President Collins had lunch with Senator Dewey Wise and informed him of the concerns expressed at the previous faculty meeting. Senator Wise agreed that faculty should elect their own representatives to the subcommittees dealing with the merger of the College of Charleston and the Medical University of South Carolina. He did recommend for subcommittees those people who expressed an interest to him, but no faculty members had. Senator Wise might accept an invitation by the faculty at the College to discuss the merger, but feels it is now premature.

There will be a special faculty meeting on Wednesday, March 25 at 5:00 P.M. in the recital hall of the Albert Simons Center for the Arts. Election of faculty members for the subcommittees dealing with the merger will take place. Time permitting, we will also try to complete the unfinished business from the March 13 meeting. Please come to this very important meeting.

Before a merger could be institutionalized, (1) the Task Force would have to complete its feasibility study, (2) a recommendation would have to be made by the Commission on Higher Education, and (3) the proposal would have to pass the state legislature. Even if things moved reasonably efficiently toward a merger, it would probably not be effected for several years.

Of the eleven state supported institutions of higher learning, only Winthrop receives fewer dollars per FTE ($2467) than does the College of Charleston ($2494). The top five schools are Clemson ($3417), U.S.C. ($3247), S. C. State ($3110), The Citadel ($2758), and Francis Marion ($2672).

Next year there will be a $100 increase in student fees, a $140 increase for dormitory fees, and a $60 increase for the meal plan. It was suggested that co-educational dormitories would be more practical and could save the College some money, but the idea was discarded as too radical and too controversial.

When Earl Morris, former head of the State Commission on Higher Education and current member of the State Budget and Control Board, was in town recently he was invited by President Collins to attend a weekly staff meeting. There followed a fruitful discussion about the difficulty of long-range academic planning without some reasonably stable financial commitment to the College. Mr. Morris was sympathetic to the needs of the College and understood some of the academic and morale problems created by the mandate that state agencies submit a plan to reduce their personnel budget by 7%. He suggested that communication might be facilitated if administrators were to visit Columbia more frequently to present cases for the College.

Details for faculty input into the evaluation of selected administrators and department chairpersons are in the process of being finalized. The evaluation will be completed this spring.

In the past two semesters, the means on the student opinion questionnaires at the College in our five point scale were 3.86 and 3.88 for overall value of the course and 4.05 and 4.02 for overall quality of instruction. The standard deviations in all cases ranged from 0.93 to 0.95.

The average high school graduate in the Soviet Union has the following training in years above that of his or her American counterpart: Geometry (8), Algebra (1.5), Calculus (1.5), Physics (4), Chemistry (3), Biology (3.5), Astronomy (1), Mechanical Drawing (3), Workshop (8). What makes these statistics even more surprising is that 98% of their school-age population completes secondary school, compared to 75% in this country.

An auction in which faculty, students, and staff contribute and bid on items and services will be held in the fall, with proceeds to be used for College scholarships. The auction had been tentatively scheduled for sometime this spring, but was postponed in order to allow more time for planning.

George Haborak is soliciting for a faculty member who would like to become the Director of Orientation. Anyone interested should contact him for further details concerning the responsibilities and compensation.
COMMITTEESPEAK

The Committee on Nominations will nominate faculty members for the various subcommittees investigating the feasibility of a merger. Elections will be held at the special meeting on March 25. The Committee has also received 105 replies regarding service on standing and ad hoc committees; of these, 16 faculty indicated they did not wish to serve and 11 gave no committee preference. The five most requested committees are Faculty Research & Development, Student Affairs & athletics, Library, Continuing Education & Special Programs, and Presidential Advisory. Elections will be held at the regularly scheduled April meeting.

The Committee on Curriculum & Academic Planning will have additional course recommendations and is continuing the investigation of hourly requirements for students within and outside their major areas.

The Committee on the Library has had three of its members appointed by President Collins to serve on a screening committee that is searching for a Director of the Library. The members of the screening committee are Carmette Clardy, Robert Dukes, Rebecca Linton, Cerise Oberman-Soroka, John Newell (Chair), Katina Strauch, and Pamela Tisdale.

The Advisory Committee on Tenure and Promotion of Faculty has completed its business for the year. The President has informed all candidates of his decisions.

The Committee on Student Affairs met with Professors K. Hunt, Norman, and Page, the three black professors at the College, to hear their perceptions of minority student life on campus. What follows are some of their thoughts. The reputation of the College in the black community is poor, in part as a result of historic exclusion of blacks. For this reason, what might seem like an innocuous comment by an insensitive professor could prove devastating to a minority student. The long established attitudes on the part of black students and white professors are difficult to define and difficult to change. The white and black community frequently have different points of view, with neither side showing much flexibility. Academic issues are the primary concerns of minority students, since this is what most affects their identity and self-esteem. Minority students may need more help, and may have to be convinced to seek that help, but require no lowering of academic standards.

The Committee on Athletics heard a report by Jerry Sanders, Director of the Athletic Department, reviewing the operation of the Athletic Department and its budget allocations. The total operational budget for 1980-81 is approximately $180,000, including scholarships but excluding salaries. It was also mentioned that approximately 90% of student athletes at the College receive degrees.

The Faculty Welfare Committee would like to urge all faculty to read carefully the rationale for its proposal that a tenure decision be made in the fifth year and promotion not before the seventh. An ad hoc committee consisting of Marion Dug, Bill Guder, Hugh Haysworth, Anna Katona (Chair), and Robert Tournier will make its recommendation on this proposal at the April faculty meeting. Another ad hoc committee consisting of Jim London, John Michel, Norman Olsen (Chair), Sandra Powers, and Pamela Tisdale will make a recommendation at the April meeting as to whether the Faculty Welfare Committee should have the duty of looking into tenure and promotion procedures and policies.

The Faculty Research and Development Committee made its recommendations, and the following grants were awarded:

1. Leslie Abram, Library. Travel to major Libraries for a bibliography of Japanese prints (publisher already obtained). $830
2. Klaus de Alberquerque, Sociology. Research in Nassau and Hope Town (Bahamas) on Historical Links with Charleston. $1800
4. Carla Droste, Languages. Travel to Germany, to visit corporations offering career opportunities to language majors. $970
5. James Hagy, History. For travel to help in writing an article and preparing a course on the Etruscans. $1200
6. Marsha Hass, BA/Econ. For a study of recent legal developments concerning use of lie detectors. $750
7. Earl Kline, Political Science. For travel to Mainland China. $1800
8. David Mann, Political Science. To continue a project on lawyers' incentives to run for public office. $1000
9. Ralph Melnick, Library. For travel to archives holding material on Ludwig Lewisohn. $750

10. Glen Merrill, Geology. To purchase supplies and meet field expenses for current projects. $1800

11. John Michel, Fine Arts. To purchase materials for the clay model of a monumental sculpture. $1500

12. John Olbrich, Fine Arts. To produce an article and exploratory study on techniques used in the Federal Theatre Project of the 1930’s. $1000

13. Jack Parson, Political Science. Travel to help produce a book on Botswana. $656

14. Patricia Seed, History. Travel to research Spanish archives on Mexican family history. $1388

15. Faye Steuer, Psychology. To participate in research on cognitive development of dolphins. $750


17. Michael Tyack, Fine Arts. Materials for an exhibit of the development of a mural-sized painting. $1800

18. Frances Welch, Education. For a survey of needs for workshops on "Teacher Burnout" in South Carolina. $552

19. Nan Woodruff, History. For travel to research the agricultural history of South Carolina coastal regions. $1180

Total: $21,845

The Ad Hoc Lilly Committee made its recommendations, and the following grants were awarded:

George Pothering $1520
Tze Ree Chang - Continuing Computer Science Education 1520
Andree Parrott 500
Typing expenses for workshop in medieval and renaissance French
David Hayes 400
Permission to carry over unspent funds for women composers project.
Rosanne Wray 400
Travel funds for Conference on Supervision of Directed Teaching
Edward Lawton 250
Travel to observe model middle-school/community programs.
Robert Dukes 2000
Conference/workshop on Computer-assisted instruction.
Samuel Hines and Political Science Department 950
Consultant on improving teaching in American Politics.
Diane Johnson 585
Consultant/Lecturer interdisciplinary art teaching and the rise of avant-garde art.
Fred Watts 1000
Consultant in department planning for Physics
Suzanne Moore 400
Study of Avellaneda, A cuban woman writer, in Cuba.
Gerald Gibson 500
Research support through a fellowship for a student researcher.
The Lilly Committee: Workshop on mid-career self-assessment. 1000

Total: $11,320

An Ad Hoc Committee for Better Lunches was appointed by Lindsey Hale, Manager of the College of Charleston Foundation Club. Its members are Jim Abbott, John Dempsey, Harry Freeman, Annette Godow, Mary A. Hass, Frank Kinard, and Peter Rowe (Chair). The members have helped to establish a lunchtime salad bar at the Blacklock House, and are planning to meet monthly.

The President’s Ad Hoc Budget Review Committee met on February 26 to hear of the student fee, dormitory, and meal plan increases that were decided at the Presidential Staff Committee meeting on the previous day.
I accepted, as Speaker of the Faculty, an invitation to write the first editorial in the newly instituted faculty column of the Meteor. To my embarrassment, the six paragraph piece was published in the February 18 issue with eleven misprints. In addition to several punctuation errors, "receive" was spelled "recieve", "inquiries" became "inquiess", and "declared" and "program" came out as "decided" and "progress", respectively. It is unfortunate that a representative of the faculty appeared to have written an article for students that would not have received a passing grade in English 101. Please forgive the errors in the Meteor and hold me responsible for any in Newspeak. I'll try not to make no misteaks in this hear newsletter.

I was recently in Washington to review grant proposals on Women In Science projects for the National Science Foundation. Since there are many common procedures for funding proposals, perhaps my recent experience might be helpful to some faculty who are applying for grants. Each proposal was read by two different panels of five reviewers. After discussion, every member of each panel rated the proposal in several categories with supporting reasons, and then came out with an overall rating. If the two panels disagreed significantly, the project director examined the reasons and made a judgment. Some grantsmanship ideas to keep in mind are:

1. Make sure your proposal follows the guidelines. If you have any doubts, contact the granting agency. Some good-looking proposals are either automatically rejected or given low priority because of ambiguity as to whether proper procedures have been followed.

2. Do not use the same phrases in the proposal that were in the booklet or pamphlet that contained the guidelines. Emphasize points that show how your proposal is innovative or different than what you would expect most of the other proposals to include.

3. Underline or otherwise highlight the important points. Reviewers read many proposals in a relatively short period of time, and might misunderstand the essence of the proposal.

4. Make sure you have a well-written document free of verbosity and misprints. You want the reviewers to know that you put a lot of time and thought into the proposal, and did not throw it together at the last minute.

The term "Professor" is an academic ambiguity that has given rise to the frequently used nonexistent title of "Full Professor". The three professorial ranks are Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, although faculty members of all ranks are accorded the title "Professor".

It has taken me almost a year as Speaker to remember consistently the most efficient way to reach the second floor of Randolph Hall. I no longer walk through the main door and then through the side door that leads to the stairs that lead to the second floor. The side door on the right, of course, is the most direct route. Now if only I can remember to dial 2420 before the other four digits.

Somebody in the outside world has heard of Newspeak. I just received an advertisement inviting me to buy a subscription to The Newsletter on Newsletters. It would seem appropriate to form an Ad Hoc Committee on Committees to see if it should be purchased.

Student evaluations of faculty are to be conducted between April 1 and April 21. Faculty who have been here at least two years may be evaluated in two, three, or four classes and submit the results from at least two classes to the Department Chairperson.

Faculty, students, administrators -- everybody is getting evaluated. Keeping in the spirit, at the April faculty meeting I will distribute a form to evaluate the Speaker. It will be used for formative rather than summative purposes. Especially appreciated would be suggestions for improvement as well as issues to be addressed next year.
My original intent was to publish in Newspeak the number of faculty that wanted to be nominated for each standing committee and the number that listed each as a first choice. I have reluctantly honored the appeal by the Committee on Nominations that I not do this; after delicate negotiations, I have received their consent and published the five most popular nominees. According to Bill Golightly, Chairperson of the Committee on Nominations, the Committee does not want to be subjected to criticism by faculty who are not granted requests to serve on committees that have more positions available than requests received. In such a case, I would prefer that the Committee furnish the faculty member with a reason for its actions, if asked to do so.

The Committee on Academic Standards, Admissions, & Financial Assistance and the Committee on Student Affairs & Athletics are both new committees formed by the merger of two committees. Technically, faculty who have served on any of the four component committees in the previous three years are still eligible to serve on the expanded new committee. Within ten days after the election of committees at the next faculty meeting, chairpersons of the outgoing committees are to call meetings and transfer all records to the newly elected committees. Since there are no former chairpersons of the newly formed committees, I am requesting that the outgoing chairpersons of the Academic Standards Committee and the Committee on Admissions & Financial Assistance jointly call a meeting, as should the outgoing chairpersons of the Committee on Student Affairs and the Committee on Athletics. I spoke with Robert Sade, Chairman of the Faculty Senate at MUSC, about the possible merger of our two institutions. He was not aware of the document, distributed by President Collins at our faculty meeting the previous day, listing members of the task force and potential subcommittee members appointed by Senator Dewey Wise for the purpose of addressing different issues in the merger. As was the case with most of the faculty at the College whose names were on subcommittees, he did not have any contact with Senator Wise or any prior notice that he was expected to serve. He and I have agreed to continue to exchange information about faculty concerns over the procedures and issues that arise. The question of who will be the chair of the merger will be addressed at an MUSC faculty meeting on April 6. Before becoming involved with subcommittee meetings, I would like to know what created the need for a merger, what kind of university is envisioned, and what financial commitment would be forthcoming for such a merger. What are your concerns?

EDITORIALS

Affirmative Action

Its proponents say it is necessary in order to correct previous injustices and its opponents call it discrimination in reverse. Liberals twenty years ago were advocating color-blindness with regard to hiring, a practice now considered to be conservative. No other academic issue, with the possible exception of salary raises, seems to arouse so much passion. What is clear about Affirmative Action is that there is no clear-cut definition for Affirmative Action. According to Lucille Whippers, Director of Human Relations at the College, Affirmative Action is a method of insuring the employment of minorities and women in positions where they have not been employed in the past. While there is normally general agreement about the sex of a person, a "minority" cannot necessarily be found in the eyes of the beholder or in the dictionary. Although there are fewer men with red hair who are seven feet tall than there are native Alaskans, the former collection is not a designated minority while the latter is.

The federal government decides which groups shall be considered minorities for which types of positions in which areas of the country. The intention is to encourage various populations to enter fields in which they previously had been denied access or had otherwise been discouraged or discriminated against, and then to aid these groups in securing appropriate employment. Supporters and critics alike view Affirmative Action programs as transitory. The ultimate success of the program should obviate the need for its continuance. If the constitution prohibits discrimination according to race, color, creed, sex, or national origin, then Affirmative Action is an attempt to prohibit retroactively such discrimination and create an environment in which all people can achieve their potential regardless of the accidents of birth.
There are essentially two types of arguments against Affirmative Action -- those that are inflammatory and those that are not quite so inflammatory. The former consists of genetic arguments, ostensibly showing that certain groups have inherited traits that make them well suited for certain tasks or occupations and ill suited for others. Some social scientists from Johns Hopkins University recently announced the results of a study that purportedly showed that girls were mathematically inferior to boys. The Association for Women in Mathematics gave a quick and incisive point-by-point rebuttal, challenging both the methodology and the conclusions drawn from the sparse data. I don't think we yet have enough information to know if some groups are more predisposed to some courses of action or study. Even if one could show that certain classes of people inherently find it more difficult overall to perform various tasks, this would say nothing about specific individuals. The lowered self-images and the closing of opportunities to those so stigmatized would created the real damage, as we have seen in the past.

The primary argument against Affirmative Action programs is that one does not end racial or sexual discrimination by discriminating according to race or sex. The argument sounds fair, and is fair in a fair society. Another contention is that Affirmative Action programs, in attempting to restructure society, arbitrarily and simplistically pigeonhole collections of people without regard to individual differences and needs. Why should a black from a middle-class background be given priority over a white from a lower-class background? Probably for the same reason that insurance companies set rates according to group rather than individual differences. In a large society, the only perfect laws are unworkable, unmanageable, and unenforceable.

Whether or not one believes in the philosophy and the efficacy of Affirmative Action programs, they are an academic reality and must be followed for pragmatic if not for moral reasons. Institutions receiving federal aid, meaning almost all institutions, must comply or be in danger of having that aid cut. Most application forms for institutional grants request information about the number of minorities and women employed. The controversy at colleges and universities is not whether to have an Affirmative Action program but what form it should take, how actively it should be pursued, and what impact it should have on the overall academic program.

Blacks are the most underrepresented minority at the College of Charleston. Despite the large black population in the City of Charleston, the percentages of black students and faculty at this formerly all-white institution is very small. Additional black faculty would help provide a more supportive atmosphere for our current black students and would help attract more to the College. Recruiting expectations are higher in disciplines in which there are significant numbers of potential black faculty in the work force. The fields of Education and Sociology have the largest percentages nationally of qualified black faculty, while geology and physics have the smallest percentages.

Women faculty are considered the next most important group to recruit. Significant progress has been made in eliminating the more flagrant stereotyping of women as unsuited for some (or all) professions. Subtle and not so subtle sex stereotyping remains, with efforts being made to provide our female students with additional role models -- especially in disciplines that are underrepresented. If you'll pardon my stereotyping, it seems that our southern female students are less inclined than their northern counterparts to enter traditionally male-dominated professions.

How does a belief in Affirmative Action translate into hiring procedures? Care must be taken to assure in advertisements for positions that minorities and women are especially encouraged to apply. There is a hypocritical tightrope that must be walked by most colleges and universities. This Catch-22 situation appears to make it illegal to advertise that preference is given to women and minorities, and illegal not to give preference to women and minorities.
All other things being equal, how does one choose between a white male with ten publications, a white female with five publications, and a black with two publications? The one Affirmative Action rule engraved in granite (for the time being) is that consideration be given only to qualified candidates. Most departments are trying to balance race, sex, academic credentials, and field of research in determining priorities. Some departments or institutions may decide that every qualified black has priority over every qualified woman who has priority over every white male. Some may want to give priority only if all other things are equal, which they never are. The priority system has been in existence longer than Affirmative Action programs have been formalized. Your sons and daughters have more of a chance of being accepted at some prestigious Ivy League University than their New York City counterparts because, in a sense, South Carolina is an affirmative action state with fewer students qualified to enter the top colleges and universities.

What seems important now is for faculty and administration to have an understanding of both departmental and institutional needs and priorities. I recently heard from a Department Chairperson who mentioned that he and his department went through a painstaking process of linearly ordering their top candidates for a faculty position, and presenting them to the administration. The administration told the department to invite candidate #4 ahead of candidate #1 because of our Affirmative Action guidelines. The Chairperson was not bothered by this decision so much as by the time needlessly wasted in determining priorities that were not given priority. The above illustration demonstrates the practical difficulty here at the College in attempting to implement our Affirmative Action policy. Better communication between Department Chairpersons, the Director of Human Relations, and the Academic Vice President about how Affirmative Action guidelines relate to specific disciplines should help prevent such misunderstandings in the future.

Quality vs. Quantity

If there is a buzzword in higher education, that word is "quality". No administrator can give a speech without referring to the quality programs, the quality faculty, and the quality students in the quality institution with which he or she is affiliated. As is the case with most words that can be employed on all occasions, it is easily abused and on the way to becoming a one-word cliché. The word "quality" has the quality that its overuse has diminished the quality of the word.

When pitted against quantity, quality always wins, as in the following story. A female rabbit asked a female elephant how long her gestation period was. The rabbit laughed at the response of "twenty-one months", explaining that hers was only four weeks. "Yes", said the largest of beasts with pride, "but I produce an elephant".

We in academe like to think of ourselves as creating elephants rather than rabbits. Several questions must be asked, though, before settling for a certain academic life style. Have I deluded myself into thinking that I am producing elephants because I produce so infrequently? What if I keep striving for an elephant without realizing that I'm barren? Am I trying in vain for an elephant because I'm afraid I couldn't even put together a worthwhile rabbit? Would I rather talk about creating an elephant than go through the labor pains of producing a rabbit? If I start manufacturing rabbits, will it become easier to bring forth an elephant? How many rabbits are equal to one elephant? If it is not much of a challenge to make a rabbit and too difficult to give birth to an elephant, should I try to develop a horse?

Before I get too carried away with my animal farm, I would like to return to the real world of academe -- where projects rather than progeny are begotten. Most faculty come to the College after completing Ph.D. theses at research-oriented universities under the direction of advisors with whom they feel they could never compete professionally. Despite heavy teaching responsibilities at the College, the new faculty hope to revise and expand upon their dissertations so that they can be submitted for publication to worthwhile presses or journals.
Time and teaching tasks tend to take their toll. What was to be completed in the fall is to be completed in the winter; what was to be completed in the fall and winter is to be completed in the spring. Summer arrives chronologically while you are still in the fall professionally and back in graduate school emotionally. You are primarily a teacher, but don't want to forgo your research career -- to have it ended before it's begun. You are entering a mid-life crisis, prematurely. What to do?

First recognize that you are not alone. Choices must be made. The first choice involves how to spend your summer vacation. Those who need long, uninterrupted periods of time to accomplish anything of significance most of us, perceive that the living can't be too easy in the summertime. You have to consider your mental, emotional, and financial status before making a decision. If you cannot or do not want to fulfill the expectations of your dissertation supervisor, if your former goals are not your present goals, then make sure you have a project that there is some reasonable chance of completing. Reading about the contributions of others is important, and should be continued, but not as an alternative to making your own small contribution to the literature of your field.

The two most significant publications for an individual are usually the first and the first that goes beyond the doctoral dissertation. The first time is the hardest, the most painful, and the most memorable. Hesitancy and fear of damaging one's reputation can sometimes delay the virgin publication anywhere from two years to life. I am not advocating putting into print anything less than one's best effort; however, an individual who does not have a reputation cannot have a reputation damaged. The academic community is much more tolerant and supportive of the work of a new Ph.D. than that of an established researcher, and is anxious to provide encouragement and direction to the newest member in the field, that community is furnished with an opportunity (publication or presentation) to do so.

The next crucial step on the research ladder is "independent" research, work done without the aid or approval of an advisor or a thesis director. To be viewed as a professional in the discipline, rather than as an extension of someone else, it is necessary to sever the umbilical cord that connects the graduate student with his or her dissertation supervisor. This does not mean that occasional collaboration with one's former advisor or other colleagues is not desirable; it does mean taking full responsibility for selecting and following through with projects, knowing well the literature, and recognizing what is and is not worthy of publication.

Commensurate with a capacity to publish fairly regularly should be a desire for the more recent publications to be both deeper and broader than the initial ones. Some faculty are content with grinding away at a small niche, one discovery not being much better or worse or different than another; some are not content unless each finding is more important than its predecessor, all pointing toward the answer to a major question; still others prefer working on different problems in different areas, publishing a little about a lot but not a lot about a little.

The College of Charleston is not one of the top ten institutions in the country, nor is any of its departments so rated. With heavy teaching responsibilities and mediocre research facilities, the College will never enter this elite class. It has been improving professionally, though, and should continue to improve. To do so, each faculty member must work hard to try to discover his or her potential, and then must work even harder to try to fulfill it. The more one accomplishes, the more one recognizes one's potential.

I have not attempted to build a case for quantity being more important than quality. I just don't want to see quality used as an excuse for lack of productivity. Keep in mind that "productivity" is objective and that "quality" is subjective. Most productive researchers have published both high and low quality papers, though even they frequently did not know at the time which was which. As a general principle for the hard-working individual, I have only the following common sense rule: If your results come too easily, then work on something more challenging; if you spend too long without a modicum of success, then find a simpler project.
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

MERGER: A MARRIAGE MADE IN HEAVEN OR ANNEXATION?

What the College of Charleston faculty thinks about the wisdom of merging the College of Charleston with the Medical University may well be irrelevant. All of the latest news creates an uneasiness that rational discussion might play no great part in deciding this issue, that in the minds of those with the clout, it is in fact decided; all that remains is to keep the bulldozer in gear. That is not a conclusion that many of us find pretty, I am sure. We want to believe that decisions of such import will be made by well-intentioned, fair-minded, well-informed, high-principled people after the most careful deliberation. This matter of merger is too significant to the taxpayers of this state and to the future of higher education in the Lowcountry to be decided out of unclear motives in smoke-filled rooms. Perhaps in the end things will be done properly, but they are getting off to a troubling start.

But let us pretend for a moment that our opinions will be invited and weighed thoughtfully. Let us put aside pique at the shenanigans that have gone on thus far—the disdain evidenced for our Trustees, President, and Academic Vice President, the loaded task force subcommittees, and all the rest—and try to look objectively at the pros and cons of the sort of merger that has been proposed.

Among the advantages that have been suggested are: (1) attractiveness of a university to industries that might locate in this area; (2) savings on periodicals, books, and perhaps library staff by having a large university library; (3) savings on bulk purchases of certain items not presently covered by state contracts; (4) improved prospects for grants; (5) improved prospects for research; (6) improved environment for the "academic" depart-ments at MUSC; (7) facilitation of the addition of a broad spectrum of graduate programs for low-country citizens; and (8) upgrading of faculty salaries for College faculty.

Disadvantages of merger that have been mentioned include: (1) the prospects for an extra layer of administration that would increase the remoteness of the ultimate decision makers from the problems to be dealt with; (2) the cost of paying the high-level administrators, which could cancel other proposed savings; (3) deterioration of services provided by support personnel in a larger institution; and (4) the likelihood that the College would be but an appendage to MUSC, with state appropriations being doled out by university administrators who are sensitive to pressures from powerful medical groups.

Although I have tried to give a dispassionate enumeration of both advantages and disadvantages, I shall not pretend that I have no bias in this matter. Until I hear better arguments than have so far been forthcoming, I remain persuaded that the consequences of merger for this College, and for the citizens of South Carolina, promise to be a net loss. We—and the other taxpayers—should feel very uncomfortable when we hear loud proclamations of solutions to problems which are not conspicuous. Anyone who believes that a larger bureaucracy will deliver us from evil—or even save money for the state—has not been sentient in 20th Century America, nor employed at the College of Charleston during the last decade. And even if human nature would allow a larger bureaucracy to function with greater efficiency, it is difficult to envision such a bureaucracy evolving from the administrations of two such different institutions as the College of Charleston and MUSC. The former is an institution whose roots are in the liberal arts tradition; the latter is a highly specialized institution that is far from universal. Moreover, both the College and MUSC are presently overcrowded and underfunded, a circumstance that will scarcely be corrected by merging the two, unless there is some law operating with which I am unfamiliar. (It is only the romantics who believe that two can really live more cheaply than one).
Those who are convinced that merger would be a net plus should examine history. This is not the first time formal association between academic and medical institutions has been envisioned. Some associations have come about voluntarily, others have been forced, but the outcomes seem not to have been very different. The University of Toledo, Eastern Carolina University, Emory University, Virginia Commonwealth University, are some examples that might be profitably studied. I have yet to hear any report of real benefits that accrued at such places for the faculty involved in undergraduate programs or for the undergraduate students; I have heard several unhappy stories about the tremendous budgetary strains produced by the necessity for supporting expensive medical education and research within institutions funded as a single entity. That there is chronic competition for the institutional dollar between the medical component and the academic component in such situations can be documented and should surprise no one. And whom would you persuade generally to win such competition? "Lives over libraries" is too persuasive a battle cry in the ears of those who hold the purse strings.

Let us not be embarrassed either to be influenced in our judgment about merger by a conviction that we are guardians of a worthy and venerable educational heritage here at the College, and to worry that we may be on the verge of exchanging our birthright for a promised mess of pottage. I am not much reassured that there is included in the "task force" to study merger a subcommittee on "institutional identity." Whoever is behind all this business is, I suspect, rather indifferent to such sentimental notions, and will see to it that the carefully crafted committees and subcommittees provide palatable recommendations in this area as in all the others. It is noteworthy that the very meaning of the word "merge" precludes the maintenance of identity: "To lose or cause to lose identity by being absorbed, swallowed up, or combined; unite indistinguishably." It is prudent to keep in mind, too, that one form of merger is that experienced by the Sudetenland in 1938 or the Sabines in the 3rd Century B.C. A merger need not be a happy marriage between consenting adults.

It is not necessary to confuse the matter of merger with the concept of a Low-country university. The latter was proposed as long ago as the early part of this century, and is an idea with merit. Should the legislators of this state move to accomplish that goal, however, common sense dictates that they not attempt it through an unnatural merger. If we plan to do it, let it be done for the right reasons in the right way.

The people who will be paying for whatever is done deserve answers to at least these questions: (1) What problem is merger supposed to solve? (2) What evidence is there that merger would represent educational improvement? (3) What evidence is there that merger would produce net financial benefits to the state? Until they get convincing answers to those questions (and perhaps some others), they should insist that their representatives decline to legislate this merger into reality.

Maybe it would be realistic to see ourselves as a faculty that will be greatly affected by an outcome which we are nearly helpless to influence. I prefer to think that this is a time for us to demonstrate leadership in an area where we are clearly qualified and even obligated to speak out. I am not suggesting that there is unanimity of opinion amongst us as to the wisdom of merger. What I am saying is that we whose professional lives are in higher education, whose experience acquaints us intimately with its day to day problems and prepares us best to foresee likely results of changing its structure, are the obviously appropriate people to consult if there is a sincere interest in improving higher education in Low-country South Carolina. And, lacking an inquiry, it is entirely proper for this faculty to speak out publicly on both the question of merger and the means by which the question is decided.

-- Gerald Gibson
I am finishing up a proposal which I will submit to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund as my entry in a national competition for a monument to the 57,692 Americans dead and 2,457 unaccounted for of the Vietnam War. The competition is open to architects, sculptors, designers and landscape architects. I have so far completed a scale model of my proposal which is now to be photographed and along with drawings and some written material will be mounted on panels and sent to Washington sometime before the deadline of March 31.

The site for the memorial is a 3-acre tract in Constitution Gardens, approximately half way between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument. The budget for the memorial - to be raised entirely by private donations - is set at around three million dollars. The memorial must bear all 60,000+ names of the dead and missing. The winning design will be announced May 4th.

John Michel, Fine Arts Department

Dear Herb,

While others are congratulating you on your re-election as Speaker of the Faculty, keep in mind the lessons that can be learned from the administrations of Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon. Their second terms as President were worse than their first because they no longer felt (if they ever did) a responsibility to their constituents. They were surrounded primarily by people who agreed, or claimed to agree, with their policies. You, too, associate mostly with faculty who share your views about College policy. You have not heard as much criticism about your handling of the position as you had expected, either because people have not noticed your obvious deficiencies or have preferred to discuss them behind your back or not at all. This letter focuses on some of the shortcomings of your first term in office.

People seem to enjoy your editorials, but are not usually moved enough to take action or even respond. You had hoped to emphasize academic issues this year, but the biggest "issue" has been your attire. There were more comments following the letter to the editor dealing with your apparel than with any other subject. Whenever you wear a suit to a College function, most faculty remark about your appearance and rarely about substantive matters. The editorial that you had hoped would be the most influential, asking faculty to describe their disciplines, has evoked almost no response. There have not been as many letters to the editor as you had anticipated. Most faculty would still rather gossip in the lounge than put their thoughts in print.

You continue to feel awkward when you are placed in a social situation where small talk is expected. You still do not feel comfortable observing the amenities and acting as the representative to the outside community.

Internally, you have sometimes dominated committee meetings more than a Speaker should. Certainly meetings have been prolonged needlessly by your raising issues of minor importance. In trying to do too much, some of the things you used to do competently, like research, have suffered. Your accomplishments are neither as numerous nor as encompassing as you had planned. Perhaps you are just taking too seriously the role of Speaker of the Faculty.

It is hoped that this letter will engender more openness and criticism in the future, which should help eradicate some of your isolation and distance from those whom you are supposed to represent and serve. Keep the ego in check.
Interdisciplinary Teaching

At a time when amazing discoveries in science and technology (e.g., biomedical research, the technological perfection of super-weapons) require an interdisciplinary approach because of the social and ethical consequences of their application, our knowledge - even in one single discipline - is becoming more and more fragmented, specialized. We live in an exciting age, on the threshold of a breakthrough concerning our knowledge of the origin of life, the galaxies, the working of the human brain. To think about the role of science (e.g. use of natural resources, genetic engineering, chemical control of human behavior, arms control) is not the privilege of the few anymore but the responsibility of each citizen of this nation, as a matter of fact, of each citizen of this planet, which - thanks to technology - has already become a global village.

We are responsible for the education of a generation that will have to make a series of awesome decisions. Quite obviously, some changes in the education system are necessary; all over the nation colleges and universities are moving in the direction of a more integrated education. This term I have been working on an interdisciplinary teaching project involving the humanities, sciences and social sciences. My sincere thanks go to the chairmen of Biology, Business, Chemistry, Geology, Political Science, Psychology and Physics for their understanding. Very special thanks go to Gary L. Asleson, Mary Gilbert Boyd, William R. Kubinec, William V. Moore, James F. Snyder and D. Reid Wiseman who graciously agreed to let me participate in one of their courses with the discussion of relevant essays, poems, short stories, dramas or novels. The program will be first implemented in January 1982 after my return from sabbatical.

I am confident that we, the faculty, will benefit from a first-hand realization of the close relationships among various kinds of knowledge and their intricate interactions. Furthermore, I hope that other members of the faculty will join us so that by developing our own awareness and knowledge we can provide for our students a less fragmented and more coherent educational experience. Such an education would give them better preparation for responsible behavior in the decision-making process concerning the quality of life for their children, national survival and ultimately, the survival of humankind.

Finally, I want to thank once more all those members of administration and faculty who agreed to try, to experiment, "To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

Anna Rabone

Thanks to those who contributed to this issue of Newspaper. I would like all standing committees to send me their end of semester reports for publication in the next issue, the final one for the academic year. The reports should include accomplishments of this semester and suggestions for next year. If you have been meaning to write a letter to the editor this year, but haven't made the time, now is your last opportunity to do so. Deadline for submission is Thursday, April 23.