Distruction in the Rankings

I don't pretend to agree with, or be scientifically responsible for, anything and everything that appears in any given issue of the GADFLY. I had nothing at all to do with the issue of two weeks ago (6), since I was occupied with work (you, I'm a student now, you'll see) and missed the editorial meeting. Hence, I feel justified in presenting a dissent in two of the items as printed.

First of all, I am a bit puzzled by Tom Taylor's editorial entitled "Distruction and discussion at Hard: a GADFLY Proposal." After opening with a characteristic rhetorical flourish, Mr. Taylor flounders badly. If I didn't know better, I would accuse him of writing a filler, since he says so little at such great length.

As far as I can gather, his conclusion is that before the advisability of having "pass-fail" courses at Hard is discussed, there should be some groundwork laid. Specifically, there should be discussion concerning the feasibility of the present system and the advantages of a "pass-fail" system to the various educational programs.

Pine and caused. It seems implicit in any consideration of the "pass-fail" system that such questions would arise, although I seem disagree with S.D.C. writer the Observer, I don't question their intelligence. If concerned with Mr. Taylor is that he is taking quotations about the course of discussion being discussion is even known. Further, he is calling for a consideration of factors and situations which we have every reason to believe have been taken place even if he had not written.

If he really is "willing to contribute to these discussions," but reluctant because he "has not sufficient perspectives for the formulation of opinions have been established" why didn't he try to form more perspectives? Why didn't he try to answer some of the questions he raised? Granted that the raising of questions in itself is a valuable activity since he asked questions about which he knew there will be no discussion, he should take the initiative and venture some answers of his own.

A second adverse comment is in regard to "Dear and Toonio Jones" by John Sarah and Slim Johnson. They conclude their pleasant little story into the world of the unknown with the following: "If you are still hung up about endemics, ask yourself, would you rather be to a rich college or a good one?" This is, I am sure, a question to stir the blood of campaigners for academic dishonesty. But, as quoted Louis Simpson, as were mortals we are doomed "Not to walk in the printed sunshine, To a summer house, but to live in the tragic world forever." In the tragic world, "good" and "rich" are not mutually exclusive categories with regard to colleges. It could be reasonably argued that, if anything, "poverty stricken" and "good" are mutually exclusive. Unless your local college is located in one of the towns of upstate New York, you'll need neither. They cost money. You'll also need to maintain nice buildings. This also costs money. You'll need to hire, and keep, nobles and localistic professors who are willing to sit around and socialize for a student to come to those. They cost money. You might even go so far as to keep books for the college (you are going to have a library, aren't you?) and hire a public-relations firm to help convince respectable middle-class parents to send their children to that, from a parental point of view, don't look like such a dog's. Did I say middle-class parents? Since you're going to do without endemics, you'd really have to stick your student body to the off-spring of parents who could afford the $10,000 or $15,000 a year this would cost them. Remember those twenty-four-hour-a-day facilities.

I would like to close with this week's translation. It costs about $100 a semester to print the GADFLY. It costs about $1,000 (live or take a few hundred) a semester to keep the "Dear and Toonio Jones" afloat. $100 a semester works out to about fifteen cents for each person who re-
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