

ulty as rivals is apt to be wrong,¹¹ and the opportunity to form a mutual support group is lost.¹²

6. *Try to find a mentor.*

It is often very hard for an assistant professor to get tenure unless there is at least one senior member of the faculty who cares about the junior faculty member as a human being, and who will provide honest advice and go to bat for him at tenure time. Ideally, such a mentor should be where you teach; but there is no reason for assistant professors to lose touch with the faculty at the institutions where they got their Ph.D.s who knew their work best.

7. *If at first you don't succeed, be willing to try again.*

A number of distinguished faculty in political science didn't get tenure at their first institution. The assistant professor's lot is not an easy one, but it still has more job security and more freedom than all but a handful of jobs. Tenure is worth struggling for. As I once put it: "Tenure is never having to say you're sorry."¹³

Notes

*This is a companion piece to "Uncle Wuffle's Advice to the Advanced Graduate Student," *PS* (December, 1989), 838-39. A Wuffle is Assistant to Professor, School of Social Sciences, University of California, Irvine. He is best known for such seminal articles as "The Pure Theory of Elevators," *Mathematics Magazine* 55 (January 1982): 30-37; "Should You Brush Your Teeth on November 6, 1984," *PS* (Summer 1984), 577-80; and "Pig and Proletariat," *San Jose Studies* (1990): 5-39 (written under a pseudonym). He is currently at work on a series of essays on empirically insightful tautologies.

1. Of course, this does not mean that an assistant professor ought not to do a "fair share," or for that matter, a bit more—since one's notion of a fair share and that of one's senior colleagues may differ.

2. Moreover, even in the unlikely event that change for the better occurs, its likely pace is so glacial that unless assistant professors have tenure they won't be around long enough to benefit from the change.

3. Get a MacIntosh. Even a moron can learn to do word-processing on a Mac. I did.

4. Alternatively, be prepared to spend a substantial portion of your salary getting your papers professionally typed. That's what I did when first starting out.

5. Preferably do both, since books and journal articles are read by somewhat different audiences and serve different purposes.

6. There are two fundamental problems in research: not having enough ideas, and having too many ideas. The former problem is curable by reading and thinking; curing the latter problem requires either incredible self-discipline or a lobotomy.

7. Of course, minor papers belong in minor journals, and specialized papers in specialized journals, but at least occasionally aim high. It's a very tricky tradeoff between sufficiently padding one's vita and doing work that matters.

8. If you want to succeed, you must be willing to fail; rejected papers don't matter, only your successes count.

9. Wuffle says: "Life like bowling alley. The more balls you throw the more pins you are likely to knock down." Or, as Oscar Wilde might have said had he lived longer: "You can never be too rich, you can never publish too much." (Warning: This advice is not meant to apply to scholars who insist on publishing the same article in numerous guises in different journals, or to those who have dedicated their lives to the search for ever more obscure journals in which to publish.)

10. Moreover, everything takes longer to finish than one expects, almost certainly requires one or more rounds of revision/submission to a different journal before being accepted, and takes longer to see print after being accepted than one might think imaginable.

11. At many schools (e.g., those in the University of California system) tenure is based on individual performance, not relative performance; while at some universities (e.g., a number of Ivy League schools) tenure is impossible unless there is a credible offer of a full professorship elsewhere—and even that usually will not be enough.

12. If you're lucky (as I was), your cohort of junior faculty can become lifelong friends and not just colleagues.

13. A Wuffle, "Reflections on Academia," *PS* (Winter 1986): 57-61.

Congress Passes Law to Clarify Fair Use of Unpublished Copyrighted Material

Page Putnam Miller, *National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History*

Just prior to adjourning, the Senate passed H.R. 4412, a bill to clarify the "fair use" of unpublished copyrighted material, which had been passed by the House in August. The Senate had passed a similar bill almost a year ago; but in the interest of getting something passed before the end of the 102nd Congress, the Senate agreed to the House version. H.R. 4412 states: "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that section 107 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the

following: 'The fact that a work is unpublished shall not itself bar a finding of fair use if such finding is made upon consideration of all the factors set forth in paragraphs (1) through (4).'" Paragraphs 1 through 4 provide four statutory factors that the courts are instructed to consider in making "fair use" judgments. These are: purpose and character of use; nature of copyrighted material (whether published or unpublished); the amount and substantiality of the portion used; and effect of the use on the market value of copyrighted work. House Report 102-836 which

accompanied H.R. 4412, however, concerned scholars for it seemed to approve only very limited use of copyrighted unpublished material. While the House and Senate bills contain similar language, the way the sponsors of these bills interpret them has been quite different. Representative William Hughes (D-NJ) advocates a narrow interpretation and Senator Paul Simon (D-IL) a broad view.

Since the House Report seemed to endorse a narrow view of fair use, Senators Paul Simon (D-IL), Patrick Leahy (D-VT), Edward Kennedy

(D-MA), Charles Grassley (R-IA), Howard Metzenbaum (D-OH), and Herbert Kohl (D-WI) made a joint floor statement at the time that the Senate passed H.R. 4412 to emphasize their legislative intent. They asserted that “the effect of the Salinger and New Era decisions has been profound, resulting in chilling uncertainty and serious apprehension in the publishing community regarding fair use of unpublished material.” Their statement observed that these two cases had “threatened to establish a virtual per se rule against the fair use of any unpub-

lished materials, such as letters and diaries.” Thus these Senators concluded that “it is no exaggeration to say that if the trend were to continue, it could severely damage the ability of journalists and scholars to use unpublished primary materials. This would be a crippling blow to accurate scholarship and reporting.” The floor statement made clear that the purpose of H.R. 4412 is to “undo the harm caused by the overly restrictive standards adopted in Salinger and the New Era, and to clearly and indisputably reject the view that the unpublished nature of

the work triggers a virtual per se ruling against a finding of fair use.” The senators specifically noted that H.R. 4412 was necessary to address the limitations of the recent *Wright v. Warner Books* which “did not explicitly disavow the narrow formulation of the fair use doctrine espoused in Salinger and New Era.” With passage of this legislation, the courts will be instructed to make a carefully reasoned and complete consideration of each of the fair use factors set forth in Section 107 of the Copyright Act.

Changes in the General Social Survey (GSS) in 1994

Tom W. Smith, *Director, General Social Survey, National Opinion Research Center (NORC)*

Redesign of 1994 GSS

In 1994 two major innovations will be introduced to the GSS. First, the traditional core will be substantially reduced to allow for the creation of mini-modules (i.e., blocks of about 15 minutes devoted to some combination of small to medium size supplements). The mini-modules space will give us greater flexibility to incorporate innovations and to include important items proposed by the social science community.

Second, a new biennial, split-sample design will be initiated. The 3,000-case sample will consist of two parallel sub-samples of 1,500 cases each. As illustrated in Figure 1, the two sub-samples will both contain the identical core. The A sample will also contain a standard, topical module, the mini-modules, and an ISSP module (on women, work, and the family). The B sample will have a second topical module, mini-modules, and an ISSP module (on the environment). In effect, one can think of the A sample as representing a traditional GSS for 1994 and the B sample as representing a traditional GSS for 1995. Rather than being fielded separately in two different years, they are fielded together.

While we will generally field separate topical, mini-, and ISSP modules on the A and B samples, we have the option of including some items on both samples if a larger sample size is needed. This would most likely be utilized in the case of the mini-modules.

In 1996 and in subsequent even numbered years the same design described for 1994 would be repeated.

Cuts in Content of GSS Core

In order to create the mini-modules section (see above), the replicating core must be reduced from about 60 minutes to about 45 minutes. This will mean that many traditional GSS time series will be eliminated. The list of possible deletions compiled by the GSS Board of Overseers and PIs (James A. Davis and Tom W. Smith) is enclosed. Approximately 75% of the items on this list will have to be deleted from the 1994 GSS.

We urge users who have opinions about the proposed deletions to contact us. If you wish to retain items that appear on the list of possible cuts, you should send us supporting arguments about why the items

should be kept. These should refer to such aspects as their theoretical importance, contributions to social science knowledge, usage, trends, connection to other GSS items, etc. Similarly, if you wish to delete items not included on the list, you should present arguments as to why these items should be deleted. All suggestions should reach the GSS no later than March 15, 1993. These comments will be assessed and in light of them the Board and PIs will make final decisions on content in spring 1993.

Additions to the 1994 GSS

Mini-Modules

The reduction of the replicating core has opened up space for the addition of new items. We anticipate up to 30 minutes of time to be available on the 1994 GSS (i.e., 15 minutes on each of the two sub-samples of 1,500). Reflecting the idea that this space is available to cover a diverse selection of topics ranging from single items to multi-item scales and batteries (as opposed to the topical module that usually focuses on one topic, this space is referred to