ΦΒΚ Visiting Scholar Program Selects Participants for 2004–2005

Fourteen distinguished men and women have been named Phi Beta Kappa Visiting Scholars for the 2004–2005 academic year. They will be hosted by 100 colleges and universities that shelter ΦΒΚ chapters. Each Scholar will spend two days on a campus, presenting classroom lectures and seminars, meeting informally with students, and delivering an address open to the public. The visits are cosponsored by the institutions’ ΦΒΚ chapters and interested academic departments.

The 2004–2005 Scholars [see page 6] are leaders in the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. Among the fields represented are genetics, archaeology, history, physics, religion, economics, biochemistry, political science, and Slavic studies. A list of participating institutions and the dates of the campus lectures will be posted on the ΦΒΚ website in early fall.

The Society established this highly regarded program in 1956. Its goals are to enrich the intellectual atmosphere at participating institutions, and to enable undergraduates to meet and talk with accomplished scholars in diverse disciplines. Priority is given to colleges and universities that are outside major metropolitan areas, or that do not have extensive resources for offering similar programs.

The Scholars are selected by ΦΒΚ’s Committee on the Visiting Scholar Program, whose members are senior scholars in a variety of disciplines. Most of the funding comes from the Society’s national office; a bequest from the Updike Foundation supports two visits. The host chapters provide a service fee to the national office and are responsible for all local expenses.

The Central Carolinas Phi Beta Kappa Association and the Phi Beta Kappa Association of Greater Tucson have been awarded charter status by the Society’s Senate. Central Carolinas officers, above, and other members celebrated with a tour of the new Airborne & Special Operations Museum at Fayetteville, N.C., home of Fort Bragg and the 82nd Airborne Division. From left are Alice Robbins, vice president; Voit Gilmore, president; Sharon Berkshire, secretary; and Alice Irby, scholarships.
According to data from the 238 chapters, 96 of them initiated 100 percent of those invited to join, and 59 initiated at least 90 percent. More than three quarters of the chapters that filed reports by December initiated at least 75 percent of the students they invited. A few chapters are finding that invited students are reluctant to join the Society. Most of these are at large state universities where many students are unfamiliar with ΦΒΚ; chapter secretaries lack administrative assistance; and even identifying qualified students can be daunting.

The Committee on Chapters will work on strategies to help these chapters in the coming months. Among them will be determining possible reasons for the success of chapters at large state universities such as the University of California-Irvine, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and Indiana University.

Society chapters continue to engage in a variety of interesting and beneficial activities. Every year many of them sponsor ΦΒΚ Visiting Scholars. Scores of scholarships are given to seniors for...
From the Secretary
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Dupont Circle is a hub of 10 spokes. It is the crossing of 19th and P Streets with Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire Avenues. Just off Dupont Circle, the rational Cartesian intersection of 18th and Q is sliced through at an irregular angle by New Hampshire Avenue. And there is the ΦΒΚ Society. You can find us at a rationally locatable point, 18th and Q, but the address is New Hampshire. I like to think that this fact reflects something interesting about the Society.

Our mission—to honor and advocate excellence in the liberal arts and sciences—is locatable on the grid of concerns about American higher education. It is a spot anyone could find and situate relative to other educational issues. Other organizations share this orientation, this location. And yet ΦΒΚ has a particular angle, like New Hampshire Avenue cutting across the grid, on the liberal arts and sciences. Discovered what that particular angle is has been the business of the Society’s national Conversations these past months.

So far we have learned that members of ΦΒΚ, seasoned by life after commencement, value most highly the capacities for understanding, expression, deliberation, and appreciation that they were able to cultivate. Members have not said to the Society, primarily, that coming to know many things across many different disciplines was the vital result. But they have not denied it, either, and the relationship between knowing things—just knowing them—and being able to communicate and deliberate well, is a subtle question we have yet to explore fully. Many of you have reminded us that ignorance of the facts is perilous: We are mindful that knowledge does matter.

In a similar way, the relationship among knowing things, being able to communicate well, and being able to
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Applications Invited for Jensen Fellowship

The Phi Beta Kappa Society invites applications from educators and researchers for the 2005 Walter J. Jensen Fellowship for French Language, Literature, and Culture. It supports six months of study in France.

Professor Jensen was elected to ΦΒΚ at UCLA in 1941. He spent his career teaching French, primarily at state institutions in New England. The fellowship was established by a bequest from him to the Society in 2001. The stipend is $10,000, which may be increased to cover airfare and additional support for dependents.

Candidates must be U.S. citizens under age 40, with a bachelor’s degree in French language and literature. ΦΒΚ members and teachers at the high school level or above may receive preference. The deadline for applications is Friday, Oct. 1. Further information and an application form are available on the ΦΒΚ website at www.pbk.org or from Sandra Beasley, Awards Coordinator, at sbeasley@pbk.org or the Phi Beta Kappa Society, 1606 New Hampshire Ave. NW, Washington DC 20009; phone (202) 265-3808; fax (202) 986-1601.
The ΦΒΚ Initiation Poem: Once a Society Tradition

Editor’s note: An original poem was once a feature of many Phi Beta Kappa initiation ceremonies. The Society would like to hear from chapters that still maintain this tradition; please e-mail bryan@pbk.org.

“The Peaceable Kingdom” was written for the 1964 initiation ceremony at Swarthmore College by the distinguished poet and scholar Daniel Hoffman. He was elected to ΦΒΚ at Columbia College, and in 1973–74, served as Poet Laureate of the United States. The poem is reprinted by permission of Louisiana State University Press from Hoffman’s “Beyond Silence: Selected Shorter Poems, 1948–2003.” Copyright © 2003 by Daniel Hoffman.

The Peaceable Kingdom

I

Now that we sponsor the extirpation of folklore,
The growing scarcity of trees,
Bulldozers gouging roadbeds through the valleys,
Traffic clogged where streams once flowed,
More people nourished by more Inplant Feeding,
The disuse of Deer Crossing signs,
Proliferation of home-heliports,
Attrition of the harvest-home
And slagheaps overshadowing the city,
The mountain’s heart quarried away,
Ingurgitation of knowledge by computers
Whose feedback gives for wisdom facts
Elicited by robots or commuters
Grown unhandy with real things
From much manipulation of abstractions,
The seasons seldom touching them,
Not even benign falls of snow disguising
A land it will be harder to love;

Where Opulence, demotic arriviste,
Counts his costly toys like beads
While Penury gnaws knuckled fists, her brawling
Brood of brats picking through trash,
The sullen disinherit and darker
Faces massing in the square
As though impatient with their ill provision
Despite the auspex of Dow Jones
That proves the National Gross Product growing,
The deserts paved with fresh concrete,
Rumbling shadows of the freightcars tilting
From mine to mill to guarded zone
And skies athrob with gaud and roar of firework,
Gigantic needles jabbing high
Swiftly trailing flame like thread, then piercing
The beady button of the moon,
Ashes on Wyoming’s fodder falling,
Milk curdled, stunted seed;

II

are we ready to go forth? Where you have come from
the students will be ever young; there it is only
the faculties and trees grow older. Leaving this friendly
hillside, you will reach your destinations—be sure
in your luggage, among trophies, clothes, and lists
of those Important Books as yet unread, to bring
the Catalogue of the Ships and tales of revolution
—the Russian, the Industrial—and explications
of both the valence table and the vertebrates
who, since the Good Duke dreamed a green world where
the court
corrupts no man, agree upon hypotheses
that define the Good and tell the False from True.

III

Imperfect learning, bless this place
With possibilities of grace.
Let Mind, that ranges Heaven as far
As Barnard’s pendant, lightless star,
Regard, though darkness shroud the soul,
Its constant living aureole
That casts one comprehending light
Across our chaos and the night;

Transform the deserts abstract thought
And unslaked selfishness have wrought
Into orchards where the trees
Stand rich with fruit, epitomes
Of sensuous joys that leap from birth,
Nourished in the dark of earth,
Toward sapling vigor crowned with flowers,
In acts as self-fulfilled as ours

Who build a city out of stone.
And in whose image is this done?
Defend our visionary quest,
Humane intelligence, that we
Who’ve eaten fruit from nature’s tree
And know perfection but in art,
May, schooled and chastened by our past,
Conceive our city in the heart.
Q. What made you decide to write a book about values and education? Is its focus primarily on public elementary and secondary schools?
A. I started thinking about the dynamic relationship among values, education, politics, and culture as I prepared to teach a philosophy course at Queens College in 1990. Ever since then, I’ve been thinking about the theme of values and education, slowly formulating a “critical perspective” that might be useful to those who read it.

“Teaching Values” is the result of my effort to critically consider issues ranging from attitudes about language (nonstandard vs. substandard English) to racism in and out of the classroom. But the book is informed as much by everyday experiences (my own and those of teachers I work with) as by contemporary cultural theory and philosophy. It’s written for anyone interested in education, cultural theory, and our nation’s ongoing debate over values. The focus is on these themes, but I also address issues of special importance to public school teachers and administrators, professors of education, and policy makers.

Q. Did you deliberately choose a provocative title? One can imagine social conservatives asking, “How can you assume that public schools should be teaching values? And whose values are you talking about?”
A. “Teaching Values,” and its subtitle, “Critical Perspectives on Education, Politics, and Culture,” were intended to be more evocative than provocative. I’m not saying this to be glib. The book’s stance is predicated on a desire to offer considerations and re-considerations of, as I wrote, “the values that teachers employ in the name of teaching, and the teaching that educators advocate in the name of values.”

And the question “Whose values are you talking about?” is precisely the one that rocks the boat. Values have been taught in U.S. public schools from the very start. How American history was taught, what foreign languages were offered, who studied biology and physics—all of this represents a value system that devalues certain people and facts while elevating the status of other people and facts. The “givens” of conservatives are being scrutinized and challenged. This is why the book may prove provocative.

Q. What reactions has the book evoked?
A. It appears to be reaching a general audience as well as school teachers, administrators, and those who work with them. It’s in many libraries and course syllabi for educators, and it’s attracting attention from philosophers, cultural theorists, and readers interested in the culture war debate. I’m especially pleased that public and private school teachers at all grade levels have found the book engaging and, as one said, “speaking to the issues in a way that others have not.”

And I’m a little surprised by the response from some otherwise-conservative policy folks who think I touched on previously unexamined issues in a balanced way. They disagree with many of my positions, but they say I’ve presented a clear and “reasonable” discussion.

Q. Do you find a consensus in the public sphere that the nation’s teachers have some responsibility for their students’ moral character? Has such a consensus existed in the past?
A. The short answer is yes to both questions. Not only is there a consensus: Teachers themselves acknowledge their responsibility. The problematic aspect is getting a consensus about which values are essential for academic and democratic success. Both the right and the left promote the values they believe are worthy of their energy.

Even teachers who see themselves outside the larger debate take sides, wittingly or not. For example, some teachers who critically discussed with their students the merits of going to war with Iraq were labeled unpatriotic, and in more than one case they were forced from their classrooms. But it was OK to show CNN and other TV news coverage extolling the success of the invasion.

Some teachers who integrate environmental concerns into life science
2004–2005 Visiting Scholars

George F. Bass, Distinguished Professor Emeritus, Texas A&M University; Phi Beta Kappa/Frank M. Updike Franklin Scholar

Founder and past president, Institute of Nautical Archaeology; director of underwater excavations of Bronze Age, Archaic and Classical Greece, and Byzantine shipwrecks off the coast of Turkey; recipient of the 2002 National Medal of Science and the Archaeological Institute of America Gold Medal for Distinguished Archaeological Achievement.

Thomas Childers, Sheldon and Lucy Hackney Professor of History, University of Pennsylvania

Recipient of four awards for distinguished teaching; recipient of senior fellowships from the Fulbright Foundation and the American Council of Learned Societies; author of “The Nazi Voter,” “Reevaluating the Third Reich,” “Wings of Morning: The Story of the Last American Bomber Shot Down over Germany in World War II,” “In the Shadows of War,” and “The Best Years of Their Lives” (forthcoming).

Steven Chu, Theodore and Frances Geballe Professor of Physics and Applied Physics, Stanford University

Co-recipient of the 1997 Nobel Prize in physics for work on the laser trapping and cooling of atoms; member of the National Academy of Sciences and the American Philosophical Society; fellow of the American Physical Society (Broida Prize for Spectroscopy and Schawlow Prize for Laser Science); recipient of the Meggers Award for Laser Spectroscopy, Optical Society of America.

Andrew Delbanco, Julian Clarence Levi Professor in the Humanities, Columbia University

Author of “The Death of Satan,” “Required Reading,” “The Real American Dream,” and “Puritan Ordeal” (Lionel Trilling Award, Columbia); editor of “Writing New England,” “The Portable Abraham Lincoln,” “The Sermons of Ralph Waldo Emerson” (Volume 2), “The Puritans in America”; former vice president, PEN American Center; fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Wendy Doniger, Mircea Eliade Distinguished Service Professor of the History of Religions, The Divinity School, University of Chicago

Past president, American Academy of Religion and the Association for Asian Studies; recipient of the Medal of the College de France; translator of Sanskrit texts; author of “Siva: The Erotic Ascetic,” “Other Peoples’ Myths,” “Splitting the Difference: Gender and Myth in Ancient Greece and India,” “The Implied Spider: Politics and Theology in Myth,” “The Bedtrick: Tales of Sex and Masquerade.”

Stanley L. Engerman, John H. Munro Professor of Economics and Professor of History, University of Rochester

Past president, Economic History Association and the Social Science History Association; fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; co-author of “Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery” (Bancroft Prize in American history); editor or co-editor of “The Reinterpretation of American Economic History,” “The Cambridge Economic History of the United States.”


Recipient of the Pulitzer Prize in journalism, the Henry J. Friendly Award, American Law Institute, and the Carey McWilliams Award, American Political Science Association; fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; member of the American Philosophical Society; author of “The Last Days of the Rehnquist Court,” “Thinking About the Supreme Court After Bush v. Gore.”

Werner Gundersheimer, Director Emeritus, Folger Shakespeare Library


Gary C. Jacobson, Professor of Political Science, University of California, San Diego


Andrea J. Liu, Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California, Los Angeles

Co-editor of “Jamming and Rheology”; member of the editorial board, Journal of Statistical Physics, Physical Review E, Soft Materials; member of the executive committee, Division of Condensed Matter Physics, American Physical Society; member of the advisory board, Kavli Institute of Theoretical Physics.

Richard Leppert, Samuel Rusell Distinguished Chair in the Humanities and Morse Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor, University of Minnesota

Author of “Art and the Committed Eye,” “The Sight of Sound,” “Music and Image,” “Music and Society” (co-editor); “Theodor W. Adorno: Essays on Music,” “Musical Extremes: The Dialectics of Virtuosity” (forthcoming); former member of the national council, American Musico-logical Society; recipient of senior fellowships from the Guggenheim Foundation, the
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Among the Visiting Scholars last year was Paul McHugh, University Distinguished Service Professor of Psychiatry at Johns Hopkins University. At St. Mary’s College of Maryland, he talked with students over lunch. He also spoke to classes on psychology, bioethics, and philosophy; met with ΦΒΚ chapter members; and presented a lecture for the campus community.
classes are viewed as Green Party “plants.” Some who try to discuss sexuality maturely and respectfully meet opposition, especially if it includes gay or lesbian relationships. Every day in every way, values are presented and promoted. One of the questions in “Teaching Values” is: Are teachers aware of how value-laden their lessons are? How value-laden their language is, filled with vocabulary and concepts that are on one side or the other of the cultural divide? This has always been part of American public school education.

Q. Where do parents’ responsibilities and authority fit into this discussion?
A. That’s simultaneously an easy and a difficult question. It’s easy because one could say that a parent’s responsibility is to raise a good citizen, by instruction and by modeling appropriate behavior. Many parents accept this responsibility, and they demand that their authority be respected not only by their child but also by everyone who deals with the child.

But this is where problems arise. What if the parents are gay? What family values are being promoted here? The Bush administration has spoken about this issue. Schools are clearly designated as heterosexual zones. People like William Bennett, Dinesh D’Souza, Pat Robertson, and Jerry Falwell have weighed in, putting pressure on teachers, school administrators, and parents to teach one set of values. In turn, everyone puts pressure on children.

Q. Can we attribute this debate to a lack of awareness that school children today represent an enormous variety of cultures and backgrounds? Or do some people maintain that all American students should be taught uniform ethical and moral standards?
A. This is another one of those very simple and complex issues. First, many social conservatives do lack awareness of the impact of the cultural diversity in our country today. But the existence of social conservatives (and there are many) who are Hispanic, African American, Asian, gay or lesbian, or other “minority” suggests that the issue isn’t about cultural differences per se but about (American) values that transcend ethnic heritage and sexual orientation. So the answer is difficult to flesh out here.

I’d like to say this much: Many who speak for the religious and political right don’t understand the dynamics of cultural diversity. But others simply exploit people’s fears and patriotism. Beyond that, many people do want one value system, a uniform moral standard, to be taught—thus the increased funding for “character education.” I too would like one “ethical standard.” The question is: How to get there? Who determines it? Is it solely an American standard, or is there a universal ethical principle that ought to be acknowledged and followed everywhere?

Q. Is it possible to generalize about how values are handled, if at all, in the curriculums of colleges and universities that offer majors and/or advanced degrees in education?
A. Values are handled in teacher education programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels much as in any other field: sometimes badly and sometimes well. It depends on the departments, chairs, deans, and senior administrators at a given institution, and the students they enroll. I’ve witnessed individuals doing incredible work, leading the way, courageously (given the obstacles) encouraging teachers (students of education) to think critically and ethically. This means reconsidering many positions previously held as true.

I’ve also been privileged to work with departments committed to such goals. But I’ve seen the opposite more often than not. It depends on who’s where and when. This is why real leadership is essential, not just the quick-fix schemes being touted today. We must look beyond the “corporate” values that many are trying to impose on school districts—things like efficiency,
Teresa Hommel is a woman with a mission. Now she hopes that speaking out about it will motivate other members around the country to share her concern and act on it.

Hommel’s focus is the Help America Vote Act (HAVA), passed by Congress in 2002. This was in response to Florida’s 2000 election debacle, which put “hanging chad” and “butterfly ballot” into the punch lines of comedians—and into the nightmares of many Americans.

The law authorizes money for states to replace lever-type and punch-card voting machines with new equipment, such as optical scanners and Direct Recording Electronic (DRE) voting machines. Optical scanners require paper ballots that can be counted by hand for auditing purposes. DRE systems have touchscreens similar to ATMs. But most DREs cannot print a permanent, unalterable physical ballot for a voter to verify before leaving the booth. This is called a VVPAT—a voter-verifiable paper audit trail.

Hommel, a law school graduate and computer expert based in New York City, finds problems with “many parts of HAVA, especially the rush it’s encouraged to buy and use DRE voting systems that don’t produce a VVPAT. With these systems, our secret ballot will be followed by something completely contrary to democracy: a secret vote count with no way to perform an independent audit to verify the final tallies. This means no recounts, and no way to count votes that are lost if the computers malfunction.” Most malfunctions, she said, are internal within a computer and undetectable without an independent audit.

“Of course we notice if our PC crashes or loses a document,” Hommel said, “and the equivalent has happened to DRE voting systems many times. But it’s a mistake to focus on observable malfunctions and concerns about the voters’ comfort level. Yes, the machines should be convenient, and they shouldn’t befuddle voters or break

down in obvious ways. But more important, computer professionals know that all systems must be audited continuously to ensure reliable, accurate results. It’s standard practice. That’s why our banks send us statements and our bills are itemized.” Voting computers also need to be audited, she said, to detect and correct both innocent and malicious errors. Auditing would require comparing computer tallies to manual tallies of the VVPAT. But DRE voting systems without VVPAT don’t allow an independent audit.

As for election fraud, Hommel noted that in the past, this usually involved counting false absentee ballots, “losing” some ballot boxes, barring certain people from the polls, or dropping certain names from voter registration lists. “The election fraud of the future won’t need these cumbersome methods,” she said. “Unless DREs are modified to produce VVPAT, fraud and hacking and innocent errors will be equally undetectable.”

Rep. Rush Holt, D-N.J., has been a leader in efforts to refine HAVA. Last year he introduced the Voter Confidence and Increased Accessibility Act, which would require VVPAT in federal elections. Sen. Bob Graham, D-Fla., has introduced a companion bill in the Senate.

When Hommel first read about HAVA a year ago, she was struck by the requirement that local voter lists must be consolidated into statewide ones. The deadlines were so short that accuracy might be impossible. In 2000, many Florida voters with the same names as felons had been dropped from the statewide list, with no notice and no chance to challenge this. She said she “stewed about HAVA until last June, when a friend sent me a notice about a forum on it at the New York Bar Association.”

She found the forum both informative and shocking. Panelists discussed the electronic voting equipment that HAVA would fund. “Many in the audience weren’t sure that auditing was

necessary,” she said. “I was aghast. All computer systems are error prone. In my experience with dozens of Fortune 500 companies and government bodies, I’ve seen systems produce errors and need fixes after years of daily use.

“I sat there in amazement as a panelist argued that DREs offer the accessibility that disabled voters need to cast their ballots in private, but that the disabled, especially the blind, couldn’t read a paper ballot in order to verify it.” About 20 percent of voters, she said, have a disability that limits or prevents them from casting a private and independent vote with older equipment. “But I knew that blind people can ‘read’ computer screens and paper printouts using assistive devices,” she said. “When I taught at Baruch College 24 years ago, they had a computer center for visually impaired people. I taught blind students to program computers. In 1991 I taught blind, deaf, and wheelchair-using programmers and engineers at IBM. All their jobs entailed reading computer screens and printouts. Surely the assistive technology existed in 2003 to enable anyone to mark and verify a paper ballot!”

So Hommel raised her hand and declared that both security and accessibility were possible, and citizens should demand both. “A fellow handed me a flyer,” she said, “announcing an upcoming public hearing. I went home and prepared a voting machine simulation program to make the problem clear; it’s available at www.WhereisThePaper.org. I demonstrated the simulation last July before the New York State Task Force on HAVA Implementation.”

Later that month she attended a workshop in Denver on voter-verified election systems, sponsored by the USACM (U.S. Public Policy Committee of the Association for Computing Machinery, the world’s oldest computer organization). There she learned that smaller manufacturers were developing systems that were both accessible to users with disabilities and auditable with VVPAT. Major manufacturers said they would not build systems with VVPAT because the law did not require it, and the sys-
tems would cost more so states would not buy them.

“The problem appeared to be political, not technical,” Hommel said. “Election directors at the workshop who were in favor of unauditable systems argued: ‘You don’t know anything about running elections.’ ‘I trust the system.’ ‘We will comply with legal requirements.’ The most amazing argument in favor of unauditable systems was that computer scientists were Luddites—people who resist new technology!”

She said she asked one election director why she trusts the system. “She told me, ‘That nice man from [vendor]—he’d never do anything wrong.’ It appeared that the people who knew the least about computers professed confidence while dismissing computer professionals who said that auditing, not confidence, was appropriate.”

Hommel did meet allies at the workshop. David Dill of Stanford University, who directs the website www.VerifiedVoting.org, named her voting machine simulation on her laptop in her campaign to help ensure that balloting in the next election leaves a voter-verified paper audit trail. For the next several months, Hommel studied security problems in electronic voting systems; wrote articles for the newsletters of the New York Women’s Bar Association and the Sierra Club NYC Group; took “Fraud-o” to conferences; conducted letter-writing campaigns at her church; and asked area members of Congress to cosponsor Rush Holt’s legislation. Last December she demonstrated Fraud-o at the Florida State Democratic Convention, and at a symposium in Maryland on “Building Trust and Confidence in Voting Systems,” sponsored by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

In February she testified before the Connecticut General Assembly’s elections committee, arguing for VVPAT and accessibility: “Banks give paper receipts. So do cash registers, ATMs, even gas pumps. Computer kiosks at airports and train stations print boarding passes and tickets. Printing on paper is not a big deal. But without that piece of paper from a computerized voting system, you have a system that is not safe … Democracy can’t survive if we let a bunch of people count our votes in secret behind closed doors. A computer is the same as that bunch of people. American citizens should not be forced to accept the results of unverifiable computers.”

In her testimony she stressed that new computer systems require both time and continuous attention: “No company expects to take hundreds of specialized computers out of their boxes, turn them on, and have them work correctly. It takes months—or years. The old system and the new one run parallel for at least one complete accounting cycle so their results can be compared. In contrast, we run elections using new computers that can’t be audited, and the people responsible for them don’t have the training or experience to recognize security problems.”

She pointed out that although HAVA does not mandate turning elections over to private vendors, that is the result: The law does not require—or fund—training for local boards of election to manage the computers. Only the vendors know how they work.

Hommel’s early career did not point her toward activism. Born in St. Louis, Mo., she went to New York to study classics at New York University but dropped out. “In those days you had to be 21 to establish independent residence,” she said, “so I worked as a file clerk and receptionist. On the day I turned 20 and a half, the first day I could legally register to vote, I registered and then enrolled at Hunter College. That was 1965.”

She also kept working as an office “temp.” One day in 1967 she learned that there were no temp openings coming up. “The lady asked if I wanted a regular job as a programmer. ‘What’s that?’ I asked. ‘No one knows,’ she said. ‘It’s new. The only requirement is that you need experience as a file clerk because you’ll be dealing with company records.’” Hommel took a test, “which introduced a tiny programming language and asked you to process some data in a particular way.” Although the time allowed was two-and-a-half hours, she was told that “everyone finishes in 20 minutes.” So did she, but then she checked her answers “and got really into it, and after two hours I found a way to answer the question in a shorter way. I took the full two-and-a-half hours, and...

In the land of a thousand cheeses Camemberts rule the roost. Nearly two million are eaten each day in France: about two a week in 60 percent of French households. And that’s not counting consumption the world over. Pierre Boisard has written the history of these fragrant rounds from their alleged birth in 1791 to the world renown that they enjoy today. And the first thing he does is recount the myth of their origin, in a secret recipe passed by a recusant priest from the Brie region to the Norman milkmaid who sheltered him from revolutionary persecution. Then he explodes it by demonstrating that cheeses of its sort were being made in the Auge Valley at least since the 17th century.

No matter. Marie Harel, the woman who learned to make Brie in a mold used to produce the local Livarot, remains a heroine: the Jeanne d’Arc of cheesedom. Her statue, inspired by American intervention in the 1920s and obliterated by an American air raid in 1944, has been replaced by another. It was paid for by contributions from workers of the Camembert-producing Borden Company of Ohio and local farmers of the Auge, home of the hamlet of Camembert.

Boisard’s eventful story is a running commentary on French economy, politics, and mentalities. Above all, though, it tells us all we want to know and more about this king of cheeses: from the penicillin in its crust to the round wooden boxes devised in the 1890s to protect the tasty tibit, to the shift from family-farm to factory production, automation, pasteurization, and the commercial plays, the marketing, and trade policies that promote and threaten it. Even fans may skip some of the detail. But all will savor the rich tale Boisard tells.


Not everyone can write an autobiography that engages the reader from beginning to end. Driven, uncompromising, solipsistic, and truculent, Pipes’s non-belonger comes through as a force of nature. Many have disagreed with his harsh interpretations of Communist tyranny, destructiveness, and self-destructiveness. But serious critics must contend with serious scholarship as well as nonconformist interpretations. Time has proved Pipes largely right, but it has also allowed detractors to forget their mistakes and his lonely indomitable.

At 80, he hasn’t stopped arguing, but this book reads almost like an adventure story: Polish youth, close escapes from occupying Germans, appreciation and exploitation of American opportunities, resolute conformism even at Harvard—where he notes little collegiate spirit in the slough of Sovietology (“scholarship is lonely work”), years in the Reagan White House (“nine tenths of government work are a waste of time” punctuated by exhilarating moments), and so on.

You don’t have to agree with this combative workaholic to savor his bons mots and what he has to say about his professional experiences, Soviet Russia, Germany, and our other “allies,” U.S. intelligence and forethought, or appeasement—as disoriented and self-indulgent today as in the past. Writing an autobiography, Pipes tells us, is like doing an archeological dig where the digger is also the site. Those who delve into “Vixi” will find a treasure trove.


The great swath of land from the Baltic to the Balkans has generated promises and problems for a very long time. Ivan Berend’s latest book addresses both, as they stimulated and lacerated local populations and their neighbors during the eventful and stormy years that ran from the late 18th to the early 20th century. Crisply, accessibly, and compendiously, he discusses the political and social reverberations of attempts to rise to the challenges of the West; Romanticism and nationalism; the struggles for independence; the striving for modernization, industrialization, and democratization; their partial successes, and their frustrating failures.

Figures and facts abound, as do pithy presentations and trenchant reflections. This is an economical and elegant narrative by a distinguished comparative historian of places and times that deserve to be better known.


All cultures are equal, but my culture is more equal than others. Contributors to this counter-trendy firebrand warn that Western culture may be going down the tubes. The prophets of doom are not necessarily right, but they’re contentious, intriguing, and suggestive. If you trail your coat as they do, something is bound to fall out of a pocket. In Kramer and Kimball’s compilation, this is mostly nuggets.

David Pryce-Jones denounces the command bureaucracy of the European Union in Brussels, its legions of civil servants, and its omnivorous commissions: “the only legislative body in the democratic world that meets and deliberates in secret.” Anthony Daniels twacks the felicitic calculus of modern medicine, its ethical imperative to avoid litigation, and the Hypocritic Oath as pretext for hypocritic action. Eric Ormsby excoriates the library administrators who wage war on books and wreak havoc for scholars and librarians. No one who cares for the printed word should miss this acerbic piece. Or the rest.

Humanities: Svetlana Alpers, Rebecca Resinski, Eugen Weber
Social Sciences: Rick Eden, Josephine Pacheco
Anna J. Schwartz, Larry J. Zimmerman
Natural Sciences: Germaine Cornèlissen, Jay M. Pasachoff

From Our Book Critics

By Eugen Weber


By Rebecca Resinski

Each of these volumes thoughtfully contributes to ongoing conversations with Homer that have persisted since antiquity. These books do not aim primarily to interpret Homer’s “Iliad” or “Odyssey”; rather, they use careful readings of Homeric epic to try to make sense of war and its consequences even in the present day.

Simone Weil published her essay on Homer’s “Iliad” during World War II. She maintains that the “Iliad” presents an unflinching representation of “force,” its workings, and its effects among humans. For Weil, Homer shows us how power turns its human victims into objects, and also deludes those who exercise power into thinking that they are immune from its destructive sweep. Weil suggests that humans may be irresistibly drawn by the allure of force. But she also points to moments of grace in the “Iliad,” passages in which love—between friends, spouses, and enemies—temporarily delivers characters from the dehumanization wrought by power.

Holoka’s edition provides the French text of Weil’s essay and an English translation, as well as an introductory piece, running commentary, and an appendix of Greek passages from the “Iliad” quoted by Weil. In his commentary, Holoka perceptively charts the development of Weil’s argument and also offers insights on the Homeric passages used by Weil. For instance, he signals when her assertions do not fully take
Homer into account (the importance of “undying glory” for the Homeric hero being a case in point).

Holoka also notes similarities between Weil or Homer and other authors of literature treating war, from Erich Maria Remarque to Tim O’Brien. With Holoka’s commentary at hand, we find that we are not merely reading Weil: We are seeing how Weil’s interpretation of the “IIiad” may be situated in the context of scholarly work on Homer and the context of meditations on war in general.

Tatum offers readers a book-length meditation on various aspects of war, with the “IIiad” as a focusing point and guide. For example, he treats mourning, monuments, the discourse of leaders, relationships forged in war, and the spectacle of war itself. His method is the orchestration of echoes among various literary, artistic, and autobiographical sources. Tatum will move a reader from the Trojan War to the conflict in Vietnam, from writings on war by eminent literary figures—such as Woolf, Stein, and Paz—to the intimate memoirs of soldiers and their families, and from words on a page to monuments and battlefields.

One does not read for “the argument” here; one reads for the resonances that Tatum creates, and for his own suggestions about what those resonances may reveal. For instance, he considers the use of figurative language in writing about war, and the way in which the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is a physical instantiation of Homeric ring composition. In the selection, juxtaposition, and analysis of his sources, Tatum shows both his own sensitive knowledge of Homeric poetry and his synthetic skill—his ability to build bridges from antiquity to the present day, from Achilles’s shield to the atomic bomb.

Shay concentrates on the other Homeric epic, the “Odyssey.” A psychiatrist for the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, he sees the travels of Odysseus from Troy to Ithaca as metaphors for the psychological, social, and practical perils faced by soldiers when they make the transition from the battlefield to civilian life. For example, the Lotus-Eaters may represent the desire to avoid painful memories, while Odysseus’s famous encounter with Polyphemus reveals a veteran’s urge to seek out danger even after war is over.

Sometimes Shay’s analysis of a Homeric episode amounts to an interpretation of the Homeric text (e.g., his chapter on Odysseus among the Phaeacians), while at other times the Homeric original provides only a springboard for the exploration of a topic (e.g., his discussion of how some veterans face the seeming Scylla of peacetime institutions). Throughout his treatment of the “Odyssey,” Shay complements his allegorical reading of Homer with accounts of the triumphs and travails of American veterans he has known. He maintains that ultimately Odysseus offers us an example of “how not to return home from war.” Shay’s reading of the “Odyssey” alongside veterans’ experiences emphasizes the dangers of psychological injury: A soldier’s ability to trust others and thereby participate in civilian communities may be damaged by experiences in war.

In the first part of Shay’s book the “Odyssey” is front and center; in the second and third parts, Homer recedes while Shay discusses the complex psychological injury sustained by some veterans, and he makes recommendations about how to repair and even prevent these injuries. The key to both treatment and prevention, he argues, lies in community. Soldiers can be trained, deployed, and discharged in ways that build social trust and cohesion rather than in ways that treat each soldier as an isolated individual. Shay maintains that such changes will not only benefit each soldier but also strengthen the fighting effectiveness of the armed forces. He does not frame these recommendations diffidently or hypothetically: He provides concrete suggestions for change, and throughout the book he writes with a spirit he describes as “missionary.”

Shay does not presume that his readers are familiar with Homer. He provides a quick overview of the “Odyssey” in an appendix, and he works summaries of key episodes directly into his discussion. Tatum, Weil, and Holoka assume to a greater degree that readers will have a comfortable knowledge of the “IIiad.” The more familiar readers are with Homeric poetry, the more actively they will be able to engage all of these texts and extend the many-voiced conversations with the ancient epic they contain.

Readers may feel at some points that their own Homer is not exactly the Homer they find in Weil, or in Holoka, Tatum, or Shay. But arrival at interpretive unanimity is not the point of reading these books: They invite a reader to listen to and participate in an exchange of ideas that has lasted for centuries, and they remind us that Homer remains a powerful touchstone for many who take it as their task to consider how and why we humans live, fight, and grieve.

By Svetlana Alpers


Marvelous small paintings from 15th- and 16th-century Burgundian books provide the many magnificent illustrations in this huge volume (575 pages). It is the authoritative catalog of an unprecedented loan exhibit of illuminated manuscripts that began its run at the J. Paul Getty Museum in Los Angeles before traveling to the Royal Academy in London.

An art-historical view once had it that the expansive verisimilitude of oil painting on panel killed off miniature painting in tempera on parchment as an art form. It is now known that the relationship between painters and illuminators was reciprocal. Some artists, including Pieter Bruegel, made both. And, far from dying out, pictures in small accompanying texts executed by hand flourished well into the middle of the 16th century. It was less the nature of the developing art of painting than the breakup of the Burgundian court, the Reformation, and above all the invention of the printing press that led to their demise.

Scholarly interest aside (and this volume provides much of that), how might we account for the taste for this privileged court production today? It is no longer the romantic cult for things Gothic. Perhaps a new interest in word and image, bookmaking as a craft, plays a part. Further, the catalog puts in play the tension between the seductive charm of the miniature and the sheer density of thought implied by oil painting: Compare Simon Bening’s calendar sheets to Bruegel’s luminous “Landscape with a Magpie on a Gallows.”

Rest the heavy book on a table (unfortunately the lighter, less-costly paperback edition has sold out), turn the pages slowly, and feast your eyes.


Images turn up in books these days in unexpected ways. The photographs that haunt the pages of W. G. Sebald’s novels come to mind. Rachel Cohen’s superb evocation of the meetings and passings of 30 or so American writers and artists opens with an 1854 Matthew Brady daguerreotype of Henry James, Sr., with his young son, Henry James, Jr. And toward the end, one comes upon a Richard Avedon photograph from 1964—his hand working to combine his face, spliced in two, with that of James Baldwin.

The making of photographs is presented as one kind of evidence of the relationship between particular private lives.

Years later, in Cohen’s account, Henry James, Jr., by then a British citizen, reprinted in his memoirs a photo with him wearing his odd American nine-button jacket, about which none other than Thackeray had teased him. And Avedon, so Cohen imagines, caught himself in a desperate attempt to merge identities—his and Baldwin’s, white and black.

It is hard to describe a book that owes so little to any established genre of writing. This is

CONTINUED ON PAGE 12
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Already in the 18th century, a book such as Francesco Algarotti’s European bestseller, “Newtonianism for the Ladies” (1737), tried to present scientific discoveries in a manner comprehensible to the general public. There have also been scientists, such as Antonio Damasio, in his recent “The Feeling of What Happens” (1991), who are popularizers of their own research. This book is something else: a collection of professional papers by specialists from different disciplines, addressing each other on a technical subject. We listen in on a challenging conversation about the nature of pictorial representation and pictorial space conducted by philosophers, perceptual psychologists, and art historians.

The depiction of a three-dimensional world on a two-dimensional surface has been a central concern of European painting. Many words (and diagrams) have been devoted to the analysis of what is called pictorial perspective, and to the question of whether or how it is “true” (or more accurate) than other modes of spatial depiction. Related to this, until the middle of the 20th century, the “eye as camera” metaphor dominated the study of human perception with the corollaries that (1) the visual image is understood to be a picture, and (2) perception is the result of interpreting static pictorial cues.

“Looking into Pictures” considers the present situation when that homology between pictures and human vision is no longer in place. But it is curious that, in the scientific study of perception, many experimenters still depend on the viewing of perspective pictures (or their computer-screen equivalents) as stand-ins for the real world.

Of special interest are papers by the philosopher Richard Wollheim on his phenomenal notion of “seeing-in” to pictures; the art historian John Willats on representational systems; and the psychologists Jan T. Koenderink and Andrea J. van Doorn on the difference between Euclidean and pictorial space. Here are two psychologists crossing over to tell art historians something new about the complexity of perceiving pictures.

Not an easy read for the general reader, perhaps, but well worth the effort.


This is a study of how the international financial system since the 1950s has dealt with problems that arise when sovereign governments are unable to service their debts or repay principal. To prevent default, creditors and borrowers agree to restructure the terms of existing loan contracts by deferring debt service payments and extending maturities to the amount deferred, or reducing the overall burden of the debt. Another term for this process is a workout of the debt problem.

To appreciate the author’s views, it is useful to review their context: What kinds of debt do sovereigns assume; who are the lenders; and to which sovereigns do lenders extend loans? Sovereigns borrow from official lenders: the International Monetary Fund (IMF), whose policies are the responsibility of finance ministers of the group of advanced countries (G-7); its sister institution, the World Bank, which is concerned with the debt problems of the poorest countries; regional development banks (Inter-American, Asian, African); the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and public-sector lenders that also include bilateral agencies, such as export credit agencies and programs to finance military equipment sales.

Private-sector lenders to sovereigns are mainly commercial banks and bond investors.

By Anna J. Schwartz

Chapters Report
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graduate study, and teaching awards are presented to faculty. Research fairs are sponsored so that honors students can present their findings. A number of chapters have established ties with local ΦΒΚ associations.

Many chapters report that they regularly receive substantial support from the administrations of their institutions. These funds enable them to involve additional faculty in a chapter’s activities; help ensure that students recognize the significance of being invited to join the ΦΒΚ Society; and demonstrate the value that the school places on the liberal arts and sciences.

What were its architectural models? How was it to be paid for? And what were the educational motives informing it? Brush tells us.

The founding of the Fogg (just before the Great Depression) was matched in 1927 Germany (a troubled Germany, one should add) by the founding of the Kunstinstitut at the University of Marburg. Brush devotes a chapter to the surprising similarities in the design of these two distinctive institutions. They were soon followed by the Courtauld Institute in London, founded partly in emulation of the Fogg. Finally, rounding the story out, Aby Warburg, who had established his Kunstubibliotheck in Hamburg earlier in the century, came to have an interest in promoting a relationship with the Fogg. His dream of links with the greater world was realized only after his death, when his library and its staff were forced by the Nazis to seek refuge in London. There, as the Warburg Institute, it continues to flourish.

Despite its specialized subject, the book has the broad effect (not fully appreciated by the author) of suggesting that the establishment of such university institutes devoted to art history was very much a period phenomenon. One is left wondering why, and what, at this very different historical moment, their future will be.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 15
accountability, and productivity. Of course you need these things. But what are those words really saying? And can such a model guarantee critical-minded citizens at the end of their educations? Or will they merely be trained to work in the corporate world?

Q. President Bush’s “State of the Union” address in January cited families, schools, and religious institutions as the “unseen pillars of civilization.” He championed such traditional values as faith in God and teenage chastity, supported drug testing, and opposed gay marriage. In a presidential election year, can a discussion about teaching values remain free of political elements? For that matter, can it ever remain apart from politics?

A. No it cannot, nor should it. But it’s important to understand why and how it’s connected to politics. My book tries to offer such a discussion. I want people, especially teachers, to see the relationships among values, education, politics, and culture.

We all have values and positions that we believe are just and important, and we all try to persuade others of their merits. The difference lies not only in the values and beliefs themselves but also in the process by which we engage others, and our stance regarding those values—revisiting our positions and testing them throughout our lives.

This is important because it’s a value in and of itself: the value of rigorous and genuine dialogue, with oneself and others. Some people want things nailed down, once and for all. Their view is: “This is what we believe, and we never have to think about it again. Anyone who challenges us is opposing the right way to live.”

But the values we hold dear must never be so fixed that they remain uncontested. The values of justice, mutual respect, compassion, love, and generosity must be strong and ever present in our democracy. And the way to guarantee their permanence in our lives is by constantly re-evaluating all that we believe: How it helps or harms others, how it preserves and enhances or undermines democracy. Teaching values, then, is central to our nation’s well-being, and can’t be reduced to—or confused with—the mere proclamation of rules or codes. Teaching values must be the work of everyone who is dedicated to the promise of our nation, the promise of democracy itself. And it is the special work of teachers who educate our nation’s youth.

Scapp Q&A
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From the Secretary

choose well in the decisions of life that matter, has yet to be explored. You have told us, in these Conversations, that education in the liberal arts and sciences ought to help make us better versions of ourselves. But we are haunted by such disappointing cases as Alexander the Great, who had three years of instruction at the hands of Aristotle and then went off to wreak havoc. We need to make sense of facts like that, and say carefully what we think the liberal arts and sciences can do, how they can do it, and why it is that even the best education can misfire.

It is looking as if, once we evaluate what we heard from the ΦΒΚ associations’ Conversations last year, and what we hope to hear from chapters and associations this year, that ΦΒΚ’s take on the liberal arts and sciences will begin with an emphasis on the abilities cultivated by those studies. It will move to a consideration of the knowledge that is necessary as the medium within which those abilities can be cultivated. It will move then toward the issues of value and meaning that should emerge from a suitably critical and yet appreciative survey of what we know.

So by analogy with our New Hampshire Avenue perspective on 18th and Q, we are trying to be more articulate about ΦΒΚ’s particular angle on education in the liberal arts and sciences. And we continue to enjoy the contributions that members make by writing us at conversations@pbk.org.

At our address in Washington, D.C., you will find an old, gracious, and sturdy structure, a building of enduring worth. ΦΒΚ is well housed here. We stand, in a changing world, for things of lasting value—for freedom of inquiry and expression, for love of learning and breadth of inquiry, for the delight of knowing that in a world of P’s and Q’s there can be, from an unanticipated angle, New Hampshire Avenue.

Key People
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I was the first person to ever get 100 on the test, so they hired me.”

While juggling classes at Hunter with work as a programmer and programming teacher, Hommel took a five-month break in Europe. “I found myself spending all my time in museums and churches, looking at art,” she said. “When I returned, I took my first art class. I had an independent vision, having seen so much without someone over my shoulder telling me what I was seeing.” She became a studio art major. And in 1971 she was elected to ΦΒΚ.

Hommel worked two years in marketing at IBM, spent a year painting, again taught programming, and then went in a new direction, devoting two years to working as “a feminist political activist” on state and federal legislation. She continued these efforts while earning a law degree at NYU and then “returned to teaching programming to rest.” She published two computer books with John Wiley & Sons and has spent the past 20 years as a computer consultant and corporate trainer.

Now her energy is concentrated on HAVA, and she wants other ΦΒΚs to get involved. “ΦΒΚs are intelligent people with good educations,” she said. “We need to participate in our democracy because democracy takes work, and it’s been neglected. I call for ΦΒΚs to inform themselves: My links web page has enough information to make anyone an expert. We could consider tithing our time to maintain our democracy.”
Anti-Semitism Revisited

I read with some dismay Robert Michael’s letter [Winter Key Reporter] about Rick Eden’s review of “Holocaust: A History” by Deborah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt. He is correct that Christian anti-Semitism played a role in making the Jews the central target of the Nazi genocide. But he is wrong that Churchmen such as St. John Chrysostom or Reform leader Martin Luther ever advocated the murder of Jews.

Christians certainly killed Jews over the centuries. But however much Christian thinkers hated Judaism or Jews who did not convert, or who even led Christians to follow Jewish practices, they tried to subordinate, humiliate, and eventually convert Jews, not to kill them. St. Augustine’s position in “The City of God,” Book 18, chapter 46, and his tract “Against the Jews” expressed definitive Christian policy, based on Psalms 59:11 (King James): “Slay them not, lest my people forget: scatter them by thy power, and bring them down, O Lord our shield.”

Neither St. John Chrysostom nor Martin Luther differed from St. Augustine’s position on this point. The Nazi genocide per se is not derived from Church policy, but is an obscene transformation of it into a dimension specifically prohibited by Church authorities that held out the hope of the Jews’ conversion, based on St. Paul’s Letter to the Romans. This is a huge difference worth noting.

Ivan G. Marcus, New Rochelle, N.Y.

Robert Michael’s letter [Winter Key Reporter] contained several overly broad generalizations. It is certainly true that some Christian groups have “considered Jews to be special objects of contempt and archenemies.” However, many Christian bodies have consistently lived in harmony with Jews. I realize that Michael’s letter dealt primarily with the situation in Germany, an important proviso which might have been stated more clearly.

Ample evidence exists to show that some Christian groups have historically chosen not to discriminate against Jews. In the 17th century, the Puritan Oliver Cromwell invited Jews to return to England during the Protectorate. Some Jewish synagogues in Amsterdam in the 17th century are reported to have been used by Reformed and/or Quaker groups. Architectural historian George Thomas believes that the Reformed practice of separating men and women during the worship derives from their interaction with the Sephardic Jewish community there. Later in that century, Jews were allowed to settle in the colonies of Rhode Island and Pennsylvania. These colonies had strong congregations of English Baptists and Quakers, neither being bodies which sought to purge those who had different understandings from theirs.

Seth Hinshaw, Downingtown, Pa.

On reading Robert Michael’s letter [Winter Key Reporter] concerning the launch point of a history of the Holocaust—Christian anti-Semitism—it occurs to me that a 21st-century challenge would be for Jewish and Christian scholars to produce an agreed history of Christian anti-Semitism. It would entail a deepening of understanding of similarities and differences between the two traditions, and it would be crucially demanding of all participants.

I have read that a common history of Europe written by scholars from its individual nations is still not possible. Nonetheless, if attempted, it would be a remarkably educational exercise.

Thomas Merriam, Basingstoke, England

Correction: In the Winter Key Reporter, a line was dropped from Robert Michael’s letter at the bottom of page 14. The entire sentence is: “All historical events have long-term and short-term causes. By avoiding the history of Christian antisemitism (the preferred spelling), the authors avoid the most significant of the long-term causes of the Holocaust.”

How We Spell

Brian McFadden’s response [Winter Key Reporter] to a previous letter about implementing standardized spelling based on phonetic pronunciation was very convincing as to why doing so would not work.

However, anyone may use a phonetic system to save time and paper. I began in clinical psychology testing, in order to write responses
Decline

Welcomes letters to the editor.

Three writing systems, the traditional one and two dialects, as in ancient times. With regard to Professor Brian McFadden’s letter (“Spelling English,” Winter Key Reporter), the late Albert Markwardt always added the following to the dialect-variety reason for the impracticability of wholesale spelling reform: (a) because of our culture's long history of literacy, all educated people would have to master two writing systems, the traditional one and any new one; (b) purely phonetic (really phonemic) spelling would drastically reduce the reading speed to which educated people are accustomed, since such spelling necessitates letter-by-letter reading.

Those that are published may be condensed. Please send letters to the editor.

Thanks also to Paul Zweifel of Radford, Va., Nana Landgraf of Shaker Heights, Ohio, and Ann Staffeld of St. Johnsbury, Vt. Toepke-Floyd’s letter, suffice to make proposals like Edward Rondhaller’s unrealistic.

John L. Brinkley, Hampden-Sydney, Va.

Regarding Edward Rondhaller’s suggestion [Fall Key Reporter] to revise English spelling, I’m surprised no one has mentioned the classic science fiction piece “Melheim in cc Klarsum,” published in 1946 by Dolton Edwards. In “The Golden Years of Science Fiction,” Isaac Asimov says, “At first blush, it seems a classic of satire, but read it again. I believe it is absolutely sensible and is the way to go—except that no one ever will.”

Ronnie Seagren, Littleton, Colo.

Before the Fall

Because at the age of 84 I have just completed reading “The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire” for the first time, the reference to “The Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire” in Professor [Judy] Owen’s article about her father [Winter Key Reporter] caught my eye. I several times have heard myself make the same mistake.

Edith F. Hunter, Weathersfield Center, Vt.

Thanks also to Paul Zweifel of Radford, Va., Nana Landgraf of Shaker Heights, Ohio, and Ann Staffeld of St. Johnsbury, Vt.

The Key Reporter welcomes letters to the editor. Those that are published may be condensed. Please send letters to Barbara Ryan by e-mail at bryan@pbk.org, by fax at (202) 986-1601, or by postal mail to the Phi Beta Kappa Society.

With this context for Lex Rieffel’s study, we can turn to his views as expressed in the book’s subtitle. The way to deal with sovereign debt problems, he argues, is to let the parties involved in sovereign workouts—borrower and creditor countries, multilateral agencies and private creditors—resolve outstanding differences by negotiation on a case-by-case basis. He rejects the IMF’s recent proposal to introduce a Sovereign Debt Restructuring Mechanism imposed on the parties involved in sovereign workouts, in effect legislating a bankruptcy law for sovereigns.

Rieffel approves of two institutions that came into existence to treat sovereign workouts. One is the Paris Club, whose operations evolved for the narrow purpose of restructuring debt owed to bilateral donor agencies. Negotiations with an individual country are usually conducted by a Paris Club chairperson one week a month, except in February and August. A second institution, known as the London Club, evolved to restructure sovereign debt owed to commercial banks. Its actual title is the Bank Advisory Committee. No machinery existed in 1975 to solve problems between banks and sovereigns. It was created after a series of experiments with workout cases to achieve a general format. A Bank Advisory Committee chairman heads the negotiating process to narrow the difference between an offer from the debtor delegation and the creditor committee’s counteroffer.

Rieffel asks why mature democracies are immune to default. His answer is that they have deep domestic capital markets, an abiding commitment to macroeconomic stability, and a political system that makes transitions smoothly.

With respect to the tradeoff between debt relief and economic reforms by countries in a workout situation, Rieffel argues: “By providing somewhat more financing than technically required, creditors may improve the odds that the country will regain its creditworthiness quickly and permanently.” At the same time, he notes that debt relief doesn’t contribute to economic growth prospects; only good policies that encourage productive investment and employment do this. Relief makes sense only as a reward for good policies.

Although the core of the book is how to improve the workout mechanism for bond debt, Rieffel believes that crisis prevention is far more important. “It is puzzling and somewhat unsettling,” he writes, “how much time and effort the G-7 and the IMF have been devoting to developing better workout machinery. Reallocation of attention from workouts to crisis prevention would seem to hold out the prospect of larger benefits for the global system.”

Rieffel insists that it is not private creditors who are bailed out by emergency financing of distressed countries: It is the debtor country that is bailed out. Yet he acknowledges that a bailout package enables some private creditors to escape without a loss. He believes that taxpayers should not object so long as the debtor country repays the assistance. But taxpayers may well respond that less generous emergency assistance would benefit the debtors who have less to repay, and shift some of the burden to creditors who would otherwise be scot-free.

One blemish in this otherwise well-documented work is a footnote that states, “The ESF (Exchange Stabilization Fund) was created when the United States joined the IMF.” Not so. The ESF was established in 1934 in a provision of the law dealing the dollar from $20.67 to $35 an ounce. It is fun to read Appendix A. It traces the origins of the quip, “Countries don’t go bankrupt.” Rieffel shows that others used the phrase or a variation of it long before Walter Wriston, to whom it is often attributed.


Some of the five chapters in this short book are addressed to specialists in labor economics.
From Our Book Critics
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It is also accessible to general readers, for whom the author provides a nontechnical explanation of the subject. From the beginnings of the discipline, economists have attempted to account for observable differences in wages paid to similar workers.

Mortensen first presents evidence for U.S. average hourly earnings by industry, sex, and firm size, measured by the number of workers employed. Across industries for each sex, average hourly earnings vary by as much as a factor of two. Industry and size differentials are smaller when human capital and other worker characteristics—education, experience, job tenure, marital status, race and location—are introduced. Also the differences between the sexes apparently disappear when human capital variables are included. Nevertheless, the results for both sexes suggest that large wage differences are associated with the size and industry of the employer.

Mortensen reviews theories of wage dispersion, including compensating differentials—for example, the occupational risk of injury and death; efficiency wages—because of the cost of monitoring effort, firms pay a higher efficiency wage above the worker’s outside option; sorting of more able workers with more productive employers. These explanations, however, turn out to be neither the sole nor even the most important factors for cross-employer differences in wages.

Mortensen’s explanation of wage dispersion is that it reflects differences in employer productivity. More productive employers offer higher pay and better working conditions to attract and retain more workers. Workers respond to these differences and move from less to more productive employers. A reallocation process leads workers and employers to invest in search and recruiting. What prevents the labor market from ever attaining employment of all workers by the most productive firms is that outside forces impose shifts to unemployment as a result of job elimination and labor turnover for other reasons.

However, as Mortensen notes, this solution leaves unexplained the reason for productivity dispersion. He speculates that friction in search and recruiting efforts—workers do not know the wages offered by all employers—produces persistent productivity dispersion. While employed at low wages and in poor working conditions, workers search for a better job, but that takes time. The most productive firms limit their size because of rising recruiting and hiring costs. Hence both sides of the labor market contribute to the persistence of wage dispersion.

In every industry and region, new firms are born. Some expand, others contract, and some die. These are responses to shocks to relative demand because of changes in tastes, regulations, and globalization; and shocks to the productive efficiency of individual firms in response to the drawn-out process of new and more efficient methods. Old technologies are not immediately replaced by the new, so productive efficiency varies across firms at any point in time.

Visiting Scholars
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National Endowment for the Humanities, and the American Council of Learned Societies.

Elliot M. Meyerowitz, George Beadle Professor of Biology, California Institute of Technology

Past president, Genetics Society of America and the International Society for Plant Molecular Biology; member of the National Academy of Sciences (Lounsbery Award); recipient of the Genetics Society of America Medal and the Gibbs Medal of the American Society of Plant Physiologists; research on genetics of flowering plants, especially Arabidopsis thaliana.

Katherine Verdery, Eric R. Wolf Collegiate Professor of Anthropology, University of Michigan

President, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies; member of the executive board, Social Science Research Council; field research in Romania on ethnic and national identity; author of “Transylvanian Villagers,” “National Ideology Under Socialism,” “What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?”, “The Political Lives of Dead Bodies,” “The Vanishing Hectare.”

Wojciech H. Zurek, Laboratory Fellow, Theory Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory

Foreign associate, Cosmology Program of the Canadian Institute of Advanced Research; visiting professor, University of California-Santa Barbara Institute for Theoretical Physics; editor or co-editor, “Physical Origins of Time Asymmetry,” “Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information,” “Quantum Theory and Measurement.”
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