

Virginia Scholar

Newsletter of the Virginia Association of Scholars

Number 1

ISSN 1073-
7235

December 1993

THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS **2**

Purpose; Founding; Annual Meeting

FROM THE EDITOR **4**

Inaugurating the Newsletter

SAN FRANCISCO 1993 **5**

Impressions from the 4th General Convention of the National Association of Scholars

WHY GOING TO COLLEGE HAS BECOME SO EXPENSIVE IN VIRGINIA **8**

The Commonwealth's newspapers investigated--but didn't dig deeply enough

BOOKS AND SUCH **10**

Classic books, important periodicals, & a bibliography of the Mandelstamm Affair

DEPARTMENTS:

Advertisement 9

Information, please!..... 15

Josef Martin..... 7

Quotes 3, 11

Virginia Association of Scholars: President, Ted J. Smith III
4010 Sherbrook Road, Richmond, VA 23235 · (804) 320-0092

Virginia Scholar: Editor, Henry H. Bauer
1306 Highland Circle, Blacksburg, VA 24060-5623 · (703) 951-2107
Please use electronic mail whenever possible, to BAUERH @ VTVM1.CC.VT.EDU
During office hours, the Editor can be reached at 231-4239 (or messages left there)
FAX can be sent to 231-3255 during office hours

Opinions expressed in *Virginia Scholar* are those of the individual authors, which are not necessarily the same as those of the Editor or of the Virginia Association of Scholars.
Permission to copy or reprint items will be readily given
(except where an author who holds the copyright refuses such permission)

THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS

believes that rational discourse is a necessary foundation of academic life and of a democratic society. So we seek to foster and protect

- the free exchange of ideas;
- academic freedom: *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*;
- the substance and integrity of scholarship and learning;
- respect for our intellectual heritage;
- rigorous standards of excellence in teaching, learning, and research;
- the evaluation of students strictly on the merit of their individual performance;

and we aim to

- create forums in which university life can be rationally discussed;
- provide informed comment on immediate and on perennial issues in higher education;

and we urge academic leaders to

- recognize learning and scholarship as the pre-eminent and primary purpose for which colleges and universities exist;
- behave responsibly in pursuit of that purpose;
- practice honesty with the public, with students and parents, with faculty, and with everyone else.

Further, we shall resist

- attempts to subsume academe under political goals;
- ideological corruption of teaching and scholarship;
- intimidation of students or faculty who voice unfashionable views;
- treatment of students, faculty, and others as ciphers and symbols of groups instead of as individuals worthy of individual consideration.

The Virginia Association of Scholars is an affiliate of the National Association of Scholars. We invite present and former faculty, administrators, independent scholars and students engaged in graduate study to join

1. The National Association of Scholars, which includes a subscription to the quarterly *Academic Questions* and automatic membership in the Virginia Association for those who reside or work in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Write to the National Association of Scholars, 575 Ewing Street, Princeton, NJ 08540 (dues \$36, graduate students \$18);

or

2. The Virginia Association of Scholars, 4010 Sherbrook Road, Richmond, VA 23235 (dues \$15, graduate students \$10).

Board of Directors:

Robert A. Anthony; Henry H. Bauer; Christopher Bright;
Robert Detlefsen; Steven J. Eagle (Chairman);
Allan Mandelstamm; Ted J. Smith, III

Officers of the Association:

President:	Ted Smith
Vice-President:	Frederick Heinzen
Secretary:	Robert Detlefsen
Treasurer:	Allan Mandelstamm

FOUNDING OF THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS

The Board of Directors of the Virginia Association of Scholars held its organizational meeting on 25 August 1990 at George Mason University School of Law, with Ted J. Smith, III, in the chair. A Certificate of Incorporation filed 6 June 1990 had established the Association as a corporation under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

By-laws, patterned after by-laws recommended by the National Association of Scholars, were adopted. Membership dues of \$15 were fixed. A number of applications for membership were approved.

Immediately following the meeting of the Board, there was an organizational membership meeting.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS

The Annual Membership Meeting of the Virginia Association of Scholars was held on 30 October 1993 in Richmond, with President Ted J. Smith, III, in the chair.

Other than routine business, the following transpired:

A motion was passed, that all members in good standing of the National Association of Scholars (NAS) who live or work in the Commonwealth of Virginia be granted concurrent membership in the Virginia Association of Scholars (VAS) without paying any additional dues. However, for appropriately qualified people who are not members of NAS, membership in VAS will remain available by joining it directly and paying dues of \$15 for faculty, administrators, and independent scholars and \$10 for graduate students.

As the present publication shows, it was decided to proceed with production of a Newsletter.

The Board of Directors was empowered to establish a network of campus or regional chapters of VAS; and President Ted Smith was asked to appoint Campus Representatives at as many Virginia colleges and universities as possible, to report on local events of interest to VAS.

The President was also authorized, in consultation with the Board of Directors, to initiate state-wide studies of issues of interest to VAS or NAS, and to report the results of such studies in whatever public forums and media that the President and the Board of Directors deem appropriate.

As a matter of convenience for most members, the By-Laws were amended to set the time of the Annual Meeting in October of each year or as soon thereafter as is convenient for the membership.

The terms of office of some Directors having come to an end, and some resignations having come to hand, the following Directors were elected or re-elected:

Term of office ending 1994:

Allan Mandelstamm

Term of office ending 1995:

Robert Anthony and Steven Eagle

Term of office ending 1996:

Robert Detlefsen and Henry Bauer

Immediately after the Membership Meeting, a short meeting of the Board of Directors was held to appoint officers for the coming year. Those elected are:

Chairman of the Board:	Steven Eagle
President:	Ted Smith
Vice-President:	Frederick Heinzen
Secretary:	Robert Detlefsen
Treasurer:	Allan Mandelstamm

LAUGH OR CRY . . .

DOES ANYONE REMEMBER ?

"I am a teacher. . . . The life I lead is the most agreeable I can imagine. I go from my study to a classroom . . . where there await me a group of intelligent and curious young men who read the books assigned them with a sense of adventure and discovery, discuss them with zest, and listen appreciatively to explications I may offer. What makes the process most satisfying is the conviction that what goes on in my own and a thousand other classrooms is more important than the large affairs carried on in the shining palaces of aluminum and glass downtown. For . . . education is mankind's most important enterprise."

When I first read this a little while ago, I thought it was satirical. Then I looked at the date and realized it wasn't. The piece is from Moses Hadas, *Old Wine, New Bottles* (Trident, 1962). Nowadays, of course, few faculty and nary an administrator believe that education is our most important enterprise. Rather, we use as our institutional role model those glass-and-aluminum palaces downtown.

FROM THE EDITOR

THE ONLY THING NECESSARY FOR THE TRIUMPH OF EVIL IS FOR GOOD MEN TO
DO NOTHING

--EDMUND BURKE, LETTER TO WILLIAM SMITH, 1795:1:9

This Newsletter is intended to further the aims of the Virginia Association of Scholars,

- by giving members of the Association a forum in which to share their views and proposals with one another;
- by making VAS a visibly active organization;
- by helping to educate the public of the Commonwealth, its political representatives, and the media, about the tradition, purpose, ideals, and benefits of higher education;
- by bringing to public notice extraordinary excesses perpetrated--deliberately or unwittingly--by believers in or dupes of political correctness and other extremist ideologies;
- by forestalling such excesses through revealing them as soon as they are mooted, thereby forewarning potential perpetrators that they will be opposed publicly.

Virginia Scholar will serve these purposes only if members of the Association use it and contribute to it.

I solicit

- news from campuses throughout the Commonwealth and beyond, as well as about relevant off-campus happenings;
- clippings from newspapers and magazines (please include name of paper or journal, place of publication, date, page number);
- expressions of opinion in the form of letters and short essays;
- details of books, magazines, and specific articles likely to be of interest to VAS members (brief annotations or abstracts would be appreciated wherever feasible--see **BOOKS AND SUCH** starting on p.10 of this issue);
- information about administrative proposals or intentions about which VAS members and the public ought to be informed.

Most or all of us joined VAS or NAS because we feel strongly that action is needed. Most or all of us are willing to do something. Let's use *Virginia Scholar* to get together about what to do and how.

Since this is the first issue of *Virginia Scholar*, let me introduce myself. I'm Professor of Chemistry & Science Studies at Virginia Tech. Every Fall I teach freshman chemistry and every Spring, Humanities, Science & Technology. From 1978 to 1986 I was Dean of Arts & Sciences at Tech, and before that I was at various times at the Universities of Kentucky, Michigan, Southampton (England), and Sydney (Australia). I like to describe myself as Austrian by birth, Australian by education, and American by choice.

My views are no secret to readers of *Academic Questions*. I've also spoken publicly against PC in forums at Virginia Tech, in letters to newspapers and remarks on TV, in the keynote address to the annual meeting of the American Conference of Academic Deans earlier this year in Seattle. If enough contributions don't come in for *Virginia Scholar*, you'll hear a lot more from me. I like to have my opinions published as much as the next person. But I sincerely hope that my time will be so taken up in receiving and editing material from all of you that I won't have time to fill these pages with my own writing.

Whenever you can, please send material by e-mail or on diskettes (as well as by hard copy, for confirmation and details of formatting). I have no scanner and no typist, and use only two fingers to enter data. Via e-mail, please single-space but leave a line between paragraphs. On diskette, please format as "Text Only", i.e. as ASCII files.

I may edit pieces submitted for publication under an author's signature, to enhance clarity or brevity; but before publication I'll ask the author's approval of any suggested major changes.

Given the prevalence of PC, some people have good reason to ask that their contributions be published without attribution. Before doing that, I will normally expect to know the provenance of information passed on to me and I will seek confirmation or contradiction of it whenever feasible. Such items may then be published in whatever style seems appropriate. Since inside information about administrative machinations can be of vital interest to VAS and the public, *Virginia Scholar* has already enrolled some confidential correspondents: Deep Mole, Whistle Throat, and Josef Martin (some of whose contributions appear in this issue).

HENRY BAUER

SAN FRANCISCO 1993: PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS FROM THE FOURTH GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS:

BY HENRY BAUER

I'd looked forward to meeting others who worry as much as I, about what's happening in academe. That hope was fulfilled. Not only that, but I heard some remarkable speeches, and came away encouraged by the Association's vitality.

For several years I've been increasingly troubled by the PC excesses at my university, a small part of which I've described in *Academic Questions* ("The Trivialization of Sexual Harassment: Lessons from the Mandelstamm Case", vol.5 [#2, Spring 1992] 55-66; "Affirmative Action at Virginia Tech: The Tail That Wagged the Dog", vol.6 [#1, Winter 1992-93] 72-84). In San Francisco it was a revelation for me to discover that what I'd thought local idiocies perpetrated by a few petty mediocrities, are actually typical of what's happening across the country. This was a liberation as well as a revelation: it makes clear what needs to happen. It won't do much good to replace one set of president-provost-hangers-on by another set, because by-and-large they're much the same. Which is not to say that one oughtn't to seek replacement of iniquitous administrators, one should; and one should bring their iniquities to public attention. But what really needs to change is the prevailing undercurrent of post-modern-deconstructed-relativism that has captured so much of the culture of academe, especially among student leaders, faculty activists, "progressive" administrators, humanists and social scientists. So fundamental a change can only come about if we enlist colleagues and work through such organizations as NAS and VAS.

The first panel session in San Francisco ("Can Higher Education be Mass Education?") set a high standard, which later panels for the most part matched: speakers chosen to provide a range of viewpoints and ample time reserved for audience participation.

Jeffrey Hart's remarks can be read in full in *Academic Questions* (vol.6 [#4, Fall 1993] 86-88). There can hardly be a college teacher who doesn't share Hart's dismay over the state in which students come to us: largely ignorant, essentially unread, unwilling to discipline themselves, uninterested in learning.

Barry Munitz, Chancellor of the California State University system, made a plausible case that the State system is more pragmatic and has students more mature and practical-minded than the "flagship" universities [my term, not his] in which PC, deconstruction, relativism and the like have all but taken over.

Robert Rosenzweig, past president of the American Association of Universities, gave the standard apologia: PC doesn't really exist, I haven't seen anything of it myself, the horror stories are just a few isolated instances, ferment

over curriculum and other things is nothing new and anyway is surely desirable, and so on. How consoling it was--dare I say empowering?--to hear the bursts of laughter that came from the audience in response to Rosenzweig's denial; and later the many personal testimonials from members of the audience, attesting that PC is pervasive indeed. But there was also some support for Munitz's claim about the Cal State system from a couple of teachers in that system, including one whose remedial math classes include roughly 75% minority students: about 50% in the classes flunk, with nary a murmur from administrators about the desirability of "retention". (By contrast, in the afternoon a teacher at a community college near Chicago reported pressure to grade on a double standard.)

Though a commendable length of time had been reserved for comments and questions from the audience, here and at every later session there were more who wanted to speak than there was time available. For me, the most consequential issue raised by commentators was the responsibility of academic ad-

ministrators for what has happened and is happening and will happen. Panelists Rosenzweig and Munitz offered the standard evasion, that it is the faculty who make academic policy; which was given short shrift by Jerome Bashinski, chief of the Union City Police Department: in universities no less than in police departments, it is the administrators' role and responsibility to give leadership, albeit the techniques through which it's done may be very different.

[That issue is meaty enough for a panel session of its own, or several sessions. But the merest moment of reflection on how academe functions shows clearly enough how and why administrators bear the chief responsibility. In every tenure case, with every course or program proposal, one's colleagues want to know what the Dean's attitude is, or the Provost's, or even the President's. Moreover nothing gets done without money, space, positions--and it is administrators who control those. It is administrators who interpret the rules, and it is they who are responsible when so many exceptions are made that the rules might as well not exist.

It is administrators who set up committees and task forces, thereby setting the agenda for possible action--or designing committees and their charges so as to ensure that no action will result. It is administrators who set the hiring quotas, even as they may leave the dirty detailed work to others: demanding only results, unwilling to argue over reasonableness or feasibility, it is administrators who goad others to unworthy actions.]

The afternoon session began with the splendid keynote address by James Q. Wilson that can be read in *Academic Questions* (vol.6 [#4, Fall 1993] 13-20). Another inspiring speech, available in the same issue (pp. 69-72), was Vann Woodward's Sydney Hook Memorial Award Address, "Where the Unthinkable can be Thought".

In the Friday afternoon panel, "Has the Curriculum Decayed?", the negating position was taken wittily by Nelson Polsby. But to my mind his points were *just* witty, not substantively convincing. I could believe that Polsby would feel comfortable letting "1000 Blooms flower" without believing Polsby to be typical of the colleagues one usually has to deal with when multi-culturalizing the curriculum is at issue. If there was a single commonalty among the panel speakers in the various sessions who argued that PC doesn't really exist or isn't all that terrible, it was that they spoke "in principle" and in generalities, not to say banalities: there's always been discussion and dissension, canons have always changed, reform should always be considered.

On Saturday morning ("The Mission of the University: Intellectual Discovery or Social Transformation?"), Todd Gitlin was in the negating role, with an unexceptionable plea against polarization, a richly complex characterization of academe, and the suggestion that PC is not so much a

sea-change as merely a fad. David Horowitz of *Heterodoxy* [see under **BOOKS AND SUCH**, p.12] then set off the only exchange of the meeting that bordered on incivility, when he called Gitlin and Richard Rorty "apologists for PC, not critics of PC".

John Leo's view from inside the media was thought- and worry-provoking. The press, he told us, has been taken over by the same ideologues as has academe. *Heterodoxy*, he said, serves a very necessary political purpose by exposing stupidity to incisive satire.

Leo clearly thinks the situation serious, yet he was outdone by apocalyptic statements from John Searle and Aaron Wildavsky (whose remarks are printed in the November 1993 issue of *Heterodoxy*). The core of Western civilization--its striving for reasoned understanding and objective knowledge--is under attack, they argued. Searle pointed out that such "marginal" philosophers as Rorty and Derrida had been adopted as heroes, not in philosophy departments but in intellectually fragile ones and by would-be social transformers. Many people in departments of social science and humanities had sought refuge there from mainstream life and are now ineducable and innately quite unwilling to make common cause with anyone who could be regarded as in any way conservative.

Here as in other sessions, it was remarked and agreed that the high schools are under attack as much as are the colleges. Their situation is no less serious, perhaps even more serious, yet there exists no analogue of the National Association of Scholars to mount a defense.

Most memorable for me in the panel on Saturday afternoon, "Government and the University", was the chilling description by Judge Andrew Kleinfeld (Ninth

Circuit, U.S. Court of Appeals) of the already tangible results of politicizing the academy. Law School graduates have no longer learned that individual liberty is the prime thing. They are ignorant, including of what it means to carry out an objective search of precedents. They have been taught to value judges not on their legal craftsmanship but by the results of individual cases and decisions--the ends justifying the means. The law should serve those ends of social justice directly and immediately, our new graduates have been convinced; whereas traditionally they learned that the law serves in an indirect but crucial manner by bringing to bear disinterested objectivity and coherent principle which remain the best--indeed the only--means for allowing fallible human beings to approximate true fairness. Researching precedents has become, for graduates of our most prestigious law schools, not the teasing out of relevant principles but a search for mind-bites and sound-bites to support a pre-selected, socially and politically correct viewpoint. That pre-law students are often English majors, exposed to PC indoctrination throughout their undergraduate years, only makes things that much worse.

The judiciary has traditionally deferred to the academy as far as possible, Kleinfeld reminded us, for instance over such matters as tenure decisions; but he sensed that as judges learn about contemporary academe, not only through the law clerks they hire but also through the immediate experiences of their children and spouses who study or teach, willingness to respect academe's judgments may be on the wane.

In the same panel session, William Allen of Michigan State University noted that universities have become just another pressure interest in society and the faculty more and more like other

public employees, tending to apartheid-like behavior.

My professional background being in chemistry, I had looked forward with considerable curiosity to the Sunday morning panel, "The Natural Sciences: Troubles Ahead?" My letter in *Academic Questions* (vol. 6 [#4, Fall 1993] 5-6) sums up the optimistic part of my reaction, namely that the panelists found it difficult to identify specific, substantive, PC-caused troubles ahead for the natural sciences. To be sure, politics does affect what gets funded, and to some extent what doesn't get studied, and certainly the spin that the media put on certain studies; but it seems farfetched that actually wrong scientific knowledge will become accepted within science as a sop to PC.

Yet the consequences are serious enough even without that, say in a field as prone to PC in-

volvement as AIDS research and treatment. Harry Rubin of Berkeley recounted some of the chilling corollaries of the propaganda that blurs some salient facts about AIDS: statistics were monkeyed with by broadening the definition of AIDS when its incidence seemed not to be rising as fast as had been predicted; a comparison of death rates from AIDS with rates of HIV infection would yield a predicted life-span of 33-to-50 years after infection, making it severely doubtful that HIV is the sole causative agent of AIDS disease; the relaxed criteria for approved use of new drugs may make it impossible ever to find out what they actually do; AIDS research now consumes 13% of the whole budget of the National Institutes of Health; there is no known cure for any virus-caused disease; and no vaccine against any retrovirus (of which HIV is one) has ever been

discovered, despite interest dating as far back as 1910 in finding a vaccine against chicken leukemia.

A bleak note on which to leave the meeting, perhaps, but it does drive home the seriousness of the whole business. When academe, which ought to be society's best hope for disinterested thought and enquiry and logical discussion, has been captured by dogmatic ideologues who know the answers *a priori*, bad things are bound to follow. But then again, when things get tough in the United States then the tough get going; and I found it invigorating to be in the midst of people who are passionately, actively, working to bring reason and idealism--not to mention plain common sense--back into academe.

JOSEF MARTIN: A TIP FOR ADMINISTRATORS

[Josef Martin' is author of *To Rise Above Principle: The Memoirs of an Unreconstructed Dean*, University of Illinois Press, 1988]

GOAL: INCREASE DIVERSITY AT ALL COSTS

STRATEGY 1: APPEAR TO FOLLOW FACULTY ADVICE

STRATEGY 2: APPEAR TO USE MERIT AS CRITERION

TACTICS:

- 1. GUIDELINES FOR SEARCHES MANDATE DIVERSITY IN POOL OF APPLICANTS. [NO ONE WILL BLINK AT THIS]**
- 2. AA DIRECTOR CAN BLOCK INTERVIEWING UNLESS DIVERSITY OF CANDIDATES SELECTED FOR INTERVIEW REFLECTS DIVERSITY OF POOL. [INTERVIEWING ISN'T APPOINTING, IS IT? WHO KNOWS BUT WHAT A NOT-SO-IMPRESSIVE VITA MIGHT NOT MASK A VERY ATTRACTIVE CANDIDATE? ISN'T IT WORTH GIVING MINORITIES AND WOMEN THE VALUABLE EXPERIENCE OF BEING INTERVIEWED? IT WILL UNDERScore OUR COMMITMENT TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION. ETC.]**
- 3. APPOINT SEARCH COMMITTEES OF PEOPLE INEXPERIENCED IN SUCH MATTERS.**
- 4. SOLICIT COMMENTS ON THE INTERVIEWED CANDIDATES FROM ALL AND SUNDRY, but only individually, in confidence, to you directly. [NO ONE ELSE WILL THEN KNOW THE DISTRIBUTION OF OPINIONS]**
- 5. INSTRUCT THE SEARCH COMMITTEE TO SCREEN OUT ANY GENUINELY UNACCEPTABLE CANDIDATES but not to rank the acceptable ones. THEY'RE A screening GROUP, NOT A selection BODY, REMIND THEM: THEY'RE advisory TO YOU. [DISARM THEM BY EMPHASIZING HOW MUCH YOU VALUE THEIR ADVICE AND APPRECIATE THEIR EFFORTS. THEY'LL GO ALONG WITH YOUR EXPLANATION THAT YOU MUST MAKE THE FINAL SELECTION OF SOMEONE WITH WHOM YOU CAN FEEL COMFORTABLE AND WORK EFFECTIVELY. THIS IS WHERE HAVING INEXPERIENCED COMMITTEE MEMBERS REALLY PAYS OFF: THEY WON'T HAVE THE INSIGHT TO REALIZE THAT YOU'RE GETTING READY TO IGNORE THEIR JUDGMENT.]**

[**Editorial comment:** As is usually the case with Dean Martin's insights, this tip is far from original. Indeed, Deep Mole informs us that the Deanship of Arts & Sciences at Virginia Tech is about to be filled very much in this manner.]

WHY GOING TO COLLEGE HAS BECOME SO EXPENSIVE IN VIRGINIA

The Commonwealth's newspapers investigated--but didn't dig deeply enough

BY JOSEF MARTIN WITH HENRY BAUER

In September 1993, a series of five articles about the cost of college education was carried by several newspapers: "The rising price of a college education is an issue worrying Virginians The breadth of the issue prompted the *Daily Press* of Newport News, *The Virginia-Pilot* of Norfolk, the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* and the *Roanoke Times & World-News* to collaborate on a series of stories that define the problem and offer solutions. . . . Over the summer, reporters from the state's four largest newspapers working together with The Associated Press talked with administrators, legislators, professors and students and combed financial documents for an unprecedented look at why college is so expensive."

But the series failed to define the problem in any convincing depth. Much of what's wrong was described anecdotally rather than analytically, making it appear that things could be set right without much further ado. But that's not the case. Discrete, simple changes are so unlikely or so ineffective in academe because any unifying sense of purpose is lacking; and because of the way in which authority and power are distributed.

The first article of the series gave some relevant data but without pressing home contrasts like this one: from 1982 to 1992, enrollments went up by less than 20%; direct state funding by nearly 70%; tuition and fees by **more than 300%**. (As so often, the dollars had not been corrected for the effect of inflation, however.)

Some scatter-shot generalities seemed to prepare the way for bomb-shells of factual details and concrete instances: "Waste . . . top-heavy administrations, duplicated and sparsely used programs, professors who seldom teach and smorgasbords of student services raising private money . . . not for professorships, scholarships or academic buildings but celebrations, arenas and star speakers. . . . bloated staffs and departments that offer degrees few students pursue."

The second article would reveal "smoke and mirrors. . . . talk about paring down and containing costs . . . is a sham. Budgets are bigger, staffs are larger . . . little evidence of restructuring or economizing."

In the third exposé, readers would discover that "Some Virginia professors spend less time in the classroom every week than most people spend in their office every day." The following day, "With Virginia schools collecting

more than \$100 million a year from private sources . . . critics wonder what all that money is buying . . . ?" And the promised finale would discuss a "lack of leadership at the state level".

In the event, university administrators breathed easier again as the series failed to deliver enough specific detail to drive home the truth and import of these generalizations. That failure, together with tiresomely banal and misinformed talk about too little teaching and too much research, made this exposé an encumbrance on higher education in Virginia rather than a pointer to solutions.

* * * * *

It's difficult for outsiders to understand the ins and outs of how academe functions. No small part of the difficulty is that many insiders don't know much about it either. One large set of misunderstandings has to do with authority and power: how decisions are made and who is most responsible for making them, about programs and hiring and curriculum. There is also widespread ignorance about the necessary distinctions among different kinds of colleges and universities. Moreover, administrators are rarely aware of student attitudes or faculty morale. And so attempts at analysis by journalists,

who talk chiefly to administrators, usually misfire because effects don't get traced to their actual fundamental causes. Here's a small example.

Staff analysts at the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) collect much data from the colleges and universities, for instance about how much--or little--classrooms are used. Usage of less than 100% is then taken as revealing inefficiency, and that interpretation is readily accepted by the Council itself, the media, and legislators. So we read in the newspapers a comment from SCHEV that the need to build new classrooms would be less if only professors could be made to teach afternoon classes, the data having shown classrooms to be little used after 3 p.m.

Fifteen years ago, when one of us became Dean of Arts & Sciences at Virginia Tech, the shortage of classrooms was even worse than it is now, and we did much looking for ways of making fuller use of those we had. Quickly I learned that it is not professors who object to teaching in the afternoon, it is **students** who avoid afternoon classes like the very plague.

All right then, I suggested, let's not give the students that choice. Let's just schedule classes

them jointly with undergraduates) and assist the faculty in teaching undergraduate courses. So a wholesale revision of the timetable would involve intricate, interconnected changes *all of which would need to be handled simultaneously* to achieve an efficient, workable result.

Having reached *that* conclusion, I was then brought up against one of the harder realities of university administration: on most matters, there's no one person and no office that exercises sufficient responsible authority to accomplish something so thoroughgoing, as to revise the timetable to make maximum use of large classrooms while taking into proper account the inter-relation of labs and lectures, the need for graduate students to take classes as well as teach labs and assist in lecture classes, the desire of every department to have its classes scheduled at the times that students most prefer.

* * * * *

A decade ago, the shortage of small classrooms as well as large ones was desperate, and it was easy to recognize just how important it actually is, to have "too

many" rooms, if quality of the educational environment is any criterion. When visiting scholars came to the campus, for instance, it was often impossible to find a room in which they could give a seminar or even just talk informally with groups of faculty or students. In many departments, faculty could visit with one another only in twos or threes, in their offices, because there was no "seminar" or "lounge" room where they could meet and no lecture room that they could use for that at lunch or at any other time.

As we in the Dean's Office chewed over that problem, someone remarked that there were quite a lot of rooms on campus that often stood empty--albeit not "classrooms": in the Continuing Education Center and in the Student Center. Could not those perhaps be pressed into service as classrooms for a few hours each day?

But the Continuing Education people were unwilling to commit *any* rooms for *any* hours of the day to regular classroom use, in case there might come a time when all of their rooms were needed all the time during a con-

ference. We couldn't even get so far as to enquire how often that eventuality might have occurred in the past; the subject was simply off limits.

So too with the Student Center. The Student Affairs empire let us know that student groups must be able to find available rooms at short notice; and so, again, *those* rooms needed to be left standing idle much of the time.

So I learned that teaching has far from the highest priority within the university, when it comes to the actual allocation of resources; perhaps in part because independent empires exist--Student Affairs, Continuing Education, not to speak of athletics--that don't hesitate to oppose the academic departments; and that many things are influenced by the reliance placed by SCHEV--and thereby the Governor and the Legislature--on quantitative measures instead of qualitative judgment.

* * * * *

(TO BE CONTINUED)

BOOKS AND SUCH

We plan to mention books, magazines, and articles likely to be of interest to our readers. In this first issue of *Virginia Scholar*, we list some classics, recommend some important periodicals, and give an annotated bibliography on a sad *cause célèbre* that transpired in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Please send us details of other items that should be mentioned here in forthcoming issues of *Virginia Scholar*. We would particularly like to list pieces germane to PC and academe published by our members.

Classic books about academe and PC

[We are deeply grateful to Deena Flinchum for furnishing us many of the following books, before we even knew of them]

The big fuss about political correctness, diversity, etc., has sprung up well within the last decade. Only very recently have I developed the "reach-for-my-revolver" tic when I hear someone say "multicultural". A nice sampling of what's been said in the last few years, pro and con, is in ***Debating P.C.: The Controversy over Political***

Correctness on College Campuses, edited by Paul Berman (Dell, 1992). Twenty-one selections range from Catharine Stimpson, Stanley Fish, Molefi Asante, to Irving Howe, John Searle, Dinesh D'Souza. Berman's 25-page introduction, "The Debate and its Origins", is quite an even-handed attempt to provide historical context.

Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus by Dinesh D'Souza (Free Press, 1991) describes how pervasive PC is and what it has meant for how people interact. The effect on the cur-

riculum in particular is emphasized in **Tenured Radicals: How Politics has Corrupted our Higher Education**, by Roger Kimball (Harper & Row, 1990). The implications of what a "multi-cultural" curriculum has come to mean are cogently analyzed in

The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society by Arthur Schlesinger (Knoxville TN: Whittle Books, 1991). Inevitably, large questions are raised: about the what and why of American culture, race relations, education. What PC reveals about contemporary American society is dealt with in

A Nation of Victims: The Decay of the American Character by Charles Sykes (St. Martin's Press, 1992).

A colorful essay on that topic is **Culture of Complaint: The Fraying of America** by Robert Hughes (Oxford, 1993). As I read this book, thoroughly enjoying its uninhibited play of potent language, I remembered that such freedom of speech had seemed only proper and natural in the Australian universities of the 1950s and 1960s that both Hughes and I had been fortunate enough to experience; an atmosphere in which the slogan, "Conserve Australian Nature", is met by the graffito, "Pickle a Possum". By contrast, in these contemporary United States of competing victim groups, "It's as though all human encounter were one big sore spot, inflamed with opportunities to unwittingly give, and truculently receive, offence. . . . We want to create a sort of linguistic Lourdes, where evil and misfortune are dispelled by a dip in the waters of euphemism. . . . It is the anile priggishness of the Puritan marm, lips pursed, seeking nits to pick."

Hughes does look forward with optimism, to "When the waters of PC recede . . . , leaving the predictable scum of dead words on the social beach", but in the meantime, the literary canon is to be cleansed of the works of "the pale patriarchal penis people", lest a black reading Evelyn Waugh might "suffer an attack of the bends through sudden decompression of self-esteem".

How refreshing to read someone who can be disrespectful of "Multi-Culti and its Discontents" and critical of "The posturing of the politically correct, and their guilt-ridden tolerance for con-men like Leonard Jefferies and the Reverend Al Sharpton".

That speech in the United States is rarely so uninhibited is copiously documented in **Free Speech for Me--But Not for Thee** by Nat Hentoff (HarperCollins, 1992). He speaks of "The Right to Read a Book with 'Niggers' in It", and "The

Thought Police--with the Very Best of Intentions", and "Law Schools That Require Loyalty Oaths", among other things.

There have been at least two noteworthy recent books about race relations from black Americans who refuse to toe any standard ideological line:

The Content of Our Character: A New Vision of Race in America by Shelby Steele (St. Martin's Press, 1990) contains stunningly self-revealing, insightful essays by a man who belongs to no pre-defined group, living in a society that insists he can be classified, in one of only two ways: either as a victim, in company with all other blacks, or as a "black neo-conservative", the modern term for "Uncle Tom".

I found in these essays deep insights valid for all other human beings, especially but by no means only for those who fit comfortably neither the purported social majority around them nor the purportedly homogeneous minority group into which others want to force them; like, say, the refugees from Nazi Germany who never felt themselves even culturally Jewish until they became so classified under the Nazi's criterion of blood-lines.

How ideological has become what ought to be intellectual, is illustrated by the reviewing of Steele's book, which comes essentially in two flavors only: the reviewers find the book either marvelous or despicable.

Just as remarkable as Steele's book, but in quite a different way, is

Reflections of an Affirmative Action Baby by Stephen Carter (Basic Books, 1991).

Carter and Steele are often bracketed just because they are black and not knee-jerk affirmative-actionists; and the title of Carter's book--like the sub-title of Steele's--lends superficial plausibility to such a coupling. But whereas Steele illuminates pre-eminently matters of personal experience and emotional significance, Carter's focus is more on matters of intellect. From Steele's essays one learns much about what it means to be human; from, Carter's, what it means to be a human *intellectual*. I cannot recall having read a more striking display of unsparing logic and needle-sharp intelligence than Carter's, as he writes about issues over which most of the rest of us emote rather than think. I can't wait to read his latest book, *The Culture of Disbelief: How American Law and Politics Trivialize Religious Devotion* (Basic Books, 1993): from early notices, it has made many people equally as uncomfortable as did his first, because his views are not commonplace ones.

The plethora of recent books on these matters should not drive into oblivion insightful discussions of much the same issues written two or three decades earlier. The corruption of affirmative action into preferential treatment for individuals who don't need it was compellingly described already in ***Affirmative Discrimination: Ethnic Inequality and Public Policy*** by Nathan Glazer (Basic Books, 1975).

Distorted, extremist, unhistorical characterizations of American culture from the Wild Left were resoundingly critiqued in ***Nine Lies About America*** by Arnold Beichman (1972; revised ed., Pocket Books, 1973). The lies Beichman addressed have nevertheless come to be largely accepted as axiomatic truths by the PCers and their fellow-travelers: "America is a fascist country"; "America means genocide"; "The Bomber Left is a moral force"; "The American worker is a 'honky'"; "Our political system is a fraud"; "American values are materialistic"; "America is insane"; "The American people are guilty"; "America needs a violent revolution".

The woes of academe under these pressures and circumstances have been much written and talked about. Published twenty-five years ago but entirely fresh, germane, insightful and cant-free is ***The American University: How It Runs, Where It Is Going*** by Jacques Barzun (Harper & Row, 1968). I've gone back to this book innumerable times for sustenance and reassurance. Its last chapter offers guidance that, if ever taken, would make our universities worthy of that appellation.

A fine retrospective analysis of the consequential 1960s is

The Campus War: a sympathetic look at the University in agony by John Searle (World Publishing, 1971). Here too one gains understanding of how universities function and sensible ideas about how we should change what we're doing now.

In my report on the NAS General Convention, elsewhere in this issue, I noted often-voiced concern about what's happening in our grade schools. Declining interest in teaching about intellectual matters can be traced to the second decade of the 20th century, when the National Education Association's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary

Education enunciated seven "Cardinal Principles" toward "preparation for effective living", the first of which was "Health". A chilling account of this history is given in

The Graves of Academe by Richard Mitchell (Little, Brown, 1981). A perhaps even more chilling account of the contemporary situation in higher education as well as in the grade schools is in ***Inside American Education: The Decline, the Deception, the Dogmas*** by Thomas Sowell (Free Press, 1993).

What deconstruction of intellectual quality, standards, and values could bring to a society, namely unprincipled competition for entitlements and victimhood, was described long ago by Ayn Rand in ***The Fountainhead*** (Bobbs-Merrill, 1943) and ***Atlas Shrugged*** (Random House, 1957). Those who--like myself--thought at the time that those works of fiction were overly simplistic and apocalyptic might do well to browse in them again. *The Fountainhead's* Ellsworth Toohey, it has occurred to me, might well have provided the role model for such people as Stanley Fish. The lengths to which entitlements are pushed in *Atlas Shrugged* are no more ludicrous than those we read about nowadays in the newspapers, for example that "obese people are protected from discrimination under the Americans with Disabilities Act regardless of whether the weight was caused by disease or poor diet, the government is arguing in court" (*Roanoke Times & World-Dispatch*, 13 November 1993, page A4).

* * * * *

Periodicals

Academic Questions is the quarterly journal of the National Association of Scholars (see p.2 for address). If your library doesn't yet subscribe to it, urge them to do so.

Heterodoxy is a biting satirical anti-PC tabloid, often saying the tasteless things that you'd love to, if only you weren't so polite. \$25 for 12 issues annually from the Center for the Study of Popular Culture, 12400 Ventura Blvd., Suite 304, Studio City, CA 91604; 800-752-6562.

CAMPUS: America's Student Newspaper contains anti-PC essays and relevant notices and items of news from around the United States, written by students. Free subscriptions to *Campus* are available to faculty and students, from the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 14 S. Bryn Mawr Ave., Bryn Mawr, PA 19010-3275, 800-526-7022.

The Underground Grammarian has carried on a campaign for good thinking and proper expression and against administrative folderol since 1977. Its favorite motto applies nicely to the PCers: "Neither can his mind be thought to be in tune, whose words do jarre; nor his reason in frame, whose sentence is

FREUDIAN SLIPS?

"[A]n ethically [sic] mixed audience filtered into the BCC [Black Cultural Center]" to hear (among other things) that Malcolm X and Martin Luther King Jr. cannot be compared "because the two leaders reached climaxes at separate times" (From Virginia Tech's student newspaper *Collegiate Times*, 93:11:12)

preposterous". Marvellous food for the independent mind; for details, write to P. O. Box 203, Glassboro, NJ 08028 .

* * * * *

The Mandelstamm Affair

Allan Mandelstamm had achieved the quite unusual distinction of being nationally acclaimed as a *teacher* and being sought after by universities on that account. By 1986, he had taught economics to tens of thousands of students at universities that included Vanderbilt, Michigan State, and (for a dozen years) Virginia Tech. Always amongst the very highest rated and most popular professors, his repertoire was a melange of high standards in covering subject matter and in grading, deft organization of graduate assistants and the logistics of teaching large classes live as well as on closed-circuit and delayed-tape TV, and vivid explications and "personal" stories presented by his alter ego, "Handsome Al".

Then came a charge of sexual harassment *because of jokes he used in class*, in front of hundreds of students live and many hundreds more via TV; the same jokes that tens of thousands of students, female and male, had applauded over the years.

In retrospect, it's easy to diagnose what happened as simply an early instance of PC in action. But in 1986 no one recognized that; and the record may be of some interest to future historians.

The charge of harassment was reported in rather neutral fashion in "A chilling effect: Could Tech professor's humor be more discriminating?" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:2:25, by Eric Randall); "Mandelstamm investigated for alleged 'sexist' remarks" (*Collegiate Times* [Virginia Tech student newspaper], 86:2:25, by Bill Rouady). Those stories quoted students who pooh-poohed the charge, as did individual letters in the *Collegiate Times* (86:2:25, from Teresa Patrick & Daniel Davis; Tom Christian; Michael Stone).

A harbinger of what PC is came from a coed: "If Mandelstamm offends even one woman with his remarks he has overstepped his bounds as an educator" (*Collegiate Times*, 86:2:28, "Offensive remarks" from J. S. Sullivan). At the same time, Associate Professor Thomas Ozro MacAdoo pointed to the First-Amendment implications of monitoring or censoring classroom speech ("Professors may say anything", *Collegiate Times*, 86:2:28).

Nancy Reynolds, the Women's-Affairs zealot in the EO/AA Office, sent Mandelstamm a letter of reprimand, which he protested vigorously: "Tech professor seeks firing of official who investigated him" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:3:13, by Eric Randall); "Mandelstamm responds to decision in sexism case" (*Collegiate Times*, 86:3:14, by Bill

Rouady). Those pieces illustrate what we've become so used to now in PC-dom: stonewalling by officials unwilling to support a teacher's academic freedom: Reynolds, "no comment"; Lon Savage, executive assistant to the president, "No comment"; EO/AA Director Johnson, "This is no longer an issue".

Professor of journalism Sam G. Riley thought it was still possible to joke about the absurdity of speech-monitoring: "Poor Professor Shufflemann--Call a girl a girl, and you land in court" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:3:19). At Tech, Provost Roselle wrote Mandelstamm a letter giving him the exoneration he had asked for; and called for a review of how the university conducts inquiries into allegations of sexual harassment ("Provost's letter salves professor's ire" by Eric Randall, *Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:2; "Mandelstamm case resolved by provost--Professor exonerated of sexism charges" by Bill Rouady, *Collegiate Times*, 86:4:4).

But this was intolerable to the radical feminists. One sees the significance of what then happened much more clearly by hindsight than any of us did at the time. Zealot Reynolds had been asked by her supervisor, EO/AA Director Judith Johnson, not to talk to the press, but Reynolds "chose to ignore those instructions because the First Amendment gives her a right of free speech" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:3; "Tech letter brings charge of favoritism--Woman says provost insensitive to concerns" by Eric Randall). Obviously, Reynolds should have been dismissed forthwith, for the First Amendment doesn't guarantee anyone the right to ignore legitimate instructions from one's administrative superior not to make statements to the media; but she wasn't (although she did leave Virginia Tech not long thereafter). Obvious here too is the blatant, arrogant double standard of PC: Reynolds can say anything she wants about her bosses and about professors, but teachers in the classroom must say only what Reynolds approves of. And ominous was Reynolds' assertion that this did not conclude the case, "In fact, it's just the beginning."

But at this stage even the regional newspaper wasn't prepared for the fury of feminists scorned and added fuel with an editorial, "A new 'minority': the humorless" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:5).

That's when the storm troopers really got going: "Women's group supports Reynolds in sexism case" (*Collegiate Times*, 86:4:8); "Group says teacher's joke wasn't funny" (*Richmond News-Leader*, 86:4:9); "Sexual harassment no joke to council" (*Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 86:4:9, by Cindy Creasy); "the Council on the Status of Women . . . of the Commonwealth of Virginia . . . recognizes that every student is entitled to be educated in an environment free from gender bias and sexual harassment" (adopted 86:4:8).

Again, especially by hindsight, one recognizes the fascist stance behind the wishful words. How on earth can anyone be entitled to an environment of such a sort? Who is capable of envisaging such an environment, let alone constructing one? For one thing, to be free of gender bias the environment would have to be free of all feminist activists. But no more than now were responsible officials--that is to say, officials who occupy positions in which they ought to exercise responsibility--ready to speak out against such totalitarian pronouncements.

An editorial in the *Richmond News-Leader* (86:4:12, "Tech for two") did point to the university's double standard: it cracked down on a joke but had brushed aside protests about the use of a Marxist history text. But then the feminists began their barrage of the university's president and the newspapers: "Professor Mandelstamm case troubling--an open letter to President Lavery" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:13, by Carol Stuart); "Lavery support sought for discrimination office" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:15, by Eric Randall); "Group expresses support for Tech EO/AA office" (*Collegiate Times*, 86:4:15, by Heather Scott), reporting that more than 400 people had signed a petition; "Raised in a sexist society" (*Collegiate Times*, 86:4:15) by Carol Stuart (described as "a graduate student in general arts and sciences", though there exists no such graduate program); "Jokes that stereotype sex" from Louis & Minrose Gwin, and "Illogical attack" [on Nancy Reynolds] from Mrs. A. F. Jones (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:17); "Editorial trivialized issues" from Evelyn S. Newlyn and "Humor demeaned" from Virginia C. Fowler (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:18).

And at once the administration capitulated: "Affirmative action support reaffirmed by Tech president" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:22, by Eric Randall); "Lavery affirms support for EO/AA principles" (*Collegiate Times*, 86:4:22, by Heather

INFORMATION, PLEASE !

Does anyone know how and when the present practice of anonymous student evaluation of college teachers began? A colleague claims to read, a few years ago in the *Washington Post* magazine, interviews with four former 1960s activists, in which it was said that student leaders were looking for issues to provoke confrontation. The idea of having students evaluate professors was thought to be one that the faculty and administration would be bound to reject. But it didn't produce confrontation because the administration and the faculty accepted the idea forthwith, to the consternation of the student leaders who then had to construct some other "non-negotiable" demands.

Scott); "Lavery responds on EO/AA support" (*Spectrum* [Virginia Tech staff newspaper], 86:5:1). President Lavery had made no reference at all to Mandelstamm; but neither did he say anything about the academic freedom of teachers in the classroom; he simply expressed support for affirmative action--yet the message was taken as clear enough by the radical feminists, who loudly claimed victory.

In retrospect, one recognizes--if only from the signatures on the published letters--how much of the fuss was created by a small group of activist lesbians. (Not many years later, the Dean of Arts & Sciences at Tech was abashed to hear from colleagues at other universities that his English Department had acquired the reputation that only lesbians need apply for positions there.) The petty viciousness of the activists was clear only to Mandelstamm and his wife, who received in their mail a number of anonymous communications, copies of the newspaper items about Lavery's support of affirmative action with various childish comments typed on them--"Ouch!!"; "Gotcha!"; one addressed to Allan VonMandelstamm--a couple of them post-marked Charlottesville, all of them apparently written on the same two typewriters. The *Roanoke Times & World-News* (86:4:23) was castigated for not being humorlessly stern enough ("When in doubt, don't do it", from Linda Rosenberg; "In good company", from Jennifer Alexander-Terry) and responded with an attempt to appear evenhanded while agreeing with the feminists ("Monitoring sexism at Virginia Tech", 96:4:17).

Mandelstamm could take some satisfaction from the setting up of a committee, as Provost Roselle had asked, to review the guidelines for how charges like those against Mandelstamm should be investigated (*Spectrum*, 86:5:1; *Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:5:6). One of the lesbian leaders took the occasion to complain [!] that "Activist people are never on that [EO/AA] committee". There continued to appear some letters in direct support of Mandelstamm: "No harassment" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:29, from Patrick E. Harris); "Set guidelines for probes" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:5:3, from Mary W. Jannelle); "Mandelstamm not a sexist" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:5:8, from F. K. Langdana). On the other hand, "Investigator of harassment complaint [Nancy Reynolds] named Tech groups' Woman of Year" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 86:4:30).

For more than 4 years, nothing more was then heard publicly about the Mandelstamm affair. But Mandelstamm had reason to believe that he was being continually denigrated--by lower-than-average pay raises, for example, when before the Reynolds investigation he had often been given reason to feel much appreciated. Mandelstamm sought from all

levels of the administration a clear assertion of his value to the university. He didn't get it, and in October 1990 dramatically announced his resignation during class: "Mandelstamm submits resignation" (*Collegiate Times*, 90:10:2, by Stephen Foster & Tia Gates); "Tech professor quits--in class: 17-year veteran cites frustrations in rare midsemester resignation" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 90:10:3, by Daniel Howes). The student newspaper editorialized, "Communication necessary" (*Collegiate Times*, 90:10:2), not recognizing that Mandelstamm had sought meaningful communication for years without ever getting an unequivocal response from the administration.

The students in Mandelstamm's class had accepted with standing ovation his explanation of why he was resigning. "Mandelstamm not replaceable" (*Collegiate Times*, 90:10:5, from Kevin Corley) was a common view, underscored by Mandelstamm's former department head Daniel Orr, then at the University of Illinois: "Irreplaceable professor lost" (*Collegiate Times*, 90:10:12). But Mandelstamm got little support from colleagues; in part because they didn't realize the years of frustration that led him to resign in mid-semester, in other part because he had mentioned that one way the administration could make up for denigrating him would be to restore monetarily what he had lost through getting below-average pay raises--yet his actual salary had still been higher than that of most professors at Tech: "Salary not an issue" (*Collegiate Times*, 90:10:9, from Nancy Wade).

Responding to students' dismay, Mandelstamm offered to continue teaching for the remainder of the semester, without pay: "Mandelstamm offers to continue teaching" (*Collegiate Times*, 90:10:9, by Stephen Foster); "Professor offers to return" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 90:10:9, by Madelyn Rosenberg). But the university rejected the offer in graceless fashion: "Dr. Mandelstamm has made his decision, and now he has to live with it" (clipping just cited, and "Mandelstamm's offer rejected", *Collegiate Times*, 90:10:12, by David Denton). Mandelstamm thanked the many students who had made contact with him, and expressed his regret that the university had rejected not only his offer to finish the semester's classes but also his offer of videotapes for the same purpose: "Professor tried best" (*Collegiate Times*, 90:10:16, from Al Mandelstamm). On November 7, at the invitation of the Student Government Association, Mandelstamm gave a farewell address to a large, appreciative, and supportive audience.

Mandelstamm has written about his experience in "McCarthy's ghost: reminiscences of a politically incorrect professor" (*Crisis*, September 1991; see also "Visigoths in tweed" [letter from Henry Bauer],

Crisis, November 1991). "Lessons from the Mandelstamm affair" by Henry H. Bauer appeared in *Academic Questions* (Spring 1992), bringing a number of comments (Fall 1992, from Abigail L. Rosenthal and Laura Bianchi with response by Bauer; Winter 1992-93, from Mandelstamm and Roger A. Fischer; Spring 1993, from Abigail L. Rosenthal again).

In 1991, a team from TV 4 in Britain, investigating PC, made Virginia Tech a major stop, and the British reporters brought some attention from the local media: "The Adventures of a Politically Incorrect Professor at Virginia Tech" (*Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 91:10:9, by Robert G. Holland); "Ex-teacher says he was 'politically incorrect'" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 91:10:15, by Madelyn Rosenberg); "Money wasn't professor's main object" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 91:10:27, from Mandelstamm). Mandelstamm was featured in the resulting program, "War of the Words", shown in Britain on 17th December 1991 but never yet shown on American TV (reviews supposedly appeared in the *London Times* and *Daily Telegraph*, but we haven't been able to get copies as yet).

Mandelstamm introduced Dinesh D'Souza when he spoke at Virginia Tech ("Tech speaker takes aim at 'correctness'" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 91:10:31, by Madelyn Rosenberg); "Opponent of political correctness speaks out" and "Mandelstamm explains resignation" (*Collegiate Times*, 90:11:1, the first by David Spates, the second a transcript from a radio interview of Mandelstamm with call-in questions from listeners).

The affair continues to be mentioned at times: "Newest campus attack weapon" by Walter Williams (*Washington Times* and nationally syndicated, 92:10:3); "If you want an example of PC McCarthyism, here it is" (*Washington Times*, 92:10:18, from Bob Foster, a former student: "'Handsome Al' was . . . the best teacher I came across at Virginia Tech"); "Modern-Day Witch Hunts" by Charles Geshekter, *Chico News & Review* (93:3:4); and see also "Affirmative Action at Virginia Tech: The Tail That Wagged the Dog", *Academic Questions* (Winter 1992-93, by Henry H. Bauer). The newsletter of the Department of Economics at Virginia Tech (92:12:1) felt free to list Mandelstamm as an emeritus professor, merely noting that "Allan Mandelstamm retired in 1990"; and the head of the department had the gall to ask Mandelstamm whether his name could be used to solicit contributions from alumni toward scholarships for economics students (but upper levels of the administration quickly scotched that idea when they heard of it).

The sad lesson is that professors cannot expect their administration to safeguard their academic freedom or even their constitutional right of free speech. So it's encouraging that the Individual

Rights Foundation recently achieved an unprecedented settlement with the University of California at Riverside: administrators were ordered to attend five hours of sessions about respect for the First Amendment (*Heterodoxy*, November 1993). For professors, the price of liberty in academe, in the contemporary United States, means not only eternal vigilance but also *standing ready to seek legal recourse*.

But at Virginia Tech, it's also encouraging that the newly appointed President, Paul Torgersen,

while acknowledging that the world changes and that the university needs to evolve too, stressed that "some truths, some values, some beliefs that are bedrocks.... There is no compromise on issues of academic quality, academic integrity, or on the fundamental freedoms of teaching and research" (*Roanoke Times & World-News*, 93:12:10).

**Virginia Scholar
Editorial Office
1306 Highland Circle
Blacksburg VA 24060-5623**

Virginia Association of Scholars

FOR REASONED SCHOLARSHIP IN A FREE SOCIETY

National Association of Scholars