

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS  
1 AIRPORT PLACE, SUITE 7  
PRINCETON, NJ 08540-1532

NON-PROFIT ORG  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
PERMIT #357  
PRINCETON, NJ

# NAS Update

Vol. 16, No. 4 ■ ISSN 1089-0874 ■ 2008



THE NEWSLETTER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS

## How to Join the NAS...

Membership in the NAS is open to all present and former university or college faculty members, trustees, administrators, current graduate students, and independent scholars sharing the NAS's principles. Renewable annually, membership includes a one-year subscription to *Academic Questions*, *NAS Update*, and reduced admission rates to national conferences. Annual dues are \$42 for full-time faculty members, administrators, and independent scholars, and \$22 for graduate students, adjunct faculty, and academic retirees. Please add \$10 for foreign non-Canadian membership.

To join, please remit the appropriate amount in a check payable to the NAS. Please include your name, address, institution, position held, e-mail address, and telephone numbers for home and school. Send to:

National Association of Scholars  
1 Airport Place, Suite 7  
Princeton, NJ 08540-1532



## NAS Update

2008: Volume 16, Number 4

**Publisher:** National Association of Scholars  
**Editor:** John E. D. Irving Jr.

**NAS UPDATE** is published quarterly as a service to the members of the **National Association of Scholars**, a non-profit, tax-exempt educational organization located at:

1 Airport Place, Suite 7  
Princeton, NJ 08540-1532  
609-683-7878/tel  
609-683-0316/fax

nas@nas.org  
http://www.nas.org

© 2008 by the National Association of Scholars  
All rights reserved ISSN 1089-0874

### INSIDE...

PAGE 2-3

■ **OUTLOOK: NAS**  
*Launches Argus Project:  
An Invitation to  
Participate*

PAGE 4-6

■ *A Bill Becomes a Law*

PAGE 7

■ *Annual NAS Membership  
Meeting 2008*  
*Affiliate Meetings in  
Virginia and  
Washington DC*

PAGE 8-9

■ *Rebuilding Campus  
Community: The Wrong  
Imperative*

PAGE 10-11

■ *What On Earth Is Going  
On in the Dorms?:  
The NAS' How Many  
Delawares Project*

PAGE 12

■ *Nebraska Association of  
Scholars Prepares for  
Ballot Battle*

*Program in Western  
Civilization & American  
Institutions Shoots for  
the Stars at the  
University of Texas*

PAGE 13

■ *Michigan Meets at MSU*

PAGE 14

■ *Conference  
Registration Form*

PAGE 15

■ *Affiliates of the National  
Association of Scholars*

## Thirteenth NAS Conference to Convene in Washington on January 9, 2009

Come January 9th our nation's capital will be like a theater between shows: one set of players hustling toward history's wings, another impatiently awaiting their signal to mount the boards. Who'll be the stars of the new cast? From what script will they read? Punditry is all confusion, but one thing is sure, of change there'll be aplenty.

The NAS has long been a critic of the shifting academic scene, its tragedy, its pathos, its often downright inanity. At times we've even clambered out of the box to provide some improving direction. Yet for all our extensive experience on both sides of the footlights, we've never seen the stage machinery under such strain. The classic unities of the academic drama, curriculum, venue, and quadrennium, are more and more becoming unglued. Other fixed assumptions about educational delivery, financing, even the social and economic status of the college degree, also look increasingly



Victor Davis Hanson  
Keynote Speaker



Ward Connerly  
Sidney Hook Awardee

insubstantial, fading perhaps to leave not a rack behind.

We present these thoughts, prologue like, in order to invite you to our thirteenth general conference, scheduled to open in Washington on that self-same January day in 2009. Its title: "The Changing Landscape of American Higher Education," reminiscent conceivably, of San Francisco before and after the big shake.

Our dramatis personae are larger than life, so there'll be no need for opera glasses. Want swordplay for instance? Then prepare yourself for the steel against steel showdown between our own Peter Wood and Cary Nelson of the AAUP debating "the meaning of academic freedom". A western fan? Then lend an ear to Victor Davis Hanson, perhaps academe's foremost champion of Western civilization, as he delivers the keynote speech (and receives our Peter Shaw Award for academic writing as well). Like happy

| Continued on page 14 |

VISIT THE NAS WEBSITE AT  
[www.nas.org](http://www.nas.org)



# OUTLOOK

## NAS Launches Argus Project: An Invitation to Participate

By Stephen H. Balch, President

The American University is like Jekyll and Hyde. To the world outside it is a bright temple of reason, filled with Dr. Jekylls, upright and illustrious men of science. But to those more familiar with its innermost workings comes a darker knowledge, the presence of legions of lurking Hydes, malignant spirits yearning not for the truth but dominion.

The Jekylls, well aware of the alter egos, try to conceal their rampages. When this fails they explain them away as merely the eccentricities sometimes associated with superior minds. The Jekylls, the anxious are earnestly assured, have the situation well in hand.

The Jekylls, of course, know better. The situation is hardly under their control. The Hydes roam ever more freely through the university's precincts, and their wills grow increasingly imperious. Occasionally the Jekylls get their backs up, but, as the balance of personae shifts, they do so with diminishing effect. In fact, Hyde is gradually taking Jekyll prisoner, paralyzing his mind, and, even worse, persuading him that intellectual vice is virtue.

The souls of the Jekylls are not altogether lost. Although their wills have weakened, their minds often remain clear. Throughout academe sensible professors and administrators continue to understand that

their privileges and immunities—academic freedom first and foremost—are incompatible with the politically correct causes and the intimidation of dissent so beloved by the Hydes. Even more important, many recognize that the preservation of the university's great service to civilization is also in dire jeopardy. There is thus hope that Jekyll can overcome Hyde's seducing, but at this late date he is unlikely to succeed without considerable outside help.

Here at the National Association of Scholars, we sometimes think of ourselves as a kind of "Dr. Jekyll Liberation Front", supporting the better angels of academe in their struggle against servitude to the worst. Much of this is accomplished by enabling Jekylls unaddicted to subducting potions to assist those fallen under their spell. This, one might say, is our "inside strategy". But we also have an equally important "outside" one. And its essential ingredient is shame.

Like Dr. Jekyll, our universities cut a figure in society. They are both respected for the genuine benefits they confer and cherished as the scenes of happy youth. The result is a strong desire on society's part to look away, to put on blinders, to ignore the ugly eruptions of Hyde's viler self.

We certainly don't seek to diminish this respect unnecessarily.



Stephen H. Balch

Much of it is deserved. What we wish to do instead is turn it in the direction of tough love—the best way the public can participate in the university's ultimate redemption. Alumni, academic donors, university trustees, legislators, can all have major roles in this saving process, but they are only likely to play them when all embarrassing facts about alma mater's nightly prowlings have been documented beyond dispute.

You might think, of course, that these facts have already been sufficiently uncovered. For nearly two decades accounts of PC mischief have been a staple of national reporting, particularly in the more conservatively oriented media. But there is a psychological dynamic at work that needs to be appreciated. Perhaps the best parallel is with Congress. People are much more likely to think highly of their own representatives than of the institution as a whole. The same is true of our universities. While most concede that academe in general has more than a few screws loose, their

own alma maters are generally thought to be doing just fine, thank you.

Each university and college works hard to maintain this impression. Jekyll realizes the importance of keeping up appearances. Trustees are wined and dined and treated to seats on the fifty yard line. Legislators, alumni, and the public at large, are also fed a carefully filtered stream of upbeat information. We could hardly expect Jekyll to do less. When he takes the shape of a university administrator, it's the very description of his job. The consequence, alas, is to reinforce the inclination toward wishful thinking by those whose tough love could do the most good. This is the inclination that we want to overcome.

The key is putting at the public's disposal more of the facts about the university's discordant personae than it can possibly ignore. And if this project is to be effective, it must be done on an institution-by-institution basis with scrupulous attention to documentation. For the many universities harboring shadowy hulks, the result will be tough love indeed. But if it forces their Jekylls finally to come clean about what's been hiding in the cellar, it might well be the first step down recovery's road. (For those with little or nothing to hide, scrutiny will bring deserved acclaim and a warrant for heightened loyalty from friends and supporters.)

To be sure, this is a big task, but it is also a practical one. The information age has put a great deal more of the university's inner life on open

display than was true in times past. University websites contain page upon page of highly revealing material about programs of every kind, some academic, some extracurricular, some hardly describable within the traditional language of the liberal arts. More than a few, to say the least, reveal institutions in stark betrayal of the principles they publicly swear by.

The university's Hydes have been getting away with their indulgences for so long that they take the world's indifference for granted. While many describe their activities in thinly disguised code, others are proudly transparent, assuming that only their fellow Hydes are in the audience. Should this assumption be punctured, they'll be woefully discomfited. As that trite but true adage has it, "sunlight is the best disinfectant".

The challenge is the sheer mass of information that must be culled. Because of its immensity, small-staffed organizations like our own can, unaided, but skim the surface. That's why we need folks like you. Only an army of intelligent observers can delve with the depth required to bring public awareness to a transforming threshold. Our hope is that every major university and college in the country, as well as many of less renown, will eventually have one or several such "delvers" working in its sandbox, bringing its more interesting usages, for better or ill, up into public consciousness.

Some guidance will be necessary, and we're ready to provide further advice as needs be. Of course, in a

good many arenas of academic life the yawning gulf between the university's professed ideals and its actual practice has grown so great as not to require any vast erudition to detect. Rather than any particular technical knowledge, what we're therefore seeking is a certain kind of energy akin, perhaps, to that possessed by the enthusiastic archeologist, willing to winnow and sift through layers of detritus to reach an artifact that lays bare a hidden world.

We're hoping that each of our diggers will choose a single site, one university or college with which he or she has, or wishes to have, both sympathy and a continuing connection. This will be a dig not a burial. A mission of redemption should be entered into in a spirit of genuine interest and affection.

Let us know where you intend to look and then keep us regularly updated about what you find. Assuming it checks out, we'll put it into our data base and finally post it for the whole world to see (giving you personal credit for the discovery). Eventually, you may wish to strike out independently, maintaining a blogsite of your own dedicated to following the life of your adopted institution, holding it to its stated ideals with whatever brickbats or plaudits are in order. Imagine a whole new blogosphere of such sites. The world of higher education would never be the same. If you would like to join us in this great endeavor, please contact Ashley Thorne of our staff at [thorne@nas.org](mailto:thorne@nas.org).

## Are You Moving?

If you are moving, changing your e-mail address, or switching jobs, please let us know! Many times, our members relocate and forget to provide us with a new address. Without that information, it is difficult to send the copies of *NAS Update* or *Academic Questions* that are due to you.



# A Bill Becomes a Law

By Steve Balch and Peter Wood

Three years ago, under pressure from Congress, the American Council on Education (ACE) released a statement endorsing the concept of intellectual pluralism as a central principle of academic life. ACE speaks pretty much for American higher education's prevailing sentiments, and it was no surprise that twenty-two other major higher education organizations, including the AAUP, co-signed the statement. With the final passage of the Higher Education Act on the 31st of July, 2008, Congress took a big step toward bringing to life what, thus far, has been merely a paper pledge.

Deep inside the dictionary-sized Higher Education Act are 130 lines of text (Part E, Section 805) describing something called the "American History for Freedom Program." Almost six years in legislative gestation, it gives the Department of Education statutory authority to make grants to postsecondary academic programs and centers that promote and impart knowledge of "traditional American history" (defined as the constitutional, political, intellectual, diplomatic, and economic history of the United States); "the history and nature of, and threats to, free institutions"; and—"the history and achievements of Western civilization."

Not so long ago, the American History for Freedom Program would have been an anodyne addition to the abundance of federally supported academic programs. Thirty years ago most colleges and universities were actuated by a conviction that America had been blessed with an extraordinary gift of

freedom, and wished an appreciation and understanding of that gift to be transmitted to each rising generation. This conviction, of course, has faded during the era of political correctness and postmodernism. It is no longer a central proposition on campus and it no longer receives much institutional support.

Nonetheless, there remain many individual scholars throughout academe who embrace the idea that Western civilization in general, and American history in particular, have something important to teach us about the creation of free institutions. The American History for Freedom Program is a giant step toward recognizing the value of this scholarly work. The new program will lift these often isolated scholars out of their relative isolation and, by bringing significant new funding to their research, raise their profile on campus.

Precisely because of this, we expect opposition. It is one thing for ACE and other organizations to endorse the idea that "Intellectual pluralism and academic freedom are central principles of American higher education." It is something else when a group of scholars who have been marginalized for more than a generation for pursuing unfashionable ideas suddenly become the recipients of their own federal support program.

The creation of the program, as Marxists used to say, is "no accident." Since the early 1990s, the National Association of Scholars has sought to forge the scattered impulses of scholars committed to free institutions into a full-fledged movement. Our goal was the estab-

lishment, on as many campuses as possible, of programs focused on the American heritage of freedom, and Western civilization more generally. Our primary emphasis initially was on saving as much of the older curriculum as we could.

But in an age that arrived with Jesse Jackson leading a chant at Stanford of "Hey hey, ho ho, Western civ has got to go," and that culminated with the University of Chicago's dilution of its famed core curriculum, we began to realize that the attempt to conserve university-wide curricula that emphasized the nexus between American history, Western civilization, and free institutions was a losing battle. Not only was the traditional curriculum fast disappearing, but so were the faculty members who could teach it. They were retiring and being replaced for the most part by individuals trained in multiculturalism and other ideologies, or too hyper-specialized in their interests to care about broadly significant subject matter. Many of the new faculty members in the relevant fields were not just indifferent but actively hostile to the notion that Western history had anything to teach us except the use of power by dominant groups to oppress others.

Where did that leave those scholars who continued to pay scholarly attention to such matters as the expansion of personal freedom in the American founding, or the rise in the West (and nowhere else) of a movement to abolish slavery? It left many of them without serious job prospects and it left others who did have academic jobs professionally sidelined. We quickly learned that

to mention this reality was to invite sneers from the victors in the "culture wars." Scholars who pursued questions about the historical roots of free institutions were dismissed variously as second-rate, out-of-date, or prone to hate. Often they are depicted as mere apologists for the powerful and privileged who, according to the new mythos, control everything.

As we sized up the picture, NAS decided that one of our few good options would be to put aside hopes for immediate and robust reform and seek instead to grow a counter-movement. We did that by helping individual scholars to found their own centers within larger institutions. There are now over thirty such programs on major campuses around the country, with a goodly number of others clearly in the making. A few are able to hire post-docs and visiting fellows temporarily. A few field minors, and all are enlivening their campuses' lives with speakers who might not otherwise get invited, and symposia that might not otherwise be held. There is even a scholarly association to unite them, the Association for the Study of Free Institutions, located on the University of Nebraska's Omaha campus.

Growing a counter movement, however, takes resources. We understood that few colleges and universities would be willing to direct much money into developing programs in the humanities opposed to the identity-politics-trumps-everything approach. The concentrated study of free institutions and Western civilization cuts against that universal leveling embedded in the nostrum of "diversity." Consequently, the faculty members who aimed to start such centers usually had to seek support from outside the usual institutional chan-

nels. In some cases, private donors came forth with the necessary funds. Others have contributed to philanthropic pools recently started by organizations like the Manhattan Institute and the Philanthropy Roundtable. The "We the People Program," inaugurated by Bruce Cole at the National Endowment for the Humanities, has also been of invaluable service. Yet dollars remain a key limiting factor, both in their actual shortage, and in the lack of organizational buzz that rather magically attends the reverse.

Thus, the NAS began to pursue another approach. Back in 2003, the NAS contacted two legislators, Congressman Thomas Petri of Wisconsin and Senator Judd Gregg of New Hampshire, both senior members (Gregg was at the time the chairman) of their respective chambers' education committees. They crafted a bill, originally entitled the "Higher Education for Freedom Act," that was introduced on each side of the Capitol. The strategy was to get its language inserted in the Higher Education Act, then seemingly on the verge of reauthorization. Alas, deliberations ended up being stymied by a variety of political tangles having little to do with "higher education for freedom." The bill's basic language was, however, finally inserted into the Senate reauthorization package and accepted by the House conferees. Hats off to Judd Gregg and Tom Petri, whose skill and dedication determined the final outcome.

Here's our calculus. If the American History for Freedom Program is funded, a great deal more money than has hitherto been available to our movement will be put into play. For example, a small appropriation (by federal standards) of \$25,000,000 per year, would be the spending equivalent of a half-billion dollar private foundation wholly devoted to backing "traditional American history", free institutions, and Western civilization programming. (There is no foundation able or interested in providing funding at that level.)

Moreover, the first off the block in going after this money will naturally be the scholars we've been grooming, who not only have programs already in hand, but can present the best academic credentials in the competition for grants—the study of free institutions and the achievements of Western civilization not being a particularly multiculturalist forte. A new federal program should also prick the nostrils of administrators, instilling, at least in some cases, a strange new respect for program architects with the right kinds of scholarly interests. These scholars will themselves feel more confident of their prospects. A contrarian movement may be enabled to attain the status of a modest fashion.

Critics of government funding for academic programs, of course, will be skeptical. We count some of these critics among our friends and allies on a variety of issues, and we're



Congressman  
Thomas Petri



Senator Judd Gregg

| Continued on page 6 |

mindful of potential drawbacks of the new legislation. Given the histories of federal programs, there is certainly a legitimate concern that colleges and universities will attempt to divert this new source of funding from its intended purpose and to capture it instead for programs that aim to deconstruct Western freedom. We've seen the strategy before. Parchment barriers are of little avail against the black political arts. Western civilization, for example, might be reinterpreted to mean the doings of Tinsel Town. We've seen what's happened to our "living Constitution." To work, the American History for Freedom Program needs to be placed in the hands of administrators who genuinely believe in it. In 2003, with fellow thinkers like Gene Hickok in command of the Department of Education, this was something we thought could be counted on at least for a while. The situation is now far less certain.

But even as some of these funds attract opportunists or fall into the hands of the academically orthodox, the cause of reform will gain. Orthodoxy already sits on a mountain of cash, largely built into the budgets of the many departments and campus activities that it controls. Reform, by contrast, is a starveling. Imagine a ten million to ten million dollar split on annual payout. Chump change for them, fields of clover for us.

There is, however, a failsafe mechanism. There are a great many programs on the federal statute books that are inoperative because they've never received appropriations. Right now, the American History for Freedom Program is in precisely that category, something that won't change at least until the next Congress and, hence, after the upcoming election and selection of a new Department of Education leadership. As an appropriator, Senator

Gregg will be in a good position to fund "American History for Freedom" should he wish. We can't speak for him, but it's our strong suspicion that he'll only want the program to go forward if it can do so in a manner likely to achieve its intended goals.

A typical fifth grade exercise, as we remember it, was to map out the stages through which a bill became a law. It's often been fascinating to watch the process in this case. It may, of course, constitute a legislative episode that eventually comes to nothing. Yet pardon us if we persist in some optimism. Our gallant little bundle of titles, sections, and clauses has finally made it through the traps and snares of Capitol Hill and into the statute books. Having thus proven itself to possess a charmed life, the American History for Freedom Program may prove, as freedom is, to be inextinguishable.

| Continued on page 7 |

## Pertinent Language from the Reauthorized Higher Education Act

### PART E—AMERICAN HISTORY FOR FREEDOM "SEC. 805. AMERICAN HISTORY FOR FREEDOM.

"(a) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—From the amounts appropriated under subsection (f), the Secretary is authorized to award three-year grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible institutions to establish or strengthen postsecondary academic programs or centers that promote and impart knowledge of—

- "(1) traditional American history;
- "(2) the history and nature of, and threats to, free institutions; or
- "(3) the history and achievements of Western civilization.

"(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

"(1) **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.**—The term 'eligible institution' means an institution of higher education as defined in section 101.

"(2) **FREE INSTITUTION.**—The term 'free institution' means an institution that emerged out of Western civilization, such as democracy, constitutional government, individual rights, market economics, religious freedom and religious tolerance, and freedom of thought and inquiry.

"(3) **TRADITIONAL AMERICAN HISTORY.**—The term 'traditional American history' means—

- "(A) the significant constitutional, political, intellectual, economic, and foreign policy trends and issues that have shaped the course of American history; and
- "(B) the key episodes, turning points, and leading figures involved in the constitutional, political, intellectual, diplomatic, and economic history of the United States.

"(c) **APPLICATION.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each eligible institution that desires a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(2) **CONTENTS.**—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a description of—

- "(A) how funds made available under this section will be used for the activities set forth under subsection (e), including how

such activities will increase knowledge with respect to traditional American history, free institutions, or Western civilization;

"(B) how the eligible institution will ensure that information about the activities funded under this section is widely disseminated pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B);

"(C) any activities to be undertaken pursuant to subsection (e)(2)(A), including identification of entities intended to participate;

"(D) how funds made available under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant non-Federal funds available for the activities described in subsection (e); and

"(E) such fiscal controls and accounting procedures as may be necessary to ensure proper disbursement of and accounting for funding made available to the eligible institution under this section.

"(d) **AWARD BASIS.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration the capability of the eligible institution to—

- "(1) increase access to quality programming that expands knowledge of traditional American history, free institutions, or Western civilization;
- "(2) involve personnel with strong expertise in traditional American history, free institutions, or Western civilization; and
- "(3) sustain the activities funded under this section after the grant has expired.

"(e) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

"(1) **REQUIRED USE OF FUNDS.**—Funds provided under this section shall be used to—

- "(A) establish or strengthen academic programs or centers focused on traditional American history, free institutions, or Western civilization, which may include—
  - "(i) design and implementation of programs of study, courses, lecture series, seminars, and symposia;
  - "(ii) development, publication, and dissemination of instructional materials;
  - "(iii) research;

"(iv) support for faculty teaching in undergraduate and, if applicable, graduate programs;

"(v) support for graduate and postgraduate fellowships, if applicable; or

"(vi) teacher preparation initiatives that stress content mastery regarding traditional American history, free institutions, or Western civilization; and

"(B) conduct outreach activities to ensure that information about the activities funded under this section is widely disseminated—

"(i) to undergraduate students (including students enrolled in teacher education programs, if applicable);

"(ii) to graduate students (including students enrolled in teacher education programs, if applicable);

"(iii) to faculty;

"(iv) to local educational agencies; and

"(v) within the local community.

"(2) **ALLOWABLE USES OF FUNDS.**—Funds provided under this section may be used to support—

- "(A) collaboration with entities such as—
  - "(i) local educational agencies, for the purpose of providing elementary and secondary school teachers an opportunity to enhance their knowledge of traditional American history, free institutions, or Western civilization; and
  - "(ii) nonprofit organizations whose mission is consistent with the purpose of this section, such as academic organizations, museums, and libraries, for assistance in carrying out activities described under subsection (a); and
- "(B) other activities that meet the purposes of this section.

"(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2009 and each of the five succeeding fiscal years.

Will ACE and its twenty-two sister organizations join us in celebrating this important step toward realizing intellectual pluralism on campus? We'd like to think they stand behind their declaration, but at the moment everyone must be busy digesting the other 1,157 pages of the Higher Education Act. The American History for Freedom Program is a very small part of that missive body of legislation. But some haystacks really do contain a golden needle. ☞

## Annual NAS Membership Meeting 2008

The election of new members to the NAS board of directors will be held during the Annual Membership Meeting to take place at 10:00 a.m., Saturday, December 6, 2008 at the Nassau Inn, 10 Palmer Square, Princeton, NJ 08542.

The nominating committee of the current board has placed the following individuals in nomination for the term beginning January 1, 2009 and ending December 31, 2011.

1. Professor Evelyn Avery
2. Professor Christina Jeffrey
3. Professor George W. Dent
4. Professor Michael I Krauss
5. Dr. Barry Latzer
6. Professor Kenneth O. Doyle
7. Dr. Candace de Russey
8. Professor Philip Siegelman

NAS members wishing to make additional nominations to the board must notify NAS secretary B. Nelson Ong, in writing, no later than November 6, 2008 (please address correspondence to NAS headquarters in Princeton). Nominating petitions must designate the number of the seat for which an individual is being nominated and include signatures of ten NAS members in good standing.

## Virginia Association of Scholars Holds Annual Meeting

The Virginia Association of Scholars held its annual meeting on April 12, 2008, at the Omni Hotel in Charlottesville. There were two excellent guest speakers, Dr. James W. Ceaser of the University of Virginia, and Dr. Thomas Lindsay, assistant director of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Ceaser discussed the activities of the Jack Miller Center, and Lindsay spoke about National Endowment projects.

There was some discussion of issues in Virginia of interest to the VAS. These included recent requirements that faculty be evaluated on their commitment to diversity at Virginia Tech, the firing of the president of The College of William and Mary, and the possibility of gender quotas for grant recipients from the National Science Foundation.

However, the bulk of the discussion concerned the ongoing problems at Virginia State University. It

was pointed out that there are seventeen faculty law suits in process against the VSU administration. The allegations include reverse discrimination, denial of first-amendment rights, and retaliation for political incorrectness. For example, of the fourteen faculty dismissed in 2005-06, twelve were white or foreign born and one of the two African Americans, Jean Cobbs, is a political pariah to the administrators, who have been accused of gross corruption and cronyism.

The officers of the VAS were re-elected: Carey Stronach as president, Samuel Payne as vice president, David Armor as secretary, Wayne Boese as treasurer, and Richard Stevens as chairman of the Board of Trustees. Dr. Fabio Guerinoni was elected to the Board of Trustees to fill the vacancy created by the death of Dr. David Springman.

The VAS Board of Trustees will meet next in October or November of 2008. ☞

## National Capitol Association of Scholars Meeting, April 7, 2008

At the April meeting of the Washington, DC chapter of NAS, Greg Lukianoff, President of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education— FIRE, spoke on "Recent Campus Violations of Free Speech." In attendance were faculty and staff from local universities and colleges as well as members of DC think tanks, NGOs, and government agencies and institutions such as the Library of Congress. The meeting was held at the home of A. Graham Down, president of the DC chapter of NAS. Lukianoff gave a brief history of the foundation noting that since its founding in 1999 FIRE has won 113 public victories at more than 95 colleges and universities affecting the over 2 million students enrolled in these institutions. His talk cited examples of the kind of harassment FIRE was created to address.

The fall meeting of the DC NAS chapter will feature a talk by William Craig Rice, new Director of the Division of Education Programs at the National Endowment for the Humanities. ☞

## Rebuilding Campus Community: The Wrong Imperative A Statement by the National Association of Scholars

*The NAS helped expose a pattern of coercion of students in the residence life program at the University of Delaware in 2007 that shocked the nation. We followed up on it with research to determine the prevalence of similar abuses. In a series of investigative articles titled, "How Many Delawares?" the NAS described a campaign of indoctrination in college dorms across the country, conducted by relatively untrained, non-faculty residence-life staff.*

*Those findings prompted the below statement, which we released on 15 July 2008.*

A movement is afoot to restore our universities' lost sense of purpose. Unfortunately, its leadership is hostile to liberal education. The movement goes by several names: "educating the whole person," "the residential life revolution," and "the student learning imperative". These *Imperativists* (our word, not theirs) are not scholars. Their outlook largely derives from "the helping professions" and views the university as an instrument of progressive social change. In most cases, the faculty is bypassed.

Most faculty members are ignorant of the movement's spreading influence, although it imperils their role as arbiters of academic content. This is an ignorance they can ill afford, because the Imperativist challenge aims at nothing less than the authority of learned judgment, reasoned discourse, and open-mindedness. The traditional goals of the university are being threatened by a morally imperious philistinism.

We know how this came about. For several decades faculty members have allowed the definition of the educational mission to slip from their hands. Faced with an increasingly bureaucratized university, many have retreated into the redoubts of their scholarly specialties, paying less and less attention to the fulfillment of broader purposes. Teaching has often been scanted or dulled. The once serious concern for

individual mentorship—the guidance of students through initial encounters with new ideas and systems of thought—is also fading. American faculties are far from perfect, but if the university is to reclaim an elevating and integrated vision, it must be guided by those who truly understand its ideals—a claim professors can make far better than the misguided functionaries now seizing upon the task.

Liberal education is emancipatory; it both opens and sharpens minds. It opens them through exposure to the robust debates that have provided civilization its most creative tensions. It sharpens them by focusing on what has brought these debates to their utmost levels of penetration, implication, and rigor. Widened horizons, breadth of knowledge, power of thought, and the intellectual confidence born of wrestling with serious issues are its culminating legacy. But this legacy can only be bequeathed by those who have themselves received it.

The ends and means of the "student learning imperative" are otherwise. It seeks to "transform" students, but in a doctrinaire and coercive way. It assumes that undergraduates arrive on campus bearing a benighted inheritance—the values of traditional American culture—that must be replaced by more enlightened attitudes. Students must confess their racial, sexual, and other prejudices; admit that

American society is, by its nature, oppressive; and pledge to promote specific forms of social and political change. In short, the "student learning imperative" aims at winning converts to an orthodoxy. The Imperativists offer thought reform, not education.

This is an affront to liberal principles and the education these principles should inspire. It also violates the basic maxims of university governance in which the faculty's core responsibility for academic content is only shared, to a limited extent, with senior institutional fiduciaries.

The facts about this movement initially came to national attention in October 2007 at the University of Delaware, when many undergraduates complained of a mandatory dorm-based program in which white students were browbeaten into admitting they were racists; heterosexual students were interrogated about their sexual preference; and all students were pressured to commit themselves to reducing their "carbon footprint" by 20 percent. Freshmen were subjected to one-on-one meetings with residential advisors who were tasked by their supervisors to break down psychological resistance. The university first tried to deny these facts, but, when confronted with copies of the planning documents, "suspended" the program.

Was the University of

Delaware's program an aberration? A National Association of Scholars canvass, "How Many Delawares?" found that it was different in degree but not in kind from hundreds of others. Moreover, the NAS learned that this movement has a history, dating back to a 1994 call by the American College Personnel Association to improve the sense of "community" among students on campus.

In principle, that call was welcome. The university had lost many of the norms that once gave it cohesiveness. By the early 1990s, a Carnegie Commission study revealed that "lack of community" was the single most prevalent complaint among undergraduates. Unfortunately, instead of consulting with the faculty about how best to reinvigorate traditional ideals, student affairs "revolutionaries" (their own term) have been allowed to attempt the construction of a wholly new kind of student community, made up of a wholly new kind of student.

This movement is rich in catch-phrases. For example, its proponents portray the college classroom as concerned merely with "information transfer," while in the dorms, residence lifers take care of "the whole student" and "identity development." At a recent national conference, residence lifers declared they were now "equal partners" with faculty in higher education. They characterized residence life in the old days as being concerned merely with "programming activities", while under the new "curricular model," residence lifers, like faculty members, act as teachers.

Teachers of what? And by what means? It is much in the interest of faculty members everywhere to begin posing these questions.

We believe that the common life of our campuses should be consistent with the goals of liberal education and, accordingly, guided principally by faculty. Although there may be faculty members perfectly happy with the "revolutionary" education served up by many residence life offices, we don't believe the program can survive an open faculty debate about it.


The "revolution in residence life" betrays the intellectual mission of the university in four ways.

1. Instead of giving students a sense of our civilization in all its richness and complexity, it insists on pat, simplistic, and tendentious answers.
2. Instead of providing an introduction to our civilization via sound scholarship, it offers the denunciations of untrained and narrow-minded partisans. Staff members in residence life may be well-meaning, but they can never be "equal partners" with the faculty.
3. Instead of demonstrating how people with diverse and differing views can form a worthy intellectual community, it suppresses differences, insisting instead on social and political conformity.
4. Instead of being candid about its intentions, it advances by stealth. Most faculty members and even many senior administrators have never heard of the "revolution in residence life." That's not an accident. The program has been insinuated onto campus under the cover of mere housekeeping reforms. The startling claims about residence life and educating "the whole person" are seldom conveyed to the faculty. (Or, for that matter, to unsuspecting, bill-paying, parents).

In sum, the new campus regime in residence life is illiberal throughout.

We believe this corrosive movement has run its course and that the time has come for responsible faculty members to assert their rightful stewardship. Colleges and universities should seek to rebuild community, but not in the regimented way embodied by "the student learning imperative." Rather, they should seek to do it in a manner that respects liberal education's fundamental ideals, that is to say, by:

- Fostering a sense of community based on shared interests in learning, involving collective commitments to reasoned discourse, intellectual honesty, open mindedness, acceptance of dissent, and, above all, the pursuit of truth.
- Respecting the individual dignity of all learners and disavowing attempts to intimidate dissent.
- Respecting a process of individual choice which encourages all learners to reach their conclusions in a manner that fortifies their abilities to advance in knowledge
- Investing academic power in those who are intellectually competent to exercise it.

Only a community holding these ideals in common is consistent with the mission of the university in an open society. The "revolution in student life" disservices these ideals. It is time for those who truly prize them to reassume responsibility for their fulfillment. 

Visit today:  
[www.NAS.org](http://www.NAS.org)

# What On Earth Is Going On in the Dorms?: The NAS' How Many Delawares Project

By Thomas Wood

The firestorm over a residence hall program at the University of Delaware, which flared up there in November 2007, was probably the greatest *cause célèbre* over political correctness and left-leaning ideological agendas run amuck in the academy since the water buffalo incident at the University of Pennsylvania in 1993. (Significantly, the earlier controversy at Penn also involved an incident at the dorms, and Penn's director of student life played a central role in that university's inept, unfair, and oppressive handling of the whole episode.) The fireworks at the University of Delaware prompted one of the NAS' principal initiatives this year—the How Many Delawares project. We wanted to see whether the events at Delaware were merely aberrant, or, as we suspected was more likely, indicative of some worrisome national trends and developments.

As of mid-July of this year, Peter Wood and I (though we are namesakes, we are not related, in case you have been wondering) have between us contributed numerous postings to this on-going series. A list of these contributions is given below. A running list of these postings and related writings and resources, including hyper-linked bibliographies, is available on the NAS web site.

Our project has brought into clear view a whole dimension of college life that hadn't been receiving much attention from the NAS and other critics of the modern academy. Little attention had been given in the public debates over the academy to what is going on in the residence halls, and to the huge growth in the last several decades of the budgets and staffs of the Res Life and Student Affairs divisions on campus. This was a serious blind spot, for the extra-curriculum is arguably much more important to the lives and the day-to-day concerns of the students than the curricular sector of the university, which (together with publishing and research) absorbs all the attention of the faculty.

In the unlikely event that you missed it, the curricular programming at the University of Delaware involved a determined attempt to indoctrinate students in the residence halls there. Despite the University's claims to the contrary, the programming was also mandatory. It involved very intrusive one-on-one interactions between students and peers (the latter being poorly trained Residence Assistants) about racism, sexism, and all the other conceivable forms of repression in American society. The

program had set goals for itself, one of which was to get white students to acknowledge that they, their parents, and the society of which they are a part, are inherently racist.

Of course, this is not new stuff in the academy. It is standard fare in critical race theory courses, and it has been the sort of thing that has concerned the NAS since its inception. What seemed novel and peculiar at U Delaware was that this ideology had been introduced into peer-group, student-facilitated encounter groups in the dorms. This involved a good deal more than simply extending the political views of tenured radicals from the academic sector of the university to the residence halls.

First, the programming violated the established norms of university governance. When a course of instruction is approved by a faculty senate, that approval merely certifies that the course meets the senate's academic standards; it does not commit the university itself to whatever views are taught in that course. It is otherwise with curricular programming run by Res Life or Student Affairs professionals. Since these are non-academic divisions of the university, which report directly to the administration, programming in a residence hall is sanctioned by the university in a way that a course taught by a faculty member is not. To the extent that there is an ideology in such residence hall curricular programming—and there clearly is—the university itself becomes committed to that ideology.

Second, the curricular programming involves a pedagogy that has little or no place in the academy. It is primarily experiential in nature, and belongs more properly to the world of psychotherapy, the helping professions, and encounter groups. Its aim is not to develop critical thinking skills or to teach any coherent body of knowledge (something the proponents of such programming often dismiss as mere "information transfer"). Its aim instead is to transform the lives of students and move them toward more authentic—and hopefully less racist and sexist and oppressive—modes of being.

"Experiential" courses have been taught by faculty as part of the regular curriculum at some universities, though this has been relatively rare. One particularly illuminating example is the program in Intergroup Relations (IGR) at the University of Michigan—Ann Arbor. The IGR, which focuses on intergroup dialogues about race, was started in 1988 in response to racial tensions on campus. IGR's founder was Patricia

Gurin, who wrote the report (called the *Gurin Report*) that the University commissioned to justify its racially preferential admissions policies in the *Grutter* and *Gratz* litigation. There is a clear link between intergroup dialogue classes on race and the desire to *provide* intellectual and academic support for the use of racial preferences by American universities. Empirical evidence supporting Justice Powell's diversity rationale for racial preferences in admissions, it is felt, is most likely to show up, not in the standard classroom setting, but rather in peer-facilitated, experiential courses focused on intergroup racial dialogues. This has been one of the principal justifications for the generous funding of such programs by Ford, Hewlett, and other foundations.

Programs modeled directly on the IGR program at U Michigan have been adopted at a number of other universities, eight of which have joined Michigan in a collaborative research effort called the Multi-University Intergroup Dialogues Research Project. The Research Project aims to find empirical evidence supporting the diversity rationale for racial preferences in university admissions that was endorsed by Justice Powell in the *Bakke* decision and by the Court in *Grutter* and *Gratz*. The other participating institutions in the Research Project are: Arizona State University, Occidental College, Syracuse University, the University of California at San Diego, the University of Maryland, the University of Massachusetts, the University of Texas, and the University of Washington.

Workshops on intergroup dialogues are now common at national higher education conferences. Michigan has held summer institutes to train other colleges in its methods since 2006. The conference this year, which was held from July 23 to 26 at Ann Arbor, had registrants from 30 different institutions. Most, but not all, of the participants in the intergroup dialogue programs are from the student affairs and res life divisions of their campuses.

Our How Many Delawares project has already provided in-depth coverage of the IGR program at U Michigan and the Social Justice Education program at U Mass Amherst. (A posting on U Mass Amherst also covered a Res Life program that is closely associated with the Social Justice Education program there called the Shaha Troupe.) We expect to cover other schools and programs in future installments.

How threatening is all of this? There isn't a

simple answer to this question. To deal with it adequately, the question needs to be addressed in three different worlds or domains: Res Life and Student Affairs; the faculty; and students.

Advocacy of the new pedagogies of "transformative education," and the claim that they are "equal partners" with faculty in the education of students, is now the prevailing view of Res Life and Student Affairs professionals. We have been able to document this claim with a profusion of evidence taken from policy papers and conference presentations of the leading professional organizations in the field like the American College Personnel Association ([myacpa.org](http://myacpa.org)). A major effort would be needed to overturn this state of affairs, and even if such a counterrevolutionary effort could be mounted, the mindset is now so deeply entrenched that the outcome would be doubtful.

We feel somewhat more optimistic when it comes to the faculty. True, the faculty senate at the University of Delaware voted in May to support a modified and considerably attenuated version of the curricular program. We doubt, however, that this vote was taken in full cognizance of the deeper issues that such programs present to the academy. The administration at Delaware assured the faculty that the revised program would be heavily monitored and that the programming would be purely voluntary. These assurances carried the day, and forestalled a much-needed debate in the senate over the governance issue and the appropriateness of this kind of pedagogy in the academy. The faculty vote on May 12 was disappointing, but much less disheartening than it probably would have been if the faculty had been fully aware of what they were doing when they ratified the revised program. More work can and should be done here, since we have every reason to think that the more the professoriate learns about what has been called the "Res Life revolution," the less it will like what it sees.

There might be a market—and therefore a great future—for the new Res Life curricular agenda if students liked it and wanted it, but, unsurprisingly, they don't. It was student

complaints that broke the story at the University of Delaware in the first place. (The initial complaints were made to two NAS members at the University, Jan Blits and Linda Gottfriedson.) Everything that we learned about the students in our site visit to the campus told us that the students at Delaware preferred traditional programming in their residence halls. In fact, the new, heavily ideological curricular programming appears to be decidedly unpopular.

But if the student culture provides some bulwark against the inroads of the new Res Life ideology, it does so for mostly disappointing reasons. The hall residents complained that they and their friends had been subjected to humiliating treatment by the program, but apart from its abusive features (which the University claims it will remove), we did not find students objecting to the programming on principled grounds: they did not, for example, object to such programming as being antithetical to the university as a free marketplace of ideas. This suggests that if the students were to object to a non-abusive program, it would most likely be because such programming interfered with the pursuit by the students of their other interests.

We need to get a better picture of what those interests are. Most faculty know little about students. They have little or no personal contact with them in the classroom setting, and students are showing up less and less during office hours. In this situation, students can seem as alien to most faculty as the Azande and Trobriand Islanders must have seemed to E. E. Evans-Pritchard and Bronislaw Malinowski. In fact, the problem has become so acute that trained ethnographers and cultural anthropologists have started applying their field work methodology to the study of students in their natural habitat—the dorms.

We will try to be as upbeat here as we can, but the picture that has emerged so far from our study of this literature has not been encouraging, either for those who support the traditional values of liberal education or for those who would like to create change agents for the transformation of American society along

progressive lines. Anthropologists and others who have studied the natives in question find that they are not much interested in either of these things. What they have found is a remarkable indifference to—and even disdain for—intellectual and academic values, and an impatience with any standards or demands that stand in the way of career making, "coming of age," and having fun (having fun being particularly important). Of course, it is an old chestnut that every older generation always sees the younger generation as going to the dogs. Yet there is solid empirical evidence of declining respect for academic work by students, increased cheating and tolerance of it, less time spent on studying and preparing for class, and so on.

What happens in the residence halls matters, and finding out what is going on there, in what might be called the students' natural habitat on campus, might turn out to be the most important aspect of the NAS' work on the HMD project. The residential college has been the leading, elite model for the American university since its inception in the seventeenth century. In some respects, even more emphasis has been placed on that model in the last twenty years, as part of the attempt to arrest the felt decline in campus community. With the decentralization that has occurred in almost all aspects of university life, the residence halls and the sports teams, it is felt, are almost the only means that universities have now to sustain a sense of campus community at all.

At the same time, the residential model is facing increasing pressures from changing demographics (larger percentages of the student bodies consist now of older students returning to college), increased careerism, the growing number of students who commute and/or hold down part time jobs while they attend college, and the advent of distance education and new computer technologies. These are developments of considerable moment that will be getting attention in future installments of the HMD series.

## A running catalog of contributions to the NAS' HMD series (*and other postings particularly relevant to it*)

- [Infestation: Widespread or Not?](#)  
December 04, 2007
- [Psychotherapeutic Interventions, Transformative Learning, and the Dorms of U Delaware](#)  
December 11, 2007 By Tom Wood
- [Residence Life, the Shaha Troupe, and Social Justice Education at U Mass Amherst](#)  
December 28, 2007 By Tom Wood
- [No Escape at U Mass Amherst](#)  
January 22, 2008 By Tom Wood
- [Res Life and the Decline of Campus Community \(Part I\)](#)  
January 30, 2008 By Tom Wood

- [Who Educates the Whole Person These Days? Anyone? \(Res Life and the Decline of Campus Community, Part 2\)](#)  
February 20, 2008 By Thomas Wood
- [Inside the ACPA Conference](#)  
February 29, 2008 By Peter Wood
- [Ideology @ UCLA Dorms](#)  
March 06, 2008 By Peter Wood
- [The Marriage of Affirmative Action and Transformative Education](#)  
March 27, 2008 By Thomas Wood
- [Just Say No to Racial Preferences](#)  
April 28, 2008 By Thomas Wood

- [UD Faculty, Students Stand Up Against Res Life Proposal](#)  
May 06, 2008
- [How to Defeat the Res Lifer's Nouveau Indoctrination Program](#)  
May 08, 2008 By Thomas Wood
- [Rebuilding Campus Community: The Wrong Imperative. A Statement of the National Association of Scholars](#)  
July 15, 2008  
(see pages 8-9)

## Nebraska Association of Scholars Prepares for Ballot Battle

Members of the Nebraska Association of Scholars are gearing up to do battle on behalf of the Nebraska Civil Rights Initiative (NCRI) on the state ballot this November. The NEAS is a co-sponsor of the initiative, part of the national effort spearheaded by Ward Connerly's American Civil Rights Institute.

Affiliate members have worked on behalf of the initiative as private citizens, no money having gone from the Nebraska Association of Scholars to the NCRI. Yet the association has become a significant rallying point for the initiative's supporters. Its members participate in the signature collection process and write editorials and letters-to-the-editor to counter misconceptions propagated by opponents of the NCRI.

Members of the Nebraska Association of Scholars led the way in urging Ward Connerly to bring his petition process to the state. They did so after watching the University of Nebraska discriminate for years in faculty hiring and graduate students admission. This discrimination became blatant and pervasive after 1997, when the state legislature passed an appropriations rider demanding that each campus conform to the average of similar institutions in percentages of woman and minorities on the faculty.

Since then, the university has seen the proliferation of "opportunity hiring," in which normal advertising is suspended and hiring committees focus only on candidates of the right color or sex. According to Nebraska Association of Scholars vice president Dwayne Ball, who has amassed detailed information on reverse discrimination in hiring and graduate-student admissions at the University, 61 of the 301 tenure track faculty hired between 1998 and 2004 were "opportunity hires", of which 45 were women or minorities.

The University of Nebraska administration has made it clear that they do not intend to change this behavior anytime soon. Passage of the NCRI will be necessary to put an end to this unfair and un-American academic discrimination. ✎

## Program in Western Civilization & American Institutions Shoots for the Stars at the University of Texas

Something big is brewing down at the University Texas/Austin—a new, rapidly growing program in Western civilization likely to become a pacesetter for similar efforts around the country. Although it has gathered around itself a sterling batch of longhorn scholars, its guiding spirit is none other than the president of our Texas affiliate, UT philosophy professor Robert Koons.

The progress of the program has been comparatively rapid and its dimensions are now quite large. In May 2003 an Ad Hoc Committee of faculty sponsors began to meet and shortly thereafter a formal proposal was in the hands of hands of the Dean of Liberal Arts. After several iterations and consultations a curriculum concentration was approved at the beginning of the 2005–2006 academic year. A year later formal recognition of new program status was conferred by the College, and a lecture series was established which has since sponsored talks by a spectrum of academics including Harry Lewis (Harvard), Robert George (Princeton), Victor Davis Hanson (Hoover Institution), Wai Chee Dimock (Yale), Martha Nussbaum (Chicago), Michael Bérubé (Penn State), Danielle Allen (Chicago), Herbert London (Hudson Institute), Hadley Arkes (Amherst), Michael Barone (American Enterprise Institute), and Harvey Mansfield (Harvard). In December 2007 a set of new, interdisciplinary courses in the field of study of Western civilization were approved by the dean and provost to be offered under the program's aegis. The possi-

bility of an associated center is currently under review with an eventual major also in contemplation. Big things indeed!

As Bernard of Chartres put it, we moderns are dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants. The "giants" he referred to were the great thinkers and writers of antiquity—the Greeks, Romans, and Hebrews. He recognized the debt he owed for the unique tradition of dialogue and inquiry that forms the heritage of Western civilization. The Program in Western Civilization & American Institutions at the University of Texas represents a revival of this tradition, a course of study that will introduce students to the "giants," whose numbers have increased to include writers and thinkers of the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, America's founders, and beyond.

As a new field of study and concentration, the Program in Western Civilization now offers a curriculum in the Great Books of the Western canon, culminating in the study of the founding of the American republic. Its unifying theme is: Learning What the Founders Knew; Reading What the Founders Read. The Program introduces the concepts and principles that have built and sustained the unique contributions of the West to human society: rule of law, representative democracy, freedom of inquiry, the equal rights of individuals, freedom of conscience, and constitutional government. There is now a core of eight faculty, forty-five affiliated faculty, and strong support from administrators.

| Continued on page 13 |

VOL. 16, NO. 4, 2008

| Continued from page 12 |

UT provides a uniquely rich environment for the Western Civilization Program. The University of Texas at Austin is fortunate to have one of the nation's strongest philosophy departments, with extensive expertise in the history of philosophy, including special strength in ancient Greek and Roman thought. The philosophy department also includes several faculty members interested in the theory of American constitutional government and its philosophical roots in the ancient, medieval, and modern worlds.

UT also has an outstanding program in political philosophy in the Government Department, led by Thomas L. Pangle, author of *Political Philosophy and the God of Abraham* and numerous other books on ancient and modern political philosophy, and J. Budziszewski, an expert in the natural law tradition. This program attracts graduate students from the best universities in the country. To supplement these strengths, the university has one of the nation's largest and strongest classics programs. There are also

clusters of sympathetic scholars in Spanish, English, sociology of religion, and Middle Eastern studies.

At the undergraduate level, conditions are ideal for developing both a well-focused certificate program of six core courses and a major program of ten to twelve courses in Western civilization. The Texas legislature has long ensured that all undergraduates receive a broad general education through an unusually wide array of required courses in the natural sciences, humanities, foreign languages, history, and government. Recent commissions appointed by the state governor and by the university president have highlighted the need to develop new core courses to give coherence to the undergraduate curriculum. The center will also offer a certificate in Western Civilization & Ethical Leadership, aimed especially at students in business and engineering.

The program will also offer a number of opportunities for the enrichment of undergraduate education through extracurricular means, including:

- An intensive summer institute in Ethics & Western Civilization, providing students the opportunity to earn 12 credits toward the certificate, and offering opportunities for college teachers, post-docs and graduate students to acquire proficiency in a great-texts approach to the study of Western Civilization.
- Opportunities for study abroad, combining the reading of great texts with an immersion in their associated places.
- Post-doctoral teaching fellows and visiting professors.
- A lecture series, with opportunities for students to join in dinners with visiting scholars.
- An annual conference in Western civilization and the principles of the American founding, in conjunction with other Great Books programs in the region (Baylor University, University of Dallas, University of St. Thomas).

Hats off to the NAS members and other UT faculty who have helped launch this exceptional program. ✎

## Michigan Affiliate Meets at MSU

A membership meeting of the Michigan Association of Scholars convened on the afternoon of 5 June 2008 in the Dean's Conference Room of the College of Engineering at Michigan State University.

MAS President Paul Moreno looked ahead to the affiliate's plans and prospects. There was reflection on the need for the Michigan Association of Scholars to collaborate in investigations of compliance with the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative. For example, since 1998 the Office for Affirmative Action, Compliance &

Monitoring has been advising the Michigan State University president on diversity. (After the 2006 passage of the MCRI, it became the Office for Inclusion & Intercultural Initiatives.) Have its mission and practices changed? This is a legitimate subject for inquiry by the MAS as part of its continued opposition to ethnic and gender preferences and administrative bloat.

NAS president Steve Balch addressed the MAS board, describing such current NAS efforts as the Argus and Perseus projects—initiatives to

organize a cadre of volunteers to monitor university policies in areas like academic freedom, intellectual pluralism, and reasoned discourse.

Dr. Balch led a discussion of policy-relevant activities that he encourages NAS affiliates to undertake. These could take the form of Freedom of Information Act requests aimed at assessing compliance with enactments like the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative. A motion to retain the present composition of the MAS board passed unanimously. ✎


endings? Then stay tuned for our bestowal of the Sidney Hook Award on Ward Connerly for his heroic services vindicating color blindness. (Two more state civil rights initiatives will probably have just been adopted.) Our own Carol Iannone will receive the Barry Gross Award for her immense contributions in furthering the work of the NAS.

And there'll be many other exciting turns as well, including panels examining the contest between

government's regulatory urge and the explosive energy of the new information technologies, and the implication of the gulf separating the culture of our campuses from that of the military.

The Washington Marriott, which hosted successful NAS conferences in 1996 and 2002 will again be our venue. Located at 1221 22nd St. NW, Washington, DC 20037 [(202) 872-1500] on the edge of Washington's business district, this pleasant nine-story brick hotel is within easy reach of all of

Washington's fascinating sites. We will set aside a number of rooms at special discounted rates for conference participants in the NAS community.

This will be a great show at a moment of high national drama, so by all means plan to come. To register, please mail in the form below, or click on the "Conferences" button at [www.nas.org](http://www.nas.org) for the latest in registration procedures and to reserve rooms on a web page that the Washington Marriott dedicated for our event. 

## CONFERENCE REGISTRATION FORM

*NOTE: You may also register on-line at [www.nas.org](http://www.nas.org).*

Please reserve \_\_\_\_\_ places in my name at the Thirteenth General NAS Conference *The Changing Landscape of American Higher Education*, January 9 to 11, 2009, at the Washington Marriott Hotel, 1221 22nd Street NW, Washington, DC 20037; 800-393-3053. Registration covers admission to all panels, the keynote address Friday afternoon, the reception Friday evening, and the awards luncheon on Saturday.

\_\_\_\_\_ \$130 per person for NAS members and their guests

\_\_\_\_\_ \$150 per person for non-members and their guests

\_\_\_\_\_ These who cannot attend the conference, as well as attendees who would help us defray conference expenses that always outstrip income, may wish to include a tax-deductible contribution of \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_ I wish to join (or renew my membership in) the NAS, receive a subscription to *Academic Questions*, and qualify for the member's conference rate.

Dues are: \$22 (for graduate students and adjunct and emeritus faculty)

\$42 (for full-time faculty and administrators)

I enclose annual dues of \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

Total enclosed \_\_\_\_\_

Name(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Guest(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Street address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP: \_\_\_\_\_

Affiliation (for name badge): \_\_\_\_\_

Home phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Office phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Total enclosed: \_\_\_\_\_ (Please make checks payable to National Association of Scholars.)

To help us in our planning, please indicate whether you expect to attend the following events:

Friday reception/buffet Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Saturday awards luncheon Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

To pay by credit card, please supply the following information:

Type of card: \_\_\_\_\_ Mastercard \_\_\_\_\_ Visa \_\_\_\_\_ American Express

Card Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Expiration Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name on card (Please print) \_\_\_\_\_ Cardholder signature \_\_\_\_\_

Amount to be billed: \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: Credit card information must be mailed, as an original signature is required; we cannot accept credit cards at the conference (cash, check, or money order only).

**Mail to: National Association of Scholars, 1 Airport Place, Suite 7, Princeton, NJ 08540-1532**



# AFFILIATES OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOLARS

### ALABAMA

President: Michael S. Loop  
University of Alabama at Birmingham  
924 18th Street South  
Birmingham, AL 35294  
205-934-6751  
loop@uab.edu

### ALASKA

President: Judith S. Kleinfeld  
759 Cranberry Ridge Road  
Fairbanks, AK 99712  
907-457-8691  
Kleinfel@alaska.net

### ARIZONA

President: Marianne M. Jennings  
College of Business  
Arizona State University—  
Main Campus  
Post Office Box 874806  
Tempe, AZ 85287-4806  
480-965-6044  
480-965-3995/fax  
marianne.jennings@asu.edu

### CALIFORNIA

President: John Ellis  
144 Bay Heights  
Soquel, CA 95073  
831-476-1144  
john.ellis@earthlink.net

### COLORADO

President: Charles L. King  
2870 Duke Circle  
Boulder, CO 80305  
303-499-7547  
kingc@earthlink.net

### CONNECTICUT

President: Jay A. Bergman  
Department of History  
Central Conn. State University  
Post Office Box 4010  
New Britain, CT 06050-4010  
860-832-2811  
860-667-9499/home fax  
bergmanj@ccsu.edu

### DELAWARE

President: Jan H. Blits  
University Honors Program  
219A Willard Hall  
University of Delaware  
Newark, DE 19716-5699  
302-831-1649  
302-831-6058/fax  
JBlits@udel.edu

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

President: A. Graham Down  
4000 Cathedral Ave., NW  
Number 152B  
Washington, DC 20016  
202-333-8258  
agdown@msn.com

### FLORIDA

Acting President: Michael D. Grimes  
Miami-Dade College  
School of Justice  
11380 N.W. 27th Avenue  
Miami, FL 33167-3495  
305-237-1411  
mgrimes@mdc.edu

### GEORGIA

President: Ann Hartle  
Philosophy Department  
Emory University  
Atlanta, GA 30322  
404-727-0105  
ahartle@emory.edu

### HAWAII

President: James Roumasset  
Department of Economics  
University of Hawaii at Manoa  
514 Saunders Hall  
Honolulu, HI 96822-2281  
808-956-7496  
808-956-4347/fax  
jimr@hawaii.edu

### IDAHO

President: Scott Yenor  
Dept. of Political Science/SSPA  
Mail Stop: 1935  
Boise State University  
1910 University Drive  
Boise, ID 83725  
208-426-2388  
syenor@boisestate.edu

### ILLINOIS

President: Jonathan J. Bean  
37 Pine Lane  
Murphysboro, IL 62966  
618-453-7872  
618-453-5440/fax  
jonbean@siu.edu

### INDIANA

President: Robert H. Heidt  
School of Law, Rm. 263  
211 South Indiana Avenue  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, IN 47405-7001  
812-855-7272  
812-855-0555/fax  
heidt@indiana.edu

### IOWA

President: Donald P. Racheter  
600 N. Jackson  
Mt. Pleasant, IA 52641  
319-385-3462  
319-385-3799/fax  
racheter@limitedgovernment.org

### KANSAS

President: Marsha L. Frey  
Department of History  
208 Eisenhower Hall  
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, KS 66506-1002  
406-251-2000  
785-532-7004/fax  
mfrey@ksu.edu

### KENTUCKY

President: Monica J. Kern  
Department of Psychology  
220a Kastle Hall  
University of Kentucky  
Lexington, KY 40506-0044  
859-257-6842  
859-323-1979/fax  
harris@pop.uky.edu

### LOUISIANA

President: William F. Campbell  
3914 Broussard Street  
Baton Rouge, LA 70808  
225-927-2042  
225-922-9959/fax  
wcampbell14@cox.net

### MAINE

President: Michael Palmer  
Department of Political Science  
University of Maine — Orono  
5754 North Stevens Hall  
Orono, ME 04469-5754  
207-581-1879  
207-581-4856/fax  
michael\_palmer@umit.maine.edu

### MARYLAND

President: Duane C. Ellison  
Department of History and  
Political Science  
Humanities Building, Room 263  
Montgomery College—  
Rockville Campus  
51 Mannakee Street  
Rockville, MD 20850-1199  
301-251-7286  
301-251-7278/fax  
208760@comcast.net

### MASSACHUSETTS

President: Douglas Sears  
Assoc. Provost/Assist. to Pres.  
Boston University  
One Sherborn Street  
Boston, MA 02215  
617-358-1360  
dsears@bu.edu

### MICHIGAN

President: Paul Moreno  
78 W. Lynnwood Blvd.  
Hillsdale, MI 49242-1962  
517-607-2578  
pmoreno@hillsdale.edu

### MINNESOTA

President: Kenneth O. Doyle  
UM-SJMC, 343 Murphy Hall  
206 Church St.  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
612-624-5341  
kendoyle@umn.edu

Executive Director: Terrence F. Flower  
Dept. of Physics  
College of St. Catherine  
2004 Randolph Ave.  
St. Paul, MN 55105  
651-690-6598  
651-690-8657/fax  
tflower@stkate.edu

### MISSISSIPPI

President: Frank Glamser  
36 Summer Place  
Hattiesburg, MS 39402  
601-264-2975  
fglamser@earthlink.net

### MISSOURI

President: Dean Monahan  
2021 Steven Drive  
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701  
573-334-6976  
dmonahan@semo.edu

### NEBRASKA

President: Edward A. Rauchut  
Bellevue University  
1000 Galvin Road South  
Bellevue, NE 68005-3098  
402-293-3701  
402-293-2035/fax  
erauchut@bellevue.edu

### NEVADA

President: David S. Fott  
Department of Political Science  
University of Nevada Las Vegas  
Post Office Box 455029  
Las Vegas, NV 89154-5029  
702-895-4187  
dfott@unlv.nevada.edu

### NEW HAMPSHIRE

President: James Tucker  
50 S. School Street  
Unit 1  
Portsmouth, NH 03801  
603-430-2838  
603-862-1814  
jetucker@hopper.unh.edu

### NEW JERSEY

President: George Zilbergeld  
24 Ellis Street  
Freehold, NJ 07728  
732-431-1047  
zilbergeldg@mail.montclair.edu

### NEW MEXICO

Coordinator: Greg Butler  
MSC 3BN  
New Mexico State University  
PO Box 30001  
Las Cruces, NM 88003  
505-522-3931  
505-646-4935  
gbutler@nmsu.edu

### NEW YORK

President: David Gordon  
History Department  
CUNY – Bronx Community College  
University Avenue  
and West 181 Street  
Bronx, NY 10453  
718-289-5658  
dmgordon@mindspring.com

### CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK CHAPTER

Chair: Dorothy Lang  
Business Dept., 3N-219  
CUNY-Staten Island  
2800 Victory Blvd.  
Staten Island, NY 10314-6600  
718-982-2927  
cunyas@earthlink.net

### NORTH CAROLINA

President: Robert Rosthal  
P.O. Box 4846  
Greensboro, NC 27404-4846  
336-299-3873  
336-299-7932/fax  
rosthal@aol.com

### OHIO

President: George W. Dent, Jr.  
School of Law  
Case Western Reserve University  
Cleveland, OH 44106-5409  
216-368-3311  
216-368-2086  
george.dent@case.edu

### OKLAHOMA

President: Andrew C. Spiropoulos  
Oklahoma City University  
School of Law  
Oklahoma City, OK 73106-1493  
405-521-5801  
405-521-5089/fax  
aspiropoulos@okcu.edu

### OREGON

President: Michael Kellman  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403-1253  
541-346-4196  
541-346-4643/fax  
kellman@uoregon.edu

### PENNSYLVANIA

President: Michael P. Krom  
617 Chestnut Street  
Latrobe, PA 15650  
724-805-2844  
michael.krom@email.stvincent.edu

### RHODE ISLAND

President: William Felkner  
14 High Street  
Ashaway, RI 02804  
401-474-1893  
401-427-0286/fax  
billfelkner@cox.net

### SOUTH CAROLINA

President: Christina Jeffrey  
801 Palmetto Street  
Spartanburg, SC 29302  
864-948-1297  
rcjeffrey@charter.net

### TENNESSEE

President: James Summerville  
Independent Scholar  
208 McCreary Hgts  
Dickson, TN 37055-1217  
866-828-3388  
mapheus@prodigy.net

### TEXAS

President: Robert Koons  
Waggener Hall, C3500  
University of Texas  
Austin, TX 78712-1180  
512-471-5530  
512-471-4806/fax  
koons@mail.utexas.edu

### UTAH

President: Royal Skousen  
Department of Linguistics and  
English Language  
4037 JFSB  
Brigham Young University  
Provo, UT 74602  
801-422-3482  
royal\_skousen@byu.edu

### VERMONT

President: Laurie Morrow  
15 Deerfield Drive  
Montpelier, VT 05602  
802-229-9208  
lpmorrow@msn.com

### VIRGINIA

President: Cary Stronach  
2241 Buckner Street  
Petersburg, VA 23805-2207  
804-732-8993 (home)  
804-896-1168 (cell)  
cestronach@comcast.net

### WASHINGTON

President: Alex Myrick  
1014 South 120th St.  
Seattle, WA 98168  
206-901-0647  
myrick\_4@msn.com

### WEST VIRGINIA

President: Robert K. Griffith  
Department of Basic  
Pharmaceutical Sciences  
School of Pharmacy,  
Box 9530  
West Virginia University  
Morgantown, WV 26506  
304-293-1481  
304-293-2576/fax  
rgriffith@hsc.wvu.edu

### WISCONSIN

President: Thomas L. Drucker  
801 East Clay Street  
Apartment C-3  
Whitewater, WI 53190  
262-472-5173  
druckert@uww.edu