

ZEDEK, a quarterly.

The official journal of the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation, the only independent organization defending social activist professors whose basic constitutional and civil rights have been violated.

Subscription Rates: \$ 10/yr. USA/Canada; elsewhere \$ 12.50/yr.
Institutional Rates: \$ 15/yr. USA/Canada; elsewhere \$ 20/yr.

ZEDEK

Volume III, Number 2

(May, 1983)

Page

- 173 Editorial: The Bishops Letter
- 174 Nuss Denied Tenure at Wayne State University
- 174 The Threat of Nuclear War to Children and Youth
- 175 Sister Mansour Leaves the Church
to Serve the Oppressed
- 176 Cases of Academic Repression
Reviewed in ZEDEK (Nov., 1980-
May, 1983)
- 177 Male Chauvinism, Nepotism, and
the Van Wormer Case: Kent State
Continues Its Program of
Academic Repression by
Helen R. Samberg
- 184 The Vita of K.S. van Wormer
- 186 SAPDF Seeking New Supporters
- 186 Some of the Men and Women Who
Have Endorsed the Aims of
SAPDF



Desiderius Erasmus (c. 1466-1536)

The Erasmus portrait, at the right, by Hans Holbein, is one of many of Holbein's works now on exhibit at the Morgan Library, 29 East 36th St., New York, N.Y., from April 20 - July 30, 1983. The exhibit is entitled "Holbein and the Court of Henry VIII."

SAPDF and the Staff of ZEDEK wish a very happy birthday to Scott Nearing, SAPDF's oldest

member and endorser. Scott will be 100 years old on August 16, 1983. If you wish to send him a personal greeting his address is: Harborside, Maine 04642.

ZEDEK, the official journal of the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation is published at 19329 Monte Vista, Detroit, Michigan 48221 U.S.A.

Editor: R.M. Frumkin. Associate Editors: Helen R. Samberg, F. Joseph Smith.

All news items, articles, reviews, letters, contributions, and other correspondence should be sent to the above address. Materials expected to be returned should be accompanied by self-addressed stamped envelopes.

Editorial

THE BISHOPS LETTER

SAPDF joins with all who would work for a halt to the nuclear arms race between the world's two superpowers. We, therefore, express our admiration, respect and endorsement of the "Bishops Letter" arrived at in its third and final draft on May 3rd, 1983 at a special meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in Chicago where a two-thirds majority vote was necessary for passage.

Two full days of debate and much criticism from within the Church and by governmental forces; efforts not to alienate in this third draft; evaluations based on the first and second drafts which occurred in Nov., 1982 and Jan., 1983, and including the two-day International Conference of Bishops at the Vatican, representing Britain, France, West Germany, Netherlands, Belgium, and Italy and the European Council, at which being cautious and going slowly was strongly recommended regarding the moral issues involved - through it all, Joseph Cardinal Bernadin, U.S. Chairperson, and his capable committee of bishops George A. Fulcher, Daniel P. Reilly, Thomas J. Gumbleton, and John J. O'Connor never lost sight of the goal. They were working for a nuclear arms race halt (their expression) which would speak as the Catholic Church's moral viewing and guidance for its 51 million U.S. Catholics specifically on this internationally vital issue.

On May 3rd, 1983, by a vote of 238 to 9 the 150-page "Bishops Letter" entitled THE CHALLENGE OF PEACE: GOD'S PROMISE AND OUR RESPONSE was approved. Cardinal Bernadin saw this third and final drafted document as an instrument of major importance for teaching throughout the Church (as the bishops agreed it would be used), as well as a continuing factor in the wider public debate over nuclear weapons.

Some moral issues addressed were the reconciliation of "the lesser of two evils" issue as it related to the matter of the use of the deterrence strategy. Much exploration brought the moral issue into clear focus when it was recognized that choosing a "lesser evil" is morally unacceptable since this also would be acceptance of evil.

Many Catholics are debating now whether stockpiling nuclear weapons is moral and, in keeping with this idea, whether working in those industries which build and develop nuclear weapons is moral. They are also raising questions about the morality of working at U.S. nuclear military installations.

The document states that deterrence (the key rationale for U.S. present MX, Pershing Cruise Missiles planned for late 1983 deployment) is not possible as a long-term basis for peace.

On the issue of "first use" of nuclear weapons the letter said: "We do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear warfare, in however a restricted scale, can be morally justified." Since the danger of escalation is so great that it would be an unacceptable moral risk to initiate nuclear war in any form, the letter went on

Bishops Letter(continued)

to stress the "unlikelihood of a limited nuclear war would ever meet the Church's criteria for a "just war" of legitimate self-defense.

Further, they say that "Today the possibility of placing political and moral limits on nuclear war are so minimal that the moral task, like the medical, is prevention. To say 'No' to nuclear war is both a necessary and a complex task."

"Our arguments in this pastoral must be detailed and nuanced; but our 'No' to nuclear war must, in the end, be definitive and decisive." The bishops urged " a clear public resistance to the rhetoric of 'winnable' nuclear wars."

The "Bishops Letter" is one which addresses everyone everywhere. It does not exonerate, nor whitewash either the U.S. or U.S.S.R. A halt to a holocaust must address both, but neither is blameless in the madness. The U.S. government is pushing heavily, despite European and domestic protests, for the first strike deployment of missiles aimed at Moscow by December of 1983.

The "Bishops Letter" which courageously states its voted-for position (in line with other Americans who have been invidiously called "Moscow-duped") could well be both inspirational and the bridge between the secular and sacred institutions and people.

Let us never forget that only one nation has already used the nuclear bomb,

NUSS DENIED TENURE AT WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

In the February, 1983 issue of ZEDEK we reported that Shirley Nuss was recommended for tenure by the Wayne State University College of Liberal Arts Tenure and Promotions Committee and its Dean. However, we reluctantly now have to report that that decision was reversed by the Wayne State University Tenure and Promotions Committee, the Provost, and the President. The Nuss case, as a result of this action, is moving into formal arbitration. Any further developments will be reported in future issues of ZEDEK.

THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR WAR TO CHILDREN AND YOUTH

On May 14, 1983 the Wayne State University's Center for Peace and Conflict Studies, under its capable Director Lillian Genser, sponsored an all day Conference on the Threat of Nuclear War to Children and Youth. This Conference's featured speakers were two Harvard professors of psychiatry, Dr. William Beardslee and Dr. Robert Jay Lifton. The former is a child psychiatrist who headed up a three-year study on the impact of nuclear developments on children and teenagers. Dr. Lifton is widely known for his work with the victims of Hiroshima, U.S. combat veterans of the Vietnam War, and his tireless efforts in the Peace Movement.

Panels were purposely broad. They included both academicians and inner city high school students. There were also posters and readings by fifth graders with their poignant plea for a chance to reach adulthood.

Beardslee found from his experiences with adolescents that "... they know about the threat of nuclear war and are worried about it." In studies completed in late 1980, it was found that 40 percent of those surveyed voiced grave misgivings and fears as to their future plans and existence.

This same attitude in adolescents was found by the Educators

The Threat of Nuclear War(continued)

for Social Responsibility* as related to the Conference by Anna Marie Roeper, an international expert on gifted children.

Beardslee, Lifton, and Roeper all pointed to the problem adolescents were having with identity formation because of the growing perception of a non-permanent world. Nuclear related anxieties surface in reported nightmares. Adolescents are now having great difficulty with developing trust in the world's uncertain atmosphere.

Lifton said that the mushroom cloud image has cast a shadow on our society creating a "futurelessness" which may help to explain the growing dependence on drugs and alcohol and the attraction of apocalyptic cults for the young.

Roeper felt that the normal fears of the unknown, of separation and death are greatly magnified by the reality of the nuclear threat. She sees the adult role as insisting on more content on nuclear issues incorporated into curriculums and that there be efforts to fuse new hope that there will be a future world with peace and security.

One of the promising facts of the Conference was the number of persons involved - mainly teachers at various levels - who made it known that this was their initiation into the Peace Movement. These newcomers were resolved to work actively to save the world for children and the rest of us.

#####

* The address of Educators for Social Responsibility is: 639 Mass.Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 02139.

SISTER MANSOUR LEAVES THE CHURCH TO
SERVE THE OPPRESSED

Sister Agnes Mary Mansour, a member of the Sisters of Mercy, until her appointment by Michigan's Governor Blanchard to head up the state's Department of Social Services, had been the respected President of Mercy College in Detroit. She was known as a capable, liberal sponsor of some excellent programs of social significance and last year had run unsuccessfully in the Democratic primaries for Congress and met no stated objection from the local Archdiocese.

Following her December, 1982 appointment as Director of the Michigan Department of Social Services, Archbishop Edward Szoka, Detroit, opposed her accepting this position unless she publicly denounce state-funded abortions.

Sister Mansour stated that while she personally opposed abortion she could not and would not deny the operation to women who could not afford to pay for such an operation privately. Archbishop took the issue to the Vatican. To avoid problems with her status in the Church, Sister Mansour



Agnes Mary Mansour

Sister Mansour Leaves Church (continued)

requested a leave of absence from her religious order while working for the state of Michigan. Bishop Anthony Bevilacqua of Brooklyn, N.Y., representing Pope John Paul II, on May 9th, denied Sister Mansour's request and informed her that failure to resign would make her subject to a church trial and possible dismissal from her order.

Bishop Bevilacqua's action proved to be of considerable disturbance in and out of Church circles. Sister Mansour was strongly supported by her Order, The Sisters of Mercy, as well as many unaffiliated persons. She and the Sisters raised the issue of sexism because of the dogmatic, undemocratic way that the Church's all-male hierarchy was determining her fate. Faced with few reasonable options, Sister Mansour resigned from the Church and her Order. Her resignation was confirmed by the Vatican on May 13 and she was released from her vows and could remain a Roman Catholic.

Ms. Mansour (no longer addressed as Sister Mansour) will continue to live frugally, giving all unneeded income from her \$58,000 annual salary to the Sisters of Mercy. In the service of the state of Michigan, she sees her "vow of service to the poor, sick, uneducated and oppressed" as more meaningful than her former "vow of obedience" to the Church.

CASES OF ACADEMIC REPRESSION REVIEWED IN ZEDEK (Nov., 1980-May, 1983)

<u>Professors</u>	<u>Issue(s) Reviewed</u>
1. Ron Aronson	May, 1982
2. John Beecher	Feb., 1982
3. Maija Blaubergs	Feb., 1981
4. Alex Efthim	Nov., 1982
5. Pat Endress	Feb., 1981
6. R.M. Frumkin	Feb., 1982
7. Hans Küng	Feb., 1981
8. John Mecartney	Nov., 1982
9. Scott Nearing	Feb., 1981
10. Shirley Nuss	Feb., and May, 1983
11. Bertell Ollman	May-Aug., 1981
12. Melvin Rader	May-Aug., 1981
13. Bertrand Russell	Aug., 1982
14. Morris Schappes	Feb., 1982
15. F. Joseph Smith	Nov., 1980 and May-Aug., 1981
16. Charles Stastny	May-Aug., 1981
17. Katherine van Wormer	Feb. and May, 1983

MALE CHAUVINISM, NEPOTISM, AND THE VAN WORMER CASE: KENT STATE
CONTINUES ITS PROGRAM OF ACADEMIC REPRESSION

by Helen R. Samberg

William James once stated that the acid test of the truly educated person is this: "He knows a good person when he sees one."

By that sensitive test Kent State University has few decisionmakers who can claim the distinction of being truly educated because that University continues not to recognize but rather attempts to destroy some of its best professors. Thus, in the past decade, it caused three of its most distinguished professors to leave, namely, F. Joseph Smith in 1973, R.M. Frumkin in 1975, and Robert Dyal in 1980.

On May 15, 1980, the DAILY KENT STATER (on page 5 of that issue), the University's student daily newspaper, published Robert Dyal's "cry of anguish" as he called it. Unlike Smith and Frumkin, Dyal was not fired, he just decided he had had enough of Kent State. After 11 years on the faculty, tenured, middle-aged, with good friends and kindred spirits on the faculty and in the community, he decided he must leave.

A few of Dyal's remarks seem particularly relevant here. In that letter he said: "Why would I entertain such a radical and risky venture? My reasons are diverse. Some are benign and positive. On the other hand, I am motivated by feelings which tempt me to mimic the fictional anchorman in the film NETWORK, who shouted: 'I'm mad as hell and I'm not gonna take it anymore!' I am dismayed and disturbed with past events, present behaviors, and future prospects here at the university. I feel a sense of growing impotence and loneliness in the face of indifference and opposition to efforts to render Kent State habitable.

"What is uninhabitable here? Among the nexus of things too complex and numerous to address, I mention only the following as symptomatic of that which is no longer tolerable.

"First, the refusal of the administration to memorialize adequately that awful event that occurred here ten years ago, May 4, 1970. The insensitivity and incompetence displayed by two administrations which triggered the gym controversy during 1976-78 is only symbolic of the past ten years of neglect - whether benign or malignant.

"Second, the growing gulf between the administration and the faculty - not caused by collective bargaining as most administrators and some faculty believe, but by a pervasive and entrenched class-consciousness on the part of the administration, which collective bar-



Katherine van Wormer

*-----
The complete Dyal letter was reprinted in the Nov., 1980 ZEDEK.

Van Wormer Case(continued)

gaining has exposed. This managerial consciousness, buttressed by the elevated salary and prestige accorded administrators, has virtually always existed here but it is now "justified" by self-deceptive attitudes and exacerbated by an accelerating unresponsiveness and indifference on the part of academic administrators toward those without whom there would be no university and no need for anyone to manage it.

"Third, a failure of nerve and imagination on the part of the faculty in general, resulting in deepening alienation and further withdrawal into individual isolation, rather than collective action.....

"I lament, to be a faculty member at Kent State is to live with a broken heart."

Dyal, after publishing this letter, took a year's leave of absence from Kent State for the 1980-81 academic year with the option of returning during the 1981-82 academic year. He chose not to return.

When the 1983-84 academic year begins another Kent State professor will not be returning, namely, Katherine Stuart van Wormer who recently lost her struggle for tenure. The Feb.,1983 issue of ZEDEK presented a brief sketch of the van Wormer case. In this issue her case will be discussed in detail.

Alleged Reasons for the Denial of Tenure

Dr. Rudolph O. Buttlar, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, in his May 19,1982 memorandum to Dr. Thomas D. Moore, Assistant Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, stated in rather patronizing tones that it is not any one of the three categories of professor performance (that is, scholarship, teaching, and service) which is significant in her being denied tenure but rather "Whether the record of performance of the candidate in the sum of the three categories of assessment has been and is anticipated to be of a level and quality such as to warrant permanent affiliation with the Department, the College, and the University."(emphasis added)

Having said that Dean Buttlar quickly contradicts himself when he says that "In Professor van Wormer's case, the more serious -- indeed, the decisive -- reservations have been with regard to her ...essential role in an undergraduate unit as a classroom teacher." (emphasis added)

Not satisfied to contradict himself once, he does it again when he states that" As stated in the UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING TENURE....'The granting of tenure is a deliberate and important decision, initiated by a candidate's peers and eventually made by the Trustees of the University. Since this decision could result in life-long employment at this institution for a faculty member, it should involve more than a mere survey of the candidate's minimum quantifiable activities. Essentially, those involved in making a tenure decision are asking the question, 'Is this the kind of person we want as a colleague for the rest of his/her career?' The way that question is answered strongly influences the general quality of the University's faculty and thus the stature and well-being of the University" (emphases had been added by Dr. Buttlar)

Note that Dean Buttlar underlined, emphasized two very crucial points: (1.)the granting of tenure should"involve more than a mere survey of the candidate's minimum quantifiable activities.Essentially those involved in making a tenure decision are asking the question (2.),'Is this the kind of person we want as a colleague for the rest of his/her career?'"

Van Wormer Case(continued)

What Dean Buttlar then is really suggesting is that it is not the sum of the three performance categories and it is not specifically the alleged teaching inadequacies which are responsible for vanWormer's being denied tenure but it is rather simply a matter of her all-male departmental colleagues not wanting her as a colleague for the rest of her career.

It seems that when she was originally brought into the Criminal Justice Studies Department in January, 1978 to teach, among other courses, two special courses on Minorities in Criminal Justice and Women in Crime and Justice, she was brought in precisely because she is a humanist, feminist, and has had favorable experiences working with Black students. Her department chairperson, Dr. Albert Bhak, had told her that racism and sexism were attributes of the department he was hoping she would help change.

Coming from a background in teaching the behavioral sciences, particularly sociology, rather than from a police background, as did most of her all-male departmental colleagues, van Wormer manifested some values significantly different from theirs. Her Quaker religious background also was a source of contention because it manifested itself in a teaching style and lifestyle relatively foreign to these men.

Van Wormer's colleagues were accustomed to a teaching style that was based on an authoritarian kind of orientation rather than the more democratic one manifested by her. They found it difficult to comprehend or appreciate her more open approach to teaching and interacting with students.



Albert Bhak

Reviewing the yearly evaluations of the departmental chairperson, Dr. Albert Bhak, is most interesting. During her first few years these evaluations were most favorable. She even had a Merit Award. And then, almost suddenly, the evaluations seemed to have deteriorated. One has to ask: why?

At the very same time that her departmental evaluations were deteriorating, her teaching evaluations by students were improving and her classes were continuing to grow larger and more popular than other criminal justice classes.

Does the increasing popularity of a teacher in elective courses indicate poor teaching? Do students flock to courses they cannot stand? Anyone who knows students knows the answer to that question. Why then was there such a huge perceptual gap in the observations of departmental faculty evaluations of her teaching and the observations of non-departmental faculty? And why, why were the departmental faculty evaluations not signed by most of the evaluators? In what way do the police backgrounds of van Wormer's departmental colleagues conflict

with the behavioral science/humanist orientation she manifested in her teaching, writing, and public appearances?

It would be instructive at this point for the reader to examine an anonymous departmental teaching evaluation and then, for contrast, then examine one by a faculty member outside of the department.

The following is a letter of evaluation from one of van Wormer's departmental colleagues:

Van Wormer Case (continued)

(Note to reader: The spelling and grammatical errors are those of the anonymous evaluator)

Dear Dr. Bhak:

I visited Dr. Katherine van Wormer's class, Introduction to Criminal Justice, 12:05 to 12:55 Friday, October 9, 1981 for the Departmental evaluation. The text used was Criminal Justice in America by Kratcoski and Walker, which I cannot make an evaluation because authors are part of this faculty although this is not a best seller.

The syllabus outline 1-10 should have accompanying bibliography and more relevant division - division seems to be popularistic. Grading policy has error - what does a student get who falls between 50 and 59? Extra credit points are not spelled out clearly - foggy! I'd rather see bibliography with the course outline. Too much of the bibliography is popularistic and appears to have been thrown together without any specific organization.

This was the second year that I evaluated Dr. van Wormer. There was approximately 40 students present and this was considerably less than the class enrollment of 89. The first fifteen minutes was disrupted by the arrival of late students. The beginning of class Dr. van Wormer handed back examinations to 10 or so students who had missed the class the previous time when exams were returned. During the 5-10 minutes that this took, class was very noisy and Dr. van Wormer's reprimand did not have much effect. The next 5 minutes she wrote a continuum-investigation to sentencing on the board. Students were supposed to have read chapter, most had not, so no questions. Consequently, the informal lecture was not as effective as it could have been. Once the class got warmed to task, they did participate some and were reasonably attentive. The lecturer was unusually nervous and made some minor errors in content. The content seemed to be from a critical position of system that was value oriented at the expense of factual material and alternative approaches. Van Wormer ask for examples why do defense attorneys have low status. However, her presentation was unclear and confusing as no distinction between status and esteem was made. The issues should have been on income, clients, and performance of work as determinants.

She ended the period speaking on court systems, warrants, booking, etc.. Students ask questions about search of auto - flustered, talked fast and defensive. Question was never really answered.

- Evaluation:
1. No real improvement from last year.
 2. One of two weakest Introductory classes visited - out of four.
 3. Text - OK
 4. Syllabus - weak, confusing and poorly organized.
 5. Class did not seem to have respect for professor - noisy read papers, etc.
 6. Material presented in value oriented manner.
 7. Unusually nervous - Lecture - Question not carried out effeciently.

#####

Now compare the following letter by someone outside her department:

Dear Professor Bhak:

Subject: Peer Evaluation of Professor Katherine S. Van Wormer

In respect to the peer evaluation for Professor Katherine Van Wormer, I attended her class in Introduction to Criminal Justice on Wednesday, November 7, 1979. In addition, I reviewed her course outline and examined student evaluations from a prior quarter. In under-

Van Wormer Case(continued)

taking this evaluation I was particularly interested to what extent the instructor was following the general guidelines of teaching effectiveness advocated by the department of Criminal Justice Studies.

The course materials were well organized in accordance with the first guideline. The syllabus clearly described the course objectives, the required text, topical subject and study progression. The mode of instruction and classroom procedure were listed in addition to the procedure for doing extra credit work for a higher grade.

In respect to the second general guideline on learning, I found the classroom atmosphere to be conducive to the arousing of intellectual curiosity and exchange of views within the terms of the course objectives. The students in this relatively large class were attentive and interested in the material being discussed. A number of students actively participated in the discussion with pertinent and relevant questions and comments. Several students talked to Professor Van Wormer at the end of the class. Her presentation on adversary systems was done in an interesting fashion.

The third general guideline on preparation and delivery was also of very high quality. Professor Van Wormer used source material from a book by the noted attorney, F. Lee Bailey, to describe the tactics lawyers use to win cases. She also related specific illustrations used by other attorneys practicing in the legal field. The professor also described the main points of a book entitled INJUSTICE FOR ALL which was critical of the adversary system.

The lecture was coherent, informative and the major points of focus were clearly spelled out. Her syllabus indicates a variety of knowledgeable guest speakers scheduled for the class as well as current provocative films concerned with the criminal justice system. She also announced current lectures and movies related to criminal justice and encouraged students to attend them. She made use of the blackboard and also gave close reference to materials in the readings. Her voice was interesting and easy to understand. She was very familiar with the material, made little use of notes and looked at students who were attentive and taking notes.

Overall Professor Van Wormer did an excellent job in presenting the material and conforming to the general guidelines for peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness developed by the department of Criminal Justice Studies.

Sincerely,

(signed) Byron G. Lander
Associate Professor (Political Science)

#####

The letter by Professor Lander is an important one because he is not only a distinguished professor of political science and a scholar but also because he is a practicing attorney noted for his fairness and objectivity.

It is most interesting to read about the evaluations of van Wormer's scholarship. The early evaluations of her scholarship were very strong, almost all characterizing her scholarship as of superior quality. However, by 1982, Dr. Bhak reversed himself completely stating: "As a whole, the overall assessment of her scholarship as I presented in my recommendation letter to be 'acceptable,' not outstanding or superior, appears to be fair and just. My rating was more in recognition of her effort and motivational value than of quality. As I see as was the opinions of the Review Committee members, her works lacked quality as evidenced by intellectually shallow and devoid of methodological vigor. Most of her works are characterized by being impressionistic, of commentary nature, even sensitizing." Examination of van Wormer's publications reveals to outside, more objective

Van Wormer Case(continued)

observers a growing maturity in her scholarship which is not as relatively evident in the work of her departmental colleagues. Her enemies have denigrated her quality of publications as well as the nature of the journals in which they appeared. These criticisms of her writings by her enemies, most of whom are not half the scholar she is, seem to be largely without merit.

Dr. Bhak's early evaluations of van Wormer's service were very positive but, just as with his teaching and scholarship evaluations, grew more and more negative with each passing year. The changes in his evaluations seem, to this observer, to be a function of the University's need to justify its denial of tenure to van Wormer. One wonders about how Dr. Bhak feels today about his recommendation of van Wormer for the \$300 merit award granted during her first year at Kent State. In noting her accomplishments he stated that with regard to her teaching:

1. Students' evaluation of teaching in courses shown to be 'good' to 'superior.'
2. Course materials are up to date and syllabi are refreshing.
3. Academic advisement has been outstanding."

With regard to her scholarship, he stated that she published a monograph and book review and had two articles accepted for publication. With regard to service Bhak mentioned the fact that she was a "1. Member of the Women's Study Program Committee. 2. Gave speeches to local and educational organizations on the subject dealing with women and criminal justice. 3. Effective in student advisement, especially for female students."

Professor van Wormer contends that her being denied tenure had little to do with her professional performance but everything to do with her values, her creed, and her political orientation. Judging from the documents available, the contention seems to have great merit.

Male Chauvinism and Nepotism

Before van Wormer joined the Criminal Justice Studies Department at the Kent State University there were no women in their Department and most members had a police background. From the beginning of her appointment, although she was hired in part because she was a woman and feminist and because she did not have a police background but had had experience with minorities, particularly Blacks, there was some conflict with her colleagues. She was a kind of stranger in a strange land, a woman among men, a sociologist among mostly non-sociologically oriented policemen, a productive scholar among relatively less scholarly persons, a progressive person among relatively more conservative ones. The slow but sure alienation between van Wormer and her colleagues must somehow be related to the male chauvinism and nepotism which, ironically, originally prompted her appointment. Her great rapport with Blacks and grasp of Black issues seemed to have led to the surfacing of anti-Black, racist sentiments among the more conservative students in the department and led to some of the negative student feedback which was deliberately used by the department against her. Because van Wormer dealt with sensitive, controversial women's and minority issues she became a center of departmental controversy. This controversy was used to build a case against her being granted tenure.

(continued on next page)

"The things which are done in secret are things that people are ashamed even to speak of ; but the things exposed to the light will be illuminated and anything exposed by the illumination turns into light."

- St. Paul

The Van Wormer Case (continued)Professor B. Earle Roberts' Double Standard of Justice

In March, 1978 Professor B. Earle Roberts, Professor of Criminal Justice Studies at Kent State signed a letter with 12 other Kent State professors supporting the idea that it would be just for the University to revoke the doctorate of former graduate Andres Bermudez if it was found that he in fact plagiarized part of his dissertation.^{1/} Professor Roberts was very clear about what standard the University should use in this particular case, that is, students must be severely punished for engaging in the dishonest practice of plagiarism.

However, in April, 1983, when it was called to the attention of Professor Roberts and the other 12 anti-plagiarism professors that two tenured professors at Kent State were guilty of plagiarism and the evidence on this was unequivocal and valid, Professor Roberts and all of the 12 other professors who signed the March, 1978 letter which appeared in the daily newspaper, RECORD-COURIER (published in Northeast Ohio), chose not to take any action against them. Rather they chose to cover up this case of plagiarism of professors by not responding to the evidence.

Of what relevance is this to the van Wormer case? Professor Roberts was one of the professors voting against granting her tenure. In voting against van Wormer's tenure, i.e., covering up the faculty plagiarism but taking a stand against student plagiarism, Professor Roberts violated van Wormer's right to equal protection.

Why? Van Wormer lost her job because she was different from her colleagues, because she did not fit into the Criminal Justice Studies Dept. She was not guilty of any unethical behavior. She was not guilty of plagiarism as are two of the tenured colleagues of Professor Roberts, colleagues protected by Professor Roberts. The tenured professors guilty of plagiarism had their jobs protected because they did fit into their department. As Dr. Rudolph O. Buttlar, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Kent State, emphasized, quoting the UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING TENURE, "Essentially, those involved in making a tenure decision are asking the question, 'Is this the kind of person we want as a colleague for the rest of his/her career?'" The way that question is answered strongly influences the general quality of the University's faculty and thus the stature and well-being of the University." (emphasis added by Dr. Buttlar) Apparently Professor Roberts supports his faculty colleagues who are guilty of plagiarism because these are the kinds of persons he wants as colleagues for the rest of their careers. Apparently Professor Roberts prefers colleagues who are plagiarists more than an ethical, scholarly woman who is different from himself and his departmental and University colleagues. The differential treatment accorded Katherine van Wormer by Professor Roberts and his colleagues and the University, therefore, represents a clear case of the violation of equal protection. Her formal complaints of discrimination made to the EEOC (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) and the Ohio Civil Rights Commission seem entirely justified.

On the basis of the facts observed, Professor Roberts lives by a double standard of justice and raises some questions about himself as a professor in a Criminal Justice Studies Department concerned about the Kent State University's stature and well-being.

^{1/} The letter in question was signed by the following professors in addition to Prof. Roberts: O.M. Casale, N.V. Duffy, E.H. Frieden, J.E. Gordon, W.K. Hildebrand, L.S. Kaplan, H.J. Landry, R.T. Myers, M.K. Nurmi, A.A. Silvidi, J.M. Someroski, and H.P. Vincent. The Bermudez affair was reported nationally, including several accounts in the N.Y. TIMES. The plagiarism of the two tenured professors has been successfully covered up since the Spring of 1975. For details write the Editors of ZEDEK.

Van Wormer Case(continued)Constitutional Issues in the Van Wormer Case

The fact that van Wormer has been denied tenure because she is different, because her values are different, because her creed is different, is certainly a First Amendment issue, a matter of academic freedom. There is also here a violation of the American Association of University Professors' stated principles on academic freedom.

Since she was never given a full, precisely stated bill of particulars, a statement of the specific reasons for her being denied tenure, in short, the charges against her, to which she could respond to in her defense, and since she was never permitted the right of discovery which is, in part, dependent on the fulfillment of the former condition, and since the decisionmakers concerning her tenure were biased and not her peers, all these facts making a fair hearing virtually impossible, she was denied her right to due process which is guaranteed to her under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. CONSTITUTION.

The right to equal protection, guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment, as detailed in the discussion about Professor Roberts' double standard of justice, was also denied Katherine van Wormer.

Such violations of constitutional rights as have occurred in the van Wormer case are not something new to Kent State. Similar violations were plentiful in the Smith and Frumkin cases alluded to earlier.

Current Status of the Van Wormer Case

Van Wormer has made formal complaints to the EEOC and the Ohio Civil Rights Commission, charging the Kent State University with having discriminated against her because of her sex, creed, and race involvement. Thus far, she has made relatively little progress with these slow-moving, timid agencies.

Like Robert Dyal, she feels she must leave Kent State to survive. Knowing her chances for reinstatement and tenure are relatively slim, she has decided, for the sake of her children and family, she will earn a social work degree and start a new career outside academia if she is not permitted returning to it.

In reviewing the van Wormer case one wonders if the impetus to hire her in 1978 was a token gesture to affirmative action. Now, having used her to fulfill the affirmative action requirement, she now can be discarded. Perhaps, she did her job too well?

In the departure of Katherine van Wormer, Kent State has lost a fine professor, scholar, and person. Like Robert Dyal, she has learned that to be a faculty member at Kent State is to live with a broken heart.

#####

[Editor's Note: In the hope that Katherine van Wormer will return to the academic world soon, at an educational institution which appreciates her, although we think she would make a fine social worker, we are presenting a short resume of her credentials]

VitaKATHERINE STUART van WORMEREducational Background:

B.A., University of North Carolina, 1966
 M.Ed., Queen's University, Northern Ireland, 1967
 M.A., Western Kentucky University, 1971
 Ph.D., University of Georgia, 1976.

(continued on next page)

Vita of Katherine van Wormer (continued)Professional Experience:

High School Teacher, Northern Ireland, 1967-69
 Instructor, Jacksonville State University, Alabama, 1972-73
 Instructor, Bluefield State College, West Virginia, 1975-76
 Assistant Professor, Livingstone College, North Carolina, 1976-77
 Assistant Professor, Kent State University, Ohio, 1978-83.

Scholarly Publication ResearchA. Articles

1. "Tasks for the Applied Sociologist in a Court of Law," INT.J. COMPARATIVE & APPLIED CRIMINAL JUSTICE, 6 (Winter, 1982), 231-236.
2. "The Elderly in Prison," FRIENDS J., 28 (June, 1982), 10-12.
3. "Social Functions of Prison Families: The Female Solution," J. PSYCHIATRY & LAW, 9 (Summer, 1981), 181-191.
4. "On Victim Blaming," J. PSYCHIATRY & LAW, 8 (Spring, 1981), 3-4.
5. "To Be Old and In Prison," Chapter 7, in CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN CORRECTIONS (Pilgrimage Publishing Co., 1981).
6. "Measurement of Ambivalent Attitudes Toward the Rape Victim," J. PSYCHIATRIC TREATMENT & EVALUATION, 2 (1981), 291-294.
7. "Are Males Suited to Police Patrol Work?" POLICE STUDIES, 3 (Winter, 1981), 41-45.
8. "The Sociologist in the Courtroom: Jury Research and Selection," THE APPLIED SOCIOLOGIST, 2 (June, 1980), 4-6.
9. "Recent Texts: Women and Crime," ACADEMY OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SCIENCES TODAY, 4 (May, 1980), 4, 6.
10. "Role of the Social Scientist in the Courtroom," J. PSYCHIATRY & LAW, 7 (Summer, 1979), 261-272.
11. "Study of Leadership Roles in an Alabama Prison for Women," HUMAN RELATIONS, 32 (September, 1979), 793-801.
12. "Alabama's Justice for Women," FRIENDS JOURNAL, (April, 1979), 10-11.

B. Monographs

1. SEX-ROLE BEHAVIOR IN A WOMAN'S PRISON: AN ETHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS (Palo Alto: R & E Research Associates, 1979), 113 pp.
2. CHILD NEGLECT: An Annotated Bibliography, with Norman Polansky, co-author (University of Georgia, 1975), 101 pp.

C. Book Reviews

1. THE SOCIAL WORK MYSTIQUE: TOWARD A SOCIOLOGY OF SOCIAL WORK by Marie Mathews. In the APPLIED SOCIOLOGIST BULLETIN, 4 (Winter, 1983), 4-5.
2. CRIME AND GERONTOLOGY by Alan Malinchak. In FEDERAL PROBATION, 46 (July, 1982).
3. NEUTRALIZING INMATE VIOLENCE: JUVENILE OFFENDERS IN INSTITUTIONS by Barry C. Feld. In CRIMINAL JUSTICE REVIEW, 4 (Fall, 1979), 152.
4. ALABAMA BOUND: FORTY-FIVE YEARS INSIDE A PRISON SYSTEM by Ray March. In TRIAL, 14 (May, 1978), 45, 51.

Teaching

Courses Taught: Sociological Theory
 Marriage and the Family
 Social Psychology
 Criminology
 Introduction to Criminal Justice
 Juvenile Delinquency
 Minorities
 Minorities in Criminal Justice
 Women in Crime and Justice
 Police Role in Juvenile Justice.

SAPDF NOW SEEKING NEW SUPPORTERS TO HELP FINANCE ITS STATED AIMS

SAPDF, a non-profit foundation established in 1980 to defend social activist professors whose constitutional and civil rights have been violated, is now seeking more funds through its program of annual memberships. There are four basic memberships: Individual, Supporting, Sponsor, and Patron. There is also a special membership for Students, Seniors, and Additional Members of a Household. All four basic members receive the official journal ZEDEK plus all special publications (reports, monographs, etc.) as they appear. The special members receive ZEDEK only. The stated aims of SAPDF can be found on pages 1 and 2 of the November, 1980 issue of ZEDEK. Since individual and institutional subscriptions do not fully pay for the current production and distribution costs of ZEDEK we have been reluctantly forced to raise subscription rates. To fulfill its many significant aims, SAPDF needs the wide support of interested and concerned members. If you are not already a member of SAPDF please seriously consider becoming one. Our survival depends on your fullest support.

SOME OF THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO HAVE ENDORSED THE AIMS OF SAPDF

Scott Nearing ... Noam Chomsky ... Benjamin Spock ... Herbert Aptheker ... Sara Cooper ... Zolton Ferency ... Roy Larson ... Shirley Cereseto ... Father Victor Weissler ... Sarah Silver ... Bertell Ollman ... Thomas Lough ... Laura Boss ... John Snider ... Rick Kunnes ... Kurt H. Wolff... Maryann Mahaffey ... Ron Aronson ... Alex Efthim ... Gerald Coles ... Murray Jackson ... Richard Weiss ... Betty Lanham ... Morris Schappes... Kathleen Calahan... Jim Messerschmidt... Shirley Nuss ... Milton Tambor... Steven Shank and many others.

Registration Form

Name: _____

Address: _____

Zip: _____

<u>Membership</u>	_____ \$10 (Student, Senior, Additional Member of Household)	_____ \$150 (Sponsor)
	_____ \$20 (Individual)	_____ \$200 or more (Patron)
	_____ \$50 (Supporter)	

Make all contributions payable to the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation or S.A.P.D.F. and return to: 19329 Monte Vista, Detroit, Michigan 48221 U.S.A.

Endorser Statement

I, _____, wish to become an endorser of the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
(complete signature)

Names & Addresses of Other Potential Members and/or Endorsers

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Thank you for your recommendations.