

Rutgers AAUP

Emeriti

Reporter

Volume 18 – Issue 1

March 2014

THE CHAIRPERSON'S CORNER **Elfriede Schlesinger, Chair** **Professor Emerita, Social Work**

It has been six months since I became chair of this group. I am having a good time doing it, and hope you will let me know when I could do better.

Rutgers is a different place than it was when most of us first came here. I can hardly comprehend the enormity of the social and technological changes that have taken place. Affirmative action and women's rights burst on the scene along with the move from punch cards to the computers of the day, smart phones and other wonders I don't know about. We are privileged to have been witness to and participants in much of what was going on. We marched against the war in Vietnam and fought for higher salaries for faculty members who were in groups that had been treated as lesser people – women, members of minority groups and others.

Right now, Rutgers is again in the midst of becoming a different place. We have seen the effects of affirmative action, at the same time as the old isms still rear their ugly heads. Not all agree that the incorporation of the Medical School into Rutgers is a positive step. There are features of this change that I find exciting. President Barchi has emphasized the focus on interdisciplinary initiatives – in neuroscience, medical ethics, public health and precision medicine.

No single profession or discipline is any longer equipped to deal with the new knowledge and skills in the physical and social sciences. As a social work educator I have long recognized the critical importance of joining structural and psychological paths to problem resolution. There is hardly a health problem that does not require exquisite medical knowledge and psychological empathy to aid a person in achieving recovery. Now that we have the technological capacity to communicate instantly with almost anyone in any part of the world, the bigger challenge is to learn how to do so with sensitivity and

understanding of vast customs. I would like to be at Rutgers in about 30 or 40 years to see how we have managed these challenges.

In closing, let me remind you that the long anticipated Center for the RETIRED FACULTY AND STAFF ASSOCIATION opened on February 28 with a special dedication at the Administrative Services Building 2 in New Brunswick. Thanks are due to the umbrella group called the Faculty and Staff Retirement Advisory Council composed of members of the Administration, Retired Faculty Association, Emeriti Assembly, Silver Knights, and OLLI-RU.

LIVING WITHOUT TENURE: A REPORT FROM NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY BARGAINING

"Living Without Tenure: A Report from Non-Tenure Track Faculty Bargaining," with Ann D. Gordon, Rutgers Research Professor Emerita and John Leggett, Departments of Sociology & Labor Studies, was presented at the AAUP Emeriti Assembly Meeting, October 15, 2013. Following are notes written by Benjamin Beede, Emeriti Assembly Secretary.

Ann D. Gordon was editor of *The Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony* and served at Rutgers for many years.

She has been a major participant in the effort to organize the non-tenure track faculty at Rutgers.

People in this category work on a full-time basis. They are not adjunct faculty or graduate teaching assistants. At some universities, though, the term "adjunct" does cover full-time, non-tenure track faculty. A little over half the non-tenure track faculty at Rutgers are women.

Overall, about thirty percent of the Rutgers faculty are non-tenure track. The percentage is higher in New Brunswick than on the other campuses. A little over half are primarily teachers, including clinical faculty in pharmacy, law, and, to some extent, in business. The

percentage is much higher in the medical school, about seventy-five per cent. When the medical school faculty are fully integrated into Rutgers, the percentage will be about fifty-fifty tenure track and non-tenure track.

The other half are research faculty working on the basis of grant funding.

One of the problems of non-tenure faculty is their lack of job descriptions. There are no formal evaluations. Seniority provides no protection from non-renewal. Non-renewals are standard, by August 1st. Moreover, there is no written policy to define "non-renewable" or "renewable." Appointments are not aligned with periods for grants.

Former President McCormick signed an agreement for multi-year appointments, but that agreement was pulled back by the university administration. Students have an interest in maintaining long-term access to their teachers.

Non-tenure track faculty rarely receive merit increases, although when they do get them, the increases are now the same basis as tenure track faculty. The practice of hiring at the minimum applies largely to non-tenure track faculty. Non-tenure track faculty have the same fringe benefits, such as health insurance, as tenure-track faculty.

There was discussion after Dr. Gordon's report. Members of the assembly found the report highly informative. Professor Tangri suggested that retirees can study these problems. More research is needed on these matters.

**EDITOR:
DONALD BORCHARDT**



IMMIGRATION

On November 19, 2013, Shanti Tangri, Rutgers Professor Emeritus of Economics, gave a presentation for the Emeriti Assembly entitled "Economics of Immigration." He led a discussion of this multi-faceted topic which stimulated interest and participation in this lively event. Professor Tangri has been an active member of the Emeriti Assembly from its beginnings. He has served as Program Chair, and was Chairperson of our organization for three consecutive terms from 2003 through 2009. His contributions have been appreciated by the membership.

THE KU KLUX KLAN

Following are notes taken by Emeriti Assembly Secretary Benjamin Beede at a presentation in the AAUP-AFT Conference Room for the Emeriti Assembly on January 28, 2014.

"What Can We Learn From the KKK: A Different Angle on the '60s" by Dr. Martin Oppenheimer, Professor Emeritus, Rutgers University, Sociology Department.

Dr. Oppenheimer was an early and long-time member of the Livingston College faculty at Rutgers. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Pennsylvania. He was involved in the 1960s "sit-in movement" in the South.

In his presentation, Dr. Oppenheimer frequently referred to David Cunningham's *Klansville: The Rise and Fall of the Civil Rights-Era Ku Klux Klan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), which focuses largely on North Carolina.

There have been and continue to be many "Klans." They are at the state and local level. No longer is there a national organization.

It is largely nativist at this point, operating, in part, as a vigilante organization by targeting individuals rather than committing the random acts of violence that generally characterize terrorist groups.

Historically, the Klan has gone through three phases.

Initially, it was a reaction to Reconstruction during the early years after the Civil War, having been founded in 1866.

After World War I, it opposed continued high levels of immigration, and it reached its height in membership during the mid-1920s.

Another revival occurred after the Supreme Court declared in 1954 that school segregation must be abolished.

After this introduction, Dr. Oppenheim moved to discuss further the Cunningham study.

North Carolina has had the reputation of being a relatively "progressive" state in the former Confederacy. It has had an industrialized economy for some time. African-Americans and whites were integrated in their work places, although they did not perform the same kinds of tasks. The Klan has been particularly strong in the eastern portion of North Carolina, where there are larger numbers of African-Americans than in the western area.

The City of Greensboro was the site of the early sit-ins to de-segregate lunch counters in department stores. Although African-Americans were far from being the majority in Greensboro, many whites reacted vigorously. Half of the entire Klan membership was located in North Carolina by 1966, but it declined sharply from then until 1968. For a time, the Klan filled a vacuum for opponents of the civil rights movement, because the White Citizens Councils that sprang up seemed to be too moderate.

Various factors operated to weaken the Klan and drive members away from it. Internal conflicts were a significant cause for the Klan's decline, but the key was federal policing, as well as action by state officials and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The turning point came with the "freedom summer" of 1964, when strenuous volunteer efforts were made to de-segregate the South. At that point, President Johnson pressed FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover to act against the Klan and other anti-civil rights groups.

Hoover had previously developed a plan and techniques to "neutralize" black militants as early as the mid-1950s. Now, he applied the same approach to the Klan. Hoover was a statist who was profoundly opposed to all kinds of potentially disruptive elements, and, therefore, despite his right-wing orientation, he had no trouble following President Johnson's directive.

The Klan was undermined through infiltration of its ranks by FBI informants and even pseudo-activists. By early 1966, the FBI actually controlled decision-making in the Klan. This successful campaign also included the use of anonymous letters to create dissension within the Klan and pressure on local officials and newspapers to oppose the organization. The FBI did not want to eliminate the Klan altogether, but rather to disrupt its operations and to guide Klan members to move toward involvement in less violent segregationist groups. Violence became a problem to the Klan, because

violence in the United States at least invites infiltration by federal and state law enforcement and investigative agencies.

After the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the House Un-American Activities Committee began investigating the Klan. Some Klan members pleaded the Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination, which made them look like communists and, thereby, helped to discredit them. Some Klan members went to prison, moreover. The Klan's legal problems entailed heavy legal expenses, thus draining funds from its dangerous activities. The publication of the names of people who attended Klan rallies helped identify them as suspicious people and hampered their employment prospects.

Despite the decline of the Klan, it left a heritage of violence stemming from the vigilante atmosphere it had created.

The stigma increasingly attached to Klan activity drove many Klan members to legal political activity. They supported George Wallace initially, but later they began moving toward the Republican Party as party attachments shifted in the South. They thus contributed to the further rightward movement of the Republican Party.

Ultimately, violence was a problem for the Klan, because violence tends to invite infiltration of the violent or otherwise extremist organization by law enforcement agencies.

Racism, of course, persists.

The next meeting of the
Emeriti Assembly is scheduled for
11:30 a.m. on
Tuesday, April 22, 2014
at the AAUP-AFT Office,
11 Stone Street,
New Brunswick.
Associate Prof. Emily A. Greenfield
will speak about
"Community initiatives as a new response
to old challenges in aging services"
Please mark your calendar.

**AN INTERVIEW WITH GORDON SCHOCHET,
Member AAUP Emeriti Assembly
Former Professor, Political Science Department
By Isabel Wolock, Treasurer,
AAUP Emeriti Assembly**



Tell me a little about your position at Rutgers before you retired.

I was a professor in the Political Science Department where I taught both introductions to the discipline and courses in my specialized areas, which included “great books” (the Plato to NATO sort of thing), epistemology and hermeneutics, legal philosophy and jurisprudence, the history of political ideas, and mediaeval through 18th century political thought. I was one of the founding members of Livingston College, and when I retired in 2009, I was a faculty fellow of Douglass College.

Mine was a standard academic appointment: I taught undergraduates and graduate students, supervised dissertations, did research and writing, and – albeit reluctantly – served as department chair, graduate placement director, and – not so reluctantly – chair of the university library committee and of several Graduate School committees.

I was at Rutgers from 1965 to 2009.

What were your major accomplishments and sources of satisfaction while you were at Rutgers?

I published a good deal and presented countless professional papers during my years at Rutgers, but my single greatest source of satisfaction was undergraduate teaching. I taught what became one of our most popular introductory courses every year and got to know a great many of my students each term. It was a point of pride for me that my upper division courses were for the most part filled with former students and that more than half of my department’s majors had been in one or more of my classes. I mentored honors students and served as an

Aresty (undergraduate research) advisor, sometimes working with as many as 5 -10 students a semester.

The honors I most treasure are my teaching and mentoring awards. Among those, perhaps, I am most proud of my mentoring award from the Women’s Caucus of the American Political Science Association, initiated by my female graduate students in recognition of my commitment to the advancement of women in the profession.

For the rest, I remain pleased to have been engaged in various anti-establishment activities. I was a member of the delegation of faculty that in 1966 persuaded University President Mason Gross to defend Professor Eugene Genovese, enabling him to receive the AAUP’s prestigious Alexander Meiklejohn Award for Academic Freedom; I was part of a faculty group that originated a movement leading to withdrawal of academic credit for ROTC; and I was the first faculty member (I was in full academic regalia) to walk out in protest during Vice-President Hubert Humphrey’s speech at the University’s 200th anniversary convocation, joining a group of students and others who stood in silent vigil at the rear (we were soon joined by others from the faculty) – all this in my first two years at Rutgers in the lowly and unprotected rank of assistant professor.

Around the same time, I attempted – unsuccessfully – to organize a faculty anti-Vietnam War group (sort of a grown-up SDS) and subsequently worked with student protesters. I was faculty advisor to the local chapter of the real SDS, counseled draft resisters, coordinated Livingston College’s participation in the 1969 anti-war Moratorium, and advised students who protested at Fort Dix, Lakehurst, and other military bases. The plans to “sit in” on the train tracks and disrupt service along the Northeast Corridor (in the spring of 1970 as I recall) were hatched in my office, and I raised bail and fine money for the protesters.

Later, when the political science department was moved to the Douglass Campus, I became increasingly concerned with women’s rights and especially women’s education. The original Rutgers organizers of “Take Back the Night” and the founders of the first lesbian and gay rights campus groups were all my students, discussed their plans with me, and claimed me as what would today be called a co-conspirator.

Outside the University and in better-behaved mode, I was a founding member – and continue to be one of the directors – of the Center for the History of British Political Thought at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, DC, and the founding co-editor of *Hebraic Political Studies*, a journal that contributed to the establishment of a new field of research, Hebraic and Jewish political thought from biblical times to the present.

Tell me a little more about your writing or research or community service work?

I presented numerous papers and wrote and edited several books on political philosophy and the history of early-modern, especially British, and Judaic political thought. My primary interests have been rights and liberty, religious liberty and toleration, conceptions of political, moral, and religious authority and legitimacy, and the changing natures of law and justice. When I was a young man, with cartilage in my knees, I also coached children's baseball.

Did you receive any award/honors before or after retirement?

I held several fellowships and research appointments and grants: Fulbright, National Endowment for the Humanities, the Center for the History of Freedom of Washington University, and the Institute for Advanced Study. At my retirement, the University funded a two-day conference in my honor that I chose to dedicate primarily to my teaching.

What did you do before coming to Rutgers?

Nothing unusual: I'm part of that group that both moved from undergraduate to graduate school without military service and went directly from graduate school to academic appointments. I did work my way through graduate school – as a teaching assistant and teacher and as a religious-school instructor.

Going back to earlier days, had you always planned on having an academic career?

My intention – or, more properly, my working-class parents' intention – was that I become a lawyer and possibly a politician. I wanted to be philosopher, or perhaps a petty criminal, something that would allow me to use my mind and mouth and story-telling ability rather than my hands and back. I quickly figured out that the one career was impossible and the other was dangerous.

What kinds of experiences or situations led to your decision to pursue an academic career?

I entered college with the hope of becoming a labor lawyer and devoting my life to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. I had not the slightest inclination to pursue an academic career – and did not know what that would have required – until one of my favorite and most renowned undergraduate instructors, in response to my request for a letter of recommendation for law school, put his hand on my shoulder and said, "Oh no, Mr. Schochet, you're not going to law school. You're going to stay here with us and become a teacher and scholar." It

was simultaneously a "call" and a literal "laying on of hands" (or at least of one hand).

That was in the spring of 1957, and the memory of that encounter and my response is as intense as if it were just last week. College was the first place in which I had ever felt comfortable: I began to take myself seriously and had the strange experience of being taken seriously by others. I am still overwhelmed by the very idea that I could – and did – spend my life doing something that I so loved and that I would – and did – get paid for doing it.

What type of prior training/education did you have?

I had the good fortune, as it turned out, to attend the Johns Hopkins University when its primary orientation was graduate education and research. I did well enough to come to the attention of senior members of the political science department and, without my awareness, was pushed toward graduate school. In my junior and senior years, most of my classes were at the graduate level.

Hopkins had few formal rules and distribution requirements. I have long had widely-ranging interests (not to mention attention-deficit disorder), and Hopkins allowed me to indulge them. I ended up with far more credits than I needed to graduate – many of them for independent study and research courses – and almost enough to complete majors in history, philosophy, and psychology as well as in political science. It was at Hopkins that I discovered intellectual history and political philosophy, which have been my academic fields.

Also, there was still a kind of patronage system in place. My instructors were able both to obtain scholarships for me and to pass me on to colleagues at other institutions. When three of my teachers determined that University of Minnesota was the best place for me, they saw to it that I was admitted and received financial support. So it was not so much my "decision" as it was my having been placed in a raft that moved along with the current.

If you were to do it all over again, would you pursue the same career or would you choose another one?

My feelings on this subject have not changed since 1957.

Is there any one event or experience or person that had the greatest influence on your life?

I had a wise, wonderful, and loving grandmother. As her first grandchild and the child of her oldest child, my mother, I enjoyed a special status and singular access to her insight. She had a rare ability to admonish and correct without in any way suggesting that she was withholding her support. More important, her stories and

her distinctive way of making her way through a world that she would not let wear her down were my lessons.

What did you do after you retired?

Except for the absence of a paycheck and young students, life after retirement looks much like life before: I am working on several research and writing projects on which I continue to miss deadlines; I lecture when invited; I write letters of recommendation for colleagues and former students seeking funding and promotion. Occasionally, I meet with and advise a graduate student. With my good friend and colleague Gerry Pomper, I taught three courses through the university's continuing education program (OLLI-RU) over the past couple of years, and this semester, I am teaching one on my own.

Most of the rest of my waking hours in a typical week are consumed by maintenance and repair – exercising, swimming, walking, and seeing physicians.

What do you see as the best thing about retirement?

No grading, no meetings, and almost no bureaucracy.

Are there any drawbacks to retirement? Do you have any regrets?

The biggest drawback is that I have to make my own schedule, and in that respect, I'm not very well disciplined.

While I have no real regrets – I taught for 50 years, and it was time – I do miss my undergraduates. I spend a lot of time on campus, and it has taken almost five years for me to accept the fact that no one is going to stop me as I walk down College Avenue and say, "I was in your class a few years ago...."

Any personal information you'd care to share?

Hobbies and interests – My primary interests are baseball, words, fiction, travel, architecture, the natural world, and junk television.

I've been a collector and accumulator almost my entire life and still acquire picture postcards and souvenir wooden pencils whenever I travel. With considerable assistance and encouragement (stopping just short of threats of divorce), I did recently rid myself of a large collection of science fiction magazines and books going back to the 40s.

Spouse - Louise Haberman
Children - One daughter
Other - Four grandchildren

What advice, if any, would you give to others who are planning to retire?

Meet with the retirement-planning people from H.R., and be sure that your pension and benefits are in order. There are various ways – which no one at the University seems to know about – to set up your medical benefits. The best advice I received came from a personal meeting at the state pension office in Trenton.

Be sure that you retain all the University privileges to which your emeritus / emerita status entitle you, namely, email, library, parking, gym. They may disappear when you are issued a new i.d. card.

How did you come to be involved in the AAUP Emeriti Assembly? Is there anything in particular you like about being part of this group?

Some years ago, before I retired, Shanti Tangri asked me to make a presentation to the group about the philosopher John Rawls. I enjoyed myself and was well-received. I came to other meetings from time to time and always found the presentations and discussions informative and, more important, very pleasant. It was almost fore-ordained that I would become a member when I retired. (Not only that, Shanti would not have permitted me to refuse.)

I continue to enjoy the meetings – the company, the presentations, and the friends, old and new.

MEMBERSHIP DUES

The fee for AAUP Emeriti Assembly membership is \$10 per year beginning each September. If you have forgotten, please send your check to the AAUP-AFT office at 11 Stone Street in New Brunswick to cover the year 2013-2014. It was decided at the November 19, 2013, meeting that it will now be possible to renew membership for one, two, or three years by paying \$10, \$20, or \$30. Plan ahead for the new option starting September, 2014.

Below is a list of organizations and their contact information including web sites you may find useful:

Rutgers Council of AAUP Chapters, AAUP-AFT

11 Stone Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1113
Phone: 732-964-1000
Fax: 732-964-1032
E-mail: aaup@rutgersaaup.org
www.rutgersaaup.org

American Association of University Professors

1133 Nineteenth Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-737-5900
Fax: 202-737-5526
E-mail: aaup@aaup.org
www.aaup.org

American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO

555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: 202-879-4400
www.aft.org

AFT's Web Page for Retirees:

<http://www.aft.org/yourwork/retirees/>

Rutgers University's Web Page on Retiree Services:

<http://uhr.rutgers.edu/ben/RetireeServices.htm>

AARP

601 E Street NW
Washington, DC 20049
Phone: 1-888-OUR-AARP (1-888-687-2277)
www.aarp.org

AARP NJ

Forrestal Village
101 Rockingham Row
Princeton, NJ 08540
Phone: 1-866-542-8165 (toll-free)
Fax: 609-987-4634
E-mail: njaarp@aarp.org
Web site: <http://www.aarp.org/states/nj/>

**NJ Department of Treasury
Division of Pension & Benefits**

Links for retirees:

<http://www.state.nj.us/treasury/pensions/retiree-home.shtml>