Critical Thinking in the Tower Ivory

Albert Keith Whitaker

In the midst of Nathaniel Hawthorne's much celebrated short story, "The Celestial Railroad" (1843), which recreates the journey of John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* by train, Hawthorne and his fellow passengers ride by the cave where, in Bunyan's day, lived the cruel giants Pope and Pagan. These two had disappeared, but in their den now dwelt a new menace, "the Giant Transcendentalist," to whom Hawthorne gave this amusing description:

> As to his form, his features, his substance, and his nature generally, it is the chief peculiarity of this huge miscreant, that neither he for himself, nor anybody for him, has ever been able to describe them. As we rushed by the cavern's mouth, we caught a hasty glimpse of him, looking somewhat like an ill-proportioned figure, but considerably more like a heap of fog and duskiness. He shouted after us, but in so strange a phraseology that we knew not what he meant, nor whether to be encouraged or affrighted.[1]

In traveling about contemporary academia, especially the haunts of philosophy and English, one is likely to stumble upon the lair of a new monster, one that bears considerable resemblance to Hawthorne's dreamy vision. It certainly sits draped in fog and shadows and also speaks a novel, half-enticing, half-threatening tongue. Like most giants, it claims a lineage more distinguished than true. But unlike Hawthorne's "Giant Transcendentalist," and more in line with his predecessors Pope and Pagan, the mouth of this new giant's cave lies cluttered with bones—bones not merely of wayfarers but of entire intellectual traditions.

The name of this huge miscreant is Critical Thinking—a name uttered by professors and students with more awe than understanding. But since those of us who share its demesnes do not have Hawthorne's luxury of whisking by it in a train, perhaps the only way to forestall further harm is to face it boldly, shine some light in its cave, and expose its peculiar mix of mischief and malice.

Though critical thinking found its parentage in schools of education and, as we shall see, attained national fame in high schools, it eventually muscled its way to the heights of academia, especially in liberal arts colleges. Its influence of course varies from campus to campus. Sometimes it lurks as an elec-

---

Albert Keith Whitaker is professor of philosophy at Boston College in Massachusetts. Please address correspondence to *Academic Questions* / NAS, 221 Witherspoon Street, Second Floor, Princeton, NJ 08542–3215; editor@nas.org.

tive for undergraduates, sometimes as a piece of summer orientation or as an add-on to existing courses. But almost everywhere it wins words of respect, and its power and appeal are such that several large institutions of higher education today make critical thinking a part of their required core or a subject of mandatory testing.[2] It is not only a giant, but a beguiler too.

Aiding its guile is the dense fog surrounding it, a fog that derives from the multiplicity of its definitions. Some of its proponents claim that it is all about method and leave the ends of the activity to the thinker: "Critical thinking is best understood as the ability of thinkers to take charge of their own thinking."[3] Critical thinking is "the art of thinking about your thinking while you are thinking in order to make your thinking better: more clear, more accurate, or more defensible."[4] Others take the kitchen-sink approach and explain that critical thinking serves a multiplicity of ends: "Critical thinking is . . . the kind of thinking involved in solving problems, formulating inferences, calculating likelihoods, and making decisions."[5] And, "critical thinking is the questioning or inquiry we engage in when we seek to understand, evaluate, or resolve."[6]

A few seeming traditionalists go back to basics and identify critical thinking with logic: "Critical thinking is the formation of logical inferences."[7] And, "Critical thinking is the development of cohesive and logical reasoning patterns."[8] But the main thrust of critical thinking theory, surprisingly enough, propels it beyond the realm of thought and into that of action: Critical thinking is "The examination and testing of suggested solutions to see whether they will work."[9] Or, critical thinking is "The propensity and skill to engage in an activity with reflective skepticism."[10] Thus, many of the most popular definitions of critical thinking emphasize its role in making decisions or judgments: Critical thinking is "reasonably and reflectively deciding what to believe or do."[11] "Critical thinking is careful and deliberate determination of whether to accept, reject, or suspend judgment."[12] And, critical thinking is "a process which stresses an attitude of suspended judgment, incorporates logical inquiry and problem solving, and leads to an evaluative decision or action."[13]

Critical thinkers like to proclaim that their intellectual ancestry reaches straight back to Socrates. But, behind the bluster, the tone of many of these definitions reveals its true origin: the hopeful American combination of pragmatism and psychology. Thus, when not making pious noises at Socrates, many critical thinkers acknowledge John Dewey as the source of inspiration for their science, citing particularly his *How We Think*; and the record bears them out.[14] As early as the 1930s, educators influenced by Dewey were championing critical thinking as key to developing children's sense of independence[15]; as the "main function" of a teacher who would have students undertake their own reasoning and scientific investigations[16]; and as the antidote to such "timeworn" practices as entrance requirements, prerequisites, tests, and generally the imposition upon young minds of "masses of unser-

viceable information."[17] Maturity, personal growth, independence, relevance—critical thinking seemed to advance all the causes of those days. Far from a monster, critical thinking seemed to be a progressive St. George, come back to slay ancient prejudices.

Still, for several decades, critical thinking remained the mascot of schools of education and only haltingly emerged onto a larger scene. As with most slogans, its first few expressions by the public voice betray a great deal of clumsiness, but also offer insights into the movement that later, more polished usage smooths over.

For example, the *New York Times*, which later became a powerful advocate for critical thinking, records its first appearance in its pages on 4 March 1975, in a story about a certain Albert N. Podell, a recently-fired lobbyist for Common Cause, who had been censured by the New York State Assembly for bragging about unethical conduct. According to Podell, he was not speaking about his own use of threats or his own attempts to procure fifteen-year-old mistresses for state legislators, but instead was speaking hypothetically, in order to "provoke some critical thinking" in the Assembly. (His tactic reminds one of former Massachusetts Senate President William Bulger, who threatened to run a highway ramp through a local utility plant unless the plant's owners agreed to certain demands. In describing his threat, on national television, he said, "I *reasoned* with them.")

A year and a half later, critical thinking received another mention in the *Times*, as the New York State Board of Regents voted to create guidelines for the use of "controversial" books on, among other things, sex, in order to "encourage development of 'critical thinking' among students." Two members of the Board, however, voted against the proposal, saying it would circumvent parental control and allow teachers and librarians to "force objectionable material" on students.

And, lest these examples appear too sinister, on 25 November 1978, the *Times* ran a story about Yale professor Harold J. Morowitz, who argued that "today's youth" need courses in critical thinking in order to protect themselves against irrational movements, such as Jim Jones's People's Temple, 914 of whose members had slain themselves only a week before. Good advice always seems to come too late.

By this time, critical thinking had also begun to find its way into business and management publications. The Fall 1976 issue of *Organizational and Administrative Science* tellingly describes critical thinking as an essential component of the "participatory/democratic consciousness" needed, the author argued, for success. In the summer of 1978, the *Atlantic Economic Review* sounded what soon became a constant refrain, that managers need to develop critical thinking as a means to solving business problems. But three years later, in December 1981, London-based *Personnel Management* signaled some frustration with critical thinking: managers must learn "to do and make,

not just to discuss." Did the English perhaps possess a special sensitivity to this American bogey?

It was in this same year, 1981, that critical thinking as it is known today, as an element in "education reform," came to truly broad public notice. The *New York Times*, under the direction of education page editor Gene Maeroff, began a series of stories touting the critical thinking programs that were popping up in the nation's teachers' colleges and in the classrooms their graduates controlled.

The political impetus for such innovations was provided by a report by the National Assessment of Educational Progress, which showed that from 1970 to 1979 American junior and senior high school students' ability to reason inferentially and to solve problems had markedly declined. Similar tests in specific states, such as Illinois, seemed to back up the national findings. A report by the Rockefeller Foundation's commission on the humanities in America, which preceded the NAEP results by about a year, also recommended that critical thinking become one of the "basic skills" taught to all American youngsters, as did a Carnegie Foundation report and the powerful National Council of Teachers of English, both in 1983.

In response, programs in "learning to think" appeared at schools as diverse as Marymount Manhattan Community College, Xavier University, Bard College, Carnegie-Mellon, and CUNY. Boldly named institutes devoted to critical thinking also arose, such as the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children at Montclair State College and the Structure of the Intellect Institute in El Segundo, California. Foundation, national, and state money began flowing to the new cause, and all sorts of lesson plans began to be marketed to teachers, by such purveyors as the above-named colleges and foundations, as well as the Scholastic Institute, Innovative Sciences, and the Edward de Bono School of Thinking.[18]

Even though critical thinking caught on in high schools in the early 1980s, the students graduating from those schools and going to college grew markedly less able to read, write, and think during the 1980s and 1990s. A naive observer might think these deficiencies would have concerned college officials, but, on the contrary, higher education seemed pleased with the new cohort of students with wide-open minds. Perhaps reasoning that high schools must be doing something right, colleges began to adopt critical thinking elements into their own undergraduate curricula.

But, true to its nature, critical thinking did not sit still. It helped usher in a host of academic novelties, and, in the process, its own character has continued to change. For example, the widespread adoption of new "writing across the curriculum" or "writing in the disciplines" programs depends in part upon their customary promise to inculcate critical thinking and not merely good habits of writing.[19] Critical thinking has thus spawned "critical writing" and "critical rhetoric."

Similarly, the heartburn felt in recent decades by teachers of the humanities led many of them to grab for the curative of critical thinking, initially in the guise of "informal logic." At first the pitch went something like this, "Why study old, out-of-date books that won't help you land a high-paying job? Because, when you converse with Plato and Shakespeare, you learn to think critically, an essential skill in today's fast paced world! At least they may help you score high on the GRE or LSAT."[20]

Alas, Plato, Shakespeare, and all the others have been unmasked as racist, classist, and misogynist, making it unthinkable for right-thinking teachers to present them as authorities. This unease, coupled with the fact that ever-fewer professors possess the knowledge of language, history, philosophy, or literature needed to teach these books well, makes the focus on "critique" all the more inevitable. Critical thinking, an essentially pragmatic, American movement, thus has come to join hands with the "continental," radical cause of "critical theory" or, as it is sometimes called by practitioners, "critical pedagogy." The assumption implied in this alliance is that, although one cannot learn anything substantial from these old books, one can learn to "think critically" by tearing them apart and refuting them, all in line with the professor's ideological direction.

Of course, self-consistent critical pedagogues realize that it is often faster, and safer, to skip the old books altogether, and "de-center" students' "consciousness" by using testimony from popular culture, their personal confessions, or the students' own writings.[21] Aping such professors, some high school English teachers have also found that if they invoke critical thinking enough, they can eventually abandon the old standards completely and find a quicker route to the prized ideology by assigning more up-to-date readings, ones closer to the students' own experiences and so, it is assumed, more likely to engage their "thinking." That way, there is no chance some deviant might become enamored of the "classics."[22]

Hot on the heels of critical theory, the latest cause to infuse new meaning into critical thinking is *diversity*. While many people no doubt consider *diversity*—especially racial diversity—as almost a theological category, somehow good in itself, the challenges to the discriminatory admissions practices currently employed to achieve racial diversity in higher education have forced supporters to come up with "outcomes" that justify its goodness in instrumental terms.

The argument that *diversity* offers an important and essential contribution to "critical thinking" has been made most famously and with perhaps largest effect by Patricia Gurin, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Michigan, in her "Expert Testimony," in the case of *Gratz v. Bollinger*, a case challenging the University's program of racial preferences in admissions. In this report, Gurin explains "The Critical Importance of Higher Education" in this way:

> Because students in late adolescence and early adulthood are at a critical stage of development, diversity (racial, economic, demographic, and cultural) is crucially important in enabling them to become conscious learners and critical thinkers, and in preparing them to become active participants in a democratic society. Universities are ideal institutions to foster such development.[23]

Or, as she explains in the same section, when discussing "learning outcomes": "Students learn more and think in deeper, more complex ways in a diverse educational environment." Everyone wants to promote critical thinking, right? So we must have more *diversity*. A movement that Dewey gave birth to, as essential to the individual's role in democracy, has now come to mean treating individuals as the bearers of racial-group identity and racial-group thoughts. One can almost hear the fiendish giant's guffaw.

This is not to say that all critical thinking proponents now understand it solely as a justification for racial diversity. There are still plenty of vassals who identify critical thinking with informal logic, or problem-solving, or even a sort of cultural literacy. But whatever may be critical thinking's wiles, aspirations, or self-delusions, this short history reveals that this is no stubborn behemoth, battering its head against its opponents in a stupid manner; rather, it is nimble and clever. Over the course of seven decades it has been able to incorporate a multitude of meanings, some in direct contradiction with one another. Unlike Antaeus, who remained invincible as long as he touched the solid ground of Mother Earth, the special strength of critical thinking is, ironically, its intellectual barrenness: its very vacuity has ensured its staying power. That is, the pragmatic intention of critical thinking—the attempt to make thinking into an instrument, to put the mind to work, to elevate method over substance—has bequeathed to several generations of teachers a tool easily pressed into service by widely divergent, intellectually questionable, but practically-oriented causes.[24]

Yet, for all these capers, had critical thinking grown up on an uninhabited island, it would resemble nothing, I imagine, so much as a pesky hobgoblin. But, as mentioned before, it was born into a world rich with intellectual traditions, and the bones of many of these lie about its den. Critical thinking must be judged not only by its freaks and frauds, but also by what it has destroyed.

It has probably made the deepest inroads in English, especially composition courses. Teachers of such classes like to proclaim that students should show up knowing "the basics"—spelling, punctuation, grammar—because college, they add, is about analyzing literature and writing fluently. Such proclamations, though they no doubt flatter students, have as much force as an edict that water should flow uphill. Since the days of William Strunk, before the first World War, college students have needed instruction in "the basics."

But, under the aegis of critical thinking, composition instructors now can freely spurn what is called "the rules approach."[25] Cluttering students' minds with all these rules, they imply, distracts them from understanding the mate-

rial, organizing their thoughts, and thinking through their expressions. It is a curious argument, which attempts to strip the meaning of such expressions from their forms—a certain arrangement of letters, a comma or a semicolon, the use of the active or the passive voice, for example. Such an approach denies students the ability to wield their own thoughts in a disciplined manner, resulting most often in the half-thoughts of sentence fragments or the stream-of-consciousness blather of run-on sentences. It also ignores the difficulty faced by students who do not know "the rules" when they have to read any complicated piece of poetry or prose. But then, as many teachers have discovered, one way to avoid this impasse is for students to read and comment upon only the poorly written work of their peers.

Also, before "progressive" reforms, a large part of any literature or composition class was devoted to reading texts aloud and even declaiming memorized passages. A citizen, after all, must always be ready to speak in public, and so considerable attention was given to enunciation and what one author called "rhetorical reading."[26] Everyday grammatical reading expresses the text's intelligible meaning; rhetorical reading expresses its passion. Neither task is simple to master, and to do either one well requires studying a work closely, perhaps even reading it aloud, on one's own, first.

But students brought up by critical thinking find these exercises a bother. Why read something aloud or declaim a memorized passage when you could be talking *about* it, dissecting, deconstructing, and dismissing it? As a result, since they never so much as mouth the words of the text, these students usually have little idea of what a text means and even less of its passion. When forced to read, their readings tend to be halting and monotone—if they are even audible. The relentless subjectivity of the critical thinking approach—put yourself, your concerns, your problems, your opinions, before the text—thus cuts students off not only from the books but also from one another. In this way, Critical Thinking hands his victims over to his distant relative, the Giant Despair.

Some students do warm to public reading and declamation out of a natural theatricality; they like to "ham it up" in front of their friends. But, sadly, it rarely strikes them that such play-acting could serve almost as a sacred ritual, as the raising of the dead or at least the channeling of spirits, as the closest they will ever come to a great artist or thinker—speaking his words, in the way he would have spoken them, before his audience.

Finally, as should be clear to teachers in every discipline, critical thinking has set up enormous obstacles to memorization. From its start it set itself against "rote" memorization of "masses of unserviceable information." All students have now been told that this "information" increases two-fold or six-fold or ten-fold every year, and so balk at memorizing anything—a poem, a theory, an equation—that they can easily find in a dozen books or web sites. After all, the truly "critical thinker" can find his way to such stuff when and only when he needs it.

True, some students are charmed when they learn that as an elder statesman Winston Churchill could still recite lines he learned as a schoolboy about brave Horatius from Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome*. Others rightly find meaning in Abraham Lincoln's memorization and regular repetition of Knox's gloomy poem *Mortality*. And still others are gladly amazed when they read of Talmudic scholars who partition dozens of books of the oral law into hundreds of rooms in their mental "mansions."

But, like the famous "puppies" of Plato's *Republic*, who happily tear apart anything old and established simply because it is old, a far greater number of young people find critical thinking's charms irresistible: they turn upon the accumulated wisdom and beauty of civilization as so much "information," to be processed when needed, and they shred apart the disciplines, the institutional memories of this civilization, as so many constraints upon their free thought.[27]

Like evil spirits of old, critical thinking did not simply invade academia or American society by force: it was invited in and given a home. The reasons are as numerous as its charms, and these charms play heavily upon the proud but timorous democratic soul. Critical thinking's very fogginess means that even those who do not eye it too closely can still speak about it without fear of rebuttal. It also promises that everyone can become a "thinker" without having to learn a bunch of rules, or study for years, or, God forbid, memorize pages and pages of material. Still, "thinking," by itself, could never catch on as a movement in American society, for the naked noun smacks of Ivory Tower indolence. But "critical" thinking suggests productive deliberation—thinking that leads to a decision of some sort—or, more frankly, thinking that tears down and tears apart, eliminating anything high, which might make us feel small, or anything difficult, which would obstruct our "getting things done."

And so, behind all these charms, critical thinking remains a blight. Dewey, one critical thinker has said, "had no doubt that what should be happening in the classroom is thinking—and independent, imaginative, resourceful thinking at that."[28] Ironically, by driving away such practices as "rote" memorization and exercises on "basic skills," critical thinking has left students tongue-tied and thoughtless, literally bereft of ideas and meaningful expressions. Together with the political movements it serves so well, it has undermined and dispersed the disciplines meant to preserve civilization and it has thwarted students' disposition to become civilized. It has filled minds with fog and duskiness and the air with a strange, and empty, phraseology.

Notes

1. Nathaniel Hawthorne, *Tales and Sketches* (New York: Literary Classics of the United States, 1982), 817.
2. Some recent examples: The University of Texas (see "U Texas System to Assess Writing Skills," *Daily Texan*, 11 December 2001); the Virginia state system (see "Virginia Tech to Evaluate Writing Skills," *Collegiate Times*, 18 September 2001); and Colorado State

("University Studies Program Changes to All-University Core Curriculum," *Rocky Mountain Collegian*, 14 April 1998).

3. L. Elder and R. Paul, "Critical Thinking: Why we must transform our teaching," *Journal of Developmental Education* 18, no. 1 (Fall 1994): 34-35.
4. Richard W. Paul, *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World* (Rohnert Park, CA: Sonoma State University, 1990).
5. Diane F. Halpern, *Thought and Knowledge: An Introduction to Critical Thinking* (Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates, 1996).
6. Victor P. Maiorana, *Critical Thinking Across the Curriculum: Building the Analytical Classroom* (Bloomington, IN: EDINFO Press, 1992).
7. See Barbara Fowler's list of critical thinking definitions, probably the most complete on the web, from which several of these others were taken with corroboration from their sources: <http://www.kcmetro.cc.mo.us/longview/ctac/definitions.htm> (22 May 2002).
8. Steven A. Stahl, *Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning About Print* (Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1990).
9. See note 7.
10. John E. McPeck, *Critical Thinking and Education* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981), 8.
11. Robert H. Ennis, "A taxonomy of critical thinking dispositions and abilities," in *Teaching Thinking Skills: Theory and Practice*, ed. Joan Baron and Robert Sternberg (New York: W.H. Freeman, 1987). See likewise Stephen P. Norris, "Synthesis of Research on Critical Thinking," *Educational Leadership* 42, no. 8 (May 1985): 40-45.
12. Brooke Moore and Richard Parker, *Critical Thinking* (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1995).
13. NCTE Committee on Critical Thinking and the Language Arts. See <http://www.ncte.org/teach> (22 May 2002).
14. See, for example, the widely influential paper of Robert H. Ennis, "A Concept of Critical Thinking," *Harvard Educational Review* 32, no. 1 (Winter 1962): 81-111, 82 and 110.
15. L. Thomas Hopkins, "Constructing a Character Curriculum," *Journal of Educational Sociology* 4, no. 4 (November 1930): 206-210, 206.
16. John B. Johnston, *The Liberal College in Changing Society* (New York: Century Co., 1930), 242.
17. George F. Arps, "Higher Education and Modern Trends," *Journal of Higher Education* 4, no. 6 (June 1933): 290-294.
18. See *New York Times*, Education Column, 21 April 1981; "Teaching to Think: A New Emphasis," 9 January 1983; and "Teaching of Writing Gets New Push," 8 January 1984.
19. For example, the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Writing at Duke University, which administers the University Writing Program, "promotes excellence in undergraduate teaching, with a focus on active learning and on writing as a means of critical inquiry," <http://www.ctlw.duke.edu/ctlw.html> (11 April 2002). Similarly, Keith Hjortshoj, the Director of Cornell's "Writing in the Majors" program, defended their work this way: "nothing is more essential to academic life than the use of written language, as a means to the ends of communication and the construction of knowledge. What we [teachers of writing] teach, therefore, is fundamentally powerful and important, even if we are not. Within our institutions, writing teachers and their courses might be subordinated to all other kinds of instruction, but written language is not subordinate to anything" ("The Marginality of the Left-Hand Castes (A Parable for Writing Teachers)," *College Composition and Communication* 46 (1995): 499). In 2000, *Time* Magazine named Cornell one of the four "Best Colleges For You." According to *Time*, their interest in writing programs was primarily intellectual: "This year, the editors focused on writing-across-the-curriculum programs, which teach students to use writing as an exercise in clear thinking, regardless of their field of study." The guide's editor, Ellie McGrath added, "We used writing-across-the-curriculum and similar programs as a vehicle to explore how institutions are helping their students develop the high-level critical thinking skills that are so important to society," <http://www.news.cornell.edu/releases/Aug00/Time.jp.html> (17 August 2000). The Knight institute also notes that *Time* explained its choices on the basis that all four schools "teach their students how to use writing as a way to learn and think," <http://www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute/news/time.html> (17 April 2002).

20. A claim that still resonates. For just a couple of examples, at the collapse of the dot-com bubble, see the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "Survey Finds Most Americans Want College to Prepare Them for a Job," 23 June 2000 and, "Average Salary Increases for Liberal Arts Graduates," 19 May 2000.
21. See, for a truly frightening litany of such practices, Cathy B. Glenn, "Critical Rhetoric and Pegagogy: (Re)Considering Student-Centered Dialogue," *Radical Pedagogy* 4, no. 1 (2002).
22. See "Schools Shelving the Classics," *Washington Post*, 19 April 2000.
23. "Expert Testimony of Patricia Gurin," Theoretical Foundation for the Effect of Diversity. See <http://www.umich.edu/~urel/admissions/legal/expert/theor.html> (22 May 2002).
24. Mortimer J. Adler, the indefatigable proponent of the Great Books, pounded critical thinking as impracticable, because, he said, "There is no such thing as thinking in and of itself." (See "'Critical Thinking' Programs: Why They Won't Work," *Educational Digest* (March 1987): 9-12, 9.) About thinking, he is correct. But he did not notice the peculiar genius of the critical thinking movement: the psychic impossibility of its claims allow it to cater to nearly any cause, even, as happens today, ideological indoctrination. It possesses no substance to get in the way.
25. Katherine K. Gottschalk, "Putting-and Keeping-the Cornell Writing Program in Its Place," *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 2, no. 1 (April 1997): 24 and 38-39.
26. Ebenezer Porter, *The Rhetorical Reader, Consisting of Instructions for Regulating the Voice...* (New York: Newman and Ivison, 1853): 20-21.
27. Consider, for example, Louis Menand's judgment about "postdisciplinarity": "To continue to be relevant today, I believe academic inquiry ought to become less specialized, less technical, less exclusionary, and more holistic. I hope that this is the road down which postdisciplinarity is taking us. At the end of this road, though, there is a great danger, which is that the culture of the university will become just an echo of the public culture. That would be a catastrophe." See Louis Menand, "The Marketplace of Ideas," American Council of Learned Societies: Occasional Paper Number 49 (2001), at <http://www.acls.org/op49.htm> (22 May 2002). Although hopeful, Menand offers no reason to think that postdisciplinarity will not lead to the subsumption of universities by pop culture, and he ignores the considerable evidence that precisely this is happening.
28. Matthew Lipman, *Thinking in Education* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 15.

Faculty/staff notes in the 14 February 2003 Macalester College *Bulletin* told of a Macalester faculty member who had traveled to North Carolina to present

a series of invited lectures at Duke University Jan. 29–31, sponsored by the Women's Studies Program, Sexuality Studies Program, GLBT Resource Center and the Romance Studies Department. He presented a public lecture based on ongoing ethnographic research, entitled "Contesting Indigeneity: Queer and Native Politics of the Sexual and Transnational." He also presented a curriculum development workshop for faculty entitled "Women's/LGBT Studies Conundrums: The Question of Transnational Pedagogy." He lectured in the romance studies graduate course "Cannibalism" on sexual tropes informing colonial narratives of first contact. The trip concluded with a presentation in the GLBT Resource Center's series "Sexualities and the South," entitled "Radical Faeries in the South: Roots of Rural Queer Activism."