

Virginia Scholar

Newsletter of the Virginia Association of Scholars

Number 2

ISSN 1073-
7235

March 1994

EDITORIAL	2
on Loyalty and Whistle-Blowing	
POTPOURRI	4
How they make appointments at Virginia Tech, and other amusements	
NO RAILING AT IDIOTS	7
an essay by O. Sonnebild	
REPORT ON A CONFERENCE IN CHARLOTTESVILLE	10
from David Radcliffe	
WHY GOING TO COLLEGE HAS BECOME SO EXPENSIVE IN VIRGINIA	13
Part II: Teaching vs. Research?	
BOOK REVIEW	18
<i>From Swastika to Jim Crow</i> by Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb	
THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS	19

TID-BITS:

<i>a nice quote</i>	11
<i>not-so-nice quotes</i>	14,15,16
<i>Down Under</i>	5,7,8,9
<i>Josef Martin</i>	12

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
Internet: BAUERH@VTVM1.CC.VT.EDU *or* HHBAUER@VT.EDU · FAX (703) 231-3255

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)

EDITORIAL --- ON LOYALTY AND WHISTLE-BLOWING**... THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE**

"Telling the truth" sounds like an absolutely good thing; but "whistle-blowing" carries an ambiguous tone: as *The Random House Dictionary* puts it, that of "turning informer" as well as "exposing, making public". Is whistle-blowing then something other than telling the truth? If so, in what way?

Loyalty is one of the most universal of human sentiments: loyalty to family, to community, to nation — loyalty to *fellow insiders*. Whistle-blowing is to reveal to *outsiders* the unvarnished truth about one's fellow-insiders. It's traitorous: showing more loyalty to some other group than one's own.

But leave aside here the plea-bargainers, the self-seeking and self-serving, the "informers", the *real* traitors. Human history abounds with whistle-blowing by admirable, idealistic people: what moved them to wash their tribe's dirty linen in public? What causes some decent people to act against the natural human sense of loyalty?

A short digression to pose a germane example. On 17th October 1993, that TV program for whistle-blowers, *60 Minutes*, explained why policemen dealing illegal drugs in New York City got away with it for a long time: for one thing, the honest cops had a feeling of solidarity with their colleagues who had succumbed to temptation; for another thing, the miscreants' chiefs wanted no public scandals.

Weren't the clean cops wrong to connive at the cover-up? Weren't their leaders wrong to close their eyes rather than admit something could be wrong? Wouldn't it have been better all around if the Department had cleaned its own house as soon as dirt was noticed?

When an alcoholic professor keeps missing classes, allowing graduate students to stand in at the last moment — should his colleagues and Department Head cover for him? Or should they inform the Dean that there's a problem?

When administrators are truly incompetent, shouldn't their superiors be told?

To those of us who aren't policemen, in particular not policemen in New York City, it's obvious that the honest cops should have blown the whistle on their dishonest colleagues. Yet somehow we feel that whistles should *not* be blown in our own organizations

Such incongruities and dilemmas exist because our loyalties are always divided. It's easy for me to criticize the non-whistle-blowers in the New York City Police; because my loyalty to law-abiding in our society doesn't *in this case* conflict with any loyalty to friends and colleagues. It is similarly easy for a New York City policeman to be quite clear that an

alcoholic professor at my University should be removed from the classroom forthwith.

I'm a faculty member at Virginia Tech. I'm a member of a couple of departmental units and of one of the colleges. Immediately there's conflict of interest, a potential clash of loyalties: what's most comfortable for my Department might not be best for the University, especially in times when budgets must be cut. Should I be truthful and admit, say, that some of our courses don't need to be taught as often as they are?

I'm an academic — truth-seeking and teaching are my profession. I'm also a citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and of the United States of America; and I'm a member of the species *Homo sapiens*. Much of the time, my loyalties to all these groups don't seem to clash too seriously with one another. Yet on occasion I see my University doing things that, it seems clear, are not in the best interests of teaching or of truth-seeking or of the Commonwealth of Virginia which supports our teaching and truth-seeking. Shall I speak out or shall I keep quiet?

There's much to be said for keeping quiet. Exposure will surely be misunderstood. Why embarrass my departmental colleagues? Why embarrass the many administrators who just honestly do their best and what they're told? They'll get very angry, and I really don't like having people angry at me. There's *much* to be said for keeping quiet.

But when it comes right down to it, there's not much *good* to be said for keeping quiet as foolish deeds are done or as lies are told. I said, "on occasion I see *my University* doing things"; but really what I see is not that, but *some individuals within my University* doing those things. Are those individuals to be somehow above the law? Is it proper for administrations to pretend that "*L'État c'est moi*"? It's a common enough ploy, of course, for administrators to seek to confuse loyalty to the institution with loyalty *to them*; but that doesn't make it so. The last refuge of scoundrels, after all, is the appeal to patriotism — the patriotism of others.

Loyalty is a two-way street. I am properly loyal to my chiefs so long as they are properly loyal to their official responsibilities (and thereby to me) — and only so long. If they lie or waste resources, then they've been disloyal and my commitment to them is

annulled. Even if they aren't deliberately dishonest but just honestly incompetent, my loyalty to academe, to the Commonwealth, to this University must outweigh purely personal loyalties. We are, after all, expected to judge for tenure and promotion even our best friends solely on the basis of substantive, objective criteria; just so should we judge our administrators.

There are further reasons for keeping quiet. The wrong-doers or incompetents are often — as people — quite *nice* people: I wish them well, I hope for their health, that they should enjoy happy children, and all other good things. Why make things unpleasant for them? Why, for exactly the same reason as I must vote against tenure even for my best friend, if he happens not to warrant tenure.

Might it not be best to keep quiet because one can't trust the media, the legislature, the public to make proper use of the truth? No; because if that's really the case, then how are we better off than the residents of the former Evil Empire? If we don't trust those we have selected and elected, they'll soon realize that they're not trusted and thereby that *they* cannot trust *us*; and so we get a debilitating "us-vs.-them" ambience instead of the feeling of community that is proper to a self-governing academe and a democratic society.

But above all we keep silent not because of rational concern over possible consequences, but because of personal fear. We academics are notoriously anxious about the smallest matters, and paranoid to boot. Let my mail-box deliver me a letter marked "Confidential" and with some Official return address, and at once I'm sure that my teaching load has been raised or my salary raise rescinded, or that financial exigency has been declared and I've been dismissed — or, nowadays, that I'm found guilty of racial or sexual harassment because someone didn't like the way I looked at them.

I've been much (though secretly) amused during the last few years as colleagues have remarked that while *others* of course need to be careful, *I* — a former Dean, etc. etc. — fortunately don't have such worries. It amuses me because I know that I'm as fearful and lacking in self-confidence as the next academic. That we may have no rational cause to be anxious doesn't make us not anxious.

But it's my very cowardice that makes me speak out. My greatest fear is to lose the goodwill or respect of my children, of the good people that it's been

my luck to have as friends, of the good people whose moral judgment hasn't been sophisticated away. I'm deadly afraid of betraying the trust of those who supported me along the way: who stinted themselves to my benefit, who gave me opportunities that had been denied them. One such was Bruno Breyer, a refugee from Nazi Europe, interned by the Allies, gaining only at the very end of his career anything like the easy life that has been my luck almost from the beginning. At the very first faculty meeting I attended, Breyer exclaimed that he hadn't escaped from Hitler in order to kow-tow to petty bureaucratic mediocrity at our University.

That's quite a load of mentoring to carry. Given my much easier life than his, have I the right to be less principled than he was?

So I speak out because I'm afraid of what would happen if I didn't. But like any other academic, I can find logical justification for what I'm driven to do. What I believe to have learned as a child, from my family's encounters with the Nazis, is that for the powerless, the "minorities", the despised, the outcast, the only real hope lies in the truth; in *principled* behavior; in the refusal to discriminate on any other grounds than those relevant to the task at hand.

What I learned makes it easy for me to recognize that the absurdities of PC ultimately harm even those they claim to help — just as Soviet Communism was soon as tyrannical toward the proles as toward the bourgeois. "Helping" some disadvantaged group by giving some of its members preferential treatment is just perpetuating and practicing a condescending paternalism. Start by doing that, and you find yourself continuing by telling white lies about it to protect the feelings of those you help — because in your heart you actually believe they're inferior, that's why such help is needed. And soon the white lies become ordinary lies, and more and more must be covered up, until you're enmeshed in precisely the pervasive double-talk and evasiveness and dishonesty and perversion of logic that now marks academe — and with which so many of us our now fed up.

It's time to get back to basics. Without truth-telling, "education" is mere propaganda. Without truth-telling, no democratic society can function well for long. The truth *can* make us free — but only if we choose to tell it.

The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil

Making appointments at Virginia Tech: #1

In our last issue, Deep Mole reported that selection of a Dean of Arts & Sciences at Virginia Tech was to follow Josef Martin's tip for increasing diversity at all costs. But happily the best-laid schemes o' mice and men (and the most manipulative schemes o' Provosts) gang aft a-gley*: in the end, to the tune of general rejoicing in the College, the best-qualified candidate was appointed: Robert Bates, Professor of Biology as well as for a number of years Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Research in the College. Several correspondents took pains to let us know that Deep Mole's prognostication had been in error:

"Some of us Department Heads weren't born yesterday. As a group, we rejected the Provost's injunction that we communicate with him only individually; and as a group we let him know that three of the four interviewed candidates . . . were unacceptable to us" [name withheld by request]

Three outside candidates had been interviewed. All of them answered (or at least responded to) questions at meetings open to everyone. Their vitae had also been generally accessible. So the following were no secrets:

— The male external candidate had bombed out.

— One of the women was relatively senior but foolishly abrasive. For example, in one of her meetings with faculty she made derogatory remarks about Tech's President and about the retiring Dean.

— The other woman was very pleasant; but entirely unqualified

by experience for a Deanship, having attained the rank of Full Professor only within the year.

It soon became known that the Search Committee had acceded to the Provost's request for *at least two names* by designating the pleasant but unqualified woman "acceptable"; and those of us who didn't know of the Department Heads' courageous action assumed that her appointment was thereby a foregone conclusion. As to what actually happened, we have so far heard two accounts:

1. According to Whistle Throat, the Provost continued in at least two minds for several days, despite the clear advice of the College's Department Heads, finally reaching a decision in the early hours of one morning.

2. According to a less well-placed source, the Provost actually recommended to the President that the unqualified woman be appointed but was over-ruled.

The truth, of course, may well be something else, with some favoring of 1. or 2. There would be, however, some precedent for version 2. — see below.

Making appointments at Virginia Tech: #2

Tech hasn't found it easy over the years to fill the Directorship of the Women's Studies Program. The current DWS came from Kentucky in 1991. At the time, the attempt to find a position also for her consort foundered when the Department(s) in which he could have been placed judged him unqualified.

In the Spring of 1993, the grapevine buzzed that a new scheme was afoot: the consort would be placed in an EOP position provided by the Provost's Office. Thus the lucky Department with which he would be affiliated — not one of those that had re-

fused him in 1991 — would be getting a freebie. As we left for the summer, it seemed a *fait accompli*.

One day last Fall I bumped into Whistle Mole. Always ready to needle him about the peccability of our administrators, I enquired how the DWS's consort was settling in. "What are you talking about?", he enquired with his straightest of faces. When I told him enough of what I'd heard to convince him that he wouldn't be telling me anything new by admitting it, he said, "Oh, all those rumors to the contrary, that was never going to happen."

Intrigued, I asked around. The most likely tale I heard is that the appointment was ready to be made, all but the formality of an approval from the Board of Visitors. But then the President put it to the Provost in some such fashion: "Who is going to explain to the Board that we use EOPs to appoint (companions, consorts, spouses-in-all-but-name) for some of our faculty or administrators? I don't intend to, and you're not going to either."

We'd love to believe that story for several reasons. The one most germane to the Editorial in this issue is that the likelihood of bad being done decreases and the likelihood of good being done increases to the degree that the good people on the Board of Visitors, and the good people of the Commonwealth of Virginia, are properly informed about what goes on and how it comes to pass.

They can only be informed by those who know. In this instance, one brave faculty member in the consort's prospective Department took an open stand against the behind-the-scenes manipulations. Through that, word spread, and finally a couple of people in the Faculty Senate realized that the

* After a poem by Robert Burns, member of a much-oppressed ethnic group.

President ought to be made aware of what his Provost was cooking up.

One person can make a difference.

Kwanza

Dear Editor:

Thanks for the copy of *Virginia Scholar*. I look forward to future issues. In the meantime, I want to share one of my own experiences with political correctness.

One thing I have noticed about the climate of overwrought sensitivity produced by political correctness is that it leads to the very racial and sexual stereotyping so decried by its enforcers. I recently witnessed an amusing example of this on our campus. The incident involved "Kwanza", an allegedly "African" holiday which some black Americans are beginning to celebrate around Christmas-time.

In case anyone has missed the yearly press on Kwanza: the holiday was created by an American professor as a way of unifying the black community. Obviously, if this isn't carried too far it can be an enjoyable and worthwhile thing. The problem is that Kwanza is also supposed to symbolize black America's connections to Africa.

Having learned to speak Swahili while living in Africa, I know a little about the subject. For one thing, Swahili is spoken only in a few East-African countries, but in none of the western Africa nations where black Americans can trace their ancestry. Also, given that Africa is three times as large as the United States, and composed of hundreds of tribes and languages, Swahili means as much to most Africans as Greek does to most Europeans (unless we assume that all people with the same color of skin are irreducible parts of a single race - but I can promise that telling a Pole he is the same as a Greek will get you into trouble every

time). Furthermore, Swahili is hardly "African" - it was created by East-African, Arab and Indian traders. It was written down only when Europeans arrived on the African continent. (So at least it's a multi-cultural language.)

Finally, the word "kwanza" means "first" in Swahili. It is derived from the verb "anza", meaning "to begin anew", which one can see would have good connotations for the American black community (and, after all, describes a wonderful thing one can do in the United States). But in East Africa, kwanza is not associated with a holiday of any kind. And as I found out, sometimes it doesn't mean anything - even to native Swahili speakers - when it's warped by the sensitivity machine of political correctness.

Shortly after my return from Christmas break I overheard a colleague and a student talking outside my office. The colleague is a fine, intelligent, and conscientious teacher who is trying hard to follow the new sensitivity etiquette demanded by "diversity" and "multi-culturalism". The student was one from East Africa with whom I occasionally reminisce and speak what little Swahili I remember. The faculty member asked the student if he had enjoyed his "kwanza". Undoubtedly my colleague had seen the same article on Kwanza in the *Roanoke Times* that I had seen over the holiday break.

I knew the student being questioned and though I couldn't see him, I had a vivid image of the look on his face. Most East Africans are very polite and, in keeping with the old British educational system upon which theirs is based, have a great deal of respect for faculty. Consequently, they want to avoid situations where faculty members make fools of themselves.

Yet here our student has been accosted in the hall and asked a nonsensical question. Imagine

yourself being accosted by a foreigner who asks how you enjoyed your "first". Your first what? Beer? Or even what only your closest buddies might ask about? ("Hey, Jack, old boy, tell us about the night you got your cherry busted by Betty Anne.")

Taken aback, the confused graduate student asked, "My kwanza? My kwanza?" I could hear a note of alarm in his voice.

"Yes", says our professor, "You know, Kwanza - your annual celebration - like our Christmas."

"Like your Christmas?" from the graduate student.

"Yes, the day all Africans celebrate their unity."

"Oh, oh yes. Oh yes," says our student, anxious to please. "I enjoyed it very much."

They engaged in a little more chit-chat and I heard my colleague leave. After a few moments of shuffling around in the hall, the student poked his head into my office: "Kwanza ni nini (What is Kwanza)?"

Best wishes to the newsletter. Let's hope academia raises its sights and once again becomes a place organized on merit and honest discourse, not apartheid and double-speak.

Sincerely,

'Frederick Douglass'

NO MORE QUARANTINE IN NEW ZEALAND?

[T]he Human Rights Bill. . . would outlaw discrimination on the grounds of disability, employment status, family status, political opinion, age and the identity of a partner or relative. An amendment . . . would extend the grounds to sexual orientation and having organisms in the body capable of causing illness [emphasis added]

— *New Zealand Herald*
93:6:18, p.1:2

Legal help for oppressed academics

In the good old days, university governance was collegial. People could depend on one another's words. Faculty could rely on administrators to back them up in those rare instances when students lodge unwarranted complaints. It was understood that teachers had wide latitude in the classroom, to give them the best chance to help their students develop their intellectual abilities — by being questioned, by being shown to be wrong, by being forced to try to respond, by being made uncomfortable when they hadn't done any preparation. Few teachers were as aggressive as the law-school professor depicted by John Houseman in *The Paper Chase*, but even so dedicated a user of the Socratic method did not need to fear a charge of harassment; moreover he could reasonably expect to be exonerated if such a charge were ever laid.

Nowadays, of course, it is *the students* who are almost inevitably supported by the administrators. Thus it is only realistic, sad though it may be, for professors to be continually on their guard against unwarranted complaints. So it behooves a professor to have written proof of every transaction with a student, to have witnesses for every conversation with a student — and, perhaps even more important, to have written proof of every transaction or conversation *with an administrator*. Scanners of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* will be familiar with numerous instances where professors or students have been charged with harassment without ever being told the details, and judged guilty in Star-Chamber proceedings without the most elementary sort of due process.

It used to be that academics disdained any resort to the courts, for fair judgments appropriate to

the academic enterprise were much more likely to be achieved within the university system, under the rules of fair play and due process established over the course of decades under the leadership of the American Association of University Professors. Nowadays, incredible though it might seem to outsiders, it is much more likely that professors will be given academic due process in a court of law than by their own administrators — or even their own colleagues meeting in committee under the rules set forth by those administrators.

Under these sad circumstances, it's very heartening that there are lawyers willing to offer free advice, and sometimes free service, to professors and students whose rights are infringed by PC ideologues. The following notices have recently appeared in *Campus* magazine and in *Heterodoxy*:

"Have you been harassed by the thought police on your campus lately? Contact **THE INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS PROJECT** for free legal assistance and advice. **Director, John Howard. 1-800-538-3152.**" The Project got some good publicity late last year following a settlement it reached with the University of California at Riverside: two administrators are to attend sensitivity training in First-Amendment rights*. The Project accepts donations and memberships.

THE CENTER FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS has established an **Academic Freedom Defense Fund** that can provide free legal advice and in-court representation to students and professors whose freedom of speech is violated. The Center is a non-profit public-interest law firm. Its *Docket Report (Fourth Quarter*

* For a full account, read "Counter Coup: when sensitivity training is a good thing" by Bill Cerveny, *Heterodoxy*, vol.2 #3, November 1993.

1993) and *Report of Activities, 1992-1993*, list involvement with a number of highly significant cases, among them several of special interest to academics: "quotas" in admission to University of Texas Law School; Professor Silva found guilty of sexual harassment at the University of New Hampshire because of classroom use of ill-chosen metaphors about belly dancing and writing-as-sex; across-the-board pay raises for all women at Virginia Commonwealth University; parents objecting to Afrocentric curriculum propaganda in the public schools of Prince George's County, Maryland; hiring restricted to "minorities only" at Western Michigan University.

Clearly the Center is a place to call when the PC police knock at *your* door. In the meantime it deserves support and thanks from all academics. Contact Center for Individual Rights, **1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 260, Washington, D.C. 20036; (202) 833-8400.**

"LANDMARK LEGAL FOUNDATION is offering free legal assistance to students, student organizations, and teachers whose rights have been violated as a result of their political beliefs or associations. Landmark believes the 'political correctness' movement . . . constitutes a dangerous threat to academic freedom and is willing to commit its resources to battle this threat.

Please contact Foundation President Jerald Hill, or General Counsel Mark Bredemeier, at Landmark Legal Foundation, **15th Floor, 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, MO 64106; (816) 474-6600."**

* * * * *

POTPOURRI
CONTINUES
ON P. 17

NO RAILING AT IDIOTS

O. SINNEBILD

[O. Sinnbild is the pen-name of someone other than Henry Bauer or Josef Martin. He, she, or they has long been familiar with doings at Mr. Jefferson's University.]

"By dint of railing at idiots," said Flaubert, "we run the risk of becoming idiots ourselves." This is self-evidently sound. We ought therefore to avoid railing at the fools — but not necessarily at the scoundrels — of political correctness. The category of fools is very much the larger. No one member of it is a danger to higher education; but their swollen and still-growing numbers do constitute a danger. Thus it's tough to avoid railing.

The scoundrels of PC, now, are easy: opportunists, every one of 'em. Today they hold many — or most (depending upon the venue) — elevated jobs in academic administration. The plain professor-scoundrels travel the lecture circuits, re-defining for fat honoraria all knowledge from law to leptons in accord with cullings from Marx, Foucault, Derrida, MacKinnon, Fanon. Their ostentatious *seemliness*, the burdens they impose upon honest thought and teaching, would vanish overnight were it not for the fools, who are supportive or oblivious. The set of fools is nowhere empty.

Flaubert did not enjoin laughter, however; nor has any other writer worth knowing frowned upon it. Political correctness, manifested in the behavior of fools, can be funny in all times and under all governments. In the midst of tragedy or bathos it has always been possible and even hygienic to find a belly-laugh in their self-congratulating virtue, usually in wildly inappropriate circumstances: think of the ecological fastidiousness of such Nazi bosses as Heinrich Himmler. Or take, for a kindlier, down-home example, the SCHEV Report of 1993 on how to fix what's wrong with higher education — and what our distinguished colleagues did about it.

The report is an intellectual embarrassment. Titled misleadingly a proposal for improvements, it consists mainly of asser-

tions about the felicities to come from awarding thousands more diplomas while reducing, in proportion, faculty involvement with students. Some of these assertions may have a trivial merit, but most are self-serving clichés without supporting evidence, insulting to universities and to faculty; a few lack not only supporting evidence but even simple logic. The noise of this report resounded as a tocsin in the universities.

Zut, alors! What a response from Virginia's handful of serious academics! It was as though the sixties, of tenderest memory, had returned. Faculty roared in anger and exhilaration. Visions of Vietnam, of marches, of takeovers, danced in heads thinly-haired and greying but still young on the inside. Committees formed, caucuses were held, strong statements were made before the cameras in support of some of the Presidents, who had opposed the report in a somewhat self-serving but justifiable document. Among professors the full, symbolic meaning of "protest" was reborn (among students and Student-Affairs types it had never died).

Unfortunately, no faculty did what was *needed*: to issue an *immediate*, polite, point-by-point refutation. To be sure, there were local and internal responses. Faculty and students met urgently — with, for example, a decent but platitudinous

Secretary of Education, and were hugely flattered that despite obvious indifference to their arguments, "he listened". The university's PR machines did their duty, treading daintily, it being understood (as reported by a press hostile to higher education) that influential legislators think the SCHEV proposals for "restructuring" higher education are just dandy and morally sound to boot. Despite endless griping (after Foucault) about power and oppression, the sensitive academic person or PR-staffer does not say, "Nonsense", to power even when power speaks nonsense.

To this day no faculty has produced a simple statement of the obvious truth: that "restructuring" according to SCHEV and our last Governor means poorer teaching, research, and scholarship and a giant step backward for Virginia, from quality estab-

NO MORE PREJUDICE IN AUSTRALIA?

Prejudice in New South Wales will be punishable the . . . penalty for serious racial vilification [will] increase . . . to \$A5000 . . . [and] be extended to cover minority groups, including homosexuals, HIV sufferers, people working or associating with them, religious minorities, and people with physical or intellectual disabilities
— *New Zealand Herald*
93:6:18, p.1:1

[Since writers of such a law obviously suffer from some sort of intellectual disability, does any criticism of the legislation thereby become punishable?]

lished earlier at great cost. To say that crisply, with evidence, would be — well — insensitive. (Spokespeople for UVa faculty did produce a very long response, months too late, within whose verbiage were buried quite a few of the necessary words. This probably made them feel better; it offended nobody and it has had no effect.)

We are not yet at the nub of the story; nor is the faculty's inconsequential response to subsequent blackmail (a Richmond plan to withhold some of the budget until the universities knuckle under to "restructuring") a part of it. But there are episodes useful for hollow laughter. One, from among the possibilities, comes from the same UVa. What happened there, in aftermath of the SCHEV report of which it was a key target? What did that faculty's distinguished Senate, its official *Vox*, busy itself with in the following months, while Rome burned?

Why, they pushed *en masse* on the hottest of all academic buttons:

Who is Allowed to Make "Amorous Advances" to Whom?

There, now, is a real issue of sensitivity, and of "power-over!" (one of the pejoratives in feminist philosophy). In succeeding months, the Senate received, debated, amended, and sent on with approval to the President (who dumped it like a hot potato, steaming, into the laps of his academic VPs) a finely crafted rule-book for the behavior, as regards actual or imagined sex, of faculty *vis-à-vis* students and other low-power types. This document aroused even the national media: columnists from Washington to Los Angeles considered that Virginia's own President, and a great many other notables, once youthful concupiscents, would have been censurable had such rules

been in effect earlier. Copies reached distant seats of learning, where, upon unfriendly doors, there were posted certain sub-sections expanded by local wags to specify, e.g., when a motel would be permissible or when only the respondent's car would be allowed.

No, the joke is not about the President, who in this case responded honorably to SCHEV, nor about his excellent spouse. It is about our colleagues, the Messrs. and Mses. Quixote and Grundy. That these sometimes-awake scholars, in a senior university threatened with a hostile takeover of academic decision-making, could devote themselves somberly and for months to debating behavior for which not a single statistic was ever — has ever been — given, and that the rest of the faculty could attend this with a matching gravity is — there is only one word for it — farcical. Where are you, Aristophanes, now that we need you?

This is, you see, a national pattern, not just a fatuous episode in the history of a noble institution founded by a great son of the Enlightenment. We have lost one of the Enlightened legacies: the ability to recognize and dissect poppycock; and the willingness to do so. From the seventeenth century to the twentieth, from Swift to Orwell, the unique and saving grace of this mixed bag of a culture has been a steady increase in that ability, together with the fact that one could often get away with exercising it.

The loss is in no way unique to the Old Dominion. Take, for example, the University of Rochester, in which there is now an "Intercessor". UR's Intercessor is one Brooke Gordon-Hare, who was moved to illuminate, in the November 18, 1993 issue of *Campus Times*, the reasons why that institution's "Sexual Harassment Policy Allows Freedom" (a headline); from which illumination, so

**BRAVE NEW MEDIAEVAL
AND PALAEO-LITHIC
SCIENCE IN AUSTRALIA?**

Australia's . . . proposed national science curriculum . . . [insisted] that students be taught the contribution to science of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. . . . [and] invited students to consider the work of alchemists alongside that of Einstein and Rutherford

— *The Age* (Melbourne)
93:5:27, p.1

One amusing aspect of Australian PC is the incessant repetition of the phrase, "Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders". Those groups have little or nothing in common. The Aborigines entered the continent at least 40,000 years ago and perfected a Stone-Age, nomadic, food-gathering culture. The Torres Straiters, on the other hand, belong to the Melanesian peoples who colonized the Pacific Ocean from Asia perhaps 10,000 years ago. But so far as the PC ideologues are concerned, both groups are the same in the only way that counts: they are supposed to be people who need continuing preferential treatment, especially as regards self-esteem, because they cannot look after themselves in this modern world.

far as I know, there has been no demurrer. This piece of English composition deserves to be reprinted in full, but modesty forbids it. Here, instead, are a few of the operative sentences, exactly as published:

The Sexual Harassment Policy defines what behaviors are not tolerated in our community. Also, inherent in this policy is the concept that the person who is receiving the behaviors, determines whatever they are welcomed or not. It is aspect

of the policy that empowers individuals so that they do not have to work and study in an environment that is sexually harassing.

So far so bad, although "receiving" a behavior awakens thoughts best left to the Id; and the notion of empowerment employed is, shall we say, vague. Preceding this, moreover, the author has explained how "each individual" is to "thrive and develop to their [sic] full capacity." These are, however, mere stylistic foibles. The important part, the moral philosophy, comes next. Responding to the remote possibility that a receiver's insult might be a behavior's intended compliment, the Intercessor puts things firmly to rights by insisting that

...each complaint is taken on a case by case basis, albeit each complaint is taken seriously and looked into. This

does empower an individual to bring forth a situation that doesn't feel right to them.

The prodigy of it! Each *single* complaint is evidently converted by this busy administration into a *multiplicity* of cases; and every one is then looked into. No wonder there are so many "Intercessors" in the countryside! "Situations" are "brought forth" — following, one presumes, a suitable gestation and confinement. A single person who doesn't feel right becomes a "them;" and seems to be empowered thereby, at least as to number.

"Does the Sexual Harassment Policy Limit Freedom of Speech?"

This question, because it is in quotes, may have been asked by someone other than the Intercessor; or she simply considered it important enough for such punctuation. Her answer, which by its

provenance must be official in this upstate New York refuge of scholars, follows:

The answer is no. The policy, in fact, expands freedom of speech and the right to have the opportunity to succeed in an atmosphere free of harrassment [sic] to all UR members.

There you have it, womyn and men. Limiting freedom of speech means expanding freedom of speech. Losing rights means gaining rights. It's a matter of definition, see? In a time — a full decade after 1984 — when this sort of thing preoccupies nationwide our putatively best and brightest, to the exclusion of such questions as who should study and teach what knowledge, and how: what else is there to do but laugh?_

* * * * *

[Editorial addendum:

Sinnebild speaks to some general concerns we have about PC:

1. "A receiver's insult might be a behavior's intended compliment" used to be an accepted insight. Albert Ellis, Maxie Maultsby and others made it a cornerstone of what they call "humanistic" psychotherapy, Rational Behavior Training, Rational Emotive Therapy. No one, they point out, can make you *feel* angry, happy, oppressed, despised, welcomed, or anything else: only *you yourself* determine how you feel, by *how you interpret* what others do or say. (See Albert Ellis & Robert A. Harper, *A New Guide to Rational Living* [1975, 1961]; Maxie C. Maultsby, *Help Yourself to Happiness by Rational Self-Counseling* [1975]; and much other material available from the Institute for Rational-Emotive Therapy, 45 East 65th St., New York NY 10021).
2. The use of plurals when referring to singulars — as in "each individual develops their capacities" — is actually recommended in certain modern Manuals of Style as one way of avoiding the use of such pronouns as "he" in their generic mode. For our taste it is a bit less objectionable than the endless repetition of "he or she", let alone "she/he", "s/he", or "s/he/it" — not to speak of "she" used as though it could stand for subjects of any sex: the plural, though certainly a mis-usage, is at least a *time-honored* and *ideologically neutral* mis-usage. So far as I'm aware, no one has yet discussed one significant factor in the dominance of PC: fanatic ideologues effectively took control of certain positions that had never been regarded as important — they're not well-paid — and made them bases of great influence. Among such positions are copy-editing of books and magazines, and the concomitant writing and commissioning and demanding the use of Manuals of Style. Other such positions include the staffs of influential granting agencies and of conference-sponsoring groups.]

HONORS BY RACE AND SEX

The Queen's Birthday honours have been criticized for the absence of men and Maori recipients Giving the top awards to women was sexist according to the Christian Heritage Party [while] the Partnership Committee to commemorate the United Nations international year for the world's indigenous peoples . . . was disappointed at "the conspicuous absence" of Maoris from the list. . . [according to] the National Council of Women . . . "everyone should admit that maybe we need a little affirmative action every now and then to redress past imbalances", [but] "many" Maori people [were concerned] that the women's suffrage celebrations had overshadowed activities celebrating Maori achievements

— *New Zealand Herald*
93:6:14, p.1

"TEACHING, LEARNING, & RESEARCH IN A PUBLIC UNIVERSITY"

— REPORT ON A CONFERENCE

BY DAVID RADCLIFFE

This conference was held in Charlottesville 24-25 February, sponsored jointly by the U.Va. Department of Physics and the Commonwealth Center for Literary and Cultural Change. The purpose was to re-examine the mission of public universities in a time of straightened finances and changing public priorities. The speakers represented a cross-section of academic disciplines and included two Nobel Laureates, two presidents of the Modern Languages Association, and students at the University. The conference was attended by over a hundred persons; department heads and senior faculty were well represented, though the presence of younger faculty and students was sparse.

U.Va. president John Casteen opened by noting that it is the business of education to empower people to make decisions about their own lives. Daniel Larson (Physics, U.Va.) argued that universities, in addition to research, are expected to contribute to society broadly — not just to study processes of change but to participate in change. Patricia M. Spacks (English, U.Va.) spoke of the need for accountability: "It's useful to those teaching in public universities to know that taxpayers are standing behind students in the classroom." She also suggested that public antagonism towards higher education stems less from academic theory, jargon, or specialization than from dislike of complexity itself: what makes a teacher successful in the classroom is thoroughly opposed to what makes a commentator successful on television.

Gordon Davies, director of the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV), sounded a stern note: "This is not a PR problem — there's something much bigger going on than a failure of the spin-doctors. The past four years are not an accident in an otherwise upward trajectory; the prospect for increases in funding is not good." He compared the situation to the health-care "crisis": there is no crisis in quality but there is a crisis in access because resources are being mis-directed. It is necessary to sacrifice some things in order to do other things well. In order to make these changes intelligently, Davies argued, teaching and research should be united within an "intentional community" organized around a mission statement informing decision-making. Failure to engage in self-criticism will lead to further erosion of political support; to ignore consumer demand for undergraduate teaching is to court disaster. Davies charged that "we do not teach our students through our behavior that community is important."

Richard Rorty (Philosophy, U.Va.) responded by commenting that "American research universities are just fine as they are If you want a research university, this is what you are paying for." Rorty twitted the "intentional community" idea by comparing the university to "a strip mall" of mom and pop stores — the original conception behind Jefferson's Academical Village. As presently constituted, universities fulfill Arnold's plea for sweetness and light, possessing a sweetness that makes universities into communities and a politeness that makes our disinterested inquiry the envy of the world. If universities are to be sacrificed to health care and

public safety, so be it; otherwise, they should be left to govern themselves.

Dominick LaCapra (History, Cornell) commented that in a time of recession, universities have been a growth industry attracting consumers from all over the world; Gib Aiken (Commerce, U.Va.) that it's odd that universities would strive to be more like businesses now that many corporations are striving to curb efficiency to encourage innovation. Some speakers noted the economic contributions of research universities; others that learning cannot be "accounted" through measurement; Bill Reading (Comparative Literature, Montreal) denied the utility of mission statements and suggested that universities should give up trying to be missionaries and instead model themselves on the stock market, a place where value is created and exchanged through a play of differences.

The keynote speech, given by Kenneth G. Wilson (Physics, Ohio State), advocated management strategies that would radically reconceptualize the business of education. The contractual model ("partnership") should yield to a dynamic model ("innovation"): universities should be complex adaptive systems capable of changing from within as well as acting as agents of change without. They can build innovation into their structure through "universities within universities," interdisciplinary centers that would foster faculty development and train new generations of teachers and researchers. Greater efficiencies are possible where teachers are cast in the role of students and students in the role of teachers: learning should be a life-long process in

which universities play a much broader institutional role in business, politics, and community life. Declaring that it would require two days to explicate what he had in mind, Wilson devoted most of his time to taking questions; in a virtuoso performance, he demonstrated the complexity and comprehensiveness of his proposal.

Gordon Davies's notion of intentional community was obviously being tested in the conference itself. Confronted with an extra-disciplinary audience, speakers were nothing if not self-conscious about their differences. Paul Gross (Center for Advanced Studies, U.Va.) attacked the campaign by non-scientists to delegitimize science, courting controversy by juxtaposing accounts of science from post-structuralists with parallel passages extracted from *Mein Kampf*. Herbert Blau (English, Wisconsin-Milwaukee) offered rhapsodic themes and variations on art and economics in a performance that deliberately undermined the conventions of conference presentations. Toril Moi (Literature, Duke) offered criticism in the form of personal history; Alfred Toole (Class III, U.Va.) introduced his paper on compassion by requesting that the audience stand up and shake hands in the aisle.

Naomi Scheman (Philosophy, Minnesota) defended the oppositional role of college faculty while insisting that they be accountable to those other than their peers. Society needs "privileged marginals" who, like animals in a zoo, suffer a repressive tolerance as the price of their isolation. Yet tenured radicals should foster trust by making their knowledge shareable with those who do not enjoy academic privileges. It was remarked that this was a little like aspiring to be Socrates without the hemlock. Bill Reading rejected the idea of organic community; like the nation-state and the liberal individual, the univer-

sity as we know it will pass into history. Kenneth Wilson observed that "why science is important" is a question that cannot be addressed in terms of pure science: social science is required for an answer. LaCapra argued that one can't expect too much from a core curriculum; the real issue is mastering a specialty in a way that engages other specializations; he offered suggestions for turning the "crisis" to good use and proposed adding contributing to "critical intellectual community" to the triad of teaching, research, and service.

Several speakers addressed teaching specifically; Norman F. Ramsay (Physics, Harvard) argued that researchers often make the best teachers and that pedagogy should be made part of graduate instruction. David Summers (Art History, U.Va.) noted that while broadening the canon makes teaching more difficult, this is not necessarily a bad thing since it demands intelligence and flexibility on the part of the teacher. Kathleen Woodward (English, Wisconsin-Milwaukee) noted that economic restructuring and demographic changes should encourage universities to serve students who may be returning to campus at several points in their lives; accountability should extend beyond taxpayers to those who cannot pay taxes and beyond the state or nation to the world.

The relation of teaching to taxes formed the sub-text of Margaret A. Miller's (SCHEV) discussion of educational technologies. Since faculty salaries account for 80% of costs, the efficiencies gained by the use of video and educational software will be vital to trimming expenses. Beyond this, qualitative changes in the student population encourage this development: older students who are place-bound need the university to come to them, while younger students will likely be

more comfortable than their teachers with the "virtual classroom." The "credit hour has become a debased currency"; in any event, it is less important to teach information than how information is organized, accessed, and circulated. Faculty should be rewarded for writing software as opposed to books, and for developments in innovative teaching, particularly those that enable students to teach themselves.

In her summary remarks, Catherine R. Stimpson (Rutgers) noted consensus on the existence of problems, a sense of change, a locus of value in the possibilities of consciousness, and on the need of accountability. She commented on disagreement over the applicability of economic models to the

"We must picture Hell as a state where everyone is perpetually concerned about his own dignity and advancement, where everyone has a grievance, and where everyone lives the deadly serious passions of envy, self-importance, and resentment"

— C. S. Lewis
The Screwtape Letters
(1959)

university, and asked, "Where was the public voice? I hear the voices within the public university, but not the voices of publics about the university."

Ralph Cohen (Commonwealth Center) questioned whether teaching versus research remains a viable distinction when teachers learn within the very process of instruction. Within the academic community, teachers are often cast in the role of students. Both arts and sciences require a recognizable body of knowledge that students and faculty amass; for change to be introduced, these bodies of knowledge will need to be "agreed upon" in ways that require time, work, and teaching. As a "university within a university," organizations like the

Commonwealth Centers can raise questions not addressed elsewhere and thus facilitate change. While technology will enable the university to teach more students with less funds, students and teachers interact through personal relations which it would be a serious loss to give up. Cohen also noted the theme of accountability: universities supply the state with doctors, lawyers, politicians, and scientists. How can such value be measured in economic terms? How can politicians be made to understand that they are accountable for what the

university provides for the state?

I came away from the conference with a sense that the state and its research universities are headed for turbulent times. The kind of root-and-branch changes envisioned by SCHEV went far beyond what many of the participants were prepared to discuss, and were certainly not welcome in some quarters. The research university, as a vast, de-centered enterprise, is unlikely to muster the "intentional community" Gordon Davies envisioned, nor were the notions of accountability offered by many of the speakers likely to

assuage taxpayers angry over the perceived corruption, venality, triviality, and arrogance of the public universities. While the economic crisis is more than a public-relations problem, this matter needs to be addressed quickly in order to secure the resources necessary to begin a restructuring that will likely take many years. If the public domain no longer exists, as several speakers insisted, it may be time for public universities to do something to recreate it. This conference made a tentative first step in that direction.

JOSEF MARTIN: A TIP FOR FACULTY—GET IT IN WRITING

[Josef Martin' is author of *To Rise Above Principle: The Memoirs of an Unreconstructed Dean*]

GOAL:

Not to do the administration's dirty work

when being asked, for example

- a. to improve the retention rate of students (of course, without being told *how* to do that); or
- b. to allow students who have missed class "to make up" for it (not being told, of course, *how* that might be possible); or
- c. to give special consideration to the learning disabled (not being told, of course, *what* special consideration to give, or how much of it); or
- d. to remember how valuable the student is to the football team (without being told, of course, *what action* on your part such remembering is supposed to engender);
- e. to incorporate into the curriculum the contributions to science of indigenous Stone-Age peoples (see p.8)
and so on, since there's no end to unsavory attempts by administrators to evade responsibility by having others do the dirty work that, the administration has decided, needs to be done to serve some higher purpose

STRATEGY:

Be cooperative

TACTIC: Always **say** "Yes" but **do** the following:

1. Solicit more-and-more detailed advice about *how* to go about doing it
and
2. keep forgetting to actually do it ("I'm getting more absent-minded every day"; "My memory isn't what it used to be"; "When it came down to it, I found I wasn't sure I understood exactly what you'd meant")
so that
3. it seems only natural when you beg to have a reminder *in writing* (whereupon, ideally, you'll get the chance to be non-plussed: "Oh, is there some problem about putting it in writing to help me do it right?")

[Editorial comment: Unfortunately, professors only ever dream of asking administrators to put things in writing, they never actually do it. Who has ever responded to the query, delivered wide-eyed with disbelief, "What's the matter, don't you trust me?", with the plain truth, "No, as a matter of fact, I don't"? Misguided politeness is the problem, just as we are never sufficiently curt when unsolicited sales-pitches by telephone interrupt our meals.]

WHY GOING TO COLLEGE HAS BECOME SO EXPENSIVE IN VIRGINIA

Part Two: Teaching versus Research?

BY JOSEF MARTIN WITH HENRY BAUER

Synopsis of Part I: *The issue of making efficient use of classrooms reveals that—*

1. *Coherence in making and carrying out policy is far from the rule in academe. The wide diffusion of authority leaves colleges and universities full of left and right hands that don't know — and, truth to tell, don't much care — what the others are doing.*
2. *Simple-minded use of numerical data supposedly indicative of what actually goes on and what should go on in higher education yields proposals that would do considerably more harm than good.*
3. *Lip service is given to the primacy of teaching, but resources for it are not assigned that priority.*

That lack of clear and effective priorities may well be the single most telling factor in what's wrong in higher education today, including its inflated cost. It's not only that intellectual matters — teaching, learning, scholarship, research — aren't given clear priority; it's that nothing takes clear priority. Our universities have become arenas in which disparate and self-serving interest-groups jockey for influence: students, faculty, administrators; women, racial groups, people of unorthodox sexual dispositions, miscellaneous victims — and those outcasts who lack any such distinction; non-faculty professional staff, non-academic employees, alumni, sports fans. It's so messy because there's no overriding purpose that all agree they should serve.

We'll say more about that in future issues. In this Part Two of our analysis, we address the confusion about "teaching and research". The widespread presumption, that these represent two competing and even incompatible interests, misses the most significant fact about what "research" in a university means — namely, the training of graduate students.

To the media and the public, teaching is readily measured by "teaching loads" and graduation rates: the usual, simple-minded and mind-numbing recourse to numbers.

The Virginia newspapers' exposé was no exception: "Some Virginia professors spend less time in the classroom every week than most people spend in their office every day", they announced; "the typical UVa faculty member, making \$52,800 and teaching 28 weeks a year, gets more than \$300 for every hour in the lecture hall".

"Good Lord!" said Gov. Douglas Wilder. "The pure data does surprise me . . . This is it?"

No doubt Wilder was thoroughly enjoying having tongue in cheek here. Being one himself, he knows how much lawyers get for their time in court: also hundreds of dollars per hour; but lawyers too have to spend a lot of time *not* in court, *in preparation* for that.

How much do ministers get for every hour in the pulpit? And how much do really *successful* preachers like Billy Graham get per appearance-hour?

What do football coaches earn per hour on the sidelines during games? Legislators, per hour in deliberative assembly? Musicians, per performance-hour? Athletes, per hour of actual competition? And how much are journalists paid for each printed word?

* * * * *

One can't usefully discuss teaching, let alone the relation between teaching and research, without being clear about what teaching involves. The common fallacy is to presume that "teaching" means what a grade-school teacher does and what a university professor does, the only difference being in the ages of the students. That's more wrong than right.

Students begin grade school unable to learn much of anything intellectual by themselves. Teaching requires constant attention by the teacher to each student. The teacher's job is to *make* some learning happen, to instruct students how to begin to learn for themselves and by themselves: "Memorize this. Write that. Practice". Grade-school students need to be trained how to learn,

and they have to be told what to learn.

High school has been successful if its graduates have learned how to learn by themselves; if they are able to master new things by reading books of all sorts, by using libraries, catalogues, reference books. A high-school graduate should be able to earn a living in most everyday pursuits while continuing with self-education as needed or desired — and in most developed countries that is the case. But some careers require a lengthier period of *schooling*, of *academic* or *intellectual* learning — "higher education". Hence colleges and universities.

What's different about "teaching" college students and grade-school students? College students ought to know already, how to learn largely by themselves. Particularly in the natural and applied sciences, there's so much material to be memorized that a few hours per week in a classroom are entirely inadequate to go over it all, let alone commit it to memory. In grade school, "homework" is additional

practice or reading to reinforce what was covered in the classroom; in college, class meetings can only emphasize or explicate a few of the points that students must themselves have learned from texts and reference works.

Learning by yourself isn't easy. The college "teacher's" job is to know the subject and its literature so well that he can smooth the learners' task: by choosing the best portions of the best texts to be read, by commenting on the texts' inadequacies and lacunae, by explaining what isn't clear in the books; by setting goals and standards that ensure that a reasonable amount of learning gets done in a reasonable amount of time; by illustrating and exemplifying *how to think* about the subject — for thinking about history isn't at all the same thing as thinking about mathematics, say, or about chemistry.

Through the level of undergraduate college, it's a matter of transmitting and helping to transmit knowledge, of making available to learners what humankind knows. But new things are steadily being discovered. Our society is convinced of the value of such novelty. Modern industry and technology are characterized by the continual drive to improve products and devise new ones.

That's the essential difference between the life-styles of modern cultures and of traditional ones, between developed countries and not developed ones. In the latter, the old ways of doing things are the good and right ways; in the former, it's believed that there can always be a new and better way of doing things. To support the modern life-style, some people need to learn how to make discoveries, how to invent new ways of doing things. That's what graduate education is for.

It's quite an art, to devise new ways of transforming matter and energy into useful products or to extract new understanding from

Nature. We aren't prepared to make new discoveries just through having read "everything" about some part of a field like chemistry or geology. We need to be trained in "research", which is a very different thing from learning about what's already known.

Graduate education means learning how to do research. The only way to learn that is by doing it. The only people one can learn it from are people who do it themselves.

That's the best short definition of university research*: work that allows graduate students to learn

**MORE ADVERTISING
BOILER-PLATE**

Since every employer is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer, the continuing repetition of that (ugly, unsyntactical) phrase would seem to be superfluous. Omitting it would save space, paper, and thereby trees. But rather than shortening these things, more and more similar features get added, as when MIT notes not only that it is an EO/AA place but also that "MIT is a non-smoking environment".

— *Chemical & Engineering News* 92:6:22, p.77

how to do research. The faculty instruct through being available to graduate students at all sorts of hours, in and out of laboratories and offices, through working together with them. It's a master-apprentice relationship, and to attempt to measure it in "contact hours" is absurd — let alone in *classroom* contact-hours.

The more able the researcher, the better served can be his students. But also the better the re-

* Universities have come to house other forms of research too. That's another story again, and we'll get to it in due course.

searcher, the more is he called on to consult with industry, to advise governments, to participate in conferences, to review the research proposals and manuscripts of others. No life, even including being President of the United States, is more time-consuming, more all-consuming, than that of front-rank scientific researcher. Such people can be judged only by what they accomplish, not by the time they spend on various aspects of their work.

* * * * *

So there are several quite distinct sorts of "teaching" and of teachers:

Grade-school teachers need know nothing about how to do research. What they need to teach their students hardly changes over the years. They become better teachers through learning steadily how to interact better with children, how to assess and handle individual differences, about how fast they can proceed.

In community colleges, teachers have little autonomy, because the courses and textbooks are largely determined by the four-year colleges to which some of the community-college graduates hope to go. Teachers in these "junior" colleges have a different task than do high-school teachers, but not that much different. In many cases, they need to remedy what the high schools failed at, namely instructing students how to go about learning.

Teachers of undergraduate students in four-year colleges bear among other things the responsibility of *designing curricula*, thereby deciding what educated, cultivated citizens ought to be familiar with. These faculty should not only be well versed in their special field, they should be *cultivated*, well rounded intellectually. They need to be aware of what's happening in the significant other academic disciplines, in education generally, in the wider society. They also need to

keep up with new developments in their special subjects, because the textbooks lag greatly behind the actual state of understanding. They need to choose among texts, to design hierarchical arrays of courses and programs; *they need to write the textbooks*, to develop the computer programs, to make the videos. Preparing college courses is not a matter of explicating standard knowledge, following some standard textbook: it is a matter of affording students an informed, individual view of the state of the subject, presented in the way that seems most suited to the learners' level of sophistication. At the college level, the amount of time needed to prepare for a given class hour begins to approximate the time it takes a minister to prepare a sermon, a lawyer to prepare a case for court, a legislator to sponsor a bill, a coach to plan and organize a season's activities.

So the "teaching load", measured in classroom "contact hours", must necessarily be somewhat lighter for community-college instructors than it is for grade-school teachers; and considerably lighter for teachers in four-year colleges; while for graduate faculty, classroom "contact hours" are meaningless.

* * * * *

The distinctions among different sorts of teachers are reflected by differences in typical salaries: on average, about 15% less at four-year universities, and about 25% less at community colleges, than at doctoral-level universities (numbers calculated from the listings in *Academe*, March-April 1992).

So different is teaching undergraduates from instructing graduate students that universities often divided their faculty into "undergraduate" and "graduate": only the latter could supervise dissertations or teach graduate courses. (The distinction has become less common as universities

have come to expect, to *demand*, that *all* their faculty be engaged in publishable research.)

Commonly, this distinction between undergraduate and graduate faculty is interpreted invidiously, as though graduate faculty were somehow "better" than undergraduate. As a practical matter, though, the distinction follows necessarily from the different types of work and the associated market forces. Lower teaching loads, as we've pointed out, follow from the quite different tasks that graduate faculty perform. But to be noted above all is that people qualified to serve as graduate faculty compete

AND STILL LONGER ADS

Instead of just a phrase or a single line, we get a fuller account: "St. Lawrence University is committed to fostering multicultural diversity in its faculty, staff, student body and programs of instruction. As an Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action employer, we specifically encourage applications from women, minorities and persons with disabilities"

— *Chemical & Engineering News* 92:6:22, p.77

in an *international* community, which is not the case at the undergraduate level. Accomplished, honored, cultivated teachers of undergraduates often spend their whole career in the same college, whereas researchers almost never do.

So when newspapers, legislators, or other pundits make such suggestions as, "Let's increase teaching loads", that makes different degrees of (non)sense for different institutions. For the research universities, it's *sheer* nonsense, because it is not within the power of the Commonwealth to define what such a university is and what the circumstances of

teaching and learning and researching in it shall be, even as the Commonwealth pays some of the bills. The Commonwealth can only decide, *whether or not* to have research universities. If it decides to have some, it can further decide whether or not to have *good* ones. Actually increasing the teaching loads would be a decision *not* to have *good* research universities: it would drive the best faculty away at a rate depending on opportunities elsewhere. The universities would sink to mediocrity and finally cease to be graduate institutions worthy of the name or worth supporting.

It's slightly less nonsensical for the Commonwealth to attempt to increase teaching loads at four-year universities — but not all that much less. The market for faculty may not be directly or altogether a national one, yet over the years and decades, attracting the best faculty means offering conditions of work that are not tangibly worse than those offering in other States. Teachers at community colleges and in grade schools are typically less inclined to be mobile, but still in the course of time a State that treats them appreciably worse than other States do, will find itself with inferior teachers.

* * * * *

Does that mean that States are quite helpless to control the costs of education, of higher education in particular? Of course not. In later Parts of this analysis, we will point to many ways in which costs could be reduced without decreasing — or while also increasing — the quality of learning or of scholarship. But States can even control what the average teaching loads are: not however by decreeing that individual faculty shall teach more than the accepted norms happen to be, but by making sensible decisions about how many doctoral-level universities to support, how many

other universities and four-year colleges, how many community colleges.

On average, community-college teachers face classes for 12 to 15 hours each week. Faculty in four-year colleges and universities, for 9 to 12 hours. Faculty at research universities, for about 6. To increase the average teaching load, it is only necessary to decrease the number of students and faculty at research universities and to increase the numbers at the others. Not only would this increase the average teaching load *over the Commonwealth as a whole* without changing the individual working conditions of a single professor, it would also decrease the total payroll because of the lower salaries of community-college and four-year-university professors.

Such policy-making has in any case long been called for. In Virginia as in the other States of the Union, after the end of World War II "research universities" sprouted like weeds*. Almost every teacher's college became a four-year college. Many four-year colleges took the title of "university". And every university, of course, strove to become a *research* university. The universities and their leaders took it for granted that this was a good thing, and no public dissent was heard. States didn't hesitate to allow or encourage these ambitions, these changes of mission, despite the far-reaching consequences: in the sort of faculty hired, and what they believe they were hired to do, and how little time they expect to spend in the classroom, and the need they have for graduate programs and

* There were 107 doctorate-granting institutions in the U.S. in the early 1940s. Thirty years later there were 307 (*A Century of Doctorates*, National Academy of Sciences, 1978).

UNIVERSITIES ARE IN THE BUSINESS OF . . . TRUTH?

"The University of Virginia hired an internationally known public relations firm . . . Hill and Knowlton . . . 'to make sure that we were presenting our information in a way that would be understood . . . It was important that we respond and release information that would not inappropriately serve the disadvantage of the university' . . . Hill and Knowlton represents such diverse clients as the Bank of Credit and Commerce International, or BCCI"

— *Roanoke Times & World-News* 92:2:3, p.A4

graduate students, and so on. Part of the trouble, of course and as usual, is that governors and legislators didn't understand what was involved, what the in-built expansion of cost was, what they let themselves in for every time a "College" was allowed to change its name to "University".

By now, the Commonwealth of Virginia has six doctorate-level institutions (though one of them, William & Mary, has kept the honorable title of "College"); another three universities (James Madison, Radford, Virginia State) have many graduate-level (professional and masters-level) programs but few if any independent doctoral programs. There are half-a-dozen public, strictly baccalaureate, colleges; as well as the two dozen community colleges. Were anyone planning anew for higher education in the Commonwealth of Virginia, it would be obvious that fewer graduate centers than this are needed.

Yet SCHEV and the legislature have approved the continuing proliferation of graduate, even doctoral programs at other than the major research universities. Most recently, for example, it

seems that Radford University will get a doctoral program in audiology. The rationale sounds reasonable enough if one doesn't understand the full implications of what graduate programs are: there is a need felt by at least some groups; it doesn't duplicate such programs elsewhere in the Commonwealth; Radford intends only to fill such unoccupied "niches" in graduate work and not to seek to become a fully graduate-education-and-research-university.

But all this ignores the fundamental difference between graduate and undergraduate education; that the faculty who participate in such programs have distinctly different sorts of responsibilities; that when a single institution has some departments that offer graduate work and others that do not, pressure builds up inexorably to have graduate programs in all the Departments; and when some Departments have doctoral programs and others "only" master's-level ones, pressure builds constantly to find at least "niches" for doctoral programs in other Departments. That's because in any department, professors who are not on the Graduate Faculty feel like second-class citizens compared to those who do; in any university, Departments that have no graduate program feel inferior and disdained compared to those that do.

In a single institution, it isn't feasible — or at least it isn't desirable — to maintain the differentials of salary between graduate faculty and undergraduate faculty that the market-place has established as between research universities and four-year colleges. The only viable way of having diversity in higher education is to maintain a strict division of missions among research universities, four-year universities or colleges, and community colleges; and it's surely obvious that one needs far fewer doctoral-

level universities than any of the others.

The single most effective thing the Commonwealth could do, to cut the *overall, State-wide* costs of higher education — and incidentally to increase the average teaching load — would be to place a total, permanent ban on the establishment of new doctoral programs at any but the designated research universities. (A truly hard-headed approach would also phase out existing graduate programs at the other institutions, but of course that lies well beyond the realm of political possibility.)

* * * * *

The Virginia newspapers' discussion, "Professors not often in class", was empty of understanding of these necessary distinctions among institutions; and so it was misguided. Not only that: it also did a terrible disservice in its treatment of specifics, not least in naming and holding up for criticism some of the most dedicated and accomplished as well as distinguished individuals in our universities.

It is of course the case that undergraduate students at research universities don't have much contact with the most famous of the professors; and that they are often taught by graduate students. But undergraduates who want a different environment are perfectly free to go to a four-year institution; indeed they *should* do so, they should be *encouraged* to do so, unless they want and can benefit from the special atmosphere of a research university. Those who need a lot of attention, who are comparatively little self-driven, those who enjoy small classes, shouldn't go to research universities, shouldn't be advised or enticed to go there; the high visibility that comes from research and from Division-I intercollegiate athletics promises nothing about undergraduate instruction. But some undergradu-

ates do benefit very much from the atmosphere in a research university, and from being taught by graduate students. Let us not forget, in all the criticism of classes taught by graduate assistants, that these are the peers in talent and in age of individuals who have made some of history's greatest advances. Moreover they are the next generation of teachers, and need to learn about teaching by doing it, just as medical interns must be allowed to treat patients even while they themselves are still "in school".

The best plan for higher education is *diversity*: a small number of research universities, a larger number of four-year universities, a larger number of places for students at community colleges. That makes sense academically, and it happens also to be in economic terms the most efficient.

(TO BE CONTINUED)

POTPOURRI

[contd. from p. 6]

E-mail

There's been talk of setting up an electronic bulletin board on which VAS members could be in rapid contact with one another. Anyone with knowledge of how to go about it, or access to the necessary facilities, is urgently invited to get in touch with us.

In the meantime, it would be worth having the e-mail addresses of all members who can be reached electronically — for news-gathering, story-checking, informing about events of interest, and so forth. A current instance is the expected visit to Virginia at the end of March by Steve Balch, President of the National Association of Scholars: it would be nice to be able, rapidly, to give members details of his schedule, including almost inevitable last-minute adjustments.

Present expectations are that he'll be in the Tidewater area on the 28th, Blacksburg on the 29th, and Charlottesville on the 30th.

So please, next time you're at the terminal, send me a message and I'll add your e-mail address to the mailing address in our files. (Those who are also members of the National Association will have seen in the latest issue of its Newsletter a similar request. We plan to cooperate with NAS headquarters in updating membership lists and addresses.)

Technical trivia

We're strictly amateurs at desktop publishing and have used available equipment to produce this newsletter: Epson Equity II (a 286 IBM-compatible computer) with 1 Meg RAM; HPIIP laser printer with PacificPage P-E cartridge (we're using its New Century Schoolbook typeface); MicroSoft Word

for DOS 6.0. (Word 5.5 would serve as well on a similar computer since the fuller capabilities of 6.0 run much too slowly to be used on a 286 with so little memory.)

We would certainly recommend a faster computer with much more memory. On the other hand, the PacificPage cartridge (or similar PostScript augmentation) is unnecessary now that TrueType fonts are available in Word 6.0.

Thank you!

— to the non-member friend who donated \$50 in lieu of dues to help with our work

— to 'Frederick Douglass', David Radcliffe, and 'O. Sinnebild' for their contributions to this issue

— to Golde Holtzman for drawing to my attention the book reviewed in this issue

— to all the Moles and Whistles who let us know what's really happening

From Swastika to Jim Crow: Refugee Scholars at Black Colleges by Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb

(Krieger Publishing. Co., P. O. Box 9542, Melbourne, FL 32902-9542, phone (407) 724-9542); \$12.50 (p).

This book focuses on refugees from Nazism who found academic havens away from the mainstream centers of American academe. In addition, owing to the author's commendable desire to put her material into necessary context, readers benefit from thumbnail sketches about anti-semitism in 1930s American academe (chapter 1), about the limitations on aid to refugees from Germany to the U.S. (chapter 2), about the education of Black Americans in the segregated South (chapter 3), and about Black attitudes toward Jews (chapter 4).

I feel obliged to note that this short (144 pages) book suffers some deficiencies of presentation and continuity; it seems at times more the raw data for a book than the finished product. But the material is of such high interest that I recommend the book unreservedly, raising as it does some perennial questions about academe, discrimination, and the like that are key issues in our time.

I found fascinating the hard-headed and overt concentration on doing what was possible, on saving the *best*, that moved influential people in the refugee-helping business: that seems from another world, in these soft-headed days when it's heretical — or even a form of punishable harassment — to suggest that some people may be more intellectually meritorious than others. How much has changed in a half-century is shown too by reminders of how insular and un-self-confident was the United States before World War II, when Britain with its Empire was still the super-power. How much has changed in just a couple of decades was brought home by the chilling reminders — including starkly effective photos on the book's covers — of the segregated South, where up to so very recently the U.S. was doing what in latter years it felt able to criticize in South Africa.

Edgcomb's tidbits from Black American newspapers of the 1930s reveal them as more prescient about Nazi Germany than was official U.S. policy or the mainstream press; and also quick to note the hypocrisy of oppressing Black Americans while deploring Nazi treatment of Jews. It is interesting, too, to be reminded that the Nazi press cheerfully made the same point, albeit with the opposite intent.

For many refugees, marginality was piled on marginality: "[In Europe, we more-or-less assimilated Jews] had had Christmas trees. But this was here [in America] resented by the Jewish people . . . we're isolated because . . . [w]e are Germans . . . Jews . . . have Negroes at our house, and we have no money". At places, we're reminded that some refugees never could come to proper terms with what they had experienced under Nazidom; at others, what an extraordinarily lucky country America

has been — "wonderful that a questionnaire asks me whether I am *happy*; I don't believe that could happen anywhere in the world except in this country", wrote one of the refugee scholars.

Talk of role models: how courageous some of these refugee scholars were in their refusal to follow the strictures to practice racial segregation, though their positions were always among the most precarious. Of course, the paradox is a human characteristic, that people who have the least security will often act selflessly out of conscience while those who think they have something to lose find reason to be cowardly.

Led to think about role models, I asked myself, "What role models could have been of help to people who suddenly found themselves persecuted by Nazis? What role model could have been useful to 7-year-old Heinz, ejected suddenly from his school in Austria, seeing his father locked up and his mother made to scrub from the streets symbols painted there for that purpose only? What role model might have led him to aspire to become a Dean in an American university?" The current faddish preoccupation with mentors and role models presumes — against all probability — that society will remain largely unchanged for decades; whereas history — and certainly the history of refugees from Hitler — teaches that the broadest liberal education, the greatest degree of intellectual cultivation, the highest degree of acquired competence best serves people under the uncertainties that life so commonly brings.

Why do some of the oppressed react with such effective vigor while some others succumb? One of the perennial questions that this book raises. We hear it asked, for instance, why legal de-segregation has not yet brought more enterprise into Black communities. It occurred to me that, as the doings of various "minority groups" are compared and contrasted, perhaps a distinction ought to be made between groups who experience sudden oppression out of the blue, by contrast to those who have experienced it traditionally, as Blacks have in America. I recalled the complaint of a Scottish socialist friend in the 1950s, that so many of his family and friends and under-class mates were nevertheless staunch voting supporters of the Conservatives instead of the Labor Party. The point is that social cultures change only slowly. Against all the mistaken generalizations made about race relations and about human relations, perhaps one little quote from one of the refugee scholars bears repeating and repeating: "What people haven't learned, they do not know". Instead of blaming them or writing them off, try educating.

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

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