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How Non-Ideological Has the Opposition Been to Nominee to National Humanities Council?

By Peter Shaw

Both the American Council of Learned Societies and the Modern Language Association have opposed the nomination of Carol Iannone to the National Endowment for the Humanities' National Council. According to a report in The Chronicle (April 10), they profess to be concerned that she "does not have a distinguished record as a scholar or administrator."

In letters to Edward M. Kennedy, chairman of the Senate committee that must approve nominations to the council, and to Lynne V. Cheney, chairman of the N.E.H., the executive director of the M.L.A., Phyllis Franklin, gave assurances that despite her political disagreements with Iannone, her organization's opposition was not "ideological." Let us see.

Franklin objected that Iannone, who writes literary criticism for a broad audience rather than strictly for scholars, published articles "that are not contributions to scholarship." Yet in a valuable article on the development of English studies as a discipline, Franklin herself a few years ago concluded: "The professional's view of his work seems finally to have been so modified that studying the humanities—especially teaching and writing criticism—are regarded by many in the discipline as though these were in themselves humanities and as though the audience for such work was the broad audience of art."

If Franklin's own criteria had been applied, she would certainly not have been appointed" to head the M.L.A.

Iannone, on the other hand, qualifies on every count. In widely circulated letters discussing the nomination, the Yale dean and respected classicist Donald Kagan calls her "one of the most interesting literary and social critics of our time," and Lynne Cheney observes that "Iannone, a teacher of undergraduates, an editor of a periodical that addresses issues in under graduate education, and a well-published writer on contemporary cultural matters, is well positioned to advise the Endowment."

The two professional organizations claim also to oppose the nomination because the representation of college and university faculty members and administrators on the council has precipitously fallen—from 37 per cent to 30 per cent, according to Franklin—and Iannone, presumably, will not bring a full-fledged academic point of view to its deliberations. But the council is made up of 16 members with Ph.D.'s, all of whom, like Iannone, have taught or been administrators in the humanities, and eight public
The appropriation of material that consumed substantial amounts of our time, energy, and resources is tantamount to theft.

Various books that Kinko's then sold to students as anthologies.

One of the first salvos fired in the battle against the unauthorized use of copyrighted material in custom-produced anthologies involved one of our textbooks, Modern Radio Production, published by Wadsworth Publishing Company. Shortly before formal action was brought against Kinko's by other publishers, a Wadsworth official came across an

...Continued From Preceding Page

members, who are not expected to have Ph.D.'s.

Phyllis Franklin's figures could have been arrived at only by narrowing the definition of the humanities so much that, as Chairman Cheney pointed out in a memorandum, members with backgrounds not strictly in the humanities, such as Henry H. Figuera, a political philosopher, are not counted. Yet the broad interests of these members surely qualify them to be counted, like Iannone, as academic humanists.

Iannone is certainly opposed to the policies of Franklin and the rest of the solidly liberal-to-radical M.L.A. leadership. She has written critically—often devastatingly—about "Feminist Mysticism," "The Barbarism of Feminist Scholarship," and the follies of the cultural left—including the M.L.A. It is entirely understandable that the M.L.A. board is not happy with her nomination.

Similarly, there are those of us who would rather not have cultural leftists running the M.L.A. Nevertheless, we are not challenging anyone's credentials, even though a better technical case could be made against some of them than they have succeeded in mounting against Carol Iannone.

As testimony to her lack of ideological motivation, Phyllis Franklin volunteers that the M.L.A., far from objecting to those conservative scholars who have "a profound understanding of the academic enterprise and the wisdom and experience needed to carry out a council member's responsibilities," approves of Robert Hollander. He will retire from the council in January, but when he "is eligible for re-consideration, we would welcome his reappointment." More effectively to demonstrate its tolerance for conservative views, the M.L.A. should do two things. First, nominate Mr. Hollander to its executive council. There he could serve as its lone traditional scholar in English studies. Second, withdraw the self-contradictory, ill-considered opposition to Carol Iannone. She is highly qualified by every measure save the M.L.A.'s current standard of ideological purity.
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