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Gaudino's Ghost: The Relevancy of Life and Story

When Robert Gaudino died in November 1974, his teaching career ended after less than twenty years. Except for his years in India,\(^1\) he spent them all at Williams College. He left two slender books; an unpublished doctoral dissertation; two didactic plays, never published, never performed outside the Williams community; one laboriously written and rewritten article on teaching, intended as a chapter in a larger work, which was never finished (a fate almost certainly known to the author even as he struggled with the revisions to the one (near-ready chapter, expending irreplaceable time and energy); several proposals, evaluations, and planning memoranda covering course offerings and College business; and an office full of books and papers, letters and notes, most of which made their way into the College archives.\(^2\)

The books collect, describe, report. The dissertation explores, asserts, defends. None cites the theories or findings of others. The plays imitate but do not capture the stark words and deeds of classical tragedy. The articles and evaluations resemble the

\(^1\)Gaudino spent the academic years 1960-62 at the University of pursuant to a Fulbright grant and parts of three other academic years in India, on leave, in connection with Peace Corps training programs, and, of course, as director of Williams-in-India. See generally S. Rogovoy.

\(^2\)His family retrieved some personal effects as mementos. A few books went to the College library, others to colleagues in the political science department; the rest were sold. The papers (and a collection of audiotapes of debriefings from his experiential courses) became the Robert L. Gaudino Collection, as cited herein. Interview with David A. Booth, September 1, 1989.
books, at the same time labored and cryptic, flat and unyielding. Of the papers, only a few lectures -- in the form of delivery notes, not full text -- offer glimpses of Gaudino's ideas in the process of crystallization.

Socrates, it is said, distrusted writing. So, too, twenty-four hundred years later, did Gaudino. Whether in emulation of the great philosophers or fear of his own intellectual or stylistic shortcomings, Gaudino wrote only when a formal or institutional necessity, unknown in Socrates' Athens, so commanded. Even then, he evaded, eluded, even gently mocked the conventions of scholarship, to the exasperation of his colleagues and to the brink of expulsion from the Williams community. In stubbornness or humility, or both, he insisted on teaching, the way he knew how, the way he believed best: by holding up to his students texts and experiences that refracted their beliefs, exposing immaturities and incompletenesses, changing perspectives, lighting inner darkneses and throwing shadows across hitherto sunlit certainties. Only at the end, when the issue had become neither promotion nor permission to offer unconventional courses, but comprehension of his life/work, did he

---


4 The "emulation" thesis is advanced by Professor George Romoser of the University of New Hampshire. Interview, November 20, 1989. The "insecurity" thesis is an influence of my own from comments in several interviews and from comments about his plays. See, e.g., RLG Papers, Box 1, Folder 10. With characteristic appreciation for paradox and complexity, Professor H. Ganse Little has suggested that the two are intertwined. Interviews, September 21, 1989; September 28, 1989; January 22, 1990.

5 When Gaudino left for India in 1960, he had been told he was virtually certain to be denied tenure for lack of scholarly production. See RLG Papers, Box 1, Folder; Interview with Vincent M. Barnett, October 6, 1989.
attempt to sum up. As we know, death pretermitted that summation. Or, perhaps, in one mind at least, it did not; perhaps, in the wonderful triple-edged epigram of Robert Penn Warren -- all the more remarkable for predating deconstructionist word-play -- "the end of a man is to know." In November 1974, Gerald Ford was president, Nelson Rockefeller vice-president. The Steelers were on their way to their first Super Bowl. New automobiles would not start unless the seatbelts were fastened. American ground troops were still in Vietnam. Hardly anyone had heard of Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Carol Gilligan. And Bob Gaudino was dead, his students and colleagues bereaved -- and challenged, for the last time, by the strongest case of the inquiry with which he had challenged the students in his classes that final fall:

"So, what do you think about my trying to teach you in this condition?"

What, indeed? Perhaps, however, it is the most important question we can ask ourselves as trustees of the Fund in 1993, as Gaudino's longtime colleagues, the first generation of trustees, and the second of two supportive College presidents retire in a near-simultaneous volley. At the same time, a generation of students arrives for whom, as a matter of birthdate and belief, Gaudino has never been anything but dead, along with the other white European males who purportedly established a tradition in their own image and disguised their particular deed behind claims of authority.

---

6See section I, infra, at


8Interview with George Marcus, December 6, 1989.
universality and justice that few scholars today defend.⁹ History offers the spectacle, oft renewed, of the struggle for control of the memory and message of a departed teacher and the consequences thereof in blood and confusion. On the world-historical stage, Socrates, Jesus, Mohammed come to mind; in smaller, more experimental theaters of human encounter -- "off-Broadway," so to speak -- one might as easily name Lincoln, Plath, Foucault, Martin Luther King. In each case, one is entitled to wonder whether such teachers would approve of the edifices erected, the doctrine promulgated, the discipline imposed in their names.

In the case of Gaudino, there is no shortage of proffered answers. One younger colleague, whose interests in quantitative methods might have been thought anathema to a political philosopher trained by Leo Strauss, has said that instead Gaudino welcomed him to the department and became the most important and challenging influence of his career. He has also said that Gaudino’s gift was his alone and cannot be replicated at today’s Williams, that the distortions arising from professional pressures, faculty politics, and student attitudes would inevitably caricature and trivialize both man and method.¹⁰

Another member of the political science department, while professing similar reverence for Gaudino, has suggested not only that he is inimitable, but should not be emulated, for two reasons: (1) the "distance" in his method, a style it "never occurred to him to alter," and his resistance to "plurality within himself" would be weaknesses,


¹⁰Marcus interview, December 6, 1989.
not strengths, in today’s environment;\textsuperscript{11} and (2) the effort to measure present projects by identifying and applying Gaudinian standards results only in a cacophony of equally arbitrary interpretations and is, therefore, a waste of time. According to this view, we honor Gaudino’s memory best by deploying the resources given in his name as we see fit, choosing among project proposals on the basis of our own collective sense of worthiness.\textsuperscript{12}

A third view, held by several trustees and faculty members (probably a working plurality of the current membership), produces practical results similar to the second, but for different reasons. Its proponents hold that there is a recognizable Gaudino tradition, established by the man himself, but that it is exceedingly broad: virtually anything that is rigorous, reflective, "uncomfortable" and "political" in the broad sense qualifies as "Gaudinian."\textsuperscript{13}

Then there are those who believe that the tradition is both identifiable and specific in character and incident; these observers are the most likely to believe that the history of the fund and its administration already reveals departures from it.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11}Interview with Raymond Baker, December 7, 1989.

\textsuperscript{12}Minutes of the Gaudino Trustees, October 24, 1992, at

\textsuperscript{13}This interpretive rubric is most closely associated with Kurt Tauber, even though he himself would disavow it. In written form, however, uninformed by his own well-tempered sense of the tradition, cf. Jacobi\textsuperscript{ellis} v. Ohio, U.S., (19) (Stewart, J. concurring) ("I know it when I see it"), this description of the elements of his construction of the tradition is not unfair.

\textsuperscript{14}This view is most frequently advanced in some form by the present writer, David Booth and, with respect to a narrower range of issues, Richard Herzog (philosophical rigor), Scott Miller (inclusiveness) and Jeff Thaler (personal growth and experiential aspects of RLG program).
Finally, there are those who view Gaudino (either at first or second hand) as simply one among many gifted teachers at Williams -- praiseworthy perhaps, even distinctive, but not unique -- and support the notion of a memorial fund as a matter of both *politesse* and *politique*. To complicate matters, all of these opinion-strata are fractured along axes connecting optimism and pessimism, professionalism and amateurism, doctrine and practice, enthusiasm and disinterest, energy and exhaustion. These disagreements, moreover, mirror a campus that is unusually discontented and unusually vocal about its discontents.

Against this restless backdrop, I write with several purposes: to assist in remembering Gaudino; to identify some of the sources of his thought and practice, to discover points of continuity between those sources and the issues that discomfort Williams today; to examine, without fear or favor, some of the problems that confront the Fund and the College in the ongoing interaction, and some of the assumptions that underpin those problems; and to suggest some directions for future work. It goes without saying that this writing excludes by including and that it is a web of interpretations subject to further interpretations, and to challenge; much of what has been excluded, however, was considered. As for what has been included, much has

---

15 This viewpoint is characteristic of most of Gaudino's contemporaries on the faculty outside the political science department, including President Oakley. See Interview with Francis C. Oakley, November 28, 1989.

16 See, e.g., Michael O'Connor, *Students air concerns at all-campus forum*, Williams Record, March 2, 1993, at 1, 4. In fact, virtually every issue of the Record published in 1993 contains more than one article, column, letter in response finding fault with the College, administration, and/or individual students in sharply personal terms. See sections III & IV, infra, for a further development of this point.
been condensed, summarized, thus raising issues of distortion (especially as the summarization is provided by a relative newcomer to the relevant literature). In the course of composing, no doubt I have erred -- or at least misinterpreted -- again and again. Most were accidental. For all, I accept responsibility.
I. A Grounding for Analysis

When research into lives and events yields surprises requiring reinterpretation, the cause of the surprise frequently turns out to be distortion near the source, through inadvertent or deliberate suppression of evidence, or near the "mouth," through the writing of an account shaped more by policy imperatives than faithfulness to the evidence. Where neither influence makes itself felt, review of familiar materials in greater depth deepens appreciation but changes previous impressions only by degree. So it is -- so far -- with the life and work of Robert Gaudino. Time, or painstaking discretion, may have hidden some few things from view, perhaps forever. For any purpose relevant to administration, fundraising, diplomacy, teaching, or remembering, what we thought we knew, we knew. We can trust it.

What, then, did we know (whether or not we knew we knew it)? We knew that from beginning to end the lodestar concept for Robert Gaudino remained "how the college...relate[s] to civil society."17 In 1955, he stated that [the] purpose [of higher education] is to produce thoughtful and reasonable citizens."18 He restated that belief in 1964: "'[T]his course...encourage[s] a transition...from private to public concerns,

17R. Gaudino, The Public Rights and the Private Duty of Higher Education: An Inquiry Based on Contemporary Understandings of Academic Freedom 175 (September 1955) (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation [hereinafter "Public Rights/Private Duty"]). See also id. at 107 ("Higher education is public when it aims to enhance the quality of the political order of which it is a part"), 169 (higher education is "substantive public trust" not to be compromised by "forces foreign to its true purposes").

18Id. at 108.
...self-consciousness to citizen-conscioussness, a grappling with objectivity...for
citizenship or a public life."19 In a slightly different form, the same concern emerges
in 1973 in "The Divided Line:" "to make distinctions...[i]mportant for giving shape
to...the purposes we are educated...and...ruled for...[:] authority."20 Even in 1974,
when Gaudino could no longer write, the original purpose may be inferred from his
whispered question, "[H]ow do you educate dilettantes?;"21 neither the arousal of the
indifferent nor the question of technique need have been addressed in that desperate
season if his motives had materially changed.

We knew that Gaudino demanded careful reading in a spirit of willingness to
"hear" the "voice" of the writer, to suspend both visceral disbelief and critical
disassembly of the argument until that argument was understood on its own terms.22
In the beginning, the perspective provided by such reading, and discussion based

19See Planning a Course 7 (1973) (unpublished manuscript) [hereinafter
"Planning"] (available in Robert L. Gaudino Collection, Williams College Library
[hereinafter "RLG Papers"], Box 3, Folder 5) (quoting 1964 course syllabus for
Political Science 103, "A Study of the American Polity"); see also President and
Trustees of Williams College, WILLIAMS COLLEGE BULLETIN 1964-65, 177
(1964); RLG Papers, Box 1, Folder (original syllabus).

20R. Gaudino, The Divided Line 5 (1973) (unpublished manuscript) (RLG Papers,
Box 3, Folder 1) [hereinafter "Divided Line"].

21R. Gaudino, Empathy 1 (1974) (unpublished dictation notes) (RLG papers, Box
3, Folder 7).

22See, e.g., Planning at 9-10, 11-12; see also Tarcov & Pangle, Epilogue: Leo
Strauss and the History of Political Philosophy, in L. Strauss & J. Cropsey (eds.),
HISTORY OF POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY 908, 912-14 (3d ed. 1986), Herzog,
Suitable Uses of the Gaudino Fund 2, 19 (April 9, 1981) (unpublished manuscript)
[hereinafter "Suitable Uses"].
thereon, was the liberal arts education. Later, as we know, Gaudino perceived the need to go beyond reading and discussion; even at the end, however, he avowed that the "talk" which had assumed such importance "starts with an analysis of the readings," is assessed by "[t]he student's...substantive grasp and articulation of the readings," and depends on reading for "structure, argument, meaning." We know that Gaudino insisted that students could not find their own way to wisdom and citizenship without the teacher, upon whom they depended for direction, interrogation, inspiration, evaluation, arbitration. As he repeated the grounding of education in citizenship and the importance of reading, so Gaudino sounded the refrain of professional oversight consistently and relentlessly throughout his career. It is even possible to infer the importance of the teacher's role from his refusal to act when

23 See, e.g., Planning 10.

24 See, e.g. Divided Line 72-78; Planning 19; Gaudino, Williams-at-Home, a Preliminary Reckoning 8-9 (August 1972) (unpublished manuscript) (RLG Papers, Box , Folder ) [hereinafter "Reckoning"].

25 Gaudino, Political Science 381-105-382: A Study of Public Authority 3 (Fall 1973) (unpublished manuscript) (RLG Papers, Box , Folder [hereinafter "Public Authority"]).

26 Id. at 5.

27 Id.; see also Planning at 20; Reckoning at 8.

28 See Empathy at 5, (Divided Line at 76 (arbitration); Public Authority at 5, Planning at 15-16 (evaluation); Planning at 4, 7-10, 12 (inspiration); Public Authority at 2-3, Planning at 9-11 (interrogation); Planning at 3-4, 43, Divided Line at 71-73, Public Rights Private Duty at 169 (direction).

29 See authorities cited in note 12, supra; see also Planning at 26 (describing type of teacher required for experiential education), Public Rights/Private Duty, passim.
his own physical limitations compromised his ability to perform the functions required for the success of Williams-at-Home II:

The faculty member should be out there with the students to ask them questions, to draw them out in discussions and to pull them out of the particulars of the homestay. The aim is not to reassure the students but to get them talking to and criticizing each other. [My disease prevents my carrying out those tasks. It is unfair to students to ask them to give up a year to a program which could not be fulfilled as conceived], unfair to the faculty and to the idea of the institution to go on....30

The reason for this indispensability is that the teacher symbolizes, replicates, mediates what is being taught: authority of the college,31 of the intellect,32 of the integrated self.33 Indeed, Gaudino’s last recorded utterance on the subject of


31 See Planning at 16-17.

32 See Buck, supra note 14, at 6, col. 1.

33 See Planning at 43-44. A colleague has suggested that Gaudino’s methods resembled psychoanalysis in their insistence on the students’ coming to terms with authority through confrontation with it in the person of the teacher. Interview with H. Ganse Little (September 21, 1989) (notes on file with author). There is no evidence that Gaudino was as familiar with psychoanalytic theory as is Little, but he had access to the theory through the writings of Erik Erikson, which were in use in courses in several departments at Williams in the sixties, including Gaudino’s own. See E. Erikson, GANDHI’S TRUTH (1969); IDENTITY, YOUTH AND CRISIS (1968); YOUNG MAN LUTHER (1958). Moreover, Gaudino began his college career as a psychology student. See Transcript of Robert L. Gaudino, Los Angeles Community College 1948-49 (May , 1949) (RLG Papers, Box , Folder ). Finally, whether consciously or unconsciously (sic.), the Socratic teaching style generally resembles therapy in that the student is made aware of unknown assumptions through a process of frustrating verbal work. Gaudino’s own great teacher, Leo Strauss, calls attention to this element in Socrates’ labors again and again, see e.g., so much so that Strauss’
educational method was, "There is no mistaking the activity [of learning] as premised on coercion. Education is not found, stumbled onto, discovered, spontaneous. It's not present without being made present." Similarly, there can be no doubt that, in Gaudino's view, principal responsibility for "making education present" rested with the teacher.

We know that the three sourcesprings of his thought and practice were his graduate education at the University of Chicago, his interaction with colleagues and students at Williams, and his encounter with India in 1960-62 as a Fulbright scholar. Other influences reveal themselves from time to time: his family, his California origins, professional friendships, the American civil rights movement, the

principal exegete calls the method of Socrates "erotic skepticism." T. Pangle (ed.), THE REBIRTH OF CLASSICAL POLITICAL RATIONALISM: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE THOUGHT OF LEO STRAUSS xii (paperback ed. 1989) [hereinafter "REBIRTH"]; cf. W. Guthrie, SOCRATES 70-78 (paperback ed. 1988). Of course, classic Freudian theory would insist on "transference" of the conflict to the analyst, see e.g., P. Rieff, THE MIND OF THE MORALIST 169-70 (1961), but post-Freudian psychology places less stress on formal transference, see, e.g., E. Becker, THE DENIAL OF DEATH 130n., 142-44; some sort of "incomplete transference" or "premature communication," see Rieff, supra, at 172-73, is consistent with the frequently-noted characterization of Gaudino's students as "disciples." See Williams Record Advocate, Jan. 9, 1975, p. 2, col. 2 (letter of Jim Specht '74 (quoting R. A. "Bud" Wobus)). Any resolution of such issues must await the attention of some more highly trained psychologist than the present writer.

34Empathy at 5. As we shall see, see sections III & IV, infra, such language itself would invite challenge at today's Williams, where "the metaphysics of presence" is hotly contested. See, e.g., BULLETIN 1992-93 at

For a relatively painless introduction to the terms and stakes of the contest, see J. M. Balkin, Deconstructive Practice and Legal Theory, 46 Yale LJ 743 (1987). For more extended (and difficult) treatment, see S. K. White, POLITICAL THEORY AND POSTMODERNISM (1971) [hereinafter "PT/PM"]; S. Rosen, HERMENEUTICS AND POLITICS (19 ) [hereinafter "H/P"].

35These sources will be developed at length in section II, infra.
Vietnam War; these, however, either provided seed and soil for personal growth or incidental stimulants to thought and rethought of philosophy, method, constituency. They flavored but did not constitute. This relative minimization of both nature and nurture, which most observers in and of our psychology-saturated age would immediately mark as distinctive, even abnormal, seems to have been accomplished in stages, with a minimum of rancor. After military service provided the first excuse for escape, Gaudino gradually put a continent between himself, his birthplace and his family, and paid few visits home.\textsuperscript{36} Whether distance strained or preserved them, his relations with parents and siblings remained cordial, even reservedly affectionate; after his death, his survivors took befuddled pride in the accomplishments for which he was revered and remembered at Williams.\textsuperscript{37} Both he and they knew, however, that, for the most part, they did not understand each other; it is difficult not to infer from the few hints that remain that both he and they thought, if never said, that it was just as well.\textsuperscript{38}

After his graduation from UCLA in 1950, then Gaudino chose a life materially

\textsuperscript{36}Booth interview, September 1, 1989.

\textsuperscript{37}Id.

\textsuperscript{38}Gaudino once described his brother’s immersion in business as “vulgar.” Id. See also Faculty Lectures Hit Education, U.S. Alliance, WILLIAMS RECORD, February 7, 1958 at 1, 6 (Gaudino reported as having said, “There is no evidence [the businessman] has attained a full mental grasp of education’s purpose”). This term should be understood in its classical, not its colloquial, sense; so construed, it is a staple of Straussian discourse. See, e.g., S. Rosen, H/P, supra note \textsuperscript{1}, at 136 (“Like the wise, the gentlemen look down on the vulgar...”). It is clear, however, that such a characterization is not a compliment in any discourse, and its leakage, direct or indirect, into family discussions would have generated tensions. So, too, however, would the level of reticence needed to mask such a sentiment.
different from the one to which he had been accustomed as a boy and a young man.

There is evidence of some aimlessness in his early studies at the community college and of his greater fascination with the practice of politics than its study while at UCLA, but none after his admission to graduate study at the University of Chicago.

The late Allan Bloom, a contemporary of Gaudino's at Chicago, recently wrote:

These essays are a partial record of a life which began with Freud and ended with Plato in a search for self-understanding. The decisive moment of that life was the encounter with Leo Strauss. I was nineteen years old, and at first everything he taught was the absolute Other for me, an Other which, if it was true, seemed to deny my special individuality. But I finally learned from that great man that self-actualization depended on seeing what the human possibilities are and that they live in flesh and blood in old books.... I never made a plan for my life, although I often thought I should. But now I discover that there is a unity. This moth always circles around the same essential flames. They light the way to the fulfillment of youth's inchoate longings.

At the time of his own encounter with Strauss, Gaudino was six years older, a veteran, a Californian, an Italian-American, a nominal Catholic. Perhaps each of these features that distinguished him from Bloom insulated him from some immeasurable increment of Strauss's power; perhaps it was simply unacceptable to him to be anyone's "disciple." At all events, Gaudino was different from Bloom and other fledgling

---

Gaudino's performance at L.A.C.C. exceeded, but not by much, the fixed standard for transfer to the university level in the integrated system of higher education in force in California. See RLG transcripts, supra note 3; Barnett interview, October 1989. At UCLA, Gaudino's involvement in student government at first competed with his course work; only in his last two or three semesters did his academic profile rise to "honors" standards. RLG Papers, Box 24, Folder 1 & Box 25, Folder 1 (academic transcripts; student newspaper clippings).

"Straussians"; his fellow students confirm his "special individuality." But, despite the differences, Gaudino himself acknowledged Strauss's influence on his thought and practice, and, in an uncanny way, Bloom's words describe Gaudino's life and work almost as well as Bloom's own. Whether the commonality of the experience extends only to the students of Leo Strauss or has broader currency is a question that is worth posing yet suspending for the time being, while we review the life and teachings of Strauss himself.

---

41 Remoser interview; Interview with Gary Jacobsohn, March 25, 1993 (reporting Bloom's recollection); correspondence with Franco Ferraroti, Oliver Williams (on file).

42 Booth interview, September 1, 1989.

43 As noted, Gaudino began college as a psychology student; his last essay was an adaptation of Plato. His own "decisive encounter" was with Strauss. His teaching life incessantly sought to confront students with otherness. Far from being "planned," except within courses or programs, he roamed through films and foreign lands, new books as well as old. And students and colleagues alike remarked on his discovery of a "unity," with a serenity and a majesty noticed but apparently never quite achieved by Bloom himself.

44 As Stanley Rosen has observed, a "curiously resonant idiom." H/P 162 (analyzing Heidegger).
II. Teacher/Self/Teacher

Gaudino disavowed both discipleship and disciples.\(^{45}\) A second (composite) quotation from Allan Bloom, this time describing Leo Strauss, suggests that discipleship is not altogether voluntary:

He knew many interesting men and women and spent much time talking to students, but the core of his being was the solitary, continuous, meticulous study of the questions he believed most important. His conversation was the result or the continuation of this activity. His passion for his work was unremitting, austere, but full of joy; he felt that he was not alive when he was not thinking, and only the gravest mishaps could cause him to cease doing so. Although he was unfailingly polite and generous with his time, one always knew that he had something more important to do. He was active in no organization, served in no position of authority, and had no ambitions other than to understand and help others who might also be able to do so. He was neither daunted nor corroded by neglect or hostility.

* * *

He detested the pose of profundity and that combination of sentimentality and brutality which constituted contemporary taste, not from any moralism but because they are philistine and boring. Most of all, he detested moral indignation, because it is a form of self-indulgence, and it distorts the mind.

* * *

[A]bove all, he was dedicated to intransigent seriousness....\(^{46}\)

\(^{45}\)Compare Booth interview, September 1, 1989; Jacobsohn interview, March 25, 1993; Romoser interview, November 20, 1989 (disclaiming discipleship to Strauss) with Joint Interview of Former Departmental Colleagues, November 14, 1989 (Barnett, Booth, M. Brown, Tauber); Marcus interview, December 6, 1989; Oakley interview, November 28, 1989 (RLG discomfort with being "idol" of "personality cult").

\(^{46}\)A. Bloom, GIANTS & DWARFS, supra note , at 236, 253, 235.
If a slightly milder term -- "disdained," perhaps -- were substituted for "detested" in the middle section, those who knew Robert Gaudino could think he was the object of Bloom's description; even those who knew better\(^{47}\) could not object to its application to him. The resemblance of these figures to each other cannot be accidental, especially when one of them insists on his distinguishability from the other two.

What, then, did Strauss teach, and what did Gaudino learn from him?

One avowed Straussian\(^ {48}\) has identified several "characteristic themes" in the work of Strauss and his students:

...the importance of founding, the centrality of politics, the presence of religion, the rhetoric of exotericism, the rivalry between poetry and philosophy, the quarrel between the ancients and the moderns, and the search for an author's intention.\(^ {49}\)

A critic's list of the "shared principles" of Straussians enumerates: "a conservative disposition to modernity born of an attachment to the ancients, especially as incarnated in Socrates; a preference for virtue...over equality and individualism..., as well as for

\(^{47}\) Although Bloom lectured at Williams in late 1971, at which time he recalled to his host that Gaudino had stood out among Strauss' students as something of an iconoclast and remarked at the excellence of Gaudino's teaching, even in the grip of illness, see Jacobsohn interview, he later claimed to have no specific memories of Gaudino. See letter of Allan Bloom, , 1990 (on file).

\(^{48}\) Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr., Democracy and the Great Books, THE NEW REPUBLIC, April 4, 1988, at 33, 34. As the identification of oneself as a Straussian may have consequences for one's career, compare id. at 36 (Straussians' poor job prospects in academia account for service of several prominent Straussians in Reagan administration) with BENJAMIN R. BARBER, AN ARISTOCRACY OF EVERYONE 167-68 (1992). (Straussians well entrenched in "extended segments" of academia, but "clannish," "elitist," "cabalist[ic]," and by inference a little paranoid), Mansfield's self-identification is worth citing.

\(^{49}\) Mansfield, supra at 37.
excellence over inclusiveness; and certain common convictions about scholarly method [namely, exoteric rhetoric/esoteric teaching and the paternalistic attitude that derives from it].

I propose to combine the list, eliminate duplications and partisan phraseology, reorder the surviving criteria and examine Gaudino’s thought and career in light of each, and later all.

A. Gaudino Measured by the “Straussian Rule.”

1. The search for an author’s intention. This quest, encompassing both the effort to understand authors "as they understood themselves" and to "take each author seriously to the point of sharing the author’s first premise -- that he possessed the truth, that he was right," never ceased; syllabi from the fifties to the seventies mention close reading (or examination) of assigned texts, augmented to a greater or lesser degree by reference to knowledge of ignorance, stripping away prejudices,

---

50 Barber, supra.

51 Cf. Martha C. Nussbaum, THE FRAGILITY OF GOODNESS 301-02 (1986), (citing Aristotle, NICOMACHEAN ETHICS 1137b30-1 [e.g., INTRODUCTION TO ARISTOTLE 421 (R. McKeon, ed., 1947)] identifying flexibility of the "Lesbian Rule" as necessary component of practical wisdom.)

52 See Bloom, GIANTS & DWARFS at 240; Herzog, Suitable Uses at 2, 19; see also, e.g., Robert L. Gaudino, Political Science 301: A Study of Political Philosophy [Fall 1964] at 2 (unpublished course syllabus), in RLG Papers, Box 18, Folder 4 ("our immediate effort is to discover the author’s meaning...his intention in writing").

53 Herzog, Suitable Uses at 2.
timelessness, openmindedness, a sense of wonder (or awe, or uneasiness) and other phrases identified with Straussian pedagogy. As time passed, references to other media of learning -- especially film and personal (experience) -- joined (and inevitably displaced some of) the readings; they did not change the approach to what was read. In this respect, Gaudino was classically Straussian; in itself, this circumstance raises problems, as we shall see.

2. A "conservative disposition" to modernity. Unless analysis is to degenerate into a matter of labels without more, the approach to this criterion must be to subdivide it into the components Barber has isolated. At the label level, all that can be said is that Gaudino's generally nonpartisan, skeptical style, originally perceived as shockingly radical for its willingness to probe for hidden assumptions, came to be seen as "conservative" by those for whom revolutionary commitment and the sort of "moral indignation" Bloom criticized meant more than sober investigation.

---

54See generally RLG Papers, Box 18, Folders 1-5.

55See, e.g., Robert L. Gaudino & Craig A. Brown, [Pol. Sci. 301, Fall 1968], id. at Folder 4.

56See section III & IV, infra, at .

57See, e.g., Telephone interview with David C. Park, November 1, 1989 (transcript on file) (characterizing Gaudino as virtually alone in Williams community after criticizing Center for Development Economics); see also WILLIAMS RECORD, December 11, 1959, at 1, 2.

58See Huge Crowd Packs Six-Hour "Teach-In," WILLIAMS RECORD, February 23, 1968, at 1. The author of this paper was present at the teach-in and remembers Gaudino being booed during his presentation, which was antiwar only by implication.
a. "an attachment to the ancients, especially Socrates": on this point, Gaudino was, if anything, more committed than Strauss himself, in that he adopted Socratic characteristics -- self-effacement, Delphic evasiveness when questioned, insistence on formality and dignity, resistance to writing -- more completely than his mentor.\textsuperscript{59} Moreover, there is some evidence that both Gaudino's modesty and his skepticism went deeper than Strauss's, in the sense and for the reason that the latter's own "political philosophy"\textsuperscript{60} may have cloaked an intellectual closure Gaudino never achieved.\textsuperscript{61} There is, however, the question of what is implied by a devotion to Socrates; recent critique has suggested that he deserved condemnation as an elitist, even perhaps an enemy of

\textsuperscript{59}It can be inferred that Strauss was not displeased with the notion that he had somehow become the founder of a "school." \textit{See} Rosen, H/P, supra at 107 ("Strauss attempted...to conceal his eccentricity beneath the persona of a medieval rabbi"); \textit{see also} id. at 120-23 (Strauss had both a philosophical viewpoint and a "political program" for protecting it).

\textsuperscript{60}\textit{See, e.g.}, Leo Strauss, WHAT IS POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY? 229 (1959); PERSECUTION AND THE ART OF WRITING 33-35 (1952) ("political" philosophy is less philosophy of politics than philosophy as politics, with self-preservation at core of both actual and stated program).

\textsuperscript{61}\textit{See} H/P at 111, 120-33. Gaudino's relentless updating of his courses to include such anti-Foundationalist works as R.D. LAING, EXPERIENCE (1966) and THOMAS KUHN, THE STRUCTURE OF SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTIONS (1962), indicates at the very least a willingness, if not a duty, to confront head-on all-worthy challenges to prevailing notions. By contrast, one senses in the later Strauss a growing conviction that he had "got it," a sense conveyed even by those he suggests insist on his openness and skepticism. \textit{See}, GIANTS & Dwarfs, supra, 247-50.
the people. In all likelihood, Gaudino would have argued that this position rests on a misinterpretation. The mere fact that not everyone wishes to or can be a philosopher is not necessarily antidemocratic; the pursuit of truth is as essential -- perhaps more so -- in a democracy than in other regimes, and the observation that attacks on truthseeking are frequently mounted in the name of the people may reflect tragic incomprehension or demagoguery rather than disdain for the people themselves.

b. "a preference for virtue over equality and individualism": Although the text itself lacks coherence, even if it is applied literally, Gaudino's concerns balanced these concerns rather than gave primacy to any one of them. His courses, particularly in the early years, stress reading the works of de Tocqueville, in which the question between equality and individualism is dramatically revealed. If any

---


63 For an excellent account of the tension between "equality" and "individualism," see Cornel West, THE AMERICAN EVASION OF PHILOSOPHY 28-41, 170-81, 211-14 (1989); see also e.g., E.J. Dionne, Jr., WHY AMERICANS HATE POLITICS (1991); William M. Sullivan, RECONSTRUCTING PUBLIC PHILOSOPHY (1986).

64 See id. at 202-07, 210-13 (analyzing Alexis de Tocqueville, DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA (George Lawrence tr., 1969); THE OLD REGIME AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION (Stuart Gilbert tr. 1955)). These are the very works that Gaudino urged his students to read. See, e.g., Robert L. Gaudino, Political Science 101: American Politics (Fall, 1967), at 1, 3 in RLG Papers, Box 12, Folder 6; Books Considered Indispensable for a Williams B.A. in Political Science, at 4, in RLG Papers, Box 14, Folder 4 [hereinafter Indispensable Books]. The latter appears to have been compiled by David Booth with input from Gaudino and others. Its location with
"preference" for virtue can be inferred, it must be in the sense in which, in its manifestation of civic-spiritedness, it regulates the conflict between equality and individuality, as the mind regulates the passions. Such a view is not particularly "conservative," unless the post-Nietzschean viewpoints discussed in Section III are taken as irrefutably established.

c. "a preference for excellence over inclusiveness": Here, the evidence points both ways. On the one hand, Gaudino consistently sought access to Williams' best and brightest. He pioneered honors courses. He sponsored campus groups that were selected on bases other than free access or democratic election. He associated with the civil rights protesters of the early sixties and the antiwar radicals thereafter because "they were the ones doing the thinking." And he chose Williams -- old, prestigious, expensive and selective -- as his base of operations. At the same time, his involvement in the civil rights movement did not remain fully detached; at one point he joined with

departmental critiques and course proposals indicates his endorsement if not his authorship.


66See generally RLG Papers, Box 14, Folder 4.

67See, e.g., Gaudino Heads Trip to Washington, D.C., Williams Record, March 17, 1956, at 1 (Mead Fund interns).

68Joint Interview, supra note (MacAlister Brown).
then-Chaplain John Eusden on a work mission to rebuild black-owned buildings, especially churches, damaged by white supremacist arson and vandalism.\textsuperscript{69} His courses were among the first to incorporate works like James Baldwin’s \textit{The Fire Next Time},\textsuperscript{70} \textit{The Autobiography of Malcolm X},\textsuperscript{71} and Eldridge Cleaver’s \textit{Soul on Ice}.\textsuperscript{72} Even before coeducation became official in 1971, women -- faculty and student wives, girlfriends, exchange students -- were welcomed into his classes and his cocurricular programs.\textsuperscript{73} Moreover, none of his "spectacles"\textsuperscript{74} -- WIA, WAH, the "experience first" course\textsuperscript{75} -- were restricted to honor students; those given permission to enroll were selected on the basis of "seriousness" and diversity (albeit a diversity of experience and outlook rather than of race or gender). Again, whether or not these are the marks of "a conservative disposition toward modernity" rests most

\textsuperscript{69}Interview with John D. Eusden, October 19, 1989 (on file).

\textsuperscript{70}Pol.Sci [Fall 19 ] at , in RLG Papers, Box , Folder .

\textsuperscript{71}Pol.Sci. 103 [Fall 1966] at , in RLG Papers, Box , Folder .

\textsuperscript{72}Pol.Sci. 103 [Fall 1967] at , in RLG Papers, Box , Folder .

\textsuperscript{73}Booth interview, September 1, 1989; Joint Interview; Williams-at-Home Reunion Notes, April 23, 1992; personal observations of author, 1966-70 (especially Fall 1968, Spring 1970).

\textsuperscript{74}The term is Raymond Baker’s. Interview, December 7, 1989.

\textsuperscript{75}Political Science: Public Authority and Social Change [Fall 1966], in RLG Papers, Box , Folder ; also reported in Faculty Votes to Revise Courses, Williams Record, March 3, 1966, at 4.
heavily on the assumptions of the evaluator, not on any inevitable
adductions from the evidence.

3. **Scholarly method.** Except insofar as it touches on the exoteric writing
title controversy, which will be treated separately, and the aspects of reading discussed in
Section II.1, the "Straussian method" appears to its critics at least, to impose an
orthodoxy and to defend it with conspiracies, inquisitions, and other authoritarian
means. The authority of the teacher, as conceived and deployed by Gaudino, has
already been mentioned; yet, as any of his colleagues or students could attest, that
authority presented itself as a "lightness of leadership" -- a stewardship
characterized by balance, empathy, guidance and duty rather than the medieval
vendetta conjured by Barber and Rorty. Moreover, in 1969, Gaudino explicitly
endorsed "individual student choices" and contended that the major "should be
structured as preparation for an informed choice of study program rather than as the
completion-culmination-capstone of a particular body of knowledge or set of
themes." On this point, then, either the critics mischaracterize the Straussians, or

---

76See e.g., Barber, supra note, at 187-89; Richard Rorty, That Old-Time

77See pages, supra.

78Cf. Stephen K. White, POLITICAL THEORY AND POSTMODERNISM 90-94
(1991) ("lightness of care"). White's metaphor evidently plays on the title of a Milan
Kundera novel, to which, however, he does not refer. See Milan Kundera, THE
UNBEARABLE LIGHTNESS OF BEING (198). As the concept is Heideggerian,
presumably White, who devotes nearly half of PT/PM to Heidegger, skipped Kundera
and went to the common source.

79Memorandum, September 30, 1969, at 1, in RLG Papers, Box 14, Folder 4.
Gaudino was atypical, or both.

4. The centrality of politics. Gaudino's views on this matter diverged from those of his fellow students while he was still at the University of Chicago, yet the ambiguity of Mansfield's phrase leaves room for him in the tradition. For most Straussians, politics is central because the shape of the regime determines the role of (and access to) philosophy, and therefore of the determination component of the good life.\textsuperscript{80} The classic taxonomy of "cracies," "archies," and "annies"\textsuperscript{81} found its way into his course preparations, but he became increasingly aware of the complications introduced by geography, ethnicity and technology. Through his studies of India, and of Asia in general, Gaudino became increasingly aware that "modernization" had acquired a meaning, perhaps rooted in the philosophy of Descartes, d'Alembert, and Machiavelli, but broader, richer, more challenging. For him, politics acquired -- and required -- perspectives from literature, anthropology and economics.\textsuperscript{82} The torrent of information had to be absorbed and assessed, both for its intrinsic value and for its implications for philosophy. Here, it would seem, one Straussian principle, free

\textsuperscript{80}See, e.g., GIANTS AND DWARFS 55-63 (arguing that political philosophy is prior to and indispensable for the composition of great literature).

\textsuperscript{81}See undated RLG chart, in RLG Papers, Box , Folder .

\textsuperscript{82}Early in his career, Gaudino began to incorporate fiction in his courses. Most, but not all, of the novels, stress the interpenetration of the political and the supposedly "private," in the sense Allan Bloom recognized. Representative authors included Camus, Edwin O'Connor, Robert Penn Warren and, as previously noted, several African-American writers. The writings of Oscar Lewis figure prominently in later American politics syllabi. Involvement with the political economy major, his own Asia-based electives, and the freshman honors courses seems to have led to increased reliance on interdisciplinary works by David Apter, J. K. Galbraith, Edwin Reischauer, and Michel Crozier.
inquiry, began to conflict with another, the protection of philosophy through politics. Gaudino's practice recognized that the insistence on the latter would inhibit the former; mindful of the risks, he chose to preserve the integrity of his search for knowledge. Some Straussians might characterize his choice as apostasy, in that the open pursuit of truth courts the fate of Socrates, and the closing of the space for philosophy. Others would disagree, contending that the manner of the quest, the degree to which its always-subversive effects could be cloaked by rhetoric or simply "concealed in plain sight" because the scale, pace and fragmentation of contemporary society increase some dimensions of privacy and anonymity even as they threaten others.83 What is important for our purposes is that while Straussian principles may suggest a dilemma, they also inform the process of evaluating and resolving it. Both what is orthodox and what is revisionist in Gaudino sprang from common roots.

5. The rhetoric of exotericism. This aspect of Strauss's work is at once the most pivotal and the most controversial, one of two aspects of his thought that made him "one of the most hated men in the English-speaking academic world."84 Briefly stated, Strauss's claim was that because of the threat of persecution, most, if not all, philosophers since and including Plato disguised their true (esoteric) teaching beneath an accommodationist (exoteric) rhetoric designed to convince regime and people alike

83See, e.g., Harvey Cox, THE SECULAR CITY (1965).

that philosophy is not, by its nature, impious and dangerous to the state.\textsuperscript{85} Only with Kant does a "rhetoric of frankness"\textsuperscript{86} emerge. The philosopher's assumption turns optimistic; s/he may coexist with the state and the people as one who "clarifies the experience we all have."\textsuperscript{87} In short, Kant teaches -- or purports to teach\textsuperscript{88} -- that all reasonable persons may comprehend the thoughts of the wise, that the people may, no, must be trusted with the truth.\textsuperscript{89}

The evidence suggests that Gaudino harbored doubts about this strand of Strauss's thought, that in fact his own views tended toward the Kant-Arendt thesis.\textsuperscript{90}

Even if he did not hold that thesis, he is likely to have viewed it as, in effect, the question of his time (or any time): whether the human race had reached the maturity

\textsuperscript{85}Much of Strauss's work alludes to this point, but it is explicitly developed in PERSECUTION AND THE ART OF WRITING, supra note , see also Exoteric Teaching, in REBIRTH, supra, note , at 63-71.

\textsuperscript{86}H/P at 27-35.

\textsuperscript{87}Hannah Arendt, LECTURES ON KANT'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY (Beiner ed. 1982), quoted in Uncommenced Dialogue, supra, at 247; see also id, at 248-49.

\textsuperscript{88}Rosen suggests that Kant, too, had an exoteric teaching. See H/P at 35-39.

\textsuperscript{89}See Uncommenced Dialogue at 247, 249-50. Rosen suggests, in effect, that Kant, as usual, confuses what is with what ought to be, opening the tensions and contradictions in the Enlightenment tradition to universal scrutiny, preparing the ground for Nietzsche and, through him, postmodernism. See H/P at 32-35, 44-49. He also identifies Kant as an intermediate point along the spectrum of philosophy from Platonism to Nietzschean. See id, at 35.

\textsuperscript{90}George Romoser remembers Gaudino as politely rejecting the exotericism thesis. Interview, November 20, 1989. Both Gaudino's innate cheerfulness, attested by Romoser and others, and the frequent appearance of works by Arendt in his courses and reading lists supply additional reasons to believe that Gaudino leavened his professional skepticism with a measure of hope.
Kant had claimed for it, or whether the hierarchy Strauss identified was instead "natural" and -- for good or ill -- inescapable. At mid-century, there were reasons to despair: the massacre of six million Jews, the invention of nuclear weapons, the outbreak of McCarthyism, the ongoing plight of those West describes as "the wretched of the earth." But those were also reasons to hope: the forging of the United Nations, the death throes of de jure segregation, demands for colonial self-determination and real, if intermittent, progress toward meeting them. Remembering the twinkle in Gaudino's eye, it is difficult to believe that he was laughing at the struggles of his students and colleagues to escape a social structure, given and immutable, that allied the wise with the comfortable in a conspiracy against the rest.

If "Straussianism" requires such pessimism, once again it seems likely that Gaudino

---

91 See, e.g., Leo Strauss, LIBERALISM ANCIENT AND MODERN 14-18 (Agora edition 1988); see generally NATURAL RIGHT AND HISTORY (1953).

92 In this context, Public Rights/Private Duty, supra note , may be seen as a rumination on the need for "political philosophy" in the twentieth century. Gaudino's ringing defense of academic freedom, coupled with his characterization of higher education as a "sacred trust," preserves an enclave for philosophy but projects the educative function further into society than Strauss might have.

93 See West, supra, note at 237. The term, once the title of a New Left bestseller by Frantz Fanon, is now defined as "poor peoples of color, women, workers." Id.

94 See generally Richard Kluger, SIMPLE JUSTICE (1975) (history of civil rights litigation prior to and including Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954)).

95 There is some reason to think it does not, or at least that Strauss was, like Aristotle, see Nussbaum, FRAGILITY, supra, at 248-306, simply identifying certain historical rules of thumb by induction: (1) threatened with extinction, philosophy (and philosophers) have found refuge "at court"; (2) the propertied classes have shown more appreciation for philosophy, and some willingness to be guided by it in their ethical lives, than the demos; and (3) the record of governance by (or, more frequently, in the name of) the people, from Athens to Paris to Peiping, has not been encouraging. Reasons for these phenomena are many and debatable, but it is hard to
departed from its mainstream.

6,7,8,9. The importance of founding/ the presence of religion/ the rivalry between poetry and philosophy/ the quarrel between the ancients and the moderns. These four criteria may be assessed together, not only because they can be discussed briefly, but because they are related to each other and to the exoteric rhetoric/esoteric teaching criterion. First, it is evident that Gaudino retained his interest in "founding" (important in Straussian theory because of the more "direct," i.e., less historicized, relation between politics and philosophy, and because of the irreverence of the exercise of power in a founding stripped of philosophy). The clearest evidence is his play, The Founding,66 which explores, through the myth of Romulus and Remus, the validity of Machiavelli's precept that the end of uniting rule in one prince's hand justifies the means: murder.97 Second, "the presence of religion" meant for Strauss primarily the irreconcilable tension between reason and revelation, between "Athens and Jerusalem."98 A secondary meaning, visible in references like "contemplation of the divine things,"99 accesses the reverence for the unknown, the beginnings of philosophy in wonder. The latter resonated for Gaudino; the former did not, except as the sort of intractable political dilemma represented by the "Catholic issue" in the

---

96 RLG Papers, Box , Folder .

97 The epigraph for the play script is a quotation from Machiavelli.

98 See, e.g., REBIRTH, supra, note , part III; see also Rosen, H/P, supra note , at 112.

99
1960 election or the abortion controversy of our own day. No one at Williams ever heard him profess any kind of religious belief.\textsuperscript{100}

Third, despite the use of drama -- a form of poetry to the ancients -- in exploring issues, the didactic character of the plays (and, later, films) demonstrates conventional Straussian subordination to the oversight of reason, the "passions" exemplified in poetry. Finally, in the quarrel between ancients and moderns, Gaudino deviated from Straussian orthodoxy in his rejection of exotericism and, perhaps, in his openness to certain aspects of modern political science, but adhered to it in stressing the search for political values and in suspecting, even isolating, the "Level 4" mindset of pure science\textsuperscript{101} and of its moral equivalent, the results-oriented manipulation rooted in Machiavellian calculation.

In summary, it is clear that, as for Allan Bloom, Gaudino took away much from his "decisive encounter" with Leo Strauss. Even his willingness to experiment with the intellectual corpus he carried away from graduate school should be seen as a departure driven, for the most part, by a spirit of Socratic inquiry also derived from study with Strauss. Only his streak of "Kantian optimism" appears to have predated and survived his years at the University of Chicago.

B. Gaudino as "post-Straussian": Williams, the world, and time(s)

Gaudino joined the Williams faculty in 1955, his position subsidized by a Ford

\textsuperscript{100}John Eusden, who spent considerable time with Gaudino during his final illness, described him as "spiritual rather than religious...vaguely Taoist...nonritualistic." Interview, October 26, 1989.

\textsuperscript{101}DL at 28-48.
Teaching Fellowship. His assigned mentor (a condition of Ford's support), Professor Fred Stocking of the English department, recalled.

"Any supervision he got from me was strictly pro forma. It took just one class meeting for me to see that he was a better teacher than many with decades of experience. He needed no tips on preparation, on capturing students' interest, or on motivating them. I can't remember if I even looked in on him again. If I did, it would have been to fulfill the terms of the grant. He didn't need any help from me in the classroom."\(^{102}\)

If Gaudino's teaching skills were sharp, they were not altogether mature, or independent of his schooling. Straussian idiom shone out in his lectures and his WMS radio show.\(^{103}\) Several faculty members recall an undercurrent of resentment directed against Gaudino and John Rensenbrink, a fellow Chicago diplomat, hired in the same year, both for gathering a "cult" of students and for implying that their rapport with students entitled them to bypass the "usual scholarly qualifications," i.e., publication. In this, Gaudino was described as unsettling in his intensity, but "naive" rather than "aggressive" in his exposition of the values he had been taught.\(^{104}\) (Rensenbrink, on the other hand, was viewed as an inflexible Straussian "true believer," personally and professionally arrogant and insensitive, and far less capable a

\(^{102}\) Interview with Fred Stocking, September 1989.

\(^{103}\) See New WMS Programs Feature BBC Dramas, Williams Record, April 15, 1959, at 4 (Gaudino appears twice weekly in show called "Controversial Fragments"); Faculty Lectures Hit Education, U.S. Alliance, supra note ; Russian Discovery Challenges American "Way," id., October 11, 1957 (Soviet system adequately organized to pursue and apply science and technology).

\(^{104}\) Barnett interview, October 20, 1989.
teacher than he believed himself to be.\textsuperscript{105}

In retrospect, it seems less accurate to describe Gaudino’s early teaching career as naïve than as quietly but unalterably committed to retracing the steps of Socrates. If he must write to obtain tenure, he would write as he saw fit: writing that explored fundamental issues rather than engaged in arid skirmishes, leaving little behind but a litter of footnotes. Like many new Ph.D.’s, his first effort to publish was to attempt to have his dissertation accepted as a book. Several publishers reviewed the manuscript; each offered the same verdict: intriguing content, difficult style, devoid of scholarly apparatus. Nevertheless, if Gaudino would submit to a reasonable amount of editing for style and supply complete footnotes and bibliography, the project could go forward, and acceptance was probable.\textsuperscript{106}

Gaudino would not. The manuscript would have to be accepted as written. Proofreading, perhaps a light copy edit to eliminate errors of grammar or punctuation, was acceptable. Nothing more. No footnotes.\textsuperscript{107} Predictably, the publishers stood firm; \textit{Public Right/Private Duty} remained unpublished. Kurt Tauber thought

\textsuperscript{105}see id.; see also Joint Interview, November 14, 1989; Interviews with James MacGregor Burns, December 6 & 8, 1989. Thirty-five years later, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Rensenbrink drew some fire that would have hit Gaudino had he been the only available target; except for Gaudino’s soft-spokenness and his listening skills, the two were very similar, and Rensenbrink’s attention to scholarship was, if anything, greater than Gaudino’s. At least by contrast, however, Gaudino seemed to "know his place" better than his classmate. As a result, the tenured members of the political science department "pulled for" Gaudino even as they deplored his attitude toward writing. Barnett, Burns interviews.

\textsuperscript{106}See correspondence, RLG Papers, Box , Folder .

\textsuperscript{107}See id.
Gaudino's stance "heroic."\textsuperscript{108} Senior members of the department urged compromise but were politely, firmly, finally rebuffed; they hoped that a new project would cure the deficiency.\textsuperscript{109} When Gaudino turned his attention to writing (and seeking production in New York of) The Founding, they were aghast; most of all, they were disturbed that Gaudino did not seem to understand that even if the play was published or produced, it lacked "scholarly significance" and would not count toward tenure.\textsuperscript{110} As it happened, there was no need to engage in painstaking appraisal of the play's worth; it, too, was rejected, several times.\textsuperscript{111}

By 1959, department chair Barnett was compelled "by a sense of fairness" to inform Gaudino by private letter that barring unforeseen circumstances, the decision on Gaudino's tenure would be unfavorable.\textsuperscript{112} Shortly thereafter, Barnett offered to help Gaudino obtain a Fulbright grant for teaching and study in India; it was, obviously if not explicitly, a gesture of charity to one who, however likable, has failed.\textsuperscript{113} Gaudino left for India in 1960; obtaining a grant renewal in 1961, he remained away from Williams for two years. While he was away, Barnett wrote to him again: upon his return, Gaudino would receive a one-year extension on his

\textsuperscript{108}See Joint Interview.

\textsuperscript{109}Barnett, Burns interviews.

\textsuperscript{110}Barnett interview.

\textsuperscript{111}See correspondence, RLG Papers, Box , Folder .

\textsuperscript{112}See correspondence, RLG Papers, Box , Folder ; Barnett interview.

\textsuperscript{113}See correspondence, RLG Papers, Box , Folder ; Barnett interview.
contract, during which time he would be expected to teach one or two courses related to his Indian experiences and seek a new position.\textsuperscript{114}

When he returned in August 1962 to take up his assignment, however, the unforeseen circumstances mentioned by Barnett had manifested themselves. Several departures, anticipated and otherwise, together with scheduled leaves and the opening of opportunities -- priceless to a political scientist -- to serve in the Kennedy Administration, had depleted the ranks of the political science department.\textsuperscript{115} Barnett himself was soon to leave, for the presidency of Colgate.\textsuperscript{116} Especially with Fred Greene (the only other "Asianist" in the department) away, Gaudino was a known quantity at a time when help was needed.

There were other changes, including two of near-revolutionary significance: the Williams fraternity system, bulwark of WASP supremacy, had responded to the inflow of ethnics (especially Jews) and scholarship boys resulting from policies of merit-based admission and generous financial aid with overt acts of exclusion and physical intimidation, and with attempts to interfere in the College’s administration by asserting fraternal obligations allegedly owed by some of its officers, trustees and faculty. Chapters that sought to make progress by admitting representatives of hitherto ineligible groups were frequently disciplined by their national orders. Recognizing that such claims and incidents were intolerable at the New (postwar) Williams, the

\textsuperscript{114}See correspondence, RLG Papers, Box \textsuperscript{115}Compare 1962-63 Bulletin with 1958-59 Bulletin.\textsuperscript{116}Barnett interview.
College elders quietly determined that fraternities would have to go, permanently.

And, second, the College had chosen alumnus John Sawyer to succeed the legendary James Phinney Baxter as President. Both events worked to the advantage of Gaudino, who, in addition to his popularity with students, was the first Italian-American member of the faculty.\textsuperscript{117}

Then there was, at long last, Gaudino's book. The Indian University\textsuperscript{118} was a meticulous description of the pedagogic, political and bureaucratic features of the Indian system of higher education. It was distinctly Gaudinian, and as such, "strange" to an experienced consumer, like Vincent Barnett, of standard American academic fare.\textsuperscript{119} It contained no statistics, no tables, no critique, no prescriptions. There were neither footnotes nor bibliography. It was doggedly declarative, specific, simple. Yet its style made it difficult to read, impossible to skim. One finished with one of two impressions, depending on the degree of care and seriousness with which it was taken: either that it was not political science but journalism, or that by depicting its educational system, Gaudino had captured in miniature many and much larger features of India itself. And if, by virtue of its publication by a foreign "trade house," Popular Prakashan of Bombay, it was subject to suspicion as "nonacademic," it was, blessedly, noncumulative: the subject did not appear to have been treated before, at least not in English. Perhaps most importantly, it was there: finished, black-covered, on the shelf.

\textsuperscript{117}Id.

\textsuperscript{118}Robert L. Gaudino, THE INDIAN UNIVERSITY (1962).

\textsuperscript{119}Barnett interview.
Its absence had barred Gaudino's permanent admission to the Williams community of scholars; its presence removed the barrier.

Once the barrier was removed, remembers Burns, there was little doubt of a favorable outcome, because the Gaudino who returned had "grown." He had always been a great teacher, said this gifted and prolific scholar who was, by his own admission, not able to bring his gifts to the classroom, but when he came back, he was "off the scale, unique." He had gained subtlety, yet was no less provocative; "in conversation with him, students in whom I had seen nothing special became interesting to me, and I even became interesting to myself." In the end, which came after two more one-year contract extensions, Gaudino was proposed for tenure and approved with little opposition. "There was a little murmuring in the CAP" said Burns, "but the department was solidly behind him. As I recall, Vince and I spoke to John Sawyer in his behalf. Once John took a direct, favorable interest, that was that."

A full biographical treatment, even a satisfactory explanation of the changes in Gaudino between 1960 and 1962, would require a firsthand investigation requiring resources far in excess of those available to me in the last four years. The Gaudino

---

120Burns interview.

121Burns described his own effect on students as "precisely the opposite of generating a cult." Id.

122Id.

123Id.

124Id.
Papers pertaining to India contain little that is helpful: chatty personal correspondence, royalty statements from Popular Prakashan.125 There are clues in the Papers, however, in introductory statements to the course syllabi for the post-India years. Three selections suggest the flavor. The first speaks of Asia:

Every liberal arts course is an intention, an association of ideas pointing toward insight and action. Here the intention is to prepare the student for an encounter, for conversation with Asians. The scope of the course is certainly presumptuous, perhaps awesome. It is useless to pretend that, in such limited time and with so few sources, we can penetrate the Asian mind. It has too many sides too complexly arranged.126

The reference to "so few sources" carries both irony and frustration; in fact, students in the seminar were required to buy twenty-three books and read excerpts from seven others on reserve. It is a leap, but not an unreasonable one, to see in this syllabus a good faith attempt to bring into the classroom a glimpse of the wonder, the richness of material for contemplation both for its own sake and for the perspectives cast on Western thought and practice. The following year the syllabus for the "same" course began:

The theme at the center of this seminar is change. The subject is traditional society in motion. The time is the present. Our intention is to discover the ambiguities, the confusions, the conflicting wants and passions, the multiple losses and gains of this movement into modernity. The approach is thereby question-asking rather than answering, critical rather than prescriptive. The ordinary precepts about what is up-to-date and civilized have no favored status. They must take their place among older, more unfamiliar, more local persuasions. Nothing must be pre-

125See Box , Folder ; Box , Folder .

126Robert L. Gaudino, Political Science H363: The Asian Situation (Fall 1963), RLG Papers, Box 15, Folder 3.
judged, although there is a necessary assumption: that we must be fully informed about the change which is taking place. The kind of knowledge we seek is that appropriate to the fair-minded and alert traveler -- that minimum insight and sympathy which identifies the person capable of open and unbiased conversation with those born foreign to him. There is little here for the pilgrim who travels to worship or the missionary (religious or secular) who travels to save.  

A year later, in a wholly different course, his struggle with the limited horizons of the classroom reached a defining point:

We are too ready to mistake our own experience for that of every part, to insist on our own motivations and insights as definitive for all. What we take for truth is too often both too abstract and limited, a haphazard view of life reflecting more our own advantages than the unsettling ambiguities of...institutions, practices, values.

* * *

A liberal arts course is not only a movement of ideas but necessarily a contact with experience.  

---

127Robert L. Gaudino, Political Science H363: The Transformation of the Non-Western World [Fall 1964], RLG Papers, box 12, Folder 10 (emphasis supplied).

128Robert L. Gaudino, Political Science 103: A study of the American Polity [Fall 1965] Box 12, Folder 4 (recorded; emphasis supplied).
III. Gaudino 55-74/Williams 93: The Challenge of Postmodernism

In a recent study, Stephen K. White described a "'post-modern problematic':

constituted for four phenomena":

growing incredulity toward traditional metanarratives, new awareness of
the costs of societal rationalization, the explosion of informational
technologies, and the emergence of new social movements.\textsuperscript{129}

Factors contributing to these phenomena include a disbelief in objective truth\textsuperscript{130}, a
commitment to the notion that the individual is embedded in, even constituted by,
social and historical forces, especially including language;\textsuperscript{131} a sense that all social
structures are relics of power relations, caused by and causing the privileging of some
and the suppression, even the annihilation, of other ideas and peoples;\textsuperscript{132} the
insistence that reason is never more than the result of such privileging and
suppression, and, therefore, any critique or construct must be an "interpretation,"
grounded in nothing more substantial than aesthetic preference;\textsuperscript{133} and a commitment
to radically egalitarian democracy, fueled by the belief that if there are no grounds for
transhistorical or transcendental "truth," then the dignity of individuals and groups


\textsuperscript{130}

\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{133}
demands that their "interpretations" be accorded complete respect. Not all who consider themselves postmodernists subscribe to all of these beliefs, or in equal measure but most adhere to a substantial number of them. And if there is one characteristic that stands slightly above the rest, it is the rejection of metaphysics -- of "universal" or "totalizing" explanations of humankind on its world -- whether Platonic, or Kantian, or Marxist. In fact, the most fashionable schools of postmodern thought disavow the creation or reconstruction of thought-systems or institutions on the ground that to do so is merely to reorder and reestablish, in a different form, existing relations of domination and suppression. No single political superstructure inevitably arises from these intellectual underpinnings (the word "foundation" is taboo); the spectrum of attitudes toward action includes the sort of fastidious abstinence mentioned above, a neo-Nietzschean anti-politics of self-creation, a mild accommodationism based on the continuation of "interesting"

---

134 These expressions are generally associated with the "deconstructionist" school of Jacques Derrida and others and the "genealogical" work of Michel Foucault. See, e.g., J. M. Balkin, supra note (deconstruction); West, supra note, at 223-26, Miller, supra note, at (on Foucault).

135 See Balkin at .

136 See, e.g., White, supra note, at 5.

137 See, e.g., White at 16; Balkin at .

138 See, e.g., White at 321-26.
dialectic or of persuasion within the humbling limits of finitude and contingency, and a crusading neopopulist pragmatism of the left, and several variations on the theme of Western European social democracy, adjusted to reduce or disperse some of the suffocating effects of bureaucratic rationalism. It is even possible to articulate a "post-Marxist" nonbureaucratic socialism as a postmodern political theory (although explanation of how the economics of such a system would avoid the self-crippling defects of the Soviet experiment is, as ever, less than satisfactory).

An additional point deserves emphasis: there is no consensus that a "postmodernist stage" has been reached; rather, postmodernism in uneasy proximity to the modern and the traditional; none of the three is "pure," i.e., uninfluenced by the others, and each may be diffracted between poles of complacency and derangement.

---

140 See, e.g., Stanley Fish, DOING WHAT COMES NATURALLY (1989); Richard Rorty, CONSEQUENCES OF PRAGMATISM (1982); PHILOSOPHY AND THE MIRROR OF NATURE (1979).

141 See West, supra note , at 235-39.

142 These variations, including his own, are catalogued and briefly analyzed in White, supra, passim. Most involve adaptations of Swedish-model social enterprise and/or adjustments to the "intersubjectivity" analysis of Jurgen Habermas. See, e.g., Jurgen Habermas, THE PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE OF MODERNITY: TWELVE LECTURES (1987). White is a serious student and "friendly critic" of Habermas. If comparing Sweden to intersubjective discourse seems like apples and oranges, or, to fine-tune the analogy, apple butter to unclassified fruit seeds, that is characteristic of the literature. Few works of political economy venture into philosophy, and most of the philosophical texts remain well "above ground," clearly theoretical even if "anti-theory."

143 See, e.g., Antonio Gramsci, SELECTIONS FROM THE PRISON NOTEBOOKS (Hoare & Smith ed. 1971).
The result is a highly fluid and confusing situation,144 and the interpenetration of these different sensibilities generates flashpoints at individual, group, and global interfaces.

In this new context, much of Gaudino's work seems hopelessly dated, irrelevant, even pernicious. The search for authorial intent is a doomed quest for a nonexistent Cibola: by the principle of iterability of signs, the author and the utterance are irrevocably separated;145 by the principle of social construction of the self,146 the "author" is an arbitrary nexus where culture (especially language, the medium of thought and, therefore, prior to specific thoughts) and the unconscious meet to organize something the "intent," of which is, by virtue of the method of its organization, derivative (and so of limited, if any, significance) and incommunicable in any but the most superficial sense to anyone not predisposed to understand it.147 If politics is "central," it is in the ubiquity -- and inequity -- of distributions of power, and there are no grounds for distinguishing "power" from "authority."148 An interest


145See e.g., Fish, supra, note , at 47-48.

146This notion is associated most prominently with the language theorists already mentioned and with "sociologists [and anthropologist] of knowledge" like Peter Berger and Clifford Geertz.

147See, e.g., Fish, supra, at 51-53. The notion of such "interpretive communities" may be coupled with a deconstructive approach, as in Fish's work, or with less radical approaches. See, e.g., James Boyd White, WHEN WORDS LOSE THEIR MEANING (1984).

148As does Gaudino, see CL at 5.
in "founding" is "patriarchal."\textsuperscript{149} Science is not "Level 4"; it is just another
discourse, with a distinctive language and method that sets it apart from other
discourses as a matter of style, not substance.\textsuperscript{150} "Empathy"\textsuperscript{151} is at best an
impossible dream, more likely a cruel hoax, designed to induce the powerless to
relinquish even their anger.

On this account,\textsuperscript{152} the responsible thing to do would be to honor Gaudino by
broad-scale selective forgetting, lest his memory embarrass us; let, instead, "Gaudino"
take its place alongside "Jefferson," "Lincoln" and "Martin Luther King" as a sanitized

\textsuperscript{149}This comment, made by a female Williams faculty member, specifically refers
to Gaudino's play.

\textsuperscript{150}See, e.g., Rorty, MIRROR, supra note \textsuperscript{152}, at 320-21.

\textsuperscript{151}See note \textsuperscript{152}, supra.

\textsuperscript{152}Proponents of one or more of the modes of thinking summarized herein may
think my account superficial, unbalanced, dismissive. My answer has two parts. First,
no disrespect was intended; I have been fascinated and challenged by my reading in
these theories and expect to continue to be. While I am not predisposed to accept
these theories in full strength, and would, as a matter of "instinct," be inclined to
oppose them from premise to proof, it is for me now a deeply organized habit of mind
to suspend judgment and to "take seriously" uncongenial points of view. I explicitly
deplore the sort of blunt-instrument baby-splitting occasionally found in Barber, supra
note \textsuperscript{152}, where he attempts to conciliate by damning only faintly yet somehow manages
to apply labels to left and right alike. See \textit{id.} at chs. 4 & 5 (reductionist/nihilist for
the left, elitist/apologist for the right). As will be especially apparent from the
discussion in Section IV, sloganeering, name-calling and guilt-by-association will not
do, and the appearance of any such tactics in this paper represents the effects of
incomplete understanding, the need for condensation, and an occasional lapse of
compositional discipline.

Second, I urge the reader to note any such errors attributable to lack of depth
or "expertise," give them appropriate weight, and MOVE ON. It is one of my
subordinate theses that a point is reached in every argument at which further appeal to
expertise is, consciously or unconsciously, a retreat from engagement rather than a

\textsuperscript{149}This comment, made by a female Williams faculty member, specifically refers
to Gaudino's play.
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deplore the sort of blunt-instrument baby-splitting occasionally found in Barber, supra
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the left, elitist/apologist for the right). As will be especially apparent from the
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the left, elitist/apologist for the right). As will be especially apparent from the
discussion in Section IV, sloganeering, name-calling and guilt-by-association will not
do, and the appearance of any such tactics in this paper represents the effects of
incomplete understanding, the need for condensation, and an occasional lapse of
compositional discipline.

Second, I urge the reader to note any such errors attributable to lack of depth
or "expertise," give them appropriate weight, and MOVE ON. It is one of my
subordinate theses that a point is reached in every argument at which further appeal to
expertise is, consciously or unconsciously, a retreat from engagement rather than a

symbol (teacher, egalitarian, emancipator, prophet, in that order, instead of elitist-sexist, shareholder, dictator, plagiarist), or, perhaps, let us turn from a notion of "carrying on" to a conventional memorialization: a room, a plaque, a professional chair. For me, however, four considerations counsel against such courses.

First, the uncritical acceptance of the "postmodern problematic" and of Gaudino's incompatibility with it elides the roots of Gaudino's learning and teaching in a critique of modernity. Strauss understood the importance of Hegel, Nietzsche and Heidegger, whose works underpin much of postmodernism, and that appreciation is recognizable in Gaudino's course syllabi; Likewise, Gaudino's struggles with the proper role of modern science and with the dislocations of modernization clearly show concern with the forerunners of rationalization and technologization motifs of postmodernism. He also understood social and

---


154 See, e.g., White, supra note , at 31-74 (Heidegger); Miller, supra note , at 495 (Nietzsche references require almost one full page in Foucault biography); Mark Taylor, ERRING (198 ) (Hegel).

155 In the sixties and early seventies, Heidegger was not thought of as a philosopher of politics and Derrida was in the midst of establishing the Heidegger/postmodernism link; there is no evidence that Gaudino was absolutely au courant with these developments. He was, however, aware of neo-Marxist and neo-Hegelian developments and devoted a significant amount of his political philosophy courses to Nietzsche, sometimes as much as 25%.

156 See text supra at , and Notes thereto.
historical situatedness ("We start on our own assumptions"), which, for him, was the value of experience, and he understood the value of a "deconstructive" approach to it; some of the language of A Preliminary Reckoning uncannily prefigures that of postmodernism's giants.  

Second, independent of "truth-claims," the very attempt to reconstruct the thought of Gaudino has educational value. Even the most dedicated interpretivist must concede that the investigation at least "keep[s] the conversation going." By contrast, discontinuing the search for a Gaudinian tradition, whether from a sense of irretrievable loss or from a sense that today's concerns are more immediate or more compelling makes a judgment that there is nothing very "interesting" here any more. My own experience in preparing for and writing this paper suggests otherwise, but perhaps I am unique in thinking so.

Third, as Stanley Rosen has asserted, "Every hermeneutical program is at the same time itself a political manifesto or the corollary of a political manifesto."

---

157 See The Asian Situation (Fall 1963), supra note , at 1.

158 Compare, e.g., Reckoning at 3 ("Discomfort...breaks the line and so makes it visible") with Balkin, supra note , at (Effect of Derridean hierarchical reversal is to permit the unseen to be seen); Compare also, e.g., id. ("reduction in the sense of self...lessening of self...holding back the self to see others") with Miller, supra note at 319-53 (collecting Foucault's thoughts on the self, including "[n]o truth about the self is without the sacrifice of the self" (324) and to "rupture with one's self" in an attempt to "lead to a different way of thinking" (325-26).

159 Rorty, MIRROR, supra note , at 377.

160 Id at 351.

161 Rosen, H/P, supra note , at 141.
Logically, this observation applies just as well to a decision not to interpret, or to decide that interpretation should cease, or to contaminate interpretation by oversimplification, distortion or mislabeling. To cease to study Gaudino is to determine that the questions he pursued have been answered, that such answers as he permitted himself were demonstrably wrong, that his oversights were so egregious as to render his work offensive to our sensibilities, or that what work he did accomplish was trivial. I do not think a fair-minded analysis will sustain these claims.

If, then, the Gaudino approach is suppressed or rejected, the reason must be that that move serves a political purpose. This purpose may be conscious or unconscious (although to many a thoroughgoing postmodern, this distinction is meaningless), deliberately formulated and elaborated, or merely accreted, a sedimentary accretion of ideas, emotions and things of all kinds. In the instant case, I believe that "purpose" to be of the latter sort, the product of a number of unexamined suppositions, including, ironically and self-contradictorily, a new set of "givens" (or, at least, "provens") insisted upon by scholars who resist the very notion of "givenness" (or "proof").

Two examples from the sources cited in this paper will illustrate the point. First, in Political Theory and Postmodernism,162 White tries to deal with the basic reflective dilemma of postmodern political theory, characterized as reconciling the "responsibility to act" with the "responsibility to otherness,"163 by posing a tripartite

\[162\text{See note } \supra.\]

\[163\text{Id. at x, 19-23.}\]
platform of focusing on "injustice,"164 "fostering otherness,"165 and establishing a method to determine when "forms of otherness...are to be examined."166 The latter point breaks down into a general principle of constraint: a "lightness of care" generated by the fostering principle,

which would also sustain a commitment to constraint, since the urge to dominate constitutes a refusal to bear witness to one’s limits, a refusal to recognize finitude. Actions that dominate or systematically manifest a failure to respect others are a willful forgetting of an inescapable dimension of human being.167

Specific decisions applying the standard would take place within a nonfinal discursive practice.168 White’s entire effort is predicated on the acceptance of (most of the normative and epistemological claims of the postmodern mind. To his credit, this is a stated premise of his work.169

By partial contrast, although Cornel West in his book identifies certain aspects of his interests and experience,170 he states that his "basic aim" is to "chart the...development...of American pragmatism"171 and that his "fundamental argument"

164Id. at 117.
165Id.
166Id at 132; see also id. at 117-22.
167Id. at 138.
168Id. at 138-42.
169Id at ix-xii.
170See West, EVASION, supra note , at 4.
171Id at 4.
is that American pragmatism is less a search for approaches to perennial problems than a series of historically situated cultural commentaries.\textsuperscript{172} Very strictly speaking, these assertions may be true. But throughout the book, certain subjects appear and reappear. Emerson was a genteel racist\textsuperscript{173} and too reliant on the middle class.\textsuperscript{174} Jones displayed the same defects.\textsuperscript{175} So did Dewey, to a lesser degree.\textsuperscript{176} Sidney Hook tired and sold out in the face of white supremacist terrorism and corporate domination.\textsuperscript{177} C. Wright Mills never grappled with the effects of racism.\textsuperscript{178} Reinhold Niebuhr was an ethnocentric cultural imperialist and an apologist for corporate capitalism.\textsuperscript{179} Rorty’s work is politically barren.\textsuperscript{180} Roberto Unger is insensitive to issues of race and gender.\textsuperscript{181} And so on. The point is not that any of these claims are false; the point is that their constant, checklist-like reiteration indicates the presence and activity of an unstated but palpable parallel agenda in which certain values -- economic equality, democracy, race/gender/class reform -- are not

\textsuperscript{172}See id. at 5.
\textsuperscript{173}See id. at 36-38.
\textsuperscript{174}See id. at 39-41.
\textsuperscript{175}See id. at 61-66.
\textsuperscript{176}See id. at 106-07.
\textsuperscript{177}See id. at 122-24.
\textsuperscript{178}See id at 147.
\textsuperscript{179}See id. at 162-63.
\textsuperscript{180}See id. at 207.
\textsuperscript{181}See id. at 223.
explored, but assumed, so strongly that the implicit, half-hidden agenda calls into question the explicit, official one.\textsuperscript{182} Whether West so intended is a question on which I have an opinion, but which I conceive as irrelevant; as in the case of "institutional racism," the greatest matter for concern is less the intent than the effect.

This brings me to my final consideration in support of the continued pursuit of a Gaudino legacy defined with some precision: I believe Gaudino would insist on uncovering such unstated assumptions, on re-examining such conscious ranking of concerns. I believe that is what he meant by "[intending]...to corrode our unexamined certainties with the ambiguities of practical decision making,"\textsuperscript{183} by seeking the "insight and sympathy" of "conversation,"\textsuperscript{184} by disdaining both the abjection of "the pilgrim who travels to worship"\textsuperscript{185} and the hubris of "the missionary who tries to save."\textsuperscript{186} At Williams today, as I expect to show in the next section, there are too many unexamined certainties, too little real conversation, a caustic mixture of abjection and hubris. I believe Gaudino would have found a way to address the first, foster the second, dilute the third and fourth; that that way, for the reasons I have shown, is neither inaccessible to us nor irreversibly at odds with most aspects of "the postmodern problematic"; and that the recapture and reapplication of his approach to

\textsuperscript{182}See text to notes , supra. For what is an untested assumption if not a "foundation"?

\textsuperscript{183}See Pol. Sci. 103 [Fall 1965] supra note , at 1.

\textsuperscript{184}See Pol. Sci. H363 [Fall 1964], at supra note , at 1.

\textsuperscript{185}Id.

\textsuperscript{186}Id.
philosophy, politics and education would improve the intellectual and spiritual health of Williams in 1993 and thereafter.
IV. The Discontents of Our Winter: A Fable

A. Patient Chart

1. Symptoms.\(^{187}\)

Hockey players harass woman. Friend of woman retaliates by calling hockey players, others, impersonating homosexual; also, in unrelated incident, discharges firearm. Order of incidents not altogether clear. Student gets probation for firearm incident, minimum one-year suspension for violation of probation in form of harassing calls; appeals to disciplinary committee, urging procedural violations, suspension upheld. Student seeks injunction. Court balances equities, denies relief.

Racial epithets, including "die, nigger," found tacked to door of Black Students Union. College Council, BSU assume white perpetrator, issues statement deploiring racism. Faculty member, told by (black) perpetrator of act, purpose, informs dean's office. Student turns self in. Disciplinary proceedings instigated. BSU holds meetings, divides, awaits outcome of hearing. Student suspended for semester, appeals, turned down. Some students threaten walkout, meet with president. Grumbling; no walkout. BSU majority backs College position. Student leaves with parting shot at disciplinary procedures.

Ad hoc student committee works on proposed revisions to disciplinary code.

Student newspapers full of charges, countercharges, editorials, demands for retraction,

\(^{187}\)All incidents reported in WILLIAMS RECORD, or WILLIAMS OBSERVER, between January 26 and March 16, 1993, or in faculty/administration memoranda distributed to the author and retained on file.
corrections. Dean's office analyzed in feature article, criticized in letters. Faculty member defends disciplinary process by citing integrity of deans and committee, right to impose higher standards than society at large, propriety of streamlined procedures.

All-campus forum convened. President restates commitment to multiculturalism, tolerance, "new society." Black faculty member stings stereotypes, ideology, insists on recognition of personhood. White faculty member states preference for Williamstown over birthplace in South Africa. Students voice many concerns: women cite fear of rape, blacks decry racism, gays describe exclusion. Most suggest administration should spend more money, send more deans to listen, "empower students."

Gadfly (not to say crank) alumnus writes to Record, cites general grade inflation, "race-normed" SAT scores. Black ex-preppie calls him wrong, and a bigot. Faculty member defends College on both counts.

Student on leave, on Christian mission in Bosnia, writes to Observer; in 20 column inch article opposing U.S. intervention on "quagmire" grounds, includes two inches that says war conditions make Muslims more likely to accept conversion, calls it one-time opportunity to escape oppression, political and Islamic. Muslim woman skips free speech class because Observer editors are in it. Students of several faiths circulate flyer protesting missionary's letter. Record storyline op-ed column, characterize missionary as ignorant and intolerant; (same) Muslim woman writes to Record, criticizing Observer editors for "failure to edit." Observer editors defend decision to publish on traditional free speech grounds.
Gadfly/crank writes again, castigates classmate for "standard left-wing tactics."

Spring break comes.

2. **Diagnosis.**

Multiple patients apparently suffer from serious outbreak of "Home-at-Williams," identified by inference from lit. author R.L. Gaudino (d. 1974). See, e.g., Prel. Reck. (1972). Syndrome identifiable by insistence on own dignity, particularity, interpretation of events w/o regard to evidence of any kind; unchallenged, comforting beliefs resting on tradition, status, prevailing attitudes; suppression of genuine communication resulting in alternation of sullen silence (false peace) with irrational outbursts; resistance to objectivity, distinction, analysis; desire for unquestioning acceptance; occasional tendency to unconscious contradiction (e.g., simultaneous demands for autonomy from parental authority, punishment of offending peer(s) by parental authority). Condition often latent, brought on or exacerbated by attempts to palliate, apply pet remedies of attendings.

3. **Recommended treatment.**

Cf. Gaudino, apply evenhanded concern for patient's well-being; encourage reading, conversation, experience with contrasting perspectives, 1st in controlled setting, gradually reduce supervision. Establish firm, temperate tone by example, not rule enforcement. Focus on patient's concerns, not attendings; institution's, but gently test patient's grasp of material, resisting glibness, hasty formulations, esp. in symp.
with attendings’ views. Assist patient to identify own beliefs, grounds, intentions, form plan thereon. Review entire course of treatment with patient at conclusion; encourage follow-up reports.

4. **Prognosis.**

Good. Condition usually self-limiting, non-fatal. Consequence of inept treatment; tendency to recurrent outbreaks throughout lifetime, causing irritation to self and others, danger of contagion. **Only patient can resolve condition; attending’s task is to help patient become aware of condition, prevent premature assumption of recovery.**

Workup by: J.E.N.
V. "What Is To Be Done?"

In light of the foregoing analysis, our purpose must be to determine whether the thought and practice of Robert Gaudino retain any value for the Williams College of 1993 and, if so, how that value may be realized. The answers will depend in considerable part, on the answers to questions about the nature of the Gaudino legacy: is it outdated, trapped in a bygone historico-cultural context dominated by discredited concepts like objectivity, transcendentalism, elitism, patriarchy? Is it inextricably intertwined with the personality of the man, and therefore lost with his death? Is it so riddled with indeterminacy and contradiction that it offers insufficient guidance for action? Or, less philosophically but no less importantly, is it simply impracticable under today’s constraints -- inflation, greater professional demands on faculty, the multicultural student body, the administrative burden of designing and implementing programs?

It is my thesis that the answers to these questions are each a qualified "no," but that the qualification is a significant one: if the trustees acquiesce in the description of the present "problematic" in section III or in the inevitability (or the prevailing diagnosis of the causes) of the attitudes reviewed in section IV, the answer will be "yes" instead.

With that in mind, I suggest:

1. Increased consultation with the faculty selection committee prior to designation of the Gaudino Scholar, and more direct involvement with and assistance to the Scholar during incumbency. Study adjustments to selection criteria.
2. Investigation of administrative and financial requirements for sponsoring courses and lectures.

3. Continuation of research into life and work of Gaudino, directed toward written description/analysis.

4. Investigation of cooperation with Center for Humanities and Social Sciences to assist in advance preparation of Gaudino-sponsored events.

5. Streamline membership and management of trustees; establish program/special events committee.

6. Begin planning "Gaudino event"; suggest "Gaudino and the Liberal Arts College" -- kick-off lecture on RLG.; rotating workshops on political philosophy, theory of education, role of experience, effective communication, then joint sessions; open to students, faculty, alumni: consider staging The Founding and/or The Assassin.
VI. **Coda**

What the ghost told me:

A claim, without more, is not a proof. A feeling, however intense, cannot justify itself.

Fawning and flattery do not foster. That is done with care, and testing. With respect, and the candor that marks it.

Empathy, translation, communication are impossible? Very well; we shall act as if they were possible, and taste their fruits just the same.