

Dr. Dakhliya and “the Facts”

How the Move of ECO to CoAL Continues to Cause Friction

Judging by the online responses being left to Meryl Dakin’s [2-Sept-09 story](#) for *The Student Printz* entitled “Economics department dodges cut,” the forthcoming reception of the ECOers over in the CoAL will likely be somewhat icy, even though the merger is scheduled for balmy 1-July-10. Those comments began with a passage from “cleetus,” who noted that the way Dakin’s article was written did little to inspire confidence in the idea that everything was out in the open. Those comments are inserted below.

cleetus

Wed Sep 2 2009 17:02

This whole thing sounds fishy. The economists "proposed" a compromise and we jump straight to dodging elimination. There's no quotes saying the compromise was accepted. Von Herman told the city paper that she knew nothing of this. Now she's saying she favors the move. Why would she use "favors", as if it's still in discussion mode, if the deal has been accepted as the first paragraph says? Besides, Von Herman has been saying in the media that she didn't see the need to have economics around, now she is saying she was never against them. The language about retirement has some kind of "phased retirement" feel to it. I am betting Carter and Klinedinst are planning to go on phased retirement only to "unphase" it if Saunders gets fired or removed. This is biding time really.

Next came words from “Social Scientist” to the effect that the ECOers had already rejected a 2008-09 invitation to join the CoAL, and would therefore not be welcomed this time around. That message is pasted below.

Social Scientist

Wed Sep 2 2009 20:59

Fishy or fiction? These guys were invited to join Arts and Letters back in the fall and with open arms before these budget cuts were known. They rejected us then with little passion for the social sciences. Now Professor Dakhliya wants to work with us when he was about to lose his job. Don't expect your false interest in us now to be so warmly received. It looks like we are stuck with you, but don't think that means we want you.

Finally, CoB associate professor of economics Sami Dakhliya entered the fray with his own comment addressing the claims made by “Social Scientist.” According to Dakhliya, an overture had been made during 2008-09 to just 3 of the CoB’s 9 tenured/tenure-track faculty, of which he was not one. According to Dakhliya, the economists did not think it a good idea to be split, with 3 in CoAL and 9 in CoB. Thus, they sent word through EFIB chairman George Carter to CoB dean Lance Nail that they wished to remain a single unit. Dakhliya concludes by stating that the 9 economists “. . . did NOT, however, exclude the possibility of moving *collectively* to the CoAL.”

Dakhliya’s retort is inserted below.

Sami Dakhli

Thu Sep 3 2009 07:09

Dear "Social Scientist": Please do not misrepresent the facts. (And I hope you are not misrepresenting yourself either.) This is what happened: earlier this year, the CoB Dean asked 3 economics faculty if they'd be willing to move to the CoAL. (I was not one of them.) We economists did not believe that it was a good idea to be split, i.e., have some faculty remain in the CoB as so-called "business economists" and others move to Arts & Letters as "social economists". Via our chair, we collectively responded to the CoB Dean that we wished to remain a single unit. We did NOT, however, exclude the possibility of moving *collectively* to the CoAL. --Sami Dakhli

Though Dakhli's recounting of the "split plan" comports with documents and testimonial housed in USMNEWS.net's library, he did not release all of "the facts" to "Social Scientist." According to testimonial at USMNEWS.net, the relevant portions of the CoAL took an actual up/down vote on accepting/rejecting any plan to bring *all* of the CoB's economists into the fold, and *they voted overwhelmingly against* such a plan. Thus, the deal that has been brokered by CoB economics professor Mark Klinedinst to bring the economics department (or what will remain of it on 1-July-10) into the CoAL has already been *disapproved of* by the relevant CoAL constituencies. So, now USM's central administration appears to be forcing upon the CoAL faculty an idea that they widely rejected several months ago.