

---

## NEWS IN BRIEF

---

### CAMPUS FORUM: 3 O'CLOCK FRIDAY

The Campus Forum on "Directions for the '70s" will be at 3 p.m., not 4 p.m. as earlier reported. Room 200 CH.

### ENGINEERS WEEK: TWO-WAY TV AT PENN

The first public demonstration of Penn's new two-way graduate engineering television classrooms marks the observation of this year's Engineers Week, February 20 to 26.

Faculty, staff and students are welcome at 2:30 p.m. Friday, February 25, for the demonstration in the new Moore School studio complex at 33rd and Walnut Streets.

James Lee Everett III, president of the Philadelphia Electric Company and 1972's Delaware Valley Engineer of the Year, will moderate a panel on "A Better Tomorrow through Technology," the theme for Engineers Week 1972—discussing the subject with students and guests in remote classrooms as far away as Valley Forge.



*Vice*

*President*

*Paul Gaddis . . .*

*Story at right*

### TRUSTEES: BACCALAUREATE ALUMNI MEMBER

The Trustees of the University have elected Charles Allen Krause (C'69) as the baccalaureate alumni representative in the new category of Young Trustees.

His election was confirmed at the Executive Board meeting Friday, February 11. Mr. Krause, a former editor-in-chief of the *Daily Pennsylvanian*, is currently enrolled in public affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University. As an undergraduate he was a member of the Sphinx Senior Society, Connaissance, the President's Committee on Communication and Phi Epsilon Pi. After graduation he served as a congressional press secretary in Washington and as an intern for *The Washington Post*.

Earlier this year the Trustees elected Arthur M. Larrabee as the graduate/professional alumni member (ALMANAC January 18). A Law School alumnus of 1970, Mr. Larrabee is a member of the Philadelphia firm of Goodis, Greenfield, Henry, Shairman & Levin, and is an instructor in real estate law for the Pennsylvania State University Department of Continuing Education. As a law student he was a member of the Sharswood Law Club and chairman of the Student Academic Committee. He is now secretary of the Law School's Class of 1970. A 1967 Yale graduate, Mr. Larrabee served as volunteer with the American Friends Service Committee in Tanzania. He is a Trustee of the Central Philadelphia Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends.

*(Continued on Page 8)*

### IN THIS ISSUE

- *Preston on Student Representation*
- WHARTON: *Gomberg on Faculty Appeals*
- SENATE: *Questions for the President*
- FORUM: *Britton Harris on Interdisciplinary Expansion; Wharton's "Unit" Structure*
- *Goddard on John A. Russell Jr.* • IN PRINT
- LETTERS • WASHINGTON • OF RECORD: *Taxes*

---

# Almanac

Volume 18, Number 23

February 22, 1972

Published weekly by the University of Pennsylvania

---

## V.P. FOR MANAGEMENT: PAUL O. GADDIS

The appointment of Paul O. Gaddis as Vice President for Management at the University was announced this week by President Martin Meyerson.

Mr. Gaddis, who takes office March 1, has been Vice President-Public Systems and Services of the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, dealing with the firm's enterprises in health services, community development, and public management systems. He comes to Philadelphia from Pittsburgh.

"Paul Gaddis will bring to our University an added dimension in our management capabilities derived from his broad experience in organizational and fiscal planning, finance, health care delivery, community development, and systems management," President Meyerson said.

Mr. Gaddis, 47, will be responsible for those areas of administration related to management planning and control, facilities, management systems development, and other activities which serve academic programs. Creation of his position was recommended in the report of the Task Force on University Governance in September, 1970. His appointment was approved by the Executive Board of the Trustees Friday, February 11.

Prior to assuming his recent position at Westinghouse, Mr. Gaddis was that firm's Vice President for Corporate Development. Earlier he had been corporate director for management computer systems, and director of international investments.

As an Alfred P. Sloan Fellow he took a master's degree in industrial management and finance from Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1961. He also holds an M.S. in Engineering degree from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 1948, and a B.S. from the U. S. Naval Academy, 1946. He is the author of *Corporate Accountability*, published in 1964 by Harper & Row.

Mr. Gaddis is a member of the Advisory Board for CARE/MEDICO, involved in the delivery of health care to developing nations, and is a Director of the Society for Management Information Systems. He has served as a Board member of Westinghouse subsidiaries in Britain and France.

# Student Representation on Faculty Personnel Committees

by Ralph C. Preston

The McGill Committee Report on Faculty Appointment and Promotion Policies and Procedures gives four reasons why the Committee does not favor student representation on review committees. Its arguments strike me as weak, not justifying the elimination of student representation in those schools which now provide for it, or in schools and departments which in the future might wish to adopt it.

The McGill Committee's first argument is that "students lack the maturity and perspective to evaluate the professional competence of faculty members whose intellectual development should be several stages beyond that of the student." The Faculty Personnel Committee of the Graduate School of Education includes two voting graduate students and one non-voting undergraduate student. The quality of their participation on the Committee for the past two years does not substantiate the McGill Committee's patronizing view of students. The sampling of students is obviously thin, but it looms large when combined with similar outcomes reported from the University of Pittsburgh and elsewhere, and in contrast to the unsupported sweeping conclusion of the McGill Committee Report.

The Report also implies that students are incapable of appreciating the sensitivity of personnel decisions as they affect the harmony of a department and the future careers of faculty members. Again, the experience of the Graduate School of Education with student members has shown them to be discreet, sensitive, and as trustworthy in handling confidential matters as are members of the faculty. It would be a mistake, of course, to assume that all students would be equally responsible. Nor are all faculty members responsible as I have learned in serving over the years on committees of several schools of the University. Vindictiveness, departmental politics, sentimentality, and cruelty have crept into some personnel decisions without any student assistance.

The Report's third argument is that students are transient members of the academic community and hence do not have to live with the consequences of their decisions. This once cogent position has less force now that the University is striving mightily (and with fair success) to get our graduates to feel permanently tied to alma mater as "annual givers." If the argument of transiency were carried to its logical conclusion, faculty members approaching age 60 would have to be regarded as having such a brief period of remaining tenure during which to live with committee decisions as to be disqualified from membership. If the choice must be made, perhaps preference should be given to a future "annual giver" than to a senior faculty member whose perceptions of the professorial role are still focused on the needs of the 1940's rather than those of the 1970's.

The final argument of the McGill Committee Report is that procedural problems associated with the selection of student committee members are formidable. That is hardly an argument. If a practice is desirable and possible, its formidableness is irrelevant. Moreover, the experience of schools that have included students on personnel committees indicate that the procedural problems tend to be magnified.

One member of the faculty, upon learning that the Graduate School of Education had voted to include students on its Faculty Personnel Committee, said with some pride that *his* department had not yet "caved in." I doubt if many of those in Education who voted for the proposition did so because they felt intimidated by students. Recognition of the propriety and justice of student representation on personnel and review committees has been growing and a sufficient number of institutions now have such a provision to make possible rough assessments of the outcomes. It is to be hoped that the Council will choose to make such a study rather than make a decision on the basis of outdated and unsupported assumptions about students and their transience. It would be a step backward for the University if adoption of the McGill Committee Report were to lock in all schools with respect to this feature of faculty personnel practices and were to bar further experimentation.

*Dr. Preston is Professor of Education and Director of the Reading Clinic of the Graduate School of Education.*

## A Procedure for Faculty Appeals Is Proposed by William Gomberg

In a letter to Acting Dean Richard Clelland, Dr. William Gomberg recently raised issues that he and Dr. Clelland agreed should be available for wider faculty discussion. The proposal outlined in the letter will be brought before the Wharton Faculty Meeting on March 21.

January 11, 1972

This letter is being written to you in response to the question that we both discussed. The question may be phrased as follows: How can the University of Pennsylvania, more particularly, the Wharton School, develop an appeals procedure for academic personnel who feel that they have not been treated fairly in the following areas?

1. The award of merit increases
2. The award, or denial of promotion
3. Discriminatory treatment by administrators

We are aware that there is some overlap between the field under observation and the existing Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

However, we look upon the mechanism which we are trying to create as far broader based than the relatively narrow focus which confines the field of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Academic administrators have been aware for some time that they have no adequate means of appeal for academic personnel who feel that they have been unfairly treated in any of the three areas designated above. At the present time a member of the academic staff who feels that he has been denied a promotion has no alternative but to appeal to the very same people who made the decision that they reverse themselves. We are aware that if due process is to be served, then some mechanism

must be created independent of the line of authority represented by the administration.

It is suggested that the Local AAUP Chapter be encouraged to create a grievance committee to whom any member of the academic staff may take a complaint that he has been unfairly treated in either the award of a promotion, the award of a merit increase or any other discriminatory treatment about which he feels aggrieved.

The grievance committee of the AAUP thus would decide whether or not in its best judgment the complainant has a case. If they feel that the man has a case, then they can take it as a first step to the administrative officer or body who made the judgment in the first place. If the AAUP grievance committee, representing the grievant, feels that the explanation given by the administrative authority is unwarranted, they then can call for arbitration.

A Wharton-wide committee of five (5) tenured, senior professors would be created as a permanent equivalent, within the University, of an Academic Arbitration body.

When a case is appealed to them, they can set up a hearing officer, acceptable to the AAUP, from the academic staff of the university who shall hear the complaint and then write a recommended solution for the parties. If either party is dissatisfied with the recommendation of the hearing officer, they can then appeal his decision to the committee of the whole made up of the senior professors whose decision in this case would then be final.

We are suggesting this procedure in an effort to combine appropriate mechanisms for due process with the requirement that problems be solved inside the university family.

Many of our faculty feel that it would be inappropriate to imitate the trade union method of resolving these problems by choosing arbitrators outside the academic community. The reason for this feeling is that the faculty does not want to be placed in an adversary position in an institution in which it asserts certain rights of governance.

In the trade union culture, it is taken for granted that management and employee are in an adversary relationship. The work force does not pretend to participate in the management or the governance of the enterprise. On the other hand, university faculties zealously guard their policy making rights.

However, due process requires some method by which academic members can appeal decisions of those higher in the academic hierarchy. I have, therefore, tried to create a mechanism which is independent of administrative pressure and at the same time treats all questions as conflicts among fellow governors of the university.

I will be awaiting your comments upon this suggested procedure with interest.

In a footnote for ALMANAC, the noted professor of industry adds:

"This procedure easily anticipates two answers that come readily to mind:

"Question #1: Doesn't the Ombudsman provide an adequate mechanism to perform the function that you cover? My answer is no. He is not independent of the Administrative line. This should not be confused with an attack on the office. The present incumbent has been invaluable in resolving conflicts between *peers*.

"Question #2: Doesn't the appeal line now available provide adequate play for the resolution of these conflicts? The answer again is no, for very much the same reason. Unconsciously the tendency of all administrators is first to mediate; but if that doesn't work, administrators are most loath to reverse other administrative colleagues lest it jeopardize the *esprit de corps* in the subordinate line.

"The very existence of such a mechanism imposes more care on administrative behavior because it short circuits this *esprit de corps*. Its very availability makes it likely that it will seldom be invoked for this very reason."

# THE SENATE

## QUESTIONS FOR THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 23

*Following is the list of questions the Senate Advisory Committee has placed before the President concerning his proposals for Directions in the Mid-Seventies (ALMANAC January 25). He is to respond at a special Senate meeting Wednesday, February 23, at 3 p.m. in Room B-6 Stiteler Hall.*

1. The proposed priorities in your progress report to the Trustees suggest some shift in the present balance between Graduate Arts and Sciences and undergraduate education. Could you give us an indication of the magnitude of the shift which you envisage, either in terms of number of students or in terms of allocation of resources or both?

2. To what extent does the choice of areas among which the Educational Opportunities Fund is to be allocated reflect the view that this University should emphasize those disciplines which are socially responsive and de-emphasize the remaining traditional disciplines? To what extent does it reflect the view that the University should emphasize interdisciplinary activities and de-emphasize the traditional departmental activities?

3. Could you specify in some detail the mechanisms to be used in determining where excellence currently exists in the University and the related question of which graduate programs are to be strongly supported?

With respect to the above:

a. What role do you envisage for the Academic Planning Committee?

b. What role do you envisage for the University Development Commission?

c. What role, if any, do you envisage for the use of expert consulting teams drawn from our peer Universities?

4. What will be the position of graduate programs in departments with good and improving quality, which nevertheless lie outside the three broad traditional areas and the three cross-disciplinary fields mentioned in connection with the Educational Opportunities Fund (heading 3)? For example, could such a department have a reasonable expectation that, if the opportunity arose to make a distinguished new appointment, additional funds would be forthcoming for this purpose? Could such a department, if student demand were adequate, expect to fully replace its losses through attrition?

5. Will the principle of selective excellence be applied to undergraduate as well as graduate programs?

6. What procedures and mechanisms will be used for selecting those programs most deserving of support from among the new programs which have been or will be proposed? In particular, how are actual and potential excellence to be evaluated once we begin redefining disciplines and exploring experimental programs and new interdisciplinary directions? What will be the roles of the Academic Planning Committee and the University Development Commission in this process of evaluation and selection?

7. To what extent, if any, will the University Development Commission be involved in decisions as to the reallocation of existing funds among programs, as required to generate the internal portion of the Educational Opportunities Fund? Do you consider a program's attractiveness to potential external sources of funds to be an appropriate criterion for the reallocation of existing sources?

8. To what extent, if any, do you anticipate the utilization of School Academic Review Committees in decisions involving reallocation of existing funds among programs as well as in the search for promising new academic directions?

9. Do you envisage the curtailment of departmental autonomy and if so, in what respect?



---

# FORUM

---

Conducted by the Senate for the Faculty

---

*The current Forum topic is a "Dialogue on University Priorities" begun in response to proposals of the President. Contributions are welcome from all members of the faculty, and may be sent either to ALMANAC or to Dr. Phoebe Leboy, Senate Editorial Chairman.*

## Toward an Interdisciplinary Environment

by Britton Harris

The visible strain between some portions of the faculty and the administration over the method of constituting the University Development Commission, the scope of its responsibilities, and the content of the President's January message to the Trustees has many and complex sources. As an independently selected member of both the Commission and the Senate Advisory Committee, it is my feeling that with a minimum of mutual respect and good will the procedural issues will be very rapidly resolved. The Commission and the faculty can then address the substantive issues of directions for the University. I am sure that one of these issues, centering on the expansion of interdisciplinary research and teaching, will prove particularly difficult. This note addresses some neglected aspects of that issue.

It is a truism that the unity of science and knowledge which existed in Ancient Greece and in the Renaissance has been eroded by the sheer scope of the increase of knowledge over the past centuries. This increase both created and was created by an increasing specialization which divided the disciplines one from the other. Despite these divisions, most scientists acknowledge their common history with the humanities. Among specialties, there is a wide commonality of philosophy, method, and technique, and there is much innovation through the borrowing of concepts and through analogy. At the same time, there is emerging a new form of unification of knowledge which is to some extent troublesome in its implications.

Interdisciplinary studies appear to arise in a number of different ways and to have a number of characteristics, not all of which are congenial to the traditions and the disciplinary organization of the University. To an extent, this dissonance is based on certain misconceptions, and to this extent a clarification of the issues may help to prevent misunderstanding.

There appear to be three principal sources of impetus to interdisciplinary studies, which I discuss briefly. The first two are (perhaps unjustifiably) barriers to academic acceptance, while the third, if properly understood, should be a stimulus to such acceptance.

The first cause for attention to interdisciplinary activities arises out of professionalism. The professions start from a concern with problem-solving and with predefined objects of study, whose implications are discussed below. But there are other particular aspects of professionalism which conflict with academic standards. Portions of this training are controlled by professional organizations outside of the University. Some professional education neglects or is antagonistic to the creation of new knowledge and new theories; professionalism may be conservative and static where the academic world should be liberal and dynamic in its attitude to knowledge. Changes are taking place in this general area. Life as a whole

is becoming more professionalized. At the same time, the increased proportion of the population in college makes education less elitist and more likely to bear on the attitudes and activities of people performing "useful" work. Finally, the professions themselves are changing so rapidly, as their scientific basis is transformed, that only a broadly scientific and humanistic education can successfully train responsible and adaptable professionals in many fields.

The second reason for interdisciplinary activity is the solution of practical problems, which are no respecters of disciplines. The academic acceptance of this process is more probable (or at least more respectable) after the fact than it appears to be beforehand. Pasteur, a chemist, opened important vistas in biology and medicine because he attempted to resolve an important practical problem in commerce—how to prevent the spoilage of beer. Would our Chemistry Department have agreed to work on this topic? Difficulty of course arises from the very large number of practical problems of this type which never lead to interesting research questions. The selection of the more promising practical issues from the academic point of view is surely an art, but perhaps should be more of a science itself.

### An Apparent Immunity

Another aspect of the practical impetus to interdisciplinary studies displays an added dimension—the impetus to social action for the solution of social problems. This depends on the immersion of the University faculty and student body in the social process, which gives them a direct personal concern (both selfish and altruistic) in social problems, and on the ultimate responsibility of the University to the society of which it is a part. This last responsibility should be judged over very long time spans—decades or centuries—a time-constant longer than the useful life of most professors. Variable winds of relevancy and political fashion are properly regarded as inimical to the sound development of knowledge and theory in the University. Because of this and because of the long time-constant of social accountability, it is customary to regard the University as being immune to such accountability. While the immunity does not exist, the accountability must be very cautiously defined, and to recoil from faddish interdisciplinary research out of this caution is surely not entirely reprehensible.

The third consideration is an altogether different matter. While for several hundred years it has proved practical to advance science by the *division* of its subject matter, it is now becoming both opportune and wise to advance certain branches of science by *unifying* the subject matter. We are now beginning to be able to give some consideration to the whole man, the whole metropolis, the whole biosphere—in short, to very large interactive systems. Previously we could

only hope to view these through understanding either selected elements or selected aspects. The change which is occurring arises in each case through the definition of a new object of study. Initially such objects of study can be approached best through interdisciplinary efforts, but the new object of study implicitly defines and organizes a new discipline which will arise out of and supersede the interdisciplinary activity.

The University must keep abreast of this new direction in the organization of the pursuit of knowledge because it is upon us in force and at an accelerating rate. It is true that attention may be focussed on these systems because many interesting and demanding political and social questions are embedded in them, and cannot be properly explored without their analysis. But quite aside from this impetus—which is felt by many members of the University community in relation to matters of peace, racism, urbanism, and ecological conservation—the study of these systems has an importance and presents a challenge on purely academic grounds.

#### **An Academic Dilemma**

A great deal depends on the relation of these interdisciplines to the existing disciplinary organization of the University. From my knowledge of half a dozen or more such activities, I must say that the levels of academic attainment are very uneven, and standards and objectives are often inadequately defined. Nevertheless, in every case there is a component (and usually a large component) of knowledge already accumulated, which applies to the field as a whole, and which is not a paste-up of scraps of knowledge and theory from other fields. If we now assume that there is good reason for the further development of knowledge and theory in any of these fields, we encounter an academic dilemma. Important inputs should be accepted from members of existing disciplines. These disciplines bear on the new field and the skills and the techniques of a capable disciplinarian will undoubtedly be useful as well. If a man continues to work exclusively in his own discipline, however, his contribution to the new discipline will be strictly limited since he cannot consider the new field as a whole without stepping outside of his own. During a transitional period the contributors to a new discipline require the support of their old discipline together with the freedom to move within the new. When the older disciplines preach that the younger ones are doomed to failure, they are making a self-fulfilling prophecy, since they limit the mobility of the more wide-ranging members of their own disciplines and thereby tend to force the new disciplines to accept second-rate members and contributors.

Many of the most exciting academic developments at the University of Pennsylvania over the last twenty years have arisen as new disciplines in this fashion, sometimes with widespread support and sometimes with widespread opposition. Many of the most productive individuals in the University today span more than one discipline. We need to learn how to take advantage of the myriad opportunities which exist in this sphere and at the same time how decorously to bury our mistakes. On balance, I should say that the disciplinary environment does not automatically produce these adventures and that in any case those which have been undertaken in the past have not received general endorsement from any organization of the faculty. The health and future viability of the University depend in part on providing room for these initiatives, and if possible drawing the faculty more broadly into creating them. Increased participation should not, however, lead to stultifying a new and imperfectly developed capability for interdisciplinary innovation.

*Professor Harris is Chairman of the Department of City and Regional Planning, the Graduate School of Fine Arts.*

#### **John A. Russell, Jr.—In Appreciation**

*I wish to take this occasion to express my appreciation for all that Mr. Russell has done for the University of Pennsylvania. Though I met Mr. Russell in the fall of 1967, I did not get to know him until the spring of 1968 when it became general-knowledge that A. Leo Levin was giving up the Vice Provostship to return to the Law School. At that point members of the administration proposed to me that Mr. Russell should be appointed Vice Provost for Student Affairs. At the first meeting of the search committee, Mr. Russell's name was brought forward and shortly afterwards he was proposed for the post by the Daily Pennsylvanian and student petitions. Mr. Russell gave a remarkably fine address at the University Commencement in May, 1968. At that point, President Harnwell and I took the occasion to become better acquainted with Mr. Russell and both of us became convinced that he richly merited the wide-spread support that he was receiving, and requested the Trustees to appoint him Vice Provost for Student Affairs.*

*Jack Russell and I served together from July 1, 1968 until December 31, 1970. During that period I saw Mr. Russell almost daily and I came to appreciate his sensitive conscience and his deep commitment to the welfare of the students and of the University. Mr. Russell soon became recognized in many areas of the country as the outstanding student affairs officer and declined many invitations to serve elsewhere.*

*As Jack leaves this campus next summer, many of us would say farewell in the lines from the Navajo Night Chant:*

*Walk along the trail of life in beauty  
Walk along the trail of life in happiness*

*—David R. Goddard*

#### **THE 'UNIT' FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS**

At the Wharton School last fall, the Faculty voted favorably on a Marketing Department recommendation to set up a separate "Unit" in the International Business-Multinational Corporation area. Acting Dean Clelland told the President's Conference on February 15 that the new "unit" structure offers possibilities for interdisciplinary programs, and that two other "units" are being considered now for Wharton.

"A unit functions in much the same way as does a department," Dean Clelland said last November. "It has a budget, a chairman, authority to initiate personnel actions, and curricular responsibility in its area of interest."

The Multinational Enterprise Unit created at that time is headed by Dr. Howard Perlmutter. It was set up by the Dean with the concurrence of the Provost; conversely, such a unit would be disbanded by the Dean with the Provost's concurrence, Dean Clelland said.

With the establishment of the new unit, the Department of Marketing and International Business changed its name to the Department of Marketing.



---

# IN PRINT

---

## FROM THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Three books that highlight the Fall 1971 season of the University of Pennsylvania Press are sketched briefly below. Press books can be ordered from the University Bookstore or from the Order Department of the Press itself. The latter requires payment in full with order.

### **NOISE POLLUTION: The Unquiet Crisis** by Clifford R. Bragdon

The author is a former Research Associate at the Institute of Environmental Studies at this University and Environmental Planner for the West Philadelphia Mental Health Consortium. He is presently an Environmental Specialist in the Bio-Acoustical Division of the U. S. Army's Environmental Hygiene Agency at Edgewood Arsenal, Maryland.

Noise is as real an environmental problem as air and water pollution. Garbage trucks and early hour jet flights signal the beginning of each day. Neighbors' children, pets and television pierce the morning silence. The noise level grows with the quickening pace of morning activity: the din of traffic, building construction, and street repair are a constant assault while modern office design with its expansive glass areas, open work spaces, insufficient partitioning and mechanical office equipment create acoustic chaos.

Not only is noise pervasive, says the author, but noise sources are multiplying rapidly. The industrial and technological development of urban society is producing an increasing number of devices with higher and higher noise outputs. Aircraft, motor vehicles, construction equipment, household appliances, lawn mowers and air conditioners all contribute to noise pollution . . . and the list grows endlessly.

Bragdon gives facts, figures, precise scientific measurements and accurate data on what noise is, what it does and how to combat it. He pinpoints noise levels of specific objects and relates these data to the measurable social, physical and psychological damage they do to human beings. Applying acoustical engineering and social science to his subject, the author cites ways in which noise affects human health and reflects concern with this growing crisis by focusing on three interrelated objectives.

The social basis for the existence of noise pollution is examined in a series of questions concerning the roles of individuals, institutions and society as a whole in creating and perpetuating the causes of community noise.

Methods of abating noise and the status of noise abatement programs are evaluated on both individual and government levels.

In his final section, Bragdon describes the various kinds of damage that noise can bring about—physical and psychological illness, reduced efficiency and monetary loss. To evaluate noise as an environmental problem in a specific setting, an extensive field survey of actual and perceived noise was conducted in West Philadelphia and Tinicum Township, Pennsylvania.

He concludes with an attempt to construct a method for evaluating the health hazard of noise in a community and describes a model presenting the three approaches from which noise can be managed—the source, the path, and the receiver. Specific suggestions are offered for controlling aircraft noise—one of the greatest contributors to noise pollution.

224 pp. 7" x 9½" \$15. Tr.

### **KIERKEGAARD: A Kind of Poet** by Louis Mackey

The author is a Professor of Philosophy at the University of Texas at Austin who has published numerous articles in *The Review of Metaphysics*, *The Southwestern Journal of Philosophy*, and others.

Soren Aabye Kierkegaard (1813-1855) is known to our reference works as "Danish philosopher" or "Danish religious thinker"—an author whose work is best studied with the instruments of philosophic and theological analysis. But to himself he was "a kind of poet and thinker . . . who would read the original text of the individual, human existence-relationship, the old, well-known, handed down from the fathers—would read it through yet once again, if possible in a more heartfelt way." If Kierkegaard, is to be understood as *Kierkegaard*, writes Louis Mackey, he must be studied also and chiefly with the tools of literary criticism.

Professor Mackey has selected for analysis some of Kierkegaard's cardinal works, and read them closely, not only for what they say but for how they say it. "I have tried to see the whole of Kierkegaard in the parts selected for analysis. Most of all I have endeavored to read the Kierkegaardian corpus as the 'poetry of inwardness' he meant it to be . . . to make clear that whatever philosophy or theology there is in Kierkegaard is sacramentally transmitted 'in, with and under poetry.'"

In five chapters Mackey offers detailed analyses of *Either/Or* I and II; the four volumes of *Edifying Discourses*; the *Philosophical Fragments* and *Concluding Unphilosophical Postscript*; and Kierkegaard's several versions of Christianity, principally that of *Fear and Trembling*. These chapters provide the evidence on which the final chapter is based: that Kierkegaard's poetic artistry, his use of pseudonyms, metaphor, and more complex literary forms dictate the way in which his ideas are to be appropriated; and that the unity of Kierkegaard's writing, like that of any poet's work, is metaphoric rather than literal; to have its full effect it must be imaginatively relived in the reader's personal response.

"The study of Kierkegaard," Mackey concludes, "can throw new light on the relationship between poetry and philosophy . . . Philosophy is not only dialectical, producing conviction. It is also rhetorical, aimed at persuading. In the works of Kierkegaard, the dialectic and the rhetoric are united in the service of poetry, as I believe they are in the major philosophical traditions of the West. Every philosopher worthy of his birthright is also 'a kind of poet.'" 320 pp. 6" x 9" \$12.50 Tr.

### **THE BERLIN CRISIS, 1958-1962** by Jack M. Schick

The author is a Research Associate at the Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research of The Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, and a Professional Analyst at the Center for Naval Analyses.

"When I go to sleep at night I try not to think about Berlin," said Dean Rusk; and in this first comprehensive reconstruction of that crucial period between Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatum and the Cuban missile crisis, Jack Schick demonstrates that Rusk's nightmare has never ended.

Schick traces the East-West pattern of impatient negotiation followed by military posturing and pressuring. He sheds new light on Dulles' intellectualized diplomacy, Kennedy's cautiously balanced Berlin strategy, and Ulbricht's urgent gamble on the Berlin Wall. Against a detailed background of diplomatic verbiage and tension-ridden events, he points up the blind convictions and dangerous misunderstandings on both sides

that inevitably led to each incident in the continual crisis—and ultimately brought us to the impasse that still remains “frozen in splendid ambiguity.”

The impasse remains—and Berlin could erupt tomorrow, its fragile armistice shattered by the merest trifle. Now the pattern of the early 1960's is repeating itself, with East and West squaring off for new rounds of negotiation-posturing-pressure. As Schick represents them, the frightening lessons of the past have become the vital warnings of the present, as well as the future; and our ultimate survival will depend upon our ability to heed the warnings. 256 pp. 5½" x 8½" \$9.50 Tr.

## BOOKS BY FACULTY AUTHORS

### THE NIGHT COUNTRY

by Loren Eiseley

The author is Benjamin Franklin Professor of Anthropology and the History of Science here. A past Provost of the University, Dr. Eiseley is author of several award-winning books and an elected member of the National Institute of Arts and Letters.

“Boulders swelled up from the turf like huge white puffballs, and there was a flash of lightning off to the south that lit for one blue, glistening instant a hundred miles of churning, shifting landscape. I have thought since that each stone, each tree, each ravine and crevice echoing and re-echoing with thunder tells us more at such an instant than any daytime vision of the road we travel. The flash hangs like an immortal magnification in the brain, and suddenly you know the kind of country you pass over, and the powers abroad in it.”

—The Night Country

Loren Eiseley has been widely acclaimed as one of the finest literary stylists writing today. *The Night Country* is the meditative summation of the personal experience of an anthropologist and sometime fossil hunter. In his foreword Eiseley says, “This volume, as all my readers will recognize, has been drawn from many times and places in the wilderness of a single life . . . my thoughts are all of night, of outer cold and inner darkness. These chapters, then, are the annals of a long and uncompleted running. I leave them here lest the end come on me unawares as it does upon all fugitives.”

The book moves from a solitary childhood and the wanderings of young manhood into the profound meditations of an adult humanist scholar. Throughout, the individual chapters are characterized by that feeling for penetrating anecdote and scientific range of experience that has made Dr. Eiseley's name so widely known beyond his own discipline.

Of special significance to educators is the chapter “The Mind as Nature”, a reflection upon the author's deprived youth and its significance to all who have successfully groped beyond such episodes into maturity. The final chapter, “The Brown Wasps”, is an unforgettable evocation of the human predicament and of the right of each generation to its own most precious memories. In short, *The Night Country* is the story of every individual human life, and symbolically of the race of man itself. Charles Scribner's Sons, 239 pp. 6¼" x 9½" \$7.95.

### RELIGION AND THE RISE OF THE AMERICAN CITY

The New York City Mission Movement 1812-1870  
by Carroll Smith Rosenberg

The author is Research Assistant Professor in the Department of History and Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychiatry at the University. She holds M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Columbia and is currently a post-doctoral trainee in psychiatry here.

The city mission movement provides the unifying theme in this study of how religious sentiment, poverty, and the growth

of cities interacted to shape the patterns of benevolence in 19th-century America.

The book is divided into two sections corresponding to phases in the growth of New York City, and each section begins with a background chapter about the city—its size, class structure and social problems. Dr. Rosenberg covers the years from the establishment of the first city mission in 1812, through the Panic of 1837, into the period of dislocation created by the Civil War.

By showing how evangelical Protestantism acted as a force for social reform during the Jacksonian and Civil War periods, she both illuminates the history of these years and provides a background for social welfare activities in the late 19th and 20th centuries. Cornell University Press, 300 pp. 5½" x 8½" \$10.50/£5.00 U.K.

## LETTERS

### CLAIRVOYANCE DISCLAIMED

In attributing WEOUP's knowledge of the Affirmative Action plans of the University to “clairvoyance” the Chairman of the Senate seems to subscribe to the wicked old notion that women possess special powers. We assure Professor Abraham that there was absolutely nothing supernatural in our ability to read what the Administration gave us for comment; nor should the document's availability to others seem magical to Professor Abraham if he would read the *Daily Pennsylvanian* or *ALMANAC* carefully.

WEOUP was asked to comment on the draft and we are doing so, both in writing and in continuing conversations with the Administration. We do so in the belief that it is more appropriate and more honest to comment in advance upon Administration ideas than to wait until plans are committed and then fall back on carping and hindsight.

We are here to help build a better University. In WEOUP's own Affirmative Action Plan we not only share but exceed the concern of male colleagues for the academic standards of the University. “The University of Pennsylvania must have a faculty of the highest quality,” the Plan states; and it adds our deeper concern “. . . that the University has been deprived of the contributions that could be made by many excellent women who are or may become available.”

This is not an idle statement. Myths disguised as “common sense” have in the past allowed men of medium talent to be hired and promoted at Ivy League institutions while women of higher merit had to go elsewhere. Unfairly generalized predictions about marriage and pregnancy, and the belief that a woman's career is a luxury and a man's a necessity, are among the myths.

And the continued exercise of prejudice will assure this University a poor competitive position in the search for women faculty even if it does ever accept the realities of major changes taking place in our society.

Like others, this institution lives now with the results of its past selection processes.

With others, it has an equal opportunity to admit its imbalances and start fresh—rather than defending, maintaining and sanctifying the status quo.

Instead, we are losing good women. (And although we seem to be looking for good women, they seem too often not to come here.) If atmosphere influences the winning of faculty to the campus, then the pronouncements of the Senate Chairman in *ALMANAC* and of the A-1 Assembly Chairman-Elect in the D.P. take on new importance. How are we to win good women, keep good women, in a University where men in responsible positions seem to equate fair treatment of women with a slide in quality?

Women, too, are concerned about academic standards; and the ending of discrimination against women will not jeopardize these standards. At most it will pose a new kind of threat to mediocrity.

—Carol E. Tracy, President

Women for Equal Opportunity at the University of Pennsylvania



## NEWS IN BRIEF CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

### HANDBOOK ON SPONSORED RESEARCH

The University's Committee on Research has expressed concern that many new faculty members (or faculty members newly interested in sponsored research) may not have the current *Research Investigators' Handbook*, which helps the Principal Investigator meet his or her responsibility by assembling in a single publication the various University policies pertaining to sponsored research.

"The purpose of this *Handbook* is to answer some of the most frequently asked questions about research at Pennsylvania, and to show where help can be obtained with the problems of applying for, and administering, research projects," said Dr. John Hobstetter in his foreword. The *Handbook* is available at the Office of Research Administration, Fourth Floor, Franklin Building.

### SPANISH FILMS TONIGHT

The Department of Romance Languages will present two films on Tuesday, February 22, 1972 at 7:30 p.m., in the Fine Arts Building B-6. "I Am Pablo Neruda" is narrated by Nobel Prize Winner Pablo Neruda, and Anthony Quayle; "The Inner World of Jorge Luis Borges" by Jorge Luis Borges and Joseph Wiseman.

Both were written, directed and produced by Harold Mantell. Donation is fifty cents.

### PECK-RIEBER CONCERT FEBRUARY 24

Marcia Peck, cellist, and Edith Finton Rieber, pianist, will appear in concert Thursday, February 24 at 8 p.m. in Houston Hall Auditorium. Admission is free.

A winner in cello competitions in Florence, Prague, and Mainz, Miss Peck is a member of the Minneapolis Symphony. Mrs. Rieber studied piano with her father, Louis Finton, former assistant to Theodore Leschetitzky, then as a scholarship student with Edwina Behre and B. M. Berlin at Gnesnykh Musical Institute in Moscow.

### PENN CONTEMPORARY PLAYERS FEBRUARY 23

The American premiere of a new work by Soviet composer Edison Denisov will highlight a performance by the Penn Contemporary Players on Wednesday, February 23, at 8:30 p.m. in the Prince Theatre at Annenberg Center.

The Players, a group of young professional musicians directed by Richard Wernick, will perform Denisov's D-S-C-H, written in homage to Shostakovich for clarinet, cello, trombone and piano; Irving Fine's Fantasia for string trio; a Duo for violin and cello by George Rochberg, and Spiritus for brass trio by Andrew Frank, a former graduate student here and winner of a 1969 BMI young composers award.

The program is free and open to the public.

### PARK DESIGNS ON DISPLAY

A display of proposed designs for the Penn Community Park to be constructed at the western edge of Superblock has been held over to February 23 in the Bowl Room of Houston Hall. Models and drawings by students from the Department of Landscape Architecture are shown jointly by the Department and by Penn Community Park Coalition. Hours are 9 to 5 daily.

#### OF RECORD



#### ON WITHHOLDING

Following is a memorandum to all employees from William Drye, Assistant Comptroller

"Tax Shelter" annuity premiums (TIAA-CREF, Pennsylvania Annuity) exempted from Federal withholding are subject to Pennsylvania Personal Income Tax withholding, according to an Information Bulletin from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Department of Revenue.

This practice will begin at the University with the monthly February payroll.

## WASHINGTON

### HIGHER EDUCATION BILL

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee formally reported its amended version of the Higher Education Bill (S-659-Pell) which clears the way for the Senate to consider later this month the question of sending it to a conference committee to reconcile differences with the House version of the measure (HR 7248-Green).

The amended version makes no changes in the higher education provisions. It merely adds provisions for aid to desegregating schools, for Indian education, and for training employees for the U. S. Foreign Service. Consideration of the bill has already been delayed by a filibuster against a bill to strengthen the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. Southern Senators plan to offer a number of strict anti-busing amendments once the Senate takes up the bill. Senator Bayh is proposing an amendment dealing with sex discrimination in Federally aided education programs.

### FEDERAL BUDGET FOR FISCAL 1973

The Federal budget sent to Congress by President Nixon calls for significant increases in Educational Opportunity Grants, Work-Study programs, and in funds for the National Science Foundation, and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. No new funds are recommended for construction grants for teaching facilities at colleges or medical and nursing schools. Loan subsidies are proposed for support of construction of college academic facilities.

The creation of a National Foundation for Higher Education is to support innovative and exemplary programs at all types of post-secondary institutions. The budget proposal includes \$100 million for the foundation for the year beginning July 1, 1972.

Institutional aid through a cost-of-education allowance based upon Federal student aid continues to be recommended by the Administration. No funds are requested in the budget, however, since the type of institutional aid awaits passage of a higher education bill. (See above). Presumably a supplemental appropriation will be requested when a bill is passed by both houses and signed into law. —Donald S. Murray

ALMANAC: 515 Franklin Building, Ext. 5274

Editor ..... Karen C. Gaines

Assistant Editor ..... Anne M. Geuss