Duke Ph.D. Wins
1994–95 Sibley Award

Yael R. Schlick, a 1985 graduate of the University of Michigan, has been awarded the $10,000 Sibley Fellowship for studies in French during the 1994–95 academic year. A visiting assistant professor in the Romance Studies Department at Duke University who received her Ph.D. there in 1993, she will use the award to complete a study titled “Rewriting the Exotic: Mille, Segalen, and the Emergence of Littérature Coloniale.” Schlick is the 46th recipient of the fellowship, which was established with funds bequeathed to Phi Beta Kappa in the will of Isabelle Stone.

In 1995 the Sibley Fellowship will be offered for studies in Greek. Candidates must be unmarried women who are between 25 and 35 years of age and hold the doctorate or have fulfilled all the requirements for the doctorate except the dissertation. They must be planning to devote full time to their project during the fellowship year beginning in September 1995. Further information and application forms may be obtained by writing to the Sibley Fellowship Committee, 1811 Q Street NW, Washington, DC 20009.

20 D.C. High School Teachers Attend Second Phi Beta Kappa Institute

“The Day the Universe Collapsed” was the subject of this year’s Phi Beta Kappa institute for high school teachers from the District of Columbia. The week-long series of lectures, tours, and discussions was sponsored by the six chapters in the Washington metropolitan area, working with the local Phi Beta Kappa association and the city’s public and parochial schools.

The school systems selected 20 teachers to take part in the institute, and Phi Beta Kappa provided the instruction, meals, and even parking spaces for the participants. The institute’s theme was the career of Nicolas Copernicus (1473-1543), whose theories on the earth’s rotation around the sun were a major element of the Scientific Revolution.

The institute opened at Trinity College on June 27, with discussions of the cosmology of the 16th century by physicists Nivard Schel and James

Astronomer John Traska of the University of Maryland begins his presentation on Galileo to the D.C. schoolteachers participating in this summer’s Phi Beta Kappa Institute on “The Day the Universe Collapsed.”
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Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education

By Joseph S. Johnston Jr.

What is the state of internationalization in U.S. colleges and universities? Let's consider four key elements of globally oriented programs and institutions: language study, study abroad, foreign students, and the internationalization of the curriculum. In each area, new life is stirring, but daunting work remains to be done.

Language Study

Statistics show that the deficiencies of our schools and universities in language instruction are systemic. Only 17 percent of public elementary schools offer any form of language instruction (including simple “exposures”), and barely one-third of all high school students take any. Only 8 percent of U.S. colleges and universities require a foreign language for admission, and fewer than 9 percent of universities require one for graduation. Students who do enroll in language classes typically study for only a year or two; very few ever attain even basic proficiency.

Also of concern is the relative overemphasis on French, Spanish, and German in our schools and postsecondary institutions; although these languages are spoken by only 14 percent of the world’s population, they account for 90 to 95 percent of all language enrollments. Other foreign languages—including Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Russian, arguably among the languages most important for Americans to know in coming decades—account for less than 1 percent of all language enrollments at the K-12 level and for 5 to 8 percent of those in college.

Nonetheless, there is evidence of renewed student interest in language study, a new focus on proficiency and language for professional uses, new methods of instruction, and development of exciting instructional technologies in the United States. Between 1986 and 1990, language enrollments at colleges and universities rose by nearly 18 percent overall; the increases were even more dramatic in languages such as Japanese (95 percent) and Russian (31 percent). Some liberal arts colleges now enroll up to 40 percent of their students in language courses; of these, more than 60 percent take courses beyond the first-year level.

Study Abroad

The typical American student abroad is a white, middle-class woman from a highly educated professional family who is studying humanities in western Europe. Implicit in this characterization are several of the key problems that must be overcome if study abroad is to fulfill its vast potential as a component of international education, notably, the small scale of the enterprise and its lack of diversity in terms of participants, locations, and types of programs. Reliable statistics on study abroad are hard to obtain, but recent data provide answers to some central questions.

First, who studies abroad, and what do they study?

Approximately 16 percent of U.S. institutions claim to send at least 10 percent of their students abroad at some time in their undergraduate careers. A few selective private colleges can cite participation rates of up to 90 percent. Nationally, however, the numbers are abysmally low: less than 0.5 percent of all students enrolled at the baccalaureate level in any given year.

Women students outnumber men by a margin of about 2 to 1. Students majoring in the liberal arts—excluding math and sciences—are approximately twice as numerous as those majoring in all other fields.

Business majors account for a large and growing subset (11 percent) of those studying abroad, but there are few students in engineering, education, agriculture, and the health sciences. Moreover, men, minorities, science majors, working adults, and professional students are not well represented abroad.

Second, where do U.S. students study abroad and in what types of programs?

Nearly 80 percent of students studying abroad do so in Europe. Indeed, by one count, far more undergraduates (27 percent) study in Great Britain alone than in Latin America (9 percent), Asia (5 percent), the Middle East (3 percent), and Africa (1 percent) combined.

More than 80 percent of U.S. students abroad enroll in programs sponsored by a U.S. institution, as opposed to enrolling directly in a foreign institution. About 70 percent of the programs last for a semester or a summer; virtually all are traditionally academic in nature, and most are completed during the junior year.

Third, how about the quality and influence of the experience abroad?

Study abroad is a marginal activity on most campuses—encouraged, unsupported, unprepared for, and unconnected with students’ work after their return. Time spent abroad too often does not entail a full engagement with the host country’s culture—let alone a true immersion in it.

The academic quality of study abroad is suspect in the eyes of some faculty members, and its contributions to learning—as opposed to attitudes and character—are rarely assessed.

Foreign Students

The United States leads all other countries by far in its enrollment of foreign students, hosting nearly one-third of all students worldwide who study outside their native countries. The 420,000 foreign students en-
rolled in U.S. institutions account for about 3 percent of total enrollments here—and constitute a cohort about six times as large as that of Americans studying abroad.

The number of foreign undergraduates has remained fairly stable; about 47 percent study at the associate or bachelor’s level. Although proportions vary by type of institution—with the highest international enrollments in undergraduate programs at Ph.D.-granting universities and selective liberal arts colleges, and the lowest at community colleges—foreign students account, on average, for 2 percent of undergraduate enrollments in this country. During the past decade, most of the growth in the enrollment of foreign students occurred at the graduate level; U.S. universities have come to rely on foreign students to fill graduate programs and to serve as teaching and research assistants. About 46 percent of foreign students are enrolled at the graduate level; they account for 26 percent of all Ph.D.’s granted, including at least one-half of the degrees in math and the sciences.

These numbers, however, obscure characteristics of the foreign student population that shape and in some ways limit its potential for assisting the internationalizing of U.S. campuses. One is the numerical dominance of Asians, who make up nearly 60 percent of the whole; 9 of the top 10 countries of origin are in Asia. By contrast, Europe—the second most common region of origin—accounts for only 13 percent; Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa for 10, 7, and 5 percent, respectively.

As for foreign students’ choices of field of study, those in four-year institutions in 1991-92 most often chose to pursue degrees in business and management or engineering (19 percent each), physical and life sciences (10 percent), and mathematics and computer science (9 percent). They were commensurately underrepresented in the social sciences (8 percent) and humanities (4 percent).

As these and similar statistics suggest, foreign students are only weakly linked with other elements of internationalization on U.S. campuses. A few may serve as resources for area studies centers, but because most speak Asian languages, their native language skills will go largely unused. Nor are foreign students well represented in courses and programs with international content, where they could make significant contributions. Most such offerings are outside the tightly structured professional, scientific, and technical curricula in which most foreign students are enrolled. Finally, it is difficult to link American students going abroad with appropriate international students because so many of the latter come from countries other than the European destinations favored by their American counterparts.

**Study abroad, language training, and foreign students notwithstanding, the heart of the matter is internationalizing the curriculum.**

Study abroad, language training, and foreign students notwithstanding, the heart of the matter is internationalizing the curriculum. Courses in microeconomics, literary criticism, marriage and the family, market research, historiography, botany, environmental science—offerings of the kind that constitute the basic building blocks of students’ work in the traditional disciplines—should transcend all nationally and geographically limited, and limiting, frames of reference.

Some fields—international studies, area studies, peace or world order studies—are specifically devoted to examining international or global questions. Other disciplines—geography and anthropology, for example—also are intrinsically international in concern. Still others—archaeology, botany, geology, linguistics, zoology, entomology, and a number of comparatives specialities in the social sciences and humanities—extend their knowledge bases in direct proportion to their access to new materials and sites.

Concerned as they are with universal principles, highly abstract fields such as physics, mathematics, and computer science are not clearly transnational or global in focus. Yet understanding even in these disciplines advances as their practitioners come into contact with the work of colleagues in other countries. Professional fields such as business, law, and medicine are shaped by developments outside the United States as surely as they contribute to them.

Unfortunately, the academy has not always been hospitable to internationally minded scholars. Some faculty members in more traditional fields regard explicitly international or global studies as lacking in rigor or prone to ideological bias; they may argue that students should gain their international understanding by working within the rigorous framework, and using the conceptual tools, of the traditional disciplines.

These same faculty members, paradoxically, often shy away from comparative issues in their own courses. Many think they lack the necessary skills to do this work or are discouraged by its marginality to what is perceived as “the real work” of their disciplines.

In fact, it is increasingly apparent that discovering the international dimensions of any discipline is centrally important intellectual work. Disciplines are powerful ways of seeing, capable of extraordinary clarity and penetration; but the disciplines afford views that are, at best, partial—and all the more so to the extent that we limit their inquiries to the study of the near at hand.

Overcoming scholarly ethnocentrism means asking new questions and reformulating old ones, collecting data from new and possibly far-flung sources, and generalizing from sufficiently diverse observations. The results can be inconvenient and sobering: One may find that prized conclusions depend on domestic data and analytical approaches, that assumptions do not travel, that theories and models lose their explanatory power. Two examples:

- **Japan’s national industrial policy**—designed to manipulate markets...
and gain dominance for that country's enterprises—plays havoc with orthodox economic models assuming free and open trade.

- Caught badly off guard by the rapid breakup of the Soviet bloc several years ago, social scientists—largely ignorant of eastern European thought and politics and perhaps too optimistic about the replicability of American experience elsewhere—have since had to struggle to comprehend why the market and social reforms there did not take root and flourish as readily as many predicted they might.

What we don't know can hurt us, prompting simplistic analysis that compromises the quality and credibility of scholarly judgment.

Conclusion
The discussion here suggests where colleges and universities wishing to realize a global perspective in their own institutions can begin working. Yet there is also much hard thinking to be done about purposes. Is the particular institution or program aspiring to ensure awareness of international differences, understanding of them, or real competence in actually reconciling them? Different approaches and levels of resources are implied by each goal.

Once purposes are clarified, there is the difficult task of thinking comprehensively about elements discussed separately here. Perhaps every academic major should have language and study-abroad options—and possibly the option of an international concentration as well. Perhaps, however, because no institution can be all things to all people, what is needed is a strategy for achieving excellence that reinforces selected areas of strength.

Then again, there is the matter of balance—an approach that appropriately internationalizes both general education and the major, gives basic attention to all world regions, leaves no discipline entirely untouched, and attends adequately to both international and (more properly) global issues.

According to Joseph Johnston's article, I qualify as a typical American student abroad: "a white, middle-class woman from a highly educated professional family who is studying humanities in western Europe." That identification may give my experience a representative quality, but my remarks mainly reflect only a few personal observations. In fact, many aspects of my experience vary from the standard picture.

As a Fulbright scholar, I cannot claim lack of support. Because of that support and because this is my third extended stay abroad, I was able to adapt quickly and to integrate myself into life in Germany. My experience is limited to Germany: Although it counts as part of western Europe, the typical destination for American students, nothing I have experienced can necessarily be applied to any other west European country. To an American, the diversity of languages, governments, and cultures in a relatively small space is striking. Moreover, western Europe as a geopolitical entity, and Germany's place in it, has been changing in form and meaning since the end of East-West polarizaton.

To narrow my perspective even further, I am exposed to only a small slice of German life. Constance is a border town on a large lake that connects three nations (Germany, Switzerland, and Austria) and the two German states of Baden-Württemberg and Bavaria (for many Germans, regional identification is stronger than national). The University of Constance, where I am studying German literature, is also untypical, in that it is a relatively new and small institution, having been founded in 1966 and counting a student enrollment of about 10,000.

The aspect of my educational experience here that has most impressed me, as a literature student, is...
German students must take more responsibility for themselves. In the humanities, different classes are offered each year, and students fill their schedules and plan their progress as they see fit. Many of the students in every class are simply auditing, not earning a credit. (Students may accumulate credits at their own pace.) In theory, a student must only show up for one test or write one paper to earn credit for a course, and in a subject such as law, it’s common practice for students to learn the material in ways other than attending class. The literature department also offers some pure lecture classes with no binding participation, tests, or other requirements; generally, however, Constance emphasizes class participation after the American model.

The most stressful time of the semester comes after classes end, during the semester breaks (February and March after winter semester, July and August after summer), when exams are scheduled and papers must be written. Compared with the constant workload I experienced in college in America, however, academic pressure for German students, at least for those in the humanities, is low during most of their studies.

Many Germans . . . assume that they already know all there is to know about the United States.

German students say that professors who have experience in the American system complain about how little the German students read in comparison with Americans. And lately, German politicians, looking for budget-cutting measures, have been complaining about how long German students take to finish their state-financed studies and have been instituting reforms—to much student protest. (After 13 years of school, students traditionally take at least 6 years to complete their university diploma, the rough equivalent of a U.S. master’s degree.)

In compensation for the manageable pace for the majority of their time at the university, German students feel the pressure of all their years of study during the final comprehensive exams, which alone determine their final grades and the granting of their degrees. Even in Constance, where the relatively small student population allows for considerable choice in seminars and more opportunity for personal relationships with professors than at the larger traditional institutions, German students I have met tend to have something akin to a fatalism about the future.

Although this pessimism is now particularly acute because of Germany’s grim job market, this attitude could have a deeper source in the educational system, which very early (starting in the fifth grade) starts tracking students into the course that will probably determine the direction of their life: university education, vocational training, or apprenticeship. Not only does this system look rather rigid from my outsider’s point of view, but Germans tend to complain about its effects (usually not about the system itself) as well.

A few weeks ago I talked with a group of students about the decision-making pressure that they face as they finish school and look toward university. The last two years (12th and 13th grades) of university-track schooling resemble American college education, with majors, requirements, and electives. University study, however, calls for specialization. In contrast to the ideals of liberal arts education, students pursue specialized fields even within their one or two exclusive subjects of study in order to become qualified for certain career paths.

We discussed the difficulty that many students experience in choosing a field of study at age 18 or 19. The Germans in the group noted that many students subsequently become unhappy with their choice and must rethink and restart their career paths with a different type of education—no small task within the specialized and bureaucratized German system, which requires a particular type of training for each job.

The students attributed this unhappiness to the pressure to conform to standards imposed by family or society, whose values and dreams may not correspond with those of the coming generation. But I believe that the reason these decisions take on monumental importance is that they have such long-range effects on a person’s life. It’s certainly less common for American students to have a crisis about changing majors, even though we are subject to the same outside pressures.

From my perspective and that of most Germans, the United States in comparison looks like the land of unlimited opportunity, for in most cases you must find your own way toward a certain career goal and develop your qualifications yourself. Common to both systems these days is the risk that your training, however acquired, may not be in demand once you enter the job market. In the American system, however, it’s easier to change directions several years into your education. But American students must pay for these educational options, whereas education in Germany is state-financed. Because liberal arts degrees in the United States provide a general education, college career centers emphasize practical experience through internships and summer jobs. Many German students say that they miss this practical side of education, as they become more limited to one specialized, theoretical area—Fachdidaten, people who are endlessly competent in a single field and can do nothing else.

American liberal arts education provides the framework for personal development and extracurricular discovery, not a direct route to a fixed
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career path. This “nonsystem” is both less clear and more flexible. Every German student I’ve talked to, however, views the American educational system with about as much sympathy as I do the German—with intellectual understanding of the advantages but a gut instinct against it. Between two cultures that have so much in common, I have found this contrast in systems—German orderliness versus the American “free-for-all”—the basis of a fundamental difference in our expectations from society.

One example of this difference is the German expectation that tasks be done in a certain way with a standard quality. As a Fulbright exchange teacher I know put it, in Germany you can go into any flower shop and receive satisfactory service because every florist has taken a standard training course and is certified for the job. In an American city, finding a good flower shop without having a recommendation is a matter of chance and you can experience the whole spectrum from excellent to poor-quality work. The principle extends to many situations and creates a different attitude toward “how things should be” that can affect virtually every aspect of daily life.

Although I have enjoyed learning from the German educational system, a disappointment that I share with many other American students in Germany is a lack of interest, on the part of many Germans, in Americans and U.S. society—because they assume that they already know all there is to know about the United States. This attitude manifests itself in two ways: indifference, more common among younger people (“The U.S. has never interested me; don’t bother to tell me anything about it”), or hostility, which I’ve heard more from older Germans (“The U.S. is ruining our culture; the only good things ever to have come out of the U.S. are medical advances”). These are the most extreme examples I’ve heard, but they are true quotes. My perception is that people who ask questions, rather than telling me how it is “over there,” represent exceptions. I realize, however, that this problem cuts both ways—my German friends who have lived in the United States are shocked by Americans’ complete ignorance about Germany, and consequent lack of interest in it.

My Fulbright colleagues in the former East Germany who have also spent time in the West note a difference in their reception as Americans. People in the East generally don’t assume that they already know everything about America, and they want to find out more. On a one-week trip to Moscow and St. Petersburg in February with a group of Americans, I noticed the same openness among the few people we met. In contrast to western Europe, overexposure to American products hasn’t set in yet in the former Communist countries, nor have American military forces been living with them for nearly 50 years.

The problem exemplified by western Germany is a good reason to place more emphasis on study-abroad programs: so that American cultural foreign relations are less massively determined by entertainment industry exports (American shows and films dominate German television and movie theaters), fast-food restaurants, and news reports focusing on violence in the United States, particularly against foreign tourists—Germans in Miami, for example. In addition, these foreign relations work both ways: As American students disseminate information abroad, our own stereotypical and limited perspectives are broken down, and we discover all the modes of thought we can no longer take for granted. Individuals and nations can only gain from this type of exchange.

Laura Barlament, a 1993 Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Agnes Scott College, is entering the Ph.D. program in English and German literature at Emory University this autumn.

---

New ФБК Plaques Available

Would you like to have a metal replica of your Phi Beta Kappa membership certificate mounted on a wall plaque? The company that has been making these plaques in stainless steel for more than two decades is now offering larger brass-matted plaques as well.

If you wish to purchase a plaque, check the kind you want from the three options listed below and send your name, chapter, and initiation date to Massillon Plaque Company, P.O. Box 2939, North Canton, OH 44720, plus a check for the appropriate amount. (Do not mail in your membership certificate.) All prices include postage and handling. Massillon unconditionally guarantees the quality and the accuracy of every plaque. A portion of all sales will be used to support Phi Beta Kappa’s programs.

1. 8" x 10" stainless steel plaque mounted on solid walnut base: $75.

2. 11" x 13" brass-matted stainless steel plaque mounted on solid walnut base: $95.

3. 11" x 13" brass-matted stainless steel plaque mounted on black base: $95.

If you prefer to pay by Visa or MasterCard or if you need additional information, telephone (800) 854-8404 and ask for the Phi Beta Kappa Order Department. Allow 3 weeks for delivery.
Survey Respondents Like Expanded Key Reporter

In retrospect, it may have been folly to attempt to survey 350,000 smart people about their opinions on any subject—especially in the absence of additional staff to process the returns. Yet because the survey mailing was spread over an entire year, the task of dealing with the response was less daunting than it might appear, and the returns were definitely worth the effort.

More than 35,000 responses have been read, and all comments (beyond checking the box) noted. Many reader queries have been personally answered by the editor, the Society’s secretary, or other headquarters staff, as appropriate. Many suggestions (more and shorter articles; more stories about members—including some younger ones—doing interesting things outside the academic world; more attention to the sciences and fine arts) have already been acted upon. The most frequent comment on the cards was, “I depend on the Recommended Reading,” followed by “I usually start with one of the feature articles” and “Thanks for asking!”

The answers on a sample of roughly one in five cards have been tallied, with the following results:

- More than 80 percent of respondents report that they receive the newsletter consistently; 3 percent had never received it. Many members living more or less permanently overseas (there are about 6,000 we know of around the world—and probably a similar number overseas temporarily, for whom we lack current addresses) report sporadic receipt, if that. Our mailer is taking various steps to improve this delivery, both domestic and overseas. (If you know of any member who does not receive the newsletter, let us know.)
- About half confess that they had not noticed the new design (one asks, “Will I have to return my key?”). A number were puzzled by the use of “recently” with respect to when the newsletter was expanded.

Our Readers Comment on—

The Expanded Format

- I like the expanded newsletter very much. Often I did not read the old Key Reporter in its entirety. Now I do, and usually as soon as it comes. A great idea, format, and newsletter. Do not change!
- Although I didn’t specifically notice the change in the newsletter’s format, I do find I’m more likely to read it through lately. I’ve especially enjoyed your feature articles. In fact it is largely owing to the Key Reporter that I am making a contribution to Phi Beta Kappa for the first time.
- The format is ugly but the articles are good.
- Is it just a coincidence that I recently established a file folder for ΦΒΚ, not wishing to part with certain articles that have appeared in the Key Reporter since the new format was introduced? . . .
- The new format is a great improvement; it’s attractive, more readable (I don’t have to squint as much, reading the larger type). News of individuals/associations humanizes the text. I enjoy the book reviews/recommendations, but don’t they read fiction?
- I enjoy the newsletter! Keep asking for money; some day I will contribute!
- I can’t imagine returning to the old format. It was a throwaway—dry and stodgy. The new format is far more informative, readable, makes members feel we really belong and are worthy of getting news about ΦΒΚ everywhere.

The Contents in General

- I have always enjoyed the Key Reporter because it is unlike any of the other publications to which I subscribe. I consider it intellectually above most of the others—not in a snobbish way, but just at a different level. The main article is always unique, and the Recommended Reading reviews have always been my favorite section. They review books I will mostly never read but love to be aware of, and your Book Committee is the best.
- I like the content even more than before. I frequently pass it on to non-ΦΒΚ friends. I’ll get accustomed to the blue margin.
- Some new initiatives of our chapter ask, “What does Phi Beta Kappa do?” . . . The expanded Reporter helps answer that question.
- The Key Reporter is a publication I look forward to amidst a number of publications I receive with comparative indifference. Keep up the quality of the newsletter, as befits ΦΒΚ.
- There is usually something for everyone in each issue. So I skim through to see what is of interest to us who are science oriented.
- Please liven the newsletter up. I find it as dry as withered leaves.
- Too chatty—keep working to include intellectual information.
- It gives interesting information that is not available to me from any other source.
- I read all issues with great interest, not always with complete understanding.
- My husband and I read the Key Reporter the day it arrives usually, because it is slim and concise. To be truthful, the books reviewed are very rarely ones I go right out and buy, but the reviews keep us informed of diverse interests of others.
- After graduating from university I married and had three children. . . . The Key Reporter reminds me of the excellence of my academic achievements and the company I keep by being a member of ΦΒΚ. It also reminds me of why I worked so hard in college—so that as an educated mother I would not bring three more idiots into this world. Thank you.
- I work for the government—the Key Reporter reminds me that there are still intelligent people in the world.
- To be honest, I enjoy reading my wife’s sorority newsletter more.
ed—doubtless because by the time the survey ended, the expansion had occurred more than two years in the past. We apologize for the confusion.

- Well over 90 percent say they prefer the new format to the old eight-page newsletter ("much more inviting and readable").
- More than 60 percent report that they read most issues with much interest. Fewer than 5 percent report that they never read the newsletter. Hundreds of those checking the remaining category ("rarely take the time") edited the language to indicate they always skim the newsletter and read carefully what interests them, always read the book reviews or an article or both, always read (or always skip) the chapter/association news, or noted "I never read it but my wife does/I don't have time but my husband likes it."

Our thanks to everyone who took the time to respond. We value your opinions and hope to continue to improve the newsletter's usefulness. And remember, you need not wait for the next survey to send us your comments.

The Economics of Publishing the Newsletter

Some survey respondents expressed curiosity about the costs of publishing the expanded newsletter.

- Because of economies of scale and other measures to consolidate its printing and mailing operations, the Society is now spending about 80 cents per person per year (down from about 90 cents per person per year over the past few years) to publish and distribute the Key Reporter (four issues) free to all members of the Society for whom we have current addresses.
- Postage (including postal returns) accounts for about 45 percent of the cost of the newsletter; postage costs are the same whether the newsletter has 8 pages or 16. (A 12-page newsletter is not feasible because the presses are designed to handle signatures of 8 or 16 pages; hence 12 pages cost more than 16.)
- Typesetting and adding the second color (blue) account for less than 2 percent of the total cost of the newsletter.
- The newsletter takes advantage of every discount the Postal Service offers for automated mailings.
- Some 15 percent of our members contribute toward defraying the cost of the newsletter (and the other activities of the Society) by becoming sustaining members.

A Survey Response That Didn't Fit Our Categories

"I have mentioned ΦBK in my will. This is provisional—given that standards are not relaxed, indeed, that the institution at which I teach... not be granted a ΦBK Chapter."

The Articles

- I consistently enjoy the main article. . . . I always intend to read the book reviews but do so only sporadically. There is a gray, stodgy quality about the newsletter that I rather like, especially because it’s out of fashion. Thank God, Madison Ave. hasn’t hit ΦBK!!
- I particularly like the reports from Visiting Scholars on their year’s experience.
- I generally read the lead article and the natural science reviews. I look forward to an examination of issues in education which is generally free of the cant that characterizes current communications in many other academic fora. Keep it up!
- Writing has been stuffy, as has the content of the articles in general. The issues raised are usually white male Western World academic in nature.
- I appreciate the Key Reporter very much, saving copies and rereading many parts of them. Sometimes I read until I find a new word or a nuance in use of a word I may know. It fascinates me almost as a game.
- Your articles are some of the most interesting and unusual, as well as incisive, that I read—and I get over $1,500 worth of newspapers, magazines, and journals every year!
- For a business person: Excellent way to stay in touch with some of the best thinking in education, . . . a distillation of key issues. It never fails to repay the time invested. . . .
- Too many esoteric topics of no interest to me.

Book Reviews

- As far as I’m concerned, the best things in the Key Reporter are the book reviews. You review books that nobody else does, and the quality of the reviews is excellent.
- I love the book reviews—so brief, so wonderful—about books I rarely see reviewed elsewhere. I enjoy the breadth of subject matter.
- The book reviews are a staple of my life and have been for years. It’s a gift to be able to write concise, useful reviews—and most of your writers have it.
- Books reviewed in the Key Reporter are seldom of general interest and often deal with academic arcana.
- Review some more books intended for "common" people. Not pulp novels, but nonfiction works which might appeal to the general public.
- I don’t have much interest in ΦBK business or local chapter activities, but I love your book reviews and read them with great interest. Perhaps 20% of the books I buy are bought after reading Key Reporter reviews.
- Although I read the Key Reporter with interest, I find far too few reviewers accord with my liberal, feminist, antiracist values. The "tilt" to the right is off-putting.
- I always browse through the book reviews because the New York Times generally steers clear of academic stuff. The Key Reporter lets me know about books in various fields of interest to me.
Svetlana L. Alpers


A connoisseur with an eye for prints and an art historian with an interest in the social history of their production and consumption have put together a fascinating study of the 70 years during which printmaking throughout Europe came into its own as an art. This is a large book, beautifully and contiously illustrated. It is also timely. Renaissance prints offer an antidote to just about the type of postmodern predicaments. The themes and the appeal of the prints exemplify the successful fusion of what is today referred to, a bit too breezily, as the high and the low. And at a moment when many artists prefer theorizing to the pleasures of making, and critical theorists in the academy suspect the pleasures of viewing, it is bracing to experience the visual delight of the skills displayed by the likes of Dürer, Mantegna, Beccafumi, and their often anonymous predecessors.

Chapter/Association News

- Having information about what’s going on in PBK chapters, etc., is much more interesting than book reviews.
- I appreciate the new—and I believe well-merited—attention to the associations and their activities.
- I always enjoy the book review sections and the longer articles. I always skip articles about Society business. Perhaps this is irresponsible of me.
- Are PBK people as boring as the newsletter makes it look? I doubt it.
- PBK, with its espoused principles, should be an organization to get involved in. The newsletter (as revised) will help some people organize themselves and do more.

Politics

- You should represent both sides of the political spectrum, left-wing liberal and conservative. The Key Reporter seems to be very biased toward the liberal side.
- While I sometimes find the articles too conservative for my taste, they are inevitably thoughtful.
- I wish you included some conservative thinkers.
- Too Liberal!!
- I’m happy to send a little money to support your (our?) efforts, but I’m not really interested in receiving a publication. I’m concerned about use of paper, cost of mailing, adding to disposal problem, etc.—and I don’t need to be convinced this is a worthy effort.
- I find your reports and reviews extremely outdated. Like it or not, Foucault has displaced Nietzsche [sic] as theorist of importance. What about feminist theory, cultural studies, film, multiculturalism?
- Have doubled my contribution. “Res ipsa loquitur.”
- I believe the Key Reporter is one of the few truly objective intellectual bulletins in print. . . . The Key Reporter has quietly held to the highest standards and continues to keep the intellectual flame burning brightly and free of political smoke.


This compact handbook on sculpture can serve as a sort of companion volume to Landau/Parshall on Renaissance prints. Smaller in scale and more modest in ambition, it, too, is beautifully illustrated. It aims to take in the whole world of sculpture in terms of the materials worked. This is an appropriate solution to the problem of dealing with an art form that, unlike printmaking, is universal and that, in Europe at least, lacks a continuous history. It is a bit odd, given this focus, to find the author emphasizing his suspicion of the old doctrine of truth to materials, that is, the Ruskin credo that it is best to work so as to reveal the qualities peculiar to each material. The book offers support for the notion that attention to a material and to the physical constraints of working it—be it ivory, bronze, calcite alabaster, or lime-wood—gives frame to the making and zest to the viewing of sculpture. The book is a useful resource for the many museum goers and travelers who probably find more interest and ease in looking at paintings.


Published on the occasion of an exhibition originating at Duke University, this book offers a photographic record and interpretive account of Mayan painted pots and the culture of 250-850 A.D. of which they are a record. The book is designed to overcome the tensions (which are hardly unique to this field) between the site-oriented work of archaeologists and the attention of epigraphers and iconographers to objects removed from the site. Any number of familiar questions, from the status of the individual artist to the relationship of word and image, are made strange and so take on new interest by being considered in a distant context. The book suits the current taste for alternatives to the European pictorial tradition. But one of the fascinating things is how often Mayan painting, in its figuration, col-
ors, and design, reminds one of non-European painting elsewhere, for example, the Rajput painting of India. This richly illustrated book also makes one think again about art and culture.


At a moment when concertgoing everywhere is challenged by the convenience and quality of the CD, here is a book that documents in detail (complete with numerous tables and a map) the invention of the public concert in London in the later 18th century. Every aspect—from audience to advertising, to concert management, to the life of the professional musician, even to the seating (or standing) arrangement of the players—is accounted for.

There is much of interest: the elitist nature of subscription concerts; the elite’s further withdrawal to an “old master” such as Handel in opposition to the “modern” Haydn; the evolution of the conductor; national taste (an English touchstone being the sublimity of the Handel air “I know that my redeemer liveth”). Familiar things are put in a new light. The sense in which concertgoing encouraged a passive relationship to music was partly compensated for, perhaps, by the developing critical discrimination on the part of the audience. The range of things taken up heightens awareness of what goes into the making of any musical culture.

Lawrence Willson


Roughly 60 years ago, before the appearance on the scene of such major figures of the southern literary renaissance as Welty, O’Connor, McCullers, and Capote, and before the critical magic of Malcolm Cowley had propelled Faulkner to center stage, the name of Caldwell would have headed the list of the important writers of the region. During the 1930s he had published three still important novels, Tobacco Road (1932), God’s Little Acre (1933), and Journeyman (1935); and he began the decade of the ‘40s with a volume of fine short stories, Jackpot (1940), and another novel almost as good as its predecessors, Trouble in July (1940), followed by another, less good, Tragic Ground (1945). It seemed that all he touched turned to literary gold, but suddenly the inspiration died, and during the next 40 years it continued to deteriorate until Caldwell became, like Sinclair Lewis, more nearly a cartoonist than a serious social critic and, as he himself phrased it, “an outcast among the literary guys.” Klevar charts the decline in this book, which shows what happens to a writer who, like Edith Wharton, strays too far from his sources of energy and never gets back to them.


Critics and scholars have pored over Emily Dickinson’s letters for many reasons, some of them noting the resemblances in them to her poems, but Shurr is the first to extract from them actual poems—498 of them. Since the poetry “disguised as prose” has been noticed before now, I am not sure that the book offers “an astonishing literary discovery,” as the advertisement claims; nor, since the poems presented add nothing to and subtract nothing from the basic quality of Dickinson’s production, do I think it represents “a major addition to the study of American literature.” But Dickinson’s admirers, who are legion, will surely wish to have such a generous addition to the canon. The cryptic, epigrammatic utterance is as arresting as ever: “Not all of life to live, is it/nor all of death to die,” for example, or “The tiniest ones are the mightiest—the Wren will prevail.” But it is perilous to start quoting, for there is no logical point at which to stop; and that is the charm of the book.


These two books, taken together, illumine racial politics in the contemporary United States. Tate focuses on the political attitudes and behavior of African Americans, while Sniderman and Piazza zero in on what whites believe about blacks and about race-specific public policies. There are some remarkable continuities in the findings of these two books and an implicit hopefulness that the political chasm between the races, while real, is both exaggerated and bridgeable.

In order to penetrate the nature and extent of racial prejudice among whites, Sniderman and Piazza build experiments into their survey research design. They discover, first, that prejudice is widespread, a fact reiterated as a backdrop against which to suggest that most whites’ racial attitudes are more complex than a simple concept of global prejudice allows.

The American public, they assert, is not “divided into two more or less fixed armies clashing over race” (p. 10). The authors demonstrate that many people do change their attitudes upon hearing opposing arguments, a finding suggestive that a deliberative democratic process might result in public policies acceptable to a majority of blacks and whites.

Among the more fascinating, if not entirely novel, findings in the book are the facts that the best predictor of prejudice against blacks is a dislike of Jews and that affirmative action policies may engender prejudice among whites against blacks and thus may exacerbate racial divisions rather than eliminate them.

If whites in the United States do not constitute a monolith on race, neither do blacks, as Tate demonstrates. Nor are their political attitudes so far apart. African Americans are a differentiated group, divided by class and increasingly uncertain of

Catherine Rudder
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race-specific policies (though largely in favor of them). On average, blacks are more concerned about unemployment and crime than discrimination per se. On some issues, such as homosexuality, blacks are more conservative than whites.

Tate charts the transformation of black politics from a highly effective protest movement to an electoral approach made possible by the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965. While the successes have been stunning—from increased voter registration and participation to the election of over 6,800 black officials by 1988—the status of many black Americans is abysmal. Moreover, black political progress seems to have come to a standstill with an unwelcoming Republican Party and with a Democratic Party that cannot appear to be too “black” lest whites abandon it further.

Applying data and argument to a multitude of important questions, Tate assesses the strategies advanced to improve the political power of blacks, including black nationalism, protest, the creation of a third political party, a black presidential candidacy like Jesse Jackson’s within the Democratic Party, and a shift to the Republican Party. She finds such strategies to be either unrealistic or unlikely to produce significant policy change.

The successful movement of African Americans into mainstream politics carries with it both the limits and the opportunities of incremental policymaking, compromise, and coalition building. Sniderman and Piizza, coupled with Tate, give good reason to believe that racial progress is possible and provide the empirical basis to create a strategy to move forward.


That public officials use historical analogies in making foreign policy comes as no surprise. Contrary to George Santayana’s famous warning about the consequences of historical ignorance, however, Yuen Foong Khong might suggest that historical knowledge misapplied is more harmful than unfamiliarity with the past altogether. He is not alone in this conclusion. Robert Jervis and Ernest May, among others, have demonstrated that policymakers use historical analogies poorly.

This author’s originality stems from his thorough exposition of how analogies were chosen and specifically how they were used in the case of U.S. policy toward Vietnam in 1964 and 1965 and earlier. He bases his work on private papers of the principals, public documents, and recent interviews with many of the key participants.

First, he argues convincingly that historical analogies—in particular, the Korean War and the Munich accord—guided decision making and were not simply public justifications for already determined policy. Then he shows how metaphors helped policymakers diagnose the situation and led to the choice of specific options of whether to use force and how much force to use.

The difficulty, of course, is that policy so derived is often misguided. Vietnam was a disaster for the United States, and misapplied analogies contributed to the debacle.

Why, then, do officials use analogies at all, and if such historical parallels are needed, can leaders improve their capacity to apply them? The author suggests that human beings need and use simplifying schemas or knowledge structures to receive and interpret information. Analogies function as schemas. Unfortunately, such structures become procrustean beds, so that incoming information is biased to fit preexisting ideas and leading to misinterpretation of incoming data.

The analogies that policymakers employ tend to be the ones that come most readily to mind, that hold superficial similarities to the current situation, and that conform to particular prejudices. (George Ball’s apparently apt analogy between the United States in the 1960s and France in 1954 at Dien Bien Phu was reportedly dismissed because U.S. advisers did not want to learn from losers.)

While the author significantly advances understanding about elite decision making, he is less able to provide a corrective to the problem that he brilliantly documents. He does suggest that the United States may be fortunate in that, because no one agrees on what the lesson of Vietnam is, future misapplication of a Vietnam analogy, at least, will be less likely.

Frederick J. Crosson


These Gifford Lectures of a distinguished scholar and former Phi Beta Kappa senator deal with the integration of Greek philosophy and Christian theology in the work of the fourth-century Cappadocians—three men and one woman. To exhibit the unity of the different perspectives, Pelikan ranges over a series of topics (e.g., space, time, and deity) in two parallel sweeps, the first time from the point of view of natural reason, the second from the perspective of theology. The writing is clear and graceful, the content especially informative for those untutored in the tradition of Eastern Christianity.


Richard Rorty is surely the best writer among American philosophers since William James, and part of his influence is due to a style that makes his ideas accessible to a large audience. But he is also knowledgeable and deft in his analysis of how philosophy has gone wrong. Hall is generally friendly to Rorty’s position, points out some of its lapses and lacunae, rebuts some of its critics, and seems to end up uncomfortable with where Rorty is, but willing to wait and see.

Farrell has a more severe critique of Rorty. It is interesting in part because it prays apart and opposes Rorty and Donald Davidson, whom Rorty has often cited for support. Farrell’s project is broader, however:
a defense of realism and a "recovery of the world" as part of the conversation of philosophy. His argument is that in the triangulation of world or nature, mind or subjectivity, and society or language, one or the other apex has tended in the course of modern philosophy to swallow up the other two. Not easy reading, but worthwhile both as an overview of how things stand with philosophy right now and as a defense of the concept of objective truth.


Anyone who thinks Freudian psychoanalytic theory enjoys some kind of confirmation or validation by the facts, say, by clinical success or experiments, should read this updating and extension of Grünbaum's first study 10 years ago. In it he responds to critics; rejects Karl Popper's assertion that psychoanalysis is unfalsifiable (and hence a pseudoscience), as well as the claims of those like Habermas who assert that it is a hermeneutical not an empirical science; and reviews the claim that clinical observations, if not experimental data, are confirmatory. Such observations are not uncontaminated, nor would they confirm Freud's general theory if they were. Grünbaum does not deny the possibility that there may be genuine insights in Freud's writings, merely that they have not been validated.

Cavell concurs with a number of Grünbaum's strictures, but her interest is elsewhere, in the dependence of meaning and mind on language. Following Wittgenstein and Davidson, she first tries to show that thought or mentality or subjectivity cannot be ascribed to someone incapable of language, and that what we call subjective experience is experience as described and transmuted by language, subsumed into language, not an independently given realm. Two test cases are explored: the psychology of neonates and infants, and, of course, Freud's position that language describes what is independently given (e.g., one's emotions, desires). If the battle is uphill, running counter to our "Cartesian" assumptions, Cavell's discussion of theories of meaning and of action are lucid and provide support for her thesis.


Sibling rivalry far outpaces companionship in the Hebrew Bible, but what is more striking is the frequency with which the younger son (and occasionally daughter) wins out over the older. The author reviews various attempts to account for this fact, for example, that it was a protest against primogeniture laws (contrary to widespread belief, there is no evidence in the Bible or elsewhere that primogeniture was standard in the ancient world). In fact the designation of "first-born" was social rather than biological, and even monarchical succession was not governed by primogeniture. Greenspahn's view is that the predominance of the younger (e.g., of Jacob over Esau) finally reflects an ambivalence that Israel felt about itself, chosen from among the family of nations. Interesting and accessible.


Malcolm here reminds us of the religious ideas of Wittgenstein and then tries to show how those ideas are reflected in the latter's approach to and conception of philosophy. His essay, which takes up two-thirds of this small volume, not only helps clarify Wittgenstein's religiousness but also provides a wonderfully compact and clear overview of the development of his philosophical position. After Malcolm's death four years ago, his friend Winch contributed a commentary on the essay in which he disagrees on a number of issues.


Another brief (90 pages) essay, originally a lecture, this time on the subject of death, specifically, what it can mean to say that my death is possible. We anticipate—fearfully, resignedly, longingly—the experience of the end of life, although death is not a possible experience. Heidegger is a major interlocutor, as one might expect, and the stream of reflection is clever, witty, often thought-provoking, and filled with playful and meaningful puns. Reading Derrida with enjoyment and profit requires alertness to the multiple vistas and levels of meaning, but he repays one's attention.

Jean Sudrann


The lovers, clowns, and fairies of Tave's title, from Shakespeare's Puck to Sterne's Uncle Toby, appear in one guise or another in all 10 of the essays, increasing our understanding of both the nature and the range of the comic. The cast of Tave's title remains constant, but the players change names, shapes, and functions as clowns become lovers, lovers clowns, and fairies wander at will through the unchronological discussion of the comedies. For example, Tave puts Shakespeare's Bottom on stage as clown, followed by Shaw's Jack Tanner (Man and Superman), whose "faulty vision of the world" aligns him, for much of the play, with the clowns; then Tave goes back to the Restoration for Etheredge's Dominant (The Man of Mode) before moving on to other worlds: Austen's Mrs. Bennet (Pride and Prejudice), Chekhov's Lyubov (The Cherry Orchard), and Beckett's Vladimir and Estragon (Waiting for Godot).

We also follow the various magics practiced in these worlds, from Puck's "natural" magic, which effectively brings young lovers together (Midsummer Night's Dream), to Volpone, in his mountebank disguise, offering for sale a magic derived from the powder that "made Venus a goddess" and is now available to "restore the complexion" and "seat the teeth" (all the magic really needed by a cast that has no lovers) (Volpone), as well as Charlotte Ivanova's mo-
mentary “miracle” presentation of a mother singing to her baby before she throws aside the empty bundle of clothes in a play whose cast contains only clowns. Throughout, Tave’s “miracle” teaches the reader to recognize the inherently comic in each scene.

The critically alert, wonderfully human wisdom of this book, presented with clarity, vitality, and elegance, is delightful.


If Samuel Beckett found his ideal actors in Billie Whitelaw and Alec McGowan, he also found his ideal critic in Ricks, who has for decades written of Beckett’s works with the compassionate heart and zest for language those texts demand. By titling this book *Beckett’s Dying Words*, Ricks from the beginning meets Beckett on his own terrain of the doubfulness and ambiguity of language, aware of how Beckett brings the “dead” language of clichés to “a lethal liveliness” very like the doctor who will give one of Beckett’s characters “a new lease of apathy.”

The mingling of life and death in this phrase is even more strongly evoked by the antitheses folded into such words as *last*: “last” forever or the “last” time I saw Paris? Through exploring such antitheses, Ricks arrives at his central argument, demonstrating how impossible it was for the Beckett who could say “imagination dead imagine” or who concluded the French version of *How It Is* with “comment c’est’ to deny either the life of the body or the life of the mind: “such equal liars both,’” he said.

Attuned to all the richness of allusion and ambiguity, irony and pity, of Beckett’s immortal words on the dying, Ricks’s complex, amused, and amusing study enlivens the work of surely one of the greatest writers of this century.


Lodge, ranging widely to illuminate the arts of fiction, selects, for each of the 50 sections of this volume, titles descriptive of such basic writing problems as “How to Begin” or “How to Introduce a Character.” Under each title, he quotes two or three brief paragraphs from a novel whose historical and literary context is part of the relaxed and nondictatorial commentary, leading the reader into a richer understanding of the given text. This design accommodates a changing mix of period, genre, and structural tools for each section, allowing Lodge to sharpen our awareness of the interdependence of fiction’s arts. Moreover, by describing some of his own writing problems, he increases our sensitivity to that interdependence.

Above all, however, his emphasis falls on the language that creates the fiction: Nicole Dyer’s shopping list (*Fitzgerald’s Tender Is the Night*); Becky Sharp’s tearful rejection of Sir Pitt Crawley’s offer of marriage (*Thackeray’s Vanity Fair*); Gerald Crich forcing his mare to remain standing while the colliery train goes by (*Lawrence’s Women in Love*). If you think you have long ago exhausted the art of these novels, or that contemporary critics only deconstruct, dip into *The Art of Fiction* to see how splendidly Lodge’s emphasis on “the word” enriches his chosen passages.

**Robert P. Sonkowsky**

**The Oldest Dead White European Males and Other Reflections on the Classics.** Bernard Knox. W. W. Norton, 1993. $15.95.

Here are three essays based on three lectures—each delivered at a glittering scholarly occasion by our finest Classical scholar—on the Greeks and the Greek heritage, but in the polemical context of modern multicultural and radical feminist criticism. Knox entertains and instructs with his own wit and wisdom showing how those of the Greeks are behind the revolution in modern thought and not so irrelevant as those critics believe.


This is an unusual and absorbing book by a history professor who transcends the modern state of her discipline. She juxtaposes different kinds of evidence that may be regarded as in the territory of various other disciplines or as unworthy of attention by any discipline. She engages the evidence both analytically and intuitively, both professionally and personally, and thereby draws the reader into intriguing aspects of the Roman psyche. One ends up with a new understanding toward peculiarly Roman, yet generally human, areas of despair, resentment, envy, desire, and fascination. The book needs to be read, is hard to put down.


A clearly written, richly detailed account of the evidence of Britain in the Roman world, from the island’s prehistoric background through the reign of Constantine III. The author has adapted some of the material from his 1981 *Roman Britain*, in which he first taught us to see ancient Britain as integrated into Roman civilization rather than as undergoing an isolated phase of foreign occupation. The present book benefits from many discoveries since then, and incorporates many color plates and other illustrations. Addressed to a wide audience, it is not burdened with footnotes, but contains a list of further reading and chronological tables.

**Classical and Modern Interactions: Postmodern Architecture, Multiculturalism, Decline, and Other Issues.** Karl Galinsky. Univ. of Texas, 1993. $35.

Galinsky’s book starts by pointing to the remarkable resurgence in 1980s architecture of free-wheeling Classical influences and ends with an exhortation to Classicists to find analogous opportunities in contemporary education for reasserting not the dominance but the fresh contributions of the study of Classical culture. In between, Galinsky discusses lessons for America from Roman history, Vergil’s *Aeneid*, and the Emperor Augustus, as well as multiculturalism in Greece and Rome.
Hubert L. Dreyfus's essay "What Computers Still Can't Do" (Key Reporter, Winter 1993/94) was a provocative survey of roadblocks in the path to artificial intelligence (AI). However, reports of the untimely death of AI have been greatly exaggerated.

Prof. Dreyfus correctly points out that wisdom and intuition are integral to expertise, and that these are far more subtle than some clever calculation. But on this basis, the philosopher edges toward Plato's suggestion that ideas are disembodied from the physical brain matter and societies that give rise to them, casting doubt that intelligence can ever be artificially synthesized.

The key flaw in most AI efforts to date has been to focus too much on intelligence and not enough on learning: too much on pristine rules of knowledge, not enough on the gritty process by which real creatures discover them. In particular, researchers too often suppose (1) that a complex interactive phenomenon such as intelligence can flow along a one-track, sequential circuit such as is modeled by a single (however elaborate) computer program and (2) that intelligence springs full-blown from the circuit or software itself rather than evolving from the interaction between the system and its environment.

By contrast, brain research has shown that the material basis for mentation is massively parallel circuitry in which decisions are arrived at by force majeur, and that these circuits and their interconnections are in a constant state of flux driven by experience. Intelligence is not the solution of an equation, but an emergent (i.e., synergistic) characteristic of the brain structure and learning processes of higher mammals and other systems.

What, then, is the prescription for Al's maladies? Not to insert yet more "grand" (deterministic) or "fuzzy" (probabilistic) logic into conventional programs. Rather, to seat AI prototypes in a multiprocessing computer environment in which learning itself can be simulated. Such a prototype would, like an infant, start out "dumb" and be "taught" by being subjected to a

---

**The American Scholar**

"I read The Key Reporter and The American Scholar regularly and thoroughly and consider these Phi Beta Kappa publications to be superior, especially with respect to the range of material covered and the objective yet engaged nature of the coverage."

— Respondent to The Key Reporter survey

Have you considered subscribing to the Scholar? If you order now, your subscription will begin with the Autumn 1994 issue. Among the articles scheduled to appear are "A Loss for Words: Plagiarism and Silence," by Neal Bowers; "Billy Blake's Trial," by Brian Doyle; "Cold Fusion," by David Goodstein; and "Immigrant Angst According to the Marx Brothers," by Daniel Lieberfeld and Judith Sanders. Also appearing in the forthcoming issue will be "Me Bod," an essay by the Scholar's editor, Joseph Epstein.

We think you will enjoy reading this issue and many more to come. To order, just complete and return the coupon below. The issue will be mailed in September.

---

**ΦBK Receives Gift from Stanford Graduate's Estate**

Phi Beta Kappa recently received $60,000 from the $3 million estate of Mary Tingley Center (ΦBK, Stanford '23), who died in January.
changing (in this case artificial and highly optimized) set of stimuli.

When the missing ingredient of learning is successfully synthesized, even such higher faculties as wisdom, intuition, and emotion—which Prof. Dreyfus supposes are uniquely human and at the same time immune from human artifact—will evolve in the tangled bundle of man-made circuits.

*Randy K. Schwartz, Livonia, Mich.*

Prof. Dreyfus carries philosophical theory a bit too far into jurisprudence when he writes that judges will rarely if ever attempt to explain their choice of precedents when rendering decisions involving conflicting concepts of the central issues in cases before them. If a trial judge should rely on “unrationailized intuition” only in writing a decision on a case, as Prof. Dreyfus claims is common practice, relying on precedents that are not rationally related, then the judge’s decision would be ripe for challenge on appeal.

“Intuition,” as defined by Webster, involves knowing or learning without the conscious use of reasoning. Expert chess players, like expert automobile drivers, of course function effortlessly within their expertise. But they are not ordinarily called on to explain their functioning to other people. Ballistics experts, by contrast, routinely face opposing experts in presenting trial testimony. The expert must convince the jury members, under their concepts of rationality, that the expert’s conclusion is sound, no matter how effortlessly the investigation had been conducted. If an expert’s intuitive approach was so unconscious as to involve error, ridicule would be justly deserved.

*Karl S. Landstrom, Arlington, Va.*

**Hubert Dreyfus responds:**

Prof. Schwartz suspects me of Platonism, viz., of thinking that intelligence can be understood apart from brain and society. In fact, I couldn’t agree more with Prof. Schwartz that human intelligence is the product of neural networks like ours and only makes sense for creatures socialized into shared, meaningful practices. I had to leave out these issues in my piece for the *Key Reporter*, but I go into them in detail in the new preface to the third edition of my book, *What Computers Still Can’t Do* (MIT Press, 1992).

I agree, too, that traditional AI viewed intelligence as full-blown and linear, while current brain simulation models use the mathematics of evolving interaction to model learning. I was delighted when neural-network research reemerged on the scene after the failure of symbolic AI. If nothing else, it answered the argument that had always been used in defense of traditional AI—that there was no other model for intelligence than our conscious experiences of solving problems in a step-by-step way.

**Coming in the autumn issue:**

*A report on the triennial Council in San Francisco, August 11-14, and ‘Life Outside Academe’ with Buffalo Bills coach Marvin Levy (PBK, Coe College ’50).*

But I am less sanguine about the future of neural networks than Prof. Schwartz, precisely because I am less of a Platonist than he. Neural nets so far have not done well at learning because they do not recognize the right similarities between situations they have been trained to respond to and new situations. Although everything is similar to everything else in an indefinitely large number of ways, only certain similarities seem important to beings with our sorts of brains raised in our sort of culture. Neural networks always take new inputs as similar to ones they have learned to respond to, but it is a matter of luck if they respond to the same similarities that a human being would. Rather than using learning to give computers wisdom and emotions as Prof. Schwartz suggests, it looks as if already having brains and bodies and feelings and emotions like ours may well be necessary before “tangled bundles of man-made circuits” can acquire wisdom and intuition.

I’m sorry to hear from attorney Landstrom that trial judges are expected to give a rational account of how they arrive at their choice of appropriate precedents when announcing their decisions, but I bow to his expertise. Still, the fact that judges are expected to rationalize their choices and that they comply with this demand does not mean that their arguments capture their expertise. In claiming that a given case is similar to a previous case and thus that the previous case provides a precedent, a wise judge may well be relying on intuitions not captured in his (or her) arguments. The test would be to put into an expert system the principles and features the judge adds to justify his claim as to the central issues in a case. Only if these principles and features would allow a computer to produce choices of appropriate precedents in future cases that agreed with those made by the wise judge would his reasons be shown to capture his expertise. So far, however, as my brother, Stuart, and I point out in *Mind over Machine* (Free Press, 1988), no expert system has succeeded in capturing the expertise of any expert by using the rules the expert produces when called upon to explain his or her functioning.

**The Key Reporter**
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Brennan. The next day the participants traveled to Howard University, where the chapter had arranged for a day-long series of lectures and discussions of non-Western and contemporary notions of the universe.

Both the Folger Shakespeare Library and the National Gallery of Art hosted the institute on June 29, exploring the consequences of the Copernican revolution in thought as manifested in art and literature. The next day the group went to College Park, where the chapter had arranged for them to view the skies for themselves at the University of Maryland’s observatory.

The institute ended at George Washington University, where Carl Linden of the chapter there and John Hought of the chapter at Georgetown University led a spirited discussion of Copernicus’s influence on the politics and religion of early modern Europe.

This institute was the second one Phi Beta Kappa has sponsored, working with the D.C. schools, to encourage outstanding teachers to remain in the profession by fostering their interest in broad themes in the arts and sciences. In 1993 the theme was “Chaos in Contemporary Thought.”

Delaware Valley Group Sponsors Decathlon

In February the Delaware Valley alumni association sponsored an “Academic Decathlon” for students from five Philadelphia high schools. In preparation for the “super quiz,” the students studied a wide range of subjects from mathematics to fine arts. They also wrote essays, prepared speeches, and practiced interviewing. The association provided funding for the project and volunteers to serve as judges.

Calling the decathlon a “pilot program,” Barbara Marmorstein, past president of the association, reports that the group undertook the activity in response to the Society’s request to associations to expand their efforts to promote excellence in their local schools, which was the subject of a conference in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, in late 1992 (see Key Reporter, Winter 1992-93).

The association recommends the decathlon to associations in other cities. For further information, write Barbara Marmorstein at 9281 Laramie Road, Philadelphia, PA 19115.