

2001

# Where Have All The Voices Gone? A Case Study in Marginalization Politics at the Robert J. Bernard Field Station of the Claremont Colleges

Yamini Bala  
*Pomona College*

---

## Recommended Citation

Bala, Yamini, "Where Have All The Voices Gone? A Case Study in Marginalization Politics at the Robert J. Bernard Field Station of the Claremont Colleges" (2001). *Pomona Senior Theses*. Paper 68.  
[http://scholarship.claremont.edu/pomona\\_theses/68](http://scholarship.claremont.edu/pomona_theses/68)

This Open Access Senior Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Pomona Student Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pomona Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact [scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu](mailto:scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu).

# Where Have All The Voices Gone?

A case study in marginalization politics at the Robert J. Bernard  
Field Station of the Claremont Colleges



By Yamini Bala

with photos by  
Kevin Bingham



## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: The Place.....	1
Chapter 2: Trusts and Titles.....	9
Chapter 3: The Coming of KGI.....	19
Chapter 4: Controversies.....	24
Chapter 5: Voices.....	46
Chapter 6: The Process.....	67
Chapter 7: Messages.....	94
Afterthoughts.....	103
Acknowledgments.....	106

## Preface

---

This thesis is not intended to be an indictment of our leaders – well, not entirely, anyway.

This thesis is meant to be an exercise in listening. I talked to a lot of people on every side of every issue, and tried hard to listen. I obviously have my biases, but I did my best to understand where everyone was coming from. I tried to evaluate groups instead of individuals as participants in this issue. My interviewees were requested to express views on behalf of the community group to which they belonged. I tried to find the opinions that best defined the majority of each group. Sometimes these came from resolutions, sometimes surveys, and other times analyses of local newspaper letters. In writing this up, I hoped to express the voices I heard from a common ground.

It seems that we've let our different voices become antagonistic – that we've lost the will to embrace new opinions and engage in debate. I hope that people reading this might listen to the voices that are speaking – understand where they come from instead of preparing a rebuttal of their opinions. Consider our own actions and how they affect the situation. Think about whether we're prepared to let this battle divide our community into the dreamers who get their way and those who don't – or if we are ready to listen to one another, offer compromises, and do what *really* benefits this community the most.

This thesis is an effort to explore different perspectives on a common issue and document the voices that have been cast aside and ignored. I originally wanted to speak for the Bernard Field Station, because I wasn't sure how much longer it would be around to speak for itself. But now I realize it is futile. If you are willing to listen, the place speaks for itself ... and the story it tells is remarkable.

Southern California is known as a land of glitz and glamour, where neon lights and freeways dominate the landscape. Driving through Claremont on the historic Route 66, one is assailed by sights of gas stations, supermarkets, fast food chains, and convenience stores that stretch on for what could be eternity. For a fleeting moment along this stretch, the monotony of modern convenience is broken and the road gives way to a different view. Through a small wire fence a rare patch of open space is visible, where oak trees and sagebrush abound, framed by the majestic San Gabriel Mountains that climb their way toward the sky in the background. This natural oasis amidst sprawling suburbia is the Robert J. Bernard Biological Field Station of the Claremont Colleges, known more familiarly as BFS. A parcel of land about 85 acres in size, the Field Station is home to hundreds of species of plants and animals which are crucial to the natural history and heritage of this place.

### **Geology**

BFS is located on the alluvial fan of the San Antonio Creek, made up of erosional debris that washes down from the mountains during rains and floods and is deposited as it reaches the creek and loses momentum. For this reason the geology of the land is inextricably linked to the history of geologic activities of the San Gabriel Mountains. The alluvium under BFS is composed of layers of rocks that have each been deposited and weathered in succession with the erosion process of the mountains.<sup>1</sup>

Recent suburban development has led to the channelization of streams which once meandered freely down the mountains and around the fan surface, depositing and redistributing soils. This, along with the 1951 construction of the San Antonio Dam, has considerably slowed this periodic flooding and depositional process.<sup>2</sup> The top layer of soil at BFS is a product of the March 1938 flood which brought in most of the rocks visible today.<sup>3</sup>

The two most common types of rocks on the station are gneiss and granite, which also compose the majority of the San Gabriel Mountain mass. Gneiss is about 1.7 billion

years old and was formed in a fault through a metamorphic process requiring enormous amounts of heat and pressure. Many of these rocks were deposited before completing the metamorphosis, as is evidenced by the bands of white and gray mineral composites.

Granite is a much younger igneous rock that cooled and formed beneath the surface of the ground.<sup>4</sup>

Within the Field Station there are a variety of soil types that support distinct plant communities. The soil ranges from soft mud, found along the marshy coast of pHake Lake, to very dry, rocky alluvial deposits found in much of the Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub community.

Some of the transitions between habitat types are quite sharp and most likely a result of differences in soil composition due to water availability.<sup>5</sup> As the Field Station approaches the foothills toward the north, the ground gains elevation along the alluvial fan, but the water table grows more shallow, allowing for increased plant growth. Also, the presence of the Indian Hill fault which runs through the station invites the formation of springs around the fault lines. These substantial pockets of shallow, accessible groundwater support the growth of Western Sycamores (*Platanus racemosa*) and other trees, which are otherwise too large to grow in such a dry ecosystem.<sup>6</sup> The Sycamore, in fact, is thought to be an indicator species of water availability in the area.<sup>7</sup>

A special type of soil is found underneath trees such as sycamores and oaks. Using the water source tapped by the trees' roots and taking advantage of the shade they provide, this moist and fertile soil is a rarity in this habitat. It is rich with bacteria, algae, and moss, but it is too moist for most other plants in this ecosystem. Because it is so uncommon in a semi-arid environment, this soil is extremely fragile and is protected in many national parks where it occurs.<sup>8</sup>

Groundwater is not the only source of moisture for this land. Claremont is part of a "semi-desert" at the extreme edge of a Mediterranean climate. The plant communities supported by this climate are found in only four other regions around the world.<sup>9</sup> Hot and dry in the summer, winters are wet and cool in a Mediterranean climate, averaging between 15 and 18 inches of rainfall per year.<sup>10</sup> In Claremont, the average rainfall is closer to 10 – 11 inches a year, classifying it as a "semi-arid" habitat.<sup>11</sup> These climatic



conditions are very harsh on the vegetation, since moisture and sunlight are generally available in opposite seasons. Most plants enter the growing season during the winter, hit peak bloom during the spring, and fall dormant by the summer drought. Many plant species in BFS experience summer deciduousness.<sup>12</sup>

Species in plant communities found at the Field Station became adapted to periodic floods and fires, and some even depend on them for successful reproduction. However due to the human suppression of these two phenomena, the vegetation of BFS has been altered. For example, the size of the poison oak population is usually controlled by fires, but is now growing almost unchecked in some parts of the Field Station.<sup>13</sup>

### **Plant communities**

The southeastern portion of the station is dominated mostly by non-native grasslands. Few species of grass are native to this area. There are no remnant parcels of exclusively native grassland in Southern California, and where native grasses are present, they have usually been planted in restoration attempts.<sup>14</sup> Most of the grasses in BFS were introduced by Europeans, especially as a result of the cattle industry, although some native species do grow here as well.<sup>15</sup> The non-native grassland in BFS is primarily composed of species such as the slender wild oat (*Avena barbata*), black mustard (*Brassica nigra*), and smooth brome (*Bromus hordaceus*), plus the native California croton (*Croton californicus*), wild hyacinth (*Dichlostemma capitatum*), and miniature lupine (*Lupinus bicolor*). This community, which covers 15.2 acres of BFS, is the only habitat within the station not classified as sensitive.<sup>16</sup> The annual grasses allow this plant community to recover quickly from disturbance, and this is therefore not a habitat of much concern among conservation priorities within BFS.<sup>17</sup> However, the loss or development of this habitat would likely compromise the ability of the rest of the Field Station to support its current wildlife populations since the grasslands provide habitat and abundant seed for small mammals and reptiles.<sup>18</sup>

Interspersed in small patches with non-native grasslands in the southeast and composing most of the southern portion of BFS is an important community known as Coastal sage scrub (CSS). This community is often a focus in conservation efforts in

Southern California, because of its particular sensitivity to development and its importance to many unique plant and wildlife species. There are approximately 75 sensitive plant and animal species associated with the Coastal sage scrub community.<sup>19</sup> Once clothing much of Southern California, human activities have reduced CSS communities to sparse parcels dotting the region, some of the healthiest of which are located in BFS.<sup>20</sup> This patch may also be the largest remainder of continuous Coastal Sage Scrub habitat in Los Angeles County.<sup>21</sup> Coastal Sage Scrub comprises about 36.4 acres of the station and is recognized federally and locally as a community of significance.<sup>22</sup> Characteristic species include California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), for which the community is named, California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*), and white sage (*Salvia apiana*).<sup>23</sup>

Plants in the CSS community have developed several characteristic adaptations to tolerate the harsh living conditions. Many species have small leaves to minimize surface area by which water can be lost through evapotranspiration. Other qualities that aid moisture retention and are often seen on Coastal Sage Scrub plant species include curled leaves, tiny hairs (pubescence), wax coatings and/or resins, and vertical orientation. Plants also have pale colors to reflect extra light and conserve water, and small flowers which require less energy expenditure on growth, reproduction, and maintenance.<sup>24</sup> Several Coastal Sage Scrub species are summer deciduous, losing their leaves during the hot summer months and remaining dormant until fall or winter rains reinitiate the growing season.<sup>25</sup>

Near the center of the southern CSS community the station's primary aquatic habitat, known as pHake Lake, and its surrounding riparian forest community are found. The Southern Cottonwood-willow riparian forest (RF) which makes up the 1.8 acres around the lake is primarily composed of Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), several willow species (*Salix* spp.), Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), and White alder (*Alnus rhombifolia*).<sup>26</sup> This community developed as a result of pHake Lake's permanent water supply and has since become a valuable habitat for numerous bird species, especially winter migrantssuch as coots, herons, and mallards.<sup>27</sup> It also provides nesting and roosting sites for raptors.<sup>28</sup> During spring migration numerous warblers and

other bird species have been observed in this habitat. Because of its importance to many sensitive wildlife species it is a high conservation priority community for the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and is considered sensitive by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).<sup>29</sup>

The artificially created pHake Lake is a vital contributor to the species and habitat diversity at BFS. Completed in 1978, this one-acre pond<sup>30</sup> has since become home to several types of invertebrates and vertebrates, including fish, turtles, and birds. The shallow eastern portion, where algal growth covers most of the surface, is less diverse and probably more eutrophic than the deeper (up to 20 ft.) western end.<sup>31</sup> The lake is highly alkaline, with an average pH of 12.5, and anoxic at depths beyond 12 feet, making it difficult for many species to survive.<sup>32</sup> Mosquito fish (*Gambusia affinis*) and Southwestern pond turtles (*Clemmys marmorata pallida*) are among the species that have adapted to the conditions of the lake's environment, and the invertebrate population of insect larvae, snails, and amphipods is rich enough to sustain several pairs of nesting ducks (*Fulica americana americana*). The fish population is dominated by the introduced largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*), which is also the top predator in this community.<sup>33</sup>

The lake was designed to maximize diversity. The rapidly dropping shoreline was intended to confine rooted vegetation to a narrow western band that could be reached by sufficient sunlight. The depth also serves to create a sharp temperature gradient between the cold-water bottom and warmer surface waters. Two islands were designed as nesting sites for birds that would be inaccessible to terrestrial predators like coyotes. The shallow eastern portion was to become a marsh, and the various types of soils ranging from soft mud to sand and rock promoted the diversification of plant and animal communities.<sup>34</sup> The lake provides abundant food and habitat for much wildlife, and is capable of supporting even higher populations given slight changes in biotic structure.<sup>35</sup>

Near the lake are the five constructed vernal pools on the station. Vernal pools are depressions in the land that are seasonally flooded to become aquatic habitats for part of the year, and evaporate to dry land for the rest of the year. The species adapted to tolerate the harsh range of environmental conditions brought on by the cycle of

inundation and dessication are highly specialized and usually cannot survive in any other habitat. Some of the species found in the BFS vernal pools are endemic to this region.<sup>36</sup> The Riverside fairy shrimp (*Streptocephalus woottoni*) is a federally-listed endangered species that is found in only about ten pools in Southern California. They require warm water for hatching and rather large, deep (>30cm) pools. Experimental populations of fairy shrimp were introduced in the BFS vernal pools in 1985 and continue to survive today.<sup>37</sup> These pools are extremely unique and sensitive habitats that require additional care and maintenance to be sustained and to maintain appropriate water duration periods necessary to support the biota. They are high-priority conservation habitats that are currently being threatened by development at BFS.

North of the aquatic, riparian, and Coastal sage scrub communities, the “neck” of the Field Station is mostly made up of two different plant communities, Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub (RFS) and Southern coast live oak riparian forest (LOF). RFS, or alluvial fan scrub, is a very important habitat because of its high species diversity, and is considered among the highest conservation priorities for the region. This habitat occurs on outwash fans at mouths of canyons along the coastal side of the San Gabriel Mountains and also on floodplains.<sup>38</sup> It features a wide variety of sage scrub and chaparral species that grow primarily in sandy or rocky alluvial deposits. The community in BFS is in the advanced intermediate phase of development and contains a mixed species composition representative of both intermediate and mature alluvial scrub. Some characteristic plant species in this community include scale-broom (*Lepidospartum squamatum*), California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*), California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*), yerba santa (*Eriodictyon californicum*), Poison oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), spiny redberry (*Rhamnus crocea*), and cane cholla (*Opuntia parryi*).<sup>39</sup> Of the distinct communities in BFS, this habitat, covering 22 acres, contains the highest diversity of plant species and associated wildlife species, many of which are sensitive and the focus of conservation concerns.<sup>40</sup>

This community provides habitat for Coastal western whiptail (*Cnemidophorus tigris multisculatus*), Yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia*), Coastal cactus wren (*Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus counsei*), Olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus borealis*),



Coopers hawk (*Accipiter cooperi*), and San Diego desert woodrat (*Neotoma lepida intermedia*), which are all sensitive wildlife species found in the Field Station.<sup>41</sup> Coopers hawks are often seen on the station flying over the alluvial scrub habitat. They roost in the large trees and nest on site in Coast live oaks and Western sycamores.<sup>42</sup> Olive-sided flycatchers have been spotted in this community, although sightings are rare because they require montane coniferous habitat for nesting and do not often migrate to the lowlands. The Field Station likely serves as a migratory stopover site.<sup>43</sup> The Coastal cactus wren is a non-migratory bird that is restricted to Coastal sage scrub habitats with ample *Opuntia* populations where they build nests. There are only about 2400 pairs of cactus wrens throughout their range, and in the BFS a single pair occurs in the alluvial scrub.<sup>44</sup>

The alluvial fan scrub habitat is the understory to another plant community known as Southern coast live oak riparian forest, which composes 7 acres of the neck of the BFS.<sup>45</sup> Dominated by Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), this open, moderately dense woodland also contains honeysuckle (*Lonicera sp.*), Blue elderberry (*Sambucus mexicana*), Skunkbrush (*Rhus trilobata*), and Western sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*). This habitat is generally found along streams and on floodplains.<sup>46</sup> At BFS, the cluster of oaks and sycamores indicates the presence of water close to the surface.<sup>47</sup> It is possible that a perennial groundwater source forms along the fault that runs directly through the Field Station.<sup>48</sup>

For a relatively small area of land isolated in the middle of suburban development, BFS provides a surprising and complex range of distinct habitats and a high diversity of plant and wildlife species therein. There have been almost 120 species of plants identified in the station, nearly 90% of which are native or naturally occurring and many of which are sensitive.<sup>49</sup> These communities serve as habitat for the 4 reptile, 48 bird, and 7 mammal species observed on the land.<sup>50</sup> It is a resource of unexpected value, both ecologically and academically, whose history with the Claremont Colleges has been complicated and interesting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Leadership in Environmental Education Partnership: Guide to the Bernard Field Station (Claremont: 1999) 5.

<sup>2</sup>LEEP 5.

- 
- <sup>3</sup> Richard Hazlett, personal communication and tour of Bernard Field Station, 2 Feb 2000. Professor of Geology, Pomona College.
- <sup>4</sup> Hazlett, 2 Feb 2000.
- <sup>5</sup> Gene Fowler, personal communication and tour of Bernard Field Station, 10 Feb 2000. Director, Bernard Field Station and Professor of Biology, Pomona College.
- <sup>6</sup> Hazlett, 2 Feb 2000.
- <sup>7</sup> Fowler, 10 Feb 2000.
- <sup>8</sup> Hazlett, 2 Feb 2000.
- <sup>9</sup> Gene Fowler, personal communication, 17 April 2000. Director, Bernard Field Station and Professor of Biology, Pomona College.
- <sup>10</sup> LEEP 9 – 10.
- <sup>11</sup> Fowler, 17 April 2000.
- <sup>12</sup> LEEP 9 – 10.
- <sup>13</sup> Fowler, 10 Feb 2000.
- <sup>14</sup> Fowler, 10 Feb 2000.
- <sup>15</sup> Hazlett, 2 Feb 2000.
- <sup>16</sup> Recon 1996: 10.
- <sup>17</sup> Fowler, 10 Feb 2000.
- <sup>18</sup> Recon Regional Environmental Consultants, Claremont University Center Environmental Constraints: Indian Hill Golf Course, Bernard Field Station and the Quarry (Claremont: September 1995): 21.
- <sup>19</sup> Recon 1996: 14.
- <sup>20</sup> Fowler, 10 Feb 2000.
- <sup>21</sup> Bernard Biological Field Station Photo Album. (Claremont, CA: BFS Library).
- <sup>22</sup> Recon 1996: 10.
- <sup>23</sup> Fowler, 10 Feb 2000.
- <sup>24</sup> Kerns, Kevin. "Basic Characteristics of the Coastal Sage Scrub Community Found at the Bernard Field Station." (Claremont, CA: BFS Library) 1.
- <sup>25</sup> "Flora and Fauna of Bernard Biological Station." (Claremont, CA: BFS Library) 1.
- <sup>26</sup> Recon 1996: 15.
- <sup>27</sup> S. Kevin Bingham, personal communication, 26 February 2000. Interim caretaker, Bernard Field Station.
- <sup>28</sup> Recon 1995: 21.
- <sup>29</sup> Recon 1995: 13.
- <sup>30</sup> JNE & Associates, Inc., Biological Assessment of pHake Lake (Claremont: June 1995): 1.
- <sup>31</sup> JNE 8.
- <sup>32</sup> JNE 2.
- <sup>33</sup> Recon 1995: 8.
- <sup>34</sup> BFS Photo Album.
- <sup>35</sup> Recon 1995.
- <sup>36</sup> Recon 1996: 14 – 15.
- <sup>37</sup> Recon 1996: 17.
- <sup>38</sup> Recon 1996: 13.
- <sup>39</sup> Recon 1996: 6.
- <sup>40</sup> Recon 1995: 9.
- <sup>41</sup> Recon 1995: 21.
- <sup>42</sup> Recon 1996: 18.
- <sup>43</sup> Recon 1996: 19.
- <sup>44</sup> Recon 1996: 19.
- <sup>45</sup> Recon 1995: 9.
- <sup>46</sup> Recon 1996: 15.
- <sup>47</sup> Fowler, 10 Feb 2000.
- <sup>48</sup> Hazlett, 2 Feb 2000.
- <sup>49</sup> Recon 1996: 6.
- <sup>50</sup> Recon 1996: 11.



### **The Group Plan**

Pomona College, the founding member of the Claremont College Consortium, was established in 1887 within a paradoxical economic context. The rise of the lucrative citrus industry in the 1870s brought with it the infrastructure and incentive for a tripling of Southern California's population and a consequent boom in land value in the 1880s.<sup>1</sup> Just as quickly as it rose, however, the value of land once again collapsed before the close of the decade. Therefore, a college that had been born under auspicious financial promise soon saw itself in unexpected straits since the donors on whom Pomona was economically dependent were losing money in depreciating investments. The collapse of the land boom was both a curse and a blessing, however. In 1988 a group of developers donated the brand new and valueless Hotel Claremont along with 260 lots of land to the college, making possible the move to Claremont and providing room for growth in the years that followed.<sup>2</sup>

In 1910 Pomona College inaugurated James Arnold Blaisdell, a Congregational minister and Professor of Biblical Literature and ancient Oriental History at Beloit College, as its new President.<sup>3</sup> During his presidency, the resources of Pomona increased four-fold and the long-term financial viability of the college was secured. By 1919, the student enrollment of 685 was rapidly approaching the envisioned 700-student maximum and was straining the available resources. Faced with a difficult dilemma between the increasing pressure to expand and abandonment of the small college character, President Blaisdell proposed the idea of a group of inter-related but autonomous small colleges.<sup>4</sup> In 1923 he wrote, "My own very deep hope is that instead of one great undifferentiated university, we might have a group of institutions divided into small colleges – somewhat on the Oxford type – around a library and other utilities which they would use in common. In this way I should hope to preserve the inestimable personal values of the small college while securing the facilities of the great university. Such a development would be a new and wonderful contribution to American education."<sup>5</sup> The criteria set out for the Consortium involved three goals:



- “Each member maintains its own identity, having a distinct curriculum, student body, social climate, faculty, administration, governing board, endowment, and academic emphasis.”
- “The members are bound closely together by physical proximity, course cross registration, shared services, and constant intellectual and social interchange across campus boundaries.”
- “Each member, no matter how strong or comprehensive, benefits through its membership in The Claremont Colleges.”<sup>6</sup>

Against difficult financial obstacles, Blaisdell soon saw his vision for the Group Plan of the Colleges come to pass. In 1925, a central coordinating corporation, now Claremont University Center (CUC), was incorporated into the plan with four main functions:

- “To initiate the founding of new colleges and to determine the conditions under which individual colleges may become and remain members of the group.”
- “To conserve, enlarge, and strengthen the central physical facilities.”
- “To enrich the instructional, intellectual, and environmental opportunities available to all students in Claremont through advanced (post-baccalaureate) study.”
- “To serve as a coordinating agency, both educationally and financially, for the group.”<sup>7</sup>

Shortly afterward in the spring of 1926, Scripps College for Women joined the Consortium.

From the very beginning of Blaisdell’s vision for the Group Plan, it was clear that a critical factor in the success or failure of the system would be a physical space upon which to locate future institutions and to allow for all immediate and long-term needs.

### **Scripps Trust**

In October 1923, James Blaisdell wrote a historic letter to Miss Ellen Browning Scripps regarding the importance of immediate land acquisition for future educational expansion.<sup>8</sup> Fearing the loss of all available land contiguous to Pomona College to rapid suburban development, Blaisdell stressed the urgency of such a move in order to preserve options for the future of the Claremont College Consortium. In keeping with his vision for the growth of the college system, Miss Scripps agreed to the purchase of “two major parcels of land: 50 acres east of Dartmouth Avenue and south of Foothill Boulevard and 250 acres north of Foothill Boulevard, from Mills Avenue to Indian Hill Boulevard,

including a beautiful 50-acre mesa (Indian Hill).”<sup>9</sup> This acquisition pieced together seven tracts of private property<sup>10</sup> and required Miss Scripps to borrow a substantial amount of the quarter-million dollar purchase.<sup>11</sup> This generous gift “gave wings” to the group plan.<sup>12</sup> The land was intended to provide ample expansion room for the long-term needs of the Colleges, and was deeded explicitly for “educational use,” not to be sold for profit.<sup>13</sup> Another proviso of the deal was that proceeds from institutions sited on the land would be added to the endowment of Scripps College. The property, therefore called the Scripps Trust Property, was placed in the care of the Claremont Colleges, now CUC. Because Scripps College received money for its endowment, it was responsible for paying property taxes on the land. The land agreement was signed by William H. Honnold, vice-chairman of the Board of Fellows, Robert J. Bernard, secretary of the Board, and Miss Scripps in May of 1926.<sup>14</sup>

This agreement demonstrated tremendous foresight on the part of the involved parties, as evidenced by the fact that the Colleges used 200 acres within 17 years, between 1946 and 1963, for Claremont Men’s College, Harvey Mudd College, Pitzer College, the Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden, and the Claremont School of Theology.<sup>15</sup> In violation of the trust, some of this land was sold in 1959 for housing development and more leased for the Claremont Golf Course.<sup>16</sup> Most of these acres were bought back by the Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden and CUC at inflated prices.<sup>17</sup>

A major setback of the Scripps Trust Property which surfaced in the years following the founding of Pitzer College in 1963 was the high cost paid in taxes on the remaining 65 acres north of Foothill Boulevard as of yet unused for educational purposes. Because the land was zoned Educational by the City of Claremont but assessed as most appropriate for Highway/Commercial/Residential by the City Assessor, the taxes posed a significant financial burden for Scripps College to shoulder.<sup>18</sup> For 1975-1976, the cost of the property tax totaled a sizeable \$42,274. Because the financial weight of this land was becoming cumbersome to the college and no new institutions were being considered for immediate establishment, the Colleges began to seek means out of such difficulties.<sup>19</sup>

During this period, the land north of Foothill was an unprotected open space most often used by students and the community to drop trash, walk dogs, and ride dirt bikes.

Plagued by the unregulated abuse, the land appeared to be of little value as an educational resource and its aesthetic appeal was minimal.<sup>20</sup>

In 1968, Louis Benezet, President of CUC, proposed the idea of developing a wildlife preserve and research center with the land so as to avoid selling the property while qualifying for the educational-use tax exemption desperately needed by Scripps. In an effort to gather support for his proposal, Benezet invited Associate Professor of Biology, Margaret Matthies to be part of the project in August 1968. Matthies responded in February of 1969, recommending Professor Clyde Eriksen from the Joint Sciences Department of Claremont McKenna, Pitzer, and Scripps Colleges as a more appropriate choice to carry out the proposal. In the written exchange between Benezet and Matthies, both refer to the property unflatteringly as "barren and burnt-over."<sup>21</sup> The proposal, therefore, was not made purely in the interest of providing resources for ecological study, but to somehow beautify the "ugly, burnt-over waste north of Foothill" and make use of the land.<sup>22</sup>

With Benezet's retirement in 1970, the idea of an ecological research station lost its primary supporter, and the Colleges further pursued an alternate plan to use the land as an additional nine holes for the Claremont Golf Course, which had been made from 33 acres of the Scripps Trust Property. While CUC looked into the golf course idea as a temporary "educational opportunity," a group of faculty and students still interested in an ecological preserve restated the case for it. Between 1973 and 1975, faculty continued to present this proposal while the administration neglected to consider it as a possible alternative to the golf course. Upon formally proposing the idea to the Board of Fellows (CUC's governing body) in January of 1975, it was once again defeated, on the erroneous grounds that the necessary tax exemption could not be obtained and that it would afford no benefit to Scripps College.<sup>23</sup>

Finally in February of 1975, an Ad Hoc Policy and Management Committee, made up of one trustee from each college, sent a recommendation to the Board of Fellows regarding a plan for the use of the land.<sup>24</sup> This report involved the division of the land into parcels to be either sold for residential development, leased, or given away, with two non-contiguous left-over areas totaling thirty-some odd acres for a field station in an attempt to obtain a tax-exemption.<sup>25</sup>

The faculty, insulted and incensed by this idea, rejected it immediately, arguing that it was unethical and inappropriate. Robert J. Bernard strongly scolded the trustees for attempting to violate the Scripps Trust, jeopardizing the future of the Group Plan, and behaving unethically.<sup>26</sup> Largely due to his convincing, the Board of Fellows agreed not to sell the land, and a meeting was arranged to discuss the field station in the Fall of 1975.<sup>27</sup> In attendance were Clyde Eriksen, Robert J. Bernard, Donald McKenna, the founding donor of CMC, President Emeritus of CMC George Benson, and Jack Stark, President of CMC. On June 4, 1976, Donald McKenna's Kennametal Foundation allotted \$600,000 to buy out Scripps' interest in the land, fence the property, build a lake, and create an endowment for the field station. The Board of Fellows officially inaugurated the Robert J. Bernard Biological Field Station of the Claremont Colleges on June 5, 1976, with Clyde Eriksen as its director.<sup>28</sup>

One of the first tasks at hand after the Field Station's inception was the documentation of its educational use and application for the tax exemption. A careful record of users was kept along with other information concerning the educational uses of the Field Station and presented to the Los Angeles County Assessor's Office in July of 1977.<sup>29</sup> The exemption was approved shortly thereafter, and a field station open house in May 1980 marked the formal establishment of the new addition to the Claremont Colleges' facilities.<sup>30</sup>

### **Academic and Community Value**

Since its establishment, both the academic and community uses of the Field Station have steadily increased. For the first few years, BFS was used by several fledgling classes in biology, mostly taught by Clyde Eriksen.<sup>31</sup> However, with the construction of the lake in 1978 and the addition of captive wildlife programs, user days more than tripled between 1977 and 1978. Within the first few years, annual user days had stabilized around an average of 2000 per year.<sup>32</sup> Between 1976 and 1994, BFS records indicated a total of 47,200 user days, or an average of 2700 user days per year.<sup>33</sup> This means that BFS has in some way contributed to the college curriculum, research efforts, and/or personal education of more than seven individuals per day for 18 years.



“At the time of its proposal, we were vastly underestimating the value of a field station. We had no idea that it would become such a tremendous resource.”<sup>34</sup>

Although it was proposed as an ecological field station for biology and environmental studies, BFS has since become a valuable resource for classes in various other departments as well, having been used by geology, physics/astronomy, external studies, art, history, economics, military science, chemistry, anthropology, media studies, and theater.<sup>35</sup> In addition to its importance to a broad variety of academic disciplines within the Colleges, the Field Station has also become an increasingly depended-upon resource for the community. Between 1985 and 1994, a total of 34 different elementary and high schools from Claremont and neighboring communities utilized the Field Station for a variety of educational purposes. BFS has also been a popular site for outdoor education programs and workshops sponsored by a variety of organizations, including Project Wild, Audubon Society, Boy/Girl Scouts, and Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden. It has served as a site for employee training, bird watching, volunteering, and creating art.<sup>36</sup>

A key to the Bernard Field Station's value is its prime location in the heart of the city. Its position along Foothill Boulevard makes it highly visible and a well-publicized resource for the community. A Field Station located at a less central site would probably not be as well-known or used. The proximity of this location to the college campuses is another important element for its proper use as an academic facility. The Field Station is within walking distance from any point on campus, taking at most 20 minutes to reach, and is therefore easily accessible for frequent or short periods of study. Since the majority of students on campus do not own vehicles, a field station even within short driving distance of the Colleges, such as the Wilderness Park, excludes a considerable number of students from independently accessing the site. Transportation costs for the number of students and the frequency with which the site is visited would be exorbitant and prohibitive to the feasibility of utilizing a more remote station. The Bernard Biological Field Station is one of four outdoor laboratories in the country that is contiguous with the campus of the academic institutions that own it.<sup>37</sup> Therefore, in an era where academic institutions everywhere have recognized the importance of acquiring

lands for field studies, the Claremont Colleges have remained one step ahead in ensuring the value of such a facility by taking advantage of an unusually favorable location.

Another contributing factor to the unexpected success of BFS as a research facility of the Colleges is its protected perimeter. The eight-foot fence around the property not only offers safety to the scientific equipment and studies within it, but also to the students and faculty themselves.<sup>38</sup> Ecology by nature is an unpredictable science. Therefore, most attempts to study a natural habitat require an extended time frame and the possibility of numerous replicate experiments. Because the Field Station is a shared facility of an academic community, it is possible to designate a study site with confidence that the equipment and materials will neither be stolen nor disrupted. In an unprotected area with unrestricted or unmonitored access, this necessary aspect of scientific research cannot be guaranteed.<sup>39</sup> The safety and convenience of BFS have made it possible for students to conduct repeated trials of experiments in order to strengthen results and education gained from such studies. Furthermore, ecological studies often require observation or recording at unusual times of day or night. For example a study in nocturnal rodent foraging may necessitate trips to the site for set-up at dusk and dawn, and perhaps even overnight observation. Since BFS is constantly monitored by on-site personnel and is connected to the nearby campus security system, college safety and Claremont Police Department officers are easily reached, so visiting this site at odd hours does not pose a significant safety risk.

### **Threats to BFS**

Despite its significant value as an academic and community resource, the BFS has not been a welcomed or acknowledged facility at the Colleges. On several occasions the Colleges have attempted to abolish this facility in various ways, only to re-recognize its value or reconfirm its importance to the Colleges.

Between 1985 and 1994, numerous discussions took place regarding planning efforts, and decisions were made involving the land occupied by the Bernard Field Station. Among the plans for station land were blueprints for a School of Theology parking lot, widening of Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden access road, and a child care center. All of these ideas required development of field station land, but were discussed

or decided without consulting the director or the steering committee of the Field Station.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, alternative suggestions, submitted by BFS Director Clyde Eriksen, never received a response from the administration.<sup>41</sup> Instead, Eriksen was approached to choose 10 acres of the entire field station land for continual use for ecological studies, so that the remaining acreage could serve as land for future colleges and other institutions.<sup>42</sup>

In 1994, a motion was raised to parcel out sections of the Field Station land for master planning of the site.<sup>43</sup> Once again engaging in discussion without consulting BFS faculty, the administration carried on with development plans involving only college deans in the dialogue. Informed of these intentions by Biology Professor and Dean of Pomona College, Laura Hoopes, the 5-college Biology faculty mobilized to convince the administration of the importance of the Field Station as an educational resource. For the first time ever, numerous faculty members pushed the administration into recognizing the value of BFS to the academic curriculum of the Colleges. The move to subdivide the property was defeated, and in January of 1997, Philippe Cohen, director of the internationally renowned Jasper Ridge Field Station of Stanford University, was hired as a consultant to assess the educational resource value of the Bernard Field Station. In his report to the Colleges, Cohen praised the station as an academic asset, and warned the administration that, its ecological viability was at risk due to its small size and poor maintenance. In addition, he urged that significant financial investments be made to provide for the maintenance and preservation of the habitat and that a full-time director be hired to oversee the numerous tasks necessary for the successful operation of the station.<sup>44</sup>

Following this report, the Presidents and Deans of the Colleges issued a formal statement recognizing the educational value of the Bernard Field Station. Furthermore, the operating income for the station was gradually increased to more than four times the income derived from the 1976 endowment of \$100,000 created by the founding donor. In keeping with Cohen's suggestion, the hiring of a full-time director of the Field Station was thereafter pursued as well.<sup>45</sup>

Although these events demonstrated considerable threat to the longevity of the Bernard Field Station, the struggles did deliver some positive results. The formal

statement from the administration and the allocation of College funds toward the station were the first steps toward accepting BFS as a recognized institution of the Colleges and removing it from the periphery of administrative focus. Additionally, the mobilization of faculty demonstrated the commitment of educators to the Field Station and reaffirmed the importance placed on such a resource.

The hard lessons learned and the small victories earned would once again resume focus with the faculty when, in the spring of 1997, the Field Station would meet its most critical match in its fight for survival with the long discussed, but finally materializing, "new venture."

---

<sup>1</sup> Claremont University Center, *A Brief History of the Group Plan of the Claremont Colleges* (Claremont, 1993) 6.

<sup>2</sup> CUC 8.

<sup>3</sup> CUC 7.

<sup>4</sup> CUC 8.

<sup>5</sup> CUC 10.

<sup>6</sup> CUC 4.

<sup>7</sup> CUC 12.

<sup>8</sup> Robert J. Bernard, *An Unfinished Dream: A Chronicle of the Group Plan of The Claremont Colleges* (Claremont, California: The Castle Press, 1982) 702.

<sup>9</sup> CUC 24.

<sup>10</sup> Bernard 703.

<sup>11</sup> CUC 24.

<sup>12</sup> CUC 12.

<sup>13</sup> Bernard 701.

<sup>14</sup> Bernard 703.

<sup>15</sup> Bernard 704.

<sup>16</sup> Bernard 704.

<sup>17</sup> CUC 24.

<sup>18</sup> Larry Oglesby, personal interview, 3 March 2000. Professor Emeritus of Biology, Pomona College. Former Member of Environmental Quality and Planning Commissions, Claremont.

<sup>19</sup> Bernard 705.

<sup>20</sup> Clyde Eriksen, *Annotated Documents Pertaining to the History of the Acquisition, Disposition and Management of Claremont Colleges Lands North of Foothill Blvd., with Reference to the Robert J. Bernard Biological Field Station*, Document 5.

<sup>21</sup> Eriksen, Document 2.

<sup>22</sup> Eriksen, Document 2.

<sup>23</sup> Faculty Advisory Committee of the Robert J. Bernard Biological Field Station, *The Robert J. Bernard Biological Field Station: Its History and Value to the Educational Mission of the Claremont Colleges* (Claremont 1994) 1.

<sup>24</sup> Bernard 704 – 5.

<sup>25</sup> Eriksen, Document 10.

<sup>26</sup> Eriksen, Document 11.

<sup>27</sup> Faculty Advisory Committee 2.

<sup>28</sup> Eriksen, Document 14.

<sup>29</sup> Eriksen, Document 16.

<sup>30</sup> "A Biological Utopia," *CMC Profile* (Fall 1980): 8.

<sup>31</sup> Faculty Advisory Committee 2.

<sup>32</sup> Eriksen, Document 19.

---

<sup>33</sup> Faculty Advisory Committee 7.

<sup>34</sup> Oglesby, 3 Mar 2000.

<sup>35</sup> Eriksen, Document 23.

<sup>36</sup> Eriksen, Document 23.

<sup>37</sup> Philippe Cohen, Bernard Field Station Assessment Report (Claremont, 5 March 1997) 4.

<sup>38</sup> Faculty Advisory Committee 4.

<sup>39</sup> Faculty Advisory Committee 4.

<sup>40</sup> Eriksen, index.

<sup>41</sup> Eriksen, Document 21.

<sup>42</sup> Eriksen, index.

<sup>43</sup> Gene Fowler, personal interview, 16 February 2000.

<sup>44</sup> Cohen 1 – 2.

<sup>45</sup> Fowler, 16 Feb 2000.





According to James A. Blaisdell's original expectation for the Claremont College Group Plan, one new college was to be added to the consortium every ten years.<sup>1</sup> Following the establishment of Scripps College in 1926, this basic schema continued more-or-less on schedule until Pitzer College was founded in 1963. For the next few decades, a new member would not join the Claremont Colleges.

About ten years ago, dialogue about a seventh college was actively reinitiated by John McGuire, President of CUC, and several ideas were entertained as to what the new member would be.<sup>2</sup> After discussing thoughts of a medical school or a law school, the Policy Council, composed of the Presidents and Board of Trustee chairs of each college,<sup>3</sup> began to narrow the possibilities down to two proposals. One was an institute in Pacific Rim Studies, including international relations and sciences related to the region, and the other was a graduate program in science.<sup>4</sup>

One of the most vigorous proponents of the latter idea, Henry Riggs, then President of Harvey Mudd College, thought a graduate level science program was critical for the well-rounded growth of the Claremont College community. As he began to do research and formulate thoughts on what type of science institution it would be, he was convinced that the "marriage of biology with engineering" was a necessary new direction for science education to take.<sup>5</sup> In 1996 he proposed the idea of a graduate academy of applied life sciences to trustees, administration, and faculty.<sup>6</sup>

Although there were very few details available on the "new venture," the concept alone raised several questions among the faculty about the appropriateness of an institute of its sort within a consortium of liberal arts colleges. Its reliance on industry and plan to prepare students for upward corporate mobility drew particular focus. Because the faculty felt they were unable to receive answers to their questions from Henry Riggs, they attempted to initiate similar dialogue among higher-level decision-makers about the perceived inconsistencies between the character of the proposed new venture and the Claremont Colleges.<sup>7</sup> However, despite letters, conversations, and presentations prompted by concerned faculty, these discussions never took hold. On January 17, 1997, without any answers to issues raised by faculty, the "new venture" in applied life sciences



was conditionally admitted to the Claremont Consortium through a vote taken by the Board of Fellows and the Policy Council. The five conditions set forth by the Board included the founding of a seed grant, adherence to the Constitution of the Claremont Colleges, and the establishment of a Board of Trustees.<sup>8</sup>

Starting in 1995 a land planning process conducted by the Colleges invited various consultants to assess the biological value of three sites for a potential new venture. Reports were prepared by Recon and Gensler about the BFS, the Claremont Golf Course, and a rock Quarry owned by the Colleges.<sup>9</sup> On March 21, 1997, upon the recommendation of the Policy Council, the Board of Fellows granted 11.4 acres of the southwest corner of the Bernard Biological Field Station as a gift of land to the new college, subject to its admission into the consortium.<sup>10</sup> Prior to this decision there had been a widespread expression of opposition to this siting option by faculty and students at all of the Claremont Colleges. Beginning in May 1996, the faculties of Pitzer College, Pomona College, Harvey Mudd College, and Scripps College passed resolutions to oppose the development of the Bernard Field Station for any new college or institution that would damage the ecological integrity of the site. Three of the four faculties voted unanimously and the fourth voted overwhelmingly with a 90% majority to locate the new venture elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> In December of 1996, Nancy Hamlett, Chair of the Biology Department at Harvey Mudd College, was asked to represent the faculty voice in a presentation to the Board of Trustees' Educational Planning Committee about the value of the Field Station to the colleges.<sup>12</sup> Regardless of these attempts, however, four out of five Presidents and all five Board Chairs voted *for* the siting of the new venture upon BFS.<sup>13</sup> After the decision was made to pursue this site, students and faculty continued to voice opposition. In March of 1997 a student protest outside of CUC brought hundreds of people together to sign petitions, write letters, and make speeches asking administrators to reconsider the siting choice and to recognize the students' academic needs for an intact Field Station. The protest ended with forced occupation of Harper Hall until a CUC administrator addressed the students' concerns in person.

The uproar of the college community was quelled by a verbal agreement to strike a compromise made by the presidents of the colleges. They suggested that the 11-acre parcel could be sacrificed in return for the preservation of the remainder of the BFS site.<sup>14</sup>

The faculty were assured that no further development would be contemplated on site within the planning period, and that college lands such as the golf course and the rock quarry would be considered next for future development before any further building on BFS.<sup>15</sup> Appeased by the seeming willingness of the presidents to compromise, the students and faculty awaited the next stage of the siting process – the North Campus Master Plan.

In July of 1997, the W. M. Keck Foundation accepted Henry Riggs' proposal for a seed grant and allocated \$50 million to the "new venture" in biotechnology, thereafter the Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Sciences (KGI). The other conditions of its admission were met, and KGI became an official member of the Claremont Consortium within the year.<sup>16</sup> While preparations were underway for its permanent campus, KGI rented a site in an industrial complex in South Claremont, less than a mile away from the Colleges to begin operations.

In order to continue with the Colleges' decision to develop the Field Station, CUC submitted an application for project approval to the City of Claremont. According to the Claremont General Plan Land Use Element, the City must establish a pattern for land use and standards for the intensity of its development.<sup>17</sup> The City must determine whether the proposal meets with its set goals for land use, which include:

- "Preserve the City's distinctive character."
- "Preserve the City as an educational and cultural center."
- "Conserve natural resources and energy."<sup>18</sup>

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would have to be prepared to assess the environmental effects that development of BFS would have. The City then hired Envicom, Inc. to prepare the EIR, which it was responsible for approving.<sup>19</sup> When the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was released for public review in March 1999, students and faculty were appalled to discover that there was no statement of mitigation requiring the preservation of any of the remaining acres of the BFS.

Throughout the 45-day public comment period, students, faculty, and community members joined together to mobilize others into writing letters, attending hearings, and voicing their concerns about the DEIR. Public information meetings, tours and open

houses of the Field Station, protests and press conferences were held; petitions were circulated, and letters to newspapers were written in an effort to raise awareness in the community and to encourage individuals to extend their thoughts and make their voices heard. There were three meetings in all where public comments were heard -- the Planning Commission, Traffic and Transportation Commission, and Architectural Commission, which each made recommendations on how to revise the document before the City would accept it. Hundreds of community members attended the hearings and wrote letters about the EIR. The public comments requesting revision of the DEIR to include some mitigation measure for perpetual preservation of the Field Station drastically outweighed those made in support of the document.

However, this mitigation measure was never recommended by any of the commission members, and in July 1999, despite much public opposition, the Final EIR was approved without any added measure for the preservation of the BFS.<sup>20</sup>

Following this decision, a newly-formed community activist group called Friends of the Bernard Biological Field Station (FBBFS) filed for an appeal of the EIR certification. On September 9, 1999, the City Council heard the appeal, but once again decided to uphold the Architectural Commission's decision to approve the EIR.<sup>21</sup>

Since the Architectural Commission decision, the Friends of the Bernard Biological Field Station have held regular meetings to consider options for delaying or preventing development of the land until some concession is made by CUC for the preservation of the remainder of the site. Among the strategies discussed were a referendum to repeal the EIR approval, an initiative to change the BFS from educational to conservation zoning, and others. The Friends have planned press conferences, mock trials, and other events to raise awareness of the issues. A student group called Students for the Bernard Biological Field Station (SBBFS) has held a number of protests outside of KGI's current site and a student "counter-conference" coinciding with a February 2000 conference held by Pomona and Harvey Mudd Colleges on the topic "Biotechnology and Beyond."<sup>22</sup> The issue is far from resolved in the minds of those who have been actively involved, although the small but distinct windows of opportunity are continually closing on those who intend to take action.

Before construction on the Field Station can begin, several steps must be completed in the approval process. The Architectural Commission will have to consider a list of benefits of the project to determine whether they override the significant environmental impacts identified by the EIR.<sup>23</sup> Once this stage is passed there is no further forum for discussion on the choice of a site for KGI, and the remaining considerations will primarily review the Building and Construction Plans.<sup>24</sup>

Unless some action is taken to successfully halt development, KGI is expected to open its doors to its first class of 15 students on August 1, 2000.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Brenda Barham-Hill, personal interview, 24 February 2000. Vice President, Claremont University Center.

<sup>2</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.

<sup>3</sup> Peter Stanley, personal interview, 20 March 2000. President, Pomona College.

<sup>4</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.

<sup>5</sup> Bernadette Busenberg, personal interview, 3 March 2000. Director of Planning and Administration, Keck Graduate Institute.

<sup>6</sup> Nancy V. Hamlett, personal interview, 5 March 2000. Professor of Biology, Harvey Mudd College. President, Friends of the Bernard Biological Field Station.

<sup>7</sup> Hamlett, 5 March 2000.

<sup>8</sup> Busenberg, 3 March 2000.

<sup>9</sup> Stanley, 20 March 2000.

<sup>10</sup> Mitch Dorger, *Land Planning Policy Statement*, 6 March 1997: 1.

<sup>11</sup> "Claremont College Faculties Support Bernard Field Station," Fall 1996.

<sup>12</sup> Hamlett, 5 March 2000.

<sup>13</sup> Richard Worthington, personal interview, 3 March 2000. Chair of Public Policy Analysis Program, Pomona College.

<sup>14</sup> Larry Oglesby, personal interview, 21 February 2000. Professor Emeritus of Biology, Pomona College. Former member of Environmental Quality and Planning Commissions, Claremont.

<sup>15</sup> Dorger 2.

<sup>16</sup> Busenberg, 3 March 2000.

<sup>17</sup> City of Claremont, *Claremont General Plan*, (Claremont, 1993) I/1-1.

<sup>18</sup> City I/1-3.

<sup>19</sup> Karen Rosenthal, personal interview, 23 February 2000. Mayor, Claremont.

<sup>20</sup> Friends of the Bernard Biological Field Station, *Claremont Approval Process for the Keck Graduate Institute*, 14 January 2000: 2.

<sup>21</sup> FBBFS 2.

<sup>22</sup> Charles Cange, personal interview, 17 April 2000. Student, Pomona College.

<sup>23</sup> Belle Newman, personal communication, 12 November 1999. Senior Planner, Claremont.

<sup>24</sup> Newman, 12 Nov 1999.

<sup>25</sup> Busenberg, 3 March 2000.









---

## **The Controversies**

The extensive community involvement in an otherwise routine land use decision is due to the intersection of various controversial points within this single issue. Some of the concerns raised throughout the approval process pertained specifically to omissions or inadequacies of the EIR document in its consideration of impacts on the BFS while others focused on more long-term, far-reaching effects of the siting decision. More recent points of contention have questioned the nature of the project itself, and its potential for impacting Claremont.

### **The “Missing Mitigation”**

When the siting decision was internally formalized within the Colleges in 1997, negotiations between Presidents and faculty left many people with the impression that the eleven-acre sacrifice would result in some measure of protection for the remaining area of BFS. At one extreme, individuals understood that the entire remainder of the site would be preserved in perpetuity.<sup>1</sup> Others, however, contend that the extent of the compromise was to delay the comprehensive master planning of the property for the “maximum foreseeable future” relevant to land planning, thereby extending the life of undeveloped Field Station acreage for fifteen years.<sup>2</sup> Naturally, those expecting perpetual preservation were disappointed to find this clause lacking in the DEIR. However, the spark that incited the community to action came upon learning that the measure had been deliberately excluded from the document.

Before the DEIR was released for public comment, a “screencheck draft” of the report was presented to a select few members of the city and academic community for inspection. Drawing on previously conducted studies as well as the assessment done by Envicom, Inc. itself, this December 1998 edition maintained that the development of the portion of the site would undermine the integrity of the natural systems and cause significant adverse impacts to the habitat and wildlife. As a mitigation for the impacts of habitat loss, it proposed that “the applicant ensure the continuing integrity of the remaining portion of the Field Station in perpetuity,” and advised that a restriction be



placed on the property title to prohibit any future development except as necessary for the continuing operation of the site as a Field Station.<sup>3</sup>

Upon the release of the Draft EIR for public view in March 1999, this mitigation was missing. Instead, the effects of development, including habitat loss, were recast as significant, unavoidable impacts for which no mitigation was suggested. Those who were familiar with the screencheck draft and others who were expecting this measure as a compromise from the Colleges were appalled. Even people who had not viewed the screencheck were upset to discover its absence since no significant mitigation measure provided for any long-term preservation of the site, leaving the Field Station virtually unprotected from future development. The community immediately took action to confront the forces behind its removal and reinstate the clause into the document.

The City is responsible for approving the EIR, but the Colleges pay for the consultants' service. While the perpetual preservation of the remaining habitat may have been the only biologically appropriate means of mitigating habitat loss, it is economically unfavorable to the Colleges. CUC owns the land with the intent of educational expansion, so the mitigation measure is a costly and inconvenient obstacle to its plans. Likely swayed by the Colleges' economic arguments and adamancy over land use rights, the City probably agreed to delete this recommendation before publishing the document. According to Senior Planner for the project, Belle Newman, the "screencheck draft" was an administrative working copy of the EIR which was "subject to change" at any time without public input.<sup>4</sup> Although it was well within their rights to modify the document, all decisions should have been made without taking economic considerations into account, because this process is aimed specifically at evaluating the environmental impacts of the project on the community.<sup>5</sup> The missing mitigation was the primary recommendation intended to diminish the ecological impacts of the project.

The probability that "backroom deals" were being made between the City and CUC in an issue of importance to the whole community, coupled with the vulnerability of the Field Station worried the citizens about the manner in which decisions were being made.<sup>6</sup> The environmental review process, which was meant to be separate from land use decisions, was evidently being confused with monetary priorities. As more and more

opinions were voiced and new questions raised, it became clear through the process that this was neither the only point of dissatisfaction with the EIR nor the single controversy at the heart of the community's concern.

### **Coastal Sage Scrub**

In place of the "missing mitigation" the Final EIR added a recommendation from the hearing bodies for significant off-site habitat replacement. For every acre developed in BFS three acres of similar habitat would have to be preserved elsewhere.

Originally, part of the debate focused on whether mitigation should be pursued on the BFS site or elsewhere. On-site mitigation would have greater benefit to the Field Station and the College and Claremont communities. Off-site preservation may have a better chance for sustained viability, especially without any guarantee for the long-term preservation of the site.<sup>7</sup> Saying that the BFS directors convinced them of this approach, the City chose off-site mitigation.<sup>8</sup>

The City of Claremont owns and operates a wilderness park in the foothills to the north of the Colleges. It is made up of 1200 acres of native chaparral habitat in a region that is largely unsuitable for development. The Claremont Colleges have recently purchased 240 acres of land near the park, which some speculate will be used to meet off-site mitigation requirements for this and future projects.<sup>9</sup> While this area is a valuable public resource for wilderness recreation, the chaparral community is ecologically dissimilar from the Coastal Sage Scrub habitat that will be lost to development within the Field Station. The plants that make up the two communities vary tremendously, and therefore, support different types of wildlife as well. For example, the Coastal California Gnatcatcher, federally listed as threatened, is dependent upon Coastal Sage Scrub as its habitat, and has even been seen making its home in sagebrush at BFS,<sup>10</sup> whereas chaparral is not as ideal for it. In addition, although both systems are adapted to the harsh climatic conditions of the semi-desert, chaparral is capable of growing in more mountainous regions while CSS is limited to topographically flat areas. Therefore, chaparral is much less threatened by encroaching development than sage scrub. Since European settlement of the region, it is estimated that between 66% and 90% of the

original Coastal Sage Scrub habitat has been lost. Most of the remnant habitat has been severely degraded by grazing, invasion of non-native weeds, and air pollution.<sup>11</sup> The Bernard Field Station is home to some of the healthiest remnant parcels in Los Angeles County.<sup>12</sup> If the area preserved for off-site mitigation is akin to the chaparral habitat of the Wilderness Park that it neighbors, this site will be of far less ecological value than the parcel of CSS that is lost in the Field Station. Furthermore, because the mitigation calls for habitat *replacement*, substituting chaparral for Coastal Sage Scrub is not an ethical way of holding up the obligation. However, the conditions of the EIR are not legally binding, unless the US Fish and Wildlife Service chooses to take legal action against the City. Both the City and the Colleges realize this is unlikely since the site in question is relatively small and the issue has not been publicized enough.<sup>13</sup> If the Colleges do choose to comply with the habitat replacement, then their search for intact Coastal Sage Scrub will surely take them out of Claremont, making the site less accessible and irrelevant to the community and the Colleges. KGI representatives expect to satisfy the mitigation requirement with a parcel of land in Alta Loma, which is several miles away from Claremont.<sup>14</sup>

Another ecological factor under consideration is the viability of the entire site. The 85-acre site is already the minimum viable size for an ecologically sustaining community. If 11 acres of the Field Station are developed, the remaining 75 will be severely impacted in terms of the likelihood for continued viability. One of the greatest ongoing threats to CSS habitat is its continuing fragmentation due to urbanization. The estimated 10% of the original habitat that now remains are now scattered across 6000 square miles.<sup>15</sup> The 33 acres that are preserved off-site are likely to be yet another biological island within suburbia which has little chance of being a viable community. Although the acreage of protected Coastal Sage Scrub may increase overall due to the mitigation, the ecological value is diminished by fragmenting the parcels. What is also lost is the diversity of habitat that is found within the current BFS site. As the field station becomes smaller, the overall integrity of the site compromised and its ability to function as a biological system impaired, the variety of plant habitats found in coexistence with the parcel of CSS to be developed will be affected. Therefore, sensitive

habitats such as the Riversidean alluvial fan sage scrub and the wildlife that depends upon it will be impacted. This is also an important ecological loss, because it is estimated that alluvial scrub currently remains in less than 10 sites in Southern California, composing of a total of approximately 10,000 acres.<sup>16</sup> Impacts could threaten the 22 acres of alluvial scrub habitat in the BFS which currently function as a viable parcel in coexistence with CSS.<sup>17</sup> It is likely that the site chosen for off-site mitigation will not have any means of compensating for or providing the diversity of habitats which will be impacted by the development of the 11 acres at the Field Station.

### **Open Space**

Another effect of the project that has raised some concern among Claremont residents is the loss of open space, an already rare commodity in Southern California. Open space allows the community “breathing room,” or an escape from endless development. It reminds us of our dependence on nature and allows for connections to the land.<sup>18</sup> BFS is further valuable because it is open space in the heart of Claremont.

In 1998, Janet Riddell, a graduate of Pomona College Class of '65, made a trip back to her alma mater. She was amazed to see the view of the San Gabriel Mountains that provide the majestic backdrop for the painstakingly landscaped environs of the campus. Because of the severe pollution, she had never been able to see the mountains from campus during the four years she spent as a student in Claremont.<sup>19</sup>

Although the smog continues to compromise the view on occasion, current residents of Claremont are lucky to enjoy this vista nearly every day. Unfortunately many do not realize what a privilege it is to have the view, and will not know its impact on the daily atmosphere in Claremont until it is no longer visible. Besides being a beautiful sight to see, the mountains shape the environment within which people live and learn and they serve as a source of orientation. In fact, when the early settlers arrived, this very view prompted them to name the town Claremont – meaning “Clear Mountain” – after “the lofty skyline so well loved.”<sup>20</sup>

One of the only places where these mountains can be viewed without any obstructions is along Foothill Boulevard through the opening between development

where the Bernard Field Station currently stands. The Methodist Church located on Foothill Boulevard is one example of how the community takes advantage of the view that BFS allows. The church is oriented so that its windows face out toward the mountains over the BFS. Deliberately designed this way by the well-known architect Richard Neutra, the church avoided using stained glass and opted to set its sight upon God's natural creations instead.<sup>21</sup> The construction plans for the site will compromise this view for the Methodist churchgoers and others, who take advantage of the window that BFS provides to view the mountains. With no reassurance that the remainder of the site to survive, there is reason to fear that the single complete view of the mountains from Claremont will give way to yet more constructed development.

### **Claremont's History**

Claremont's history began with the Tongva people long before missionaries, the citrus industry, or the Colleges arrived. Tongva presence can be traced as far back as 5000 BCE in some places, although by 500 CE they were definitely settled in all of their villages in the Los Angeles Basin.<sup>22</sup> One of these villages, Torojoatngna, was located in Claremont, and is currently the subject of some concern in the community.

The site of the Tongva village in Claremont has not been confirmed. However, according to the oral history of the local Tongva community, Torojoatngna was located on the Bernard Field Station. Because the structure of the villages were not coincidental with modern day municipalities, it has been hard to pinpoint the exact location. What is known is that the village was at least one square mile in area and included areas for dance, sacred ceremonies, grinding, "sweats" and shaman's work.<sup>23</sup> Torojoatngna was a trading village of nearly 40 – 50 houses and 200 people.<sup>24</sup> The chief lived in the center of the village, usually on an elevated plateau, and the houses were arranged radially around it.<sup>25</sup> The Indian Hill Mesa, now in the Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden immediately neighboring the BFS is thought to be this center. Evidence that supports the Tongva claim to the land is found in early maps and history books of Claremont, which all label the current BFS site as "Indian Village."<sup>26</sup>

As part of the EIR, the cultural resources of the impacted site were reviewed. An archaeologist for Envicom, Inc. examined the site for indication that the land was once the location of the village. No artifacts were uncovered during this dig, so the consultant concluded that the Tongva claims were false. Further, because the Tongva were expected to have built their village close to a water source, the archaeologist supposed that a more likely site for Torojoatngna would have been at the base of Indian Hill, where they could catch the run off from mountain springs.<sup>27</sup> Since this was the expert's report in the EIR, the City has not chosen to pursue the Tongva's continued claims to the land.

This issue is still not resolved in the minds of many. There are several reasons why the Tongva people feel that an archaeological dig does not suffice to falsify their tradition. The search conducted was a fairly low-scale, superficial dig. A more extensive exploration would uncover more accurate results, but would require damage to the land. Since the Tongva traditionally did not practice burial, but rather cremation of dead bodies along with all of their earthly possessions, the likelihood of uncovering archaeological evidence of their inhabitation of this site is slim. Weapons, clothing, and household implements were "ritualistically killed," and would not be readily found on any of the Tongva village sites.<sup>28</sup> In addition, it is probable that missionaries or citrus industrialists who worked the land uncovered most of the artifacts in this area long ago. In that case any items found would have been taken up by collectors, who regularly traded or gave away many artifacts and were often poor at keeping records of where and from whom the objects were received.<sup>29</sup>

Both Pomona College and CUC own fairly extensive collections of Native American artifacts from all over Southern California. CUC's collection was given to the Colleges in 1929 by a well-known collector named Jonathan Tibbett at the urging of Robert J. Bernard, and was housed for many years in the basement of Big Bridges. In 1969, Pitzer Professor of Anthropology, Sheryl Miller, taught a class that began an inventory of the objects in the Tibbett collection.<sup>30</sup> One of the students in the class, now a Claremont resident, recalls seeing thousands of objects, including several large grinding stones, beaded jewelry, and pottery in this collection.<sup>31</sup> Along with these objects she saw hand-written card stock notes that labeled the artifacts as having been removed from "the

Indian Hill in Claremont.”<sup>32</sup> The “Indian Hill” probably refers to the 50-acre mesa currently in the Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden that neighbors the Field Station. Oral history among senior citizens who have lived in this valley since the early part of the century also identifies this mesa with the same name.<sup>33</sup> Given the structure of the village houses around the central plateau, the southeastern portion of Torojoatngna would have been on land now on the BFS, supporting the Tongva’s claims. The artifacts owned by the Colleges that may have information to clear up the confusion on the issue were not admitted into the archaeological study done by the consultants.<sup>34</sup>

Similar to the studies conducted by scientific experts, the archaeological study was also paid for by the Colleges, for whom confirmation of the Tongva presence on their desired development site would not be beneficial. The differing results between evidence presented by the Tongva and the hired consultants raise questions about the evaluation that was done. For example, the archaeologist, Jeannette McKenna stated that she had a conversation with Chief Anthony Morales of the Tongva Tribal Council in which he told her that the village was never located on the site. Chief Morales publicly denied ever having such a conversation with her or making those comments.<sup>35</sup> Since backroom negotiations seem to have dictated other sections of the environmental review process, skeptics wonder if the Colleges’ pressure was able to influence the outcomes of the study or the thoroughness with which it was conducted.

Very few communities have the ability to boast a pre-Columbian heritage like Claremont does. While Californians take pride in and glorify the Golden State, they have shown an uncanny addiction to denigrating its history, landscape, and culture.<sup>36</sup> There is much to be learned from the people who preceded European settlement and whose ancestors lived through the era of missionaries and every other major historical period that defines this community. Their story makes up a significant portion of the identity of this community. For this reason, the controversy over the location of the Tongva settlement has become an issue of importance to many people, who still seek answers to questions raised during the EIR process. If the Tongva have been wrongfully denied respect and recognition of their roots from the community, it reflects an unwillingness to acknowledge a little-known but very important piece of Claremont’s history and heritage.



### **Claremont's Character**

Another question that has been raised by residents that are concerned with the controversies surrounding this issue is that of a change in Claremont's character. One of the great sources of pride for Claremont citizens is the character of a city that has not sold out to fast food chains, strip malls, and corporate offices. The place preserves a distinctive small-town atmosphere that is quickly lost these days to global culture. However, residents are worried that the losses associated with the eventual development of the Field Station coupled with impacts of the project will detract from the character that is so prized in Claremont and among the Colleges.

One of the projected benefits of the addition of KGI to the community is that it will attract small businesses to the area. In the Draft EIR, increasing the presence of the biotechnology industry was considered an impact on Claremont's character. By the Final EIR, the projected change in character was removed from the document,<sup>37</sup> because the economic enhancement brought by industry presence was expected to improve the community. A goal of those associated with the project is to make Claremont a part of the "Biotechnology Corridor" of high-technology communities throughout the San Gabriel Valley.<sup>38</sup> While some feel the economic growth and business spin-off will improve the community, others are worried that these projected benefits are actually drawbacks that will impact Claremont's unique character.

Agreeing to the importance of preserving Claremont's character, Mayor Karen Rosenthal referred to the place as "a great little oasis in a basin of mediocrity." She said that its character would not be significantly altered by the project. Since the loss of habitat would be mitigated elsewhere it could not be considered loss of open space. Furthermore, she argued that because corporations are intimately linked with higher education, neither the corporate ties of the new college nor the increased industry presence in Claremont would affect the character of the town or the Colleges.<sup>39</sup>

On the other hand, those who do not consider economic growth to be a priority of the community, especially with regards to its unique character, argue that Claremont is not about being on the "forefront of progress," and that adding the industry and technological focus of KGI and its business partners to the community will be a detriment

to its spirit.<sup>40</sup> Instead, this is a town that values the sense of place fostered through small shops that have remained largely unchanged through history, tree-lined streets, and Victorian homes, where large corporations and multinational biotechnology industries have no place.<sup>41</sup>

### Land Use

There has been ongoing debate about the intended use of the Scripps Trust Property more-or-less since the time of its donation. When James A. Blaisdell appealed to Ellen Browning Scripps for the gift of land, he was hoping to secure enough room on which his envisioned Group Plan could grow. While Miss Scripps was very much convinced of the merits of this plan, she was also personally invested in the welfare of Scripps College for Women whose founding she had recently authorized. Therefore, she included a provision that any income above the cost of maintaining the land that was generated by its use would be added to the Scripps College endowment. When President Blaisdell heard of this provision, he was apparently disappointed because he had intended that the land held by the Claremont Colleges in the interest of the Group Plan could be given to future member institutions free of charge. Miss Scripps had understood that new colleges would buy the land.<sup>42</sup> This misunderstanding was cleared and the practice went on as Blaisdell had hoped, such that gifts of land for Claremont Mens' College and Pitzer College were granted for free.<sup>43</sup>

This confusion was reflected in the Scripps Trust document, which maintained that the land was only to be reserved for "educational use."<sup>44</sup> However, because Miss Scripps had intended that it be *sold* to educational institutions, she also gave the Claremont Colleges the "uncontrolled discretion to lease, sell, dispose of, encumber, and manage all said property without interference from anyone."<sup>45</sup>

The Colleges have taken advantage of the latter clause on many occasions, selling land to developers, building a golf course, and nearly authorizing numerous other capital ventures including shopping malls, day care centers and housing tracts, seemingly in violation of the overarching stipulation that they be for "educational" purposes.<sup>46</sup> In 1976, when the desire to be rid of an onerous tax burden came to a head, Robert J.

Bernard's passionate plea to the Colleges' obligations to the Group Plan and the integrity of the contract was the only thing that kept the land from being sold. He said, "... let me remind you of one basic fact surrounding this whole issue. There has never been a time since the Group Plan was undertaken in 1925 when we could not have sold the site of Claremont University Center or the site of Scripps College or the site of Harvey Mudd College or the site of Pitzer College to great financial advantage. Are you sorry we didn't do that?"<sup>47</sup> At that point Donald McKenna's financial gift made it possible to hold onto the land while avoiding tax costs and developing a new institution of the Claremont Colleges -- the Bernard Biological Field Station.

In legal terms BFS constituted an "educational use" of the Scripps Trust property. Most people at the Colleges would argue that it qualifies in practice as well.<sup>48</sup> However, in a 1994 deposition given by Donald McKenna, he maintains that the BFS was an interim use of the land until a "more intensive educational use" required space to build.<sup>49</sup> While it does not say so in the Scripps Trust, McKenna states specifically that the land was intended for "future colleges." He states that he would not have made the gift "had the understanding been anything other than an interim use."<sup>50</sup> Further, he wrote that he would sue the Colleges if the land was prevented from being put to use in building future colleges.<sup>51</sup>

This assertion that the land is formally for future colleges is the subject of current controversy. The Scripps Trust for the land was intended for the expansion of the Group Plan, but it was never explicitly written that the land was for "future colleges" but rather "educational use." In fact, part of the land donated by Miss Scripps was "a native plant tract known as the Biological Preserve."<sup>52</sup> The 3.85 acres that made up this preserve<sup>53</sup> were set aside by Miss Scripps to be maintained in perpetuity in the 1926 agreement.<sup>54</sup> Therefore, part of the donor's intent for the land was for it to be preserved as such to study native wildlife and vegetation and to safeguard a parcel of land from development.<sup>55</sup> This tract is currently in the "neck" of the BFS.

When the land changed hands from Scripps College to CUC via Donald McKenna's gift, the 1978 *Agreement for Fund to be Known as "The Robert J. Bernard Trust"* designates the land to be used for "educational purposes,"<sup>56</sup> and to aid in the

development of related institutions to the Claremont Colleges.<sup>57</sup> "Related institutions" were defined as "the presently existing institutions, which are commonly known as the Claremont Colleges, and any other college, university, or other institution, created or operated for educational, scientific, literary, or similar purposes, which institution is non-profit and either is or becomes associated or affiliated with the Claremont Colleges...."<sup>58</sup> The term "future colleges" is never used explicitly, and, although the agreement allows for the future colleges to be built on the land, it is not restricted to use for this purpose.

Therefore, the intention for the land to be used expressly for the building of future colleges was never legally expressed until 1994, when Donald McKenna gave the deposition to Munger, Tolles, and Olson LLP. This was the same year when a motion to subdivide the land resulted in mobilization of the 5-College biology faculty to get the Field Station recognized as an academic resource of tremendous worth, causing some debate over the intended use of the land.

Many question the need for such a deposition. If the intended land use for future colleges and the interim nature of the BFS were as clear from the beginning as Donald McKenna indicates in the deposition, there would be very little use for formally reiterating this in 1994.

However, it is possible that this intent was not clearly expressed at the time of the establishment of the Bernard Field Station. According to Larry Oglesby, Professor Emeritus of Biology at Pomona College, faculty were given the impression that BFS was a permanent facility. "Nobody was operating with the attitude that it could be shut down at a moment's notice."<sup>59</sup> In such a case, it is questionable that the intent would be formally stated for the first time 20 years after BFS was established and almost 70 years since the original Trust to hold the land was created. The legal and ethical viability of such an agreement, upon which the fate of the BFS now rests, has recently been challenged by the debate over the intended use of the land.

### **Concerns over KGI**

As the details about Keck Graduate Institute have been revealed to the community since its 1996 admission into the Consortium, an increasing number of questions have

been raised about the nature and potential of the institution itself. Beyond the concerns about the losses sustained to the environment and the community's heritage, people have begun to worry equally as much about what will be gained from the controversial new neighbor that replaces these losses.<sup>60</sup> KGI will bring Claremont cutting-edge science, plenty of money, and an impressive array of accomplished faculty and advisors. However, along with these things arrive a host of multi-national corporations, industry professionals, patent wars, and an academic arena with the power to alter the face of the earth. While part of the package poses an exciting new path upon which to approach the new century, millennium, and era in history, it also brings with it important as-of-yet unanswered questions and a heavy burden of responsibility.

KGI is designed to provide a unique educational experience which "experiments with new modes of instruction and avoids the rigidities associated with traditional academic departmental organization."<sup>61</sup> It follows an interdisciplinary approach to applied life sciences, calling upon "the marriage of biology and engineering" to provide solutions to modern questions in agribusiness, pharmaceuticals, and other industries.<sup>62</sup> The curriculum is intended to provide first rate professional training for business practitioners to be able to run companies without leaving science behind. Departing from the traditional tracks that lead to careers solely in research or teaching, KGI hopes to broaden the range of practical options for its students to pursue in industry, government, or higher education fields.<sup>63</sup> In order to balance student needs with practical demands from the professional world, KGI put together an advisory committee and a corporate roundtable as a way of "asking the masters what a novice should know to be successful."<sup>64</sup> The advisory committee compiles eleven individual leaders in science, industry, and engineering, and the 18 corporations represented on the roundtable are all applied life science corporations.<sup>65</sup> Together the two bodies play a critical role in shaping the possibilities for collaboration between KGI and industry, and keeping the school up-to-date with emerging trends and needs in the rapidly changing arenas of applied sciences. Through these partnerships, the curriculum and research agenda can better adapt in order to foster long-term congruence between KGI and the industry for the mutual benefit of both.

In theory the concept driving KGI's goals appears to provide a solid networking of the academic and industrial approaches to life science, bridging its pure and applied realms. An important curricular emphasis at many institutions of higher education involves taking learning out of the classroom and into the real world through practicum, internships and field studies. In this way KGI's focus on industry internships and research models are compatible with goals of other colleges. However, the specifics of the academic program, corporate partnership, faculty structure, and the mission of Claremont's seventh college highlight doubts about its place among the Consortium. Many worry that the fundamental dissimilarities between KGI and other liberal arts schools give it vast potential to be a significant departure from the nature and goals of the other members of the Claremont Colleges.

KGI is a graduate institute of applied life sciences, committed to the emerging, and potentially revolutionary, field of biotechnology. While it has some new and exciting avenues for applying scientific knowledge, it also has amazing potential to restructure man's relationship to himself and nature. There have been numerous questions raised about its potentially destructive impacts and the ethics of its application. One of the most controversial aspects of the field relates to genetic engineering. The genetic engineering of new life forms has the power to unleash creations upon the environment that nature itself has not yet designed. With the understanding we have of how introduced species can wreak havoc upon ecological systems, the possibilities for introducing new species not only to a single ecosystem, but into the world has mind-blowing potential.<sup>66</sup> The use of DNA in creating new organisms has now entered the realm of human genetic science, where human genes are the new basis for manipulation. This raises a tremendous array of ethical questions that affect the way people relate to one another and their environments, and can challenge our fundamental definitions of what it means to be human on the earth. Humans now have the capability of accelerating natural ecological change beyond the velocity of evolutionary processes. The implications of these changes upon natural and social systems are as of yet unexplored and provide daunting new challenges for all of humanity to face. Biotechnology is a field that has equal potential to benefit humanity as to destroy it. For this reason, many poorly understood effects of biotechnology must be

taken into account when applying the life sciences. Until some fundamental questions are asked and answers found, society must proceed with caution into these new realms. In an era where everyone is in a rush to reach the "new millennium," institutes like KGI carry a tremendous responsibility for their potential to transform the world. At the official founding of the school in 1997, Pete Wilson, then Governor of California, said "This new, small, and very, very important institution is going to have an impact not just upon higher learning, not just upon sales, but upon our quality of life."<sup>67</sup> While some people are ready to charge forth on a bold new adventure into realizing these impacts, others are determined to take smaller steps until the ultimate destination towards which society is currently hurtling with unprecedented speed comes into clearer focus.

One of the hottest topics of debate is the role of KGI's corporate roundtable in its industry-focused curriculum in the controversial field of biotechnology. Ties between industry and academia have come under a lot of fire lately because of the incompatibilities between profit-driven corporations and non-profit colleges and the implications of their alliance. Corporate ties are not a new concept in higher education, and there is nothing inherently wrong with them. A close look at any institution will demonstrate an undeniable corporate presence through such things as Trustee and donor affiliations and institutional investments.<sup>68</sup> Increasing corporate funding of scientific research has raised many questions. For years some of the most scientific premises lay in disinterested inquiry and open exchange of ideas. Introducing the interests of for-profit corporations compromise both of these ideals through questions of proprietary research. For example, pharmaceutical companies sponsoring academic research have a vested economic interest in the findings. Scientists conducting research on potential new drugs would be less likely to explore or publicize the possibility of negative side effects that their research has found at the detriment to the profit potential of their sponsoring corporation.<sup>69</sup> Furthermore, in the interest of capitalism, corporations often require scientists to sign agreements of secrecy, thereby impeding the free exchange of information so vital to the scientific process of building on existing knowledge.<sup>70</sup> The corporate roundtable of KGI is expected to contribute both to the funding and curricular design of its research. Their investment is to pay off through proprietary research, and



also by the preparation of students who will fit the industry-defined mold of a professional.<sup>71</sup>

The specific companies that make up its roundtable complicate the doubts about KGI's corporate advisors. Among the most notorious members are Bayer, DuPont, and Monsanto, who have been known to create environmental disasters around the world for which they do not take responsibility.<sup>72</sup> Bayer, a familiar maker of pain relievers today, was involved in creating the first poison gas used by Germany in WWI, and later for enslaving and performing cruel medical experiments on Jewish prisoners in Nazi concentration camps during WWII. They did not formally accept responsibility or issue an apology until 1995. More recently their manufacturing of pesticides has caused severe health and environmental damage in developing countries as well as the US.<sup>73</sup> DuPont has been known to release toxic chemicals in violation of the Toxic Substances Control Act, and has been caught on various occasions by the EPA for negligent behavior that posed significant threats to human and environmental health. DuPont has consistently been one of the top ten polluters in the nation.<sup>74</sup> Monsanto has been associated with such substances as PCBs, Bovine Growth Hormone, and Agent Orange, which is among the deadliest chemicals known to humans. This corporation has also begun genetic engineering of Bt Corn and terminator seeds, which have caused widespread agricultural revolt around the world. Although these corporations have undoubtedly produced some products that have served the public good, they have not been necessarily willing to sacrifice profit in the interest of basic human and environmental rights.<sup>75</sup> Therefore, there is much resistance among community members to trust an institution associated with such companies with the type of knowledge and potential involved in life science applications.

The KGI faculty and advisory committee members are mostly associated with industry and were selected for their experience with business collaboration.<sup>76</sup> Because of their close ties to corporations, many worry that their approach to science is influenced by the profit-driven mentality common to corporations, and that their academic emphasis will teach students from this business perspective rather than an unbiased academic one. This has effects on the eventual applications of the science they are taught. Industry researchers are held to different standards of academic integrity than are academics. The

business perspective on goals and purpose of research are very variable from academic research which aims for neutrality of knowledge. Besides the effects that having industry professors may have on the curriculum and messages to students, some wonder how they will affect the dynamic among faculty at all Claremont Colleges. While some feel they may disrupt the faculty morale fostered by a commitment to a common academic environment,<sup>77</sup> others think they will broaden the horizons and contribute a “real-world” emphasis to the Colleges.<sup>78</sup>

Another concern about KGI’s propensity toward industry is the absence of an ethics professor among its faculty. During a recent conference held at KGI, a speaker from the California Institute of Technology was speaking of the exciting potential for technological transfers with KGI. One way he hoped that CalTech could contribute to KGI’s curriculum was through the addition of business managerial classes that would teach students about patents and ownership of intellectual property.<sup>79</sup> He was concerned that too many students leave their education with good scientific knowledge but do not have the proper background in business management and “lose their companies before they start.” With the business curriculum in place, KGI graduates will learn about patents and other issues relevant to proprietary research and for-profit business management in order to find success and “remember their institutions generously.”<sup>80</sup> With KGI admittedly training students to become industry leaders and providing the proper backgrounds in patents, it is of concern that KGI has not hired any faculty to educate students on the ethics behind the application of their life sciences training before they put it to use for personal profit.

Unlike the other Claremont Colleges, there is no element of social responsibility included in the mission of KGI, which reads, “KGI is dedicated to educational programs and research aimed at translating into practice, for the benefit of humanity, the power and potential of the life sciences.”<sup>81</sup> The only mention of any responsibility comes from the vague clause, “for the benefit of humanity,” awkwardly spliced into the mission statement. While this sounds noble, it is also unpromising of any actual outcome. Hardly any developments in science have benefited “humanity,” but rather some people often at the expense of others. Very few things in the world have the power to help all people.

Rather as the “power and potential of the life sciences” are increasingly harnessed, this knowledge and its applications become more technical and less accessible to “humanity,” and instead form the tools and weapons of an elite few. For example, genetically modified plants may appear to be a good solution to ending hunger and malnutrition in the world. A company could engineer a plant to have all the genes necessary to contain all vitamins, minerals, and proteins to provide the adequate daily nourishment of a balanced diet in one serving. The company could give this seed away for free to all the poor local farmers in the world to grow food and feed their local communities. This may seem like a solution that makes these benefits accessible to all of humanity. However, what occurs is that the knowledge of these plants and processes becomes inaccessible to the local farmer. The gap between the generators and the users of the knowledge increases. “In sustainable agriculture, the complex nature of the agro-ecosystem requires a high degree of responsiveness and adaptability to local conditions,” which small scale farmers no longer have since they are now unfamiliar with the plants they grow.<sup>82</sup> The likelihood of a successful yield is therefore compromised. Without careful exploration of these issues through an academic commitment to socially responsible applications of the life sciences, it is likely that the industry professionals trained at KGI will not be prepared to work for the “benefit of humanity.”

The single most controversial aspect of KGI’s academic program is its decision not to grant faculty tenure. KGI will be hiring a core of regular faculty along with industry professors and professors-at-large. The last group will be drawn primarily from corporate partners and will be appointed to short-term positions to complement the offerings of the curriculum with specialized knowledge in emerging or underrepresented fields in KGI’s academic program. Because the faculty size is so small and the field of biotechnology is rapidly advancing, KGI must have the flexibility to update their curriculum through hiring of new faculty with more relevant specialties. Furthermore, because all faculty hired by KGI are expected to be high quality leaders with plenty of experience and prospects for jobs outside of academia, KGI representatives feel that tenure is not as necessary here as in a traditional academic setting.<sup>83</sup>

The faculties of Pitzer, Pomona, Scripps and Harvey Mudd have all passed resolutions condemning KGI's lack of tenure policy.<sup>84</sup> They worry that it will cripple the academic integrity of the institution, defeat the morale among faculty across campuses, and jeopardize the reputations of the other colleges.<sup>85</sup> Tenure is of importance in an educational community primarily because it promotes academic freedom. "Sometimes being a good teacher or scholar calls for behavior that makes it more difficult for a college president to raise money, or to speak out in opposition to policies advocated by the college administration."<sup>86</sup> Faculty without tenure are more akin to business employees whose job is to help employers make a profit. According to many faculty, the tendency to self-censor is already strong<sup>87</sup> at small institutions where public critical inquiry can "rock the boat."<sup>88</sup> "So even if President Riggs and his board of trustees had the compassion of Mother Theresa and the wisdom of Solomon ..." there is little possibility for academic freedom to exist without a tenure system.<sup>89</sup> Some faculty members worry that the ramifications of such a system could spread to the other Colleges. Others question this decision because of the precedent set by Henry Riggs who insisted on tenure upon his arrival at Harvey Mudd in 1988 as a condition of his acceptance of the position.<sup>90</sup> Therefore it is ironic that he would claim that it is not a "prerequisite to academic freedom."<sup>91</sup> Supporters of KGI's policy in the administration look at it as fundamentally a labor issue, akin to unions, which is why they believe so many faculty are incensed by something that has relatively little effect on them.<sup>92</sup>

The compilation of the various questions raised about KGI bring into consideration its appropriateness as a member of a liberal arts consortium. The new and controversial field of biotechnology to which the institute is dedicated requires that it be proceeded into with caution while concerns are thoroughly addressed and its safety assured. However under the influence of corporate partners whose motivation rests in profit, the academic integrity of the research conducted at KGI is questionable. In training students to become industry professionals and in collaborating with industry through curricular internships, KGI contributes knowledge in the form of proprietary research to these for-profit corporations, many of whom have a history of abusing such knowledge for financial gain without accepting responsibility for the consequences of

their actions. Because KGI faculty, Trustees, and advisors are all associated with the industry as well, they may approach teaching the applications of life science through a perspective already indoctrinated to the profit-driven mentality of corporations. The patent curriculum will pass on these values and strategies for business management and profit maximization through life science applications. The absence of an ethicist on the faculty implies that the pervasiveness of the industry motives will not be challenged with respect to consequences of applying powerful knowledge gained at KGI. The Institute's mission does not commit to social responsibility either, and therefore may not introduce the necessary elements of caution and consideration required for this field. And finally, lack of faculty tenure implies a likelihood that any questionable directions taken by the institute or its corporate partners will not be challenged and the important issues associated with the controversial and revolutionary undertaking of the Institute will not be addressed.

Thus far, the implications of KGI's academic program compromise the academic integrity of the institution at the research level and at the application level. Critics worry that there is little chance KGI will become anything more than a training ground focused on churning out "good employees" for industries that in turn "quash academic freedom" for profit.<sup>93</sup> Proponents regard it as an exciting new adventure that challenges the routine of traditional education with a new and innovative spirit.<sup>94</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Paul Faulstich, personal interview, 25 February 2000. Professor of Environmental Studies, Pitzer College.

<sup>2</sup> Peter Stanley, personal interview, 20 March 2000. President, Pomona College.

<sup>3</sup> Envicom, Inc., *North Campus Master Plan Draft EIR "Screencheck,"* (Claremont, December 1998) 5.7 – 12.

<sup>4</sup> Ben Glatstein, "Community Opposes Keck," *The Student Life* 30 April 2000: 1-2.

<sup>5</sup> Larry Oglesby, personal interview, 3 March 2000. Professor Emeritus of Biology, Pomona College. Former member of Environmental Quality and Planning Commissions, Claremont.

<sup>6</sup> Relf Alison Star, letter, *Claremont Courier* 11 August 1999: 8.

<sup>7</sup> Planning Consultants Research, *Habitat Mitigation Cost Assessment: Bernard Field Station* (Santa Monica, 31 January 1997) 6.

<sup>8</sup> Karen Rosenthal, personal interview, 23 February 2000. Mayor, Claremont.

<sup>9</sup> Susan Schenk, personal interview, 1 March 2000. Biology Laboratory Instructor, Joint Sciences Department.

<sup>10</sup> Recon Regional Environmental Consultants, *Claremont University Center Environmental Constraints: Indian Hill Golf Course, Bernard Field Station and the Quarry,* (Claremont: September 1995) 20.

<sup>11</sup> John F. O'Leary, "Bibliographies on CSS and related Malacophyllous Shrublands of other Mediterranean-type Climates," *California Wildlife Conservation Bulletin* 10 (1994).

<sup>12</sup> Gene Fowler, personal communication and tour of BFS, 10 February 2000. Director, Bernard Field Station. Professor of Biology, Pomona College.

- 
- <sup>13</sup> Schenk, 1 Mar 2000.
- <sup>14</sup> Bernadette Busenberg, personal interview, 3 March 2000. Director of Planning and Administration, Keck Graduate Institute.
- <sup>15</sup> Natural Communities Conservation Plan homepage: <http://ceres.ca.gov/CRA/NCCP/index.html>
- <sup>16</sup> PCR 6.
- <sup>17</sup> Recon 9.
- <sup>18</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>19</sup> S. Kevin Bingham, personal communication, 21 March 2000. Interim caretaker, Bernard Field Station.
- <sup>20</sup> Frank P. Brackett, *Granite and Sagebrush* (Los Angeles: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1944) 20.
- <sup>21</sup> Larry Oglesby, letter to Architectural Commission, 23 April 1999.
- <sup>22</sup> Mark Acuña, personal interview, 28 February 2000. Claremont resident and Liaison to Tongva Tribal Council.
- <sup>23</sup> Acuña 28 Feb 2000.
- <sup>24</sup> Mark Acuña, "A Journey to Tovangar," (Claremont, 7 April 1999) 2.
- <sup>25</sup> Carol Gil, personal interview, 8 March 2000. Claremont resident.
- <sup>26</sup> Mark Acuña, personal communication, 13 April 2000.
- <sup>27</sup> Brenda Barham-Hill, personal interview, 24 Feb 2000. Vice President, Claremont University Center.
- <sup>28</sup> Acuña 7.
- <sup>29</sup> Steve Comba, personal interview, 19 April 2000. Acting Director and Registrar, Montgomery Gallery, Pomona College.
- <sup>30</sup> Marjorie Harth, letter to Peter Stanley Re: Information regarding Native American collections, 2 July 1999.
- <sup>31</sup> Gil, 8 Mar 2000.
- <sup>32</sup> Carol Gil, personal communication, 13 April 2000.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup> Comba, 19 Apr 2000.
- <sup>35</sup> Acuña, 28 Feb 2000.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>37</sup> Schenk, 1 Mar 2000.
- <sup>38</sup> David Dreier, KGI Biotechnology Conference, 18 February 2000.
- <sup>39</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>41</sup> Aimee Eshbaugh, "Claremont Heritage," *Claremont Courier* 4 July 1999: 8.
- <sup>42</sup> Robert J. Bernard, *The Unfinished Dream: A Chronicle of the Group Plan of The Claremont Colleges* (Claremont, California: The Castle Press, 1982) 78.
- <sup>43</sup> Francis Bernard Drake, *TwoMen and an Idea* (Claremont, California: Claremont University Center, 1996) 183.
- <sup>44</sup> Bernard 78.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>46</sup> Bernard 79.
- <sup>47</sup> Drake 183.
- <sup>48</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>49</sup> Donald McKenna, Deposition, 1994.
- <sup>50</sup> McKenna 20.
- <sup>51</sup> Donald McKenna, letter to Gene Fowler, 21 July 1994.
- <sup>52</sup> Bernard 78.
- <sup>53</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>54</sup> Fowler, 10 Feb 2000.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>56</sup> Agreement for Fund to be Known as "The Robert J. Bernard Trust" (Claremont, 1976) 3.
- <sup>57</sup> Bernard Trust 1.
- <sup>58</sup> McKenna 7.
- <sup>59</sup> Oglesby, 21 February 2000.
- <sup>60</sup> Relf Star, personal interview, 8 March 2000. Claremont resident.



- 
- <sup>61</sup> KGI, "Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Sciences," (Claremont, 1999) 3.
- <sup>62</sup> KGI 1.
- <sup>63</sup> Busenberg, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>64</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>65</sup> KGI 9 - 11.
- <sup>66</sup> Fowler, 16 Feb 2000.
- <sup>67</sup> Gary Scott, "Biotechnology: Corporate influence remains in the background as a topic of discussion" *Claremont Courier* 14 July 1999: 3.
- <sup>68</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>69</sup> Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn. "The Kept University," *The Atlantic Monthly* March 2000: 42.
- <sup>70</sup> Press 40.
- <sup>71</sup> Gary Scott, "The world of academia: An issue over social responsibility," *Claremont Courier* 13 November 1999: 3.
- <sup>72</sup> Gary Scott, "How do private and public meet?" *Claremont Courier* 14 July 1999: 4.
- <sup>73</sup> Erin Quies, Margaret Reynolds, and Michael Waterman, "Bayer: Nazi War Crimes and Other Offenses," *Look Who Is Moving in the Neighborhood* May 1999: 9.
- <sup>74</sup> Rachel Newman and Abigail Singer, "Toxic Waste with a Corporate Face," *Look Who is Moving in the Neighborhood* May 1999: 8.
- <sup>75</sup> Geordie Schuurman, "Monsanto: Tampering with Nature for Profit," *Look Who is Moving in the Neighborhood* May 1999: 6.
- <sup>76</sup> KGI 3.
- <sup>77</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>78</sup> Stanley, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>79</sup> KGI Biotechnology Conference, 18 February 2000.
- <sup>80</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>81</sup> KGI 1.
- <sup>82</sup> Martha Crouch, "The Very Structure of Scientific Research Mitigates against Developing Products to Help the Environment, the Poor, and the Hungry," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 1991: 157.
- <sup>83</sup> Busenberg, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>84</sup> Richard Worthington, personal communication, 10 Apr 2000. Chair of Public Policy Analysis, Pomona College.
- <sup>85</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>86</sup> Melvin Henriksen, letter, *Claremont Courier* 13 July 1999: 23.
- <sup>87</sup> Schenk 1 Mar 2000.
- <sup>88</sup> Gary Scott, "Biotechnology: Corporate influence remains in the background as a topic of discussion," *Claremont Courier* 14 July 1999: 2.
- <sup>89</sup> Henriksen 23.
- <sup>90</sup> Nancy V. Hamlett, personal interview, 5 March 2000. Professor of Biology, Harvey Mudd College. President, Friends of Bernard Biological Field Station.
- <sup>91</sup> Henry Riggs, letter, *Claremont Courier* 21 July 1999: 8.
- <sup>92</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.
- <sup>93</sup> Scott, "The world of academia," 3.
- <sup>94</sup> Busenberg, 3 Mar 2000.







The intersection of so many controversial issues within the situation has drawn a variety of participants to voice their opinions and raise their concerns. While each individual has a distinct view of the situation, each group of participants within the community demonstrates strong tendencies toward shared perspectives based on the role of the group in the process and the capacity in which they have been involved in decision-making. The trend indicates that opinions of administrators and City officials vary drastically from students, faculty, and community members.

### **Administration**

The first body of people to become involved in making decisions and forming opinions on the use of the BFS land was the college administration, including Presidents, Boards of Trustees, and CUC personnel. The conflict as it appeared to them was between a legal obligation to comply with donor intent and the faculty desire for preservation of an academic resource.<sup>1</sup>

When the money was donated to establish the BFS, the idea was that it would be a temporary fix to a difficult financial situation that would allow for the future expansion of the Claremont Colleges and especially the Group Plan. Donald McKenna, of the Kennametal Foundation, explicitly made his wishes known that the Colleges were not to make any decisions that would impede the use of this land from the building of future institutions.<sup>2</sup> Some even say that he threatened to sue the Colleges if they did not comply with his wishes.<sup>3</sup> Whether this intent was committed to writing in 1976 by Donald McKenna is not known, but the college administration has made its legal and ethical obligation to donor intent a higher priority for decision making than the expressed academic wishes of the faculty. According to Peter Stanley, President of Pomona College, one of the only ways that institutions like the colleges are able to survive in the long term as non-profit organizations is through the generous gifts of money and land, such as the ones that have made the existence of BFS possible. Many times these gifts are donated with particular conditions attached, and the College enters into a binding agreement to respect these conditions when it accepts the gift. Therefore, the College

cannot rightfully violate the donor's intent for the use of the gift if it expects to receive gifts from other donors in the future.<sup>4</sup> For this reason, the administrations of the Claremont Colleges were unable to commit to the preservation of the BFS in perpetuity.

The administration further supports the Bernard Field Station siting decision because it is a more appealing option than the alternatives. The primary locations considered in the land planning process were the Claremont Golf Course and the Quarry on the corner of Foothill Boulevard and Claremont Boulevard. The quarry would require money to prepare the site for construction because it would need to be filled and compacted before it could be graded for development. Estimates for how much this process would cost have ranged from \$12,000 per acre<sup>5</sup> -- or \$136,000 for the 11.4 acre site -- to \$20 million total.<sup>6</sup> The administration of the Colleges uses figures in the millions of dollars, which they consider prohibitive for use of the quarry.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, the land planning survey uncovered geological and hydrological hazards to development in the quarry. A fault that runs through the quarry threatens the safety of the buildings, and a basin at the bottom collects water during unusually heavy rains.<sup>8</sup> The golf course, on the other hand, would cost very little to prepare for construction, but its development would forego the income it generates as a commercial facility. Another reason why this site is less appealing than BFS is its increased distance from the other campuses.<sup>9</sup>

The administration does not appear to have many concerns with regards to the appropriateness of KGI itself. Concerned faculty have noted a paucity of discussion at the higher levels of the college bureaucracy about the potential ways in which KGI could be a significant departure from the Colleges and the impacts of such a direction upon the Consortium.<sup>10</sup> Respect and trust in Henry Riggs, who has played an important role in the consortium for many years, have primarily informed this confidence. Administrators have expressed the feeling that, "there is no reason why he shouldn't know what is good or bad for the Colleges as much as anyone else."<sup>11</sup> There are also high expectations at the administrative levels for KGI's contribution to the Colleges. It will be the first institution in the US devoted singularly to biotechnology,<sup>12</sup> bridging the worlds of pure and applied science in a very modern curriculum. This type of establishment is expected to place the Claremont Colleges on the cutting edge of applied science and bring luster and international notoriety to the consortium.<sup>13</sup> Currently there is no graduate science

program at the Colleges other than a small botany program at the Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden through CGU, so it will fill a noticeable void in the offerings of the institutions while contributing to the well roundedness of the group.<sup>14</sup> The administration also envisions much potential for academic growth by incorporating students and faculty from the government and industry sectors into an otherwise entirely academic setting. This diversity of intellectual participants is predicted to enlarge the collective vision of the colleges beyond academia into the "real world."<sup>15</sup>

### **Faculty**

The faculty of the Claremont Colleges operates under a very different set of priorities and obligations to the institutions than the administration. The academic integrity of their work is the highest priority under which they make decisions and take action. Therefore, while the administration sees the decision under legal terms, the faculty views the Bernard Field Station as a valuable academic resource which should be protected for as long as possible. Although it is difficult to generalize the perspectives of so many people, the resolutions that have been passed at different schools concerning different issues of controversy indicate that the faculty voice is primarily a united one. Besides overwhelming opposition to the siting decision, the faculties of Pomona, Scripps, Harvey Mudd, and Pitzer Colleges have already passed a second resolution that condemns KGI's lack of tenure.<sup>16</sup> The faculty of the Colleges was the first group of participants in this issue to speak out against the administration's decisions with concerns over the new institution as well as the siting plan.

Faculty of the Claremont Colleges challenge the administrative adherence to legal priorities on several fronts. First, according to the documentation of the Scripps Trust and the Bernard Field Station deed, the land is intended for "educational uses," a clause that most agree the field station satisfies.<sup>17</sup> When Donald McKenna expressed his intent that the land be used specifically for building future institutions, it imposed new restrictions on the fifty-year-old contract that the Colleges had kept with the Scripps Trust. Some even wonder if this intent was expressed any earlier than 1994, when controversy over the use of the BFS land first began. Whether this is legally or ethically appropriate is questionable.<sup>18</sup> The administration has used this reasoning to avoid



making a commitment to the perpetual preservation of the Field Station. However, most faculty feel that this should not prevent a commitment to maintaining its academic integrity for a longer term. Thus far, the only assurance made to BFS supporters has been a vague statement to not consider further development on the site in the next ten to fifteen years.<sup>19</sup> The administration has been unwilling to offer any compromise beyond that.<sup>20</sup> This is particularly disturbing when the administrative actions toward other college lands are considered. The Claremont Golf Course was built on 33 acres of the original Scripps Trust property and is neither an educational resource nor an institution for expansion of the colleges. Although it was also intended to be a temporary use of the land at its 195? creation, the Colleges have recently committed to the City to place a moratorium on its development for 25 years.<sup>21</sup> This action brings into question the consistency with which the parameters guiding land use decisions are established. While fifteen years is the “maximum foreseeable future” for the Field Station,<sup>22</sup> 25 years is not too long to commit to the Golf Course. While an “ethical obligation” to donor intent demands building a college on one parcel of land, a golf course is permissible on another. It also challenges the Colleges’ commitment to the educational mission when it is willing to diminish the value of an important scientific and academic resource while extending the use of a non-educational, income-generating public facility.

Faculty members who support the Field Station have also challenged the administration’s arguments against the alternative sites. The Colleges purchased the quarry with the intent of further expansion, and it will have to be prepared at some point before it can be used. Whether that is now or in the future, it will cost money. As time goes on and it is used as a dumping site for construction debris, the process will require that it be cleaned out before it can be filled, compacted, and graded. This will likely increase the costs of undertaking any development within it. BFS supporters argue that filling and using it now makes economic sense as well as academic sense since the life of the field station can be extended while other development possibilities are exhausted. The geological hazards of building in the quarry are not significantly increased from those in BFS. The Indian Hill fault that runs through the field station will be directly underneath one of the proposed dormitories of the graduate school, and poses an equally likely threat as the geological hazards in the quarry.<sup>23</sup> The argument that development in

the quarry is impossible without significant improvements in geological and hydrological stability is challenged by an earlier project. In 1984, Worldvision, the Christian relief organization, made plans to build their coordinating office in the quarry. The development was approved and the land planning process was concluded, including preparing the appropriate mitigation measures to offset the geological and hydrological effects. Because Worldvision encountered financial difficulties, the project was never completed. However, the precedent was set for development in the quarry and the relevant precautions have been addressed.<sup>24</sup> The quarry is contiguous to the Claremont Colleges and is closer to four colleges – Pitzer, Scripps, Claremont McKenna, and Pomona – than the field station site,<sup>25</sup> which is closer to Harvey Mudd and CGU.<sup>26</sup> Those who find the arguments for contiguous campuses and proximity weak suspect that the visibility and centrality of Foothill Boulevard is the most likely motivating factor for KGI's desire for the BFS site.<sup>27</sup> Given the existence of feasible alternative sites for the project, the faculty nearly unanimously would prefer to see KGI built somewhere other than the field station.<sup>28</sup>

With regards to the institution itself, there are a wide variety of opinions, but the faculty are not quite as optimistic as the administration about KGI's effects on the Colleges. Several professors feel that KGI will not have much to contribute to the other colleges since relations between undergraduate and graduate programs are so sparse within the Consortium.<sup>29</sup> Although KGI has stressed synergy with Harvey Mudd and Claremont Graduate University, there has been little attempt to coordinate academics with other members.<sup>30</sup> Others believe that it will not be successful or long-lived within the system.<sup>31</sup> Many expect it to detract from the Consortium in a variety of ways. The entire faculty of Pomona College has stated that it believes that the institution will have a detrimental effect upon the remaining members, specifically because of its tenure policy.<sup>32</sup> They expect it to decrease morale among faculty, diminish the good reputation of the Claremont Colleges, and affect the dynamics of the educational mission of the Consortium.<sup>33</sup>

Once it has been admitted, a new institution is autonomous and free to make decisions without the approval of the other members. There is no provision for the expulsion of a member within the Constitution of the Claremont Colleges and no system

in place to check or modify the decisions of the colleges to provide that they affect the other institutions positively. Although CUC is the umbrella organization for the administration of the Colleges, they do not take responsibility for KGI's impacts upon the Colleges.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, if KGI is not as successful as the administration predicts, there is very little that can be done. According to President Stanley, "We just have to trust them and live with them now, because they're in."<sup>35</sup> Many of the faculty are not eager to accept this fate.

The expression of this voice has been attempted in various ways. The votes and resolutions that have been passed are the most obvious example of the widespread reservations held by the faculties of the various colleges. Some of the more involved members of the faculty have met with administration and community members to voice concerns or increase awareness of the controversies. Others have gotten involved in the political process through the city by writing letters, speaking at hearings, and even joining protests. Still others have worked with students to guide the expression of their opposition to the administration and city. Despite the various measures taken by individuals and entire faculties, their opinions have largely been ignored.<sup>36</sup>

### **Students**

Condensing the perspectives of the entire Claremont College student body into one voice is a difficult and imprecise task. The majority of the diversity in opinions results from the varying degrees of individuals' awareness about the situation and its implications. One common trend encountered among students is the tendency to think that all decisions made are final and that dialogue is closed to student input. Many do not believe that there are ways to make their voices heard or feel that their opinions do not affect the outcomes of such processes.<sup>37</sup> Therefore, the number of students who become and remain active in such issues are not appropriately reflective of the perspectives of the entire student body.

The primary priority of students at the prestigious Claremont Colleges is the quality of their educational experience. While the academic benefits that can be reaped from KGI will essentially be present at any location, the strengths of BFS as an educational facility of the Colleges are largely site- and size-specific.<sup>38</sup> Therefore, even

those few students who expect to gain more from KGI than BFS are probably sympathetic to the opposition to the siting decision.<sup>39</sup> The BFS is a unique resource that presents an increasingly rare opportunity to learn about native Southern California through hands-on field experience. Furthermore, it allows for nearby recreational activities through the approved and organized hikes and camp-outs offered by campus organizations.

The administrative commitment to the business aspects of the institutions over academics is difficult for many students to appreciate. Although legal obligations and financial concerns are critical, the primary mission of the Colleges is to educate its students, who expect their academic needs to be the main priority and objective of those who make decisions.<sup>40</sup> Students can understand that sacrifices must be made from some programs in order to improve others. However, in this case, the diminution of an existing, valuable facility for an institution whose benefits are still hypothetical does not appear practical to many students, especially in the face of so much opposition.<sup>41</sup> Many often feel that the quality of their education at the Colleges can be improved significantly, not by the creation of new programs, but through the strengthening of existing ones. Furthermore, alternative methods of education are welcome at liberal arts institutions. The chance to move out of a classroom and into the field for applied ecology is an important means of engaging students while offering educational opportunities that cannot be simulated in a laboratory setting. The Colleges' commitment to educational expansion does not necessitate new institutions, and learning does not have to occur in classrooms. The Claremont Colleges are a unique model of liberal arts higher education within the US, and resources like BFS that afford incredible practical, academic, and personal educational opportunities are part of what make these institutions so.

The administrative response to this perspective is that it only applies to a very small segment of the student population.<sup>42</sup> Those that express opposition to the decisions made about the Field Station are a handful of concerned students for whom this issue is relevant, whereas the vast majority is unaffected. When students find something that is important to them, they tend to imagine that everyone around them feels the same way about the issue, although it is likely that many of them do not share the same opinions or

emotions.<sup>43</sup> However, the results of a survey conducted earlier this academic year indicate otherwise.

An electronic survey was sent out to the entire student body and faculty of Pomona College in order to gauge the level of awareness and concern of students with regards to the BFS controversy. A single question about people's opinion of the siting decision asked respondents whether they agreed, disagreed, or did not feel informed enough to make a judgment on the plans to site KGI on the Bernard Field Station. From the total sample size of 480 surveys, 63% of students opposed the siting decision. Only 6% responded in support of the Colleges' plan to locate the seventh college, and 31% did not feel informed enough to make a judgment.<sup>44</sup>

There has been a broad range of ways in which students have expressed these perspectives on the BFS issue. In the spring of 1999, a group of students informally called the BFS Support Committee met to prepare informational packets to raise awareness among students and community members about the controversy. Public meetings and community open forums were held to promote discussion of controversial topics and/or concerns, while tours and open houses were conducted at the site for people to experience the Field Station for themselves. This group also worked to increase both student and community participation in the city's political process by encouraging letter writing and speaking at public hearings, and by circulating petitions. Another goal of the group was to empower and motivate students to express their voices, for which protests were held.

Throughout this academic year different student organizations have attempted similar tactics to express their voices and raise awareness, ranging from protests to conferences. Tours of the Field Station have been organized for community members, college administrators, and alumni. And work parties conducted on site help meet maintenance needs while encouraging students and community members to learn about and spend time at BFS.

For the most part, students have not been heard, although they have been able to impact change in a few isolated instances. For example, an important Architectural Commission meeting was scheduled by CUC and the City to take place on March 15, in the middle of the Colleges' week-long Spring Recess. A group of students approached

the CUC executives with a request to delay the meeting so that student participation could be possible. As a result, the date was changed to April 12.<sup>45</sup> However, it was subsequently rescheduled at CUC's request for May 10, during the week of Final Exams.

## **Community**

Members of the surrounding community of Claremont have also taken an active role of participation in the controversy-ridden siting process for the Keck Graduate Institute. Once again the level of interest and the opinions on the issue cover a wide range of perspectives, and there is no data for the views of Claremont citizens as a whole on this issue. However, the segment of the community that has been actively involved has voiced numerous concerns about both the siting decision and the institute itself, whereas there has been little expression in favor of either.

It is not obvious why members of the community outside of the Colleges would be concerned with the preservation of a closed-access educational facility. The primary concerns that have been expressed include the necessity for open space in Claremont and the desire for an uncompromised view of the mountains. Many community members view the Field Station as a means of preserving rapidly dwindling open space right in the heart of the city. Although it is not a public access recreational facility, it is still a significant means of preserving a quickly disintegrating memory of native Claremont along with its history and its character. Open space also serves to provide some breathing room between ever-encroaching development, and grants the feeling that Claremont is not a maximum-capacity site for suburban sprawl. The loss of native habitat and open space is thought to impact the quality of life in the community for everyone. The disappearance of the view of the mountains is another impact on the character of the community living environment.<sup>46</sup> Community members have also expressed concern over the increased traffic that will result from the increased population of commuting students and from spin-off biotechnology companies that locate in Claremont. Further, the importance of BFS in regulating the climate of Claremont is another point of necessity for the site. The temperature at BFS often varies several degrees from the campuses, and it has a moderating effect on the semi-desert climate.<sup>47</sup>



Besides the impacts of the loss of a portion of the Field Station on Claremont, the community additions that will replace the open space and the view are topics of concern for residents. Many of these participants have demonstrated concern over the effect of KGI upon Claremont's character. While the Colleges are excited by the possibilities of putting the institutions on the cutting edge of modern applied science, residents of Claremont insist that this community is not about the "forefront of progress"<sup>48</sup> and that this goal is not one that they share with KGI. Many are weary of the impact of a biotechnology institute on the historically oriented, quaint atmosphere of the community, especially given the expectation for the establishment of spin-off companies from the industry. While this is projected to bring economic growth to the city, there is little evidence that Claremont residents are anxious to become part of a "high-tech corridor" in the San Gabriel Valley that will put the city on the "Silk Road to the new Millennium."<sup>49</sup> Economic growth and preservation of the city's character are not necessarily in conflict with one another. However, the key to remaining prosperous while maintaining a unique identity is that the Claremont economy is not dominated by big business. Fast food chains, industrial complexes, and international corporations are rarities in comparison with the "mom-and-pop" style boutique shops that comprise most of the town's business sector.<sup>50</sup> As this unique balance gives way to larger industries and corporations, the personality of Claremont will be altered. This is a sacrifice that the Claremont residents are not willing to make.

Once again, the citizens of this community make the argument that feasible alternatives have not been given appropriate consideration.<sup>51</sup> Given the \$50 million endowment of KGI it hardly seems prohibitive to spend a portion of it, even several million dollars, on preparation of the quarry site. The Golf Course, however, is a public facility and the only place in Claremont for golfing. Therefore, this site is not a preferred option.<sup>52</sup> The attendance and testimonies of community members at the various public hearings of City commissions indicate that there was widespread dissatisfaction with the Environmental Impact Report. Other ways in which community members have voiced their opinions through participation in the City's process have included writing letters to the City and the newspapers, signing petitions, joining protests, attending public meetings, and forming activist organizations such as the Friends of the BFS and the Local

Wilderness Coalition.<sup>53</sup> One individual filed an initiative to change the City's designation of the BFS land from Education to Conservation zoning.<sup>54</sup>

The City has basically denied all of these attempts. Although the overwhelming voice of the various public meetings has been in opposition to the siting decision, the City continues to regard this as a minority within the town population. The Mayor has said, "I hear protesters and complaints. There's some concern about BFS, but only a small fragment of the community is intensely involved."<sup>55</sup> Individuals have been belittled in front of the City Council through dismissive and patronizing comments made by council members at hearings,<sup>56</sup> which express to community members that they are not taken seriously.<sup>57</sup> The City Attorney denied the initiative on an obscure technicality, the legality of which is currently under examination at the state level.<sup>58</sup>

### **Native Americans**

The sacred Tongva village of Torojoatngna is what we now know as Claremont, although the boundaries of the two municipalities are not necessarily coincident. For the Tongva people of Claremont, the Bernard Field Station represents some of the last of their ancestral land which has not been paved over or lost to development. It is an important reminder of Tongva history and affords a rare opportunity to view, experience, and even use nature as it existed for their ancestors. An intact Field Station is important to the Tongva for a variety of reasons.

The Bernard Biological Field Station, being one of the only ecologically viable remnants of native Claremont and especially Coastal Sage Scrub, is a living museum of Tongva history, including their lifestyle, food, and physical surroundings. A careful study of the plants found in the Station reveals the materials available to and used by the Tongva to provide for themselves. The Tongva used a wide variety of local plants for many purposes, but some of the primary uses include acorns from oak trees as a dietary staple and salvia for food and medicine.<sup>59</sup> The vast majority of land where Tongva villages once stood has been extremely difficult to preserve. Over 3000 archaeological sites now lay buried under shopping malls, churches, schools, office buildings, and other products of modern development.<sup>60</sup> Therefore, the very existence of BFS offers the

Tongva a rare glimpse of their past and heritage – a look into the lives and times of their ancestors.

When the missionaries of San Gabriel arrived to Torojoatngna in 1771, one of the first steps in the process of “converting” the Tongva from “savages” to “humans” required the bonds between the people and the earth to be severed. The relationship between the Tongva and their land could be described as a “sacred cycle” through which the land bountifully provided food, tools, clothing, and shelter for the people, who in turn cared for and tended to it.<sup>61</sup> One of the ways this “break” was accomplished involved fencing off lands from which the Tongva gathered foods and medicinal herbs for healing and spiritual ceremonies. By preventing the mutualism between the Tongva and their land, the ecology of the region was altered and the land began to change.<sup>62</sup> Through ceremonies, gathering, and rituals the Tongva forged a connectedness to their earth that could never be broken, despite the endeavors of the missionaries. In 1850 when the Constitution of the State of California was drawn up, it stated that only European Christians could own land, and that all Native Americans were considered trespassers. The language still exists today in the attitudes of many people and political institutions.<sup>63</sup> However, the Tongva have never given into the laws of those who claimed the land; they follow the law of the one who made it. To the Tongva, Nature was the law.<sup>64</sup> The Bernard Field Station is an example of the land as it was before missionary activities began to alter it. Having the plants that sustained the people for thousands of years healthy and flourishing on land that is well cared for and protected is a valuable gift to the Tongva community. The mere existence of this site is one means of continuing the relationship of these people to nature. Permission to make presentations and teach on the site, gather a few plants for rituals, or conduct singing ceremonies on the land has been granted on occasion to Tongva members, and allows them to maintain an active bond with the land and their heritage.<sup>65</sup>

Beyond a relationship with the earth that provided for long-lasting sustenance, the Tongva connection to the land was also a spiritual bond. The Tongva lifestyles were guided by a set of spiritual principles that depended heavily on nature. “The forces of nature – wind, rain, sun, earth, moon, sea, and the plants and animals – were all part of the grand cosmos of divine beings that guided all human activity.”<sup>66</sup> Food gathering was

one important practice both in daily activities and in special ceremonies that carried with it spiritual implications. Rituals conducted by shamans, or “priests,” made use of specific plants, land characteristics, and even astrological conditions to communicate with gods or spirits and to gain direction on the people’s duties and responsibilities toward one another and their environment. The earth, therefore, played an important role in Tongva spirituality, and a healthy bond with the land was often correlated with healthy spiritual relationships.<sup>67</sup> The Tongva have an important spiritual tie to the BFS, because it is a healthy parcel of local ecology. While this connection may not be a perpetually active one, it provides comfort to the Tongva people. “I may not use [the spiritual tie], but I know it exists. I don’t call the police until I need them, but I know they exist.”<sup>68</sup> The Tongva have spiritual ties to BFS whether or not they physically use the land for sacred rituals and ceremonies. However, if the Field Station is developed, these ties are weakened and eventually lost. The Tongva go to nature to find answers from the Creator. The land is their classroom, where they seek and learn about their spirituality. While the Colleges have chosen to build KGI next to the Christians’ school, they have also decided to build *on top of* a Tongva school of theology.<sup>69</sup>

The Tongva, as have all Native American tribal nations at one time or another, have been subjected to hundreds of years of persecution. From their enslavement on mission lands to their current struggle for federal recognition, these people have had their identities, property, and culture stripped from them without any real explanation or repayment. An area that was once the site of great Tongva civilization founded upon the coexistence with nature has given way to the concrete and asphalt civilization of modern Los Angeles. Over 3000 once-standing villages have now been annihilated.<sup>70</sup> Currently in Claremont, there is one parcel of land that stands frozen in time as a recognition of the history, culture, and spirituality of the Tongva people. Further development of any or all of it would demonstrate a genuine lack of appreciation, respect, or understanding for these people or their place in the past, present, and future of Claremont. The Tongva talk about the “3 R’s” as “recognition, respect, and responsibility.”<sup>71</sup> Thus far there has been no formal acknowledgement of the presence of Torojoatngna in Claremont, its pivotal role in the trade route, the difficult history of post-Contact times, or the current presence of these people in this community.<sup>72</sup> Without recognition of these things, the identity that

was taken from them is not returned.<sup>73</sup> Allowing the people to reclaim their sense of themselves must be followed by the respect of their true identities from others. Eventually when others choose to take responsibility for their own actions toward these people, they are able to participate equally in the community. This is not only true for the Tongva, but for every group of individuals within a larger collective society.<sup>74</sup> The Tongva in particular, however, are looking for the 3 R's in Claremont. Understanding the importance of the Field Station to the Tongva community and taking appropriate measures toward its preservation would be a beginning. Its development would be a slap in the face – a choice to continue in the tradition of a history that “takes without asking and abuses without using.”<sup>75</sup>

Representatives from the Tongva community have been active participants in the City political process. As a liaison between the Tongva Tribal Council and the City, Claremont resident Mark Acuña has pointed out the site of Torojoatngna on all early maps of Claremont and information in books of Claremont history confirming its location on the Field Station. He and others have written letters, spoken at hearings, and presented the Tongva side of the issue. They have also become involved with the Friends of the BFS to find ways to increase awareness of the controversy and educate people about the Tongva role in the issue. They have requested Tongva monitors at the archaeological dig and invited the City to engage in discussion, both to no avail. Both the City and KGI have issued vague and uncommitted statements to “work with the Native American communities” as a long-term goal.<sup>76</sup>

### **City of Claremont**

The officials of the city of Claremont have a unique role to play within this issue. The submission of an application for project approval of the Keck Graduate Institute opened up the City's involvement in the issue. By city mandate the EIR was completed and ultimately approved. The main priority of the City, therefore, was to ensure the validity of the EIR so that the environmental impacts of the projects would be properly addressed and mitigated.<sup>77</sup>

Most City officials believe that eleven acres of development is not enough to make significant impacts on the environment, open space, the view of the mountains, or

the academic value of the site. The 3:1 replacement program is expected to mitigate the habitat loss from development in the Field Station. Because BFS is not virgin open space, the ecological value of off-site replacement will be comparable to the parcel of land within BFS, and there is no loss of open space sustained to Claremont. Also, the City has decreased responsibility to the site unless there are endangered species present.<sup>78</sup> Representatives of the City have indicated understanding the community's general attitude as believing that "carving off a small portion doesn't affect much,"<sup>79</sup> either ecologically or socially. Because the Keck Graduate Institute will be oriented away from the street, the City also believes that impacts to the view will not be significant.

In considering the alternative sites, the City feels that more residents of the community care about the Golf Course than the Field Station and would have stronger opposition to its development. Also, because the quarry costs \$20 million to fill,<sup>80</sup> it would be best suited for a parking lot or an athletic stadium that could be built below grade.<sup>81</sup> The quarry is also on the borders of Claremont, Upland, and San Bernardino County boundaries, and the prospect of undergoing all of the political formalities on a site in three jurisdictions is overwhelming. The City also sees the quarry as having more environmental concerns as the BFS because an EIR done 15 years ago found that the geological hazards and the existence of a waterway in the quarry rendered its development infeasible.<sup>82</sup>

"The City is pro open space,"<sup>83</sup> as is shown by the fact that Claremont owns a 1200-acre Wilderness Park in the foothills.<sup>84</sup> Because adequate mitigation was ensured in the EIR there will be no loss of open space if the BFS is developed. The City archaeologist found no evidence of a Tongva presence upon the land, so the Native American claims are not of concern to the City.<sup>85</sup> As for the EIR being heard by the Architectural Commission instead of the Environmental Quality Commission, it is believed that there is no need for experts to scrutinize the documents. The scientific and cultural sections are all prepared by a wide body of hired consultants who translate the information into easily understandable language so that anyone could make a simple decision without any previous background in ecology, hydrology, geology, biology or archaeology.<sup>86</sup>



The effects of KGI itself are thought to be positive. The addition of a world-class institution to the town will enhance Claremont's reputation and the spin-off businesses are expected to bring economic growth to the community. Because KGI is a good academic fit with the other colleges and it has a good vision for the parcel of land it will be using, it will not have significant negative impacts. In fact, because the school is so small, its effect cannot be very significant.<sup>87</sup>

The City has been placed in an awkward position due to the controversy over this issue. Because it has no role in making curriculum decisions or regulating internal disagreements within the Colleges, it is not in the position to address many of the concerns raised by residents about tenure, biotechnology, the loss of the educational program at BFS, or the lack of an ethics curriculum. Many people who do not comprehend the City's limited role on this issue expect the various councils to "play referee for battles taking place within the original institution."<sup>88</sup> Outside of certifying the EIR and scrutinizing the land use, the City has no role in the Colleges' controversies.

### **Scientists**

One of the unusual factors in this situation that sets it apart from most other environmental controversies is that the distribution of scientific expertise is weighted more heavily toward the environmentalists and those protesting the development than the developers. In most cases of land use disputes, the developers have the money to hire technical experts. Because this is an issue of interest to a collection of college professors, especially those in the sciences, there are numerous professional scientists who counterbalance the expertise of the hired handful of scientific consultants to the developers.<sup>89</sup>

Ecology is an unpredictable science where there are rarely definite answers.<sup>90</sup> When the City reads documents written by hired consultants, the council members that make decisions based on recommendations given by experts have to realize that these are only predictions. When the EIR suggests that the habitat loss of 11 acres can be mitigated with a 3:1 replacement program, this does not imply that the impacts of the development are erased, but rather that this may be one means of partially counterbalancing the disruption. The city council-members are of the impression that the

consultants do all of the work and give them the right answers. "Anyone could do it because the hired consultants spell it out for everyone. There is no need for trained biologists, geologists, or hydrologists [on the councils] because the consultants already have them."<sup>91</sup>

Scientists see significant problems with this logic. Besides the fact that accurate ecological predictions are practically impossible to make, there is a conflict of interest that biases the scientific expertise of hired consultants. Experts who are paid by an interested party face a lot of pressure to produce results that are to their employers' liking.<sup>92</sup> They know that their knowledge may be inconvenient or counterproductive to those who pay them, so they are more likely to produce incomplete findings.<sup>93</sup> Studies show that scientists who are paid by a party with economic stake in their results are less apt to publish results that could contribute to a profit loss (e.g., negative side effects of drugs).<sup>94</sup> Because the decision-makers themselves are not experts in science and have little experience with reviewing documents like an EIR, the flaws in a study are rarely uncovered.<sup>95</sup> Objectivity is one of the most fundamental principles of science, and many believe that its emphasis is one factor that has allowed modern humankind to achieve unparalleled technological progress by way of science.<sup>96</sup> A self-preservation motive of the consultant and a vested economic interest in the employer compromise the accuracy and objectivity of this science. If the findings are not invalidated due to bias, documents warrant careful scrutiny by impartial experts before decision-makers act upon the recommendations. Since the council-members of the City rely so heavily on these experts' suggestions in making decisions and the Claremont Colleges depend upon the consultants to support and advance their project approval process, the experts face pressure to produce agreeable results. This tendency became evident in the approval process for development on the Bernard Field Station when the recommendation for perpetual preservation of the remainder of the land was removed between the Screencheck and Draft versions of the EIR. The scientific recommendations present in the Final EIR are the results that these consultants were paid to find,<sup>97</sup> and the document is therefore "deficient, erroneous, and inadequate in many ways."<sup>98</sup>

With few exceptions, the shared opinion of the scientific community at the Claremont Colleges concerning the Bernard Field Station is that it is an exceptionally

valuable academic and ecological resource that should be preserved.<sup>99</sup> The diversity of the habitats, plants, and wildlife found in such a small area is rare for any region, but especially in Southern California where so much of the native vegetation structure and geology have been altered by human activities.<sup>100</sup> The possibilities for scientific study are numerous, and use of the Station for classes from a variety of departments indicates that it is a valuable facility for studies outside of biological science.<sup>101</sup> To have such a resource within walking distance of the Colleges is an exceedingly rare opportunity, and it facilitates the access and utility of BFS to students.<sup>102</sup> While it is of such value and importance to the Colleges, its small size and fragmented location make it extremely vulnerable to impacts of development. It is difficult to say with certainty that the loss of eleven acres will eliminate any chance for long-term survival of the station, but there is even less evidence to assume that the loss will *not* cause significant impacts that could threaten the ecological viability of the entire site. Therefore the effects of the siting decision are currently difficult to gauge, but there is little or no support for an argument that assumes effects are minimal. Since alternative options are feasible and environmentally superior and the precedents have been set to develop them, the scientific community of the Colleges would prefer that BFS were not the site chosen to build KGI. Most scientists believe that long-term preservation of the site is crucial to its continued viability.

The principle aim of science is to provide accurate and objective new information and insight into the workings of the world. The main priority of the scientists at the Claremont Colleges is to educate students about science, including the ethical responsibilities of its application. There is a wide range of ways in which science can be studied. While some fields require expensive technology, for others a minimum of basic equipment will suffice. Some experiments are undertaken in isolated laboratory settings under strictly regulated conditions and others occur under the unpredictable and stochastic rule of the field. While the establishment of new laboratories with cutting-edge technology will always be possible, the areas fit for field study are constantly diminishing and cannot be regained once they are lost. Ecology is a relatively new field of science which is still growing. However, as rare habitats disappear, the potential for understanding the ecological systems that comprise them are also lost forever. The study

of ecology is limited by the availability of these outdoor laboratories where observation and experimentation take place.

The Keck Graduate Institute is dedicated specifically to biotechnology, a study whose possibilities are endless. While this is an exciting and promising new arena for science, many people are cautious of its potential. Whether or not scientists at the Claremont Colleges are opposed to the idea of biotechnology, most agree that it is important to proceed cautiously until many doubts are cleared and questions are answered. Examination of appropriate controls and notification, exploration of patents and ownership issues, and ethical debates are necessary steps before skepticism can be quieted.<sup>103</sup>

The scientists of the Colleges have participated in varying degrees in this issue. While some have been active participants in the municipal political process by writing letters and speaking at hearings, others have been more silent supporters of the Field Station.<sup>104</sup> Some scientists have been consulted either by the City or the College administration for mitigation recommendations or to review documents.<sup>105</sup>

For the most part, these experts have been ignored,<sup>106</sup> their data overlooked,<sup>107</sup> and their recommendations tweaked for convenience.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Peter Stanley, personal interview, 20 March 2000. President, Pomona College.

<sup>2</sup> Stanley, 20 Mar 2000.

<sup>3</sup> Donald McKenna, letter to Gene Fowler, 21 July 1994.

<sup>4</sup> Stanley, 20 Mar 2000.

<sup>5</sup> Lyle Gustaveson, Architectural Commission testimony, 28 April 1999.

<sup>6</sup> Karen Rosenthal, personal interview, 23 February 2000. Mayor, Claremont.

<sup>7</sup> Brenda Barham-Hill, personal interview, 24 February 2000. Vice President, Claremont University Center.

<sup>8</sup> Larry Oglesby, personal interview, 21 February 2000. Professor Emeritus of Biology, Pomona College. Former member of Environmental Quality and Planning Commissions.

<sup>9</sup> Mitch Dorger, personal communication, March 1999. Former Vice President, Claremont University Center.

<sup>10</sup> Nancy Hamlett, personal interview, 5 March 2000. Professor of Biology, Harvey Mudd College. President, Friends of the Bernard Biological Field Station.

<sup>11</sup> Kate Finger, personal communication, 20 April 2000. Student, Pomona College.

<sup>12</sup> KGI, "Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Sciences," (Claremont, 1999) 1.

<sup>13</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.

<sup>14</sup> Bernadette Busenberg, personal interview, 3 March 2000. Director of Planning and Administration, Keck Graduate Institute.

<sup>15</sup> Stanley, 20 Mar 2000.

<sup>16</sup> Richard Worthington, personal communication, 10 April 2000. Chair of Public Policy Analysis, Pomona College.

<sup>17</sup> Paul Faulstich, personal interview, 25 February 2000. Professor of Environmental Studies, Pitzer College.

- 
- <sup>18</sup> Worthington, 3 March 2000.
- <sup>19</sup> Susan Schenk, personal interview, 1 March 2000. Biology Laboratory Instructor, Joint Sciences Department.
- <sup>20</sup> Gene Fowler, personal interview, 16 February 2000. Director, Bernard Field Station. Professor of Biology, Pomona College.
- <sup>21</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.
- <sup>22</sup> Stanley, 20 Mar 2000.
- <sup>23</sup> Richard Hazlett, personal communication and tour of BFS, 2 February 2000. Professor of Geology, Pomona College.
- <sup>24</sup> Oglesby, 21 Feb 2000.
- <sup>25</sup> Jacob Sloane, City Council testimony, 9 September 1999.
- <sup>26</sup> Busenberg, personal interview, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>27</sup> Fowler, 16 Feb 2000.
- <sup>28</sup> Friends of the Bernard Biological Field Station, *Claremont Approval Process for the Keck Graduate Institute*, 14 January 2000: 2.
- <sup>29</sup> Gene Fowler, 16 Feb 2000.
- <sup>30</sup> Larry Oglesby, personal interview, 3 March 2000.
- <sup>31</sup> Schenk, 1 Mar 2000.
- <sup>32</sup> Worthington, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>33</sup> Paul Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>34</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.
- <sup>35</sup> Stanley, 20 Mar 2000.
- <sup>36</sup> Gene Fowler, 16 Feb 2000.
- <sup>37</sup> Wei Wang, personal communication, 30 March 2000. Student, Pomona College.
- <sup>38</sup> Oglesby, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>39</sup> Teo Grossman, personal interview, 13 April 2000. Student, Pitzer College.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>41</sup> Tidhar Ofek, personal communication, 24 March 2000. Student, Pomona College.
- <sup>42</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>44</sup> Jonathan Vanasco, personal communication, 24 April 2000. Student, Pomona College.
- <sup>45</sup> Charles Cange, personal interview, 17 April 2000. Student, Pomona College.
- <sup>46</sup> Relf Star, personal interview, 8 March 2000. Claremont resident.
- <sup>47</sup> S. Kevin Bingham, personal communication, 9 April 2000. Interim caretaker, Bernard Field Station.
- <sup>48</sup> Schenk, 1 Mar 2000.
- <sup>49</sup> David Dreier, KGI Biotechnology Conference, 18 February 2000.
- <sup>50</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>51</sup> March Rosenbluth, letter, *Claremont Courier* 14 July 1999: 10 – 11.
- <sup>52</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>53</sup> Star, 8 Mar 2000.
- <sup>54</sup> Carol Gil, personal interview, 8 March 2000. Claremont resident.
- <sup>55</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>56</sup> Star, 8 Mar 2000.
- <sup>57</sup> Charles Cange, letter, *Claremont Courier*, 10 November 1999: 9.
- <sup>58</sup> Gil, 8 March 2000.
- <sup>59</sup> Mark Acuña, "A Journey to Tovangar," (Claremont, 7 April 1999) 11.
- <sup>60</sup> Mark Acuña, personal interview, 28 February 2000. Claremont resident.
- <sup>61</sup> Acuña 17.
- <sup>62</sup> Acuña 17.
- <sup>63</sup> Mark Acuña, personal communication, 13 April 2000.
- <sup>64</sup> Robertjohn, personal interview, 23 February 2000. Claremont resident.
- <sup>65</sup> Acuña, 28 Feb 2000.
- <sup>66</sup> Acuña 28.
- <sup>67</sup> Robertjohn, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>68</sup> Ibid.

- 
- <sup>69</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>70</sup> Acuña, 28 Feb 2000.
- <sup>71</sup> Robertjohn, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>72</sup> Acuña, 28 Feb 2000.
- <sup>73</sup> Robertjohn, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>74</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>75</sup> Acuña, 28 Feb 2000.
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>77</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>78</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>79</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>80</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>81</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.
- <sup>82</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>83</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>84</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>85</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>86</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>87</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>88</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>89</sup> Worthington, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>90</sup> Oglesby, 21 Feb 2000.
- <sup>91</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>92</sup> Emil Morhardt, class discussion, Natural Resource Management, Fall 1999. Professor of Biology, Joint Sciences Department.
- <sup>93</sup> Gil, 8 Mar 2000.
- <sup>94</sup> Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn. "The Kept University," *The Atlantic Monthly* March 2000: 42.
- <sup>95</sup> Oglesby, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>96</sup> Richard Hazlett, class discussion, Ecology and Religion, Spring 2000.
- <sup>97</sup> Robertjohn, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>98</sup> Larry Oglesby, Letter to Architectural Commission, 23 April 1999.
- <sup>99</sup> Oglesby, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>100</sup> Gene Fowler, personal communication and tour of BFS, 10 February 2000.
- <sup>101</sup> Clyde Eriksen, *Annotated Documents Pertaining to the History of the Acquisition, Disposition and Management of Claremont Colleges Lands North of Foothill Blvd., with Reference to the Robert J. Bernard Biological Field Station*, Document 23.
- <sup>102</sup> Catherine McFadden, class discussion, Experimental Ecology, 18 January 2000. Professor of Biology, Harvey Mudd College.
- <sup>103</sup> Oglesby, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>104</sup> Paul Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>105</sup> Fowler, 16 February 2000.
- <sup>106</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>107</sup> Oglesby, 21 Feb 2000.
- <sup>108</sup> Hamlett, 5 Mar 2000.





In the face of overwhelming opposition, numerous questionable decisions have been made by the Colleges and the City which leave members of both communities wondering about the decision-making process. Thus far, KGI was admitted into the Consortium, the Bernard Field Station was chosen as the site, the EIR for the project was approved, and no significant mitigation measure was added to the document to provide for the long-term protection of the remainder. Other than the two groups ultimately responsible for making the final decisions, every segment of the community that has participated in this issue has voiced valid reasons why the project should not go forth as such. However, each of these decisions was made without resolving the numerous concerns raised by faculty, students, and community members, and choices have been made all along according to the envisioned plans of an elite few. Various important factors within the collegiate and municipal systems of governance have allowed decision-makers to overlook the opinions of their constituents and make choices that disregard comments voiced in opposition.

### **Lack of expertise**

The individuals responsible for making decisions often have an inappropriate background for the scope of the choices they are charged with making. In general, their expertise is not relevant to the topics covered by such decisions and they are ignorant of the repercussions that application of their choices has on the community

At the Claremont Colleges, major academic decisions are made by businessmen who do not participate in the intellectual environment that they govern. The Boards of Trustees of each college are the bodies that hold the legal title to the institution, and in whose hands, therefore, rests the authority over the schools.<sup>1</sup> The Presidents, who are responsible to the Boards of Trustees, represent the voices of the campus. While these individuals have a good sense of what it takes to manage the financial and legal aspects of the institutions, they usually have little sense of the reality of the academic environment that their decisions affect. Many are trained in business and administration, but their expertise does not cover educational concerns such as the effectiveness of particular

programs and strategies for strengthening them. They rely on professors to determine academic needs, which they choose whether or not to make possible by allotting the necessary funds. In making business decisions of this nature for the Colleges, they carry much influence over the education that students receive.

With regards to the Bernard Field Station, it may appear to Trustees to be in the financial and legal best interest of the Consortium to use the land for construction of new colleges. This does not take the Field Station into account as a valuable academic institution, nor does it incorporate student and faculty needs for an outdoor space to conduct scientific study. The majority of the Board does not spend time in the Claremont area and has never even seen the BFS, whose fate they must decide. In fact, some of the administrators of the Colleges, who *are* in Claremont, still refer to the BFS as a vacant lot and are completely unaware of its importance to the Colleges.<sup>2</sup> Even those who are sympathetic to the academic needs for such a resource do not appreciate its value to a science curriculum about which they have little knowledge. On a recent tour of the site, President Stanley of Pomona College remarked several times that he had never fully understood what a remarkable space the Field Station was.<sup>3</sup> It was the first time he had visited the site in nine years.

Although the Colleges have formally acknowledged the value of the Field Station in writing, this is mere rhetoric so long as they have not used the space or put its worth into practice for themselves. They can not understand its contributions to the academic program of the Colleges through hearsay alone, and therefore are unlikely to help guarantee its long-term use. If the decision-makers are interested primarily in the business management of the institutions, the Field Station can never serve as more than a temporary convenience in the interest of a tax dodge. Under these terms, the benefits of BFS may be expendable in the face of more profitable expansion. However, if decisions were all made in the academic best interest of the Consortium, the perception of the BFS and the services it provides would likely be different.

Decision-makers in the City of Claremont are equally unequipped with proper training to consider important topics that are fundamental to this issue. The environmental review process is intended to separate consideration of ecological effects

of development from concerns of appropriate land use.<sup>4</sup> However, the municipal body in charge of considering and approving the various stages of this project, including certification of the EIR, is the Architectural Commission. There is an inherent inconsistency in the fact that a group of commissioners appointed by the City for their expertise in development and construction is the body that reviews the environmental impacts of new projects. Because their interests and knowledge do not lie in biology, hydrology, ecology, or geology, they can hardly be expected to offer an adequate assessment of these topics as they pertain to development. They also have no professional experience with the review process for an EIR, and are not adequately trained to assess the quality of work done by hired consultants. Furthermore, their bias toward development may prevent them from giving justified consideration to environmental concerns that could halt or delay a project.

A more relevant commission to review and certify the EIR for KGI would have been the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC), which was abolished by the City of Claremont around five years ago.<sup>5</sup> The EQC would have been a panel of biologists and other scientists appointed because of their knowledge of the environment and their expertise in issues of development impacts of ecological concern. Most commissioners would have had experience with reviewing EIRs and would also understand the topics raised within the document as well as by concerned citizens. This commission would have had the relevant expertise to provide that questions of environmental impacts be addressed separate from development and land use concerns, thereby executing the review process as it was initially intended.

City representatives have stated that it is not important that commission members have expertise in the fields under consideration, because the hired consultants provide their own experts to conduct thorough studies of the land and provide informed recommendations. According to Mayor Rosenthal, the consultants spell out the answers for the commission, whose only job is to grant formal approval.<sup>6</sup>

These assumptions about the roles of consultants and commissions become problematic, for example, in the instance that the experts do a poor job. If the recommendations or assessments of the consultants are either incomplete or erroneous, a



political body expecting to be spoonfed the “right answers” would not know where to begin in uncovering the mistakes or discovering more appropriate solutions for the community.<sup>7</sup> A minimum level of relevant expertise is required to ask telling questions of the consultants in order to determine the adequacy of their work.<sup>8</sup>

The Architectural Commission was not only inadequately trained for inspection of biological and other scientific concerns in the EIR, but also of the archaeological background necessary to evaluate the impacts upon the cultural resources found within BFS. The planning body in charge of approving a document whose primary purpose was to evaluate the impacts upon biological and cultural resources of the land was unable to review these concerns to the satisfaction of the community. When an appeal was filed to repeal the Architectural Commission’s certification of the EIR, many of the same problems resurfaced.

### **Information Imbalance**

The system of information transfer in place at the Colleges and in the City of Claremont provides that decision-makers do not receive adequate information to make these decisions well. There is a tight, one-way filter through which information flows from constituents to decision-makers, and because of it, much important information is never heard. Therefore, it becomes impossible for the uninformed few at the top to become informed.

The Colleges operate on a hierarchical pattern from students at the bottom to Trustees at the top. While the Trustees make decisions that govern the lives and education of the students, they are separated by at least three degrees of bureaucracy from one another. The needs and concerns of students are most often communicated and best understood by faculty, who then inform the Deans of the colleges. The Deans maintain communication with the President, who, either directly or through the Board Chair, represents the campus to the Trustees.<sup>9</sup> Therefore, the Trustees rely on the recommendations of the Presidents and Board Chairs to adequately inform them of student needs. However, the legal and financial priorities of administrators have proven to be largely out-of-touch with the academic priorities of the students and faculty they

represent. For example, while the faculties of four colleges voted overwhelmingly not to site the new venture on BFS because of its value to the academic community and their need for such a resource, four of the Presidents and all five Board Chairs recommended the BFS site to Trustees, who eventually chose to gift this land to KGI. Obviously the opinion of the Presidents is heard most clearly by Trustees making decisions on the behalf of the students and faculty, whose participation is not allowed at Board meetings.<sup>10</sup> The Presidents and Trustees are so far removed from the daily lives and experiences of students and faculty at the Colleges that they have little sense of the academic needs of the institutions. Rather than furthering the value of students' educational experiences, Trustees base decisions on pragmatic political and economic concerns that have little relevance to students.

The information available to Trustees is even more limited and subject to administrative bias through the practice of sharing Trustees between old and new members of the Consortium. It is common practice for each institution to "donate" an individual from its Board to the founding Board of the new member. This is so the new institution can have a panel of experienced Trustees who can aid its early development and establishment, and also to increase lines of communication across campuses.<sup>11</sup> The Board member who serves the new institution, therefore, plays a large role in informing the Trustees of the original consortial member to which they belong about developments within the new institution about which they must make decisions. Along with the Presidents of the Colleges, this individual is responsible for the information that reaches the decision-makers. This system contributes to the imbalance of information within which decisions are made, since the President, who is far removed from the campus represents its voices, while the shared Trustee, who is intimately involved with decision-making at the new college serves as its spokesperson.

The commissions of the city, which are meant to be in communication with all citizens in the community, also receive a one-sided version of the information. Both CUC and KGI have discussions at length and work closely with City staff and consultants when preparing documents and proposals.<sup>12</sup> The staff and consultants, who are hired aides to city decision-makers, therefore play a large role in informing and shaping the



attitudes of commissioners. Furthermore, council members place a lot of trust in staff and consultant recommendations because they count on their expertise to deliver solutions.<sup>13</sup> While staff negotiates with the Colleges and advises them on how best to structure their plans so as to be in the favor of the City,<sup>14</sup> they also make recommendations to the commissions on the worth of such projects. Further, the consultants hired to prepare the EIR were chosen by the City, but paid by the Colleges. Thus the company expected to fairly assess environmental impacts of the project and make suggestions to the City is also in close contact with College administrators and is under pressure to find favorable results for both.

Numerous community members have voiced the concern that City officials are receiving information through closed, backroom negotiations with CUC.<sup>15</sup> The decision to remove the mitigation measure that called for perpetual preservation of the remaining site from the DEIR was made in a meeting with City staff, Envicom, Inc., and CUC.<sup>16</sup> Whether commissioners ever meet directly with representatives of KGI and the Colleges is unclear, however city staff and hired consultants provide two important avenues for amplifying CUC's position to the City.

The public, on the other hand, including citizens of Claremont as well as College faculty and students, has little opportunity to engage the City in dialogue regarding their concerns. Members of the community are given three minutes each to present ideas without response from the commission at the one public hearing on the issue. Although the commissioners consider the comments while making decisions, there is never any exchange of thoughts between the panel and the public. Many concerned individuals who contribute public comments are science faculty from the Colleges who are experts in relevant fields. While their opinions, assessments, and recommendations may be equally valid to those of the hired consultants, the unbalanced input to the City and the commissioners' expectations and reliance on the consultants almost guarantee that other scientific expertise is ignored. Limiting the statements of scientists not associated with the hired consulting company severely compromises the adequacy and quality of the information transmitted to an already uninformed city commission.<sup>17</sup>

Additional public comment is admissible in writing, and all letters are required to receive a response from the council. However, inspection of the EIR reveals that the likely written reply is a form letter that does not address any of the citizen's specific concerns.<sup>18</sup> Based on the structure of this system alone, it is clear that decision-makers within the City gather much more information from the College administration both directly and indirectly than from other community constituents. Therefore, if City commissioners are not experts on environmental and anthropological issues of concern in the decision, the lack of free-flowing, balanced information from all sides guarantees that they will not have any means of making more informed choices.

### **Lack of dialogue**

Another factor that allowed for such arguable decisions to come to pass was the notable lack of widespread dialogue about controversial topics, especially among decision-makers.

When KGI was originally proposed, very few details about its curriculum, mission, and contributors were known. The only information really available on the "new venture" was its focus on merging biology and engineering through applied life sciences.<sup>19</sup> The few particulars that were revealed at the time raised questions in the minds of many faculty, who sought to engage administrators in discussions. Despite various attempts, many noted an unwillingness to discuss these issues or critically examine the potential of the new venture to depart from the nature and missions of the established Consortium members. The few attempts at initiating this type of inquiry did not receive much attention from Hank Riggs or the administration of other colleges.<sup>20</sup> Therefore the new venture was admitted into the Consortium before anyone had a clear idea of what it was. By the time the details became available to the community, the decision had been made and it could not be reversed.

The process for choosing a site was similar to the procedure for admitting the new member to the Group Plan. When the Colleges began its land planning process to examine its options for locating hypothetical future institutions, individuals associated with the Field Station recognized that the land was at risk of being developed, and

published a newsletter warning that the site may become the preferred location of a new venture. They suggested that interested parties should become informed on the possibilities and help raise awareness among others. Following this publication, CUC administrators reprimanded the BFS directors, saying that the site had not even been a considered option and that disseminating this unfounded information before any discussions had taken place was inappropriate. Therefore, the individuals who attempted to initiate this dialogue were encouraged to remain silent, and potential discussion at that time was squelched. For months, CUC continued to assert that BFS was not a consideration for future development.<sup>21</sup>

In the Fall of 1996, CUC held three public forums to discuss the results of the land planning efforts and to solicit public opinion on a site for a new venture. A "Planning Update" was published to explain the need for a master plan and outlined the siting options for future expansion. The three locations mentioned for consideration were the Claremont Golf Course, the Quarry, and the Bernard Field Station, and each was given a summary of the environmental analysis and a list of "other issues" for consideration. While the issues identified for the Golf Course and the pit were either uncontested benefits of the existing site (i.e. the golf course "Has educational mission") or hindrances to its development (i.e. the pit has a "Perception that it's UGLY"), the BFS was presented as having arguable value in its current form ("Development potential versus academic value as a field station" and "Original vision of land use versus evolving priorities") with benefits mentioned last.<sup>22</sup> Additionally, the accompanying photographs of each site depict the Golf Course as a grassy expanse with many trees and the Quarry as a populated community of native plants and shrubs. The Field Station photo shows the sign at the entrance and the curb along Foothill Boulevard.

Another purpose of this planning update was to advertise the community forums for discussion of land use options. The update mentions highlights of one meeting that had already passed, and announces another upcoming forum. Catherine McFadden, who was co-director of the Field Station at the time, recalls that the brochure was printed late and circulated so close to the date of the forum that it was irrelevant for gaining community participation,<sup>23</sup> despite its closing claim that "Your involvement is wanted

and needed!”<sup>24</sup> In March 1997, CUC circulated a letter announcing that the site chosen for the “new venture” was the Bernard Field Station.

This process illustrates how the Colleges intentionally quieted discussion initiated by BFS supporters by claiming that it was not a considered option. Then, when it was too late to be relevant, CUC produced the brochure that invited community input on the decision, although it was clearly slanted toward the Field Station option. Although not formally, “it was clear that the decision had already been made” to locate the new venture on the Field Station site.<sup>25</sup> In fact, before the land planning process was completed, Henry Riggs approached Catherine McFadden and asked her to choose between the southeast and southwest corners of the Field Station as the site of the new venture, implying that all other options had been eliminated.<sup>26</sup> The process, therefore, appears to have been a public relations stunt to make the Colleges appear as though they valued community input, and to center the discussion and bias the information toward the preferred location.

Recent incidents have echoed this trend of preventing dialogue about controversial issues. Letters written by Henry Riggs and David Baltimore, President of California Institute of Technology, to President Stanley at Pomona criticized his contributions to bring Jeremy Rifkin, a well-known critic of biotechnology, to a student-run conference on the topic of “Biotechnology and Beyond.”<sup>27</sup> Fearing the conference would bring bad publicity to biotechnology institutions at a time when awareness is rising and these schools are increasingly vulnerable to public disapproval, they hoped to limit the debate to only favorable commentators. This action demonstrates a clear unwillingness to engage in meaningful and two-sided dialogue about a very controversial topic, and even an attempt to control the information and discussion on the campuses. When Peter Stanley responded with a letter highlighting his professional obligation and personal belief in academic freedom,<sup>28</sup> Riggs organized a separate conference of biotechnology advocates for the same day, demonstrating that if he was unable to control the debate, he would simply ignore the other side of the argument.

Some argue that the fear and silence that pervades the Claremont Colleges atmosphere is evidence of a dysfunctional academic environment in which the free

exchange of ideas is not always welcomed.<sup>29</sup> A visiting professor at Harvey Mudd College said that it had the most repressive administration he had ever experienced, and he worried for the state of academic freedom at the Claremont Colleges.<sup>30</sup> “Only a smattering of professors will criticize Claremont University Center or KGI about the latter’s mission – and those only when asked.”<sup>31</sup> The lack of dialogue on controversial issues has allowed decision-makers to take quick steps largely unnoticed and uncontested.

Again, this trend is evident within the City of Claremont as well, although the democratic process serves to obscure it slightly. Most decisions of community concern made by the City require a period of public comment, where written letters and spoken statements at public hearings are accepted. Although formally it may appear as though this process serves to widen the dialogue about an issue before decisions are made, it is clear in practice that the City manages to stifle discussion as well.

Subtle gestures by the City demonstrate that it is willing to minimize discussion on controversial topics. At the various public hearings where spoken testimony was accepted from community members, the comments, body language, and attitudes of council members revealed their unwillingness to listen to ideas and concerns of citizens. The actions of the mayor were thought to be indicative of a desire to limit public comments.<sup>32</sup> Repeated incidences of commissioners rolling their eyes and admonishing applause or cheers in support of another citizen’s comments were noted by participants.<sup>33</sup> Questions addressed specifically to the commission were not answered. Therefore, while community members may have been expressing their thoughts, the lack of a response meant that dialogue was impossible. The City also made it very clear that it would not consider all comments. Children who spoke were specifically not addressed because commissioners decided they were too young to make contributions to the discussion. Also, when asked, the City said that it responded to all of the substantial comments only, implying that those that did not receive a direct response or any acknowledgement were insubstantial.<sup>34</sup>

Others noticed that many letters written to the staff received responses such as “comments noted,” without any substance or reference to issues raised. According to the law, anything submitted in writing to the City required a response. However, if that was

the extent of the City's response, one important means for a dialogue between citizens and the City was completely trivialized to a formality as mandated by policy.

Still more actions taken by the City gave evidence of an effort to minimize dialogue so decision-makers could move on with their process. It appeared clear from the start that the minds of certain commissioners were already made up. Therefore, the entire process was a mere hurdle to be crossed before they could get on with project approval and reap the economic benefits of the new venture. A former member of two city commissions said that the environmental review is often considered an unnecessary stepping stone before the "real" issues could be considered.<sup>35</sup> One example was the decision to hold the Architectural Commission hearing during the Colleges' spring break – the one week between January and May that the Colleges are not in session. Because this is an issue that affects the College students and that many of them care about, they requested that the date be changed to a time when the Colleges were in session. The date was changed, more likely because CUC was not ready with its documents than because of student desire. It was rescheduled for a date in April but was moved again to May 10, during finals week at the Colleges, when the entire senior class is off campus before graduation and the remaining underclassmen are occupied with exams. The coincidental timeline of these meetings is explained by the Mayor's response that "The City does not operate on an academic calendar." While this is true, it is extremely dubious that the dates fall as they do. Some believe it is an infringement on the students' right to participate in discussion of important issues that affect the academic and greater community.

In asking for an explanation from the City of its position, the majority of its justification for overriding the voices of the community was that the impacts would not be significant. The impacts to the view of the mountains, to the habitat on the site, and to the Tongva culture were said to be insignificant by the Mayor. However, when hundreds of people write letters and testify that they are concerned about these impacts, a City that unanimously finds the confidence to rule that their concerns and all project impacts are insignificant is obviously not engaging itself in critical inquiry of the topics raised. They are showing not only that they are unwilling to consider these concerns, but also that they



dismiss them as unsubstantial, even though they are obviously of significant concern to many citizens. Also, by insisting that the segment of the population against the decisions is only a few individual activists, the City belittles the magnitude to which this is an issue of concern to the community. It shows that the City is dismissive and does not allow for or engage in widespread dialogue. Instead, officials appear eager to forge onward upon a bold new adventure into the new millennium, without thinking through the consequences of their decisions or their effects upon a concerned community.

### **Lack of Checks and Balances**

Both the Colleges and the City lack a system of checks and balances that can either reverse decisions or undo the damage of poor judgment. For this reason, decision-makers often take rapid action while maintaining a low profile on issues they know will be controversial, and there is little that can be done to mitigate for their effects.<sup>36</sup>

At the Colleges, KGI was admitted into the Consortium before adequate information about its nature and potential was made available. Despite unresolved concerns about the new venture, its membership in the Claremont Colleges was decided quickly and based on faith in Henry Riggs more than the sound logic of the proposal.<sup>37</sup> However now that further details about the project are being revealed to the academic community and the public, numerous people have discovered many points of contention with the structure, curriculum, and goals of the Institute. Even the mission of the seventh college appears in some ways to be a departure from undertakings of the other members in that it has no focus on social responsibility.<sup>38</sup> In this way, KGI could potentially challenge or alter the aim of the Consortium as a whole with impacts on each College. However, there is no provision for the expulsion of a member institution within the Consortium's constitution.<sup>39</sup> Therefore, if KGI does somehow compromise the purpose or the goals of the group, as some people fear, there is no course of action that can check its impacts upon the system or reverse their effects.

As a full member of the Claremont Colleges, KGI is an autonomous body within the Consortium that has the power to make decisions without input or approval from other Colleges regardless of their impacts.<sup>40</sup> There is no system in place to monitor or

check its effects either on the whole Group or on any individual member. The Constitution of the Claremont Colleges includes a provision that if CUC makes a decision that “affects a member college or one or more central programs and services,” individuals of its Board of Fellows can follow a procedure to “review such action” and subject it to another vote.<sup>41</sup> There is no such clause whereby one member college can review the choices of others which affect it.

Many worry that this particular institution, with all of the unanswered questions circulating about it, has the ability to depart from the character and the mission of the Claremont Consortium. The existing colleges are no longer in a position to set standards, influence policy, or ensure the accordance of the new member with the group’s identity. In short, there is no guarantee that KGI will be an appropriate academic fit with the Colleges, and there is no means of limiting its potential to detract from the group.

The democratic process of the City of Claremont does include means for the public to review decisions, including appeal and referendum options. However, as has been discovered, neither of these means are effective because they are subject to the same factors that affect the decision-making process at other levels and allow for choices to be made against the will of the public. The appeal of the EIR certification, for example, was “heard but not listened to,”<sup>42</sup> by a disengaged City Council who was not trained appropriately and seemed to have its mind made up from the start.<sup>43</sup>

Another symptom of the lack of checks and balances upon city determinations is that the damage caused by these choices cannot be amended. The EIR for the construction of KGI was already approved despite the myriad voices of protest because the concerns were assumed to be inconsequential. Now, if the project is also approved without resolving the concerns it generates, there is no means of mending the damage that a hasty decision could cause. This issue is one of recognizing and respecting relationships between individuals in the community. If ties to native Claremont are severed by destroying one of the last remaining memories of this town’s ecological foundation, there is no means of regaining this bond. The same action would equally disconnect the Tongva people from their history, heritage and spirituality all at once, never to be regenerated. Impacts on the character of Claremont by the inclusion of the

biotechnology industry can never be erased. The impacts of this project are far-reaching, long-lasting and irrevocable, and must be given appropriate consideration before decisions can be made. The ecological foresight that is at stake with these decisions and the acceptance of a global responsibility to protect the environment as a shared resource cannot be replaced once they are lost. If the City makes hasty decisions without properly weighing their repercussions, the significance of their actions cannot be discovered until it is potentially too late to rectify their harm. There is no system in the world that can check or balance these types of impacts upon community and nature.

### **Acceptance of Accountability**

The decision-makers in this situation have not displayed a willingness to accept accountability for the implications of their choices. Rather they demonstrate a trend of denying responsibilities of their positions and of trivializing the consequences of their choices and of others' concerns regarding them.

At the Colleges, this is blatantly demonstrated in the reluctance of CUC administrators to take responsibility for ensuring that KGI is an appropriate academic fit that advances the aims of the Consortium. According to the Group Plan, CUC's first function is "to initiate the founding of new colleges and determine the conditions under which individual colleges may become and remain members of the group."<sup>44</sup> Therefore, CUC is directly responsible for insuring that new colleges are appropriately suited for the Consortium. Faculty at four of the Colleges have indicated that KGI's lack of tenure policy is a direct threat to the academic freedom and integrity of this community and that it is an irresponsible decision on the part of the Institute because of the negative effects it will carry. As the Central Coordinating Institution charged with managing the commons of the Colleges as well as "taking the initiative in ... the development of new institutions," it is expected that CUC will assume oversight responsibilities towards the members<sup>45</sup> and take a leadership role in guiding the establishment of a new member in directions appropriate to the Consortium.<sup>46</sup> However, members of the CUC administration believe that its function in this scenario is as a co-equal which has no control over member institutions. "We work together, but we make our own decisions.

CUC cannot mandate curriculum or any other choices at the other Colleges.”<sup>47</sup> Others call this a cop out and a denial of the social responsibility embedded in the function of the institution.<sup>48</sup>

Educational institutions are social resources intended to pass on socially constructed and held values to students who will carry them out into the community and contribute beneficially to society in some way. If these values are held in question by a member of the Consortium and there is no body in the system to address its dynamics upon the group or to hold it responsible to the others, it appears that either the Colleges as a collective institution are failing to recognize the social obligation of their educational missions, or the body intended to serve this purpose is denying this aspect of their responsibility to the others. With CUC claiming that it is not their responsibility to keep KGI in check with the missions of the other schools, the organization responsible for the proper management of the commons between the members is denying responsibility to ensure that the Colleges are responsible to one another. In the case that KGI chooses to conduct research on biological warfare or human genetic cloning, there is nobody to hold them accountable to the academic community, and this decision could be passed off as a curriculum choice in which outside interference was inappropriate. While this scenario appears farfetched, it is within the realm of possibility for an Institute attempting such a controversial undertaking in which it is not held accountable to the larger community through any force but its own liking.

The City of Claremont demonstrates a similar trend to CUC in denying responsibility for decisions that affect the community. In this case, the City dismisses the majority of the public’s concerns regarding KGI and the siting decision as “curriculum decisions” which have to be made internally. However, it is clear that there is dissension within the college community as to the appropriateness of the new project, and there is no body responsible for the internal regulation of such concerns. Each time a member of the community raises concerns about the loss of the Field Station and the questionable nature of KGI, the City insists that these are out of its bounds as a ruling body. Furthermore, if a member of the academic community approaches the City as a member of the Claremont

community, their voice is dismissed as reflecting an “internal battle” within the Colleges in which the City has no role.<sup>49</sup>

Regardless of whether these concerns are related to curriculum within the Colleges, they have obvious impacts upon the larger community. However, by denying its role to examine these impacts, the City denies its responsibility to the welfare of the community and to the democratic voice of the public. The City claims that there is confusion over what is within the realm of judgment of the commissions and what the Colleges are responsible for, and that too many people require them to play referee to the internal struggles within the Colleges.<sup>50</sup> However, if the Colleges are making uninformed, irreversible, and irresponsible decisions that affect the entire community, it is well within the City’s rights to step in on behalf of the community. However, because both College and City decision-makers are passing off accountability for their decisions by insisting that it is “not my job,” important concerns are ignored and the project surges forth despite its impacts on the community.

Furthermore, the City has dismissed virtually every remaining public concern as not probable to have significant impacts. The loss of the view, loss of habitat, change in Claremont’s character, and loss of cultural resources were all said to be “insignificant” by Mayor Rosenthal, as justification for her voting in contrast to the voiced opinion of many participants in the political process. Therefore, the concerns that are considered within the City’s purview are ignored as well.

### **Unintentional Marginalization**

The siting decision for the Keck Graduate Institute was very deliberate, and the final choice reflected the administrative “assumption all along that [KGI] would go North of Foothill.”<sup>51</sup> Therefore, a key component to the completion of a process in which desired decisions had to be made against the expressed wishes of almost all participants save the decision-makers was the systematic marginalization of voices of opposition. There were several types of marginalization demonstrated in this issue, and countless incidents of the occurrence of each throughout the decision-making process.

Some voices of dissension were marginalized unintentionally. It is a human tendency to assume that one's view is appropriately reflective of the social environment in which one participates. Therefore, it is very easy for people to hear what they want to hear, absorbing only morsels of information already compatible with their own beliefs and using them to define others' views as similar to their own. "When you get involved with something of importance to you, it takes on exaggerated proportions, and you assume everyone feels the same way."<sup>52</sup> This tendency was demonstrated both in the City and at the Colleges on numerous occasions.

Both the College administration and the City expressed their belief that the opposition to the decisions they made came from a very small, isolated segment of their respective constituent populations. It was clear that only the voiced opposition was considered, and silence from others was assumed to imply agreement. The default statement assigned to those who did not express their views was tacit support of the ideas held by decision-makers. However the imbalance between voices of opposition and support indicate that the decisions made poorly reflected the reality of public opinion. "There were 350 letters of opposition [to the EIR] and 12 in favor. How is that listening?"<sup>53</sup>

Similarly, the voice of scientists was conveniently manipulated to serve the ends of the decision-makers. For example, Dr. Fowler expressed to the City that he would prefer to see money invested into the BFS endowment rather than on-site habitat replacement as a mitigation for habitat loss.<sup>54</sup> Of this conversation, the Mayor later said that the BFS Directors convinced her that on-site mitigation was less preferable to off-site.<sup>55</sup>

Of the faculty opinions at the Colleges, "the preponderance of science and environmental studies faculty at the Colleges is to preserve the BFS for educational use."<sup>56</sup> The only known supporter of the siting decision among science faculty is Dan Guthrie, who argues that the eleven acre sacrifice has brought more money, attention, and care to the remaining 74 acres of the Field Station than would otherwise have been realistic, ultimately benefiting the site.<sup>57</sup> As a result, both CUC administration and City Council believe the faculty voice is split. The Mayor mentioned Guthrie as an example



of a supporter of KGI, and while mentioning Dr. Larry Oglesby, one of the most outspoken critics of the decision and its process, she stated that she does not know where he stands on the issue.<sup>58</sup> Oglesby's 19-page letter detailing his stance is part of the public record that is now included in the EIR which the City Council, headed by Mayor Rosenthal, ultimately certified. There is no reason, short of ignoring him, why the Mayor should not know his stance.

Further, despite the number of scientists from the Colleges who testified at public hearings against the siting decision for its significant impacts on the ecology of the site, the City understood that the habitat loss would not be significant.<sup>59</sup> Clearly the only scientific testimony being heard was that of the "experts" hired by the Colleges who reported results that confirmed the biases of the City and College administration.

A final example that illustrates how personal bias affected the message heard by decision-makers involves the different responses to a 1997 assessment of the BFS by Philippe Cohen of Stanford University's world-renowned Jasper Ridge Biological Preserve. Those in favor of developing the land understood the report to say that the site was already too small to be an ecologically viable community in the long term, thereby compromising the academic value of the Station and precluding the sensibility of preserving it.<sup>60</sup> However, scientists at the Colleges who examined his report gathered that he praised the tremendous academic value of the site and advocated that increased investment would be required for the long term ecological viability of the land.<sup>61</sup> In the executive summary of the assessment, Cohen wrote,

- "Currently Bernard Field Station is an important pedagogic tool and provides essential benefits to the field sciences curriculum of the Claremont Colleges."
- "... BFS's academic value is likely to increase in the foreseeable future."
- "... academic value and ecological viability, especially as it pertains to native habitat, are not always synonymous."
- "The academic value of BFS is at risk due to serious management shortcomings. Unless these shortcomings are addressed, then BFS will eventually lose any real academic value." The recommendations addressed: "Lack of academic oversight, inadequate funding resources, and lack of data management."<sup>62</sup>

Other incidents indicated that the practice of marginalization is institutionalized at the Colleges and in the City, and that often, without realizing it, we participate in a

system which, by its very nature or structure, casts aside certain voices while exalting others.

The faculty voice is marginalized in the decision-making process at the Colleges. While the Trustees have the final say in almost all decisions, faculty are not even allowed to attend these meetings. There is one faculty representative on some of the College's Board of Trustees, and for issues of special concern, an individual faculty member may make a presentation to a sub-committee of the Board, although they are asked to leave before the decisions are deliberated.<sup>63</sup>

While making decisions within the Colleges, the administration thinks that the voices of community members are irrelevant to the needs of the academic community, so they ignore public comment.<sup>64</sup> The City, on the other hand, dismisses the voices of faculty and students as symptoms of an internal struggle within the Colleges.<sup>65</sup>

The Native American voice is marginalized throughout this process. At the Colleges, their claims to the land are not considered. The Colleges do not want the Tongva community using the BFS for gathering or rituals.<sup>66</sup> They have to apply for special permission to be allowed to see the artifacts that potentially belonged to their people.<sup>67</sup> In the City, they are not given adequate consideration and have to face a clash of cultures. In three minutes, one person is expected to present hundreds of years of history and oppression and a little understood cosmovision that requires ties to native land to remain intact for his entire tribal nation. In the Tongva culture, people are accustomed to speaking until they are finished, and others listen. All decisions are made through joint discussion in which everyone's concerns are incorporated.<sup>68</sup> However, in the City, their voice is only heard until the red light flashes, their history is outweighed by the findings of an archaeological experts, and they are not involved in dialogue concerning cultural resources of the land and the area.

Furthermore, the Tongva concerns are not given consideration unless they are federally recognized. The US government has imposed an arbitrary set of criteria to determine whether a tribal nation deems recognition. These criteria are irrelevant to the Tongva social structure, but because they appear to lack them in a form the government recognizes, they are not granted money or a voice in government.<sup>69</sup> The only thing that

speaks for them are artifacts, implying that “dead Indians” are worth more than the words of “live Indians.”<sup>70</sup>

The environmental studies are marginalized at an institution that values future colleges with potential benefits over a rare and precious resource that provides actual value for the academic pursuit of ecology. Any science that does not require expensive gadgetry or technical equipment is seen as less valuable than field studies that are relatively equipment un-intensive. “In biology there is a heavy bias towards funding the most reductionist areas: much more is spent on the study of molecules and cells than on ecology, for example. Research likely to be useful for biotechnology receives a disproportionate amount of money -- and thus talent -- for it is most likely to generate results that can be patented ... thus generating profit.”<sup>71</sup>

In the City, economic benefits of a project are considered during an environmental review, implying that they override impacts on local ecology.

The Field Station has been a marginalized academic resource since its inception. Administration were reluctant to adopt it, but gave in because of its potential use as a temporary tax evasion technique. For years it received no funding, and it does not have an administrative advocate. It remained at the periphery of administrative focus until Philippe Cohen’s report urged them to issue a formal statement recognizing its value and contribute money to its upkeep. Many continue to call it a vacant lot. Those who testify to its value are marginalized as well.

### **Intentional Marginalization**

Finally, yet more incidents reveal that intentional marginalization of voices was also a commonly occurring practice in both settings, where for reasons of convenience and sometimes fear, individuals were ignored or actively silenced. This is particularly disturbing given the widely held assumption that an intellectual environment depends upon the free and uncensored exchange of ideas, and also that the viability of a democratic tradition rests on the principles of free speech and tolerance of political opinions.

At the City Council hearing in September of 1999, a community member was belittled while testifying in front of the council. She was told to "make your little speech now," by the Mayor of Claremont.<sup>72</sup> "As required by law, the city council members watched as Claremont residents aired their views, but ... [the Council's] respectful deferential questions were reserved for those who represented KGI and pro-development speakers while those expressing thoughtful opposition were greeted with calls for order and admonitions not to clap."<sup>73</sup> The comments and body language of commissioners throughout the hearings were considered inappropriate by many residents.<sup>74</sup>

The City further marginalized voices through the political process by deciding that children's comments would not receive any consideration. Many written concerns received the response, "comments noted." When questioned about this, the Staff stated that responses were reserved for "substantial" issues, implying that others' concerns were inconsequential.<sup>75</sup> Many testimonies were dismissed as emotional, and students were often called uninformed upstarts who were manipulated by Paul Faulstich into taking up a cause they had little understanding of.<sup>76</sup> Numerous citizens felt that their concerns were not taken seriously. "The City is require by law to hear us," said one Claremont citizen, "they don't have to *listen*."<sup>77</sup>

Unsatisfied with the City's handling of the issue, Carol Gil, a Claremont resident, filed a Notice of Intent to Circulate a Petition with the City Attorney last fall. The petition would have given residents the opportunity to vote on an initiative to establish a conservation zone in Claremont that included the BFS site. The City Attorney rejected the petition and denied to prepare a ballot title and summary for the municipal election. For nearly one month no clear explanation was given for the rejection.<sup>78</sup> After filing a complaint with the secretary of state, state attorneys determined that the City Attorney had no legal grounds for rejecting the petition.<sup>79</sup> The refusal was justified on an obscure legal technicality which was not entirely within the scope of the law, knowing that the likelihood of being caught was slim because the resident would not have enough money to hire a lawyer and receive legal advice on the matter.<sup>80</sup> This move intentionally marginalized the efforts of one resident to bring the power to make decisions to the public.

During the hearings, Tongva residents of Claremont requested an archaeological monitor to accompany the consultant on the exploratory dig of the site as a representative of the Tongva community. This request was ignored. The information presented to the City that indicated the presence of the village on the BFS site received cordial, but unsubstantial responses from the City, but no acknowledgment from KGI or CUC.<sup>81</sup> They have not been granted permission to have a Tongva monitor on site when construction starts, although an archaeological expert will be available for consultation in the event that artifacts are uncovered. Throughout the process, the voices of the Tongva people have been outweighed by hired archaeologists. Mayor Rosenthal said, "The Indian tribe makes claims to the land and demands things, but when archeologists and paleontologists prove that they were never here, we have to ignore that."<sup>82</sup> Further, their oral traditions are apparently disregarded when making decisions because "Native American word-of-mouth is notoriously imprecise."<sup>83</sup>

On another occasion, it seemed that "city officials also expect to silence their citizens into submission."<sup>84</sup> At the weekly Farmer's Market in Claremont, members of the Friends of BFS had set up a table and were distributing information about the issue, when an Architectural Commissioner complained to the organizers of the event that their presence disrupted the "farmer-like atmosphere" of the market. The city official tried to make the organizers prevent the Friends from setting up information tables.<sup>85</sup> Ironically, on a separate occasion, the City Council set up a similar booth for a public event in order to answer questions and respond to concerns of citizens.<sup>86</sup>

An article in the Claremont Courier brought up the lack of dialogue within the community regarding the "admittedly controversial mission of KGI," in which college faculty members are quoted about the intimidation of engaging in critical inquiry of a project that "the top brass really wants to have happen."<sup>87</sup> Responding to this article, Henry Riggs wrote a letter to the editor of the paper saying, "Faculty felt perfectly free being vocal," both about the siting decision and subsequent controversies that have arisen.<sup>88</sup> He denies that the intimidation of faculty took place at the Colleges and questions the possibility that such behavior could occur at institutions of higher education.

Unfortunately intimidation can and does occur at the Claremont Colleges, paradoxically in a community that prizes itself on the free exchange of ideas. Beginning in the summer of 1999, Rebecca Coleman, Director of Foundation Relations at Harvey Mudd College, started to feel pressure from the administration for her interest in the Field Station. As a child, Rebecca had spent time at BFS with her best friend, who was Clyde Eriksen's daughter, so the ongoing controversy over its preservation piqued her curiosity. Shortly after she became involved with the Friends of the BFS, her boss decided to talk to her about her role in this issue. They had assumed that her stance in support of the Field Station meant that she was against KGI, and it began to affect the way she was treated. It began with some jokes about her political views and casual comments intended to silence her participation. Eventually the pressure became more direct, and she was expressly instructed not to interact with certain members of the HMC faculty who were outspoken critics of KGI or the siting decision. Being forbidden from collaborating with certain faculty members impeded her ability to do her job, however she was worried about her job security, so she agreed to keep her opinions private. As a gesture, she removed her "Save the Field Station" bumper sticker from her car. Following this, she was informed that her boss had said, "I'm reigning her in and keeping her in line," by someone present at a senior staff meeting of the College. This sort of treatment continued and accelerated for a period of several months, until she resigned from her position.<sup>89</sup>

Nancy Hamlett, Chair of Biology at Harvey Mudd, was also similarly targeted for her views on the BFS. Unlike Rebecca Coleman, who was a member of the administrative staff, Nancy is part of the tenured faculty, so her job security has never been threatened by the pressure she has faced. However, it has intimidated her from speaking out on occasion, and has affected the way she has been treated at HMC.<sup>90</sup> In the Fall of 1998, the administration of Harvey Mudd decided to draft a proposal to the W. M. Keck Foundation to fund programs that would forge synergy between HMC and KGI. Because Nancy still had some residual concerns about the nature of KGI and its relations with other member colleges, she approached the administration to voice her queries. They let her speak her mind, but it was obvious that they disregarded her concerns, because they then asked all of the department chairs to generate ideas for collaboration



with KGI and formulate the proposal. Rebecca Coleman was responsible for writing the proposal, but they told her that she was not allowed to meet with Nancy, because they were worried that both of them together would have a stronger voice of dissension.<sup>91</sup> Their colleagues would make comments like, "we wouldn't want both of you in the same room" and participated in the sexist culture that labeled them as the two hysterical women making lots of noise about an unimportant issue.<sup>92</sup> At every meeting thereafter, Nancy's voice was outvoted and her ideas were routinely dismissed. She was forced into collaboration with KGI through this process, and she was also marginalized by it so that her ideas never received any merit.<sup>93</sup>

After the Friends of the Bernard BFS (FBBFS) had become incorporated, they designed a website of information about the organization and the Field Station. The site was run through the Harvey Mudd College's server, and was accessible from the HMC webpage. Calling it inappropriate, Hank Riggs tried to force the HMC computing service to pull the website from the server.<sup>94</sup> This act, coupled with his attempt to prevent Jeremy Rifkin from speaking at Pomona College, demonstrates his fear of well-rounded discussion about controversial issues and showed that he felt threatened by the prospect of faculty mobilization around them.<sup>95</sup>

Another attempt at silencing the debate arose in June of 1999, when the W. M. Keck Foundation wrote a letter to the Architectural Commission saying that its \$50 million seed gift was contingent upon the siting of KGI on the Field Station. This letter came over a year after the controversial DEIR hearings were begun and in the wake of the debate over the approval of the Final EIR, and it raised many questions. The agreement to make a founding donation of money as large as Keck's grant to KGI is not an impulsive or haphazard deal. Months of deliberation and careful negotiation are spent finalizing the exact details of the agreement. Therefore, if the site was already a requirement of the deal, KGI representatives should have said so from the start, and many of the deliberations may not have been necessary. In that case, it implies that the entire political process of public comment and review were merely a formality and democratic interests were never an issue.<sup>96</sup> However, many feel this is an unethical requirement for funding, and the more likely scenario is that, threatened by the amount of opposition to

the decision, KGI leadership approached the Foundation to include this “requirement” in order to shape the debate in their favor.<sup>97</sup> This scenario has powerful implications as well. KGI demonstrates an unwillingness to compromise and has shown that they are prepared to use underhanded methods to get their way. Whether or not this is a welcome addition to this community merits important consideration in light of this action.

<sup>1</sup> Peter Stanley, personal interview, 20 March 2000. President, Pomona College.

<sup>2</sup> Paul Faulstich, personal interview, 25 February 2000. Professor of Environmental Studies, Pitzer College.

<sup>3</sup> Kevin Bingham, personal communication, 14 April 2000. Interim caretaker, Bernard Field Station.

<sup>4</sup> Larry Oglesby, personal interview, 3 March 2000. Professor Emeritus of Biology, Pomona College. Former member of Environmental Quality and Planning Commissions, Claremont.

<sup>5</sup> Larry Oglesby, personal interview, 21 February 2000.

<sup>6</sup> Karen Rosenthal, personal interview, 23 February 2000. Mayor, Claremont.

<sup>7</sup> Oglesby, 3 Mar 2000.

<sup>8</sup> Carol Gil, personal interview, 8 March 2000. Claremont resident.

<sup>9</sup> Stanley, 20 Mar 2000.

<sup>10</sup> Nancy Hamlett, personal interview, 5 March 2000. Professor of Biology, Harvey Mudd College. President, Friends of the Bernard Field Station.

<sup>11</sup> Stanley, 20 Mar 2000.

<sup>12</sup> Bernadette Busenberg, personal interview, 3 March 2000. Director of Planning and Administration, Keck Graduate Institute.

<sup>13</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.

<sup>14</sup> Busenberg, 3 Mar 2000.

<sup>15</sup> Relf Alison Star, letter, *Claremont Courier* 11 August 1999: 11.

<sup>16</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.

<sup>17</sup> Oglesby, 21 Feb 2000.

<sup>18</sup> Julia Karet, letter, *Claremont Courier* 20 November 1999: 26.

<sup>19</sup> Busenberg, 3 Mar 2000.

<sup>20</sup> Hamlett, 5 Mar 2000.

<sup>21</sup> Catherine McFadden, personal communication, 20 April 2000. Professor of Biology, Harvey Mudd College.

<sup>22</sup> Claremont University Center, *Planning Update* (Claremont, CA: December 1996) 3.

<sup>23</sup> McFadden, 20 Apr 2000.

<sup>24</sup> CUC 4.

<sup>25</sup> McFadden, 20 Apr 2000.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Richard Worthington, personal interview, 3 March 2000.

<sup>28</sup> Kate Finger, personal communication, 20 April 2000. Student, Pomona College.

<sup>29</sup> Rebecca Coleman, personal interview, 14 April 2000. Former Director of Foundation Relations, Harvey Mudd College.

<sup>30</sup> Gary Scott, “The world of academia: An issue over social responsibility,” *Claremont Courier* 13 November 1999: 2.

<sup>31</sup> Gary Scott, “Biotechnology: Corporate influence remains in the background as a topic of discussion,” *Claremont Courier* 14 July 1999: 2.

<sup>32</sup> Charles Cange, letter, *Claremont Courier* 10 November 1999: 9.

<sup>33</sup> Julia Karet, letter, *Claremont Courier* 20 November 1999: 26 – 27.

<sup>34</sup> Finger, 20 Apr 2000.

<sup>35</sup> Oglesby, 3 Mar 2000.

<sup>36</sup> Scott, “Biotechnology,” 2.

<sup>37</sup> Hamlett, 5 Mar 2000.

<sup>38</sup> Worthington, 3 Mar 2000.

- 
- <sup>39</sup> Stanley, 20 Mar 2000.
- <sup>40</sup> Brenda Barham-Hill, personal interview, 24 February 2000. Vice President, Claremont University Center.
- <sup>41</sup> *Constitution of the Claremont Colleges*, 22 October 1993: III-2.
- <sup>42</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>43</sup> Cange 9.
- <sup>44</sup> Claremont University Center, *A Brief History of the Group Plan of the Claremont Colleges* (Claremont, 1993): 12.
- <sup>45</sup> *Constitution*, III-2.
- <sup>46</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>47</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.
- <sup>48</sup> Worthington, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>49</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>50</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>51</sup> Barham-Hill, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>53</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>54</sup> Hamlett, 5 Mar 2000.
- <sup>55</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>56</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.
- <sup>57</sup> Daniel Guthrie, personal interview, 14 April 2000. Professor of Biology, Joint Sciences Department.
- <sup>58</sup> Rosenthal, 24 Feb 2000.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>60</sup> Stanley, 20 Mar 2000. Busenberg, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>61</sup> Fowler, 16 Feb 2000. Oglesby, 3 Mar 2000.
- <sup>62</sup> Philippe Cohen, *Bernard Field Station Assessment Report*, (Claremont, 5 March 1997): 1-2.
- <sup>63</sup> Hamlet, 5 Mar 2000.
- <sup>64</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>65</sup> Rosenthal, 24 Feb 2000.
- <sup>66</sup> Guthrie, 14 Apr 2000.
- <sup>67</sup> Steve Comba, personal interview, 19 April 2000. Acting Director and Registrar, Montgomery Gallery, Pomona College.
- <sup>68</sup> Mark Acuña, personal interview, 28 February 2000. Claremont resident.
- <sup>69</sup> Robertjohn, personal interview, 23 February 2000. Claremont resident.
- <sup>70</sup> Steven Nagler, letter, *Claremont Courier* 18 September 1999: 15.
- <sup>71</sup> Martha Crouch, "Confessions of a botanist," *New Internationalist*, March 1991: 2.
- <sup>72</sup> Relf Alison Star, personal interview, 8 March 2000. Claremont resident.
- <sup>73</sup> Karet 26 - 27.
- <sup>74</sup> Cange 9.
- <sup>75</sup> Finger, 20 April 2000.
- <sup>76</sup> Teo Grossman, personal interview, 13 April 2000. Student, Pitzer College.
- <sup>77</sup> Robertjohn, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>78</sup> Carol Gil, personal communication, 13 April 2000.
- <sup>79</sup> L.C. Greene, "Petition rejection not legal, state says," *Inland Valley Daily Bulletin* 26 November 1999: A1.
- <sup>80</sup> Carol Gil, 8 Mar 2000.
- <sup>81</sup> Acuña, 28 Feb 2000.
- <sup>82</sup> Rosenthal, 23 Feb 2000.
- <sup>83</sup> Guthrie, 14 Apr 2000.
- <sup>84</sup> Relf Alison Star, letter, *Claremont Courier*, 11 August 1999: 11.
- <sup>85</sup> Star, 8 Mar 2000.
- <sup>86</sup> Karet 26.
- <sup>87</sup> Scott, "Biotechnology," 2.
- <sup>88</sup> Henry Riggs, letter, *Claremont Courier* 21 July 1999: 8.

---

<sup>89</sup> Coleman, 14 April 2000.

<sup>90</sup> Scott, "Biotechnology," 2.

<sup>91</sup> Hamlett, 5 Mar 2000.

<sup>92</sup> Coleman, 14 Apr 2000.

<sup>93</sup> Hamlett, 5 Mar 2000.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid.

<sup>95</sup> Worthington, 3 Mar 2000.

<sup>96</sup> Fowler, 16 Feb 2000.

<sup>97</sup> Faulstich, 25 Feb 2000.











Whether or not we have had any say as individuals in the outcome of these decisions, we are all in this together. This is one community and the decisions made here affect us all and reflect equally on each of us. We have some important questions to ask ourselves. What messages are we sending out as a community? As educational institutions charged with social responsibility, what values do we teach? What do we hold sacred as a society? In light of the history, controversies, perspectives, and process that have gone into creating this issue, an analysis of the implications of the choices made in this community demonstrates the powerful statements we make.

**Education only comes from classrooms.**

Regardless of the debate over the intentions of the donors for the use of the land, the documents read that the land was set aside for “educational use.” A simple fact is that the Bernard Biological Field Station is an educational use of this land. The government acknowledged this fact when they granted the Colleges a tax exemption. The Colleges accepted it when they issued a statement recognizing its value. Faculty and students know it, and make use of it every day.

Another simple fact is that times have changed.

When the land was donated to the Colleges nearly 75 years ago it was under a very different set of circumstances than those that exist today. There was no “group” in “Group Plan” at the time. The success of Blaisdell’s visionary idea depended upon the establishment of new colleges. Today the Claremont Colleges is a prestigious and well-rounded collection of institutions. If the Consortium never gains another member, we will not have failed. Claremont would still be one of the “great centers of learning” that Blaisdell dreamed of.

At that time, land was imperative for ensuring the long-term viability of the Plan. The only option was to go north. “Since a railroad, a 60-foot deep pit, and solid residential occupancy surround our campuses on the east, west, and south, we have nowhere to go but north for any sizeable area.”<sup>1</sup> So the option was secured and safeguarded for nearly 75 years. Today land is still a necessity for the establishment of

new colleges, but we have options. Alternative sites exist. Whether or not they are attractive, they are possible, whereas at another time they were thought unimaginable.

In the 1920s Pomona College's financial stability was not yet secured, meaning that its prospects of acquiring more options were uncertain. Today there is little doubt as to the Colleges' long-term financial viability. This newfound economic security brings with it a flexibility in decision-making unavailable to our predecessors.

In short, we do not *have* to build new colleges on the BFS; we choose to.

Today, unlike 75 years ago, there is no shortage of colleges. There is, however, a glaring lack of wilderness, of native habitat, and of ecological awareness. Because this type of resource is a rare and precious commodity, we have much to gain from preserving it. It affords unique and rapidly vanishing opportunities for study, observation, reflection, and connection that cannot be replicated or regained once lost. So long as there are available alternatives that we choose to overlook in order to build on this academic resource, we demonstrate that we value the indirect educational use of the land over the direct.

We are faced with a challenge unlike our predecessors. While they were charged with preserving the possibility of education for future generations, we must preserve education. We must ensure the long-term viability of the opportunities for direct education from the land. If we neglect our responsibility to provide for the future what it is in danger of losing, we fail our predecessors, who worked so hard to leave us with the resources that may have been lost had they not protected them. We must choose carefully the education we leave our legacies.

If we choose not to protect BFS, we say that we have nothing to learn from the land. If we replace it with colleges, we imply that they afford us opportunities at "educational use" not otherwise available. The decisions that have been made thus far indicate the latter. We no longer know how to learn from the land. We have become dependent upon classrooms, chalkboards, overhead projectors, and the Internet to educate ourselves, and this is what we will pass onward.

### **Science is only worthwhile if it is expensive.**

The Bernard Biological Field Station has been marginalized since its inception. Outside of the faculty there was very little interest in an ecological preserve for academic reasons. Louis Benezet, who came up with the idea, was the single administrative advocate, and his enthusiasm left with him at his 1970 retirement.<sup>2</sup> Robert J. Bernard was a strong supporter, but more in admonition of the alternatives than for the merits of the proposal. If not for the economic motivations, BFS would neither have been conceived nor established. Even the founding donor was very unattached to the concept, but more to the tax exemption it allowed. Of its establishment, he said, "Somebody had suggested that the land could be used as – I think they called it an ecological thing. Anyhow a field station for biological things."<sup>3</sup> He also admitted, "... we're so monetarily motivated ..." when asked why the land was considered being sold.<sup>4</sup>

Since the monetary gain was the only thing that caught the attention of the administration, BFS did not hold CUC's focus for long. The endowment created by McKenna's donation provided the only operating budget for BFS. Therefore, it never showed up as a figure on the payroll for academic resources. Because maintenance and upkeep were operated on a minimal budget and separate equipment was rarely required, additional funding was unnecessary. The programs conducted there and the ecological research projects did not necessitate advanced technical equipment. The amount of money that having the BFS was *saving* the administration each year was never acknowledged.

BFS has since garnered some recognition and funding from the administration, and the recent controversy over its use has brought BFS out of the periphery of administrative vision and into the forefront of its consciousness.

"In biology there is a heavy bias toward funding the most reductionist areas: much more is spent on the study of molecules and cells than on ecology."<sup>5</sup> The topics that have the most potential for yielding commercially valuable results are those that receive the most attention, and biotechnology is the hottest science on the market.

At the Colleges we portray this attitude as well. We are imbued with the idea of "big science." We assume that the sciences that require the most expensive equipment and laboratories for research are the most worthwhile. "If it doesn't cost anything, it isn't

worth anything.”<sup>6</sup> Ironically, one of the main reasons why the Field Station proposal was feasible at the time of its establishment was because of its low cost in set up and maintenance. Now that we are seizing the opportunity to include the “big science” of biotechnology at the even higher level of graduate education at the expense of a low-budget field research station for undergraduate ecology, we reveal this attitude through our actions.

For years the ecological research conducted at BFS did not cost the Colleges any money. This lack of funding contributed not only to the marginalization of BFS outside of administrative recognition of its academic value, but apparently to the idea that the studies conducted there were not worthwhile. “Other than one paper on caged owls, no research done [at BFS] has been published, so it is not a research institution.”<sup>7</sup> The amount of time and money dedicated to published research is not commonly found at the undergraduate level, so this should not be used as a criterion for judging the quality of the Field Station as a research institution. Furthermore, other research done at BFS *has* been published.<sup>8</sup>

We are at a very critical point in history where the need for ecological understanding is imperative if we are to promote sustainable living with the earth. Because ecology does not necessitate the advanced technology or funding of other fields of research it is regarded as a less sophisticated science. If we promote this view at the Colleges, we are denying our responsibility as an educational institution to fill in an important void of knowledge for the world.

### **Land is best used when built on.**

When Ellen B. Scripps donated the Scripps Trust Property to the Claremont Colleges, the document gave the “uncontrolled discretion to ... manage all said property without interference from anyone...” to CUC, which formalized its right to decide how to use the land.<sup>9</sup> The concept of owning land is a relatively new one, which did not gain entry into this continent until the European incursion of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>10</sup> Today this idea of property rights is one of the most inviolable prerogatives of our society. We spend billions of dollars a year creating titles and trusts, fighting legal battles, and designating successors to protect our property.

In fact, one of the benefits of building KGI on the BFS is that CUC retains its ability to assert the right to use its property as it chooses.<sup>11</sup> Many argue that the only reason the Colleges have safeguarded this land for nearly 75 years has been to locate future campuses there. Therefore, siting the new college there will put the land to use as it has always been intended.

Regardless of whether or not one considers them significant, building KGI will result in unavoidable impacts to the land. Losses will be sustained to the habitat, the wildlife, the view, the ecological viability of the site, and the global environment. Despite these costs, we consider our right to develop the land a gain. Our right to inflict this damage is the gain. This implies that the land itself does not have value, but our ability to use it has value. The costs of environmental destruction are a small price to pay for putting our property to its rightful purpose.

**We do not need nature. We can engineer life.**

Our willingness to sacrifice a rare parcel of native habitat for a training ground in applied life sciences implies the view that biotechnology can replace nature. The Colleges and the City of Claremont, through their welcoming of such an institution under such conditions, say that the benefits of the project outweigh the costs. In other words, the money, the enhanced reputation, and the novelty of biotechnology override the local and global need for open space, native habitat, and sensitive wildlife. Also, the education gained from an institute of applied life sciences for 125 students offsets the education lost by 2700 students of conservation science at BFS a year.<sup>12</sup>

Apparently we see in biotechnology the potential to provide us with knowledge we cannot do without, whereas the lessons that nature has to offer are expendable. Furthermore, life science education is somehow more valuable when applied toward biotechnology than conservation biology.

These actions also state that we value manipulation over participation. Biotechnology depends on the manipulation of seeds. For agriculture, seeds are altered to yield bigger, more plentiful crops. When this manipulation extends to the realm of genetics, the “seeds of humanity” are tweaked as well.<sup>13</sup> Ecology depends on relationships between organisms and their habitats, and strives to piece together an

understanding of the complete systems within which life operates. The decisions we have made demonstrate that we value the manipulation of seeds, which are the basis of all life, over the understanding of the life systems that already exist. We take ourselves out of the whole and alter its parts instead of understanding it and participating in it. As one Claremont resident said of the siting decision last spring, "We pave over life to engineer it."<sup>14</sup>

**We do not need history or a sense of place.**

The local Native American community has told us that their ancestors once inhabited our land and that the sacred village of Torojoatngna was among us. They have shown us maps, given us history books, and translated their use of the land so we may see that they occupied this place. This people's identity is rooted in the land, as well as the plants and wildlife that live there. Their spirituality depends upon its well being.

However, we choose not to listen to them. Their oral traditions, spiritual connectedness, knowledge of the land, and sacred customs carry no weight with us. Instead, we have devised our own method of verifying their history. We look for remnants of their dead rather than listening to the living. When our methods fail us, we tell them they are mistaken, that a more natural place for their ancestors to have settled is at the base of the "Indian Hill," and that we probably built on their village "long before any of us were sensitive to these things."<sup>15</sup> We offer them three minutes to present hundreds of years of oppression, persecution and exclusion, but we continue not to listen. Instead we only hear the information we have bought from our consultants. Without a fair chance, we dismiss their voice and deny their claims.

In doing so, we turn away the possibility of discovering a little-known part of our history. Claremont has the potential to realize its Pre-Columbian heritage by welcoming the Tongva to our community, making an attempt to uncover and explore the past, and respecting their worldview. The possibility to exchange ideas and customs, to embrace diversity, and to broaden our horizons slips away as we cast these people aside and ignore their voices.

We deny that they have anything to offer us. We deny that we too are rooted to our land and that it connects us to our past.



Walking through the streets of Claremont, we are transported to the Shakespearean gardens of England, the Eucalyptus groves of Australia, and the lush, green lawns of New England. Rarely do our painstakingly landscaped surroundings offer a reminder of what Claremont would have looked like before we brought millions of gallons of water and pesticides into the semi-desert. The Bernard Field Station is one of the only windows we have onto this past. It is one of the last remaining parcels of Native Claremont that ties us to our land and its history.

If we diminish the BFS, we say that our artificial landscape is enough to inform our sense of place, and that we do not require any reminders of our native environment to orient ourselves to where we are.

BFS is one of the last links within Claremont to our natural and ancient histories. If we refuse to recognize its importance, we deny its impact on our heritage and our identities today. This land may be the site of Claremont's Pre-Columbian heritage. In 1994, Donald McKenna, the donor of this land, wrote, "Did you know that an Indian village was once located on the southwest corner of BFS?"<sup>16</sup> Currently, we deny what has been regarded as common knowledge for years. In denying the existence of what could be a site of our heritage in order to pave over it, we deny that we are rooted to our past through our land. Further, when we surround ourselves in landscaped artificiality and sacrifice the one remnant memory of our native surroundings, we deny that our natural history has any contribution to our sense of identity today. We deny that an understanding of where we are and where we came from are important to knowing who we are and where we are going.

### **Money is more important than education.**

The decisions about the educational programs of the Colleges are made exclusively by Trustees and administrators, who are the business executives and managers of the institutions. Trustees are the wealthy individuals who can draw funds to the Colleges, not necessarily those most closely involved in the academic environment. Choices about curriculum are made based on legal and economic concerns, and the faculty, who supposedly have control over the curriculum of the Colleges, have little role in the decision-making process about monetary concerns that affect the academic

programs of the schools. Furthermore, some of the administration has demonstrated a readiness to compromise or limit academic freedom and integrity when faced with potential financial repercussions. When the decisions that govern the educational experience are made based on economic and legal concerns, even at the expense of the quality of academic programs and the voiced needs of students and faculty, it becomes clear that money is the higher priority to the Colleges. Although money is required to provide this education, when educational concerns are displaced by the pursuit of financial and legal security, we have lost our focus on the missions of these institutions.

**We do not need democracy.**

The Colleges do not operate as a democracy, nor do they pretend to. There is no role for students or faculty in the decision-making process, and their voiced concerns are often overruled by economic or legal concerns. This bureaucratic system of governing the Colleges is explicit, and it demonstrates that money – or those who have it – are enough to run the institutions.

The City of Claremont, on the other hand, is a municipality charged with upholding the democratic process. However, the City has shown that it does not listen to the voices of its constituents and that it allows economic benefits to override the concerns of the community. Despite the comments of hundreds of community members, including numerous scientists and anthropologists, the City has determined that the environmental and cultural impacts of the project are not significant based on the recommendations of the consultants. These “experts,” who are paid by the Colleges, undoubtedly face pressure to find results that would be compatible with their development plans. Therefore, in valuing the assessment of hired consultants over those of the community experts who do not have vested economic interests in their findings, the City demonstrates that it responds to money and not people. By making decisions in this fashion, the community of Claremont displays that democracy is not relevant to our political process.

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert J. Bernard, *The Unfinished Dream: A Chronicle of the Group Plan of the Claremont Colleges* (Claremont: The New Castle Press, 1982) 704.

<sup>2</sup> Gene Fowler, personal interview, 16 February 2000. Director, Bernard Field Station. Professor of Biology, Pomona College.

---

<sup>3</sup> Donald McKenna, Deposition, 1994, page 19, lines 6 – 8.

<sup>4</sup> McKenna, 19, lines 2-3.

<sup>5</sup> Martha Crouch, "Confessions of a Botanist," *New Internationalist* March 1991: 2.

<sup>6</sup> Larry Oglesby, personal interview, 3 March 2000. Professor Emeritus of Biology, Pomona College. Former member of Environmental Quality and Planning Commissions, Claremont.

<sup>7</sup> Daniel Guthrie, personal interview, 14 April 2000. Professor of Biology, Joint Sciences Department.

<sup>8</sup> Gene Fowler, personal communication, 29 April 2000.

<sup>9</sup> Bernard 78.

<sup>10</sup> Mark Acuña, personal interview, 28 February 2000.

<sup>11</sup> Brenda Barham-Hill, personal interview, 24 February 2000. Vice President, Claremont University Center.

<sup>12</sup> Faculty Advisory Committee of the Robert J. Bernard Biological Field Station, *The Robert J. Bernard Biological Field Station: Its History and Value to the Educational Mission of the Claremont Colleges* (Claremont, 1994) 1.

<sup>13</sup> Robertjohn, personal interview, 23 February 2000. Claremont resident.

<sup>14</sup> Mike Keenan, Planning Commission statement, 6 April 1999.

<sup>15</sup> Barham-Hill, 24 Feb 2000.

<sup>16</sup> Donald McKenna, letter to Gene Fowler, 21 July 1994.



## Afterthoughts

I spent the day at the Robert J. Bernard Biological Field Station of the Claremont Colleges, intending to take a last look at the place that has been at the heart of my personal struggles against the Colleges, the City, and even myself, intensely for the past year. Sitting on a hill overlooking the 11.4 acres designated for KGI, I've been thinking about things coming to an end – this thesis, my time at college, and this part of the BFS. The culmination of these three segments of my life have converged all at once in a way, and they have descended upon me much sooner than I was prepared for. At the beginning, nobody expects the end to draw so near so fast, but it hits far before we're ready.

This “vacant lot” was given a purpose for its existence in 1976, when an anonymous donor gave money to build a fence and formalize its use as an academic resource. At the time nobody could have known the possibilities that would grow out of this gift, and all the same they couldn't have known how long they would enjoy it. But just as it was given, they want to take it back. They fought to create it, and now we fight not to destroy it.

I am somewhat at a loss for closing comments. I have seen a lot of people behaving childishly and unfairly. But it is important for me to recognize that I am probably guilty of every sin I have accused the administration, KGI, and City of committing. In fact, probably every indictment could be turned around onto the other side with some amount of truth and accuracy behind it. How carefully have I really been listening? How often have I imposed my own agenda on the words and intentions of others? I do not want to blame the decision-makers. Just because the fight is going their way, it does not mean they have not been treated unfairly. How many of us can say we have not participated in an attempt to discredit their voices and opinions, to turn others against what they say, to marginalize them?

We run into problems because everyone has dreams. The nature of some people's dreams requires them to be realized at the expense of others'. We can't blame them for wanting to pursue them. But dreams aside, societies hold values in common – this is what community and culture are all about. It seems that some people have let their dreams get in the way of Claremont's values. This community is not about “the forefront



of progress.” Most people would probably prefer to preserve the unique, historical atmosphere of the town rather than reaping the economic benefits of turning Claremont into an industrial city on the “high-technology corridor” that promises to be the Silicon Valley equivalent for the biotechnology industry.

This is a college town – an intellectual community where the free exchange of ideas, open and uncensored expression of diversity of thought, dynamic and flowing dialogue about issues of interest, and the opportunity to listen to one another, embrace differences of opinion, and learn from this freedom lay the foundations for our interactions. We have seen people who fear the disruption of their dreams threaten, silence, ignore, belittle, and marginalize those who present obstacles, all in order to avoid making a compromise. When these people are allowed to challenge our values in this way, our community breaks down.

America is (arguably) a democracy that was built on the ideas of freedom and equality under the law. It depends on the participation of the people and in turn the leadership and integrity of its elected officials. These leaders are not intended to possess power over others, but rather to serve as the spokespeople to represent the interests of a group of individuals under the law. They are intended to protect us and the things held sacred by this community. However, we have seen this system break down as well. People who participate are ignored, and others are scared to make their voices heard for fear of even more harmful outcomes. When the people of the town are asking for a recall of their city leaders, and the Secretary of State is being consulted on the illegal actions of the City Attorney, democracy has been sacrificed at the expense of the people for the dreams of the few.

During this day at the BFS I have watched a red-tailed hawk circle overhead on a hunt for food, tadpoles hatch in a vernal pool, poison oak eat away at an elderberry tree, woodrats forage for seed, and hummingbirds engage in a territoriality display. My clothes smell of sage and yerba santa, and I have cactus spines in my pants and shoes. This experience can not be replaced. Nothing we could genetically engineer could possibly make up for what we may lose here. No textbook or high-tech laboratory could take the place of the scientific education students receive in a single day at the Field



Station. Those lessons could be learned anywhere, but the benefit of this education is site specific.

I think of Rachel Carson, who predicted the day not too far off when there are no birds left to chirp and the world suffers its first *Silent Spring*. I fear those consequences taking hold in Claremont, but even more, I fear a different kind of silent spring – one in which no human voices are heard – when people no longer speak out for fear of losing jobs, being ridiculed, labeled, or outcast – when people who realize that their voice is ignored become too apathetic to participate in this community or its politics – when people no longer have free dialogue because we have bred a monoculture in which differences in opinion are not tolerated – when people have all let their own dreams take over society's values and there is no remaining sense of community. Even worse, I fear the day when people speak their voices, but nobody bothers to listen.

## Acknowledgments

This project could not have been completed without a lot of help from a lot of people.

To my advisors, Professor Worthington, Professor Fowler, and Professor Hazlett – thank you for the guidance, information, encouragement, and flexibility.

To my sources, Rick Hazlett, Dr. Fowler, Dr. Oglesby, Robertjohn, Mayor Rosenthal, Dr. Barham-Hill, Paul Faulstich, Susan Schenk, Mark Acuña, Professor Worthington, Bonnie Busenberg, Nancy Hamlett, Carol Gil, Relf Star, President Stanley, Rebecca Coleman, Dan Guthrie, Charles Cange, Teo Grossman, Steve Comba, Professor McFadden, and Kevin Bingham – thank you all for your time and valuable knowledge.

To Dr. Schenk and Paul – thank you for loaning me your archives of related articles. To Jim Bogen – thank you for the hearing tapes. To Jonathan Vanasco – thank you for surveying the students and loaning me the results. To “Elaine from Brenda Barham-Hill’s office” – thank you for arranging the interview and tracking down sources for me.

To Kate Finger and Amanda Carr – thank you for suffering through this with me.

To Wei and Nura – thank you for the caffeine.

To Paul, Teo, Mike, and Sean – thank you for getting me involved and keeping me interested. To the activists – thank you for keeping the struggle alive.

To Mom and Dad – thank you for never saying the T-word, and for everything else along the way.

To Kevin Bingham – thank you for the time, patience and magnificent vistas.

Most of all, to the Bernard Field Station – thank you for the unforgettable story.

