

~~THE NEW SCHOOL~~
~~SOCIAL RESEARCH~~

~~THE~~
~~NEW~~
~~SCHOOL~~

~~NEW SCHOOL~~
~~BULLETIN~~

~~NEW SCHOOL~~

~~NEW SCHOOL~~

~~NEW SCHOOL~~
~~BULLETIN~~

~~NEW SCHOOL~~

~~NEW~~
~~SCHOOL~~

~~NEW SCHOOL~~
~~or~~
~~SOCIAL~~
~~RESEARCH~~

~~THE NEW SCHOOL FOR GENERAL STUDIES~~

~~NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH~~

BY ANY NAME

THE VERA LIST CENTER FOR ART AND POLITICS
AND PARTS & LABOR GALLERY PRESENT
"BY ANY NAME" -
AN INSTALLATION AND EXAMINATION OF
INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY AND ARCHIVING
AT THE NEW SCHOOL

OCTOBER 19-24, OUTSIDE OF
66 W. 12TH STREET, NEW YORK

2009

**By Any Name: A Tiny Archive of
Critical Viewpoints on The New School
2009**

The desire to collect, organize, and store artifacts for posterity constitutes a principal mode in the social production of knowledge. *Archive* is the metaphor that we use to describe this process as well as its physical result. It is a catalog of desires, awash in the presence of the past but also haunted by absent voices.

The archive is at once an epistemology—a way of viewing the world—and at the same time it is a material fixture, comprising texts, objects, points of access, rituals of circulation, and designed spaces. Whether open source or closed to prying eyes, the archive is a mentality that conditions its material form.

–Joseph Heathcott, “Archive/City”
Chair, Urban Studies
Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts

Table of Contents

Preface	I
Acknowledgements	II
Introduction	1
Essays	3
Survey Responses	23

Preface

Sly, provocative, gentle and true – *By Any Name* celebrates The New School’s 90th anniversary at a time when the university contends with a highly publicized period of internal criticism and activism. The voices assembled in this publication examine the school’s legacy of progressive pedagogy and institutional policy, and ask that it remain a catalyst for social transformation in the future. The booklet complements an exhibition by the same title – with workshops, classes, lectures, and séances with psychics – and feeds into a yearlong series of programs on “Speculating on Change,” the Vera List Center’s program theme for 2009-2010.

–Carin Kuoni,
Director, Vera List Center for Art and Politics
The New School

Acknowledgments

The Vera List Center and Parts & Labor Gallery would like to thank the following individuals for their support, knowledge, and generosity:

Andy Bichlbaum, Seth Cohen, Tess Drahman, Luana Elias, Mark Fitzpatrick, Julia Foulkes, Alyssa Herman, Thomas Iliceto, Brian Kase, Lin + Lam, Peter J. Russo, Robert Sember, Tim Sheldon, Julie Snavely, Chen Tamir, and Pam Tillis.

Parts & Labor Gallery would especially like to thank:

Carin Kuoni, thank you for having the confidence, faith, and vision to support three truck-drivers, fueled by a little diesel and some dreams.

Alyssa Pheobus, this project would not have come together without you. Thank you for your skills, patience, and wisdom.

Introduction

This slim volume in the guise of an exam book contains responses submitted by members of the university community to questions about institutional identity and memory posed by the *By Any Name* team: the Vera List Center, internal to The New School, and Parts & Labor, an external entity whose staff consists of three New School alumni. These statements were solicited as part of an exhibition which examined the art of preservation at an institution with a legacy worth some attention. Renowned for its commitment to progressive adult education and socially-minded scholarship, The New School has a lot to live up to—recording its identity, over time, is an essential part of its responsibility to its own future, and to a general posterity.

The writings herein were sought in several ways—first, through a brief questionnaire disseminated to New School addresses in a mass e-mail, and hand-delivered to as many faculty mailboxes as could be found by the Vera List Center’s hard-working interns; second, through one-on-one conversations with members of The New School community in the form of an impromptu missive, a passing chat, a scheduled class visit or staff meeting, etc. Since beginning work on this project in May 2009, we estimate over 500 individuals among The New School population were invited to participate in this publication, which was our attempt to archive a moment in time in The New School’s history, as articulated by the voices of those who constitute its community.

And so, with the exhibition a mere three days away, we ask ourselves: Given the range of personalities, backgrounds, talents, areas of expertise, and given the not-few numbers of divisions, faculty, staff, students, and resources at The New School, why is this publication pocket-size? Why was there not a flood of responses, or a few impressive waves, or even the semblance of a steady trickle? Certainly, we could have been more diligent with our outreach, more strategic with our approach; but there are wider implications. For every response received, there are countless ones which never materialized—and not because this majority has nothing to say about their institution.

As it turns out, the signature requirement, applied to both the free-form and survey responses included in this booklet, prevented many from committing to participate. More often than not did we receive the reply: “I wish I could, but I wouldn’t feel comfortable putting my name on it...” The fear inherent in this decision is understandable, stemming as it did in most cases from fear of

offending the institution. Yet this vague sense of fear begs a very simple question: Why, at an institution founded on the basis of academic freedom, does such fear take the place of expression? Both the size of this volume—small—and the quality of those insights we *did* receive—high—say something about this moment in the school’s history, which formed the focus of *By Any Name*.

Art has the ability to express what cannot be communicated otherwise. Yet this process we attempted to start with *By Any Name*—the process of making meaning and constructing an identity which cannot be named—occurs in every aspect of life. In a sense, we are all charged with creating and defining the things around us which cannot be named, and naming them. If John Cage enabled us to hear silence, surely we can hear sound. It is loud; we simply have to listen.

–Brooke Chroman & Meghan Roe
Co-Directors, Parts & Labor Gallery

Essays from The New School Community

(In alphabetical order by authors' last names)

“myNewSchool”

**Nicholas Allanach, Asst. Director of Academic Affairs
The New School for General Studies**

“Within every cynic you’ll find a disappointed idealist.” –George Carlin

Life is full of clichés that define how we understand reality; ultimately, we decide which ones to accept or reject. Thus, as educated and “engaged global citizens” we must not only question clichés, but challenge those we perpetuate. I suppose, a strong cliché for me is “The system is broken.”

As an undergrad, this cliché resonated loudly in my mind. I wanted to “change the world for the better.” Although the system was “broken,” I truly believed socially conscious people could build better and more just systems. Accordingly, when I heard about The New School’s “progressive history” and founding mission “to create a place where global peace and justice were more than theoretical ideals,” I enthusiastically applied to The New School for Social Research and saved money for my move from Maine to Manhattan. But before leaving home, my friends of a “hippy,” “punk,” and “anarchist” persuasion justly asked *how* I planned on “changing the world by reading Hegel?” ... Good question, and I knew an answer wasn’t going to come easy. In fact, after years of wondering “What the hell was this all for?” I realize they were correct—real change doesn’t come through old philosophical theories or from heady discussions about Robespierre at cocktail receptions. Sure, theory provides a foundation, but it is through practice and application that a broken system can be fixed.

My brief six years at The New School have been rewarding and challenging. I’ve made many friends and feel honored to work at an organization that educates and encourages open and free discourse. Along my academic journey, I’ve earned an MA in Liberal Studies, a Certificate in Screenwriting, and am currently earning a Certificate in Teaching English as a Second Language. Thus, I continue to move (perhaps like The New School itself) away from theory and toward practice. Whatever I do, I know I still want to “change the world for the better,” but I never want to become the aloof academic, who narcissistically believes I’m making the world a “better place” by only associating with those within the safe walls of an academic institution.

Admittedly, it’d be disingenuous to assert I’ve “changed the world for the better.” Or even that I believe The New School remains true to its history. Somewhere along the line that stretches back to the day I walked into 65 Fifth Avenue as an idealistic student, to where I sit now as an administrator behind a desk—I know I lost something. Perhaps, I’ve become a cliché? Sure I’ve tossed aside the Hegel, but for what? ... Fukuyama? This may not be “the end of history” for civilization or The New School, but sometimes it feels like it; it sucks to admit—the crooks won, the good guys lost.

Indeed, “the system’s broken.” But instead of sulking let’s start solving as we continue to change as individuals and as a school. Accordingly, I still expect “myNewSchool” to be one of the few places left where any repairs to this broken system can occur.

“The Orozco Room”

**Margaret Boe Birns, Literature Faculty Member
The New School for General Studies**

When I first started teaching at The New School, the Orozco Room was open to students. I would often teach classes in that room, with all the faded Marxist icons staring down at me through a haze of student cigarette smoke that can't have done them much good. No one seemed to care. Although I would always point out the murals at the first session of each class, I was always surprised at the lack of interest, despite the fact that my New School students were so warm, so intelligent, so brave in thought and often also in action. But then, these were changing times, and although Kafka was still something of the rage, I was making much of authors such as Virginia Woolf, Jack Kerouac, and Doris Lessing in her mad, mystic phase. Hardly the party line.

The moon was in the seventh house and it was the dawning of the Age of Aquarius; the talk was of the New Left and the New Age. My gesture to the working class heroes of the past was always partly ironic, but I also often wondered what the figures in the Orozco painting would think of my classes as they gazed down at me—would they approve? Would they give me their blessing? Perhaps it didn't matter—far from their sometimes frightening and menacing historical reality, they seemed to be fading away, unappreciated and neglected. Relegated, fallen from power in a manner perhaps reminiscent of the procedures of every Soviet workers' society that was one of its celebrated subjects.

But then it seemed to me that suddenly—sometime in the '80s—the murals were restored to their original vibrancy and the room made into something of an inner sanctum, a bit of a forbidden city. I sometimes wonder if the Orozco murals miss the fun and energy of the classroom, but it is nice to remember how much they have been through, how much they have seen and heard; those murals were in the thick of things. And although those days are behind the murals, I am happy The New School has given this neglected political panorama its due, not only for its aesthetic value, but as a way to remember the “old left” wing scholars who founded the school back when revolution was in the air, and the narratives were grand.

“Aims of Education”

**Julia Foulkes, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
The New School for General Studies**

I teach in the original undergraduate program of The New School, opened in 1944, partly in response to the G.I. Bill of World War II in which the federal government helped veterans go to college after returning from the war. The degree program placed undergraduate students alongside the original audience of the school, anyone who wanted learn something new. This tradition continues today. In every class I teach, the students are people who want to reinvent themselves. Some have never gone to college, some may have gone to college and left before finishing to pursue a more immediate passion, and some have come here from another school because they believe this education is more aligned with their values and principles. They are parents who are determined to finish college now that their children have; entrepreneurs who made money and now want to think about ideas without that aim in mind; and waiters who want to be filmmakers and writers. Whether they are pursuing a degree or not, these are people looking to education to answer questions, acquire a skill, consider a new career—and to see themselves anew.

Ninety years ago, disaffected faculty members from Columbia University initiated another kind of reinvention, that of the university itself. In 1919, The New School for Social Research began with six lectures in the spring from esteemed intellectuals of the time, Charles Beard, James Robinson, and Thorstein Veblen among them, and expanded in the fall to a fuller offering of courses in the social sciences, social work, and public affairs. Some of the founding ideas for the school came from John Dewey, the prominent philosopher whose book *Democracy and Education* came out just three years prior. Dewey never had a formal appointment at The New School but lent his influence and ideas to the founding of the school, lectured here occasionally, and celebrated his 70th, 80th, and 90th birthdays here. (Dewey’s 150th birthday celebration occurs this year alongside the university’s 90th.) Dewey argued for the moral necessity of education because “conscious life is a continual beginning afresh.” He maintained that education was life-long, not confined to a particular age or institutional setting, and critical to the workings of a sound democracy. These principles formed The New School’s commitment to educating citizens on the crucial issues of the day. In its initial inception, The New School combined a research institute with a direct telling of those ideas to the public through courses and lectures. The first formal document of the school proclaimed that people would come for “no other purpose than to learn.”

A university provides a structure in which people generate and exchange ideas, not only in the classroom but in its governance. The impetus for The New School, in fact, resulted from faculty members who disputed the decision-making in the firing of faculty members at Columbia who expressed disapproval with the government for entering World War I. The New School’s reinvention of the university instituted faculty governance and closer relations between students and faculty alongside a robust embrace of academic freedom at its heart. When the school began, faculty made up four of the eleven board members and all decisions were approved by the faculty, from the content of courses to the amount of money spent on supplies. Three years later, Alvin Johnson began putting together an administrative structure to support the faculty. (Johnson’s administrative contributions are still with us today, as the referent for Alvin, the

repository of personal data for everybody who is a part of The New School.) These first few years of the school reveal both the appeal of and need for faculty governance and the difficulty in building an enduring institution solely on that foundation. Faculty and administrators need one another. The Manichean divide that has developed in universities between faculty and administration—on loud display last year at The New School—is one that I grapple with personally as I take on more administrative. I am faculty and administrator. I understand the tasks as different—teaching and research occupies more of my time as a faculty member; policy-making and managing take up my day as an administrator—but the obligations are the same: to put student learning at the center of what we do; to think about and advance ideas that will better that learning, at the university and in the world. Perhaps the reinvention of our university most needed right now is to renew these obligations, both faculty and administrators. This demands extensive, serious, and well-intentioned debate about what it is that faculty best govern, what aims of education administrators hold, and what of our many—and contradictory—founding ideals we should preserve.

Reinvention entails missteps. Newcomers to The New School often note that we are very good here at spending an enormous amount of time creating and discussing policies that are commonplace elsewhere. Our name creates a mandate—to make it new—and yet often we end up with policies, curriculum, and structures that are either just as they were or exist plainly elsewhere that could have been more easily replicated. We reinvent the wheel, and call it a *new* kind of circle.

Taking a look further back at the history of the university, it is clear that this proclivity for reinvention has been the only constancy. Just three years after the school began, Alvin Johnson not only instituted an administrative structure in addition to faculty governance but reoriented the school to focus more particularly on students rather than a research institute; he also turned the curriculum away from a strict focus on politics, public affairs, and social work to the arts, literature, and psychology. Ten years later, the University-in-Exile put firmly in place the research institute first conceived. From that, Johnson built a degree-granting graduate program—in defiance of the original impulse to forego degrees in favor of a less instrumental view of education. The reinventions only accelerated in the coming decades: the school established a Dramatic Workshop in 1940 that closed down nine years later; considered a merger with NYU in the early '60s and then opened a seminar college that we now call Lang; and acquired Parsons School of Design in 1970 and Mannes College of Music in 1989, creating an opportunity for integration between the arts, design, and the liberal arts that, almost forty years later, we are still attempting to build. These changes have not been merely opportunistic; they have embodied vastly different views about what kind of university this is.

Newcoming students, faculty, and administrators will likely quickly become enmeshed in the ongoing, nearly relentless discussions about the reinventions of our university. But those conversations are matched or exceeded about the necessary reinventions of our society as well. The university began with a mission to impact the world, to understand societal problems and come up with solutions—and there is an impressive tradition of doing exactly that. The assessment of our impact, I think, should come less from what faculty members have achieved, notable as they are, than what our students have accomplished.

Enduring reinvention entails figuring out what needs to be new. The New School today is not the school of 1919 or 1933 or 1970, nor should it be. This new school is now old. (Or, in the long history of universities, perhaps it has reached puberty.) We face the task of remaining relevant while also honoring our self-made tradition. The university's reinventions demand difficult confrontations, compromises of ideals, and losses. There are mischaracterizations of what the university was and is. Looking at our past should not be in an exercise in nostalgia or even a map to the future. Instead, it is a way to meet the present with informed critique. The full past of the university, not just its most well-known moments long ago, should inform a wide-ranging, inclusive discussion about what ideals and traditions we should hold on to—and what we should let go.

The New School—its halos and warts—holds out the promise for reinvention, of oneself, the university, and the world. We are people and an institution constantly in the midst of change, in search of, unsettled but on our way. We can be accused of looking dewy-eyed—in both senses of the word Dewey—at the possibilities of education, at the malleability of our institution, the opportunities it affords and impact it can have. We may begin anew too often, giving up significant legacies or promising half-starts. Missteps and failures are inevitable. But the mandate of our founding and all that has come since demands that we try again and “fail better,” as the writer Samuel Beckett asserted.

As students at The New School, I believe the point of your education here is not that you will be what you study—a jazz musician, a political scientist, or an interior designer. The point is you may not. The hours spent practicing arias, writing papers, and designing websites is not wasted, though. It is about the formation of a catalog of ideas, some rote today but perhaps not tomorrow. And it is also about the creation and practice of habits of inquiry, persistence, and critique. “The mind is a muscle,” the dancer Yvonne Rainer proclaimed. It needs strengthening, stretching, and rest, all of which this university provides in shared communion. The ideas you learn and the habits you develop here will prod you to lead life as “a continual beginning afresh,” perhaps going from being an actor to an illustrator to a policy maker.

Education does not guarantee successful reinventions, whether of oneself, this institution, or the world. But I think it makes such quests deliberate and meaningful. Education grounds us in what has come before, lays out what lies ahead, and demands that we articulate what is at stake. It gives us the skills to adapt and the courage to change.

“An Interest in Everything”

**John Halsey, Music Faculty Member
The New School for General Studies**

The most inspiring professor I ever encountered was a New School alumnus named Martin S. Dworkin. A brilliant multi-disciplinary scholar and renaissance man, he was also a most dedicated teacher.

I was a grad student in the early 1960s at Columbia TC’s department of philosophy and social sciences, where Dworkin was an adjunct lecturer. (He was skeptical of academic professionalism and preferred to make his living as a free lance writer.) He had studied at The New School during the heyday of the “university in exile,” and the two courses he offered came right out of the Graduate Faculty’s sweeping vision—“Aesthetics and Educations” and “Education, Ideology and Mass Communications.” In and out of the classroom he came on as a man whose mind was on fire. I remember him once saying “I am interested in everything,” speaking with such passionate conviction that it seemed to pull the rug out from under the entire trend of scholarly specialization.

Through the years I’ve met others who had also studied at The New School in the ’40s and ’50s, and they all seemed to be possessed of an excitement and enthusiasm for the integrated approach to knowledge—a marvelous legacy.

I joined The New School adjunct faculty in 1986, when Lewis Falb was humanities chair and dean of the adult division. He had a wide-ranging mind, combined with an instant comprehension of the subtleties of interdisciplinary teaching. He refused to make advance appointments, but his office door was always open, and you could drop in at any time. In a few minutes of friendly conversation he could help solve almost any academic or pedagogical problem. His understanding and encouragement are well remembered.

In recent years I have seen The New School evolve away from the informal and off beat and more in the direction of a conventional degree-granting institution. Some of these changes, such as expanded departmental offerings, higher faculty salaries, and e-mail contact with the students are surely for the good. My hope is that, in the midst of this rapid evolution, the classic model of humanistic education—in which The New School has excelled—will continue to play a prominent role. One thing that might help is for the students, in their liberal arts classes, to be given more exposure to our university’s wonderful history.

“Founders”

**Gustav Peebles, Chair, Social Sciences
The New School for General Studies**

“Thus in the beginning all the world was America.” So says John Locke in his “Two Treatises on Government,” when trying to provide us with a quick and dirty definition of the infamous “state of nature,” a colorful trope that proved to be quite a fertile field for many Enlightenment thinkers.

But had he been witness to the events that led to the creation of The New School, he might well have paraphrased his adage, to instead read: “Thus in the beginning all the world was Greenwich Village.” Counterintuitively, we might think of Greenwich Village in the 1920s as the wilds of America—slightly anarchic, but alluring for all that. It provided a space of freedom in which revolutionaries could forge a new social contract, newly detached from a previously restrictive government.

To think of Columbia University as a teetering Leviathan, with myriad dissatisfied subjects who felt as though their sovereign had broken covenant with them is perhaps a bit overwrought. But perhaps not. As both Hobbes and Locke knew well, commonwealths fail and dissolve. Part of these authors’ task was not only to probe how they were founded, but also how they foundered. To help explain all this, both of them posited a state of nature that hovered, as a sort of Derridean “trace,” in the very foundation of the commonwealth; its oppositional but never-quite-there status always circumscribed the powers of the sovereign. For otherwise, quite clearly, all “rational” men would merely disavow their social covenant and remove to wilder quarters, decamping for the free state of nature.

Locke’s arguments about a sort of free market in government, where people can wander the globe in search of a better sovereign because they always have the “public option” of the wild is at best a historical fact now gone, at worst, a historical fiction conceived by imperialist Europeans. But then, in the midst of the most densely populated part of this New World, did Greenwich Village provide a refuge, a new and improbable state of nature? After all, The New School founders could easily be read as a “seditious faction,” in Hobbes’ sense. And there is no doubt that they managed to leave the warm embrace of a certain sort of sovereign for a more uncertain, but freer, Greenwich Village. Most other institutions of higher education began with charters and wealthy benefactors, even opened by sovereigns of the very commonwealth itself (not least, Columbia). Ours clearly had no such stamp of approval, and is instead the result of open rebellion.

But Hobbes and Locke both explained that mankind never chooses to live in the state of nature for very long, what with its complete equality paired with extreme uncertainty. There are no artificial titles there, no honors, no possessions. Indeed, no writing, and perhaps no history either. So we are endlessly driven back into political union, and so too did The New School gradually start dispensing degrees, certificates, tenure and all the social hierarchy that comes in train with commonwealths. And just like The New School, many commonwealths also find themselves having a “natural” tendency toward expansion—an expansion that can sometimes be their undoing, if not done via proper social covenant. In short, over the several decades since its

inception, our founding fathers slowly abandoned the perfect equality and anarchism of the state of nature and instituted formal governance.

According to Locke and Hobbes, we all make a tacit agreement each day that we prefer this formal governance to the state of nature. So long as the sovereign doesn't abandon its commitment to guarantee us with peace and security, we will forgo the temptations of faction. But Hobbes and Locke both tell us that subjects always have the right to quit an erratic and arbitrary sovereign. No one should know better than us that we can always leave for a new state of nature, beckoning in some other quadrant of our experimental city.

But perhaps all this about our founding fathers fleeing the tyranny of Morningside Heights for the wilds of Greenwich Village is a mere founding myth, just like the state of nature itself. But that may just be the point. As myth, it coaxes forth a belief that we share a rebellious origin—an origin to which we must hold true, if we are to hold together. As myth, it hovers in our souls, always reminding us that we stand on the precipice of the state of nature; always granting us a choice between breaking or retaining our mutual covenant.

“October 1, 1941”

**Jed Perl, Liberal Studies Faculty Member
The New School for Social Research**

A couple of years ago I found some New School bulletins from the 1930s and early 1940s on the dollar cart outside of Skyline Books, the used bookstore on Eighteenth Street just west of Fifth Avenue. I bought every one they had. Although they are printed on what looks like a fairly cheap paper, they have held up pretty well. There is something elegant about the simple typography, with sans serif type and an appealingly sober, let's-get-down-to-business look.

Naturally, since art is what interests me most of all, the first thing I did when I got them home was turn to one of the course indexes—this is the booklet for 1941-1942—to see who was teaching what. And here, sure enough, teaching “Introduction to Art” on Tuesday evenings, is Meyer Schapiro, the most original art historian America has produced. Offering drawing and painting on Wednesday afternoons is none other than Stuart Davis, the master of a jazzy, hard-edged, quintessentially “New York” abstract style. But as if my days, at least in fantasy, are not already full enough, I have to consider that Berenice Abbott is conducting photography workshops on Thursday evenings and Monday afternoons. (“A darkroom is available to students for a fee of \$2, hours to be arranged with the Superintendent.”)

Then there is Alexey Brodovitch, one of the greatest graphic designers Manhattan has ever known and a major influence on Richard Avedon and many other photographers, who is around on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings, presenting “Art Applied to Graphic Journalism, Advertising, Fashion, Design.” And Atelier 17—the printmaking studio run by Stanley William Hayter, where the likes of Jackson Pollock and Mark Rothko made prints—is open for business at The New School on Mondays and Thursday. So I have a bewildering array of choices, although they are all presented rather matter-of-factly, as if this were (ha!) business as usual.

And if I cannot decide what to take, I do have the option of signing up for “How the Artist Goes to Work,” a fifteen week course, beginning October 1, 1941, which includes lecture-demonstrations by Davis, Hayter, Abbott, and five other studio art instructors. They will discuss: “Vision. Memory and perception. Direct or naïve reaction. Interpretation and original expression.” And “Students registered in art courses with fees aggregating not less than \$20 may enroll for this course at a fee of \$7.50.”

Okay. No problem. I'm sold. I'm taking Schapiro, Davis, and the lecture-demonstration course. I've marked October 1 on my calendar. The only trouble is that I won't be born for another ten years.

“1957: Liberating Art and Pedagogy at The New School”
Timothy Quigley, Philosophy Faculty Member
The New School for General Studies

In January 1957, a young Irish writer by the name of Brehon O’Riordan came to America to write a book about the New York School painters. It was the young poet Frank O’Hara who first suggested the idea. O’Hara had read some of O’Riordan’s stories in a small Irish literary magazine and was impressed by their directness, wit, and lack of sentimentality.

He proposed the idea when the two met for the first time at McDaid’s Pub in Dublin in June 1955. Brehon O’Riordan, in his early thirties at the time, had never been to America but had been following the literary and artistic scene there with great interest—to the extent one could, he thought, from his rather provincial locale. He liked the idea, had nothing keeping him in Ireland, and thought it would be a great opportunity to meet other writers and publishers and connect with a very different audience.

O’Riordan spent the next year and a half reading essays, books, and exhibition catalogs on American art going back to the mid-1930s. He collected issues of *ArtNews*, the most influential and widely circulated art magazine at time, and learned everything he could about the development of modern art and the critical response to it. In January 1957 he arrived in America and moved into a small apartment on 10th Street next to the Albert Hotel.

In the early stages of his research, O’Riordan came across a number of essays by Meyer Schapiro that he found particularly helpful, including “The Nature of Abstract Art” from 1937. In fall of ’56, he initiated some correspondence with Schapiro who sent him a draft of a lecture he was preparing on “The Liberating Quality of Avant-Garde Art.” When O’Riordan arrived in New York, Schapiro invited him to his New School class to discuss the relation of modern art to literature. O’Riordan was happy to oblige and, thinking about Schapiro’s manuscript, suggested they focus on “the avant-garde artist today”.

Schapiro’s comfort in the classroom and his ability to bring together a wide range of interests—the role of the artist and demands of artistic labor, the significance of the handmade object in a modern technological age, a Cézanne still-life, late Matisse cutouts, a black and white abstract painting by de Kooning, and the moral dimension of avant-garde art—in an unpretentious, engaging, and extemporaneous manner was truly impressive. Of course, Brehon had already heard stories from Frank and others about Prof. Schapiro’s charismatic lectures, so this was more an opportunity to see him in action.

What Brehon did not anticipate was the generosity of spirit and openness among Schapiro and his New School students, unlike anything he would have seen in his days at University College Dublin. The social and cultural environment at The New School was informal. A diverse group of people mixed comfortably with one another in the 12th street lobby, the halls, and in the classroom. In that context, Schapiro’s art history class had somewhat the flavor of a salon, rather than a university lecture course, Brehon thought.

The students, many of whom were themselves artists and writers, clearly enjoyed the class

discussion and were not at all reluctant to press Brehon for more information on Beckett, to question claims made by Schapiro about the expressive content of a Joan Mitchell painting, and to offer their own perspectives on the role of the avant-garde artist today.

At one point during the lively exchange, for just a moment, Brehon wondered why Schapiro was doing this. After all, he had a full-time job at Columbia University, his own active research projects in both medieval and modern art, additional administrative responsibilities no doubt, and bright young students and colleagues vying for his time and attention. Why would he come to The New School in the evening to teach?

The class would end in a few minutes. In the back row near the door, Brehon noticed John Cage and Allan Kaprow listening intently as Meyer Schapiro launched into what appeared to be an extended discourse on the virtues of expressive form in de Kooning's *Pink Angels* and the liberating quality of non-alienated labor as an antidote to the numbing effects of modern life. Schapiro looked up at the ceiling with his characteristic grin, paused, and said quietly, "We'll pick it up there next week."

“New Voices, 1964: Student Writers at The New School”
Joseph Salvatore, Writing Program Faculty Member
The New School

In the summer of 1996 I had moved out of my apartment north of Boston, in Salem, and was staying at my parents’ house south of Boston, making ready to move to New York to attend The New School’s MFA program in creative writing. In mid-August, I had dinner in the Back Bay with a friend who had brought a goodbye gift for me. She handed across the table an old used book. On the hardback’s torn and frayed blue cover was the title, *New Voices ’64: A Collection of Stories, Sections of Novels, and a Few Poems by Enormously Talented Young Writers of the New School*, edited by Hayes B. Jacobs.

The book included the work of 30 writers I’d never heard of; it was, as well, edited by someone unknown to me. Going home on the T, I tried to read a short story by Beverly R. Gologorsky called “Oh, Lillian!” about a young woman who “longed desperately to make a good impression” on an upcoming date with a Frenchman. Concerned her ignorance of his language will dash her romantic chances, she enlists her French friend, Lillian, to accompany them.

For some reason, the story didn’t hold my attention, nor did the others I glanced at. I then turned to Jacobs’s preface, a description of the qualities of the book’s writers:

Each writer is, or has recently been a student at The New School for Social Research . . . The writers represented here are studying, it’s true, but they are quite different from the usual college student. They are for the most part people with a good deal more years, training and experience . . . More than half hold bachelor’s degrees. Many have had advanced professional training—in literature, bacteriology, languages, the dance, drama, theology. Several have master’s degrees, one has a Ph. D., and some have children who are in college. And so I am moved to say, by way of explanation and not defense, that the major portions of the writing here is not what is usually called “student writing.” If you insist, though, then apply another modifier and let it be ‘graduate student writing.’

In another section, Jacobs speaks to the feeling I have now as I type these words: “Then too—and this is probably the nub of it—isn’t there something splendid about trying to do something one cannot quite accomplish? Does it matter that one is never quite satisfied with the result?”

I decided I would take a new tack with the volume. Instead of skipping through at random, I would begin with the first story: Anne Parsons’ “A Young Person With Get-Up-and-Go,” an exploration of “the internal torment of the self-conscious teenager . . . a boy trying to grow spiritually tall, but who is stunted by the drug of squalor, and shackled by the demands of a helpless, psychotic parent.” Anne Parsons’ young protagonist, Walter, is almost as unbelievably earnest and generous as Charlie in Mel Stuart’s *Willy Wonka*: “Listen, Daddy, I thought I might fix up the garage, and have a few kids over some night before it gets too cold out. We wouldn’t be in anyone’s way or scare Mama. Just mess around and listen to the radio, or play some cards. I got lots of friends, people who been nice to me, and I’d like to pay them back.” His father, standing at the stove, frying an egg, his back to Walter, replies: “Worries me enough, you hanging around with trash, without you don’t bring them here. That’s all this house needs, is a bunch of free-loading bums on the premises. Between you and your brother, I’d come home some night and find we was living in a roadhouse.” Many of the volume’s stories embodied this

theme—a misunderstood protagonist of good intentions who only wants a little joy in life; but the indifferent world ultimately teaches life's bitter lessons, leaving the protagonist sadder but wiser.

As I read through *New Voices '64*, I wondered what had happened to its writers. A Google search revealed little. Few of the names even yielded matches for “writer.” And what information did emerge, left me with even more questions. Was the Anne Parsons of “A Young Person with Get-Up-and-Go” the same Anne Parsons who ended up becoming the orchestra manager for the Boston Symphony Orchestra? Was Anne Parsons the same Anne Parsons who published a novel with Cheap Street Press in 1984? And, if so, was that Anne Parsons by any chance friendly with the publishers of that press, husband-wife duo, George and Jan O’Nale, who, in the early 1980s, started and operated Cheap Street, a press that was known for publishing “forced-scarcity” or “artificially rare” books—signed, numbered limited editions of science fiction and fantasy works, which books were renowned as excellent examples of the book-making arts, having been created with elegant, imported silks and bound in leathers with matching slipcases. Did Anne Parsons know that their books were typically issued in editions of 50 to 200 copies, and sold for up to \$250 each? Was she aware that George and Jan O’Nale approached primarily only authors whom they identified for excellence in writing quality and did not even respond to or return unsolicited manuscripts? Would Anne Parsons have been flattered to discover this fact? Did she know that George and Jan O’Nale were hermitic in their habits, strange loners living in a fairly unpopulated area in the Virginian countryside? That they collected books and guns? That they were eccentric and irascible, and were known to suddenly and arbitrarily fall into contention with anyone they came into contact with, flashing guns in the faces of people who stepped onto their property and on many occasions firing warning shots in the air? That George was an expert marksman and that Jan was known to wear a pistol in a hip-holster whenever she went into town to run errands? I wondered if Anne Parsons would know if George and Jan O’Nale were acquainted with Carolyn Chute? Did Anne Parsons know that in 2002, the O’Nales, both of them 56 years old, donated their entire collection of books and press materials to Tulane College and then, in the spring of 2003, committed suicide together, citing increasing health problems, some residents claiming that Jan had developed ovarian cancer. Was she aware that the O’Nales’ planned their deaths carefully? More than 40 boxes of books and papers and at least one copy of everything Cheap Street ever printed, along with the company's correspondence and much of the O’Nales’ personal collections were transferred to Tulane University in 2002. Or that the O’Nales began considering all of this as long as two years before their suicide, when in October of 2001, they posted a notice on the internet announcing that Cheap Street Press was looking for a library to take its archives, stating that “At this time the proprietors of Cheap Street are retiring the press (and themselves as well).”? Did Anne Parsons know that they closed their business, and that in April they arranged and paid for their own cremation? Did she know that they boxed and labeled things they wanted particular people to have, and then stored those boxed items in a rental storage space, every item meticulously labeled? Did she know that they prepared their wills, mailed letters to people they wanted to say goodbye to—and then mailed their final letter to County Sheriff McPherson telling him what they'd done, and where he could find their corpses.

Did Anne Parsons know that on May 27, after leaving the post office where they mailed that last letter, George and Jan O’Hale went home and got into bed together and died in that bed,

breathing helium through a homemade device described in the book *Final Exit*. Did she know that at least one of the letters said “Due to failing health we're going to take our lives in a quiet and peaceful manner. And we ask that our privacy be respected.”?

Did she know that the sheriff was quoted as saying that the O’Nales were “considerate” in their act of self-destruction? That they took care of everything except their own bodies? Did Anne Parsons know that Sheriff McPherson brought along a high-powered rifle, concerned that maybe this was a hoax and that George and Jan, notoriously unwelcoming of drop-in visits, might take aim at the sheriff? Did Anne Parsons know by any chance if George and Jan O’Nale were members of the infamous Hemlock Society? Would Ms. Parsons have thought they would have made good members or prickly ones, concerning, say, a less fastidious member who would, in fact, choose to use a firearm to make the final exit?

Did she know that the O’Nale’s bodies were cremated in accordance with the last wishes, and their ashes scattered in a location they wanted to keep secret? Was Anne Parsons aware that the O’Nales had no children?

Did George and Jan O’Nale take hold of each other’s hands when they finished inhaling that lethal dose and had removed their lips from the helium device’s rubber tube? Did they look into each other’s eyes hoping to be the first one to expire or the second? Did they want the other partner to see them expire or did they want to watch their lover die first so that the dying partner would feel that they were loved entirely in this world up until and beyond very the moment of their death, and that regardless of what they would find after their deaths, they would not feel that they were going to some unknowable void all alone?

Did they hold each other desperately in those last moments, hoping somehow that in doing so they would be able to find each other easier on the other side? Did they even believe there would be another side? Did they, at the last moment, wish they had not done this? Did they think about how, had they not done this, tomorrow morning might be yet another morning of pain and discomfort but that at least it would be another morning with that person who was at that very moment expiring next to them? Would Anne Parsons happen to know George and Jan’s last words to each other?

Was Anne Parsons the same Anne Parsons who authored a cookbook in 2007?

“The Long View”

**Wendy Scheir, Director, Anna-Maria & Stephen Kellen Archives Center
Parsons The New School for Design**

When I started at the Kellen Archives in 2008 I found two enlarged photographs mounted on foamcore. One, taken around 1900, features American impressionist painter William Merritt Chase, founder of the Chase School of Art, which was to become Parsons The New School for Design. Elegant in slender suit, boutonniere, pince-nez hanging from his vest, Chase stands before a class of female students. In the second a rag-tag collection of male students (including Edward Hopper) are gathered against a paint-splattered wall. In front sits Robert Henri, founder of the Ashcan school of painting. He’s leaning forward, tie askew, gaze leveled on something behind and right of camera.

I was curious and did some digging. What I found confirmed I’d landed a great job at an institution with a fascinating past; and reconfirmed one reason why I love and value the work of archivists. Here's what I discovered:

Chase, profoundly influenced by the European impressionists, was known for his polished paintings of genteel subjects. Henri's early paintings were similar. But by 1902, when he joined Chase to teach at the New York School of Art (the school has gone through four name changes over 113 years), Henri’s work was changing. His paintings were depicting poverty, urban congestion, his brush strokes freer. While Chase continued emulating a model of European sophistication, Henri reflected a moment when America was struggling out from the shadow of Europe, inventing an identity.

Chase and Henri’s teaching styles were equally at odds. Chase urged students toward technical perfection. Henri prodded them to represent life as they found it, unvarnished. (At the Kellen I found a notebook by a student who took classes with them both—in these pages their differences spring to life.)

The men clashed. Henri's work was rough, ugly, Chase said. Chase's was detached, conventional, countered Henri. Attracted by Henri’s spontaneity, philosophical expansiveness and macho sensibility, students flocked to his classes. It got nasty. In 1907, Chase quit (some accounts—and the fracas was all over the New York press—say forced out). He left the very school he'd founded!

At stake in this brutal battle was nothing less than the definition of American modern art. And it happened right here, at Parsons.

* * *

There are no papers in the Kellen Archives about the Chase-Henri conflict. Fleming’s notebook is the only primary document even showing the men at the school at the same time.

Why? I'd wager that in that charged climate no one was thinking they were enacting a drama over American identity. They were in the present, where friendships were broken, careers redirected. Letters may have been burned, squirreled away, left behind.

What's painful or insignificant today in a hundred years may be powerful testimony to an important historical moment.

In my job I take the long view as I work to document Parsons from as many angles as I can. This way just maybe, hopefully, a hundred years on, the life of the school will come through as it is now. Its *full* life—in all its immense talent and energy, and in its darker episodes of disturbance and controversy. All its stories—and this school is full of stories.

Important things are happening here; we just don't know what they are yet.

“Week One of My Employment at The New School”

**Jeanne Swadosh, Asst. Archivist, Anna-Maria & Stephen Kellen Archives Center
Parsons The New School for Design**

I began working at The New School in the beginning of April 2009, as the assistant archivist for the Kellen Archives. My previous employment had been in the private and non-profit sectors with a few forays into consulting for federal and state agencies. I had never worked in a university environment.

At the conclusion of the my first week on the job, I arrived in the morning to discover a substantial NYPD presence on Fifth Avenue, students on the roof of a neighboring building holding unintelligible placards, and clumps of curious onlookers sipping coffee and texting. Unaware that the building across from 66 Fifth Avenue was part of The New School campus, I attributed the protest to some random anarchist group and went about my morning.

An hour later, I received a call from the Friday work-study student, informing me he would like to work but that he was trapped behind a police barricade on 12th Street. Might I assist him in entering the building? My supervisor was unreachable and it was unclear how I should address the situation. This scenario did not figure into my employment orientation tutorials. A primary concern was to avoid inadvertently getting this student into any sort of trouble. A call to Campus Security was completely unhelpful; I was advised I would have to negotiate with the NYPD myself to extricate the work-study student from the growing crowd behind the barricade. An underlying problem was that I had never met this student and couldn't identify him. I called him back and inquired as to how I might point him out to an NYPD officer. Luckily, he was wearing a Tyrolean hat and no one else on April 10th had adopted that sartorial style.

Over the course of the day, as more administration-authored e-mails arrived in my in-box, and periodic visits to NY1's website revealed noteworthy developments, I was able to piece together the protest's trajectory. Returning from my lunch break at the much mourned Joe, Jr.'s, I spied a discarded placard rolled up in a trash can on Fifth Avenue. The innate archivist in me—my archival id, if you will—compelled me to bring it back to the Archives. The newly hired employee, still on probation, balked at the idea. I let it go.

The following week, while recounting Friday's events to the Kellen Director, I mentioned the placard. She advised that next time, I should definitely snatch it up.

“Fogelman the Place”

Guy Greenberg, New School Student

Gone is the patina and shadow of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th floor hallways of 65 Fifth Avenue, the tattered carpets and darkened glass displays cases that made its contents harder to see, the musty smell upon entering the ground floor reading room, the oily residue that years of sleeping students left on its armchairs. I remember the original Fogelman and the sunken faces I experienced in its librarians. There it was—the spirit of giving up, a shrinking amount of new additions, vacant shelves and a lowering circulation. Now there is the new “temporary” Fogelman, a modernized outpost of the old one, spread through floors with little definable, private space. Is our administration implicitly making a larger argument that print and their housing institutions are losing relevance—internet databases, googlebooks.com and textbook downloads to kindle are economical and inevitable. Leave the teachers to produce all-in-compositing, course packets and direct those insistent fans of the library to our consortium, NYU. This future proofing philosophy neglects first that a transition from print to files is far from complete and the space of library is lost. In tens years perhaps New School students will have every book but right now, I must go elsewhere. I will not lament over the texture of the page over the glare of a computer screen and the possessive qualities book lovers materially enjoy. The space is my highest concern. As the taking-in of culture and information become more portable and personalized, music, film and newspaper captured in the space of a cell phone, the communal space must be seen as less relevant. The necessary silence of the library makes its social-ness unusual. It develops a barrier to others, similar to the noise cancellation of blaring headphones subway readers often listen to, or the quietude obtainable at home, being alone. Its social power is through the function of proximity. Sitting next to others, to see others at work—to spend time here. The New School is an in and out experience for me. It must show an investment in place and I will be less the stranger.

“On the 90th Anniversary of The New School”
The New School In Exile

In seeking inspiration for our own liberation, we necessarily reflect on the history and legacy of The New School, and its long tradition of critical engagement with the world. How can we—as students who desire to wrest control of our lives, our intellectual labor, and our future from the grips of bureaucracy and capitalist exploitation—learn from our past while creating an emancipatory future? This is not an easy question.

The New School over the past year has witnessed massive internal upheaval due to the unaccountable actions of senior administrators, actions that led the students and faculty to rise up in a collective, unified cry of outrage and protest. How could things have come to this, we asked ourselves? What about our legacy and our past, do these things mean nothing; have they too been reduced into clever marketing gimmicks for an overpriced education? Yet we balked at this thought: these values do mean something, and we must show the value—the power—of these ideas. And so we rose up; we occupied, we marched, we issued communiqués, and we spoke to the world through our actions of freedom, of autonomy, of another world we knew to be possible. And the world responded, and other students responded, both here and around the world. From New York to California, from Mexico to Brazil, and from Pakistan to Japan, we heard our struggle echoed back, of a desire to be free, truly free, as students, as workers, as people. Inspired, we raised our banners higher, and called for more. Occupy everything, people shouted, and the streets lit up from the fire in our hearts.

But even this was not enough to shake ourselves free from the bureaucratic malaise that seeps out of every nook and cranny, which watches us at every moment with its panoptic eyes and swipe card mouths. The fortress was breached, but only momentarily, and soon reinforcements arrived to shore up the institutional gaps we had slipped through. Free speech is a threat to academic discipline, or so it was implied. Out of order you seek to create chaos, those in power told us, never understanding that they themselves were the source of the chaos. But we persisted and we organized: teach-ins, marches, and protests. We went to the students and we exposed the lies that were whispered through *Announce Announce* messages. We smiled to the infiltrators sent by the powerful even as we infiltrated the halls of power. We did as we were taught. We used our minds to critique and respond, just as our predecessors had done, to the injustices of our day.

The story does not end here; in fact it has just begun. The desire to rise up and seize the day, to make a New School in our own image, has just begun. Our name is The New School In Exile, and it is time to come home.

Survey Responses

The following contributions were submitted online in response to this questionnaire (they appear in the order in which they were received):

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?
2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?
3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)
4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?
5. Do you feel there is an adequate forum to discuss the future of the university and the direction of your discipline/field/work at The New School? If not, how can self-criticism be better structured into your discipline, program, division, or the university at large?
6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?
7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?
8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?
9. Please describe your relationship to The New School, choosing all that apply:
 1. Faculty
 2. Staff
 3. Student

P.C. Grim Student

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

I came to The New School after I learned of the legacy of supporting uniquely focused studies.

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

I think the foundation is solid and from my short experience at the school it is only evolving with the foundation at the forefront of the strategic vision.

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

Most inspiring, the other students. Most problematic, a minority of bored upper class dilettantes who think they know what class and labor struggle looks like.

6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?

I think it is fine. I think a minority of students and teachers are driving the conversation. Not unlike the national health care debate right now. The people who have no issues with how the school is working, that is the majority, are too busy with studies and work to enter into what really looks to be a silly debate (from the outside).

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

Academic freedom is the freedom to pursue whatever field you would like to study. If classes are being cut because of "economic constraints" more money should be raised by the Development Department for general use and parceled out accordingly, as long as there is a large demand for those classes. Another option is to strengthen the ties to NYU and see if students could take classes there.

8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?

I will remember The New School as a place of supportive freedom to pursue what I wished to study without distractions or micro-academic-management.

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

In 1859 John Stuart Mill wrote in *On Liberty* that, “when the most active and inquiring intellectuals find it advisable to keep the general principles and grounds of their convictions within their own breasts, the price paid for this sort of intellectual pacification is the sacrifice of the entire moral courage of the human mind.”

Mill insisted that the only way that a society moves closer to truth is by allowing full freedom of thought. If we believe that universities and institutions of higher learning are vital to the progress of society and humanity, then these same institutions must not limit themselves to facts and figures, but also be willing to approach the more ambiguous questions of an ever-changing society.

I’m not sure that the definition of academic freedom has changed much since Mills wrote *On Liberty* and Rutkoff and Scott published their history of The New School, but academic institutions at all levels have met many challenges in the fight for freedom of thought—including the problem of evolution vs. intelligent design, periods of political unrest, and cuts in funding and support. While the issues of the time will change as society progresses, the loss of economic support for a University can have serious, permanent repercussions—not only for the institution, but for entire generations of students becoming incapable of the “critical inquiry” that the founders of The New School found necessary for progress.

Schools, having to depend on the generosity of both individuals and organizations outside of themselves for survival, can begin to view the jeopardization of the institutions’ stated values as miniscule compared to the threat of the actual continuation and success of the institution. It is necessary that schools, and the individuals that make up these schools, continue to find academic expression, freedom of thought, and constant critical inquiry not only a right and a priority, but an obligation, so as to avoid the intellectual pacification of an entire society. I have no true answers to this Catch-22 of an institution’s economic survival versus its core values, but as a student at The New School I am hopeful that the University will persevere in its struggle to uphold the values of its founders.

Scott Pobiner

Faculty

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?

Idealism for all individuals, courses for all classes, individualism for all idealists

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

I would say that I was interested in both figures and movements.

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

Spray paint didn't exist when The New School was founded and now it is the typeface found in The New School logo.

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

Federation / Confederacy

5. Do you feel there is an adequate forum to discuss the future of the university and the direction of your discipline/field/work at The New School? If not, how can self-criticism be better structured into your discipline, program, division, or the university at large?

There are plenty of forums. Perhaps too many people speaking at them though.

6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?

Why would one want to reconcile ideals with bureaucracy?

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

Academic freedom is the right to reflect on the past, consider the present, and discover the future through discourse, study, and appreciation for the hard work of others.

8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?

Planning for its 100th anniversary of course!

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?

Academic Freedom. Work for the greater good of human kind.

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

I heard about NSSR when I was in high school, in the sixties, as THE institution to study Sociology.

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

NSU governance and the unionization of adjunct faculty have benefited our vast part time population. The growing core group of fulltime faculty is finding its voice and inciting much needed change. This is HUGE for The New School.

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

The faculty and students are truly awesome and inspiring. The BUREAUCRACY and REGISTRATION are problematic because they are slow. Blackboard is a poor interface for our online learning environment. Banner is a nightmare and its functionality has never been updated to the 21st century. It still looks like the interfaces of the '80s. It is difficult and cumbersome to use. Instead of dealing with economic downturns by slashing classes, the faculty should be consulted to assist with the best and most efficient ways to address shrinking resources. Harming the quality of the curriculum is short sighted and much like killing the goose that laid the golden eggs.

5. Do you feel there is an adequate forum to discuss the future of the university and the direction of your discipline/field/work at The New School? If not, how can self-criticism be better structured into your discipline, program, division, or the university at large?

No. There is not enough mentorship for faculty who don't know fundraising to find money for their research. There is not enough opportunity to teach teachers effective pedagogy. There is not enough opportunity for professional development of faculty. The alumni should be included in more of the life of the school. There should be better coordination of institutional research. We need to better measure the success of our students. We need to preserve the work of students and faculty better. There are no proper archives at The New School.

6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?

Bureaucracy rules—Their inefficiencies are supposed to gain the bureaucracy more power and make the public feel like they can't do without it.

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

Academic freedom extends to all the aspects of life at The New School. Economic constraints are totally outside of this discussion. A transparent structure that respects the faculty and administrators it hires and the students it recruits, is a winning institution able to innovate in all ways: financially, artistically, and intellectually.

8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?

A world class institution with a vibrant multi-platform art, design, and scholarly presence. An institution with a transformative effect on the ways to address the problems of humanity.

M. Doctor Staff

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?

Freedom of thought and speech.

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

I came by chance.

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

It has changed with the times but continues, in my opinion, to be a place of free thinkers.

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

Inspiring: Its openness and welcome of opinions. Problematic: the occasional struggle for power.

5. Do you feel there is an adequate forum to discuss the future of the university and the direction of your discipline/field/work at The New School? If not, how can self-criticism be better structured into your discipline, program, division, or the university at large?

There is adequate forum.

6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?

I feel there is a sliver; however, we shall see when the dust settles.

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

It is still in place today. The best way is to have open talks between the two sides within the university. The economy, however, can't stop your thoughts or expression.

8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?

10 years from now TNS will be bigger than it is now with more students, faculty and space (fingers crossed)!

Alex Draifinger Staff

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?

The Founding Ideals are foremost to survive and succeed as a university. In the face of turmoil that civilization experiences, the freedom to question, discuss, and learn about today's issues are fundamental to all academic institutions. But for The New School, it's that much more important, so that humanity does not lose sight of injustice and inhumanity. It needs to revitalize itself from time to time so that it doesn't become stale among its peers.

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

I came to work at the institution, mostly because it had a profound impact on many intellectuals during World War II. It was the first to save many scholars from Europe when no one else wanted to. As a child of Holocaust survivors, I was that much more motivated to work for The New School. Having started in 1984, and started the university budget office, I was especially proud to be at the helm with the President and Deans, as it survived many crises from a financial perspective, while having the vision not to be afraid to grow, and change.

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

The New School has changed in volume of students, and depth of academic subjects and emphasis.

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

The leadership has been inspiring. Captains of industry on the board, coupled with the vision of the Presidents has laid a course that has been amazing. The problem is that The New School has lacked other subjects in the technical fields (i.e. Business, Science, Computers, Public Education, Nursing, Engineering, etc).

5. Do you feel there is an adequate forum to discuss the future of the university and the direction of your discipline/field/work at The New School? If not, how can self-criticism be better structured into your discipline, program, division, or the university at large?

The Forum is inbred, and needs a fresh perspective from the technical fields, as mentioned above.

6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?

The world is more bureaucratic, and therefore, so is The New School. Ideas are difficult to bring to fruition without money, and other legal hurdles.

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

The social sciences must endure. They are the most difficult for students to enter, for the prospect of financial security is more difficult. Without the freedom in these fields, society cannot find its way. Government, Universities, and Private industry must support these fields for the sake of future justice and balance. The New School certainly has had the luxury of great leadership from its board of trustees and officers. They were able to convince many that freedom rests within these walls, and the future of this society lies with the alumni.

8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?

The university will be here, and it will combine with other Colleges, and grow in stature and overcome financial crisis, again. It might even change its name, a bit, again, but it will remain "New," and a "School."

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?

In the university archives there is a booklet announcing the new New School building at 66 W 12th Street, and there is a line in that document that, I think, captures succinctly and brilliantly the kind of intellectual work that defines The New School. Describing the relationship between faculty and students, the author refers to "master-craftsmen working out their ideas in the presence of other craftsmen, who may observe, select what they need, and occasionally take a hand in the work." Although today's faculty might push the metaphor ever further, leveling out the hierarchy and arguing that teacher and student alike are both craftsmen, neither are masters, this "participatory" style of pedagogy was progressive in its time. And it continues to define the way faculty engage with students, the way the University engages with the world's problems. The craft metaphor, too, is especially apt: it implies the marriage of theory and practice, of thinking and doing, that continue to define many of our programs.

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

My faculty profile on our program's website includes the following passage: "As a graduate student in New York, I frequently took advantage of The New School's public programs – and I soon came to appreciate the University's daring curricula and innovative pedagogy. It seemed such a vibrant and quintessentially "urban" university, and I always imagined that my own interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship would fit in well here. After moving away from the city for a couple years, I was delighted to be invited back to New York, to join the faculty and take part in this great urban learning experiment."

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

The acquisition of outside institutions, which then became additional New School divisions, certainly expanded the University's focus, although I can't say that the University's unifying "mission" was adapted quickly and dramatically enough to encompass and integrate the myriad divisions. During my time here, the past six years, The New School has made many efforts to find new means of coalescing the institution's many parts. The discussion of inter-divisional collaborations raise many exciting prospects. The institution of tenure throughout the University will indeed help us to attract the best faculty, but I fear that we are failing to seize the unique opportunity to define, though the tenure process, the faculty we want and need to carry on the "craftsman" tradition alluded to in the archival documents. I fear that, in an attempt to boost our academic stature, we are forgetting that intellectual work can take many forms, that "scholarship" isn't only the production of scholarly monographs, and that these other ways of working are not "lesser" means of contributing to one's academic field, to the University community, and to the world.

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

Its openness to pedagogical innovation; its location in New York City, whose streets are extensions of our classrooms; its mix of design, social sciences, humanities, performing arts, and management, which offers tremendous promise (though not always realized) of collaborative, cross-disciplinary work.

5. Do you feel there is an adequate forum to discuss the future of the university and the direction of your discipline/field/work at The New School? If not, how can self-criticism be better structured into your discipline, program, division, or the university at large?

Open discussions among faculty, among students, among staff, and then among all three parties. We have had a few "town hall" meetings, but these events have been too scripted, controlled by a few administrators and representative faculty (chosen by whom?) who sit at the front of the room and speak on behalf of everyone else. We need a series of small-scale Quaker meetings! We also need to find a means of talking *across* the widely disparate cultures in different divisions. I'm afraid I have no solution to this perennial problem.

6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?

After having completed three years in an administrative term, where I realized just how much "numbers," budgets, enrollments, dictate so many other decisions, I am *less* hopeful that such reconciliation as possible. Yet I feel that several recent changes in leadership have brought us inspiring new deans and provosts with different values and priorities. These personnel changes are very encouraging.

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

I'm not going to answer your specific questions, but I will address the issue of academic freedom at The New School. I believe TNS embodies the liberal values and unorthodox views and practices that "academic freedom" policies are meant to protect. However, I believe that, at TNS, radicalism becomes orthodoxy. We are not always open to non-radical (e.g., conservative) viewpoints, and actually go so far to suppress these alternative views that we may do damage to academic freedom and set an example of intolerance.

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?

Diversity, pushing boundaries, and enforcing equality and a safe space to learn, to question and develop as an independent thinker.

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

It was the universe drawing me in really. I have an extensive background in the performing arts, over 20 years. I have lived and performed abroad and have grown accustomed to international life. I really felt as if I were a stranger in a strange land in my birth place, America. I often thought I was so creative that there would never be an institution that would affirm and nurture the kind of person I am. Well I was coming from a catering event for MTV and I was on the train and I kept saying, "What in the world am I going to do with the rest of my life?" Just like Rhema words highlighted off of Holy Writ, "The New School University for continuing education, international studies, creative writing, etc." I wrote the information down. A part of me was so apprehensive because I had been out of school for about 15 years. Yet I know now that faith + destiny = my success. I am grateful for The New School. I am now on my last year as a creative writing major and when I think how my life has been impacted, it makes me want to cry with gratitude. Being at The New School has changed my life and has given me the confidence to pursue even higher levels of education. I will continue on to get my MA and doctorate.

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

I've been at The New School since 2004 and from the evolving campuses to the computer labs, to the expansions of buildings, The New School is constantly looking to advance and stay current with technology. It is a wonderful, open place to use practical and clinical and historical resources to learn. What I love about learning at The New School is having educators who are also active in their prospective fields.

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

I love the liberal atmosphere. I believe it is a great place to grow and learn. I am quite partial I cannot think of anything that I am challenged with. Perhaps if there were some support groups for students that fall in between ages of the younger students and not quite seniors that might be nice. I'm almost 40 and I'm not sure if such a group exists at The New School.

5. Do you feel there is an adequate forum to discuss the future of the university and the direction of your discipline/field/work at The New School? If not, how can self-criticism be better structured into your discipline, program, division, or the university at large?

As a creative writing major I believe there is a vast wealth of resources and professors to inform my direction as a writer. I am also a minister, and have utilized many of the social

sciences and psychology classes as well, to give me a better understanding of humanity and interacting with a broader base of people.

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

Academic freedom is one's right to be affirmed within one's philosophies upholding integrity and character while being challenged in a "safe space" to take understood concepts, thoughts, ideologies and ways of thinking beyond the realm of conventionalism to aid in the empowerment of a generation.

8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?

Ten years from today I believe I will remember The New School as a place of great challenge, of great compassion, of great discussion, of great development and for me a chance at a greater life. The New School has assisted in me finding my purpose beyond just singing.

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?

Pushing beyond the boundaries of what exists to what can be imagined and dreamed.

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

I came to teach here eight years ago, and The New School has been a place that opened my eyes to new knowledge and opened my heart to the young generation of students who care about our city, our society, and most importantly, our world. Over those eight years I have learned from my colleagues and my students. The legacy of The New School is a living entity, found in the discussions and questions of its students and faculty.

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

I think The New School echoes its past in its present, and creates its future through an organic thirst for the truth.

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

Chance and the commitment to exploring and testing boundaries is inspiring, and also what can cause problems. Problems are key components of the search for new knowledge, the basis for all academic endeavors. The New School is a laboratory that is friendly to the uncomfortable search for answers. Most answers lead investigators to new questions, completing the cycle and beginning it again simultaneously.

5. Do you feel there is an adequate forum to discuss the future of the university and the direction of your discipline/field/work at The New School? If not, how can self-criticism be better structured into your discipline, program, division, or the university at large?

Yes, there is a great deal of room for inquiry as far as the University as well as my field of cultural policy studies.

6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?

Yes, there can be harmony in the disjunction of the past, present and future; the important thing is to foster dialogue, such as this project.

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

This is a balance and as such evokes imbalance. The striving for the right mixture of management and creativity is a challenge that is exciting.

8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?

The university will be at the forefront of an exciting and unknown model of education that will serve as a global resource. It will retain its unusual personality, with quirky and distinct parts of the seemingly disparate whole. It will be questioning itself, since it was born of this kind of questioning and its self-reflection is in its very nature.

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?

An educational institution where freedom of ideals are respected and valued. A safe academic environment to study regardless of religious or political views.

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

Many years ago, I was introduced to The New School by a friend who was employed at The New School. She was happy and spoke very highly of The New School environment. On several occasions I expressed the desire to continue my education but couldn't afford it. She encouraged me to apply for a job and eventually I did apply and was hired. My first experience was my best experience. For many years now, I've taken a variety of courses that have made a difference in my career as well as my intellectual perspective. I've also taken the opportunity to explore areas that were not of interest. They include courses in management, philosophy, anthropology, and sociology.

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

It has grown considerably but still seems to have maintained a small school environment. I think the school has to work much harder now to compete with larger universities colleges with similar programs (NYU, Baruch, Columbia).

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

It's known for its liberal slant politically, but there's little if any discussion around diversity and change from the top down.

6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?

Yes, I think it's possible with new structure and more transparency. A top down approach is critical for success.

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ...academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

Academic research to include various voices and cultures. Students are exposed to many different views and ideologies and encouraged to explore and express their thoughts and experiences.

8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?

In ten years, the university divisions and departments will become more blended. The degrees and concentration options will be more diverse.

1. What do you consider the founding ideals of The New School to be?

Rigorous, independent intellect.

2. How did you come to teach/work/study at The New School, and how did your knowledge of this institution's legacy (i.e., figures or movements affiliated with The New School) influence your decision?

I learned about The New School through my high school guidance counselor. I had no knowledge of the school's legacy.

3. How do you think The New School has changed, both over the course of its history and throughout your time here? (i.e., philosophically, practically, academically, for you personally, etc.)

I came to the school in a time of transition. The school went through a re-branding. The school seemed to be throwing all this money into an advertising campaign while ignoring internal problems it was having. The philosophy of The New School is obviously changing.

4. What are the most inspiring aspects of The New School, in your opinion? What are the most problematic?

I was able to develop close relationships with professors and the students because of the small class sizes; the school was very insular. However, the school is also unorganized.

5. Do you feel there is an adequate forum to discuss the future of the university and the direction of your discipline/field/work at The New School? If not, how can self-criticism be better structured into your discipline, program, division, or the university at large?

No, there doesn't seem to be a great forum for students or faculty. The professors are one of the most important resources/assets the university has. They have an understanding of the academic ideals and the students' preferences more than most of the higher ups. They should have more of a voice.

6. Is reconciliation taking place – or possible – between The New School's founding ideals and the often bureaucratic forms it takes today?

It seems like the people running the school are trying to do so according to finance. A great deal of the students and faculty seem upset. They don't seem to be happy with the current direction.

7. In the only published history of The New School, the authors Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott state that for founding New School professors, ... academic freedom included the right and even the obligation to subject every preference, institution, and presumption of knowledge to critical inquiry, unhampered by political, religious, or philosophical conventions. How would you define academic freedom today? What do you think is the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic constraints?

Wow, this is difficult. I think Rutkoff and Scott define academic freedom quite well. I guess the best way to preserve academic freedom within institutions bound by economic

constraints is to hire faculty and staff that care about such freedom. Presidents and deans who refuse to compromise the original ideals.

8. For faculty and staff: Where will the university be ten years from today? For students: Ten years from today, how will you remember The New School?

I love The New School; it was perfect for me. It was a place of great intellectual growth. I love the school and hope that it can maintain an interesting staff and small classes.

**Published on occasion of *By Any Name: Institutional Memory at The New School*,
an exhibition with events, lectures, workshops, séances with psychics, and panel discussions,
October 19 - 24, 2009.
New York: Parts & Labor Gallery, 2009**

By Any Name is an ongoing project. Please submit your essay or questionnaire to
byanyname@newschool.edu.

www.veralistcenter.org
www.partsandlaborgallery.com