

LETTERS *from Santa Fe*

St. John's College—Santa Fe, New Mexico

Fall 1993



INSIDE

THE IMPACT OF SPECIALIZATION

page 2

THE FUTURE OF TEACHING

page 5

THE TYRANNICAL MACHINE

page 9

THE CHARGE THAT RESEARCH IS NARROW AND OPAQUE IS DECADES OUT OF DATE

page 14

SENSE AND NONSENSE

page 17

MAR 1994
LIBRARY
St. John's
College
Santa Fe NM

RESEARCH AND TEACHING

Something has happened to teaching. Simply put, at some point, I know not when, it stopped being the highest function and core calling of many professors. At some point it dawned on administrators in higher education that it was easier to count books and articles in refereed journals, or check off the number of times an article was cited elsewhere, than make the difficult judgments required on something as subjective as good teaching. As everyone now knows, the money and the rewards are less in teaching than in research and publishing.

My favorite example is not actually from the U.S. but from a university in Mexico City where, as one of our tutors at St. John's discovered, you get points for various activities. For instance, you will get 3300 points for publishing a research paper. For teaching a course for one semester, you will get 210 points. For writing a textbook or a computer package, you will get 6600 points. For directing a thesis, you will get 220 points. For getting a patent you will get almost 7000 points; if you're on a thesis committee, merely 60. And he who wraps up the most points gets the promotion and the higher pay.

The status of teaching in America may not be as cut and dried as it is south of the border, but I recently received a request from a very good foundation for a list of the best teachers of history here at my college. Why? To reward them with a year off from classroom teaching. The personnel offices of big corporations repeatedly say how highly they value a liberal arts education, and then consistently hire people with technical or business degrees. So also do universities consistently proclaim their devotion to good teaching and consistently reward something else. This emphasis on the value of research is particularly odd in the humanities, where research, rather than widening our view of important matters, has probably subtracted from the sum of human knowledge.

I'm not going to get into an argument over whether or not some research scholarship does not, at times, prove a great benefit for classroom teaching—of course it might. Or that researchers are not great teachers—of course some are. All I mean to say is the obvious as well as the empirically verifiable: that less time is spent on teaching today than before, that fewer university rewards are given for teaching, and that where there are great scholar-teachers, such benefits as have accrued have accrued to their scholarship, and often works to the detriment of their hours in the classroom.

With the selection of the articles in this issue, I have tried to present something of the history of the conflict between research and teaching as well as anecdotal evidence of the problems it leaves in its wake.

THE IMPACT OF SPECIALIZATION

by
Frederick Rudolph

*Subjects and courses
were often offered not
because students wanted
or needed them but
because an essentially
autonomous group of
academic professionals
could and would teach
nothing else.*

The American liberal arts college was of pre-industrial origin. Its concern with the education of gentlemen, its lack of sympathy with many of the egalitarian and exploitive impulses of the age, and its Christian orientation suffused the classical curriculum and the humanistic style of the old colleges. The American university, on the other hand, was a child of the new order, a product of the Industrial Revolution eager to play a central role in the refinement and specialization of knowledge and in the training of cadres of experts to keep the machinery of society running.

Once the university began to define the mission of American higher education, the colleges were essentially contrary institutions, evoking the old values, suspicious of much that specialization celebrated, preferring to regard higher education as primarily a center for humanistic study, social criticism, and ethical concern. Increasingly the colleges found themselves at a disadvantage, even anachronistic in an age that was being defined by specialists, corporate bureaucracies, growth, and consolidation. The curricular battles of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries must in some ways be seen as struggles between the demands and needs of the professionals—including the professional academicians—and the

traditional concerns and purposes of the colleges as sources of enlightened and responsible community leadership.

The impact of the universities on the undergraduate curriculum was devastating. They promoted old vocations learned on the job into new professions, certified by the universities' own professional schools. They dignified old utilities with new learning, revealing an appetite for new subjects and a receptivity to applied science that allied them openly with the industrial order. They identified themselves as agents of social mobility by offering the courses that appeared to lead the way into corporate and government bureaucracies. In asserting the equality of all subjects, as did Ezra Cornell and Charles William Eliot each in his own way, they invited an expanding clientele to join them—the universities—in their own version of the meritocratic bureaucratic system.

It is no wonder that it was difficult to keep a clear vision of purpose, to give order to academic priorities, or even to remember that higher education had once revealed more concern for the conduct of society than for the ambitions of individual men, more interest in shaping a human community than in shaping individual careers. In an atmosphere of confused purpose, jumbled priorities, and forgetfulness, the universities and the colleges that aped them had no difficulty in offering a course of study equally confused, jumbled, and forgetful.

* * * * *

Perhaps this is the place to dispel the false dichotomy that often clouds any consideration of the useful and the liberal in higher

LETTERS from Santa Fe

A newsletter on higher education.

Published at St. John's College, Santa Fe

Submit letters or comments to:

John Agresto, President

St. John's College

1160 Camino Cruz Blanca

Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501-4599

Telephone (505) 984-6098 Fax (505) 984-6003

Lesli Allison, Editor

Patrick Daugherty, Design

Copyright © 1993 by

St. John's College, Santa Fe.

We are very grateful to the
Laurel Foundation
for their generous support of
LETTERS from Santa Fe.

education. Liberal studies were from the beginning eminently useful even if they were not specific in their vocational focus. The skills and attitudes of an educated man were expected to be vocationally useful. It was not enough, however, for a liberal study to be useful; it also had to possess the dimension that made it liberal. The vocational subjects, the professional curriculum, the technical utilities that made their way into the colleges could not justify their liberal pretensions without providing that "something else" that differentiated liberal studies from the rest. What was that something else?

The difference between a liberal subject and one that was not was the degree to which there was an emphasis on cognitive skills, rational analysis, the stuff it took to be communicative—clear, expressive, imaginative. A liberal course of study invited contemplation, a look inward, an assessment, even a reassessment of self and society. "Something" went on in the old colleges that helped their graduates to be recognized as possessing a certain style, a moral stance, a reliability in taste and values, a capacity to analyze and even to imagine derived from that amalgam of experiences known as "going to college." It was precisely that "something" that liberal arts colleges nurtured.

The growth of professionalism changed who went to college, what they sought there, and who taught there. The consequences for liberal learning, associated as it was with an earlier professionalism, a narrow governing elite, and a less secular orientation, were dramatic—challenging and subversive but not fatal, for

much was missing in the new order, as attractive as its dynamism and energy and authority may have been. And that "much" included a social ethic, an element of human concern and regard for community.

The professionalization of the professors and the proliferation of academic specialists helped to fuel the institutional rivalries that made academic life very much like industrial life. The competition for professors, the rivalries between departments, the focus on size and numbers and growth, and the



appearance of endless numbers of specialists in a growing number of departments led to a kind of acquisitiveness and imperialism that made students both objects of conquest and victims of professional indifference. To that end the curriculum was an expression of the power of the professional academicians. Subjects and courses were often offered not because students wanted or needed them but because an essentially autonomous group of academic professionals could and would teach nothing else. To compensate for the unpalatable offerings of one kind of academic specialist, the institutions acknowledged their responsibilities to the student clients and the need to bolster enrollments by offering students what they wanted in the way of

undemanding courses and career-oriented programs in the neoprofessional and technical studies. Ironically, when the professors abandoned a curriculum that they thought students needed, they substituted for it one that, instead, catered either to what the professors needed or what the students wanted. The results confirmed the authority of the professors and students but they robbed the curriculum of any authority at all.

The reaction of students to all this activity in the curriculum was brilliant. They concluded that the curriculum really didn't matter. Their response was an accelerating growth of the extracurriculum, an explosion of fraternities, sororities, and athletic teams that in one sense overwhelmed the course of study. Nothing is more revealing of the depth of this point of view than the failed effort of many institutions, including Harvard in the 1890s, to reduce the course to three years. Students would have none of it: they were not there for the courses. They were there for the fun, the sociability, the experiences that gave shape to character, personality, and individual promise.

Even as the professional academicians were insinuating intellectual focus into the curriculum, moving away from values and ethics and all those sticky questions that the classical college was comfortable with, the students were relocating such concerns in their fraternities and athletic teams. It would be embarrassing if widely known, but the heir to Mark Hopkin's mantle was not the new professional professor of philosophy but the football

coach. An elective curriculum allowed students to get what they wanted, but what they wanted was not really very much, since they had long since learned that the jobs they would one day hold depended far less on the courses they took than on the firmness of their handshake and the directness of their eye.

* * * * *

Out there in the real world employers who say that they prefer business or engineering majors really do not care very much about the technical content of undergraduate education. They know as well as the rest of us that most of what makes a person effective on the job is learned on the job, something that anyone with a Ph.D. degree knows without having to be told. What that business or engineering major means to an employer is that the young man or woman in question has not been contaminated by the

liberal arts, subverted by the liberal ethos.

If the American college graduate is weak in analysis and the spirit of inquiry, unable to communicate in his own or any other language clearly and effectively, and with it all, ethically unsure and ignorant of his own history and culture, the responsibility lies not with the schools or with college and university presidents, nor with the politicians or the people, but with the professors. They have the power to change the curriculum. They should not be allowed to get away with pointing the finger of responsibility elsewhere.

Professionalism among the professors, their narrow specialization, the complete neglect in their training of any concern with teaching or with any professional responsibility other than to scholarship, are conditions that inhibit optimism about whether even liberal arts colleges can in fact teach liberally.

Too many teachers of liberal subjects are so far gone into specialization and into the scientific understanding of their specialties that the challenges of teaching, of bringing students into a humanistic relationship with their subjects, are beyond their interest or capacity. And, these days, the uncertainties of the academic job market and the territorial behavior that goes along with academic departments all but disqualify the professors from thinking creatively and responsibly about what a comprehensive and coherent college education ought to be. But, this is where any reform must begin. The professors have the power. They must be encouraged to use it responsibly.

Excerpted from: "The Power of Professors: The Impact of Specialization and Professionalization on the Curriculum" that originally appeared in Change magazine, May/June 1984.

SCHOLARS AND SOCIETY

From "Scholars and Society," a speech by Lynne Cheney, former chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, to the American Council of Learned Societies, New York, April 15, 1988.

When new theoretical interests are added to specialization, the problem of communication becomes even more severe. Not only does the public fail to understand us; sometimes we don't even understand each other. Last month, a professor at South Puget Sound Community College handed me a current issue of a well-known scholarly journal. He wanted to point out a long article in it that he regarded as largely impenetrable. One sentence in the article—part of an explanation for a three-part chart—reads as follows:

Second, the denotative-connotative-stereoscopic triplet is indebted to David Bleich's idea of language as a Casirerian "symbolic form" capable of creating knowledge that is "always a re-cognition because it is a seeing through one perspective superimposed in [sic] another in such a way that the one perspective does not appear to be prior to the other" (a process described by Jean Piaget as "the internal reciprocal assimilation of schemata"), the kind of knowledge occasioned "when we 'get' a joke; more specifically and pertinently, such "stereoscopic knowledge" involves language evoking the "perspectival possibilities" of always interdependent denotation and connotation."

The Puget Sound professor would probably not have taken the trouble to point out this article, except for the fact that its topic is how to teach English.

THE FUTURE OF TEACHING

by
William Arrowsmith

I am suggesting what will doubtless seem paradox or treason: There is no necessary link between scholarship and education, or between research and culture, and in actual practice scholarship is no longer a significant educational force. Scholars, to be sure, are unprecedentedly powerful, but their power is professional and technocratic; as educators they have been eagerly disqualifying themselves for more than a century, and their disqualification is now nearly total. The scholar has disowned the student—that is, the student who is not a potential scholar—and the student has reasonably retaliated by abandoning the scholar. This, I believe, is the only natural reading of what I take to be a momentous event: the secession of the student from the institutions of higher learning on the grounds that they no longer educate and are therefore, in his word, irrelevant. By making education the slave of scholarship, the university has renounced its responsibility to human culture and its old proud claim to possess, as educator and molder of men, an ecumenical function. It has disowned in short what teaching has always meant; a care and concern for the future of man, a Platonic love of the species, not for what it is, but what it might be. It is a momentous refusal. I do not exaggerate. When the president of Cornell seriously proposes that the university should

abandon liberal education so that specialization can begin with matriculation, and when he advocates this in order to reconcile the conflicting claims of research and teaching, it should be obvious even to the skeptical that education is being strangled in its citadel, and strangled furthermore on behalf of the crassest technocracy. I find it difficult to imagine the rationalization of these salaried wardens of a great, ecumenical tradition, who apparently view themselves and the institutions they administer as mere servants of national and professional interests.

* * * * *

What students want is not necessarily what they need; but in this case it is the students who are right and the universities that are wrong. Here, unmistakably, we have students concerned to ask the crucial questions—identity, meaning, right and wrong, the good life—and they get in response not bread but a stone. Almost without exception the response of the universities to this profound hunger for education, for compelling examples of human courage and compassionate intelligence, has been mean, parochial, uncomprehending or cold. Above all, cold. Why, you ask, is teaching held in contempt? Because it has become contemptible by indifference. Teaching has been fatally trivialized by scholarship which has become trivial.

* * * * *

The Colleges

I can think of no more conspicuous failure of leadership than in the liberal arts colleges. With a few notable exceptions, the record of

*. . . we have students
concerned to ask the
crucial questions—identity,
meaning, right and
wrong, the good life—
and they get in
response not bread
but a stone.*

the college is one of failure, at least if judged by its own claims. Whatever else it may be, Socratic it is not, in faculty, in style, in results. This I take to be a matter of fact. Certainly it is hard to imagine a more damningly documented indictment of the liberal arts college than that of the Jacob study, with its bleak conclusion that, apart from three or four colleges, the effect of college teaching on student values is simply nil, zero, and that what

from within. They have recruited their faculties heavily from the major graduate institutions, and these recruits have inevitably altered the tone and finally the function of the colleges. There has doubtless been pressure from the graduate schools, but for the most part the colleges have consented to the process. And they are now in the ludicrous position of proudly claiming, on the one hand, that seventy-odd percent of their gradu-

higher regard for the teacher and a corresponding tolerance of the student. If the wealthier colleges have managed to recruit able faculty, the poor colleges have fared badly, recruiting second- and third-rate Ph.D.'s, who for their part regard the college as an academic boondocks and lust for the day when they can return to the urban Edens of research. In the meantime they teach the only thing they know—technical expertise—and thereby both corrupt their students and refuse their Socratic opportunities. The colleges, in short, have yoked themselves to Pharaoh's chariot and, if they regret their loss of function, they have only themselves to blame. A handful of small colleges have dared to break the bond of snobbery and respectability that binds the college to the university, and they have done so simply by daring to profess the values they assert and finding teachers who profess them too.

I am, of course, in violent disagreement with those who believe that "the selective liberal arts colleges of the future. . . must become first-rate preparatory colleges for graduate education." If we believe that the liberal traditions of the colleges are viable and that the college may have a higher function than feeding professional schools, then we must set about saving it. If I am right, the trouble with the colleges is that they recruit their faculties from uncongenial sources; the well is poisoned. By imitating the universities, the colleges have everything to lose and nothing to gain; neither their funds nor their human resources are adequate to the competition.

My solution is dramatically simple. Let the colleges go into



small change occurs comes from the student subculture. The conclusion is the more devastating because it is precisely on the claim to teach that the American college stakes its case. Here—in low student-teacher ratios, in college plans, tutorials, etc.—it has spent its money and ingenuity, and it is here that its failure has been spectacular. Why?

In my opinion, the colleges have failed as teaching institutions because they have been subverted

ates go on to graduate or professional schools, and, on the other, of complaining that they are being turned into prep schools for graduate study. Gentility and snobbery have played a large part in this subversion, as well as the hunger for academic respectability which is now firmly linked to the business of research. Instead of cleaving to the Socratic pretensions and traditions, the colleges have tended instead to become petty universities, differing from the universities only in a slightly

business on their own, against the graduate universities; let them form their own league as it were and train the kind of man they cannot expect to recruit from the universities. I am aware that such federations are in the air, and perhaps already exist; but I am emphatically not suggesting federation on the principle of beating the graduate schools at their own game. It should be a different game altogether, designed to produce men who do not think it beneath their dignity to educate others; men in whom the general civilized intelligence survives; humanists with a concern for men; scholars convinced that the world needs humane knowledge as never before. Ideally, I think, it would seek to involve its students in the real world, and it would surely seek real association with the vocations and professions. But its primary purpose would be to produce truly educated graduates as well as teachers to whom it could reasonably entrust the crucial task of providing models for those who wanted to become civilized men instead of scholars. I also believe that a formidable but generous enterprise helps to summon large behavior into being, and that the immense task of building institutions worthy of his love and learning might do much to create the kind of man who is missing. Enterprises which require humanity are the first prerequisite for a greater humanity. Men must use themselves significantly in order to grow. That is the law of all education, all growth. Why not apply it to education? We need new or renewed institutions; in the act of renewing them, we may renew ourselves.

Such institutions would surely not lack for students. Those who

desire to study further but have no wish to be processed as professors are, I am convinced, far more numerous than is commonly suspected. The country is rich; leisure is available; educational expectations are rising. Far too many graduates of our colleges and universities feel, moreover, that they never got an education, and it is these who go on to graduate school in the hope of getting what they failed to get as undergraduates. It is graduate education they want, not graduate training. This is why dissatisfaction with the graduate schools is so keen. There is simply no option available on the graduate level; everything is geared to professional training. And among those disenchanting with graduate school are precisely those from whom the colleges should in fact be recruiting their faculties—those students who are not averse to learning but who demand that it be given relevance and embodiment. It seems a cruel shame that such talent should go to waste or find no meaningful fulfillment at a time when it is so terribly needed. We are not so rich in the *higher* human resources that this source can be so tragically wasted.

Are there enough men to staff more than three or four such experimental "graduate" centers in the liberal arts? Probably not. But what matters is that there should be at least a handful of colleges in this country which dare to resist the conformity imposed by the research cartel and to distinguish themselves by putting the teacher—and therefore the humanities—squarely at the center of the curriculum. Two or three such places would, I am convinced, reinvigorate, perhaps even revolutionize, American education simply by providing

But what matters is that there should be at least a handful of colleges in this country which dare to resist the conformity imposed by the research cartel and to distinguish themselves by putting the teacher—and therefore the humanities—squarely at the center of the curriculum.



convincing examples of the daring and diversity we need. The logical place for them to be established is either upon the existing base of the better liberal arts colleges, or as a new "higher college" created by a group of colleges acting in concert. Only by some such device, by striking at the source of the trouble, can the traditional role of the college be protected and expanded. It would be a staggering loss if the only institution of higher education still committed to liberal education should be subverted by the demand for professionals and technicians.

The Universities

Teaching is notoriously worse off in the universities than in the colleges. Not only is the university traditionally more committed to pure research, but it is particularly vulnerable to the pressures that have eroded the teacher's status. Vast numbers of students, huge classes, intense competition for Federal funds, and therefore for distinguished research professors, political and professional pressures, all these have operated to downgrade and even discredit teaching. . . .

At present the heart of university power is the department. It is this departmental power that now so vehemently promotes research and is hostile or indifferent to teaching. It is at the departmental level that the evaluation of teaching is subverted, since chairmen apparently equate research and teaching; it is there that publish-or-perish policies are really promulgated; that the pressure for reduced teaching loads derives; from there that graduate deans are recruited; that the demand for early specialization arises, as well as the jealous specialism that fragments the curriculum into

warring factions. Put a mild and gentle man of broad learning into a department chairmanship, and within two years he will either be murdered by his colleagues or become an aggressive and vindictive *mafioso* of the crassest specialism. The process can no more be resisted than the ravages of time. It is inexorable and destructive; and it is the remorseless tragedy of university politics.

This is why it is so imperative that some rival to it, some countervailing, antidepartmental force be created. Research is dominant now because teaching has no effective representation, no normalized political place or power, within the structure of the university. The departments are theoretically composed of teachers or teacher-scholars, but actually they have been wholly captured by the research professoriat. The scholar has everything—the departments, the powerful committees, the learned societies, the Federal funds, the deanships, and the presidencies—and if he chooses to say that he finds teaching distasteful and unworthy of his abilities, who will say him nay? Who speaks for teaching here? Clearly nobody, except perhaps the students.

* * * * *

This is the present state of affairs; a vast educational enterprise built entirely upon a cast of learned men whose learning has no relevance to the young and even seems to alienate the young from both education and culture. It is a vision of madness accomplished.

* * * * *

One final point. I expect to be told that I am actually meeting the

problem of research and teaching not by reconciling them but by divorcing them altogether. That is my intention, and one which I am prepared to risk, since the only likely alternative is to make teaching the lackey of scholarship. I think we have reached the point at which slogans like "scholar-teacher" merely darken counsel; there may have been a time when that was a viable ideal, and doubtless some exceptionally gifted men still incarnate it. But by and large its vogue passes on to the professor the two functions which the university has inherited and which it cannot meaningfully reconcile. The realities of educational practice make it starkly apparent that no reconciliation can now occur except at the expense of teaching. And I am not prepared to incur that expense if I can humanly help it. This is why I urge you to consider freshly the wisdom of separating teaching and research, with the thought that significant teaching and fresh energy in academic institutions may eventually make scholarship human again, and that an invigorated scholarship may once again accept the burden of teaching as the source of its vigor and the test of its wisdom.

Excerpted from: The Academic Man, Logan Wilson, editor, Octagon Books, 1967.

THE TYRANNICAL MACHINE

by

Lynne V. Cheney

Former Chairman

*National Endowment for the
Humanities*

For decades critics have been saying that institutions of higher education do not do enough to encourage good teaching. Classicist William Arrowsmith made this point in 1967, observing that "at present, the universities are as uncongenial to teaching as the Mojave Desert to a clutch of Druid priests." Almost a quarter century later, historian Page Smith asserts that faculties "are in full flight from teaching . . . In many universities, faculty members make no bones about the fact that students are the enemy. It is students who threaten to take up precious time that might otherwise be devoted to research."

This situation has not come about because faculty members necessarily prefer research. In a recent survey, 71 percent reported that their interests either leaned toward or lay primarily in teaching. But the road to success—or even to survival—in the academic world is through publishing. . . .

The most dramatic examples of how research is valued over teaching occur when faculty members who have won campus-wide awards for teaching suddenly find themselves without jobs. A 1988 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* even raised the possibility that teaching

awards, by implying that a faculty member is not as serious about research as he or she should be, are "the kiss of death" as far as achieving tenure is concerned. Economist Thomas Sowell reports, "I personally know three different professors at three different institutions who have gotten the Teacher of the Year Award and were then told that their contracts would not be renewed."

The emphasis on research is greatest at research universities where 64 percent of the faculty report spending five hours or less per week on formal classroom instruction and 86 percent report spending six or more hours per week on research. At liberal arts colleges, however, the emphasis on research is growing. Fifty liberal arts schools have banded together under the lead of Oberlin College and are considering calling themselves "research colleges." Schools such as Colorado College, Grinnell, and Wellesley have reduced the number of hours faculty teach so that they have more time to do research. A recent survey of twelve liberal arts colleges reported that faculty frequently distinguish between teaching and "what they often call, significantly, 'my own work' or research."

* * * * *

The model that increasingly drives all of higher education—the tyrannical machine that reigns—was first established in the United States at the end of the nineteenth century. Derived from German universities, the model emphasized the production of knowledge rather than its diffusion. Both Daniel Coit Gilman and G. Stanley Hall, influential spokesmen for the new

According to one estimate, teaching responsibilities at noted research universities have, since 1920, decreased in many instances by one-third, and often by half to two-thirds.

university ideal, thought that the scholar's proper role lay in producing "bricks" for the rising temple of knowledge. William James was among the first to note that such a single-minded view threatened a system in which there were many paths to excellence.

Teaching Less

One of the most dramatic effects of emphasizing the production of new knowledge—that is, research that leads to publication—rather than the communication of knowledge to the next generation—that is teaching—has been a decline in how much faculty members teach. At four-year institutions, time spent by faculty in the classroom has decreased steadily. According to one estimate, teaching responsibilities at noted research universities have, since 1920, decreased in many instances by one-third, and often by half to two-thirds. As the president of York College of Pennsylvania, Robert Iosue notes, it is difficult to be precise about the degree to which teaching responsibilities have declined because official teaching loads are often different from actual ones, which may be reduced for such work as service on a faculty committee. "In one bizarre case," Iosue says, "a professor received fifteen hours of reduction from an official work load of twelve hours. He was paid a three-hour teaching overload yet did not step inside the classroom."

The gradually shrinking academic year also affects time faculty members spend in the classroom. In the late 1960s, according to an executive director of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers, most colleges had two seventeen-week semesters.

Now, two fifteen-week semesters are more typical, with some schools in session as few as twenty-eight weeks—or half a year. Observing that students in Missouri institutions of higher education now spend a semester and a half less in college than students in the 1940s, Governor John Ashcroft has asked the schools in his state to lengthen the academic year.

When faculty members teach less, there is a financial consequence. Because more people must be hired to teach, the costs of education escalate—and so does tuition. Between 1980-81 and 1989-90, average tuition charges rose an inflation-adjusted 50 percent at public universities, 66 percent at private universities, and 57 percent at other private four-year schools. Other factors, including increased administrative expenses, account for some of these increases; but with instructional budgets typically comprising 40 percent of educational and general expenditures, the decline in the amount of time faculty members spend in the classroom clearly plays a role.

Between 1977 and 1987, while the number of full-time arts and sciences students decreased by 14 percent, the number of full-time arts and science faculty members increased by 16 percent, but it is hard to find evidence that instruction benefitted. Instead there are reports of students unable to get into classes or to take the courses they want. At the University of Texas at Austin, after the English department reduced the teaching load by one-third, students stood in long lines in Purloin Hall, waiting, as the student newspaper put it, "for an English class, any English class, to open." At Northwestern University,

a student editorial complained about course offering in history, noting that 20 percent of the department was on leave to do research and that none of the four highly publicized, newly hired faculty members in the department was teaching.

Even though the number of arts and sciences students has declined markedly and the number of faculty members has increased significantly, many institutions still find themselves short of teachers. They frequently fill in the gap with what has been called an "academic underclass"—part-time instructors. Part-timers, who in 1988 comprised 37 percent of faculty nationwide, are paid much less than full-time faculty. A survey of English departments showed the typical part-time faculty member earning \$1,500 per course although there were examples of departments paying as little as \$400. Colleges and universities often cap the number of courses that a part-timer can teach so they will not have to pay fringe benefits. Thus many part-timers become "gypsy scholars," frantically commuting between teaching assignments at different institutions and frequently looking for other ways to supplement their salaries. Michael Shenefelt, a part-timer at New York University and Long Island University, reports that by supplementing his income as an office temporary, he is able to earn \$20,000 a year. "A New York University elevator door operator begins at \$20,000," Shenefelt observes.

For Ph.D. granting institutions, graduate students are another source of cheap labor for the classroom, one used extensively at some universities. A 1989 walkout of

teaching assistants at the University of California at Berkeley is reported to have caused the cancellation of nearly 75 percent of classes. Like part-time instructors, graduate students are often unsupervised; and while some manage to be excellent teachers without any orientation or opportunity to discuss their work with experienced faculty members, few find themselves rewarded for a job well done. In fact what graduate students learn, all too often, is that teaching is not worth doing well. Says Frank Manley of Emory University, "I left [Johns Hopkins] with the idea that my main job was to do research, write books, and neglect undergraduates, because otherwise they would take all my time My career has been in part an unlearning of what I learned in graduate school." Jaime O'Neill of Butte College in Oroville, California, says that it took him "five years of adjustment to get over the snobbery of graduate school."

Across the country are thousands of faculty members whose professional lives run counter to the prevailing culture of academia. At a liberal arts college in the Midwest where a new emphasis on publication has led to a cutback in course offerings, a literature professor teaches as many courses as he possibly can to try to make up the shortfall. "I am permitted to teach on an unlimited basis," he says, "and I do. If I did not do this, many students would not be able to take a literature course." All too often, however, a decision to emphasize teaching exacts a price. At the University of Maryland, associate professor Maynard Mack, Jr., notes that his own focus on teaching "is not a fast track to that promotion. I

should minimize my campus responsibilities and produce a second book."

Faculty Interests and Student Needs

The increased emphasis on research has resulted in a surge of publications. The number of books and articles published annually on Shakespeare grew by 80 percent between 1968 and 1988; the number on Virginia Woolf by 800 percent. With so much being written, individual researchers find themselves having to take up narrower and narrower topics in order to find a niche.

It is not surprising that faculty would want to teach what interests them professionally, but the extent to which specialization and new theoretical approaches have affected curricula may well startle anyone who has not followed the collegiate course of study over the last few decades. A student can fulfill core requirements at Harvard by studying tuberculosis from 1842-1952, and distributive requirements at Dartmouth with "Sexuality and Writing," which analyzes "the use of sexuality and its ramifications as symbols for the process of literary creativity, with particular reference to . . . potency and creative fertility; marriage or adultery and literary sterility; deviation and/or solitude and autobiography; prostitution and history; chastity and literary self-referentiality."

At the University of Minnesota, faculty in the humanities department recently proposed doing away with the ten courses the department offers in Western civilization and substituting three new courses: "Discourse and Society," "Text and Context," and "Knowledge,

The number of books and articles published annually on Shakespeare grew by 80 percent between 1968 and 1988; the number on Virginia Woolf by 800 percent. With so much being written, individual researchers find themselves having to take up narrower and narrower topics in order to find a niche.

Persuasion, and Power." In these introductory courses, students will analyze "ways that certain bodies of discourse come to cohere to exercise persuasive power, and to be regarded as authoritative, while others are marginalized, ignored, or

to give up plans to abandon the Western civilization courses immediately. For the time being, the older curriculum will continue to be offered along with the newer ones. There is concern, however, about how long the Western civi-

teach"—which is not necessarily what undergraduates need to learn. A recent nationwide survey conducted by the Gallup Organization for the National Endowment for the Humanities showed that many students manage to approach college graduation with alarming gaps in knowledge. About 25 percent of the nation's college seniors were unable to date Columbus's journey within the correct half-century. More than 30 percent could not identify the Reformation. A majority could not link major works by Plato, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton with their authors.

"We are graduating a generation that knows less and less," says Vassar sociology professor James Farganis. In the absence of required, broad-based courses in which undergraduates study significant events and books, Farganis notes, "students are picking and choosing, making their own curriculum in a haphazard fashion." Some students do not study American or English literature at all: It is possible to graduate from 45 percent of the nation's colleges and universities without doing so. Similarly, some undergraduates do not study history: It is possible to graduate from 38 percent of the nation's colleges and universities without doing so. At 41 percent of colleges and universities, it is possible to graduate without studying mathematics; at 33 percent, without studying natural and physical sciences.

Between 1968 and 1988, while the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in the United States grew by 56 percent, the number of bachelor's degrees awarded in the humanities fell by 39 percent. There have also been significant declines in mathematics and physical science



denigrated." More advanced courses are also being planned including "Music as Discourse," for which the syllabus includes music video, a heavy metal concert, and songs sung at a workers' strike.

Resistance from faculty in other departments as well as from students has led the humanities department

zation courses will last since the overwhelming majority of faculty members in the humanities department has little interest in teaching them.

A disgruntled student at Minnesota observes, "This is all because members of a department want to teach what they want to

majors during this period: down 33 percent and 9 percent respectively. For the humanities (and for mathematics) the situation has improved in recent years, but the loss remains significant. Twenty years ago, one out of six graduates majored in the humanities. Today the figure is one out of sixteen. No doubt there are many explanations, but surely one is that many students come to college poorly prepared in the humanities—and in mathematics and physical sciences as well—and once in college, they do not take introductory courses that fully introduce them to the challenges and pleasures of these disciplines. How could an undergraduate who has never taken a meaningful course in history or physics choose to major in one of these fields?

Those who do major in the humanities often find that their courses are not conceived as comprehensive treatments of important subjects but as preparation for graduate school. Even though most majors in subjects like English do not go on to work on Ph.D.'s, they may well spend time as undergraduates becoming familiar with critical theory—perhaps more time than they spend reading literature. "I strongly suspect," writes Professor Robert Alter of the University of California at Berkeley, "that many young people now earning undergraduate degrees in English or French at our most prestigious institutions have read two or three pages of Lacan, Derrida, Foucault, and Kristeva for every page of George Eliot or Stendhal."

In graduate school, students prepare to publish and survive by narrowing their focus as much as possible—and by reading theory. Elizabeth Fentress, who went to

graduate school because she wanted to concentrate in original works of literature, has written about her discovery that there was no way to earn an advanced degree without diving into a "tidal wave of theory." Rather than be diverted from her goal, she ended her graduate studies. "I deemed it best to leave. . .," she writes, "and to learn what I wanted to learn on my own."

Research interests affect teaching and learning at all levels of higher education, and they have an impact on schools as well. Among today's college students are tomorrow's teachers; and if their curricula have been haphazard, they may well know less than they should about the subjects they will teach. If they have been taught in an indifferent fashion, they will be less likely to know how to teach well themselves. "The undergraduate education that intending teachers receive is full of the same bad teaching that litters American high schools," a group of education school deans observes. "If teachers are to know a subject so that they can teach it well, they need to be taught it well."

Excerpted from: Tyrannical Machines: A Report on Educational Practices Gone Wrong and Our Best Hopes for Setting Them Right, 1990.

*"I strongly suspect,"
writes Professor Robert
Alter of the University
of California at Berkeley,
"that many young
people now earning
undergraduate degrees
in English or French at
our most prestigious
institutions have read
two or three pages of
Lacan, Derrida,
Foucault, and Kristeva
for every page of
George Eliot or
Stendhal."*



THE CHARGE THAT
RESEARCH IS NARROW
AND OPAQUE IS
DECADES OUT OF DATE

*Most academics still
have a special field,
and academic fields
communicate in
specialized vocabularies
that few lay people
can penetrate. But the
things that are said in
these vocabularies
increasingly strive for
large general import,
if only because
it is difficult otherwise
to get a job, a
promotion, or a grant.*

by
Gerald Graff

This article by Gerald Graff is an attempted response to the charges made by Lynne Cheney in the previous piece. Sadly, it probably speaks the mind of most of the higher-education professoriate. And do notice how tentative and ideological the "new" research is compared to the old.
—J.A.

One of the least examined assumptions in the debates that have raged lately over the compatibility of research and teaching is that academic research is narrowly specialized. Those who criticize the research enterprise and its reward structure for drawing professors away from teaching tend to accept the late Allan Bloom's observation in The Closing of the American Mind that "most professors are specialists, concerned only with their own fields." Even those who defend research against such criticisms often accept the idea that most research is so highly specialized that it conflicts with the needs of undergraduate general education.

Neither the detractors nor the defenders of research specialization, however, seem to have been paying much attention to what has actually been happening to academic

research over the past generation. Indeed, the whole research-versus-teaching debate has been marked by a curious reluctance to examine what academics now actually do under the name of research, in contrast with what they used to do. We seem so used to the image of research as over specialized and opaque that we don't feel any need to actually look at the stuff.

The over specialized image was certainly an accurate one in the past. In its first half-century, the modern university was dominated by an ethos of Germanic positivistic science that viewed any broad generalization as a symptom of dilettantism; it held that the narrower a research topic was, the sounder the scholarship. Ideal research subjects were ones like "The Syntax of *at* and *ana* in Gothic, Old Saxon, and Old High German," which was the title of a Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Chicago in 1916.

But that was quite a while ago. With the expansion of higher education after World War II, what counted as "research" became more flexible and capacious. The brute accumulation of facts started to be valued less than interpretations that gave significance to the facts. Not only interpretation, but creative work in the arts began to count toward tenure and promotion. Then in the 1960s a barrage of attacks on narrow specialization began to reshape the way younger scholars defined their work.

The result is that today, at least in humanistic and cultural fields, the more specialized kinds of research are actually penalized rather than rewarded. Anyone writing a dissertation in 1992 on "The Syntax of *at* and *ana*" would be unlikely to get a teaching job in

today's competitive market. Far more likely to catch the eye of a hiring committee would be broad topics like "Fascism, Modernism, and the Historical Avant Garde: Theories and Praxis," or "Writing Like a Man: Gender and Readers in *Adam Bede* and *The House of Mirth*," to mention two titles from the 1988 edition of *Dissertation Abstracts*.

We need only look at the way academic books have come to be promoted to see how much things have changed. Consider the following comments from recent university-press advertisements.

"Twenty-eight of the nation's leading critics and scholars offer a comprehensive exploration of American society and culture."

"[The authors] journey into the minds of men and bring to light an imaginative history of women and of the relations between the sexes."

"At once fascinating and provocative, [the book] looks at the history of the automobile for evidence on the nature of dreams and desires embedded in modern culture."

Even if such comments often contain more hype than sober truth, the mere fact that academic books have come to be promoted in this way is proof of a significant shift in priorities, from over specialization to "provocative" and "comprehensive" generality.

Indeed, if today's academy is over-anything, it is overgeneralized rather than over specialized, reserving its greatest rewards for scholars who make large, sweeping theoretical and interdisciplinary claims. As a result, excessive pressure falls on younger scholars to produce the Big Synthesis before they may be ready to do so, while worthy but modestly defined topics go unappreciated. The beneficial consequence, however,

is that significance is valued over pedantry.

Of course, a lot depends on what we mean by words like "specialized" and "narrow". As Catherine R. Stimpson has observed, "Specialization is a feature of every complex organization, be it social or natural, a school system, garden, book, or mammalian body." Most academics still have a special field, and academic fields communicate in specialized vocabularies that few lay people can penetrate. But the things that are said in these vocabularies increasingly strive for large general import, if only because it is difficult otherwise to get a job, a promotion, or a grant.

As Ms. Stimpson also has pointed out, "specialization" has lately become an ideological buzz word, part of the current attack on new forms of scholarship that allegedly pander to "special interest groups." Thus some would object that a topic like "Writing Like a Man: Gender and Readers . . ." is no less specialized than "The Syntax of *at* and *ana* in Gothic . . .," and it is true that both dissertations might seem equally obscure to many students and lay people.

Nevertheless, there is clearly a big difference, as the critics themselves betray when they object to topics like "Writing Like a Man" for being too political. The objection implies that, far from being narrowly specialized, such topics are all too aggressively general in ways the critics disapprove.

Consider "Tyranical Machines," a 1990 report from the National Endowment for the Humanities by its chairman, Lynne V. Cheney. Mrs. Cheney restates the old chestnut that humanities research is over specialized and that general educa-

tion suffers as a result, with courses in "increasingly narrow topics" taking the place of broadly general ones. For example, Mrs. Cheney cites one university that has replaced traditional courses in Western civilization with new courses in "Discourse and Society," "Text and Context," and "Knowledge and Power."

But what is "narrow" about courses in "discourse and society," "text and context," and "knowledge and power"? Since these courses probably encompass cultures outside the West, they are in one sense less narrow than the ones they have replaced. Obviously, it is something else about the new courses that bothers Mrs. Cheney, not a difference in degree of specialization but a difference in ideology. The question of ideology needs to be debated, but tying it to specialization only confuses the issue.

If I am right that the assumptions about research specialization that have dominated recent debates are a generalization out of date, then the prospects for reconciling research and teaching (and research and general education) may be better than we have been led to think. If much of today's research, as I have argued, does tackle questions and problems with wide significance, why can't that research be used effectively in the classroom?

At my first job interview in 1962, I was asked the following question: If assigned to teach a freshman course, how would I go about adapting the topic of my doctoral dissertation to the needs of my students? This kind of question, which is still commonly asked, clearly assumes that academic research is adaptable to the "general" interests of undergraduates.

The question assumes not only that research has pedagogical relevance, but that professors should teach their research to undergraduates. In the past, of course, such a view often might have been just a cynical rationalization for inflicting the most boring and vacuous professorial specialties on students. Today, however, I think it signals a new desire that research possess a potential interest for non-specialists, and a new appreciation of teachers who can translate whatever may necessarily be esoteric and technical in their research into terms that can be understood by students.

It seems that in practice we have been evolving a better, more realistic solution to the research-versus-teaching problem than the nostrums usually proposed. This solution is neither to subordinate research to general education (as if they were opposed), nor to separate research from undergraduate teaching by quarantining it in non-teaching research faculties. It is rather to make our research more available to undergraduates, even thinking of undergraduates as co-researchers.

Does this mean, then, that there is no substance whatsoever in the widespread perception that academic research interferes with teaching or inordinately narrows its scope? No, but I think that many critics have not diagnosed the real problem. Today the problem often is not that academic research lacks general import, but that the academy does a poor job of clarifying this import for students and lay people. If most academic publication still seems opaque to general readers, the chances are this is not because its concerns are irrelevant to such readers but because that relevance

is not spelled out for them. Much of what is currently mistaken by the public for specialization is really just bad writing, or at least writing that fails to try to make its point accessible to outsiders.

Instead of persisting, then, in the traditional, futile attempt to shift the emphasis from research to teaching and general education, universities should try to do a better job of clarifying the educational significance of the research that their faculty members conduct. The public needs to be convinced that, despite

what they have been hearing from critics, time devoted to research is not necessarily time stolen from teaching.

Gerald Graff is professor of English and education at the University of Chicago.

This piece appeared in the "Point of View" column of The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 21, 1992.



SENSE AND NONSENSE

IN THE ACADEMY

A note from John Agresto —

This is a new column that will, in this and future issues, reprint the foibles, failings, shortcomings and downright lunacy in the ever-crazy world of higher education. Please, reader, if you have stories to tell, tell us. For my part, I think I'll look into college catalogues for the next issue.

Here, just so we all have it on record, is what happened at the University of Pennsylvania, not in the "Water Buffalo" episode, but in the aftermath of the theft of *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. The only decent part of this whole shabby story is that the interim provost and the interim president at Penn both seem reasonably mortified not only by the publicity surrounding the episode, but by the episode itself. I wrote the provost asking for some explanation of the events recounted below and, though he didn't address these issues directly, he did send a statement that both he and the interim president signed. In part it reads:

"This action [the theft of the papers] violated long held principles of freedom of the press and freedom of speech on the University of Pennsylvania campus. We will respond vigorously to any future violations of those principles.... The confiscation of any publication on a campus is wrong and will not be tolerated. Individuals who engage in such actions will be subject to the full range of judicial sanctions."

Nonetheless, the charges against those who confiscated the papers have been dismissed. And there is no word if the courageous museum administrator

who tried to stop the theft will still be disciplined or if Penn's security forces still have to go to diversity-sensitivity training.

These articles appeared in *The Wall Street Journal's*, Review and Outlook Section, July 26, 1993.

Penn: The Report

Not long ago, during the memorable Water Buffalo trials at the University of Pennsylvania, we also reported on the concurrent suspension of Donald Fitzgerald, director of security for Penn's University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. Mr. Fitzgerald, it appeared, had run afoul of the Penn administration—which has some markedly peculiar notions about the duties of security officers—because he tried to apprehend two women students running out of the museum carrying three large plastic bags.

It turned out that the women were not, as Mr. Fitzgerald worried, running off with museum pieces. Part of a group of black activist students aggrieved by the views aired in the student paper, the women had confiscated all the copies of *The Daily Pennsylvanian* at the museum, as their friends were doing elsewhere around campus. On April 15, virtually the entire press run of the paper was appropriated and carted off.

The administration, headed at the time by President Sheldon Hackney (who recently won confirmation as head of the National Endowment of the Humanities), determined at once that Mr. Fitzgerald should be suspended from his security duties. He would remain on suspension many weeks, while a "blue ribbon panel"

appointed by the Penn administration deliberated over the events of April 15.

Those deliberations have at last come to an end. With that end has also come a report on the panel's findings—one so remarkable for the depths of its fastidiously argued nonsense that we thought it only fitting to reprint portions nearby. The document is a pure specimen of political cravenness. But such cravenness is hardly limited to the University of Pennsylvania. The unhappy fact of university life today is that there are many Penns and many administrators who thought they were purchasing peace by accommodating political zealots.

The degree of that effort to accommodate is reflected in the central pronouncement of the Penn panel's report—namely the judgment that the theft of the newspapers was a "form of protest" and therefore not criminal behavior. Apparently, then, any assault—including, presumably, the removal and destruction of library books some group considers offensive—might be held immune from prosecution if it's a "protest."

The report goes on to say that rather than taking action, the police should have contacted entities at Penn called "Open Expression Monitors" to study the students' actions. Think we're making that up? Read the following excerpt. The panel concludes that the Museum security director's pursuit of the women with the shopping bags was "inappropriate" once those students had left the property of the Museum and was not in "accordance with . . . his job functions." Presumably, then, any thief who wishes to appropriate some

invaluable museum piece can now consider himself immune from pursuit, if he can get past the door and grounds.

The report recommends that for his inappropriate behavior, security director Fitzgerald's superiors should review his role for possible disciplinary action. Mr. Fitzgerald—who has been returned to active duty—received a letter of reprimand and will, along with other security personnel, have to attend sensitivity training classes.

There have been other instances in which activists have undertaken to silence opposition views by removing the offending publications. At Penn State (not the same as the U. of Pennsylvania) two former students—journalism majors, no less—made off with four thousand copies of an alternative, conservative student publication called *The Lionhearted*. Here the legal outcome was different. To their credit, the police charged the perpetrators with theft, receipt of stolen property, and criminal conspiracy.

Still, it's a measure of how far the assault on free expression has gone on campuses that the Penn State undergraduate paper, *The Daily Collegian*, actually editorialized in favor of the notion that the removal and burning of *The Lionhearted* was a legitimate act of free expression. Presumably these student "journalists" will soon be making their way into the American press corps.

George Orwell had the word for this sort of reasoning—and for the entire tenor of the Penn panel's report. That word is "doublethink"—a description unfortunately as relevant today as it was in the 1930s.

During his confirmation hearings, Mr. Hackney assured the

Senators that his administration took the most serious possible view of the theft of *The Daily Pennsylvanian* papers, and that the students who took them would be disciplined. Just how seriously the university in fact took this attack on the right of free expression will be clear to anyone who wants to take a look at the excerpts of this stunning Orwellian document from the minds running America's campuses.

Doublethink at the University of

Pennsylvania

Following are excerpts from the report of a panel of University of Pennsylvania administrators appointed to study the theft of one entire press run of the student newspaper. The papers were seized all over campus by black activist students opposed to The Daily Pennsylvanian's editorial content. The report, which criticizes security guards, absolves the students of any wrong-doing—except failure to show I.D. cards. The panel analyzed what supposedly transpired at each of the campus sites involved.

Individual Incidents on April 15, 1993.

1. *Biomedical Library/Johnson Pavilion (6:52 a.m.):* Incident involving two students and two officers responding to a call from a School of Medicine security guard.

The panel found that one officer behaved in a discourteous manner toward the students by ordering them to leave before determining who they were or giving them an opportunity to explain their presence.

The panel found that his actions violated Section 8.4.02 of the "UPPD (University of Pennsylvania Police Department) Policies and Procedures Manual" and should be reviewed by his supervisor for possible disciplinary action.

The panel found that the Medical School security guard behaved appropriately by contacting the UPPD.

The panel recommended that all security personnel receive training on working and interacting with people from diverse backgrounds. This training should include information about the diversity of the Penn community and the expectation that all members of the community should be treated with civility and respect regardless of race, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, national or ethnic [sic] origin, age, disability, or status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran.

2. *Blockley Hall/Johnson pavilion (7:48 a.m.):* Incident involving two students, one Medical School security officer, one Medical School Supervisor of Security, one security office . . . and four police officers responding to a call to UPPD that "A black male at Blockley Hall tried to take all the DP's [Daily Pennsylvanians]."

The panel found that one officer behaved in an unprofessional manner in violation of Section 8.4.02 of the UPPD Policies and Procedures Manual" by cursing at the student and used excessive force . . . by striking the student with his baton. The panel also found that the officer failed to conduct a proper and thorough investigation because he neglected to interview the security personnel who were in pursuit."

3. *David Rittenhouse Laboratories (8:20 a.m.):* Incident involving two students, four officers, and the UPPD dispatcher. When two officers stopped the students carrying a large trash bag outside of DRL, they were informed by the students that this was a protest action.

The panel found that the responding officer. . . violated Section 5.22.0 of the "UPPD Policies and Procedures Manual" by not requesting that a supervisor be dispatched to the scene in response to a demonstration.

The panel found that the dispatcher violated UPPD Divisional Directive 92.08 by making a command decision without consulting a supervisor.

4. *University Museum/Sports Medicine (8:16 a.m.):* Incident involving two students, a Museum security guard, a Museum administrator and two officers. The Museum administrator pursued the

students, who took the DP's from Kress Gallery, and caught up with them in Weightman Hall, where he made a "citizen's arrest" and detained the students.

The panel found that the Museum administrator's actions in pursuit of the students were inappropriate after they left the property of the University Museum and not in accordance with the authority and responsibility of his job functions. His actions should be reviewed by his supervisor for possible disciplinary action.

The panel found that the students should have shown their Penn cards.

In summary, the panel concluded that once the incident occurred at DRL [David Rittenhouse Laboratories], the UPPD should have recognized that the removal of the DP's from at least three different locations was a form of student protest and not an indicator of

criminal behavior. According to the University's "Emergency Procedures Protocols". . . the UPPD should have contacted the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life as soon as it recognized that the students were involved in a form of protest. Once the VPUL was notified of the protest, Open Expression Monitors would have been dispatched to observe and monitor the students' actions, in compliance with the existing Open Expression Guidelines. Since this act was a form of protest and not a criminal offense, it would have been more appropriate for Open Expression Monitors, not police officers, to mediate and attempt to resolve any further conflicts that resulted from the removal of the DP's. The Open Expression Monitors could have informed the students about the Open Expression Guidelines, notified them if their actions violated the Guidelines, and identified students who violated the Guidelines.

GIFTS AND THE NEW TAX LAW

As the end of the year approaches, the following, taken from an item in the New York Times, might be of interest. As with any tax-related matter, check with your tax adviser if there are any questions about making a gift.

The tax bill introduces, restores and expands several kinds of tax breaks, and among the greatest of these is charity.

Philanthropic gifts have been tax deductible all along. But it is even more advantageous for the wealthy to give now that the after-tax cost of gifts is just 60 cents on the dollar for those in the highest marginal tax bracket.

There has been another important change in the law, however, that makes it easier than in recent years to make gifts of property that has increased in value over the years. These gifts can be deducted at present market value even though the taxpayer never paid that much for them, and the gifts do not incur any capital gains tax.

Under the new law, this kind of transaction can no longer trigger the punishing alternative minimum tax. And the provisions have been expanded to include not only property like paintings, but so-called intangibles, such as stocks or even royalty rights. . . .

The Internal Revenue Service has also been ordered to develop a method for taxpayers to agree in advance of making a charitable donation with the I.R. S. on the value of a painting or other property, so there will be no disputes.

To our readers,

If you know someone who might be interested in receiving information regarding the programs offered at St. John's College, please fill out this form and return it to St. John's College, 1160 Camino Cruz Blanca, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501-4599.

Name of interested person (s)

Address

Possible area(s) of interest —

Undergraduate Graduate

Eastern Classics Summer Classics
(one week courses)

PROFILE

St. John's College:

An independent, non-sectarian, four-year liberal arts college.

Founded:

Established in 1696 in Annapolis, Maryland, as King William's School and chartered in 1784 as St. John's College. Great Books Program adopted 1937. Second campus in Santa Fe opened in 1964.

Curriculum:

An integrated, four-year, all-required liberal arts and science program based on reading and discussing, in loosely chronological order, the great books of Western civilization. The program also includes four years of foreign language, four years of mathematics, three years of laboratory science, and one year of music.

Approach:

Tutorials, laboratories, and seminars requiring intense participation replace more traditional lectures. Classes are very small.

Student/Faculty ratio is 8:1.

Degrees Granted:

Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Arts. Master of Arts in Liberal Studies.

Student Body:

Enrollment is limited to about 400 students on each campus. Current freshman class is made up of 55% men and 45% women, from 37 states and several foreign countries. Sixty-five percent receive financial aid. Students may transfer between the Santa Fe and Annapolis campuses.

Alumni Careers:

Education - 21%, Business - 20%, Law - 10%, Visual and Performing Arts - 9%, Medicine - 7%, Science and Engineering - 7%, Computer Science - 6%, Writing and Publishing - 5%.

Graduate Institute:

The Graduate Institute in Liberal Education is an interdisciplinary master's degree program based on the same principles as the undergraduate program. Offered on both campuses year-round. Readers of the newsletter may be especially interested in applying for our summer session. For more information please contact the Graduate Institute in Santa Fe 505/984-6082 or in Annapolis 410/626-2541.

LETTERS from Santa Fe

St. John's College
1160 Camino Cruz Blanca
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501-4599

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

U. S. Postage PAID Non-Profit Organization Permit No. 231 Santa Fe, NM
--