



Project  
**MUSE**<sup>®</sup>

*Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.*

---

## **Brainwashed: How Universities Indoctrinate America's Youth**

Baum, Evan.  
Perna, Laura W.

The Review of Higher Education, Volume 28, Number 3, Spring  
2005, pp. 423-425 (Review)

Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press  
DOI: [10.1353/rhe.2005.0004](https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2005.0004)



 For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/rhe/summary/v028/28.3baum.html>

of colleagues, not being a chronic complainer, not becoming enmeshed in departmental politics, conducting oneself in a professional manner, being sensitive to the feelings of colleagues, being willing to negotiate and compromise, and so on. Such individualistic language is problematic, as I explain below.

Silverman also argues against conflating collegiality with “congeniality”—i.e., “behaving in a manner conducive to friendliness or pleasant social relations” (p. 7); but the language he uses makes it seem to me that he indeed conflates the two concepts. He might heed the warning of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) that such conflation is central to the problem of collegiality. The AAUP’s statement, *On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation*, discourages collegiality as a criterion in faculty evaluation because it is “exceedingly difficult to distinguish the constructive engagement that characterizes true collegiality from an obstructiveness or truculence that inhibits collegiality.” Collegiality may be used as a proxy for the suppression of dissent, and hence become a threat to academic freedom.

The AAUP’s warning seems correct to me; but at a more fundamental level, it too misses what is really at stake in the concern over collegiality. Like Silverman, the AAUP is concerned with individual actions and behavior rather than the power and control that collegiality implies. One should recognize that the term is a derivative of *collegium*, and, according to the 1984 edition of Webster’s *New World Dictionary*, collegiality is alternatively defined as “the sharing of authority among colleagues.” Collegiality in academe, therefore, refers to the sharing of authority *on behalf of* the collegium—that is, the academy. Understood this way, collegiality concerns the suppression of individuality for the collegium; and thus it is the academy, not the individual, that one must foreground for an understanding of collegiality itself.

It might be informative in understanding authority in the academy to distinguish the control and power of the administration vis-à-vis the faculty; and it might be fruitful to highlight how the politics of race, gender, class, sexuality, economy, and knowledge dictate what forms of power will be exercised by the academy over its members. But I emphasize here that “collegiality” concerns the power and control exercised by and for the academy. We should be leery, then, of the individualistic, intentional language used by Silverman. Such language masks what gives the academy its power. It obscures as well how failing to abide by conventions of collegiality might be understood positively as a fundamental challenge to the academy and that which is privileged in it.

We all have colleagues with whom we prefer not to associate, but it might be telling to ask ourselves what structures those feelings, and what is hidden or exposed when we act or refuse to act on them. When we feel that a colleague isn’t pulling his or her own weight we could question the nature of the weight that we are asked to bear. What is it that the academy is forcing us to do, what is being privileged, who is relieved of having to worry about it, and to what extent do we uncritically perpetuate these things? The idea of collegiality should direct our attention, not to what individuals need to do to survive in the academy, but to the punishment and reward mechanisms that disguise themselves as the actions and intentions of individuals. In other words, we might want to pay attention to the academic norms and structures that determine the choices we make.

The choices faculty make are *academic* choices—that is, they take place and are intelligible only within the academy. Thus, a more difficult question about collegiality than that found in Silverman’s book is: How is it that faculty actions come to be understood as effects of personal choice rather than effects of the academy’s structures? Of course, the academy is not a disembodied thing; and so an even more difficult question is: How do we come to incorporate academic norms as our own? This inquiry might get us to another, more political, and thus riskier, place: How might refusing the lure of collegiality allow the academy to be challenged and changed? In conclusion, although Silverman may be the first to address the concept of collegiality in book form, I think we could benefit from more critical analyses of this important but slippery concept.

---

**Ben Shapiro. *Brainwashed: How Universities Indoctrinate America’s Youth*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2004. 256 pp. Cloth: \$22.99. ISBN: 0-78526-1486.**

REVIEWED BY EVAN BAUM, RESEARCH ASSISTANT, WITH LAURA PERNA, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, BOTH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION POLICY & LEADERSHIP, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

In the words of the author, *Brainwashed* is meant to “rip the cover off of [sic] a system that for too long has claimed diplomatic immunity while simultaneously feeding students a steady diet of leftism” (p. xviii). Underneath the poorly written substance of the book, much of which seems to be a personal vendetta against UCLA Professor Robert Watson, is a devout hatred of higher education that typifies the arguments of such

neo-conservatives as Dinesh D'Souza, Diane Ravitch, and David Horowitz. A recent graduate of UCLA, 20-year old Ben Shapiro is a nationally syndicated columnist with Creators Syndicate, an international distributor of features to newspapers and internet sites. He is perhaps best known for his conservative and controversial columns in UCLA's *Daily Bruin* and the social lore surrounding his dismissal from the paper, the focus of Chapter 11.

Shapiro's central thesis is that the academy is overwhelmingly comprised of people who are anti-Republican, anti-Israel, and anti-American, against capitalism, religion, war, and God, while being pro-Democrat, pro-Islam, and pro-Iraq, in favor of socialism and communism, affirmative action and multiculturalism, homosexuality, abortion, euthanasia, radical environmentalism, and moral relativism. Despite the book's title, the text is often more an indictment of social policy and liberal ideology than an attack on higher education. Shapiro organizes his discussion of these themes into 12 chapters and concludes by outlining recommendations for conservatives in a brief (six-page) chapter entitled "Solutions."

A critique of his arguments is warranted, at least in part, by the fervor underlying his categorization of the typical American faculty member. The book has serious methodological limitations, as the author consistently provides no, incomplete, or biased support for his assertions. To "document" the ways in which the academy brainwashes students, Shapiro relies on one-sentence quotations from faculty members without providing any additional information, including the extent to which one faculty's view was representative of all faculty, whether the statement was related to the faculty's area of expertise, whether it was based on any research, or whether it had instructional purposes beyond indoctrination. Shapiro also inappropriately generalizes from his experiences at UCLA to the experiences of all students at all institutions. When included, sources supporting his perspective are drawn from conservative organizations, talk radio, and online reactionary media outlets. The irony in Shapiro's presentation is that, while his concluding recommendation to students is, "Please, think for yourselves" (p. 182), his own conservative brainwashing seems little different from the left-wing version he so vigorously opposes.

It is tempting to critique the book line-by-line, not only because of the methodological flaws but also because of the pervasiveness of inflammatory language. Two of the more outrageous examples are: "Many professors excuse and even encourage pedophilia" (p. 62) and "Professors are willing to go out on a limb to kill babies" (p. 95).

We stopped counting the number of times that he used the word "idiot."

The general style and structure of the argument may be illustrated by a representative example. In Chapter 2, "Partisan Politics," Shapiro summarizes opposition to legislation that he favors, the 1996 Welfare Reform Act, by stating that professors advocate for a "big, expensive, useless form of welfare that keeps teen pregnancy high, work ethic low, and the upper class paying massive taxes" (p. 13). He then quotes Professor Shelia Kamerman of Columbia University: "There is a fantasy that these changes are going to significantly reduce out-of-wedlock childbirth and teenage pregnancy. But very little attention is being paid to the consequences for the children" (p. 13). Shapiro fails to mention that Dr. Kamerman is the Compton Foundation Centennial Professor of Social Work and a nationally and internationally recognized expert on child and family policy. He also does not critique the basis for her statement but trivializes it: "Kamerman knows the trick: When you have no grounds for a real argument, weep for the children—a tactic (perhaps learned from leftist comrades in Congress) that gets good play in the press most every time it's tried" (p. 13).

While we do not recommend that supporters of higher education purchase this flawed book, reading a chapter or two may have at least two benefits for higher education professionals. First, the book raises the important question: To what extent are higher education institutions encouraging free and open exchanges of a full range of ideas inside and outside of the classroom? Free expression is a core value of American higher education. Although Shapiro does not acknowledge ideas other than those with which he agrees, a review of this book should encourage faculty and administrators to consider the extent to which existing policies, programs, and practices do in fact promote expression of diverse perspectives.

Second, this book sheds light on the nature of the conservative argument and the ways in which it is constructed. The book demonstrates that some portion of the population harbors a high level of anger, cynicism, and distrust toward higher education. The popularity of Shapiro's ideas is reflected, at least in part, by the number of laudatory comments published on the book's jacket and preliminary pages as well as in online reviews. Shapiro recommends that conservatives act on his perspective of higher education by shifting their financial support from "liberal colleges to conservative start-up colleges," establishing systems to rank colleges and universities by their "anti-conservative bias" (i.e., providing an alternative to the *U.S. News and World Report*

rankings), and hiring only graduates of conservative institutions (p. 182).

While colleges and universities may not feel threatened by these recommendations, the underlying sentiments may have real consequences, as suggested by increased calls for accountability. Higher education professionals clearly need to do a better job of communicating the purposes and benefits of higher education in a manner that persuasively reaches across ideological spectra.

---

**William E. Becker, and Moya L. Andrews (Eds.).** *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Contributions of Research Universities.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004. 338 pp. Cloth: \$34.95. ISBN 0-253-34424-7.

REVIEWED BY DAN BERNSTEIN, PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY AND DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE, UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, LAWRENCE

Professors Becker and Andrews have put together a highly readable volume that will be of great interest and use to many people in higher education. The editors explicitly argue that faculty members in research universities are especially capable of enhancing undergraduate student learning because of their discipline-based inquiry and up-to-date research agendas. To counter the complaint that research university faculty are not providing excellent undergraduate instruction, they present 11 chapters by faculty members who use their research knowledge to promote excellence in education. The editors ask readers to conclude from these examples of the "scholarship of teaching and learning" (SoTL) that their claim is correct.

An opening chapter by Lee Shulman of the Carnegie Foundation offers four models for including SoTL in the structure and primary agenda of research universities. All of the models are viable and useful, although unfortunately there is no direct connection with the other work presented. All of the chapters share some common themes: Everyone asserts the superiority of active over passive learning, and there is a general preference for preparing lifelong learners in preference to covering every possible topic related to a course title. The prevailing meta-model is that of learner-centered education with a focus on learning and not just on teaching.

Readers looking for good ideas and rich examples of teaching practices will find excellent chapters. Claude Cookman's account of how he teaches the history of photography will make you

wish you could be in the class, and his articulation of the intellectual goals of his course is an extraordinary analysis of what it means to think like an expert in his field. William Becker and William Greene offer excellent examples of learning activities made possible through technology, and Daniel Maki and colleagues describe several fascinating courses developed through their work on mathematics throughout the curriculum, including the arts. None of these chapters provides evidence of student learning, although the authors mention student acceptance and appreciation.

Three chapters do, however, report evidence about the impact of courses on students, only two of which relate to learning. Andrews provides a detailed evaluation of the performances of master's degree students in a clinical course on voice therapy, with a very sophisticated analysis of how the students were judged. Jeanne Sept describes the evolution of students' use of simulation technology in learning about the methods of archeology; students gradually perceived themselves as more comfortable with concepts and methods in archeology as the technological tools were refined. Bernice Pescosolido and colleagues evaluated the impact of a three-course summer program on the grades and retention of incoming first year students. Even though they determined that the program was ineffective, the authors note the value that the project had for the sociology graduate students who conducted the evaluation and discuss the role of problem-based research in a graduate curriculum.

Several chapters take great advantage of the disciplinary background of the authors to make a point about teaching in higher education. George Kuh's chapter on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is a remarkable document, reflecting his rich background in instrument design and great sensitivity to the many problems inherent in using surveys to guide policy. Reading this chapter would be an excellent introduction to this very widely used survey, and the presentation of the data helps readers avoid many typical errors of interpretation. Kuh acknowledges that NSSE is only a proxy for learning and further recognizes that smaller, non-research institutions directly capture student learning. Janice McCabe and Brian Powell's sociological interviewing techniques provide a thoughtful discussion of faculty members' perceptions of grade inflation, and Craig Nelson offers an insightful essay about the evolution of his teaching of biology. Becker writes with rich knowledge about the many pitfalls in drawing conclusions from non-experimental data, including dire warnings about the multitude of statistical sins that are routinely committed. This chapter will