

HSA

HISTORY STUDENTS ASSOCIATION
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

CRITIQUE AND PROGRAM



CRITIQUE AND PROGRAM
OF THE
HISTORY STUDENTS ASSOCIATION

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
MADISON
September, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | i |
| Critique | 1 |
| The University and Society | 3 |
| The Teaching of History at the U.W.: Its Relation to Society | 6 |
| The Undergraduate in the History Department | 12 |
| The Graduate Student in the History Department | 14 |
| The Teaching Assistant in the History Department | 17 |
| Power and Process on the History Faculty | 24 |
| Program | 31 |

INTRODUCTION

The History Students Association is an organization of undergraduate and graduate students of history. It is dedicated to the restructuring of the university, and its role in society, and in particular, to the reform of the teaching of history. It seeks cooperation with parallel organizations in other departments and with other groups on campus for the achievement of common goals. The critique and program which follow embody in part our understanding of the university as it is and our demands for its reform, both internally and in relation to the society of which it is a part.

We realize that fundamental change in the university is contingent upon fundamental change in our society, and we see our program as part of the larger effort to transform society. The reforms which we propose, therefore, are seen not as a means of perfecting the university in isolation, but as a means to change and use the university in a way which will facilitate change in the whole society. We see our struggle for these reforms as well as their achievement as promoting a critical attitude among students who will ultimately take their part in working for the transformation of our society.

This pamphlet is the collective effort of the H. S. A. Parts of it apply directly to other departments and parts are meant to point out possibilities for further work. We hope it will inspire others to undertake similar efforts. We encourage the reproduction of any part of this booklet.

S t u d e n t s o f t h e w o r l d, UNITE!
Y o u h a v e n o t h i n g t o l o s e b u t
y o u r g r a d e s.

THE UNIVERSITY AND SOCIETY

The American university has for years been falsely conceived as a cloistered sanctuary of pure thought and learning in the midst of a corrupt and commercial society. But recently it has begun to declare and vaunt its increasingly active role in that society. The preface to the University of Wisconsin bulletin, for example, explains the goal of the university as "to train you to earn a living in a socially useful manner," and in the process to create a "moral, intelligent and well-informed citizen." The definitions of "socially useful" and "moral" are already provided by the university and by the content and structure of its departments and divisions and "useful" really means functional in terms of the existing network of government, political, economic and social relationships.

The service that the university performs in American society has many dimensions. The involvement of the university with U.S. Government and military projects has been well documented and is by now common knowledge. But the university serves America in less obvious but more pervasive ways. These range from such explicit services as personnel training to the communication of certain moral and social values equally necessary to the functioning of our society.

The most obvious contractual links between the university and the government and military are found in the physical and biological sciences, for example, Harry Harlow's chemical and biological warfare project "The Toxicology of Chemical Warfare Agents," funded by Army contract "DA-CML-13-108-61-G-12. But the social sciences play an equally important role. According to the Report of the Panel of Defense Social and Behavioral Sciences, "To maintain an adequate base for planning and for the conduct of military operations when and where they occur, the U.S. military establishment must have access to a steady flow of knowledge that originates in social science

studies." The example of the University involvement in the most reactionary government agencies such as the CIA, IDA, CBW and other needs no more documentation than the New York Times. The Times of August 14, 1968, for example, reports that India is "still wary of U.S. scholars," and that "Indian concern over Pentagon or C.I.A. involvement is "strong." As Professor Gerald D. Berreman explained to the Times reporter, "The sources of research funds in the social sciences have been drying up, but a social scientist willing to do work that will be useful to the Defense Department can get backing." One of the chief apologists for the Vietnam war, Abrom Katz of the Rand Corporation, stated very clearly that the U.S. government had to shape itself to deal with such wars through "efforts to collect data on current experiences; retrieve--before it is too late-- data from past experiences; conduct and sponsor research in this field."

The university serves the interests of our society in another way by the training of highly skilled individuals to fill professional, management, and technological roles. Since the late 19th century, with the establishment of graduate schools and primarily graduate universities, the university has continued to produce teachers and lawyers, doctors and pharmacists, scientists and social service personnel who are trained to carry out, unquestioningly and uncritically, their specific roles in the operation and maintenance of American society and American hegemony. The "experts" it turns out learn how to handle and control tensions and threatening disequilibrium both at home and abroad, in classrooms, in American ghettos, in developing nations.

In the process of imparting vocational skills and turning out good citizens, the university transmits a whole complex of values which in their turn are essential to the operation and maintenance of the society. University education tends to channel the student in certain directions, to choose and reject certain assumptions about social conditions and social change. ^{ne} such basic assumption is that American society, the economic system on which it is

based and the moral precepts it holds inviolate do indeed constitute "the best of all possible worlds," not only for us, but for other nations as well. History, political science, sociology and economics courses can therefore present the American system as one which does of course have problems, but problems which are merely kinks in a basically good system, kinks which can be easily ironed out. Because America is the model, and American interests the criterion, foreign nations, both in a historical and contemporary context, are judged by our standards. One of the most important of these standards is social stability, or the absence of radical or violent change. Revolutions are seldom viewed as "good," although explanations may be given as to why they occurred, presumably in an effort to avoid any such further occurrences.

Implicit in, and necessary for the acceptance of these values is the prevalence of what we might call an "analytical" as opposed to a "critical" approach. In English courses, we are more concerned with the form of a work of literature than with its content, meaning, or implication. Again, in political science or sociology or economics courses, we find ourselves limited to a description of systems, or contemplating their alternatives. Political science 423, *The Conduct of American Foreign Affairs*, is listed as "Descriptive analysis of the way in which American foreign policy is formulated and carried out by federal agencies." In history courses, we most often concentrate on "what happened" rather than why it happened. For takes precedence over content; descriptive analysis over critical analysis. In fact, so pervasive is this approach, that it never occurs to most people to question it, to posit a different set of questions about the subject under discussion, to ask "why?" -- "what for?" instead of "how?"

Of course a certain amount of critical thinking does exist within the university, and is tolerated as long as it does not lead to a disruption of the smooth functioning of the university apparatus. As long as the majority of students do not see beyond the ideology of the administrative bureaucrats, the university has served society in its most essential

role. When the governing principle of the university, i.e. the adjustment of the people to the conditions of a society based on technological development for profit, is challenged, as occurred in October at Wisconsin and in May at Columbia, the university responds accordingly with calling in the more blatantly repressive agencies of society -- the police, with their spies, tear gas, mace, clubs, and strategically applied brutality. Those who still believe that the university is in search of truth and democratic in nature need only look to a very clear case at Columbia. There, the social work school discusses and undertakes projects in the Harlem ghetto, presumably to help alleviate the suffering there while the University is the largest slumlord in the area, owning some 200 buildings in the community. It would not be antithetical for the University to have courses which deal with the problems of the urban poor in the abstract sense or with a view toward solving the problems of the ghetto. But if students try to organize the ghetto against the exploitative University-landlord, the repressive organs of social control take precedence over academic debate. To organize the poor to take collective action against oppressive conditions, to challenge the University gym in a Harlem community park, is to become critical in a way which the University will not and cannot tolerate.

The function and purpose of the University dictates certain structural and procedural characteristics. The importance of expertise, the compartmentalization and specialization of knowledge create a situation in which students are taught only one dimension or one specialized area of a whole problem or subject. We are taught the economic history of a country for a fifty year period, instead of an integrated approach linking all aspects of history-- economic, social, political, cultural. Such an approach prevents people from seeing any problem in its totality, from making certain connections. Problems are divided and subdivided until they are made "solvable" by individuals trained in these various subdivisions. A total picture of society

ands its interrelating parts is thereby suppressed.

The problem is not a question of the University reflecting society--it is society, or part of it, an institution which carries out a specific function in the service, perpetuation, and expansion of that society. But it is unique as an institution that can be used, it can be exploited to ends different from its own, or the society's. It can be made to really educate, to produce critical thinkers, and critical action. We recognize that we cannot fundamentally change the University without fundamentally changing American society, but we can work to allow for the fullest exploitation of its resources and its potential to produce such critical thinkers and such critical actions.

THE TEACHING OF HISTORY AT THE U.W.:

ITS RELATION TO SOCIETY

As our first e ssay, "The University and Society" pointed out, one of the ways the University serves society is by the communication of certain values and assumptions which ensure the smooth functioning of American society and American policies. This essay will point out and illustrate the various means by which this is done in the teaching of history at the University of Wisconsin. The specific characteristics of the teaching of history with which we shall deal fall into two main categories. Elitism a n d gradualism deal with the judgments of historical interpretation. The problems of specialization and lac of present mindedness , on the other hand, deal with judgments historians make in choosing topics for study.

Elitism is the first characteristic of teaching and writing history which will be discussed. It involves the emphasis on the study of leaders and ideas to the exclusion of the study of social movements. The significance of this can be seen from the following example. The second half of the nineteenth century in Russia is studied at this university mainly by reviewing the theories of the various oppositi groups to the monarchy. The relationship between these theories and the social and economic situation in Russia during this period is hardly touched upon. Simply by the ommission of certain material from the course the student can justly conclude that it was the dynamism of these men which caused the revolution. The dynamics of history seem to be centered in the maneuvers of a few extraordinary men. A sense of popular support, discontent or participation are entirely lost. It is not fair to claim that the professor omitted certain material due to lack of time. Since the historian has no time to make lists of all the events of the past he is forced to select, and this in turn implies a judgment about the importance of these forces in history. The conclusions drawn by students on a n

exam follow from the course and have the appearance of fact, but in reality the student is assimilating the "hidden assumptions" of the course. The idea he has assimilated fits in well with the society's assumption that Communism was forced on the Russian people by the well laid plans of revolutionary schemers. Also, the student who has learned his lesson well has no sense of the possibilities and limitations- in short, the dynamics- of group action as a force in history. Instead he is struck by the impossibility of changing society if he personally does not have the dynamism of Lenin. No wonder movements for political and social change in the United States flounder. Students do not have the opportunity to study mass movements which have brought about change outside the existing structure of society. In this regard the contention of the history department that the study of history is supposed to help us in understanding and analyzing the present (Majors, 1967, p. 51) is clearly not upheld in practice by the department.

Another characteristic of the teaching and writing of history at the UW is Gradualism or Cooperatism. It involves the assumption, very important in the rhetoric of American politics, that historical change does not come about as the result of a struggle between unreconcilable interests. For example, the failure of the Kuomintang (KMT) in China in the 1920's and 1930's is seen as the result of the failure of the leadership to provide a strong direction and take a strong lead. The contradiction between the social program of the KMT and the interests of the rich landlords who composed the party is ignored. Instead, it appears as if a stronger leader than Chiang Kai Shek could have held the KMT together and prevented the Communists from winning. Again, the historical process is seen in terms of the maneuvers of a few important men at the head of the movement. In this case, however, it is the possibility of conflicting interest between social classes, or even the rhetoric of the movement and the actual practice of the party that is ignored.

As a corollary, movements born from a situation of conflict or violence are labelled by necessity, developments which will be detrimental to the people involved and also a threat to other countries. Stalin, and Stalin's tactics for example, are seen by many historians as an inevitable product of the Russian Revolution. The appointment of Khrushchev and the policy of peaceful coexistence came as a surprise to many who felt that the Soviet Union could only survive if its leaders were to act like Stalin. The position of the Soviet Union after the war in terms of the destruction caused by the war, the relationship of the Soviet Union to capitalist countries in Europe, etc., were all ignored in terms of explaining Soviet policy. Instead the Soviet Union is seen in terms of an abstraction. She is the great red bear with grasping claws, who captures smaller nations and hopes to dominate the world. This image of the Soviet Union is found in a high school textbook written by Professor Petrovich. Certainly with this view of the Russian revolution the course he teaches can be no more than a sophisticated version of the interpretation we received in high school. The student may receive as the history department claims, "a more systematic and intensive study of a variety of histories" (Majors, 1967, p. 51), but of what use is this great store of factual material if the student is not taught to view it critically, in other words to get at the basic assumptions underlying the presentation of this material and to see how this may be used to justify or buttress a particular view or policy of our society.

Again, let us ask what the implications are of the two problems discussed above. In the first place, class analysis is completely ignored, since it is assumed that there is no issue or problem which can't be settled by compromise. Also, revolutionary activity is condemned out of hand, since it is not in the spirit of compromises. Consequently, no attempt is made to understand revolutionary

activity. No wonder history is such a good major for students who plan to enter the government bureaucracy. In a sense the teaching of history even channels students into the government bureaucracy and existing political parties by emphasizing either the futility or destructiveness of conflict and revolutionary movements. It is quite natural for a student with this perspective to see movements which work outside the existing system of government as either dangerous or futile. Add to this the "conspiracy of silence" in regard to the dynamics of mass movements and the interaction between these movements and the political, social and economic situation of the time, and in essence you have a method of teaching and writing history which not only does not help us in understanding and analyzing the present but which negates itself because it is a-historical.

Specialization is another characteristic of teaching and writing at the U.W. Professors concentrate, in their lectures and books, on very limited aspects of the period under study, without relating these details to a larger interpretation of the period. This mania for specialization or cubbyholing is reflected in the books written by full professors in History. For example, take the professors at U.W. whose names begin with A through H (a total of sixteen of our 32 full professors who will be teaching in 1968-69 academic year.) Not one of these professors has written a synthesis of a whole era or a period in the history of a city, nation or empire, encompassing all aspects of society -- political, economic, social, cultural and intellectual -- and transcending them as rigid categories. Our grandest generalists are T. Hamerow (Restoration, Revolution, Reaction -- Economics and Politics in Germany, 1815-1871) and R. Cameron (France and the Economic Development of Europe, 1800-1914; Conquests of Peace and War.)

After them the next broadest studies are in fact of very modest proportions: Paul Glad's McKinley, Bryan and the People, and Paul Conkin's FDR and the Origins of the Welfare State. Both of them are strictly political studies confined to single decades! But the typical work

are very specialized indeed, such as Allan Bogue's From Prairie to Corn Belt; Farming on the Illinois and Iowa Prairie in the Nineteenth Century, and E. David Cronon's Josephus Daniels in Mexico. This is the kind of work which historians are trained to produce in graduate school, and which is remunerated with advancements and job offers. Much consummate scholarship is done at this high level of specialization. Certainly the frontiers of knowledge could not advance very far without work at this level. But what value does this research serve if it is not related either to the larger problems of a period or to similar problems we face today. Is a career of research which is entirely this specialized the best concurrent preparation for a career of teaching undergraduates and graduates? Specialization is a problem at the U.W. because it obscures the usefulness of history, and leaves students with the idea that history must be studied for its esthetic merits. The only buttresses the somewhat elitist idea that college days are more for learning to appreciate Western civilization than for analysing the conflicts of interests and ideas in a society which is a very special product of this Western tradition. If education is considered a culture mill, then the student will remain perfectly harmless -- he will not have the ability or the desire to challenge either the assumptions of the society or some of its policies. He has just been trained to admire. Experts who know better can take the responsibility for change.

A final characteristic is the lack of a specific kind of Present - mindedness on the part of historians. Only two of the full professors in our department (from A through H) have written historical works which stem from the author's commitment to present day problems. Merle Borrowman wrote The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education; a Historical Survey of American Thought in search of "new meanings in current problems and new light on their solution." Rondo Cameron wrote Banking in the Early Stages of Industrialization; a Study in Comparative Economic

History "to shed light on a pressing practical problem --namely, financing economic development." Yet, neither of these works constitutes a contribution to social criticism of the fundamental kind found in Merle Curti's American Paradox; the Conflict Between Thought and Action or C. Vann Woodward's Strange Career of Jim Crow.*

Lack of present-mindedness like Specialization serves to immobilize the students by removing the relevant aspects of history from the student's field of vision. The term "relevance" here is not synonymous with treating contemporary subject matter. Nor is it concerned with either distorting history to make the past conform to an interpretation of the present or establishing a one-to-one correlation between the problems of the past and solutions for the present. It is concerned, however, with the kind of present-mindedness which makes an American historian include in an course on the Civil War and Reconstruction period, for example, the social and psychological as well as the economic and political aspects of slavery. In as much as the black revolt in urban ghettos is of major concern to us today, a course which touched upon this material would be relevant. Also, in as much as the nature and value of our whole liberal heritage is in question at present, a course in development of liberalism would be relevant. Furthermore, to be relevant, material presented must be more than selected with a view to present problems. It must also be treated in a critical fashion. History can serve either as a means of self-justification or as a means of self-criticism. This essay is dedicated to the development of a critique of society used to justify itself. Only the development of critical approach to historical material can expose these hidden assumptions. First we propose the development of a critical approach to history and then the development of a critical university. This is our goal.

THE UNDERGRADUATE IN THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT

The undergraduate at Wisconsin feels isolated and alone within the competitive structure of the university. There have been few attempts to see undergraduates as a collective body with the power and the understanding to voice grievances and to make proposals for change within the university. There are organizations for TA's but no organization (before HSA) which emphasized the identity of interests between these groups and undergraduates.

This sense of isolation is emphasized by the structure of the educational system at the university. Grads and undergrads are segregated into different sections. The timidity of the undergrad in the face of the all-knowing first-year grad student is a foregone conclusion. The professor, situated on a platform and lecturing to an audience of note-takers with heads lowered and pencils raised, appears as a figure with ultimate knowledge of the subject matter. (How else would he have the courage to address an audience of this size and in this manner?) This makes the undergraduate fearful of criticizing the professor, let alone approaching this stellar figure to ask a question. This isolation is further emphasized by the meager contact students have with each other in the classroom. The atmosphere of the class is formal even in the allegedly more relaxed discussion sections. The student therefore has no way to discover that his classmates have the same fears and perhaps similar ideas about ways to change the class. It is also very easy to forget that the TA is also a student--subject to similar pressures and with similar complaints. But, since it is his job to give grades, he wears the armor of authority of the department. Indeed, he is often the only source of contact a student has with a salaried member of the department. Competition to win recognition and approval from these figures is fostered on the students. And grades, dispensed by professors and TA's are easily accepted as the true measure of success and the achievement of recognition in this large and impersonal university.

In addition to imposing a sense of isolation on the undergraduate, the university deprives him of t h e

means of carrying on free inquiry, the "fearless sifting and winnowing" so clearly vaunted in the student handbook and the bronze plaque on Bascom Hall. Here again the structure of the classroom, the large lecture and the impervious attitude of the faculty foster a situation in which critical thought is discouraged if not made impossible. The lecture format serves to spoon feed already prepared and packaged material. The student is given little opportunity or time for independent thought and analysis. The lecture progresses rapidly and a student must copy all the notes so that he may do well on an exam which for the most part will ask for rote repetition of the lectures. (This transcription is necessary only if the student does not have already a copy of notes from last semester donated by well-meaning friends or fraternity brothers.) No attention is paid to the thought process that went into the lecture or to possible alternative approaches to the subject matter. A student is given so little time for thought and analysis that it becomes easy to accept the presupposition of the professor that undergraduates are incapable of critical thought.

There are few innovations within the department which help cope with the plight of the undergraduate as described above. Independent reading courses and, more recently, proseminars are open to a very small minority of students. These courses only serve to further isolate the privileged undergraduates, and to siphon off the discontent of the more articulate and brave students who do not fear standing in corridors to ask a professor to work with him. The undergraduate must be given a strong organ of influence in the department and in individual classes. He must find a means by which he can develop his critical faculties, and have opportunities for really free inquiry and expression. An organization with these goals will end the isolation and fear of the student. He will have the power to influence both the form and the content of his education.

THE GRADUATE STUDENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

The new graduate student is proud to be at Wisconsin, which, he knows, sports one of the finest history departments in the country. He is excited at the prospect of studying history intensively and on a full time basis. He looks forward to studying with teachers he believes worthy of respect--those with whom he will have a community of interests. He expects to learn, and to enjoy learning.

He is soon disappointed. Ideally, the small seminar is the focus of graduate learning. Yet history graduates find themselves spending over half their credit hours in lecture courses where the size of the class and the lecture situation stifle any creative exchange of ideas. The graduate, an apprentice historian, may be singled out from the undergraduate mass by a special assignment or a segregated quiz section. But, like the undergraduate, the graduate shares in the boredom and tedium of the usual lecture course.

The graduate seminar, in theory provides conditions highly conducive to intellectual inquiry. In practice, it is often dissatisfying. It is "led" or conducted by the major professor, who is of critical importance in the career of the graduate student. The major professor admits the student for graduate work in the Department of History. He generally determines one-third or more of his student's G.P.A. In large part he decides which of his students should be candidates for scholarships and other forms of financial aid. And he has the major voice in determining whether a student should be allowed to engage in work beyond the masters degree level. A graduate student stands in relation to his major professor much as a vassal stood in relation to his lord. He stands not as an individual, a whole person, but as so-and-so's student, a part of a large academic fiefdom.

This peculiar situation determines the atmosphere and functioning of the seminar, which becomes less a cooperative venture for historical meaning and insight

than a number of simultaneous, competitive performances by the individual students aimed at gaining the notice and approval of the professor. Frequently, the seminar meeting consists solely of the entire group listening to one individual's seminar paper. Exciting and interesting and valuable discussions in which everyone participates are indeed rare. Instead, seminar discussion too often atrophies into pedantic and minute dissection of the secondary aspects of a third-rate study. Fragmentation and competition also result from the nature of seminar papers. Though sometimes clustered around some general theme or time period, these papers are usually unrelated to each other and boring to all involved. Very often, the topic or choice of topics is assigned by the professor who, of course, selects questions which interest him or with which he is most familiar. Students, unnerved by the pressure to choose a topic almost immediately and conditioned to feel insecure and unworthy by their lack of knowledge, welcome the assignment given them. They then find themselves saddled with a major piece of research in which they have not the slightest concern and which will prove useless to them and others.

The history graduate student soon learns that he has no voice in the determination of the educational process which is supposedly operating for his own benefit. He is the "product" of the university factory system and as such is a passive object--to be acted upon and not expected to act on his own. Decisions are made for him and not by him. He may voice grievances only in an informal, ad hoc manner. If he has a complaint about a university or departmental policy, he may speak to his major professor, who, in turn, may bring the matter to the attention of the history faculty, or may speak directly to the department chairman. In either case, he is acting as an individual, with an individual grievance. The student must depend on the good will and "justice" of the powers that be if he is to receive satisfaction. As likely as not, those powers were the source of the student's original complaint and those powers can easily dismiss it. The complainant is totally powerless. The department did not pay attention to the interests of its graduate students in regard to

departmental policy, the graduate program, the content and organization of courses, and the allocation of financial aid. Neither graduates, nor indeed any students, have sought to bring pressure to bear in these matters. They have no power.

The exclusion of graduate students from the determination of policy which most directly concerns them can be seen most clearly in the case of the recently adopted procedures in the selection of teaching assistants. In the past, the procedure for the selection of TA's had been shrouded in mystery. Reportedly, a point system based upon one's progress and the influence of one's major professor were the key factors. (Again, analogous to the feudal system, the most powerful lords got the most spoils for their vassals.) When the Harrison Committee on Graduate Financial Aids was established in 1965-66, its primary task was to come up with a fairer means of appointing TA's. The committee issued a call to all interested parties for written suggestions, but when the TAA Affiliate in History asked to appear before the committee, their request was denied. The committee's report was not made available to students before it was submitted to the history faculty for action, and the Affiliate only found out what the faculty had adopted after the fact. The new system for appointing TA's was as bad as the old. While the new procedure for selection was "objective," it placed primary emphasis upon the G.P.A. Grades currently stand as one of the most effective tools of authoritarianism in the classroom. The new procedure will only accentuate the negative effect of grades in the educational process.

If graduate demands were distorted in this case, no formal channels existed for students to express and implement their views in regard to the recent reform of the graduate program in American History. A Committee on Program Changes in American History submitted its report to the history faculty in late April 1968 and the report was largely adopted. The report contained recommendations for sweeping changes but students were never consulted in its draft-

ing or adoption. Many of them never even knew that anything was happening. Several aspects of this new program are quite positive, such as the elimination of lecture courses, the alternative to an MA with thesis, and the expansion of student contact with professors. But, we must object to the clandestine manner in which it was formulated and adopted. Students are permitted only the most circumscribed role at faculty meeting. This is fully illustrated by the reception given TAA representatives who appeared before the history faculty committee to make the case for TAA recognition. The chairman was obliged to ask if anyone present objected to allowing the representatives to speak. It was not regarded as proper for TAA representatives to even be present during the debate and voting. You can get better treatment at a city council meeting. Graduate and undergraduate representation must be real and not token gestures. It is essential that formal structures be created to allow all students their full role in every matter that affects their education and their lives.

THE TEACHING ASSISTANT IN THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT

Basic function of the TA:

As undergraduate enrolments have increased in the past decades, the TA system has played an indispensable role in accomodating these enrolments to the existing structure of the university. The TA system has made it possible for the faculty to preserve as their main orientation their research and the research carried out by their graduate students. The TA relieves the professor of the task of meeting with undergraduates to discuss the lectures and readings, of advising undergraduates on their problems with the course, of administering final grades. Of the total man hours of teaching preparation and advising involved in Letters and Sciences on the Madison campus, TA's put in 76%. The corresponding figure for upper division and adult courses is 44%.

Clearly the university could

not continue to function without TA's. While the individual TA is told that he is "privileged to be a TA, or that being a TA is a valuable experience, these explanations overlook the obvious truth, the truth being that the TA is cheap labor which frees the faculty to devote the better part of their energies to research. And TA's do more than that. Even if the primary orientation of the faculty were teaching, TA's would still be necessary to make mass education possible at the college level.

The TA's Teaching Situation:

In the History Department, most professors do not visit the classrooms of their TA's. The means which the professor in History uses to judge the TA's performances are 1) how the TA talks about his work in conference with the professor, which may be very seldom, and 2) what the undergraduates tell him. (In the university at large, 73% of professors get some information from the undergraduates.) Reappointment as a TA in the History Department is dependent upon "satisfactory classroom performance"--meaning no failure to perform duties and no serious complaints.

If these facts seem to suggest that the TA has a fair amount of latitude in his teaching, look again. The professor has as much power over the TA's work as he cares to exercise, and he does not need to hover over his TA's to see that they do what they are told. He can tell his TA's what they will "discuss" each week. He can compose the examinations without any consultation with the TA's. He can insist that attendance be taken in the lecture and quiz sections, and that TA's give frequent, mindless quizzes. He can control the way in which grades are dished out. Any resistance or even suggestion that things be done differently can be put aside with the remark, "You are being paid to do such-and-such," namely whatever you're told. TA's are often badly hampered by the stupid way in which their professors dictate to them how to do their jobs. When that happens, the TA is in the demoralizing position of having to defend, explicitly or implicitly, the professor's methods against his students and his own best interests.

The appalling proportions of the problem are revealed in two statistics. Thirty percent of all TA's in the university do not even have respect for the teaching ability of the men they are working for. Sixty-two percent of all TA's say that they are not encouraged to innovate in the classroom.

This is the situation. What, then, are the reforms recommended by the Mulvihill Report? TA initiative and creativity should be encouraged, it says. There should be ongoing departmental programs on teaching led by faculty members recognized for their teaching excellence, more and better conferences between the TA and his professor, and more classroom visitation! Is a mere admonition to encourage TA initiative and creativity going to do any good? So long as professors have the power to inhibit TA initiative and creativity, won't their egos and their preferences for no hassels make that admonition nugatory? Who are these professors who are recognized for their teaching excellence? The academy and academic marketplace have maintained a studied indifference to teaching excellence. Instead all attention is focused on the good and productive scholar. Are we to believe that the system is capable of identifying a good teacher? Who in the system is to judge.

As for more conferences between TA and professor and more classroom visitation, the results of this kind of increased control in other departments where it already exists are often worse than useless. A professor in Math gives her nine or ten TA's a list o called "Do, and Don't" which includes"

- Don't address students by their first names.
- Don't chew gum while teaching.
- Don't laugh at questions or embarrass students.
(They become taxpayers and sometimes legislators.)
- Don't be influenced by attractive students of the opposite sex when giving grades.

Is this where teaching is at? An important professor in English tells his TA's to see to it that they

maintain respect for their authority in the class - room. Another English professor visited a TA and later remonstrated with him for not chewing out a student who arrived late. The system of visiting and grading TA's in the Freshman Composition course is notoriously paternal and a lot of advice is bad.

The unlimited prerogative of the professor has been accepted as right and fitting for too long. It has survived under the slogan that the professor's academic freedom must not be abridged. No one has objected that freedom is power, and gone on to ask, "Power over whom and what?" And, no one has gone on to ask, "Is that power right and fitting?" It is now time for TA's to get greater influence over their own jobs and to share that influence with their students. For starters, TA's in history can forestall the imposition of more orientation for new TA's, a faculty - run program on how to teach, and a general system of faculty visitations. They can establish their own orientation; their own program on how to teach, demanding academic credit for participation in it; their own voluntary program for visiting fellow TA's. The TA's in history will only get to the heart of the problem, however, when they start to participate, along with their students, in the decisions about where the course is going to take them, and what educational methods will be used in it. (Statistics are from the Wisconsin Survey Research Lab Project 269 as cited in the Mulvihill Report.)

Appointment of TA's:

Until this spring, TA's in history were appointed by a system which permitted the senior members of the faculty to throw their weight around. G.P.A., progress toward the degree (as determined by a system of points), and professors' recommendations were all considered. But it was never known how these three elements were combined. It did become clear that senior faculty recommendations carried more weight than the rest. There was even a case in which a full professor tampered with the list after it had been finalized.

The Harrison Committee on Graduate Financial Aids

devised a new system by which all students with a G.P.A. of 3.75 and above (4.0 for first year grads) are considered for TA appointments. They are divided into point categories using the following schedule:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|
| for each of two language requirements | 1 pt. |
| for MA degree | 2 pts. |
| for prelims | 3 pts. |
| for minor field completed | 2 pts. |

Those with all nine points are considered first in order of G.P.A. down to 3.75, then those with eight points down to 3.75, etc., down to those students with 3.75 and above without any points. If the system does not produce enough TA's, a second list based on a lower G.P.A. is adopted. (For additional features of the system see the memo: "Financial Aid for Graduate Students in History.") The meaning of the new system is that 1) the Harrison committee found no way to eliminate undue influence except by excluding professor's recommendations entirely and 2) fantasti emphasis is put on high grades as opposed to sharing the TA experience as broadly as possible. If the faculty really believe that all PhD's should have experience as TA's as part of their training, why isn't 3.4 used as a cut-off instead of 3.75? TA appointment would be awarded largely to those who were more advanced toward their degree. Even the "mediocre" student (by G.P.A. standards) who was closing in on the PhD would get a chance at teaching experience. Even the Mulvihill report admits that G.P.A.'s for graduate students are "notoriously unreliable." (p. 3.) One's G.P.A. also tends to drop a little as he progresses toward the degree.

No one knows how summer TA appointments are awarded. It is interesting that the memo on "Financial Aid for Graduate Students in History" makes no mention of them.

Assignment of TA's:

It is now permissible for TA applicants in History to express a preference as to course and professor. A few years ago an appointee questioned h i s

assignment because he had no training for the subject matter he was to teach. He nearly got the shit kicked out of him for being so presumtuous. (That is a metaphor naturally...)

TA pay:

Pay for the TA's is established annually on a university-wide basis. The booklet, "Financial Aid for Graduate Students" says that the TA's salary "depends upon the amount of time devoted to departmental duties; present salary is \$3,375 for experienced 'half-time' assistants for the academic year." (p. 15) "Half-time" is interpreted differently on five different pay scales in the Letters and Sciences alone, and History TA's are paid according to the Social Studies scale. Six sections is considered "half time" on the scale, but almost all history TA's have only four sections and have their hands full at that. Thus, while the financial aid booklet gives the impression that you might expect to received \$3,267 as a new TA, in history with the usual four sections, you get \$2,178. Out of that you have to pay tuition. The Social Studies scale allows for slightly less pay per section beyond four sections if all your sections are in the same course. But if you have four or fewer sections split between two courses, you get exactly the same pay that you would if you only had one course to prepare for. If you have five sections requiring two preparations, you get less than 3% more pay than if you had five requiring only one preparation. (All figures for the year 1967-1968)

TA's in history should considering working through the TAA to confront the university with an analysis of all TA pay scales--and with recommendations. In history, TA's do not get equal pay for equal work. That is shown above. The inequities from one pay scale to another are even greater.

A Union for TAs, RAs, PAs and Graduate Work Study Grantees:

All recipients of aid who are thereby employees of the university are eligible for membership in the

Teaching Assistants Association. This includes TA's, RA's, PA's, and graduate work study grantees. (Amendment to the by-laws, 13 May 1968.) Among other things, the TAA defends the job interests of these employees. It negotiates individual grievances and cooperates with departmental groups in the negotiation of collective grievances. Its batting average so far has been high despite the fact that the TAA does not have a credible strike threat. The departments are apparently fearful of exacerbating student discontent and do not want trouble.

The History Department:

recognize the rights of its teaching assistants to be represented by any person or agency of their choice in any negotiations with the Department involving disputes over their employment; and ... further recognizes that the Teaching Assistants Association may be selected by its teaching assistants as one such agent. (Resolution, 3 May 1968)

Now that membership in the TAA has been extended to other graduate employees, it is reasonable to suppose that the department will accept TAA representation on their behalf as well.

Conclusion:

This essay is just a start. History students--and not only TA's--need a close analysis of the Mulvihill Report on the TA system because its recommendations give an indication as to what directions the system is likely to take. (Faculty Document 183, February, 1968) They also need a close look at the data on graduate students and TA's compiled by the Wisconsin Survey Research Lab for the Mulvihill Committee. (WSRL Project 269). When the TAA asked to see the data, its requests were denied because the Committee wanted to make sure that its own interpretation came first. (Sifting and winnowing, yes. But some sifters and winnowers have priority.) Now that the committee has gotten its licks in, everybody else should get theirs.

POWER AND PROCESS ON THE HISTORY FACULTY

The fifty-five members of the History faculty do not form a highly structured body. There are few standing committees. There is no coherent and accessible set of rules by which the department operates--with both good and bad consequences. Instead, rules are made in an ad hoc fashion, and when a problem of application arises, professors rely on their memories as to what the relevant rules prescribe. As for its politics, the faculty operates on a consensus rather than factionalism. One of the basic vester interests of professors in History is the maintenance of that consensual basis of the department's politics. The attitude of the faculty toward change has not been very forward. Until this past year there were few indications of dissatisfaction with the status quo. It has been a status quo of an old fashioned and comfortable, sort, if also a very thoughtless sort. History professors have not generally been intellectuals about their work considered as a social task.

The chairmanship of the Department is a rotating post. The chairman is elected annually by the Executive Committee--the tenured members of the faculty.¹ A chairman is usually re-elected for a second or third year, depending upon his willingness to serve. The chairmanship is a position of considerable power. The chairman appoints his vice-chairman, subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee. (Vice-chairman usually serve for one year.) It is the chairman's prerogative to appoint personally all committees, although all committees are not in fact appointed by him at present. With regard to instructional practices in the Department, professors act on their own initiative, but it is within the power of the chairman to lay down the law to any professor using teaching methods he might consider improper. The one area in which the chairman does not have special power is that of hiring. The consensual nature of faculty politics is an important general limitation on the chairman's power.²

The faculty is divided into three caucuses--American, European and Non-Western. The present chairman, Mr. Cronon, being an American historian, acts as chairman of the American caucus. Mr. Senn, recently vice-chairman of the Department, is Mr. Cronon's designated liason with the European caucus, and presides over its meetings. The Non-Western caucus is not only chaired, but also controlled by Mr. Curtin. The caucuses do not meet regularly and have no formal authority. They do not generally vote on issues, so that the very great informal influence which the caucuses exercise over degree program, curriculum, and other matters in its field is largely the influence of the tenured members of the caucus. That influence is exercised upon the Executive Committee of the faculty which makes the actual decisions.

The whole faculty meets once every two weeks. When the chairman announces that the meeting is to go into executive session, non-tenured faculty members are obliged to leave. The remaining Executive Committee is the sole legislative body in the Department except in the approval of new courses, where the whole faculty votes. The division of the meeting into full and executive sessions also operates to give the tenured men greater access to information. Many professors both tenured and non-tenured do not go to faculty meetings, and the result is that departmental power is largely exercised by a body of regulars.

All committees are established by vote of the Executive Committee, and as we have already stated, it lies within the power of the chairman to appoint their members. There are three standing committees of importance in the Department--Planning, Budget and Fellowship. The Planning Committee serves as the chairman's advisory board. He appoints its members and it meets only at his request. It does not report to the Executive Committee. The Planning Committee was instituted two years ago. The Budget Committee reviews salaries--but not ranks--once a year and sends its recommendations to the

Dean of Letters and Science, who makes salary decisions. The Budget Committee is composed of full professors, and is elected annually by the Executive Committee. The Fellowship Committee prepares lists of candidates for submission to the Graduate School for the all - University competition for fellowships and scholarships. It directly awards any monies arising from History Department endowments. The endowments amount to only \$200 - \$1200 in any given year. The Fellowship Committee is composed of one representative from each of the three caucuses and was chaired this past year by a fourth, the vice chairman of the Department. Before the Fellowship Committee was first established this spring, fellowship and scholarship candidates were taken from the top of the TA list. The Committee was established presumably because the new system for appointing TA's gives no weight to professors' recommendations. Before the Committee, the occasional monies declared available by the Graduate School were awarded through informal inquiries. The vice-chairman, working with the administrative assistant to the Department, would simply inquire among faculty members to discover who should have the money.

In addition to standing committees, there are usually a number of ad hoc study committees, such as the recent committees on graduate financial aids and on program changes in American History, and the current committee on the honors program. A list of the current committees and their members is available.

The hiring of new professors begins in the caucuses. Members of the caucus propose a search committee, which is then more or less elected. Individual professors then suggest the names of men they want hired. If the search committee should fail to agree on names, it can maintain consensus by not acting at all. When the search committee has selected its names, the Executive Committee votes on them. They are then transmitted by the chairman to the Dean of Letters and Science, who transmits them to the President, who in turn

recommends to the Regents that they be hired. The real power in hiring lies with the tenured members of the caucus.

Advancements in rank and tenure decisions are also effectively controlled by the tenured members of each caucus. This control reinforces the consensual basis of faculty politics. In deciding to grant a man tenure, the tenured members naturally consider whether or not they will be able to work with him. They also grant tenure to men who they know they cannot actively work with, but who they assume will at least not rock the boat. Men who hope to be seriously considered for tenure are aware of these considerations, and behave accordingly.

All changes in course offerings must be approved by the faculty in full session. Most curriculum change, however, occurs through the independent action of individual professors within the framework of existing course offerings. A professor may drastically revise a course while retaining its title; the faculty does not interfere.

Two attempts at change in the Department this past spring -- one successful and one a failure -- show the political process at work. The Executive Committee adopted sweeping changes in the graduate program in American History in early May, to be effective September 1969. The changes involved a reduction of the number of graduates admitted to the program each year from no upper limit -- in practice about 85 -- to an imposed limit of 50; a change of admissions procedure from admission at the discretion of the individual tenured professor (admitting for himself and perhaps for a non-tenured colleague) to admission by committee; elimination of the tie to a major professor for a period of time; provision for a MA - without - thesis option; elimination of credit for taking undergraduate lecture courses in favor of more seminars, proseminars and independent study; and some TA experience for all in so far as possible. Changes going beyond just the graduate program were: provision for a meeting of

the American caucus each semester to oversee course offerings in their entirety to insure a balance; and a reduction in the number of period lecture courses offered, with a corresponding broadening of the periods. These changes were carried not by the old guard in the American caucus such as Mr. Cronon and Mr. Jensen, but by young professors who have not been in the Department long. Over the opposition of Mr. Cronon, new and young men such as Mssrs. Katz, Glad and Conkin⁴ succeeded in beating down the laissez nous faire attitude which has been traditional in the Department. The changes may on balance be bad, owing to the impact of the changes in the numbers and procedure of admissions. Yet their authors have compelled the caucus -- if not the whole Department -- to use their minds about their work considered as a collective and social task.

An attempt to bring greater self - consciousness to the European caucus was defeated at about the same time. Mr. Koehl proposed that the caucus meet once a month, that it elect a three - man steering committee, and that it elect an ad hoc committee to study the implications of the changes in the graduate program in the American field. Mr. Koehl proposed in effect that the caucus acquire a sense of direction. While a favorable vote of the caucus on these proposals would have to have been ratified by the Executive Committee, the proposals did not get that far. All three were voted down handily in the caucus, with the younger professors either voting against them or abstaining. It was felt that these changes involved unnecessary tinkering with a situation that was essentially satisfactory.

A recurrent theme in this essay is consensus, the consensus of those actively involved in departmental decision-making. Consensus has proved an obstacle to change because it is primarily a conservative consensus, because those who take active roles in departmental decision-making have not been receptive to innovation. But even those

faculty members who are outside and who are sympathetic to student interests have in the past practiced and counselled moderation, fearing faculty pressure on one side and student pressure on the other. Faculty who want radical change will have to learn to surmount this barrier; students should recognize its implications in their struggle for power.

Another theme is the power of tenure. Students seeking to acquire some power in the running of the Department are demanding something which is for the most part denied to non-tenured faculty. That does not impair the justice of the demand. Students can acquire a formal advisory role -- something far short of power -- if they want it, but they should not imagine that any such role can put them on an equal footing with even non-tenured faculty. Non-tenured faculty are listened to because they are colleagues and because they are prospective tenured faculty. Graduate students are not listened to because they are conceived of as traditional apprentices, and undergraduates are naturally not even heard. The power of tenure must be replaced with the power of faculty and students.

FOOTNOTES

1. Associate and full professors always have tenure; instructors and assistant professors rarely do.

2. The recent past chairmen have been Messrs. Wyllie and Jensen. The current chairman is Mr. Cronon, whose vice-chairmen have been Messrs. Rothstein and Sewell. He has made an appointment for the coming year, but it has not been confirmed at the time of writing.

3. The members of the committees for 1967 - 1968 were as follows. Planning Committees: Messrs. Cronon, Bogue, Curtin, Hamerow and Harrison. Budget Committee Messrs. Cronon, Bogue, Curtin, Hamerow and Edson. Fellowship Committee: Mr. Sewell as chairman, and Messrs. Katz, Kingdon and Curtin, who the chairmen of the fellowship subcommittees in the

caucuses. American Fellowship Subcommittee: Mssrs. Katz and Nesbit. European Fellowship Subcommittee: Mssrs. Kingdon, Harrison and Cameron. Non-Western Fellowship Subcommittee: Mssrs. Curtin, Boardman and Smail.

4. Mr. Katz is an assistant professor; Mssrs. Glad and Conkin are full professors.

PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROGRAM

The program of the H.S.A. is in two parts. Part I comprises our demands respecting the internal structure and functioning of the University. In Part II, we present our demands for changing the relationship of the university to society.

As we have explained, we see the reforms within the university as contributing to the larger fight by producing a democratic atmosphere in which a critical approach to society can be developed. Our demands are aimed mainly at the elimination of the authoritarian character of the university. This authoritarianism is of a piece with the repressive mechanisms of the society at large. By striking at authoritarianism in the university, we take a step toward its elimination in the society. We teach people to be free.

PROGRAM OF THE H.S.A.

PART I: TO CHANGE THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONING OF THE UNIVERSITY.

1. DEMOCRATIZE THE UNIVERSITY BY INSTITUTING GOVERNANCE OF THE UNIVERSITY BY STUDENTS AND FACULTY. IN THE HISTORY DEPARTMENT, ESTABLISH EQUAL AUTHORITY OF STUDENTS AND FACULTY.

Student discontent is not a result of a failure of communication, and its remedy is not a series of student - faculty committees for the purpose of talking about things, Mulvihill Report to the contrary notwithstanding. Student discontent arises from a conflict of interest. The professor wants to do his research, but the student wants a more conscientious teacher. Student discontent arises from a conflict of fundamental ideas about teaching which won't be ironed out around a table. The professor likes traditional teaching forms based

upon imposed authority because they are efficient (from his perspective), and above all because they support his self-esteem and sense of security. Students want control over their own lives. They are suffering under the strong and friendly hand from above. They know that the existing system isn't even a satisfactory frame in which to spend four, six, or eight years devoted to learning.

The H.S.A. proposes equal voting power for students and faculty in the Department of History. That power should be exercised in an assembly having most or all of the authority of the whole departmental faculty. All faculty members should have a vote, and students should have as many voting representatives as there are faculty members. Under graduate majors and graduates should share the student representation equally and should freely decide how their representatives are to be chosen. The student representatives should be empowered to sit with the caucuses as well. Institute governance of the Department by students and faculty.

2. ELIMINATE THE COERCIVE TOOL OF GRADING BY ABOLISHING THE GRADING SYSTEM AND SUBSTITUTE A MUTUAL EVALUATION PROCESS.

Grades are the foremost weapon in the university's arsenal. They discourage any student initiative, experimentation or questioning, and produce instead, docile consumers of facts, programmed periodically to regurgitate what the book or the professor says. Grades promote ruthless competition, cheating, plagiarism, and, perhaps worst, the subservient manner and mentality of the slave. The student often internalizes the grade as a measure of his own worth, a process so destructive as to create long waiting lists for university psychiatrists. Grades not only divert the energies of students from
real

learning to successful performance on exams, but also divert the energies of teachers from teaching to the devising and operating of elaborate systems of evaluation. In fact, the psychological, intellectual and social perversions attendant upon grading are so numerous as to require further enumeration and analysis in a forthcoming H.S.A. pamphlet, which will also present suggestions for alternate systems of evaluation.

3. FREE STUDENTS FROM THE COERCIVE CONDITION OF FINANCIAL INSECURITY BY PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR ALL STUDENTS FOR THE DURATION OF THEIR EDUCATION.

The granting or withholding of financial support is another aspect of the coercive reward and punishment structure. Those who toe the line get the money. The H.S.A. demands an end to the contradictions of a system in which a social task (i.e. being a student) is paid for with private funds. We demand guaranteed financial support for all students, to free students to learn and to think.

4. ESTABLISH THE PRIMACY OF TEACHING IN THE UNIVERSITY BY ELIMINATING THE PRESSURE TO PUBLISH AND INSTITUTING A POLICY OF HIRING AND FIRING TEACHING FACULTY ON THE BASIS OF THEIR TEACHING.

5. MAKE LEARNING A COOPERATIVE EXPERIENCE BY INSTITUTING THE TEACHING CONTRACT OPTION, BY WHICH STUDENTS AND TEACHERS CAN DECIDE ON WHAT THEY WANT TO LEARN AND TEACH, AND BY WHAT MEANS.

These days there are few defenders of an outright authoritarian educational structure. It is generally understood that students cannot be merely passive and receptive if, first, they are to learn much at all, and second, if their learning is to have meaning for them. But the way in which that understanding has been put into practice has fallen short of achieving meaningful learning. Students are encouraged to take an active part within a framework which they are expected to passively accept. This encouragement within-bounds is consonant with the prevailing attitude which puts more emphasis on getting stu-

dents to learn than upon making learning meaningful to them. The teacher still dominates in the classroom, the seminar and the lab. If the students are to commit themselves to learning--students and teacher must be able to determine general goals jointly, and each partner must be able to take the initiative at every stage in the process of learning. There must be give-and-take, joint decision-making, and mutual feedback.

As a modest gesture in the direction of realizing the ideal of a two-way educational process, we would like to propose the teaching contract. The concept of the teaching contract implies that the teacher and students are relatively equal at least in the initial stages of their relationship. Hopefully, students come to a teacher because there is something they want, even need, to learn from him. The teacher, in turn, comes to the students expecting to be of help to them and to learn from them. There is thus no reason why the teacher should assume that what he plans to teach is necessarily what the students need to learn. Even less is it possible for the teacher to assume that his method of teaching will be usefull to the students. The notion of the teaching contract is meant to stress the mutuality of the educational process. Basically, it calls for the general assembly of teacher and students at the beginning of the semester to decide what the curriculum and method of teaching in the course will be. Both the teachers and the students will be free to make whatever proposals they desire. Neither will be permitted to dictate terms to the other. The contract is an understanding approved by both partners. It should involve the material to be covered in the course, the books to be used and the procedures for the teaching (lectures, tutorials, discussions or some possible combination of these and other methods) and evaluating (examinations, interviews, collective work projects or some form of self-evaluation) of both teacher and students.

Obviously, the teaching contract may prove difficult to implement. Students are accustomed to playing a purely passive role in the classroom. And even with the adoption of the contractual procedure,

the authority of the teacher, thanks to the one-sided and arbitrary grading system, may outweigh the power of the students. Finally, the students themselves may be divided over what they wish to see done in a course. Nevertheless, the way to overcome such obstacles is not by ignoring them, but by practical experience in working out teaching contracts. The teaching contract can be the means through which students both recognize their passivity and begin to overcome it.

6. INSTITUTE A CRITICAL APPROACH TO LEARNING. IN HISTORY, ABANDON THE SURVEY PRINCIPLE, AND ALLOW STUDENTS TO TAKE AN ACTIVE ROLE BY EXERCISING THEIR INTELLECTS ON HISTORICAL PROBLEMS.

The survey principle must go! Its main consequence is an agreeable stupidity. It is based on mistaken notions about what is actually achieved by teaching history and about how people learn. You start at the beginning of a historical period of half a century, a century, or even two thousand years, and you run through to the end. Everything of importance is touched on, without undue emphasis on anything. The exams, correspondingly, are composed to find out if you've "covered" everything. There is an allied notion that the object of the course is not merely to teach information, but an organized body of knowledge. So the information is held together with a few broad, easy and uncontested generalizations--useful for rote learning, but for nothing beyond. The survey principle involves an additional feature, derived from a misunderstanding of historical inquiry itself. There is, namely, a specious notion that we can't obtain complete objectivity, but we can approach it--that the values and broad propositions which govern our analysis of present society have no necessary links with our interpretation of the past. Above all, the survey course should not exhibit such ostensibly incidental links--they would disturb its catholicity. So the points of view which do in fact inform the course--and determine its emphases and choices--are neither acknowledged nor distinguished from others. Coverage and the generalization of convenience, and pretended objectivity are the features of the survey principle.*

The necessary alternative is the course which is organized around problems or questions, which clarifies the values and broad propositions underlying the choice of problems, and which uses the problems to teach historical analysis. In a course on American history since 1929, for example, professor and students could decide to devote the semester to the problems based on the New Deal, the origins of the Cold War, and the McCarthy (Joe) era. Historical analysis is studying causes and consequences. It is generalizing about events and testing generalizations. It is pitting one interpretation against another, and not merely gathering evidence for a favored interpretation. It requires exercising the intellect. Its processes contribute to the exercise of intellect in approaching the problems of our own time.

The surveyor -- the defender of the survey principle -- will reply that you have to have a body of knowledge in order to set to work on a historical problem, and hence people must have survey principle courses as necessary preambles to historical analysis in the more advanced courses. Spend three weeks reading a textbook and you know how it works and what you can expect to find there. When you begin work on a historical problem, you develop a need and desire for certain background knowledge to help answer the questions raised by the problem. And you seek it out because it serves a purpose.

In the name of relevance and spirited learning, the survey principle must go.

*Not all of those course commonly called surveys are run on the survey principle. It is the principle which is under attack here.

PART II: TO CHANGE THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE UNIVERSITY TO SOCIETY

Our total vision of society necessarily brings us beyond the reform and democratization of the History Department or even the university. We feel that our department--together with others--can be the spearhead for a university wide movement which will lead to faculty and students democratically reorganizing the university in which they work and live, and beginning to operate it for the benefit of the entire society.

The central question is how we conceive the relationship of the university to society, to the forces which operate within the society. As we have explained, the University of Wisconsin, like all American universities, is an integral part of the major aspects of the American way-of-life: imperialism abroad, racism and capitalist exploitation at home.

To state as a long term objective that we seek to sever the relationship of the university to these phenomena does not mean that we desire the creation of a university-utopia, sheltered and detached from society. Instead, we call for the initiation of a long political struggle which will transform the University of Wisconsin into a critical university, a center of research and learning in constant dialectical rapport with the society. We do not want a neutral university, but rather one which develops both critical thinking and fruitful activity. It will advance the realization of human potentiality just as the present university acts in concert with those forces which tend to limit and suppress it.

This transformation will not come about overnight, but will rather be the result of a continually changing balance of forces, not only on campus, but also in the State at large. The demands listed below will be fought for in the spirit of revolutionary reformism; we will be neither bought off nor contented by the

conquest of all or some of them. They will only be utilized as stepping stones from which to launch new and even more far reaching demands. They are not traditional in that we do not ask them as a favor from an institution; we assert our right to carry them out on the principle that it is we who constitute the university. If we succeed as a result of university agitation, it will be both an indication of the strength of the Left, as well as an additional reinforcement of it. The content of these demands is such that if utilized properly they will definitely hinder the operation of imperialism, racism, and capitalist exploitation, and will succeed in creating internal crises in the university. Even if it is impossible to reach the objective of the critical university, the very struggle will have a radicalizing effect on the university community.

In this spirit, the H.S.A., in addition to its demands for change in the internal structure and functioning of the university, pledges its political support for the following programs:

1. DEMOCRATIZE THE COMPOSITION OF THE UNIVERSITY WITH REGARD TO THE BLACK POPULATION, AND THE POOR AND WORKING CLASSES.

a. There must be a black student enrollment at least equal to the national proportion of blacks in the population; a minimum of 3,000 black students must be brought to the university on scholarship.

b. The university must also actively recruit students from all poverty areas, and from working class areas.

c. Establish summer school clinics for these students in order to compensate for inferior educations.

d. Expand the curriculum to include black history and culture as a way for black students to better understand their own heritage, and for white students to combat white racism.

2. UTILIZE THE RESOURCES OF THE UNIVERSITY FOR PROGRESSIVE ENDS.

a. Extend and revise the School for Workers so that it functions as a place where workers can become critically aware of their role in society.

b. Establish a positive program of technical and pedagogical aid to those underdeveloped countries striving for independence from imperialism.

3. SEVER UNIVERSITY CONNECTIONS WITH THE DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT.

a. Cancel the \$1.2 million in defense contracts.

b. Prohibit faculty members from working for the State Department, Defense Department, and C.I.A.

c. Abolish the Army Mathematics Research Center.

d. Abolish military and C.I.A. recruiting on campus.

e. . . . Air Force, Army and Naval R.O.T.C.

Additional copies available from:

H.S.A.
439 W. Dayton St.
Madison, Wisconsin 53703