The Emeriti Assembly has been represented on the Faculty and Staff Retirement Advisory Council by our secretary, Ben Beede, and me. Gus Friedrich has acted as Chairman and conducted meetings for the past academic year. Much progress has been made toward the establishment of a special office space that will act as a University umbrella office for the Silver Knights (retired staff), the Retired Faculty Association (RFA), and the Emeriti Assembly of AAUP-AFT. The new office will be called the Retired Faculty and Staff Association. It will be located in the Administration Offices Building 2 in New Brunswick on Highway 1. Applications are being accepted for a full-time staff position devoted exclusively to the operation of this office. The office is expected to open in the month of April, 2013. The three retirement organizations will function as usual and use the new administrative office as a source of information on benefits and opportunities for retirees. There will be abundant information about our organizations, and addresses of retirees will be maintained. Faculty anticipating retirement will have a source to consult about the numerous possibilities to continue a relationship with Rutgers. Congratulations are in order for all who have worked to make this relationship between the Administration and Retirees possible.

The next meeting of the Emeriti Assembly is scheduled for 11:30 a.m. Tuesday, February 26, 2013 at the AAUP-AFT Office, 11 Stone Street, New Brunswick. Professor Emeritus Martin Oppenheimer will discuss “The Rise and Fall of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.”

The title for Professor Emeritus Shanti Tangri's presentation in the AAUP-AFT Conference Room at 11 Stone Street in New Brunswick on September 18, 2012, was "I Know Where I am Going and Who I'm Going With -- or Do I? The 2012 Elections: An Economist's Perspective." Following are notes written by the Emeriti Assembly Secretary, Benjamin Beede.

The address included numerous provocative insights. So many issues were covered incisively that the following notes only suggest the scope of this presentation.

In an innovative fashion, Dr. Tangri began with a reference to an email exchange he had with his son recently about the failure of the current presidential campaign to deal much with environmental issues. He distributed copies of his son's message that provide a comprehensive strategy for dealing with climate change. Neil Tangri asserted, however, that "there is currently zero prospect of the US enacting the above agenda, or any significant subset of it."

Dr. Tangri noted that the title of his address comes from a folk song, beginning with the words "I know where I am going."

There is a significant conflict between short-term and long-term solutions to current problems. Growth in the economy can solve many problems, but not those of an environmental nature. Indeed, economic growth is a two-edged sword, because it creates environmental degradation. The scientific community is not as divided on the issue of climate change as some politicians want to suggest.

Contrary to many economists, Dr. Tangri has contended for many years that "infinite growth is impossible in a finite world." There are conflicts between the views of many economists and those of unions. Economists advocate wage and salary flexibility, and unions do not.

Conflict is endemic in United States society. Dr. Tangri
cited Bell's book *The Future of American Politics*. Bell referred to the "politics of mutual frustration." Diversity of opinions in a society is important, but it also allows consensus only in times of crisis.

The next section of the presentation dealt with preferences. Dr. Tangri asked, "What are your preferences and how do you rank them?" Planning theory involves ranking policy preferences and giving them differing weights. The coefficients add up to 100%. There are objections to measuring preferences, but something like this is necessary. Kenneth Arrow has indicated that analyzing preferences can lead to compromises, and therefore, action. Following Arrow's work, including his book *Social Choice and Individual Values*, Dr. Tangri distinguished between the "economic market" (money) and the "political market" (votes) and discussed the vital relationships between them.

He dealt with the "social welfare function," emphasizing several topics. One of them is "full employment." When it is articulated, the next question is, "At what wage will a person work?" Another principle is "no extremes of wealth," which has been violated significantly in recent years.

A problem in dealing with public policy issues is the frequent use of false analogies in debates. Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, for example, famously compared a balanced budget to a balanced diet during an address to the American Medical Association. The outline Dr. Tangri distributed to those attending the presentation included a list of partial truths and falsehoods related to economic and social issues. Two examples are "more is always better (whether income, employment, good, housing, etc.)" and "the poor will always be with us."

The balanced budget ideology is an especially prevalent and influential false analogy. The comparison between individual and governmental budgets is fundamentally flawed. There is a limit to deficit spending, of course, but no limit is really known. The ability to service the debt is the key to making decisions about deficit spending.

Dr. Tangri also pointed out that governmental bonds are assets in the hands of the lenders. In this connection, he asked how governmental bonds differ from private sector bonds. Much of the federal debt remains held by lenders in this country, and, thus are assets for the society, not liabilities.

He noted that libertarians want "small government" as an end in itself. The problem with this theory is that reduced government spending cuts income and, therefore, harms the economy.

---

**AN INTERVIEW WITH GUS FRIEDRICH, Member AAUP-AFT Emeriti Assembly**
**Former Dean of SCILS, Currently Chairman of the Retired Faculty and Staff Advisory Council**
**By Isabel Wolock, Treasurer, AAUP-AFT Emeriti Assembly**

Tell me about your position at Rutgers before you retired.

I came to Rutgers in 1998 as Dean of the School of Communication, Information, and Library Studies and Professor II in the Department of Communication. I went on sabbatical in 2009-2010, intending to retire at the end of that year. Changing my mind (I wanted to retire teaching rather than administrating), I taught in 2010-2011 before retiring at the age of 70 after thirteen years at Rutgers.

How did you end up in academe?

I ended up in academe by accident. I was born in Nebraska as the son of a Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod minister. My dad had three brothers who were also ministers and it was assumed that I would join them. After six years of pre-ministerial training, I married, left Concordia, and enrolled at the University of Minnesota. I was on the debate team there and, after trying out history and psychology majors, ended up with a degree in communication summa cum laude. I was admitted to UM’s Law School, but followed my debate coach to Kansas as an assistant debate coach. I received an M.A. and a Ph.D. in communication at the University of Kansas.

What did you do before coming to Rutgers?

My first job was at Purdue where I directed a basic communication course that offered over 100 sections each semester, taught by 50+ TAs and lecturers that I trained and supervised. My academic career has seldom been without administrative responsibilities. From Purdue, I was hired at the University of Nebraska as Professor and Chair of the Department of
Communication. I left Nebraska for the University of Oklahoma as Professor and Chair. While there I served as a Faculty Fellow in the Provost’s Office for two years. I came to Rutgers from Oklahoma.

Tell me about your teaching and research interests.

My teaching and research focus on the application of communication theory to practical settings, with a major emphasis on communication in instructional settings. In addition to teaching over 30 different courses at the undergraduate and graduate level, I directed over 40 Ph.D. students to completion. For me teaching, research, and service are interrelated and I received both university-wide and disciplinary awards for teaching, research, and service.

How about your service contributions?

My service contributions were balanced among community, university, and profession. I served as President of the National Communication Association and Editor of one of its journals. I was active in the committee structure of the university and consulted on communication issues for the wider community.

If you were to do it all over again would you take the same career path?

My move to Rutgers was a wonderful one for me both professionally and personally. As I tell my sister in California, I live in a small town (Highland Park) where I can walk everywhere. And I’m only minutes away from a train station and an airport that can get me anywhere else I want to go. Rutgers is a wonderful university that continues to get better. I wear the RU pin that Joe Seneca gave me my first year here everywhere.

I’m proud of my years as Dean and Professor II in the School of Communication and Information. The synergy of strong faculty in three departments (Communication, Journalism & Media Studies, Library & Information Science) makes it a prestigious school that continues to get better and is known as such locally, nationally, and internationally. Outside the school I especially enjoyed chairing the Committee to Advance Our Common Purposes (an all campus committee focused on issues related to diversity), serving on the Academic Over Sight Committee (a committee that works to ensure that recruited athletes have the academic abilities that allow them to succeed at Rutgers); and being on the Advisory Board of the Brodsky Center for Innovative Editions (an artistic and educational unit of Mason Gross). And I loved teaching Bryne Seminars (a pass-fail, one-credit course for first year students geared to socializing them to life in a major university).

Tell me about what you’ve done since you retired and whether you are enjoying this phase of your life.

Since retiring in 2011, my wife Betty Turock and I remain active professionally (me in communication, she in library & information science). We also enjoy devoting more time to family and to social and cultural activities (opera, theater, music, art, film). At Rutgers, both of us serve on the presidentially appointed Rutgers Advisory Council on Retired Faculty and Staff. The goal of the Council is to advise the university on the creation of programs that enhance synergy between Rutgers and its retired faculty and staff across all campuses (i.e., what can Rutgers do for retired faculty and staff and what can retired faculty and staff do for Rutgers?). My favorite post retirement activity is serving as a docent at the Zimmerli Art Museum, one of the largest and most prestigious art museums on a college campus (top ten in physical space and top five in terms of collections). I love leading tours of the permanent collections and the special exhibitions. So please let me know if you would like a tour.

While my decision to enter academe was by accident, it was a happy accident. I benefitted from and thoroughly enjoyed the many opportunities for growth that academe provides as I invented and reinvented myself within and across multiple university campuses. I joined the AAUP in 1968 and appreciate what it has done for academe and me. While I am now officially retired, I still consider myself an academic. I spend time on the Rutgers campus, participate in activities there, read the Chronicle of Higher Education, and continue to do academic work. In short, retirement is but another stage in my academic career.

Would you like to comment on anything else?

Let me end with a request. You will soon, if you have not already done so, receive a letter from me written on behalf of the Rutgers Retired Faculty and Staff Advisory Council. Please treat the request at the end of it for questions, comments, or suggestions seriously. The Council, including Don Borchardt, is working hard to ensure that Rutgers is meeting the needs of its retired faculty and staff and to identify ways that retired faculty and staff can make meaningful contributions to Rutgers. So please send ideas that will help us achieve our goals.
DICK WASSON AWARD

Professor Emeritus Isabel Wolock, Emeriti Assembly Treasurer, presented the Dick Wasson Leadership Award to Benjamin Beede on October 23, 2012. Following are the words of her presentation:

The Dick Wasson award was established in 1999 in memory of Richard Wasson, Founder and First President of the AAUP Emeriti Assembly. This award is presented to an individual who has demonstrated leadership in the area of academic retirement. The leadership can take any number of forms -- teaching, research writing, public service, organizing programs or promoting the provision of resources and legislation.

Ben Beede is the 2012 recipient of the Dick Wasson award. He was a Rutgers University librarian for a total of 34 years. Eleven years (July 15, 1969 to August 1, 1980) at the Camden Law Library and 23 years (August, 1980 to July 31, 2003) at the Kilmer Library. As a librarian his job titles were many.

Ben has demonstrated leadership in several of the areas used as criteria for the selection of the Richard Wasson Award. He has been a faithful, most conscientious and accurate secretary to the AAUP-AFT Emeriti Assembly for several years. He served on the University-wide Task Force set up in 2010 to plan for ways of strengthening and coordinating services for faculty and staff retirees that would foster lifelong connections with the university community. In March, 2012, the Task Force was replaced by the more formal structure, the Faculty and Staff Retiree Advisory Council. Then President McCormick invited Ben to continue to serve on this more formal body.

Research and scholarship is another area in which Ben made a contribution. As a retiree he continued publishing annotated bibliographies. In 2004, after retiring, he published the index to Contemporary Military Articles of the World War II Era (1939-1949 Bibliographies and indexes in Military Studies). Recently, he published the 2nd edition of The Small Wars of the United States, 1899-2009. It is described on the publisher's website (Routledge) as "An invaluable research tool...A critical resource for students and scholars studying US military history." Another work underway is a combined encyclopedia entry and bibliography on paramilitary groups which was requested by Oxford University Press. Paramilitary and militarized police were the subject of an article Ben wrote -- published in the Journal of Political and Military Sociology in Summer, 2008. It was also the title of the presentation he gave in February, 2012, to the AAUP-AFT Emeriti Assembly.

I've said more than enough to convince you that Ben deserves this award. And so, it is with great pleasure that I present this award to Benjamin R. Beede on behalf of the AAUP-AFT Emeriti Assembly.

PRINCIPLES AND POLITICS

A presentation entitled Why 'The West Wing' Was Not About America: Principles and Politics Don't Mix by Rutgers Professor Emeritus of Political Science, was given on October 23, 2012 at the Conference Room of the AAUP-AFT office building. The following notes were written by Benjamin R. Beede, Secretary of the Emeriti Assembly.

Gordon Schochet argued that principles and ideals have little to do with electoral politics in this country. Daniel Boorstin in The Genius of American Politics (1953) asserted that generally Americans are a pragmatic people; we believe that we do not need political philosophy. We do not discuss great thinkers. There are no real discussions at Tea Party meetings, for example, because the attendees agree with themselves.

What principles we do have are given from the past and geography and are a mixture of past and present. They are simply cited as rote, to the extent that they are mentioned at all. There are appeals to principle occasionally in regard to such issues as citizenship, immigration, and racial discrimination and their relationship to justice. Generally, it is impossible to utter the word "fairness" in political debates.

There is a history of religious rights and liberties being considered in the United Kingdom and the United States, but even this did not have its origins in principles so much as it was a consequence of the understanding of the costs of exclusion. In the United Kingdom the Act of Toleration in 1689 led to the grudging acceptance of minority views.

There has been a concern with the possible dangers of mobilizing the masses, which lack socialization to democratic procedures and principles. In this connection, Professor Schochet mentioned the classic
study *The Politics of Mass Society* by William Kornhauser. There is a long tradition of demagoguery in United States political history, with Huey Long as an example.

However, the United States policy has not always been completely about bargaining between parties and interest groups. There was an assumption in the Federalist Papers that high-minded leaders would rule for the benefit of the society. The assumption was, of course, that such leaders would be male, propertied, and that they would meet religious qualifications.

The two-party system and the presidential system have come to an impasse today. Professor Schochet noted that President Harry S. Truman actually won the 1948 election by campaigning against the Congress. Parties are really coalitions of groups, which change over time. The Democratic Party, for example, has moved to from the center/left to the center/right.

Competition and conflict are "economized" and are based on the "zero sum game" theory that if one party to a conflict gains, the other party loses. Even a profound thinker like John Rawls assumed such a "zero sum game" in respect to justice. Groups are focused on short-term objectives. Discussions about principles could lead to cleavages within the political parties.

With respect to the television series "West Wing," which Professor Schochet viewed favorably as entertainment, "President Bartlett" gives too much emphasis to principles, thus undermining any claim that program might have to political reality. The "Veep" is much more realistic in a sense.

Professor Schochet's advice to people seeking political, economic, and social change is to focus on a single issue and make progress gradually.

The presentation generated questions and ended with an enthusiastic round of applause.

### SPECIAL EVENT

A presentation, "The Election of 2012--An Analysis and Discussion," by Dr. Gerald Pomper, Board of Governors Professor of Political Science at the Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, took place on November 16, 2012, at the Rutgers Club. The event was co-sponsored by the Rutgers Retired Faculty Association and the Rutgers AAUP-AFT Emeriti Assembly. The following notes were written by Benjamin R. Beede, Secretary of the Emeriti Assembly.

A set of stable political coalitions seems to be developing in the United States. Exit polls show that party loyalties and ideological stances have hardened. Issues rather than personalities of candidates seem to be much more important to voters than they were at one time. The fact that undecided voters at the beginning of the campaign only amounted to six per cent reflects the consolidation of political opinion and behavior in this country.

In the 2012 election, Democrats proved to be even more loyal to Obama than Republicans to Romney. Ninety-three per cent of Democrats voted for Obama, and ninety-two per cent of Republicans voted for Romney.

Within the Democratic Party, those who viewed themselves as "conservative" demonstrated their loyalty through their votes at even higher percentage than they had in the 2008 election. The percentage of Republicans who consider themselves to be "liberals" has declined sharply. Not too long ago it was ten per cent; now, it is merely one per cent.

Various social groups can be identified as being strongly supportive of the Democratic Party. Unmarried people, people who do not attend a church, urban dwellers, and gays voted heavily for Obama. The percentage for gays reached seventy-six per cent, for example. By religion or lack thereof, the percentage of support for Obama was, as follows:

Protestants 42; Catholics 52; Jews 70; Non-religious 72.

The election results demonstrated further the existence of a significant gender gap among supporters of the two major parties. Among blacks and Latinos, the gap was about nine to ten per cent. It was smallest (four per cent) among whites. The percentage of white, married people in the United States has dropped dramatically in the past half century. In 1960, it was eighty per cent; today, it is only forty per cent. Given the propensity of such people to support the Republicans, this is another disadvantageous trend for the Republican Party.

Latino voting behavior was a major factor in Obama's victory. The election could have been much closer, if Romney had garnered the same percentage of Latino votes as Bush. Only twenty-seven per cent of Latinos supported Romney, as opposed to forty-two per cent who voted for Bush.

White racism, which some had predicted would disadvantage Obama, proved to be unimportant. Indeed in five southern states, white support for Obama dropped less than in the rest of the country.

There are several other trends that should be encouraging to Democrats. Young people were strongly
supportive of the Democratic Party in 2012, despite predictions that they were disappointed with the Obama administration. Sixty per cent of them voted for Obama; only thirty per cent supported Romney. Population is growing in states with Democratic strength, such as Georgia, moreover.

One of the tactical advantages the Democrats have over the Republicans is their possession of an extensive database that pinpoints the interest group affiliations and other characteristics of voters. This is an important factor. The Republicans are definitely behind the Democrats in this respect.

Effective voter turnout efforts by the Democrats helped them retain control of the Senate. The election experience showed that robocalls are generally ineffective. Personal telephone calls are much more productive. Democrats had some losses in the House contests, but only in eleven cases of Democrats losing a seat did the Republicans win by more than five per cent. That suggests that many of the lost seats are competitive. Thus, the Democrats have at least a reasonable chance of regaining them in the next election.

The impact of the debates was only temporary. At the same time, the debates were improved by changing their structure from debate to debate.

The election results have ensured that divided government will continue.

Dr. Pomper's presentation was considerably enhanced by his extensive, masterly use of graphics to demonstrate the many points in his presentation.

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