insights. The home is not preparation for the intellectual, analytical purposes of a truly higher education. It gets in the way. It is too close to the teachings of common experience. The requirements of study do not include the purposes of the home, what it does, its ways of relating, its methods of living. As a place of study and learning, the college wants students that come from a "good" home. It is dependent upon a good home, meaning that its activity is dependent on the security, poise, self-confidence, willingness to risk that a good home makes possible. The college needs the home to do its task of protecting and reenforcing well, in order to transcend it, to turn the student around to new values and aims. It is the college which insists on this primary distinction between its own work and the background and situation of the student. It bifurcates, splits in two, separates, distinguishes. It doesn't ask for or want the whole person. Regardless of the ambiguous statements in its catalogue or the persistent leftover practices from the past.

What the college really wants is access to the mind of the student. It wants to develop that mind, encourage it in articulations different in kind from home values. The college wants to reorient the students' way of seeing and knowing, his way of dealing with specific realities outside of himself. It starts him on a precise, clearly defined vocabulary. Words and concepts not shaped out of his experience and background, but by the needs of disciplined theory. He must master the several paradigms which determine both the questions asked and the explanation given. The student is provided with well defined methods of bringing reality into a coherent and consistent theoretical expression. The college places him in a community of professionals who can use that precise vocabulary, those established methods, the reigning paradigms, for unambiguous discussion with each other and, through this communication, to push inquiry along certain designated lines. The professionals work together joined not by friendship or compassion but by the common definition of task. Teams of professionals talking about, looking at, evoking explanations according to their established criteria. They do not claim to be whole or to show the whole of reality, but simply that cut out part of reality which is the proper object of their own peculiar vocabulary, methods, questions, paradigms. They would call these pursuits humane, but they try very hard to keep their own humanity out of it, and certainly the students' humanity has no standing. Reduction of the effects of self is indication of their rigor, their control, their courage. The professional must get away from home in this effort, for this particular part of his life. The training and discipline of the mind, so necessary to all serious and stable articulations of reality, is the basic task of the college. It requires the separation of Williams and the home. The home is concerned with early growth, wholeness, exclusiveness, protection, being oneself,

old age. The college is concerned with mind, conscious selectivity, precision in talk, distinguishing, disciplined generalizing, the middle years.

The form that the college effort at Williams takes is the sovereign department. The structure used by the faculty is the academic discipline. For the student, the faculty provides the major. Each academic discipline and department and major has its special paradigms, its articulation of what can and cannot be known, its specific vocabulary and concepts, its commonly defined questions and problems, its old and new factions, its explicitly defined methods and modes of testing work, its special revolution. Attack on the major and the required course is an attack on the kind of education provided by the disciplines.

Important to this work of the college is a high level of self-awareness. The effort to separate fact from value is the struggle to separate self from work. It expresses the need for the professional to be very aware of his own premises and of their effect on his study. He seeks to become aware of self in order to reduce its effects. The purpose is not the flowering and free development and full expression of self, but the curbing and control of it. This serious effort to remove the self is grounded in a desire for knowledge not derived from one's own needs, not from one's own class, not from one's own family, not from one's own home. This concern has definite consequences: how one knows affects very definitely what one knows. Method influences content. It also takes particular kinds of personalities to do its work. Commanding and using an academic discipline is not an easy, natural, effortless task. It is not dancing in a meadow. It requires a different kind of imagination. Much less abandon. It demands interest, dedication, passion, skills, long hours of study, and a willingness to change and shift with the evidence. There's a good deal of disappointment and wasted effort, too. Home life is far more secure and easy and stabilizing, not at all tense about objectifying reality.

Williams-at-Home, then, is not an innocent or haphazard title. It suggests a contrast. Why not Williams-in-America? Surely it is more descriptive, and it doesn't raise all these difficulties. Williams-at-Home is better because it suggests tension, even opposition, perhaps betrayal. It shows awareness about what it is doing. The home contradicts Williams in its most established and valued study. Williams is the place for reflection, putting a distance between self and subject matter in order to objectify reality. Home is the place for direct experience, the expression of the whole self, the reduction of reality to locality. It is with this basic distinction that Williams-at-Home begins. The program originates in this difference, or more exactly, in the seeing of this difference. It does not validate either Williams or home. Validation is not its purpose. It juxtaposes the two educations, clarifying

each through the other. It is the opposition between the two which is learned. Williams-at-Home is irresponsible in not choosing, in not awarding a prize to either. As seen from either side, it fails the test.

The modes of learning in Williams-at-Home are more attuned to the college; the uses and ends of this learning are more like home. This study insists upon reflection, because that is what a college does best. Reflection includes distinguishing and generalizing. But the reflection in WAH is not used to enhance the academic discipline. Rather, its purpose is wider personal observation. The aim is to prepare students to be both perceptive about and sensitive to meanings in life. It is to encourage them to look closely at people and situations. It is not to put together objective theory.

There are five parts to the learning in WAH: 1) The program begins with reading for background, for preparation, for preliminary understanding. The books are used to give the student grounds from which to ask relevant questions, and to answer some of his questions in the field and after. The reading is not supposed to predefine the situation completely, but to establish a starting point to be modified and corrected by observation. Certainly, it is not to provide protection against meeting and engaging individuals. It is not a substitute for looking directly. 2) The encounter with the individuality of a family or of persons within the family as they are at home and in public. To understand their individuality and uniqueness, how they are different or similar to what people and books have said about them. 3) The understanding of their situation, their history, their goals, the milieu they have been brought up in, the public and private pressures on them, their institutional setting, the joys and frustration of their present, an estimate of their prospects for the future. Also, an effort to discover what they share with associated people close around them. 4) The use and exchange of observation and insights by other Williams students close by in associated families. Talking through with each other what they have seen in an effort to give a wider, fuller dimension to their own observations. There are two parts to this co-operative study: A) being conscious of and using the experience with another family to clarify one's own observations and B) to discover the different values and premises that each student applies and uses in his own descriptions. 5) The continued use of comparison as experience widens from one family to students living close by with other families, to students living at a distance from the local area, to comparisons between the phases of the program with their different kinds of association.

It should be evident that our purpose is not the professional elaboration of theory. It is rather to prepare the student for living in the world with some imagination and grace. It does not give the student

means of control. It encourages, and even forces, his seeing and putting together responses to persons and situations unseen by him before. Neither side has captured the program. It has in it too much of standing back and observing for the home, and too much emphasis on self and living for the college. It stands on its own uncertain ground between the two.

Both home and college are uncomfortable in the presence of each other. It could be said they are unfriendly. They don't like contact. It unsettles their conviction and proper work. They would rather be left on their own, each in his own proper environment. Our program has a quarrel with both of them. It rejects their exclusiveness. It insists they appear in each other's company. Seeing their contrast is a necessary preparation for entering a home and, of course, for entering Williams College as well. It is not the usual preparation. The two sides are seldom consciously juxtaposed. Traveling in a year off from college or working through a summer are not substitutes for Williams-at-Home. They tend to give themselves up to experience without reflection. They form pleasant but vague memories. They lack the Williams component. But, on the other hand, the classroom without experience can produce boredom and indifference, and often produces too great a vulnerability to theoretical knowledge.

Growth in personal insight is a basic aim of Williams-at-Home. The individual moves both with and against certain hard, external realities: other persons, other situations, other assessments and purposes, other needs, other kinds of association. It is a growth encouraged by resistance and difference more than by enhancement and reenforcement. It is not like home growth. Rather, it is a growth rooted in the particular character and situation of people not ordinarily visited, specific people in very real concrete settings. It is not learning just by absorbing many discrete details of personality and places. Rather, it is learning by direct engagement, by opinion in tension and opposition to others, by the formation of identity in touch and in contrast with real people in real places.

All this is rightly suspect at Williams, not because it is denied as necessary, but because of the belief that it is best done elsewhere. The very legitimate question raised by the college is: Doesn't the survival of disciplined knowledge depend upon the survival of the institution of the college with its formed academic specialities so well defined in their premises, methods, purposes? Shouldn't the home be left to its own private sphere, free of the prying eyes of youthful and immature strangers? The answer is no. This is too parochial an approach. The grounds are too narrow and exclusive for a liberating education. It is not practical enough to show the student his exact limits. The sense of

limits provided by the disciplines is theoretically drawn, not practically. The full education is the one that penetrates into the meaning of both home and college, betraying each in turn by the awareness of the other. The best education is to see and know more than either side tells of itself. Isolated from each other, neither one can tell the student about its opposite. But seeing and knowing both sides, and how they are opposed, is at the center of study in Williams-at-Home.

One thing that emerges clearly out of the experience with this program is that there are very evident differences among students in the way they adjust to the environment of home and of college. What they are able to learn is definitely affected by their response to home or college. Their ability to do work is determined by where they are most at ease: home or college. The possibility of learning in both situations is in all of us, but students differ quite markedly in their ability to settle into, flourish, and use college or home. For some students, there is very little they can learn in a home stay, just as there are students who learn only a minimum amount in a classroom or a laboratory. Responses vary according to the mixtures of home and college in any one personality. These variations show up in the adjustments the students make in any given home, in how they are received, in what they talk about and what they see, in what they write and how they write it, in what they remember, in what they do and what they postpone.

Williams in the Fall

The year is broken down into two parts: study at the college from September to December, and life in the families from January to June. That is what happens: the year breaks down. It is hard to make the parts touch. This is one of our unresolved challenges. How to integrate the two parts of the study? How to make the college relevant to what happens in the field? How does the field relate best to the college?

We did have our failures last fall. To begin with, there was only one course on public authority in which the students met together as a group. Their other three courses were their own choice. There was very uneven participation in the class. Certain students spoke steadily; others not at all. Their reading of the books was often lax and casual, when they were read. Too often the discussions did not go far enough in clear analysis of the text nor in integration with other materials and the experience ahead. It was unfortunate that the course met on the one hour-three times a week schedule. Time-consuming announcements and arrangements to make about the program reduced our time for discussion in class even more. These factors got in the way of a full discussion moving in a sufficient time period to use our sources well. It is necessary, with a group of eighteen students, to have at least a two hour time period

for class discussion. It takes that long to get moving.

The question of participation is a sensitive one. Probably, students should be called on to participate in class even if they do not volunteer. Some degree of coercion is necessary. It must be coercion which serves legitimate purposes of the program. Also, it must be built on trust. It must be accepted. This is difficult practically but still essential: both the trust and the coercion. We like to think that because the student has volunteered for the program that forced participation is unnecessary. But the voluntary choice to be in the program is the result of very different kinds of reasoning in each student, and does not parallel the actual content and requirements of the program. Students just don't know what they are getting into, no matter how explicit and evident the explanations. Telling is never the same as doing, especially in a program where past educational experience is not much of a guide to method and content. Further, students vary in what they do well. Thus, there is the tendency to hold back in certain parts of the program, even in some cases to play down and undercut those activities one does not do well in. Also, coercion is made necessary by the intention to learn through differences and some pain. Force is necessary to deflect the student from his well-defined line of competence and security. How much and where coercion is necessary is a practical question, not resolved by theory or principle but by a knowledge of a students' needs and difficulties.

We tried student-led discussions in the classroom. They were not very successful, but at the same time not a complete failure. Students don't take much to discussions led by their peers, often with good cause. It is hard for students to move a discussion toward coherent insights. They often argue points, present anecdotes, show difficulties, talk to each other in ways which tend to end and close off discussion rather than to push it further. It is not easy to lead a discussion in ways which help the students to show their judgments, and to use the discussions to illuminate those judgments. Mostly, student-run discussions end up as lists of comments and opinions without engagement or movement.

There was not enough time for preparation and thought about what was going on. The assignments were too long given the course requirements of papers and films and outside discussions. This was just one course out of four. The association of the students in the program was casual and somewhat guarded. They had neither the time nor the occasion to associate on social grounds. Certainly, they did not seek each other's company outside the planned events of the program. Thus, the feeling grew that they did not know each other well enough during the semester. This may be a good thing. It is not a friendship project, although friendships may certainly

develop through the study. Rather, it is an association for learning consisting of individuals consciously selected for their difference from each other.

The public events had a certain success. Through the documentary films of Frederick Wiseman, we tried to open a dialogue with local people in the schools, at the hospitals, with the police. These were the three institutions, along with the church, that we stressed for examination. The films and discussions went well, but they provided no sustained encounters. There were a few follow ups on contacts by the students who did their papers on the police or on the schools. We had hoped that the same community people would attend all the discussions after the films. It didn't work out that way. Understandably, the community people had neither the time nor the interest, nor did they feel that at home in the college environment. Sustained attendance was better with the faculty and student participants. We had eight discussions going after each film, each one led by two WAH students. They did well as discussion leaders. Several times we went into the institutions with these films. Discussion was good in these efforts. The purpose of our discussion was not to assess the quality of the films so much as to initiate contact with community people, and with them to gain some understanding of the institutions they worked in.

We had a weekend with the parents of the participants which went very well. We talked of the program, its structure, content, intention. We suggested possible failures, but they reassured us that that could not happen. At that time, all our home stays were not set up. We had a lively discussion about institutions, loyalty, duty. This took place after seeing together Wiseman's latest film on the army and basic training. Keeping in touch with the parents and having their personal participation is very important to our aims. We will meet together again early this fall for an examination and assessment of what has happened.

These events and the academic course did not in themselves create a strong bond among the students. This was not surprising because the students were not chosen on their ability to get along with each other. On the contrary, they were selected for their differences. We wanted students with different personalities and styles. Also, differences of commitment and belief and politics. We have indicated that it is too much to expect that they become friends, but there are social expectations: it is essential that they develop interest and respect for each other's judgment. It is evident that a classroom at Williams does not pull students together into close social interaction. There is no reason why it should. It is not a social situation, not a friendship group. But a program like this is different. A closer association is expected and desired by the participants, but they are not sure how to go about it. A heightened awareness of and response to each other is

more possible when they get into the field through sharing events, seeing each other under the pressures of action, reacting to the same strong personalities, common experiences, standing up to the tests and trials of practical life. It is evident that association and respect which goes beyond the formality of the classroom, but stops short of the easy give and take of friendship is difficult for them to bring about. They have little experience with such kinds of association. We have not done enough in the college to encourage it, yet its presence is supportive of the task of the college.

Students discovered that not much reading is done in their families. And, nowhere is reading done as at Williams: the close examination of ideas and concepts, the formal directed discussion, the reasoned comparison of sources, ideas, meanings. This discovery is to make the activity of the college seem even more artificial. It is true that this kind of analysis of sources is mainly carried on in colleges and universities. It is not a preparation for the at-home world, but for a profession. Books are not read this way in the world. Sources are not so closely examined and compared. The skills mastered in the college are not really valued in the world. They are mostly impractical, and not the grounds on which trust is established with people in the world. It is not the news media which cause this. Rather, it is the way people live their lives. Those books from high school and college gathered dust on the home bookshelves long before TV came into the home. Students, both old and new, see the artificial and removed and vulnerable nature of academic study much more clearly than its civilizing and liberating quality. They may talk about the latter; their action shows the former.

We didn't consider the papers the students wrote in this program as finished products or professional pieces of research. They are seen as instruments of learning, as a testing of judgment, as a means of focussing insight. It is hard to put reflection on one's experience down on paper. It requires some principle of selection, some consciousness about what one is doing. The student shows himself through his selection of both the form and the content of the paper. It indicates how he sees events and places and people. It is hard for the students to find the time to write the papers. Families tend to resent the time off taken in writing. The papers should be distributed to the people involved. They should not just be read and commented upon by the instructor and the faculty advisors, but also by other students in the program and by the people they are writing about. Arrangements should be made not only for comments but for a rewriting using and applying the criticism to improve the quality of the paper.

This fall semester is essential to the program. It provides insight into the meaning and significance of Williams-at-Home. Also, the contradiction inherent in the central idea of going to the homes. It

indicates what Williams can do, what Williams has not done. It allows for an understanding of people they cannot give on their own. The reading can show the premises and consequences of competing views of authority. It examines, compares, contrasts according to premises, theories, authors. It looks at background, history, structure; sees them in a way the locality cannot. This reading and talking does not provide control. That is not the purpose. Rather, it prepares. It provides for those who read carefully theoretical insight, relevant questions to ask, the grounds for empathy. The college gives what is not personal, immediate, definitive, direct, intuitive. It provides for the mind more than the feelings, for the background rather than the person, for the situation not the individual. It is the necessary beginning, exactly where we must start. It is definitely a shaping up of the mind. Hopefully, the placing of the heart in the way of seeing. Obviously, it offers more to the reason than to the feelings.

The South: The Limits of Hospitality

In looking at each phase of the home stays, we will call attention to certain themes that appeared in experience there. These themes are not descriptive of what happened to every student. Their experience is almost as varied as their personalities. Nor are these brief comments a full report on the various kinds of learning that went on in each student. But these are themes or moods that appeared often enough in our informal discussions.

This was the beginning: everyone open, full of expectations, ready to risk themselves, somewhat apprehensive. The challenge was new and unpredictable enough to keep them alert. During this month, the students were to make the most determined and sustained efforts to look at and to describe the four assigned institutions of school, church, police, health. The weather was good to us: sunshine, warmth, and rain to wash the air. None of the damp melting cold of Massachusetts. We were spread out among three southern states: Georgia (12), Mississippi (1), Texas (3). One student stayed behind with the winter in Massachusetts to study a correctional institution for youth near Springfield. Three students lived with black families, one in a mixed anglo-chicano home, and the rest with white families.

The families were middle or lower income people in small to moderate sized towns. The work we were looking at was the small family owned business, mostly retail trade. Not all the students worked with the same people they lived with. This was not a good idea. The home and the work life were severed into different lives. The contrast was lost. It was not the work in isolation that interested us. It was the comparison and association of the two. It is important to the educational

aims of the program that a student be with the same family in work and at home. The students are not studying small business or retail trade as such. They are living with people who do that for a living. The purpose of the program is not always well understood by the people who arrange home stays. It is not surprising, for the home stays and their purposes are unique, even in experimental studies.

Our contact organization was Slash Pine Community Action Agency. They helped place nine of our students in counties and small towns surrounding Waycross, Georgia. This is an OEO funded private corporation. The staff was very helpful in finding locations for us through their county supervisors and outreach workers. The agency itself provided the opportunity to see a semi-government organization doing poverty work. The people in the organization were very helpful, cooperative, generous. They gave us a good deal of time and attention. Some of the students were less enthusiastic about the organization itself. They felt that it was providing services and individual help to the poor, but doing nothing to change their conditions. We placed three students in Forsyth, Georgia with the help of a member of the Williams faculty and the cooperation of the Junior Chamber of Commerce in the town. Three students went to San Angelo, Texas. They found their families through the help of both a community action organization and the Chamber of Commerce.

There was no lack of things to do and see in these locations. With family, work, the town institutions, and the poverty agency, there was a lot to examine and to describe. Especially time-consuming were the hours of work that the business proprietors expected of them. Most found the work in retail trade boring and routine. The advantage was the opportunity it provided to talk casually with people who came to shop and pass the time of day. It is certainly true that there is not much learning in the long hours of work in retail trade. Also, the store contacts with people are rather restricted and superficial. The students were not paid for their work, and they felt their time was better spent in seeing other kinds of associations. This particular home stay and work situation does not seem very productive of learning. It was the least relevant to the aims of the program of the four phases. Some students felt it more challenging to get out into the community and to look at public agencies and private institutions on their own.

Cars were very important in giving the students mobility, although those without cars did get around well enough. Still, it is a convenience and help. Nine students out of 17 had cars. They were essential for transportation between home stays. We had several breakdowns but nothing serious, although we did have two sparkling new foreign cars by the time we reached Detroit.

The students were kept busy in observing, working, talking, visiting institutions. In this first phase, there were no problems of idleness or boredom; on the contrary, there did not seem to be enough time to do all they wanted. This does not mean that they used their time in energetic, efficient, directed, productive ways. But they did fill it up easily without much effort. There was much more enjoyment during this stay than tension or difficulty. They seemed to be at home.

They were well received, even enthusiastically, in their home stays. Their hair was cut to the proper length, with the help of the local barbers and Slash Pine officials. They were relaxed and open with their families. They did not attempt confrontations disagreeable to the people they lived with. There were no bad situations. No antagonisms. No maladjustment and no breakdowns. Neither hosts nor students asked for a change in home stay, with the exception of one student whose white host objected to his working in a black business. He was shifted to a black family. In most cases, the students and their families genuinely enjoyed each other. There was little discomfort. With such harmony, and easy acceptance, one wonders how much they were learning. Shouldn't this encounter of northern students with southern families provoke some tensions? some uneasy adjustments? Wasn't it all too pleasant and hospitable? Surely, something

The first thing seen, what appeared immediately to the student, was the friendliness, the informal openness and easy good will, not just from their families, but from the whole community. This friendly hospitality was contrasted with the reserve, the formality, the restraint and caution of their own northern experience. This casual and warm hospitality was agreeable to the students. It was loose and confident. It contrasted sharply with their expectations of intimidation, violence, suspicion, hatred. They had read the news stories of the 60's. In Dallas, the students had been warned of the pickup, with the shotgun mounted in the window, moving on the highways to the west. Instead, they found people ready to welcome them, ready to respond to them with an easy familiarity, taking some interest in why they had come. This first stay was going well. It was a pleasure to live among these informal, friendly people who smile and say hello so easily to strangers. There was indeed a "southern hospitality." This was a proper beginning. Or was it? Certainly, it was reassuring. All the promised failures, difficulties, pain did not appear. What had gone wrong?

In time and for some, the hospitality began to show certain dimensions, a form, a set of boundaries. It had limits. It involved certain hidden premises, a way to play the game, selected objects. Hospitality was played out in a social arena, and that arena was restricted. This hospitality was a convention, but not less real for being so.

There were some untalked about reservations. The problem for the student was to find out exactly how black and white (or Chicano and Anglo) lived together and how they lived apart. What new patterns of association were emerging in the south? With the new legal and institutional changes, what kinds of contacts and feelings went along with them? These things were very hard to see, hidden behind reassurances and silences. How did one get at it? One student, arrested in a black neighborhood where he was living and put in jail for a long night, discovered in this experience, and what followed from it, some important truths about black-white relations in Waycross, Georgia.

The students sensed antagonism, but it was hard to penetrate to exact feelings, motivations, strategies. It was hard to see what was shaping up as the result of changes. What was accepted and what was not allowed? These were hardly topics that southerners were willing to discuss openly and clearly with northern students. A circle had been drawn around the students by their first contacts. It was hard to break out of it, to reach out and touch those people who were outside the hospitality and make invisible by it. There was a special difficulty in meeting and talking honestly with young blacks. It became evident that knowing individuals and particular families could only be a starting point. One had to look beyond what was directly in the line of sight.

There was another characteristic of this friendly treatment: it tended to define the participants according to its own conventions and expectations. It assigned identities. It had no desire to listen to strangers if they insisted on talking about themselves. The outsider was not encouraged to show himself. There were limits to individual expression, to the full, frank, straight forward presentation of what one was. This second stage of WAH, the friendly exchange of judgments, was resisted. It was not part of the social pattern, especially as it turned on race and racial attitudes. There was a certain ambiguity of expression, a sunny surface good will with something darker running underneath. There was a very evident reluctance to show open conflict. It was sometimes difficult to know just what was being said and meant, what was really at stake for these friendly people. And, there were the long digressions from work and action, which were marked by sociality and friendly exchange. So many people stopped to talk. Long, long stretches of unused time, the absence of a really pointed sustained effort. And in the home, through the mornings and afternoons as well as evenings, the television flashes on, eating up the days and nights.

Thus, the visitor, really a stranger, is placed in a set of social relations that he plays no part in determining. They are there, well established and operational when he arrives. The stranger has no special

rights outside the conventions by which he is handled. He plays the game according to the local rules. There is no question of open criticism, no neutral ground on which individuals can engage and dispute each other frankly and honestly. It is the locality which counts. It is the locality which mediates, which establishes the grounds on which one associates and communicates. Also, there is a history to be taken account of.

There are real advantages to these ways of the south: the liesurely unpressured hours of sociality, genuine friendliness toward those within the boundaries, plenty of time to pause and take stock, a minimum of harassment by demands of duty and work and efficiency, the chance in January for warmth and sunshine. But learning is slow and imprecise in such an environment. And among the people met, the places visited, the activities observed, there was the difficulty in putting it all together, of finding the proper grounds of judgment, of correctly distinguishing, of choosing the appropriate form of expression. The place had much to teach, but how to bring it all together? Evidently, it is not enough to take the word of individuals. One might be mislead. One discovers the need for some analysis of the situation beyond what is said by the people in it. There have to be other sources: books, teachers, students, reports, statistics. One family intimately known and understood cannot substitute for these sources. Nor is conversation with the principal or the teachers at school enough. The ride in the patrol car or the visit to the hospital are not enough either. More has to be built on these beginnings.

As the first phase came to a close, the paper became a problem. The line of pure experience was broken by the question: "What can I write about?" In preparing for writing, there is a healthy sense of: "What do I really know?" It is an occasion to stop, to take account, to look back, to examine persons and one's judgment of them, then to look at what is around persons, to search their situation and how they deal with it. Perhaps, an occasion to gain insight. But this is really an ideal view of the paper. Practically, it was seen more as a burden to be tolerated for the program's sake. There was some joy in writing, but for most it was hard work.

The students wrote their papers alone, in isolation from each other. We never developed the idea of the paper as an exchange between students or as communication with the family. The paper was individual and confidential, shared only with the instructor. It was not an instrument of association with others. Most students wrote about what was before them and how they reacted to it. Of course, they talked with a few friends in the group about what was happening to them. But they made no substantial effort to use each other to increase their understanding, or correct their impressions. Several students presented their diaries

as a paper. Some very good writing was done in this form, but the diary is a very private, individual form of expression. It leads back into the self.

Take Waycross, Georgia. We had three students in town and six students in the surrounding counties. Each followed his own interests. Sometimes the students touched, especially those living close to each other. But their interaction was neither created nor reenforced by the program. No provision for cooperative learning. WAH in no way encouraged them to use each other for insight. Suppose they went into Waycross prepared to work together. Suppose they have as their interest the ways blacks associate in Waycross: how they treat each other, the various ways by which they deal with or respond to whites, the variety of work situations, how they see their lives and families, etc. Suppose a number of students living with different black families in different situations in town and in the close-by rural area and writing about what they observe. Suppose they determine together what to emphasize in this writing. Suppose the papers were seen as a joint project, an elaboration of things they have agreed to write about together. The form of the papers could vary, but they would be joined by common themes. In the preparation of the paper, they would be in consultation with each other and with their families, trying out ideas, pushing both criticisms, examining their differences. They would be constantly in touch, and ready to show both the rough draft and the finished product to anyone who is ready to respond to it.

The Time Between: Morehouse and Kansas City

Between home stays, we wanted to meet together and talk over what had happened. I chose Morehouse College in Atlanta. It was a bad choice. It did not relax us. It merely added tension. Between home stays is a time for quiet conversation, a pressure-free environment, relaxed communications, a stretch of time without tension. Morehouse was too much of a distraction, too many things going on, a sizable emotional strain. There were events to go to, staff to meet, discussions, tours, Morehouse students to get to know. The campus had its own internal tensions, some very overt, and we weren't that relaxed with each other, yet. We couldn't seem to settle into communication. There were too many interruptions, too many distractions, too much of a city close by.

It went better in Kansas City. We stayed in the suburbs. At least the setting didn't require new adjustments. We were well housed, fed, and taken care of by parents of Williams students. We had some good talks with them as well. We attempted meetings of our whole group. There is some resistance to these large discussions. The

easiest, most accepted form is informal smaller groups, really rap sessions. These are pleasant and valuable at this time, a means of catching up, but not enough. The formal discussion does things the smaller and free flowing rap session does not. It requires more focussed distinguishing, objectifying, generalizing. Williams creeps back into the group, and this is resisted by some. The mood may be against it, but the need is there. It would help to have definitely scheduled presentations by different student groups whose members had worked with each other.

This period between home stays is the best time and place in which to write the papers. Students have a difficult time writing papers in the home stay. It separates them from the family. It is difficult to arrange the privacy and the quiet to concentrate and to think. It is easier to set down daily impressions in a diary, but hard to plan and work out an analysis. The writing should be done between home stays and in cooperation with other students. More time will be needed for these efforts, maybe about ten days. The main effort would be talking together, comparing experiences, contrasting and differentiating, writing and reading and judging the papers of each other.

All papers will have to be finished before the next phase so that the past will not get in the way of living in and responding to the present. Each part should be completed before going on to the next. It makes it much easier for both family and student. And with each passing stay, the comparisons and contrasts should be building up and moving the student onto new grounds of insight.

Appalachia: Survival and Pride

The mountains rise up sharply. The steady rain turns the back roads into deeply rutted tracks, full of mud and cold. Thrown-away industrial products lie about, rusted and immobile. Not really built for the people's lives, they are possessed at third-hand and run down and out. They are thrown away, littering the little flat space that there is. They are left thrown away, visible from the road. A man does what he wants. That is the way it looks. That's the way it is: up close and littered and independent. No horizons or stretched out space. The mountains are right there by you, ready to bump into. But it is not easy to reach the mountain people, no matter how possible you feel it. They do not have the conventions of the deep south. Strewn around the periphery of the mountains, things and people maintain an upright position, able to stand alone, surviving in time and in their place. And proud of it.

We divided into two groups: 9 went to Tennessee and 8 to Kentucky. In Tennessee, as in Georgia, we worked through a community action agency (LBJ&C) funded by OEO. In Kentucky, arrangements were made by Lionel Duff, teacher and director of the Hindman Settlement School.

By the time we arrived, LBJ&C had our home stays all set up through their own workers in the surrounding counties. The students were placed in rural areas with poor families. Some of the families were working in agriculture, looking after livestock, felling trees. Most were receiving some kind of assistance and support. The families lived on the subsistence level. Some were without electricity or running water. It was a cold damp time of year. The roads impossible for normal cars. Most of the houses were out and away from the county seat. There was a sort of challenge to the students by the agency. A challenge to their good will, openness, sustaining power, patience as qualities sufficient enough for living in these areas. The students stood up to the challenge well. They really worked hard on making their home placements successful. They do not give up or walk away. It finally happens that in time both sides manage to come to a respect for each other, if not lasting affection. Thus, not without pain, the students manage to survive among difficulties just as their families have survived in their own struggles with life.

In Kentucky, the home stays were not immediately available. The students had to improvise a bit themselves. At first, they lived together on the second floor of an old building on the grounds of the Settlement School. With the help of Lionel Duff, they arranged their home stays by making their own contacts. While providing a chance to relax, this week together was not particularly beneficial to their study or understanding of each other and of the region they were in. Especially because it reduced the time with their families. They lacked the ability to use the time and the contact with each other to look at what was around them. They had not quite mastered the act of making their time together helpful, open, cooperative.

The pride of being in one's own place, of being a part of that place, of moving easily within it are important to understanding the people who live in Appalachia. It is not so much consciousness with them as it is acceptance. This unreflective confidence of place together with the practical struggle for survival impressed the students very strongly. It was not so much the physical hardships which made things difficult for them, though the effects on them were debilitating and diminishing. The deeper problem was the psychological distance and the reserve. The people did not need them.

The physical hardships were many and varied: lack of plumbing, no electricity, the cold climate, water carried up from the well, chopping wood, collecting coal, starchy food, alcohol. But things other than physical discomfort got to the students. Most surprising was the lack of energy and will in oneself, the feeling of indifference and the tiredness which slows down everyone. It takes all one's energy just to keep going, just to survive. And even survival was hard to manage on a diet of beans and potatoes.

It was the second stay: the curiosity to see and will to act were harder to sustain. They were not as spontaneous, not as ready to learn as before. Back in the hollow, pushed up against those mountains with the constant damp rain, it was easy to forget the institutions and functions in town. It was another world in town, and it became a necessary release for the student. In fact, "in town" came to be a relief, a reassurance, a shower, a night's sleep without interruption, quiet in the morning, privacy, meeting one's peers. At home, the work was sporadic, often an effort just to keep things going or maintained. Farming was mostly marginal. Work had necessity in it, but it existed on the periphery of life, away from primary interests, even respected but not at the center of one's identity. It is true, though, that sharing work, helping out with the chores was a primary method of communication. It was the best grounds on which to begin to trust. Some silence and reserve was also helpful to that trust.

The study of institutions suffered. It tended to disappear, to be given up. Or pursued in casual uncritical ways. Not so for every student, but that was the trend. In Appalachia, it is not an easy, normal movement from the family to the town institutions. There was a large gap between family and town, and very hard to make the leap. It was more possible, though even this was not done in some cases, to explore the grounds of life and belief in the family. Also, to look at the situation of the family locally, and the consequences of that situation for the family's contact with and action in the active world. Students became especially interested in and concerned about children, how they were treated in the family and school, and how they responded to that treatment. This led them into questions about education, child rearing, family attitude, expectations from life.

Appalachia was not as friendly, as hospitable, or open as the deep south had appeared to be. For the student, this was a time of some despair, of looking beyond the present, wanting to get out, of mild depression. The weather, the material inconveniences, the restraint and indifference of many adults, the fierce attachment of the children, the poverty, the clutteredness of the land, the slow reserved conversation, the mud, the difficulty of laughter: all these things brought about the first real loss of morale. These contacts with people required more sensitivity to human qualities than it needed ordinary friendliness or the willingness to work hard. As a result, the students spent more time with each other. They had to. They needed it more. Here was learning as pain. Here was learning as the discovery of one's limits. A few did not chose to see those limits in themselves, but shifted this burden of despair over onto their hosts: they were the ones who had failed. It was not the kind of situation we usually consider as conducive to growth. Here was resistance, pride, a socially difficult relation, not very talkative people.

It was not a situation in which words and questions could make anything happen, or even create a favorable friendly response. In fact, too many of them could do you in. The indifferent, unyielding, unsympathetic nature of this reality tended to turn the student back on himself. Some reassessment was necessary. His normal ways of responding, his learned expectations, his practical skills did not in themselves put him very close to the people. It was to be like this in Detroit as well. Most students, even (especially?) the ones who had done their reading well, were not prepared for this kind of encounter. Their experience was not equal to it. That is what the people in the community action agency that had placed them expected. What came as a surprise to them, what they didn't expect, was the fact that the students stayed with it, and tried to get some understanding of what was going on.

Iowa: Utopia

We placed 14 students on productive family farms of several hundred acres growing feed corn and soy beans, and with their own livestock, mostly hogs and cattle. One student lived with a newspaper editor. We arranged our home stays through the help of an official of Iowa State University in Ames. He put a story on the program in four local papers in counties around Ames. The people responding to these stories helped us to contact others. There was a good deal of interested, generous response. Two students, at their own request, were placed outside of Iowa: one in Minnesota to study the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party and the other in North Dakota to study responses to educational changes in the schools there.

Iowa made things easier. Of course, the farming was new. But getting back to familiar family ground, and the active work-oriented values put the students at home. For most, it was the least tense place, the one most like themselves, the one closest to home. Except some felt that it was more down to the earth, more sure of itself, a more integrated life than their own home situation. A real Utopia. Their ease of adjustment pointed to the lack of real difference between this kind of well-endowed rural life and their own suburban situation. It is the things done, the day to day hard work, which are different, not the basic values and life style as in Appalachia.

The land was flat all right, just as the descriptions said it would be. But the horizon was not at all a straight line. It was broken by the two-storied, upright white houses, nestled in among the rambling out-buildings and the clumps of trees. The broken horizon was important. Geometry broken up by family farms. Regularity affected by the seasons. A circle drawn over the square. The constant and fruitful contrast between nature and order. That is what students discovered in Iowa. Those houses seem to fit the horizon, improving it by qualifying the

severity of the unadorned straight plains. The farms introduce human control to that flat plain. It is not a full and unequivocal control, not at all absolute, but one tempered by the seasons and climate. A control still requiring character, skill, hard work, expert management, foresight.

It wasn't the shape of the land which made it seem like home to the students. They are used to mountains and hills. Certainly, it wasn't the chores in early morning and late afternoon. They don't usually work that hard at home. Nor were they used to the things a farmer does, or the care of the animals, or living in a small county town. What put them at home was the quality of family life, the relations within the family, the value of work. Work that can be seen from the front porch of the house, that uses technology as an instrument, that requires both planning and prowess. There is the attraction of work out of doors. Results can be measured and seen. It is work which varies: the use of a tractor, the cleaning of the pens, welding, repairing buildings and fences, hauling feed, milking, etc. Variations but work that is not just a stack of isolated tasks. Work which is whole, demanding, concrete. Work which is put together in front of and for a family. All this, and the invisibility of the city. Should we call it innocence? Probably not

In Iowa, there was the strong feeling of durability, of proportion, of things that last because they are cared for. One doesn't see things thrown away. This more prosperous farm area is less littered. Means are fully adequate to ends. The farmer controls without absolutely being in control. There is risk. Work is integrated with family, seen and shared by the family. Technology is used efficiently, and for family prosperity. It is instrumental, and not in command.

Also, it was spring, the growing season when things come alive again. A season to open out to life. A Utopia time of year. Besides, the students were eating better. The students mood of indifference came under control. They took up the present again, looked at what was before them. The work itself was not all that agreeable, especially around the hog pens. But that was just a part. Like the farm smell, it was very endurable within the whole effort. Most important was the spirit in which the work was done, the ends which it served. Family, self-suffering, challenge, profit.

There is a healthy middle to Iowa. The absence of obvious public luxury and poverty. Individual skills and personal energy do make a difference. They affect farm organization, order, effectiveness, profit. A man's experience and character and resourcefulness still are important to success. Wholeness and organic, natural change are part of the life itself: the natural growth of crops according to season, the evident stages of sowing, ripening, harvest, the variation of chores according

to the needs of crops and livestock, hard work which shows results, yet the element of uncertainty, the dependence on forces and things yet uncontrollable. It is the visibility of the work which ties the family together. Work to which all members of the family can make some contribution. Step out on the porch and look. There it is: the land, the corn, the animals, the work which makes them grow. Of course, it is not all that self-sufficient. The farmer does not produce the instruments of his own prosperity. The machinery, the pesticides, the fertilizers, the seeds come from a technology that the farmer did not create, does not sustain, and does not improve. Technology, though, which he converts to his own uses. Technology put into service. Physical labor first of all, and the pleasure that comes from having worked well, but also the mental effort: the planning, the calculation of profit, the market analysis. The farmer must look ahead, and sharply. Yet the absence of words and concepts in the work itself, right down to earth.

Behind this visible prosperity and dedication to work, is a not quite evident sadness before the hard facts of running farm. The rise in acreage and the increase of livestock necessary to make it pay. Result: the reduction of the number of farms (What can a man pass on to all of his sons?), the declining towns far from the growing peripheries of the cities, the large capital needed to start farming, the loss of the young to other occupations and ways of living, the abandoned empty houses, the decline of loyalty to a particular place with the loss of need for the durability of things, new ways of organizing one's private life, the decline of family. Prosperity and success are not given without struggle and change. The foundations shift.

But this Utopia with an uncertain future is not chosen by the students. It is achieved without confronting the tensions and pressures of the city, with too little touch with people of a different kind, class, race, sensibility. Besides the students lack the skills, ambition, experience, will. There were no conversions to the farming life.

The families were friendly and quite open to discussions with the students. For the first time in the program, students and families in an area met together, and shared dinner and a social evening. It was easily arranged, because such gatherings are not uncommon in Iowa. Discussions with students and families together did not work out at all in the south or in Appalachia. They occurred easily in Iowa. Such gatherings are enjoyed there. They are an important part of social life. Therefore, they are structured to a social use. They have their accepted ways of proceeding, their proper topics of discussion, and their established separation of participants. It was not too adaptable to our purpose of a free flowing exchange between all members of the families and the students. Not until we got to Detroit, did we have not only the pleasures of a social occasion together, but a chance to talk

in a frank and honest way about the stay, the students' responses to his family, the kind of education possible and impossible at home, and the expected consequences of such an education.

The families in Iowa were good to us. Most of the students enjoyed their time there. There was not much controversy, very few deep-reaching differences. The real stirring up was to come in Detroit.

Detroit: Alienation

This was the final stay, the only one with full time paid work. This was the city. The United Auto Workers were to help us make contacts with families. They were helpful, cooperative, interested. The various officials and staff we talked with liked the idea of the program. They sympathized with our educational aims. But we had some difficulty reaching the rank and file worker, the kind of working man who would vote for Governor Wallace in the primary election going on there. We did want at least a few stays with workers' families of Polish or Italian background. This was not possible. We were unable to reach these kinds of families through the Union. We could not even get in touch with them. We did have 9 black families out of 17 placements. The UAW in the end provided for 12 stays. The other five were through contacts by a Williams alumnus (4) and by the parents of a Williams student (1).

The Chrysler Corporation provided us with 15 jobs. This was very fortunate, and necessary. Most of the jobs were in the city, either in assembly or stamping plants. One student did some volunteer work in a city hospital. Another had a job with an exporter. The students at Chrysler worked either the day or the evening shift. The work from the start was physically tiring. It was a definite strain: first in mastering the tasks assigned, and later in mastering the boredom. This was as difficult a stay as Appalachia, for different reasons. There were four homes where considerable tension developed between student and family; three homes with lesser tension. There seemed to be more strained feelings and petty unnecessary misunderstandings in this phase of the program than in the first three. It was the last phase. Patience was not up to par. The city introduced tensions of its own. The work was tiring. Irritability showed in minor ways: payments for the stay, the use of the household, hours, personal characteristics, etc.

We had interviews arranged by the students, with union and Chrysler officials, and with outside organizations. Seven of the students went through a week of training for and with new company foremen. The students were able to see some of management's current ideas on the morale and the training of workers. The students were interested in getting to know their co-workers. Talking was not easy in the factory, and there was no association that went beyond the work in the plant.

Time outside work was spent with other students or in the family. We had two very good discussions in union members' homes. We talked about the consequences and responsibilities that follow from a study like WAH. The union men wanted to know what the students were going to do with their education. This challenge came to the students from active and involved staff members in the labor movement. They pressed the belief that the education must result in some kind of significant action. The students present resisted the idea that any particular kind of action should follow from these experiences.

Our discussions with labor and management people brought into consideration important themes: worker morale and needs, the company's conscious effort to improve both the quality of product and worker participation, the union's grievance procedures as an expression of the rule of law, the kind of educations necessary for management and foremen and the hard core unemployed, what is at stake in collective bargaining, the corporation's public stance. The discussions in Detroit went well. They were attended by a third to half of the students. The ones interested came. They were questioning and talking about work and attitudes of which they were gaining immediate experience. The smaller number helped in keeping the discussions focussed.

The students came to know very well the boredom and deadly routine of the job, not only in its effects on them but on others at work with them. They had trouble in moving the understanding from its view of their own responses to work to an analysis of the system of work in the whole plant. And, not just the organization of production, but the social structure of the plant as well. Who respects whom? What kind of association takes place? What is shared? What are the differences between the union steward and the company foreman? What goes on with drugs and drinking? Is it possible to change the work flow? How? What is the relation between union and management? What is the quality and purpose of their leadership? How are differences resolved? The program should be structured in such a way that the students ask them of each other, and answer them in association together. In Detroit, there was no program structure or requirement helping to bring them together in these inquiries. It was hard to keep the seven students in full attendance in the training program.

Students found themselves looking ahead to the return home, anticipating the promises and pleasures of summer. They found themselves indifferent to the present. Flagging interests again. Sustained direct curiosity about the realities before them slips away from the students. It is difficult to keep them in the present and alert to it. The temporary character of his job and situation (and his commitment?) causes his mind and sympathies to migrate to the future. It is not easy to keep students curious and responsive to the present, even in an active program like this one, where success depends so much on staying alert,

on keeping the mind and will on what is directly before one, on sustained thinking through implications and consequences. The last stay will probably always have more neglect.

It was from union men, officers in the union, that we got the greatest challenge about the results of our learning, about how we were going to use it. They spoke from their own commitments and work. They wanted to know why the students had come. What did they intend to do with this learning? Was it just to observe for their own pleasure, or did it involve helping working people? These were deeply felt questions. They were not, and perhaps cannot, be answered to the activists' full satisfaction. This program has not insisted upon, it has even discouraged, any direct forcing of action. Seeing and understanding alternatives is as far as we take the students. Action, of course, is discussed, but it is for each student to decide for himself what content he will give it. Each will have his own resolution to make. He will have to choose among various actions and inactions. WAH is not designed to encourage the student to either defend or to attack any particular set of beliefs, group, ideology, association. Certainly, we are concerned with choice, action, participation. We insist students make as conscious a choice as possible, when they feel themselves ready for it. But we are not concerned with forcing commitment. It must be the student's own considered judgment which connects and relates the content of what he has learned to how he lives his life, to what he uses his life for. The aim is to encourage, yes even force, the student to look at his own judgment, to see the grounds of it and the consequences. To see, to examine, to think about. And to act out of his own choosing. This implies he has a present which makes possible choice: an immediate reality of persons, things, situations which demand a response from him. WAH, though very much in the world and in the present, loses little of the ivory tower quality of the traditional liberal arts commitment. Nothing is resolved by being in Williams-at-Home. No injustices removed. No great new dedication created. The content of study is practical, particular, local, and its applications and uses derive from the state of mind, the character, the established commitments of each student. The purpose is to bring the student out of himself into the world. It is not to improve his behavior, make him scholarly, cut his hair, put a tie on him. The student should become more sure of what and who he is, through the reflection on the new people he encounters and the new situations he discovers. Hopefully, he becomes more confident, more secure, more tolerant, more open, more knowledgeable about who he is, by being taken out of what is familiar and responsive to him and put where he has to figure out the territory. Hopefully, he will learn how to smile. The students most given to despair and to withdrawal are those who spend too much time with themselves, not those who are in the world, who are aided by an active curiosity about the world. It is the encounter with things outside of and antagonistic to one's own life and values that help one discover

one's place and identity, one's loyalties and home. It is difference which both secures and educates, and makes possible

The college is a protected place, protected from action and the pressures of home, but not protected from giving reasons. Not from explanation, discussion, argument. The college is one of the few places in life where one can experiment, risk, try out ideas without the pressures of action or the demands of loved ones. But each of us, teacher and student, is accountable for his judgments. He must explain himself in words, not just by actions. WAH does not betray the college in its primary function of preferring reason over kinship and love. The college must also protect the student from demands for definitive behavior, party loyalty, home ties. The student dwells in a place apart for these four years, where even the strong ties of home and family are looked at, considered, seen. But not necessarily acted upon. In Detroit, this educational stance was not well understood or accepted by either labor or management. Both wanted commitment. Which is a proper expectation for people active in the world.

Looking Back

The "home" situations went well. There were few falling-outs. In 68 placements, only twice did we change locations. But staying together does not necessarily mean open and understanding relations. There was surprisingly little tension between student and family. Both sides adjusted to each other with some grace. The students did make a definite effort to get along. They did it well, reaching out more than half way. Even in Detroit, where there was the most friction, adjustment tensions were unsettling in only four places.

There are quite marked differences in students' ability to reach people on their own ground. That is the real test: listening and understanding. Most students can survive in a home, achieving a normal and routine interaction, protecting themselves and missing communication through conventional politeness. They are not used to moving right into a family at home. They have never been educated in this way. The students show an engaging openness, natural to their background and youth, and appreciated by the families. With very little effort or thought, they can be relaxed and smiling, which is not the same as getting into close touch with the family. Communication takes much more effort, alertness, listening, sympathy, than it takes to produce a friendly smile. But being at home does start with that smile. The students genuinely want to reach their families, to develop friendships with them. That takes not only listening, but encouraging people to talk and respond. Students have very little experience doing this. It has not been part of their growing up or their education. It has not been encouraged in them by adults. There are no courses on it in the college.

Students do not learn by the same instruments. They do not learn the same things in the same situations. Home stays are not the best means of learning for everyone. Some students do not have the sensitivity suited to this kind of learning. It does not mean that they are not received well or responded to by the families. Generous treatment is more common than deep-going communication. Not really at ease in the home situation, students fall back on convention. Affability is often a cover for the absence of understanding. Very smooth relations may be used to hide the fact that neither side has gotten very close. It is necessary to be able to see and to sort out differences between a conventionally friendly situation and real understanding. It is hard to predict how a home relation will go; how much a student will profit from being at-home. On the other side, understanding is different from friendship, although the two do go well together. There is no one best way of educating, one best method of putting dimension into a person's perception. There are many ways to open an individual to both specialized and larger sympathies, and yet the ways which work for any one individual are so particular to him. It should be evident that Williams-at-Home is definitely not the best way for every student.

Living in single person households did not work out well in terms of discovery and learning. In future arrangements, effort should be made to place the student in a full, even an overflowing, family. This is more important than the convenience of having a private room all to oneself, no matter how comfortable the room is. Being able to be alone is helpful, and may even be necessary. But the learning takes place right in the family.

The easy, casual stance of openness and friendliness in the student seldom showed in it any sense of being patronizing or condescending. For most students, there was a relaxed willingness and ease in accepting things as they were. The students enjoyed their home stays: they felt at-home. They were not "studying" these families. Nor did they appear that way. They did not put their families off. From their side, the families did not usually question or press the students too closely. They did not try to figure them out as they were back home.

In the south and in Iowa, there was very little personal strain, with some interesting exceptions. Appalachia was different. The difficulties then were physical of course, but the pride and the independence did create problems of personal communication. In Detroit, there were some class tensions, but little evident racial tension.

The students had no difficulty with academically derived pre-judgments getting in the way of understanding. Pre-judgment is much overrated as an inhibiting factor in responding to people. It is not at all

a problem. Students tend to forget what they have learned in preparation for the home stays. More accurately, they are highly selective in what they do remember. It is not the study at Williams that prejudices them; it is their early life experience. They carry their prejudices around with them; they don't get them out of books.

The college should be reassured by the ease with which the students made the adjustment to families. The people living with them think well of the program and of the college. But what does this harmony tell us about the education going on? There are two possible grounds of harmonious adjustment: 1) the two sides are quite alike, and build an understanding on these similarities or 2) they do not really know what they share, but one side has suspended its own judgment in the interest of understanding the other. The second makes for an easy living situation if differences are quite marked but there is a loss of dialogue. Deep disagreements are hard on honesty. To be at home with conflict, the two sides must trust each other. That is hard to bring about in such a short period of being together. In Detroit, conflict mostly took the form of somewhat trivial quarrels on money, household rules and routine, food, etc. Frustration was expressed through these domestic quarrels, but they were not the real cause of friction. Even with the good intentions on both sides, we were not very successful in creating honest, open, straight-forward discussions of differences. We didn't develop very well that mutual respect which allows people to deal with opposition openly and without anger or malice. The harmony achieved was mainly through the silence of the student where he felt his judgments might offend. He tended to avoid conflict-raising issues. Of course, controversy alone does not do the job of educating. In learning, conflict must provide some clarification. It must distinguish, show alternatives. Effective opposition should bring out something new and unseen about each side. It should push us to look more closely.

The four institutions we emphasized in the fall were the school, the police, the hospital, the church. In the spring, the students were expected to look at these institutions in their local structure and expression. The four institutions were to stimulate interest and encourage discovery and criticism. But the students' interest in the institutions was forced. They did make visits and ask questions of participants and leaders, but the interest did not last, nor was there much comparison. Even the visits were somewhat haphazard. The contacts were according to chance and convenience, without much preparation or basic questions in mind. Responses were not developed, criticized, tested. Schools received the most attention, probably because the students felt so close to them in time and experience.

Thus, the institutional dimension of this program was not successful. Descriptions and comparisons were few, and not very penetrating,

not very conducive to cooperation among students. There was no natural, meaningful movement of analysis from family to institution, not much viewing of the institutions from the family's perspective. Instead of stressing these particular institutions, it might be better to look at the person at home, and at his opinion on a variety of life situations (work, leisure, recreation, the old, authority, love, religion, marriage, liberation, etc.). Important is how much the person feels himself an individual and separate from others. How much stake does he have in being involved in a group? What does it mean to him? How does he associate? What are the ends of association? the means?

It is important to begin with an understanding of a person's unique quality, his at-homeness. This is made possible by living in the family. But the student must also have an idea of the setting of his family's life, how others see and react to the family, how it compares in value, opportunities, love to other families. There is a distinction here between two kinds of knowing: what we learn from our contact with persons and what we learn systematically. It is the latter in which the college was most helpful. In the fall, through books, we learned different views and conceptions of public authority, the kinds of adjustment made by different groups, analyses of different systems of power, the kinds of adjustment made by different classes, etc. With a background in these descriptions, with the specific understanding he gets living in the family, with his own expanding experience as he moves through the separate phases of home living, the student should begin to build knowledge beyond what just one or several members of the family are able to tell him. The student comes to know more about a person and his situation than that person can tell him.

This use of other sources for information and enlightenment is not an undermining of the personal relation. It is not a betrayal of the person. All depends upon how this knowledge is used. There are both good and bad uses of such knowledge: to appreciate, to take advantage, to reenforce one's self, to understand, to control, to set back, to love, to command, etc. How one uses the knowledge is the important test of whether we can speak of betrayal or not. This program aims to use it to see the contradictions of private and public life, to understand very different kinds of people and the adjustments they make, to attempt to get some perspective on differences through talking about them. The purpose of analysis is not to control, not to take advantage, not to second guess, not to fit individuals into arbitrary categories and imprison them there. This study insists on gaining and using the two kinds of knowledge: the analysis of situations and the direct engagement of persons. Both are essential parts of learning: knowing the situation which is the most foreign to us and the free contact with the person which is usually the most reconciling. It is again the contrast which instructs: the universal, theoretical, general bent implied in the

articulation of situation and the particular, practical, immediate quality of the face-to-face encounter. What is learned outside the home experience should be made known to the family, where it is possible and appropriate and without offense. This kind of open discussion is difficult to bring about, especially where such a practice is quite unknown in the social life of the family. But with the right kind of persuasion and sincerity, it may be more possible than our lack of experience with it seems to indicate. Certainly parts, if not all, of the students' papers should be made available to his adopted family. Some of the hosts in the program have specifically requested to see the papers. Now, we leave the decision or distribution to the writers. Is this the best way?

We were not too successful in bringing about substantial discussion among differing students. A new program should emphasize more the cooperation of students with each other. Students do talk to each other easily and seriously where there are common interests and similar styles of living. Where there are individual differences of character, interest, judgment, they fail to try to engage or to understand each other. They are not good at bringing each other out without the support of friendship.

Williams-at-Home is a college program. Application for participation is open to all. Its purpose is not to create friendships, although friendships are likely to develop. It is a program which consciously recruits different kinds of students and which values contrasting readings of experience. Students are expected to exchange judgments, analyses, responses. They don't do this very well. It's not what they have learned to do. It is not in their education. Students are certainly interested in what is happening to each other. They like to hear what is going on in different parts of the program. But they do not really engage each other, argue, comment, criticize, push each other into judgments. They do not seek together a greater generality about what they are experiencing. They like to stay close to their experience, talk to friends, protect the experience from the criticism of those not friendly. The result is that they do not differentiate, theorize; they mostly comment. They do not talk, correct, focus, contend, disagree out in public with students who are not their friends. They are not equipped for that public dialectic in which the participants push their insight a little further in answer to each others' questions and criticisms. They are unable to move their observations together to a higher understanding. It's not really their fault. It has not been a part of their education. They have always sat alongside other students in class, not facing them.

Some felt that when we did come together as a group, it was too much like Williams: competitive, abstract, calculated, a kind of showing off one's ability to talk and analyze. That does happen, for competition

is part of spirited discussion. A certain competitiveness gives an edge to discussion. But it is essential to focus the competition and analysis on the objective understanding, not on the status of the people talking. The aim of discussion is to overcome spontaneity, to build on experience, to move up and away from local immediate insights, to raise the understanding above the individual and specific relationship of family and student. It is both appropriate and necessary for a Williams student to go outside of "at home" values, to know something else about the local situation than his family tells him. Williams-at-Home does not stay at home. The maintenance of local values is more important for personal security than it is for education. The home values are the foundation of security. They are not very good for reality testing. We have to build at least part of our understanding of the family situation on knowledge which members of the family cannot and do not give us. Probably he will distrust, possibly resent and reject, this knowledge from outside, this disciplined generalized knowledge. He won't see himself in its categories, in its analyses, in its theories. He will feel it's distorted. Especially if he has been made defensive about his home by what he feels to be external attack on it.

Many of the families with whom the students lived do not value book knowledge. They live quite well out of their own particular experiences. Both the family and its student visitor may resist theoretical knowledge not only to preserve what little local control each has, but in the interest of defending the relation between them. The college is not interested in preserving that relation between family and student, except insofar as it helps the student learn. The knowledge that Williams as an institution believes in and makes possible is certainly relevant to and descriptive of life situations but that knowledge is not seen as essential by those living in or fighting against those situations. Williams aims at knowledge beyond the ordinary insight and low level generalizations of common sense experience. It is on a separate track. It rejects undifferentiated experience. It aims to sort out, select, examine in a very conscious effort to see something more precise and verifiable than common sense can give. This knowledge, so important to any well defined discipline and so critical of common sense, could come between a student and his family, and if taken and applied literally would prevent a close relationship developing at all. In its effort to see as objectively as possible, this knowledge is antagonistic to home values. It has different foundations, serves different purposes, speaks in a different tongue. It should now be evident how different in character, style, method, purpose is the WAH presence in the home from that of a social scientist who comes home for research.

In placing the home stays at the center of the Williams-at-Home education, we affirm the insights and qualities relevant to being at home, but we do not affirm them from inside. We do not affirm the home values

as sufficient for a true education. We do not affirm them as sufficient to finding one's way in life, among the day-to-day realities of life.

We return to Williams to affirm its methods of knowing, analyzing, distinguishing, taking distance. We return with a richer expanded content of experience. We return with revised purposes for the Williams education. It is not for profession or discipline or academic major that we study, talk, read, write, contest. It is for discovery of and personal orientation in the world. It is to see the world in its ambiguities, contrasts, dislocations, paradoxes, confusions, ideals, hypocracies, and whatever else. Yes, and to get some kind of view of its injustices and their causes. The education essential to this seeing is not a betrayal of practical things, not an abandonment of family and friends, but an affirmation of them and of the knowledge necessary to living well with them. There is much to study and to read about beyond our local experience. History, social structure, class values, racial attitudes, geography: one could make a very long list. When we move outside the familiar circle drawn around us by our early experience, there is much more to know and to discover than results from living at home.

The origin and form of systematic knowledge may come from very different sources and be experienced in very different ways. But it is always subject to criticism by professional peers. Knowledge may be intuitively understood, arising from direct participant observation, or it may take the form of well defined, precise, generalized hypotheses or propositions. The latter is what Williams as an institution most values and around which it builds its association. It is a standard which is used to judge (not always consciously or perfectly) the various projects of the college. It is both a good and necessary standard, but not complete enough for a full education. It is not enough for us to be definitive about what we do inside this kind of systematic framework. It is necessary as well to show it in contrast with another kind of knowing: the at-home kind of knowing. Each student (and teacher) has a mixture of the two in him. His particular response will be shaped by the emphasis of his own personality, his present situation and encouragement, his early education, his style, his taste, his mind and feelings. Keep your eye on the student. Will he choose to use a documented, analytical report or a personal diary as a means of expressing what has happened to him in WAH?

The students' most unqualified success was in coming home to America. It was not just the strong feeling they had for the individuality of people and place, but the discovery of the difference in being at home and being at Williams. They got to the starting point, a modest but necessary accomplishment. Among the best papers written for the program were personal diaries, in which were recorded the day to day particulars.

It was in getting beyond these first descriptions and encounters that the students ran into trouble. It was difficult to raise what the student saw to a higher level of generality. He did not succeed in using what he learned, in concert with others, to moving beyond the individual and particular.

Inside the family, there are prime questions to be answered before the study of outside institutions. How do members of the family see education, rather than how the schools are run What do law and order and justice mean to them, rather than the description of a police officer in a patrol car? What is the significance of health to their condition and how available is it, rather than determining what the doctor's effort is in the hospital? What are the members of the families feelings about youth, old age, work, labor, leisure, childhood, marriage, love, politics, power, compassion, profession, loyalty? And what are the consequences of these responses and feelings for others, for the local community? How do they relate to outsiders or strangers? How do they associate and for what ends? Of course, the questions are not asked so literally and obviously as listed here. The communication is far more ambiguous, indefinite, subtle than simply questions and answers. There are silences which are important as answers.

Where does all this leave us?

Williams-at-Home II: Looking Ahead

The students' observations and insights, our talks together, this paper, conversations with families, all point to changes in the program. There is a next step in these experiments in educating by experience. A step building on our successes and correcting our failures. What shape and content do these discoveries suggest for WAH II? Where do we go from here?

We haven't really worked out clearly yet the relation between what is learned in the fall and what is learned in the spring. We are aware conceptually of the difference between Williams and "at-home," but we haven't yet solved the problem how practically to relate one to the other. The kind of sensitivity and skill involved in both questioning and responding to people has been too little developed in the students' education. The normal modes of academic questioning are not appropriate. A person at ease and creative in the Williams classroom will not necessarily do so well at home.

It is said by some professional students of elections that most people are unpolitical. They mean by this that what is close up, immediate, and local is more important to people than issues of public policy. Good

enough, but there are further assumptions that are not so good. It is contended that most people do not think coherently about politics. They have no ideology, no position, no worked out political views. This is said to be most evident in the public realm, in the expression of their reactions to public issues. Perhaps, but this is certainly not true on a person's own grounds, in his home. He is there much more whole, much surer of himself, more willing to go into depth on his feelings. He is not necessarily consistent. That is not much of a value with him. But he does have his own judgments. In the home, the positive grounds of his commitments and thinking are more evident. These same judgments often appear in public as defensive, as negative, as resentful. Many people feel that their private lives and spaces (which institutionally are their schools and their churches) are being invaded by persons, groups, claims unsympathetic to them. They feel they are being pushed by people who have no sympathy for the quality and character of their private lives at home. This was most the case in Appalachia and Detroit.

Our fundamental premise remains in this program: the student must live at home and close to families, and have access to the work situation of the main provider of the family. The students are capable of living at home with very little tension. They are accepted in a variety of home situations with very different kinds of people. The ability to learn from such an experience is a different thing, far more tenuous and uncertain. The students vary quite markedly in the amount and kind of learning possible.

The way we teach and study at Williams produces very little guidance or direction or example for the at home kind of learning. Our means of proceeding, the kind of knowledge we seek, the performances we reward are not dictated by at home standards. Discovery and understanding of the person on his own home grounds is not just asking him what he thinks about work, old age, politics, marriage, leisure, authority. It does involve asking questions, but not until one has penetrated the density of local things, of seeing a person at home, with his family, among his peers, at the shop, in the neighborhood. The questions must arise out of trust and understanding, not out of a desire to have objective knowledge about the family's condition. Categorizing and generalizing have very little standing with families. They criticize the students for the time taken in writing papers. But questions which follow from a trusted association do get a response. Also, a question about age does not follow directly from just talk on aging, but from observations about what is said and done with old people in the family.

Most people don't learn and perfect their judgment according to the curriculum of a liberal arts college. That approach is very

artificial for them. The curriculum was not created to cope with and be successful in local situations. Its purpose is to arrive above locality, to move toward universals not to master the particulars. For success in the home situation, Williams does not prepare the student but inhibits him. It adopts an attitude toward locality which is highly suspect by local people. This is expressed in the quite conscious tensions between town and gown. Williams-at-Home enters the home not for purposes of research, not to take an opinion poll, not to have a representative sample. But it should enter the home equipped by the college in the background of what is found there: history, economic factors, institutions, class structure, etc. It describes the situation with words and concepts that the family would not use. The student who is only his Williams education will never penetrate the locality; just as the student who is solely interested in particular people will never search the people of this locality for higher insight and comparison. This program thrives on both of these kinds of students put into touch and put into conversation. If each student becomes aware of these two elements in himself and sees which one has priority for him, it means his education has begun.

The sensitive student will soon become aware that there are no definitive, unequivocal answers to traditional questions of authority, law, power, war, education, death. Nor are their definitive answers for himself in this period. In the first assigned paper, he becomes aware of how little these things are thought about, worked out, clearly articulated in his own growth. We can ask these difficult and theoretical questions at Williams College because we have institutional support for them. This is not true in the family, nor is it true among peers. We are most like others in our public lives, and most subject to others' judgments there. We are most like ourselves at home and most reassured of ourselves there. We must keep them separate. When the home is used for public purposes, there are the possibilities of emotional problems; when the public is used for home purposes, there are the possibilities of corruption.

One of the courses in the fall should be a workshop course. The student writes a paper in the summer on himself, his background, his education, his experience with different kinds of people and institutions, his grounds of judging authority. These papers are read by other students in the program. They comment, criticize, perhaps even celebrate. The paper is rewritten later in the course and again criticized by his fellow student. For the second paper, four groups of 6 are formed to study a special kind of association in the area: old people in North Adams, the Polish community in Adams, the faculty in Williamstown, professionals in Pittsfield, blacks in Albany, etc. They write their papers in conference groups of 6. They make their presentation to the other 18 students, receive criticism, and then rewrite the papers. Through this process of writing and discussing and rewriting, the students should become conscious of what they are doing, what they are seeing,

how they are putting it together. There should be some reading on various ways of observing and describing people and situations. Students should be encouraged to start a diary on their observations and judgments. It is a very effective instrument of learning for some students. All should be encouraged to try it.

There are three other required courses in the fall: an economics course of basic theory as it applies to the American situations and institutions with some emphasis on industry, farming, poverty, regions; an American history course stressing the biographical approach; and a course on public authority including the issues and claims of authority in contemporary America together with analyses and descriptions of people and groups like the ones the students will encounter in the spring.

The central theme of WAH II will be association, the way people come together in specific localities, how they see themselves and others, the difference within associations, and the consequences of association for those outside. The first home stays will look at groups of people who are outside of or in the process of entering public life. The setting will be middle sized towns in the south and west. There will be 4 groups with six students in each. Six will go to live with different members of the black community in Savannah, Georgia, six will live with Chicanos in El Paso, Texas, six with American Indians in Gallup, New Mexico, six with the rural poor in Whitesburg, Kentucky.

The second group of home stays will emphasize the loyalty of small towns and rural areas as contrasted with the loyalty of ethnic groups in larger cities. The students will live with people who come together with some sense of durability of the place and the neighborhood. Six students will go to a small town in Iowa surrounded by family farms; six will go to a small town in Nebraska or the Dakotas surrounded by corporate wheat farming, and two groups of 6 will go to live with ethnic neighborhoods in Cleveland and in Saint Louis.

The third and final phase of home stays will emphasize power and professional values, placing the students in situations requiring the planning and sustaining of large production and financial enterprises. Four groups of 6 students will be formed to go to Chrysler and the UAW in Detroit, to bankers in Chicago, to corporation lawyers in New York, to the steel industry in Pittsburgh. The groups of six will be composed of different students in each of the three phases of the program.

The papers will be written with the students in communication and consultation with each other. As a group, they will work out the form of the paper and the contribution of each member. Because it is difficult to write in the home, and the hosts are not at all enthusiastic about this writing, 10 days of discussions and writing will take place

at the end of each of the three phases. The papers will be read and discussed by all participants in the program. The locations should be away from distractions, probably in some natural area. The first stay will be at Big Bend Park on the Rio Grande in Texas.

Although it is difficult, perhaps impossible, some effort should be made to involve the families in these discussions and papers. Several families can meet with students in discussions during the six weeks, and read some of the papers written after the students leave. Students should be encouraged to return to these homes. Certainly we hope that some contacts will be renewed beyond the period of the program.

Each group of students will be given contact people in each of these places. The students on arrival will help to arrange the home stays. It is expected that they will seek out families in very different situations, classes, employment, and with contrasting judgments. We hope all the students in one location will be in touch with each other: listening, making distinctions, forming judgments, criticizing each other, exchanging insights on an informal basis. It is necessary to avoid too much interaction, of course. That will have to be worked out. Hopefully there will be as full an exchange as possible with their families in ways in which the family can respond.

These ideas are somewhat sketchy at this point. Students of the present Williams-at-Home will have to work them over. We hope to get some perspective and guidance on them from parents, persons who participated with us in the field, and faculty at Williams College.

* * * * *

That does it for now. But don't think that this is the final work on Williams-at-Home. This doesn't complete the evaluation. It merely begins it. After all, it was the students who were at home in all these places. The next step we take with them: their reports on what happened, what it meant to them, what they learned, how they would change things. In this report, we look from the college out; they will look from the experience back.

Robert L. Gaudino