

V

4.6  
G. Hicks To P  
April 1974  
Circled from 42

Louphoro:

As far as I know, Louise meets all her appointments (albeit with her customary tardiness) and classes. But she has a very serious problem in her teaching. In Anthropology 2, she delivered a guest lecture for me and, from that observation and hearing her speak publicly on several occasions, I have what I think is a fairly clear picture of her performance generally. This is buttressed and confirmed many times over by reports from graduate and undergraduate students about her other classes.

Louise's speaking style is irritating. She is often inaudible, she has a number of mannerisms that detract from what she is saying. Were this only an occasional element of her delivery, it could easily be dismissed, as with most of us. But it is, in her case, serious and constitutes a severe handicap in her teaching.

Her instructions to students--what she requires from them and her counsel--are often confusing and unclear. She is inconsistent, often accepting work of poor quality when she had previously declared she would not. Thus, when a graduate student, for example, receives an incomplete grade, waits until the second or third following semester to complete the work, it is well known that, in order to receive an adequate mark or commentary, the work need not be of good quality. This has happened (judging from comments of students and Louise herself) on a number of occasions and is, perhaps, one explanation for the large number of incomplete grades she turns in.

She seems to lack, or at least show evidence of, a general critical ability in her presentation of anthropological issues to students. The content of her presentations, in my opinion, is often irresponsible. An example was her talk to Anthropology 2, which was billed (at her suggestion) as a commentary on the two books assigned: Head's Sex and Temperament and Tiger's Men in Groups. In her talk, however, she turned to sexism in America and delivered a generalized diatribe against institutional sexism. She provided an example of Brown University's responsibility for the perpetuation of sexism by pointing to the University Club's exclusion of women during the noon hour lunch. When I suggested, in a comment from the floor, that this was not entirely fair, since the University Club was a private organization and without any official connection with Brown, she replied that it was indeed fair, since Malcolm Stevens was an officer of the University Club. Stupified, I sat back to hear this kind of logic repeated again and again throughout the afternoon's talk. I consider such presentations treacherous to students, and irresponsible.

From those graduate students who assisted her in the women's course (1972-73), no comment was more frequent than expressions of amusement, even pity, for Louise's handling of the course. According to these students, she lost the respect of most of the undergraduates and that of the graduate students as well. In Anthropology 122, the class simply got out of control and began, on several occasions, hurling veiled and unveiled insults at her.

Louise's seminars have gained a very poor reputation as primarily "fill sessions," with little of the time being devoted to substantive anthropological issues. Whether this is the case or not, I have only the testimony and constant commentary of graduate students over the past five years. She is, in the same manner, willing to accept poor quality (in the students' own estimation) work as adequate to satisfy the requirements of her seminars. She is known as an "easy touch," both for her uncritical acceptance of reports and papers and for her willingness to approve relatively poor performances in departmental examinations.

*By [unclear]*  
EXHIBIT 14 for [unclear]  
DATE 8/2/76  
D.M.D.

Louise's publication record is certainly adequate in quantity, but I think not at all outstanding in its content. Her earlier work on the Navaho is essentially ethnographic description, and lacks the kind of theoretical insight that can be found, for example, in [redacted]'s articles on the Cree and the Zulu empire's expansion.

Since it is one of her most recent works, and is regarded by Louise as particularly significant, the book she is editing with M. Rosaldo deserves some comment. It can be fairly taken as representative of her current stage of intellectual development. I have read the introduction and several chapters of this manuscript. The chapter written by Louise stands essentially unchanged from when she presented it as a colloquium paper and came under what most of those present considered devastating criticism. Throughout this chapter and the introduction, a polemical attitude is substituted for any kind of reasonable critical approach. The logic is faulty, generalizations are made that are unsupported (and, in my view, insupportable). Even the undergraduate students, who read much of the manuscript when they took her course on women, found it lacking in the same way. It seems to me ~~as~~ a piece of work that is typical of Louise's thinking, in which intellectual vigor is sacrificed for the satisfaction of muddled ideology.

I am definitely opposed to granting tenure to her.