

# *The Libertarian Review*

Personal Autonomy, Direct Democracy, Cooperative Community

## Students: this is *your* publication

We at the *Libertarian Review* would like to announce some exciting changes to our approach to organizational structure and community dialogue. We would like you to take greater control of this publication. Yes, that's right—you.

By the publication of our next issue, we plan to have up and running a website geared toward letting you view, monitor, and contribute to the editing process of this publication. We want radical transparency and direct democracy, and we believe that the best way to achieve this, while maintaining pseudonymity, is to have a writing and editing process that is completely open to those who want to participate.

We also want you to have control of what gets published. That is why we will also have an open review and editing process, as well as an open forum for comments on the publication's content. To reinforce transparency, we will have a system which will allow members to track which edits were made by which members. The forum will also be open for the discussion of specific edits and, as a last resort, for voting for the exclusion of members who persist in trying to publish offensive or harmful material. This, however, we believe will not be necessary, as discourse and mediation between members usually go a very long way toward solving such disputes.



Having continuous, non-hierarchical input between members is also a great way to encourage innovation and creativity. This is an idea that such companies as Google have employed to reach their own innovative peaks in technological development. Bureaucracy, by contrast, suffocates and squelches innovation because of its inherent resistance to change and dissent.

We believe that our own changes will be very positive ones and will foster community cooperation and cohesion. Especially in the information age and in a world of evolving technology, communities like Drew's can no longer afford to have hierarchical organizational structures. From here on, what we need is direct democracy, egalitarian and transparent information sharing, and free and fair community discourse. We invite the entire community to be a part of this process.

## Review Exclusive: Professors protest Weisbuch's tyranny

Cleisthenes, Editor in Chief

Ever wondered why too much power in the hands of one person is a bad thing? President Weisbuch and the Administration are a case in point. The American Association of University Professors, a professor-advocacy group, has recently been in collaboration with Drew's professors concerning a five-million-dollar budget deficit that Weisbuch and the administration's mismanagement has caused.

According to Sept. 28 and Oct. 11 AAUP meeting minutes, Weisbuch overestimated the amount of students that would be accepted to Drew—by about 100 students—and failed to consult the professors or the administration's financial advisers on his decision to set this enrollment target. As a result, the university is in the hole for \$5 million, and the administration has told the professors that it is their job to clean up the mess. To add to the debacle, Weisbuch has requested an additional \$2 million to fund "seed" programs. How are the professors expected to fill this gap?

According to the Sept. 28 AAUP minutes, the members expressed the concern that the administration's suggestion of "reorganization" is really an attempt to "downsize the faculty and staff and force firings and furloughs." At the same time, according to the Oct. 11 minutes, the administration "has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for branding consultants (at a time when Drew supposedly has financial problems)..." This consulting group "does not appear to make educational excellence a top priority" and is "focused on 'efficiency' rather than academic excellence."

The faculty and the AAUP, however, have diagnosed the real problem. According to the Sept. 28 minutes, the members commented that "the faculty were not consulted about the CLA class enrollment targets. CLA enrollment determines the lion's share of Drew's usual revenue. Therefore, the administration bears the responsibility

for the shortfall in enrollment and the increase in the deficit of the operating budget." They also stated that the administration has been making "poor management decisions."

The AAUP sums up the main issues concerning the "lack of shared governance at Drew": "Certain things are consistently kept off the table and from faculty view, such as large administrative salaries and the significant increase in the number of administrators during the term of this administration. **The administration pretends to share governance, but pretty much goes ahead and does what the president wants.**" (emphasis ours)

As a result, professors have threatened to submit a vote of no confidence on the upcoming Strategic Plan, the administration's yearly outline of operational plans for the university. If submitted, such a vote could threaten Weisbuch's presidency. Will the professors achieve their goals and effect change? At the end of the day, do they even have the power to do so? We will find out in December. Until then, consider this: if something is not done, the quality of education and resources at Drew will plummet, and the cost of attendance will rise even more than it already is. Who will be hurt by this mismanagement? Yes, the professors, but also you, the students—especially those in sophomore, freshman, and incoming classes.

**What can you do about this? Take this article with you to your professors, tell them that you are informed about this issue, and let them know that you stand behind them and will support them. Ask Weisbuch and the administration what they will do to solve this problem—and to save our top-notch, high-quality professors.**

**Will you sit by while your education—and your money—goes down the tubes? Will you really?**

## Letter to the Editor: Cooperative community? I'm skeptical...

*Dear Editor,*

I picked up a copy of this newspaper, and I must admit, I was surprised to find it refreshingly distinctive in its outlook and goals. Its slogan indicates it promotes "cooperative community", which, if a student newspaper can contribute to realizing, would certainly benefit the members of Drew community. At the same time, though, I am filled with skepticism. The articles are published anonymously, which, in spite of its potential advantages (a student, staff, or faculty member could freely voice his or her views or share a vital piece of information with the public without worrying about backlash), could also trigger rumors, slander, misinformation, and tension, all of which could bring about not a cooperative but a chaotic and hostile community. Several years ago, an article was published in *The Acorn* which led to ugly racial tension on campus, leading faculty to take action.

My question to the editor or editors of this newspaper is: how can you assure the Drew community that this medium will not eventually turn into one that will foment discord, conflict, and tension on campus, instead of one that will contribute to creating a community in which the members are encouraged to respect one another, to be truthful to one another, to put education and learning before fads, fashion, or finance, to break barriers that are preventing Drew from becoming the best educational institution that it can be? I would certainly welcome a medium that could contribute in any way to bringing this about. But I also know how difficult it is to create such a realm. So, to conclude, in theory I wholeheartedly support you, but in practice, you'll not easily dispel my deep skepticism.

—Professor Z

## Response to Professor Z: Why we're different

It is certainly difficult to create a realm that is a truly cooperative community. But at the same time it is an essential task, perhaps one of the most essential. We think that we all have a duty to work towards creating such a community.

We think that anonymity is also an essential component of this goal. The ability to refuse, to censor, and to shun certain views is a two-edged sword: on the one hand, it allows such unethical speech as you have listed to be barred from publication; on the other, it cuts unpopular views, slashes discontent towards the unjust, and severs the information that is embarrassing but vital to true understanding. This raises the question of how unethical speech can be avoided without such censorship. If one is immersed in the typical news paradigm, this is considered impossible. An essential component of news from this view is that it is carefully filtered, weighed, and measured by bureaucratic policy and a controlling hierarchy. These systems can be all but blind with respect to how they refuse necessary speech. We have created this paper with the goal of turning this view on its head. The solution to this question, we think, is represented in the themes of our paper. Through Cooperative Community, dialogue between members allows us to challenge each others' beliefs in a way that makes us all think carefully about what we say and do, while at the same time it supports us in our pursuit of views that may be unpopular. This is impossible for a hierarchy, where challenge and support is normally determined by expediency. Through Direct Democracy, each member would have intimate knowledge of the workings of the systems of governance, and would be able to personally work to change any unjust elements of those systems, or unjust uses of them. This is impossible for a bureaucracy, where change is often unwelcome. Through Personal Autonomy, we can each express our views without fear from a retributive institution. This is impossible when the individual is the subject of the institution, rather than the institution being the expression of the individual. Thus, we wish for the Libertarian Review to not only support these themes, but for the Review to become an embodiment of them as it grows and matures.

You will likely be wondering how we plan to support these goals with concrete plans and how specific mechanisms preventing unethical speech would work. So far, the *Review* has only been an embodiment of a small slice of the themes, due to its fledgling status. By raising these questions, however, you have given us a good opportunity to announce the plans we have been laying out for the future. We would like to create a Website where the members of the Review are both anonymous and openly meet and discuss the plans of the paper, and what will be written. These discussions would take place through a web forum which is open to any members of the Drew community. Through this radical transparency in the way the Review functions, the openness with regard to the community, and through carefully building the Review's policies to include the community in a good and constructive way, the theme of Cooperative Community will be expressed. By organizing the members as a direct democracy, rather than as a hierarchy, and making all decisions democratic ones, the theme of Direct Democracy will be expressed. So if someone intends to slander, for example, the first mechanism to prevent this would be the dialogue and debate within the community, which would raise the issue with the offender and try and resolve it by talking to that person. The second mechanism would be for the Review members to vote to not publish the article, which will hopefully end up being a method of last resort. This is how we plan to give an answer to the problem of censorship versus slander. We intend to unveil the website in the next issue. We would like to invite you, along with any students, faculty, or staff to participate in this new growth.

The combination of both students and faculty may be another essential piece for creating a good community. Faculty contribute their wisdom and long term views, while students contribute fresh ideas. Together we can build a great paper and a great university.

---

Spartacus and Cleisthenes

---