

REPORTS FROM THE ACADEMY

The Trivialization of Sexual Harassment

Lessons from the Mandelstamm Case

Henry H. Bauer

Many universities and colleges now have policies that explicitly prohibit sexual and other forms of harassment. These policies typically define harassment in broad or vague terms. Thus, they provide opportunities for the unwarranted persecution of persons innocent of harassment as commonly understood. As a rash of recent cases testifies, these opportunities have not been wasted. In this essay, I examine one such case and draw some lessons from it about the conditions within universities that foster this new form of injustice.

The Story

Allan Mandelstamm, charismatic teacher of economics to tens of thousands of students, abruptly announced his immediate resignation during class on 1 October 1990. Mandelstamm had come to Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI) in 1974 with a reputation for maintaining high standards while teaching huge classes to the great satisfaction of his students. At VPI he continued that tradition in a course taught live to some students, shown on closed-circuit television to others, and videotaped for yet more.

Pear-shaped, balding, with a drooping left eyelid, Mandelstamm had created for pedagogic purposes the character of Handsome Al, an active yet unfailingly unsuccessful lecher. Through this character, Mandelstamm enlivened lectures with sexually-oriented humor. For instance, in using the purchase of a necktie to illustrate a point about pricing, he would produce a bag full of ties, pretend to offer them for sale, reminisce about a tie printed with a woman who undressed as it was manipulated, and regret its theft by a former student. Once, when a student asked the question he had been angling for, Handsome Al twisted his face in lewd delight and exclaimed, "Aha! That's the question I was waiting for. Now I've got you in my grasp, and I can do anything I want with you!...Now, let's look at the figures again." And back he went to economics. Periodically, the class would loudly ask him to tell them

Henry H. Bauer is professor of chemistry and science studies at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0212.

stories. Once, he responded: "No! No story today! I'm too upset with you. Did you read in the morning paper the piece [holding up the clipping], '1 in 6 Female Students Claims Sex with Professor'? [Laughter.] Well, I teach 1200 students....[Loud laughter.] Yes! 1200! And that divided by six is 200! [Remark from audience.] Girls, boys, neuters, I don't care. I should have 200! What sort of a class are you?"

Despite his persona, Mandelstamm was a considerate teacher. He encouraged students to ask questions, allowing them either to raise their hands or pass written queries to the front of the class. Furthermore, because he knew that not every student would enjoy his style and humor, Mandelstamm always insisted that a concurrent section of the same course be taught by someone else. Not surprisingly, student evaluations of Mandelstamm's courses were usually the highest in his department.

Though teaching was his main focus, Mandelstamm was also a very visible academic good citizen, leading a successful fight for competitive faculty benefits and serving on and often chairing important committees. The recommendations of one committee he chaired led to increased support for the fine and performing arts at VPI and for years were called "The Mandelstamm Report."

In February 1986, Mandelstamm was visited by Nancy Reynolds, who headed Women's Affairs in VPI's Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EO/AA) office. She said complaints of sexual harassment had been made against him, that jokes and remarks he made in class inhibited female students from asking questions. Reynolds then spoke to the head of the economics department, Daniel Orr, who, fully aware of "Handsome Al's" style, expressed skepticism that anything had happened that could legitimately be called sexual harassment. Rebuffed by Orr, Reynolds told Richard Sorensen, dean of the College of Business, that some female students were afraid to ask questions in Mandelstamm's class. Sorensen proposed to Orr that Mandelstamm be removed from the classroom immediately.

Incensed, Mandelstamm informed his class of the charges and said he would venture no jokes and stories until he had been vindicated. He then distributed student evaluation questionnaires with several newly drawn questions, including: "I am afraid to ask questions...because he makes offensive sexist comments in reply." The responses were 3 "yes," 279 "no" from women and 0 "yes," 217 "no" from men. To, "The professor should permanently change his teaching style to prevent any possibility that anyone might take offense at the perceived sexist quality of his lectures," 3 women, again, said "yes," 277 "no"; 4 men said "yes," 216 "no."

Mandelstamm forwarded copies of the complete evaluation results to EO/AA and other VPI administrators. In response, he received a memorandum from Reynolds that said in part:

I appreciate your including me in this information sharing opportunity. Because the materials are not germane to the issue under consideration...I have not viewed the envelope contents.¹

The following day, Mandelstamm received another memorandum from Reynolds:

I met with you...to inform you of formal and informal reports...from students taking your...course...[Y]ou tell jokes and stories...which are forms of sexual harassment....Examples...are the discussion of your tie which illustrates a woman undressing,...the article...“1 in 6 Female...Students...Reports Having Sexual Contact with a Professor,” followed by a comment that you should have a certain number of your students....The purpose of the EO/AA Office...is to inform the faculty member of how she or he is being perceived, how the activities may fall within a definition of discrimination, and what liabilities ensue should a complainant prevail in a proceeding outside the university. This information sharing process is to benefit the faculty member, not to serve as an accusation or a formal proceeding....After this... the faculty member is considered knowledgeable....Further complaints of the same type of discriminatory activity which occur after the meeting require a more in-depth review with consideration of more serious consequences.

The EO/AA Office has received information that you have excluded from your lectures the kinds of jokes...about which we received complaints. In light of this corrective action, the EO/AA Office considers this matter resolved.²

But Mandelstamm did not. After informing Orr that he would not teach his classes unless the university publicly exonerated him, he received a letter from the provost, David Roselle, stating:

The overwhelming majority of your students consider you an excellent teacher. I hope you do not think that the EO/AA Office has challenged that finding....[T]he overwhelming majority of your students also do not consider your jokes and stories as sexist or offensive....[T]hey consider the stories to be an aid to learning, as you intend them....

...[A]ny complaint filed with the EO/AA Office must be investigated....Thus, at least up to the point of the interview, Nancy Reynolds was carrying out the duties of her position as prescribed by law and University policy.

The inquiry is now fully completed....[T]he complaint is based on a negative interpretation of your classroom humor by an extremely small minority...[who] misinterpreted the intent of certain aspects of your humor and thus found it...offensive....[I]t will assist you to be aware of the perceptions of such students so that you are able to be sensitive to their viewpoint....[T]he great majority of your students find your humor to be as it is intended—good fun and an assistance to your teaching. In particular, do know that the inquiry did not lead to the conclusion that a change in your teaching technique is indicated. We regret any unnecessary anxiety that you have experienced....I have asked [for]...a review of the manner in which any future inquiries are to be conducted. My concern is that

we may...have caused unnecessary anxiety for a valued member of our faculty (as well as for the EO/AA Office).³

Many people also spoke and wrote in support of Mandelstamm's stance, for the right of professors not to be harassed on matters of style or taste and against the notion that a few students out of many hundreds should dictate what goes on in a classroom. An editorial in the local newspaper, the *Roanoke Times and World-News*, suggested that Mandelstamm and Roselle had reason on their side: "Mandelstamm discriminates against a minority: students who don't share his sense of humor. Honestly, we're not making it up....The law offers protections for the kinds of minorities subject to ethnic, religious or sex-based discrimination. But for the humorless, there is no legal shield against an onslaught of jokes."⁴

Reynolds, however, did not approve of the provost's letter. An article in the *Roanoke Times* quoted her as accusing Roselle "of being insensitive to minority issues." The article also noted that her supervisor had asked her not to talk to the press, but that she chose to ignore those instructions, "because the First Amendment gave her a right of free speech." Roselle's letter did not close the Mandelstamm case, Reynolds said, "In fact, it's just the beginning."⁵

Women's groups mounted a campaign; letters and petitions went to newspapers and to then VPI president William Lavery. At the time, I was dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, but because the economics department was then in the College of Business, I was not officially involved in the affair. Nevertheless, I learned that one of the more extreme feminists had assured graduate students in her department that it would be worth their while to come up with something on Mandelstamm. I told my source that if anyone would give a first-hand report of the offer, I would gladly prosecute the matter. However, as so often happens in academe, this private information was not publicly available.

President Lavery bowed to the feminist pressure, issuing a carefully ambiguous public statement that reiterated the university's support for affirmative action. The statement did not mention Mandelstamm, but its timing made its object clear.

Eventually the furor died down, and Reynolds moved to another institution. But Mandelstamm still had received no clear exoneration of his teaching style from the university, though he sought one for several months through repeated appeals to Orr and Roselle.

In addition, Mandelstamm could hardly fail to notice that his raise that year was 9 percent below average, whereas it had been 32 percent above average the previous year. In the following two years, Mandelstamm received raises that were 15 percent below average. In other ways, too, he was treated prejudicially, with serious consequences for his salary.

After Orr left VPI in 1989 (when the economics department also became part of the College of Arts and Sciences), Mandelstamm sought reassurance

from his new department head, Yannis Ioannides, and Dean Herman Doswald that his service was valued. Instead, he was denied a compensatory raise, and two newly created chairs designed to recognize outstanding teachers went to other faculty. In May 1990, Mandelstamm was notified of yet another below-average salary raise. He told Vice-Provost James Wolfe about his frustrations and sought the counsel of a former provost, who promised to write to the new administration on Mandelstamm's behalf.

In June 1990, it appeared to Mandelstamm that he was about to face a new wave of harassment. Ioannides spoke to him about the most recent set of student evaluations and some new student complaints. He told Mandelstamm that some of his jokes were inappropriate, but declined to view the videotape of the lecture in which Mandelstamm made them.

Mandelstamm was fed up. He had failed to get a signal that he was an appreciated professor rather than a culprit on probation. On 1 October 1990, Mandelstamm announced his resignation to his economics class, told his tale, and left after receiving a five-minute standing ovation. There was a brief flurry of newspaper reports. Some students urged him to reconsider, and in a letter to the president, James McComas, Mandelstamm offered to finish teaching the semester without pay. The offer was refused.

The student newspaper published a letter from Orr that said:

Your university has lost a remarkable personality....certainly one of the best large-group teachers on any economics faculty in the nation....Seventeen cohorts of graduate students learned about organization and preparation, and many learned much economics...as Al's assistants....He believed passionately in the integrity of the academic process: students should work hard, high grades should be earned and weak performances should be met with low grades....But...also that learning should be fun, and can be accomplished most effectively when it is fun.⁶

On November 7, at the invitation of the Student Government Association, Mandelstamm gave a farewell talk. He remains convinced that the university treated him badly and has said so in newspaper and television interviews in recent months.

An Analysis

What was the outcome of the Mandelstamm case? One cohort of students was greatly inconvenienced and many future students lost the opportunity to learn under an excellent teacher. The university lost a nationally renowned instructor and gained unfavorable publicity. The professor concluded in bitterness a career that ought to have been capped by celebration. For this, some blame Mandelstamm himself. It is inexcusable, they say, to abandon students and colleagues in the middle of a term; and he could have made his humor inoffensive.

On the first point, I would reply: Mandelstamm gave the university ample notice of his intention and of the continued frustrations that led to his resignation. Had Mandelstamm been a leading researcher, bringing in millions of dollars in grants (including "overhead costs"), the administration would have kowtowed to him. Instead, it ignored him and must share in the blame.

On the second point, I would argue that very few people know what it takes to capture an audience of undergraduates. Mandelstamm used means that he found, over decades of practice, to be effective. Is it surprising that the humor he employed strikes some people as sophomoric? Videotapes of the offending lectures reveal that his audience laughed at his jokes. Reporters viewing those tapes in my presence shook their heads in disbelief that anyone should find in them anything but self-deprecating humor and pedagogic showmanship.

Mandelstamm could have taken the easy way out. After his run-in with Reynolds, he learned from the president that nineteen of his colleagues had accepted reprimands from her. Why, the president asked, hadn't Al?

One might better ask, why were there so many reprimands? Were they all justified? And, if not, why were they accepted? In one more recent case, students charged a professor with racial (and, as an afterthought, sexual) harassment. He was found not guilty. The EO/AA office recommended that the matter be resolved by having the professor attend a sensitivity workshop and write apologies to each of his students for his role in creating an emotional situation. One wonders what would have happened had he been found guilty. No apology was asked of the students, even though their charges were pronounced unproven.

Why have Mandelstamm and other professors been unjustly accused of harassment; and why, once such charges are made, do they tend to generate reprimands and other sanctions even after being disproven? The president might have told Reynolds to cut it out. Instead, he asked the accused professors to plead guilty to frivolous charges and submit to her reprimands. Why?

An explanation must include at least the following four points.

The university's loss of a clear sense of purpose.

Faced with a charge of harassment, a professor can choose from several options. One who feels guilty (which does not of course entail *being* guilty) may apologize and accept sanctions. One who does not feel guilty can also bow to bureaucratic power, accepting whatever denigrations are decided upon, if the charge does not seem worth fighting or the chances of winning are too low. Or, one can choose to fight, making use of every grievance procedure and appeal the university offers. Finally, one can behave as Mandelstamm did. Whatever the choice, it is unlikely to be well thought out; for an unexpected accusation of sexual harassment is about as traumatic an event as a teacher can experience.

Mandelstamm explained his refusal to use VPI's grievance procedures thus: "I thought...I would have won the money, but that isn't what I wanted to win. I wanted them to recognize that they had done wrong—that I had done a lot of good for this university."⁷ He did not want the settlement forced on the university by a judicial committee. In Mandelstamm's anthropomorphizing vision, the university was inherently rational, had clear goals, and made choices in its own best interest. He saw its administrators as stewards of an intellectual enterprise who would be willing to admit that wrong had been done. On all counts he was unrealistic.

Like other multiversities, VPI has no clear goal. Instead, it has many disparate, unranked goals. "Mission statements" embody every conceivable nice intention and banalities abound. Relative to these, anything can be defended. But a look at how VPI actually spends money reveals what really matters: buildings have been erected for other purposes while a grave and long-standing shortage of classrooms persists; administrative offices have been air-conditioned and sumptuously refurbished more than once over the last decade while existing classrooms still lack adequate ventilation; when the state mandated large budget cuts, VPI made them within the instructional budget; and when the Commonwealth permitted a surcharge on tuition to restore cuts in teaching positions, some of the money was used not to restore former positions but to recruit minorities and senior women, regardless of field.

When Mandelstamm came to VPI, the university was new to big-time research; now it is a research university. When Mandelstamm joined the faculty, he was unique; now there are many professors who teach classes of several hundreds. This is not because they are adept at it. Rather, as the university devotes more resources to graduate instruction and research, less is devoted to keeping classes small. Mandelstamm mistakenly thought that VPI put a high priority on teaching, that it would recognize what he did and encourage him to keep doing it.

The multiversity lacks a definite self-interest; instead, it is a congeries of interests and fiefdoms. The president tries to please alumni, parents, governing boards, faculty, students, legislatures, agricultural federations, engineering societies, lumber industries—all in absence of agreed-upon priorities. Colleges and vice-presidents war over budget shares, and administrators at other levels have their own priorities. Department heads, for example, need to preserve their departments' national visibility, which is gained by research, not by teaching. Mandelstamm thought that when he spoke with his department head, a dean, or a vice-provost, he was talking with "the university"—with someone who could see his case in institutional perspective. Not so.

Finally, Mandelstamm was mistaken about administrators' willingness to redress an injustice. A new department head like Ioannides, for example, is rarely willing to assume responsibility for his predecessor's actions. Furthermore, though the multiversity has no clear priorities, it does bow to the sacred

cows of diversity, multiculturalism, and sensitivity. And Mandelstamm was guilty of that most heinous of offenses—not the committing of sexual harassment, which has always been an offense, but *being charged with committing sexual harassment*. Thus Ioannides refused to look at the videotape of one of Handsome Al's offending jokes, though surely he would have examined evidence had the offense been less heinous, say a charge of unfair grading.

The creation of an independent EO/AA bureaucracy.

The university's loss of academic purpose has permitted a nonacademic purpose that many find attractive or compelling to grow unchecked and to acquire a supporting bureaucracy that flourishes independently of the academy's traditional structure. About a decade ago, VPI department heads and deans agreed that affirmative action and equal opportunity efforts should be administered and supervised through the existing chain of authority, from head to dean to provost to president. Nevertheless, as on many other campuses, there grew up a separate empire of EO/AA personnel. These persons are charged with the impossible task of achieving a statistical ideal in the university's racial and sexual composition, contrary to what the marketplace or plain common sense may say, and of castigating professors when impossible things do not get done.

The EO/AA office is more like a personnel or payroll office than an academic department or college. Its staff do not know the faculty personally, and they have no academic credentials, ideals, or purpose. The EO/AA office does not serve the intellectual mission of the university; instead, it furthers social goals. Hence, EO/AA personnel tend to be social reformers and sometimes ideologues. As the rectification of social injustice is its *raison d'être*, its staff has a clear interest in ferreting out and publicizing instances of real or apparent injustice. Thus Nancy Reynolds not only rejected Provost Roselle's exoneration of Mandelstamm but publicly extended the charge of "insensitivity" to the provost himself.

The EO/AA bureaucracy operates independently of the rest of the administration, ignores academic traditions of due process, and cares little for learning, teaching, and scholarship. At VPI, all charges against faculty are handled (according to AAUP recommendation) by faculty committees—*except* charges of racial or sexual harassment. These are addressed by the EO/AA office.⁸ And this office handles those complaints differently from the way the university otherwise operates. Normally, complaints lodged against a professor are first brought to the department head. Department heads know their faculty and appreciate their disparate energy, talents, and records of achievement. If a complaint is made about one of them, the head can place it in the perspective of the faculty member's larger professional life. Had the head of the economics department been the first to inform Mandelstamm of the complaints lodged against him, he would have been less offended at the outset. But Mandelstamm was badgered by a stranger and petty bureaucrat with no

understanding of scholarship and who declared him guilty on the say-so of an anonymous student and wrote him memos couched in menacing bureaucratese.

Such an impersonal and ideologically driven method of investigating and punishing real or imagined instances of sexual harassment opens the process to interference by extremists. I believe this happened at VPI, where a few campus radicals, looking for an opportunity to make a public statement about sexism, chose Mandelstamm because of his visibility.

The university's broad definition of sexual harassment.

Even the very highest student evaluations are never 100 percent favorable. Mandelstamm had 490 students who rated him excellent at coming to class on time and 11 who rated him good, but 2 who rated him poor or very poor. No one, surely, would take this as a sign that Mandelstamm should have been reprimanded for tardiness. Yet when a similar proportion of women pronounced themselves offended by his jokes, the EO/AA office sprang into action: "If one student is afraid to ask a question, that's one too many.... This is not a nightclub where you can choose whether to buy a ticket or not. This is a class the students are required to go to."⁹ I would agree that one offended person is too many if a professor has propositioned a student, but not when the issue is about the "insensitivity" of a statement addressed to hundreds. Moreover, the claim that students were required to attend his class is false. Mandelstamm always insisted that someone else teach a concurrent section of the same course.

But even if Mandelstamm had been the only game in town, it would not necessarily be his fault if a few students out of many hundreds were afraid to ask a question. Students come from an enormous range of backgrounds, and professors cannot make them all feel instantly at ease. Nor can a university demand that professors please every single student. (Deans, provosts, and presidents like to present themselves as serving the faculty. May we find them guilty of harassment if they offend even one professor?)

VPI's sexual harassment policy defines sexual harassment as including

verbal...conduct of a sexual nature...[that] has the...effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work or academic environment. (For example, a pattern of conduct that causes discomfort or humiliation...sexually explicit statements, questions, jokes, anecdotes, visual materials, or literature.)¹⁰

The EO/AA interpretation that even one complaint is too many may be supported by the reference here to "an individual." Yet surely one would still have to assess how "unreasonably" Mandelstamm was interfering with that person's performance and judge whether the environment was indeed "intimidating, hostile, or offensive." If three hundred women have no complaint but three do, does that not show an environment to be inoffensive?

The expansive definition of sexual harassment to include jokes and other verbal acts that may cause someone "discomfort" necessarily results in an exaggerated statistic of sexual harassment, thus justifying the existence of a special bureaucracy to handle sexual harassment cases. None of this would be tolerated were it not supported by the prevailing atmosphere of "political correctness," in which "sensitivity" is elevated into a supreme virtue and all white males are held guilty until proven innocent—or even after being proven innocent.

The prevailing climate of "political correctness."

Sacred cows and taboos do not belong in a modern university. They belong in a prescientific culture of magical thinking, in which superficial resemblances assume significance under the "principle of correspondence" and words assume power in spells and incantations. Political correctness is characterized by magical thinking. Since a blow can "hurt" and a remark can also "hurt," political correctness equates the two as equivalent forms of "ethnoviolence"—or sexual violence.

Only in the current climate of political correctness would anyone have labeled as harassment humor that offended the sensibilities of a tiny few. Only in a climate of fear would a professor found not guilty be warned not to offend again lest worse consequences befall him.

The same climate explains the otherwise inexplicable behavior of administrators, when charges of harassment begin to fly about. Many administrators are afraid that campus extremists might call them racist, sexist, insensitive, or unresponsive. Thus, when Mandelstamm asked VPI administrators to view the videotapes of his classes and determine his guilt or innocence for themselves, they refused. Had they examined the evidence they might have concluded that the allegations were unproved—and no administrator wants to have to tell a woman that her charge of sexual harassment is unjustified. (This is particularly true where the EO/AA director not only investigates, judges, and recommends action when charges of harassment have been made, but also authorizes several steps in the appointing of new faculty, beginning with the advertising of position openings and the composition of search committees.)

Administrators at VPI and elsewhere hope that their faculty will not do anything to displease extremists. Professors soon learn that they cannot rely on the administration for protection against unwarranted charges made by students. Students, hence, can make irresponsible charges with impunity. Thus the incentive is great to pander, to lower expectations, to do anything to please the least serious and intellectually committed students. That's a helluva way to run a university.

Political correctness is not a matter of specific social goals; its essence is extremism. Its advocates claim to be for equality and diversity, just as Joseph McCarthy claimed to be against communism; but McCarthy then and the

PCers now are simply after power.¹¹ Conservatives and Republicans were reluctant to criticize McCarthy because they wrongly thought his goals were theirs; nowadays liberals and Democrats refuse to criticize PCers for the same reason. The victims of political correctness on American campuses, however, have typically been traditional liberals. Fanatics and extremists misconstrue dedication to moderation in means as only moderate devotion to ideals.

Usually, I disdain conspiracy theories, but in this case, here is the evidence. First is the outrageousness of the charges made against Mandelstamm. It is absurd to maintain that anyone in his class was afraid to ask questions, because students could always ask questions anonymously. Nor should Mandelstamm be indicted because 1 percent of his female students felt uncomfortable with him; certainly their alleged discomfort could not be labeled “sexual harassment”—only fanatics would do so. Second is the organized campus campaign against Mandelstamm, suggested by the fact that one of the extreme feminists on campus urged graduate students “to come up with something” on him, and by a series of letters from prominent feminist activists in the local newspapers.

What Ioannides told Mandelstamm in June of 1990 further supports this interpretation: over the course of a few weeks, several people on separate occasions made the same complaint about a “sexist” remark more than six months after the alleged event occurred. According to Ioannides, the complaints came to him in a way that is not directly indicative of conspiracy, yet his criticism of Handsome Al’s humor gave Mandelstamm ample cause to feel that the campus speech police were still after him.

Conclusion

Immediate causes of the Mandelstamm debacle lie in the university’s politicized atmosphere, in the expansive definition of sexual harassment, and in the existence of an independent EO/AA bureaucracy.

However, if VPI—and other universities—were otherwise sound, political correctness, absurd definitions of harassment, and overweening bureaucracies would not be tolerated, or their effects would not be as serious. Unfortunately, higher education’s loss of clear purpose leaves academic institutions vulnerable. Because nothing in a university comes first, not even scholarship, each group within it feels free to push its own concerns, and the group pushing hardest wins for the time being.

In meetings, faculty and administrators talk incessantly of visibility and image, budgets and lobbying, student credit hours and accountability, affirmative action and diversity. Yet they say almost nothing about scholarship or the curriculum; and when they do, they are thinking about what is in it for them and their departments. Administrators offer no intellectual leadership, and faculty do not ask for any.

Ultimately, the Mandelstamm mess must be blamed on that which is also responsible for undemanding and incoherent curricula, sports scandals, and lowered standards: on the fact that the university has no predominant intellectual goal. Instead of being the heart of the university, the faculty is just one of several competing groups; indeed, it is becoming the least attended to and the least influential among those groups.

Notes

1. Nancy Reynolds to Allan Mandelstamm, memorandum, 6 March 1986; copies were sent to Daniel Orr and Richard Sorensen.
2. Nancy Reynolds to Allan Mandelstamm, memorandum, 7 March 1986; copies were sent to Daniel Orr and Richard Sorensen.
3. David Roselle to Allan Mandelstamm, letter, 27 March 1986; copies were sent to Daniel Orr, Richard Sorensen, and Nancy Reynolds's EO/AA superiors.
4. Editorial, "A New 'Minority': The Humorless," *Roanoke Times and World-News*, 5 April 1986.
5. Eric Randall, "Tech Letter Brings Charge of Favoritism," *Roanoke Times and World-News*, 3 April 1986.
6. Daniel Orr, "Irreplaceable Professor Lost" (letter), *Collegiate Times*, 12 October 1990.
7. Stephen Foster and Tia Gates, "Mandelstamm Submits Resignation," *Collegiate Times*, 2 October 1990.
8. The AAUP has commented on this deplorable development in, "Due Process in Sexual Harassment Complaints," *Academe* (September/October 1991), 47. At VPI, only after the EO/AA director decides that a professor is guilty and should be disciplined does he have recourse to a jury of his peers—a committee of three people chaired by the EO/AA director.
9. Madelyn Rosenberg, "Ex-Tech Teacher Says He Was 'Politically Incorrect,'" *Roanoke Times and World-News*, 15 October 1991.
10. "Sexual Harassment Policy," *Faculty Handbook*, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1988; latest update 4 March 1991.
11. Note PCers' calls for the empowerment of groups for whom they claim to speak and their philosophy of extreme relativism: because objectivity is impossible, disagreement can only be resolved by force.