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Senator Franken encore, dating data, lecture lessons

ART, SCIENCE, CULTURE, ECONOMICS

Thanks for the wonderful essay by E.O. Wilson (“On the Origins of the Arts,” May-June, page 32) on Chauvet Cave. Its 30,000-year-old paintings show individualistic animal portraits: a running bison (having many legs), a red bear, lions, rhinos, and four horses in a Mount Rushmore-like tableau, but there are no people depicted, except perhaps for one partial Venus goddess figure on a stalactite on the ceiling.

Why no people? Today our museums and churches are filled with portraits of people. People like depicting people. But paintings predate writing, so maybe its portraits represented the names of people. There was “Running Bison” on this wall, “Red Bear” on that wall, and “Dark Horse” over there.

If one wanted to learn the history of the ancestors, this cave showed them. One goddess figure among many people would not be unusual—the Sistine Chapel is similar, with God at the center of the ceiling. Maybe the Chauvet artists liked depicting people just as much as we do today.

J. Richard Gott III ’69
Professor of astrophysics
Princeton University
Princeton, N.J.
Wilson writes, “The novelist says ‘Does that work?’ and the scientist says ‘Could that possibly be true?’” One might add that an economist says, “I see that works in reality; I wonder if it works in theory?”

John L. Rafuse, HKS ’81
Alexandria, Va.

Thank you for E.O. Wilson’s thought-provoking essay on the evolution of cultural imperatives in modern humans. The search for a life of meaning beyond mere survival could fill the moral and spiritual void in modern pulsating scientific-industrial communities that value prestigious well-paying professions, monetary wealth, and ever-narrowing subspecialized expertise. The commoditisation and commercialization of information and education, homogenization from globalization, and the hyperkinetic distractions of digital technology and social media pose significant threats to humanity’s need for sustained contemplation, solitude, and the pursuit of meaning and non-monetized worth.

The paradox remains that the instant interconnectivity of today’s hyper-accelerated world is associated with reduced meaningful, life-affirming social and cultural activities or education. Alexis de Tocqueville cautioned against a society that invariably inclined towards majoritarian tyranny that could only be mitigated by a cultural life of the humanities. It strikes me that the arts and culture are now more imperiled than at any time since humans were freed from the preoccupations of food, water and shelter for survival.

Joseph Ting
Brisbane, Australia

The letters in the May-June issue (page 2) that castigate you for featuring Al Franken in March-April (page 30) have one thing in common: none is from Minnesota. One writer even accuses those of us out here who voted for him of playing a joke on the rest of the country. Please know that many consider our junior senator a fine legislator who takes policy matters, both big picture and in detail, seriously. Indeed, we see him standing in the tradition of one he hails as a model and mentor, the late Paul Wellstone.

The writers all seem to disdain comedy as a profession beneath contempt; they, and maybe Harvard itself, need to lighten up.

Patrick Henry ’60
Waite Park, Minn.

The letters on my friend and classmate Al Franken ’73 perfectly exemplify the maximum-vitriol/minimum-facts style that now blankets American media. It may be “absurd” to two-time Republican congressional loser and “Contract for America” signer Richard P. Sybert that Franken be taken seriously, but Al wrote and got passed the law requiring healthcare insurers to refund all premiums of which at least 80 percent is not spent on medical care, a law that in its first year is resulting in billions of dollars in

NOTICE TO READERS

President Drew Faust has requested space for a regular column, titled “The View from Mass Hall,” where she can share her perspectives with readers. Her first commentary appears in this issue, on page 63.
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refunds to employers and individuals. Not demonstrated any real accomplishments, Mr. Taft? Besides the billions in refunds, and leading the fight for Internet neutrality in the Senate, Al drafted and pushed through the requirement that the SEC study the conflicts of interest in banks paying credit agencies to rate their subprime mortgages and other junk investments and force random assignment of credit agency reviews if the conflicts persist. Or is all this Sybert’s taking money from “those of us who produce”? Perhaps it is Al’s relentless exposure of lying by Focus on the Family, Limbaugh, Coulter, O’Reilly, and company that has your correspondents so upset. Whatever it is, their arguments cannot survive the slightest analysis.

David Wade ’73, J.D. ’76
Portland, Ore.

Richard Sybert’s letter, alas, reflects the level of reasoning so common in today’s political discourse. Franken’s “ideas and value system are comprehensively wrong,” Q.E.D. To this reader, humorist Franken’s thinking seems far more nuanced and smart. Thank goodness that Sybert and I are admirable overtaxed lawyer-producers, in contrast to those unproductive undertaxed consumer/spongers, by which he must mean carpenters, bakers, farmers, assembly-line workers, and minimum-wage waiters, cleaners, and shop clerks who serve us.

Mary von Euler, Radcliffe ’52
Bethesda, Md.

I know, alas, that many of my fellow Harvardians are conservative rather than liberal. But I was surprised by the crude vitriol of the “Fie on Al Franken” letters. Especially offensive was the remark that Franken’s politics “rest on taking money from those of us who produce and add value, and giving it to those who consume.” There are at least as many idle consumers among the rich as among the poor and at least as many hard-working producers among the poor as among the rich. The kind of judgment reflected in these letters sadly exposes the simplistic, reactionary rhetoric that has now become acceptable currency in our political discourse.

David Gordon ’51, A.M. ’52
Scarsdale, N.Y.

The great thing about the American political enterprise is that its openness affords an Al Franken the opportunity to seek—and win election to—a U.S. Senate seat—just as it allowed Sarah (“I can see Russia from my front porch”) Palin’s run for vice president.

While Franken’s rhetoric may be offensive to Mr. Sybert, Ms. Jensvold, and Mr. Taft, the great thing about the United States is that it is truly a land of opportunity, where a comedian can be elected to the Congress, just as one from any other path can be elected. The current U.S. Congress includes: screenwriters; orchard owners; social workers; ordained ministers; sheriffs; accountants; pilots; educators; dentists; physicians; veterinarians; and various other professionals.

The terms used in the letters to describe Franken and his political views—aggressive, obnoxious, rude, comprehensively wrong, profane, an embarrassment to everyone, partisan, has not demonstrated any real accomplishments in his brief public service—are each equally partisan, obnoxious, and offensive. That Franken rubs these folks the wrong way is precisely what makes our political system so vibrant, cherished, and spectacular.

Ted Baker, M.D.S. ’90
Miami

DATING DATA

As a New England Romantic born and bred, I applaud Kevin Lewis for seeking answers to one of life’s great mysteries: how humans choose intimate partners (“Mysteries of Mate Choice,” May–June, page 9). However, I am dismayed by his choice of New York City as the forum for his studies. Ever since Dutch traders landed in the sev-
Letters
discovering how the architecture of the brain changes our life’s course

In the Gen ed course “From neurons to nations,” students study the human brain and learn how the interaction of genes and environment shapes human and societal development.

—JOHN H. BOYLE, A.M. ’58
San Francisco

OVERSEER OVERSIGHTS!
The May–June issue of the magazine (“Vote Now,” page 63) outlines our choices for those for whom we will vote to lead us as Overseers (for six-year terms) and alumni association directors (for three-year terms).

As I read down the lists of names, I was struck, and appalled, by their backgrounds. Eight of our fellow alumni are running for Overseer. Of those eight, seven come from backgrounds of finance or white-shoe law. Nine of our fellows are running for director; seven of those come from backgrounds of finance or white-shoe law. Even the candidate who lists his career as “fine-art photographer” actually made his fortune at Goldman Sachs first.

Thus, to govern ourselves we have 17 candidates, with 14 from careers devoted to making as much money as possible as quickly as possible. Can we as a community do no better than this?

—STAN COERR, M.P.A. ’99
McLean, Va.

MORE NOTES ON LECTURES
If the lecture method is indeed facing twilight (“Twilight of the Lecture,” by Craig Lambert, March–April, page 23), I’m pleased that I was around to see it at zenith. I’m thinking of the legendary year-long course “History of East Asian Civilization,” quickly dubbed “Rice Paddies,” which I attended in the 1950s. It was taught by Edwin O. Reischauer and John K. Fairbank for decades. I would never have described either of them as mere conveyers of “information.”

George Packard, Reischauer’s biographer, writes that attending their class was “like walking into an atomic reactor. The quality and density were tremendous...enthusiasm was contagious.” Neither Reischauer nor Fairbank objected to being called a “missionary.” With passion and wit they were proselytizing the cause of a glorious and unfamiliar culture.

Lambert quotes Professor Eric Mazur as advocating a “group activity” style of teaching in which the big lecture hall is replaced by a classroom with square tables seating four children each. I’m trying to imagine if someone had suggested in 1956 that Rice Paddies be taken out of its majestic setting in Memorial Hall and placed in rooms with groups of four of us callow youth exchanging our ideas about T’ang dynasty poetry, let’s say. I think there might have been an early movement to Occupy the campus.

—JOHN H. BOYLE, A.M. ’58
San Francisco

Mazur’s “active learning” innovation certainly struck sensitive alumni nerves (Let-
I respectfully suggest that the critics confuse education with performance. My memorable experiences of performance include Archibald T. Davison’s lectures in Music 1, E. Power Biggs’s recitals in Grand Rapids and later Cambridge, and live performances in Symphony Hall. All of those experiences changed me, as the Mazur critics were changed by the polished lectures they remember. But all of these, I humbly suggest, were closer to theater than to education.

Toward the end of my teaching career, I, like Mazur, reinvented the pedagogical wheel and began to ask my introductory students to learn ethnography by doing it, and by adding alumni of the course to my staff each time I taught it.

Two positive results stand out. First, students are far more engaged when they work on problems that have not yet been solved in the discipline, even if these problems are small. Second, the old cliché is perfectly true: that no one learns more than the teacher, and that making every student to some extent a teacher transformed a group of willing (or not) teenagers—from empty vessels to be filled, into culturally experienced citizens charged with sharing their diverse lives and teaching each other. Such a thorough change in culturally experienced citizens charged with sharing their diverse lives and teaching each other. Such a thorough change in such a thorough change in such a thorough change in

SOFTBALL PITCHING, FLAT-OUT
As an alum, father of an incoming freshman, and most importantly, a die-hard softball dad, I was pleased to see Craig Lambert’s profile of star Harvard softball pitcher, Rachel Brown ’12 (“Queen of the Hill,” May-June, page 58). It did a nice job educating readers on the many subtle differences that make softball such a different game from baseball. But you missed one important difference: there is no “hill” in softball for Brown to reign over. Softball pitchers throw off a flat rubber in the “pitcher’s circle” and there is no elevated mound. Perhaps the title should have been something like, “Summa of the Circle.”

TODD COLLINS ’83, M.B.A. ’92
Palo Alto

BASKETBALL BIAS?
In the May-June 2012 issue (“One for the Books,” page 60), you rightly praised the historic accomplishments of the 2011-12 Harvard men’s basketball team and their record-setting run into the NCAA tournament. As an alumna teaching within the SEC, which fascines itself ruler of all things athletic, I proudly cheered the Crimson (who, incidentally, got as far as our Crimson Tide did...) in this year’s bracket. However, my next favorite pastime during March Madness is waiting for the inevitable slip by television commentators who, in their eagerness for newsworthy upsets, boldly state that no #16 seed has ever beaten a #1—at which point I yell at the screen “1998! Harvard versus Stanford! Allison Feaster! Check your facts!”

I have come to expect this kind of oversight from men’s basketball commentators, thus I was disappointed that Harvard Magazine would use the same male-centered language in claiming that “For only the second time in history and the first time since 1946, Harvard sent a team to the Big Dance...with their second consecutive league championship season—after having posted no titles since the Ancient Eight’s incarnation in 1956.” These statements are true for the Harvard men’s team and only for them; the Harvard women’s basketball team has won the league title 11 times and appeared in six national tournaments, including three appearances in the past 10 years.

Unlike women’s crew or rugby, which maintain a link to Radcliffe in their team name, the women’s basketball team, since the 1972 passage of Title IX that ushered in its varsity status, has proudly worn the crimson H on its uniforms. If only female athletes have to state their gender when we discuss sporting accomplishments, it remains crystal clear who society thinks truly belongs on the court.

Meredith M. Bagley ’99
Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Editor’s note: That article was a brief summary, for the record, of extensive online coverage of the men’s basketball season. As the dates make clear, it was only about men’s basketball. The magazine was delighted to feature the women’s 1998 victory in its summary of sports highlights in the September-October 2011 Harvard 375th anniversary issue (page 56), and has regularly included the Crimson women hoopers in its sports coverage, including a profile of the formidable Feaster (“Charlie the Great,” January-February 1997, page 72), among other stories.

TAXES, EFFORT, EQUITY
According to John Thorndike ’64, J.D. ’68, most people in this country are rewarded fi-
Support for the Life Sciences enhances opportunities for research and hands-on learning.

Gilbert H. Kliman ’80

“The world is a better place if more academically qualified students are able to attend Harvard,” says Gilbert Kliman ’80. Gilbert’s father, Allan Kliman ’54, MD ’58, and uncle, Bernard Kliman ’51, MD ’55, inspired his professional life and his personal decision to give back. “They came from limited means but because of full scholarships to the College and the Medical School, they went on to become respected physicians,” says Gilbert, managing director at InterWest Partners in Menlo Park, California. “As a result, my father had the resources to send me to Harvard. My education inspired me to not only become a physician myself, but to pursue a novel career track in medical venture capital.”

In honor of his father and uncle, Gilbert and his wife, Yasemin MBA ’99, established a scholarship fund for his 30th reunion that benefits undergraduates concentrating in the life sciences.

To read more, please visit www.alumni.harvard.edu/stories/kliman.

Byron Wien ’54, MBA ’56

An orphan by the age of 14, Byron Wien moved to a small apartment with his aunt and worked after school to make extra money. Now a vice chairman of Blackstone Advisory Partners LP, Byron will pay tribute to his mother and his father, a physician, by funding a professorship in life sciences. “With the Max and Anne Wien Professorship, my hope is to extend the life of my father,” says Byron. “The faculty member who holds the Professorship will pursue cutting-edge life science research.”

Byron has also established the Byron and Anita Wien Professorship of Drama, and the Byron R. Wien Scholarship Fund for students who, like him, lost a parent.

At the age of 79, Byron still thinks about Harvard every day. “My life has turned out so much better than I thought it would, I wish it would go on forever.”

To read more, please visit www.alumni.harvard.edu/stories/wien.

Photos courtesy of Gilbert Kliman and Byron Wien
Letters

Financially relative to how hard they work, so if we raise taxes on the rich, we will disincentivize hard work (Letters, March-April, page 4).

That notion requires an enormous leap of faith. In a country where CEOs make 475 times the average worker’s salary, the work-to-wealth correlation is especially dubious.

Free-market fetishizers, who currently include each and every national Republican politician, worship the fallacy that an unregulated economy rewards people reasonably and fairly, based on how hard they work, how much they produce, and what they deserve.

The rest of us recognize the more complex reality: that hard-working poor people deserve higher wages than they are getting, and that many people get rich—outrageously rich—through destructive greed, speculation, chicanery, manipulation, inside knowledge, and unethical behavior, none of which have anything to do with productivity, hard work, or any relative benefit to our economy, and none of which we should encourage.

From 1946 to 1980, the United States achieved sustained economic growth, widespread prosperity, and unprecedented market stability. Our recipe for economic success included tax rates as high as 90 percent on income that has historically been considered excessive, to discourage the greed and speculation fueled by dreams of unlimited wealth; a livable minimum wage, to encourage hard work by guaranteeing reasonable reward; and strong labor unions, to build a productive and strong middle class.

With higher wages for the struggling many, and higher tax revenues from the super-rich few, we will be able to increase public investment in those things that have been repeatedly shown to benefit everyone, including education, infrastructure, health-care for all, and green-energy development.

Ricardo Ashbridge Hinkle, M.L.A. ’90
New York City

Using Animals in Research

After reading “Animal Research Reforms” and Jessica Sandler’s letter (May-June, pages 45 and 6), I found Harvard’s attitudes toward research animals, including primates, at Harvard Medical School/New England Primate Research Center extremely callous from top to bottom. The only things that seemed to elicit attention to animal care were primate deaths and the threat of fines and personal public embarrassment. An animal’s not even being seen when its cage was being sanitized is a pointed metaphor about the invisibility of animals and their needs. Harvard cannot even provide water, that most basic necessity. Yes, animals should not die from neglect, but what about the quality of life for these poor creatures who are given extremely abusive, frightening, and painful treatment while seemingly being viewed as just lab tools. The goal should be to eliminate the use of animals in research and lab work.

Nick Percival ’64
Ridgefield, Conn.

Editor’s note: A photograph accompanying the article on the use of animals in medical research was captioned as depicting a common marmoset—information supplied, in error, by the stock agency that provided the image. Several correspondents wrote in to suggest that the primate in the photograph was instead a juvenile baboon.

Erratum

“Class reports, redux,” about the novel The Red Book, by Deborah Copaken Kogan ’88 (Commencement & Reunion Guide, May-June, page 4H), inadvertently misspelled her father, the late Richard D. Copaken ’63, J.D. ’66. We regret the error.

Lilacs’ Own Calendar

Lilacs in the Greater Boston area are already in bloom today, April 24. I fear that none will remain in bloom on Lilac Sunday, May 13 (“Voluptuous Sunday,” May-June, page 76). Chalk it up to the unnaturally warm winter.

Harley A. Haynes, M.D. ’63
Bedford, Mass.
In 1997, James Robinson and Daron Acemoglu were at an economics conference in Boston, listening as a presenter used historical data from the previous two decades to explain underdevelopment in Haiti. “We went for coffee, and remember saying to each other, ‘This is crazy!’” Robinson recalls. “Haiti is like it is because of a very deep-seated, historical process. You need to go back 200 years, not 20.”

What Robinson refers to as the duo’s “opening salvo” came four years later, with the publication of their paper “The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development” in the American Economic Review. In addition to taking a longer view of economic development, the paper was a response to the work of UCLA geography professor Jared Diamond ’58, JF ’65, whose Pulitzer Prize–winning book, Guns, Germs, and Steel (1997), attributed the success of a state’s economic development—or lack thereof—to characteristics of its physical environment. “One of the impulses for that first paper was this ‘geography theory,’ which we found sort of preposterous,” says Robinson. This offered a challenge: If not geography, then what?

The short answer, as they note in their recent book, Why Nations Fail, is politics. Robinson, now Florence professor of government at Harvard, and Acemoglu, Killian professor of economics at MIT, argue that countries in which political institutions (constitutions, regulatory authority, legal systems, distribution of power) have a long history of being inclusive—thus incentivizing the development of strong economic institutions—are more likely to succeed.

One of Robinson’s favorite examples is the contrast between the present wealth of the United States and Canada and that of most of their southern neighbors. In the book, he and Acemoglu detail how the original Spanish conquistadors of Latin America succeeded in imposing their will on the native people, mining the lands for gold and silver, and setting up a system that would enrich only the colonial elite and the Spanish crown. The historical persistence of this same sort of extractive structure, they say—where the government violates property rights and concentrates wealth and power in a class of elites—continues to disadvantage much of the region.

The British, on the other hand, not only failed to impose their will on the native population in their North American colonies, but were also unable to enforce extractive policies on their own colonists. Their only option, they found, was to motivate settlement through incentives. The authors specifically note the experience of the James-
right Now
town colony, where settlers were given land grants and offered political inclusion; the
book highlights a General Assembly in 1619 that “effectively gave all adult men a say in
the laws and institutions governing the colony.” It was, Robinson and Acemoglu write,
a powerful precedent: “Ultimately the good economic institutions of the United States
resulted from the political institutions that gradually emerged after 1619.”

That, they say, is the difference: countries like the United States have benefited from
a history of inclusive institutions that have provided for economic prosperity; Latin America—like the Middle East and
sub-Saharan Africa—has been damned by traditions of rulers seeking gratification at
the cost of the majority.

Some have questioned the depth of their work, Robinson reports. At a recent speech
at Britain’s Department for International Development, an audience member stood
and accused Robinson of being “simplistic.” “In social science, simple frameworks
are very powerful for organizing thinking,” he says. “I don’t think we deny that
geography or culture can be important in some contexts, but we think that isn’t the
big story—that isn’t what explains these big patterns. And so let’s focus on these
big patterns, and here’s a way of thinking about them.” Besides, he says, their frame-
work is based on more than a decade of academic work and dozens of academic pa-
pers: “So it is an abstraction, it is a simplification. But it is based on a lot of research.”

As for Jared Diamond, whose geography theory inspired the duo’s counterargu-
ment, he is thanked in the acknowledgments of Why Nations Fail. “He is a good
friend of mine,” says Robinson, noting that the pair have since co-edited books and set
up academic conferences together. “He and I have spent hours arguing about the evi-
dence. We just disagree.”

JAMES ROBINSON’S WEBSITE:
http://scholar.harvard.edu/jrobinson

The Library Test Kitchen

“W

ot if you thought se-

riously about the library

as a laboratory, as a place

where people do things,

where they make things?” asks Jeffrey

Schnapp, addressing his “Library Test Kitch-
en” class. Libraries as centers of knowledge

and learning have a rich history—but an un-
chart future. The digital revolution, be-

sides changing the nature of books, is trans-
forming the role of libraries in preserving

and disseminating information. “What if the

Library of Congress were to become a digital

library?” continues Schnapp. “What, then, is

the role of the physical public library? This

is a source of enormous anxiety at the local

level because public libraries” face increas-
ing political pressure, in-

cluding budget cuts, but

“play absolutely funda-

mental civic roles, often

as the only public space

that remains in smaller

communities.”

Last fall, Schnapp, a

professor of Romance

languages and litera-
tures who is deeply in-

terested in design ques-
tions triggered by the
digital revolution (see
“The Humanities, Digitized,”
May-June 2012, page 40), teamed
up with then Ess professor of
law John Palfrey (who chairs
the steering committee of the
national Digital Public Library
of America project), to teach a
seminar at the Graduate School
of Design (GSD) exploring what
form the library of the twenty-

first century might take. The

seminar was “both an attempt to
get the design community inter-
ested” in this question, Schnapp
says, and to have a “historically
informed, design-driven con-
versation that was in dialogue with Harvard’s
big, institution-wide conversation about
the reorganization of its own library sys-

A WiFi cold spot,
the project of
student instructor
Ben Brady, is a
radically designed
mini-room
intended to be a
place for reflection
or refuge from an
increasingly
connected world.

Timeslice lets library users post event
announcements containing graphics to a
digital community calendar.
a “rapid prototyping studio” at the GSD. During the semester, students designed, built, and deployed novel devices and objects in an attempt to model the library of the future; Schnapp’s co-instructors were Jeff Goldenson of the Harvard Library Lab (which fosters innovation in library services), GSD library director Ann White-side, and GSD student Ben Brady, who’d taken the fall class.

In the seminar’s freewheeling atmosphere, ideas flew like cream pies at a food fight. What if behind-the-scenes work could take place in the open instead, suggested Matthew Battles, a fellow at the Berkman Center. “What if you set up somebody processing medieval manuscripts in Widener or Lamont—a processing station in a public space?” Battles had just come from a used-furniture depository, where he’d been scavenging for shelves that could be repurposed for use as curator stations, places where faculty members or librarians could be asked to curate small collections of books. “What about a mobile, inflatable library?” suggested Golden-son. “What would that do?” Or how about an “Artist in Reference,” he continued. “We could bring in experts in a particular subject to serve as guest reference librarians in their area of expertise.” Schnapp, running with the idea, noted that “Widener contains collections in fields that haven’t been taught at Harvard in a hundred years, where we have the best collections of materials.”

By semester’s end, the brainstorming sessions had generated dozens of good ideas, and a few had become student projects: Biblio, a conceptualization of a handheld device for scanning books that tracks and shares research and even makes bibliographic recommendations for further study (see the online video); Timeslice, a “graphical electronic bulletin board” that lets library users post event announcements to a community calendar that incorporates digital graphics; Neo-Carrel, a study chair with a raised platform in front that doubles as a laptop stand and a comfortable place to rest one’s head for a nap (now installed in Lamont library); and a WiFi cold spot, a radically designed room (opposite) for reflection or refuge from an increasingly connected world.

“We think this is an opportunity to be real catalysts for thoughtful change that can’t easily come from other quarters,” explains Schnapp. “Because we’re not librarians, but instead a community of artists, scholars, engineers—people interested in knowledge—we come at the questions a little bit differently. So we think we can be innovative and breathe some fresh air into a conversation that often is about how many jobs are going to be cut, or what will happen to all the space that is freed up once the stacks move out to the Harvard Depository. That’s a conversation that may have to happen, but it would be a tragedy if that were the only framework in which we thought about the possibilities for enhancing the mission of libraries.”

—JONATHAN SHAW

LIBRARY TEST KITCHEN WEBSITE: www.librarytestkitchen.org

CHILDBIRTH AND STATUS

When Having Babies Beats Marriage

In February The New York Times ran a story under the provocative headline, “For Women Under 30, Most Births Occur Outside of Marriage.” The article suggested childbearing outside of marriage was the “new normal”—that recently released data signaled a “coming generational change” in Americans’ attitudes toward family formation. It was a dramatic story, but sociologist Kathryn Edin says it obscured the truth about how childbearing is changing in the United States.

“What the article essentially got wrong is that this is an education story, not an age story,” explains Edin, professor of public policy and management at Harvard Kennedy School and a prominent scholar of the American family. She points out that 94 percent of births to college-educated women today occur within marriage (a rate virtually unchanged from a generation ago), whereas the real change has taken place at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder. In 1960 it didn’t matter whether you were rich or poor, college-educated or a high-school dropout—almost all American women waited until they were rich or poor, college-educated or a high-school dropout—almost all American women waited until they were wealthy to have kids. Now 57 percent of women with high-school degrees or less education are unmarried when they bear their first child.

The decoupling of marriage from childbearing among lower-income Americans is arguably the most profound social trend...
in American life today and has sparked intense political debate. But as Edin's ethnographic research demonstrates, many of the basic assumptions about why this decoupling is occurring are wrong.

Consider, first, the explanation that conservative political scientist Charles Murray ’65 advances in his recent book Coming Apart: that poor Americans value marriage less than the middle class does. In the late 1990s, Edin spent two years living in Camden, New Jersey, the nation’s poorest city, where she got to know several hundred poor, unmarried mothers and fathers. Her conversations with them—and five years of follow-up interviews—served as the basis for Promises I Can Keep (2005), about unmarried low-income mothers, and Doing the Best I Can (written with Timothy Nelson, a lecturer in social policy at the Kennedy School), a forthcoming book about unmarried low-income fathers. In both books, Edin argues that the poor place tremendous value on marriage—but often see it as unobtainable.

“The poor all say they want marriages like middle-class people have, marriages that will last,” Edin says. “Middle-class people are searching longer for their partners, they’re marrying people more like themselves, and as a result marriages have gotten happier and more stable.”

The poor may share middle-class attitudes toward marriage, but the fit with their circumstances isn’t nearly as good, she argues. Her 2005 paper “Why Don’t They Just Get Married?” cites a range of obstacles that prevent the poor from realizing their marital aspirations, including the low quality of many of their existing relationships; norms they hold about the standard of living necessary to support a marriage; the challenges of integrating kids from past relationships into new ones; and an aversion to divorce. People told her that “marriage is a big thing which they respect and don’t think they’re up to.” A mother quoted in that paper said, “I don’t believe in divorce. That’s why none of the women in my family are married.”

But even as low-income Americans view marriage as out of reach, Edin asserts, they continue to see bearing and raising children as the most meaningful activity in their lives. “One theme of Doing The Best I Can is that poor men really want to be dads and they really value fatherhood,” she says. “Both women and men at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder see having kids as the ultimate form of fulfillment”: given their bleak economic prospects and minimal hope of upward mobility, being a parent is one of the few positive identities available to them. Middle-class women have substantial economic incentives to delay childbearing (a woman who gives birth right after college earns half as much in her lifetime as the classmate who waits until her mid-thirties), but those incentives don’t exist for poor women. As Edin writes in Promises I Can Keep, “Early childbearing is highly selective of girls whose characteristics—family background, cognitive ability, school performance, mental-health status, and so on—have already diminished their life chances so much that an early birth does little to reduce them further.”

This teenager regularly hurries from his job to a local day-care center to spend time with his son in his new role as a father.

Doing The Best I Can includes the story of 15-year-old André, who rejoiced to learn his ex-girlfriend was pregnant. Edin was initially perplexed by a reaction so different from a middle-class teen’s—but she began to understand his behavior after a year in his Camden neighborhood. “He was embracing life and rejecting death,” she explains. “He could have been out there dealing drugs but instead he’s dealing his baby and learning how to twist her hair. Given the incredible trauma in André’s life, the condition of his neighborhood, what the real counterfactuals to having a baby might actually be, is taking a risk on a pregnancy and then embracing the child a mistake? Probably not.” Nevertheless, André’s genuine excitement about becoming a father doesn’t change the long odds his daughter faces. Children born to unmarried parents, Edin points out, are at higher risk of dropping out, getting pregnant as teenagers, struggling to find employment, and going to jail.

As Edin sees it, reestablishing the link between childbearing and marriage in low-income communities requires giving residents reasons to wait to have children—to better align their childbearing and marriage timetables. The only way disadvantaged Americans will delay childbearing, she argues, is if they see other, equally posi-
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High-speed, Rocksteady

The only feature film to mix reggae and stock-car racing

by Stephen Potter

Instead of ending with a car chase, this film starts with one: Royal Canadian Mounted Police cruisers pursue two young men in a souped-up sedan down two-lane roads and through cornfields. The guys lose the cops and succeed in selling the drugs they’re smuggling into the country: prescription medications from Canada for a grateful group of hard-pressed elderly Americans.

Rocksteady, a good-natured coming-of-age story, is the first feature film from television and commercial director Mustapha Khan ’84. Aimed, he says, “at car-crazy teenage boys who love action films, the purpose of the car chase scene is to grab the audience’s attention. But the film is about something larger, the connections between fathers and sons. Rocksteady poses the question every young man has to answer, ‘How do I grow up?’ He has to figure out if he’s a guy who can walk in his father’s shoes.”

The film’s protagonist, B.C. Cook, and his widowed mother are the sole Caribbean family in a small town in upstate New York. His late father held himself to a high standard, aware that the Cooks were the only Jamaicans most of their neighbors had ever met. B.C. has a talent for driving cars, handy for his prescription-running exploits. He dreams of becoming a Hollywood stunt driver, but hasn’t the wherewithal to enroll in a training school in Los Angeles; in fact, his mother faces eviction. So he, his stoner pal Rudy, and Faith, an attractive girl from their high-school days with a “thing” for B.C., form a team to enter stock-car races at the local dirt track, where the season-ending grand prize of $10,000 will cover the trip to California and tuition, too. A dream, a team, an interracial love story, and a reggae soundtrack (“rocksteady” is a reggae precursor), plus a lean $1.5 million budget—in the hands of an Emmy-winning director like Khan, the result is an entertaining, sleekly produced indie film.

Stephen Hays, a hedge-fund founder turned independent film producer, initi-
Thinking Outside the Pack

This is a book about the history of cigarette design, cigarette rhetoric, and cigarette science. My goal is to treat the cigarette as part of the ordinary history of technology—and a deeply political (and fraudulent) artifact....It is also, though, a story of how smoking became not just sexy and “adult” (meaning “for kids”) but also routine and banal. The banalization of smoking is one of the oddest aspects of modern history. How did we come into this world, where millions perish from smoking and most of those in power turn a blind eye? How did tobacco manage to capture the love of governments and the high rhetorical ground of liberty, leaving the lesser virtues of longevity to its critics? And what can we do to strengthen movements now afoot to prevent tobacco death?

Think again about the numbers: in the United States alone, 400,000 babies are born every year to mothers who smoke during pregnancy. Smoking is estimated to cause more than 20,000 spontaneous abortions—and perhaps as many as seven times that. Seven hundred Americans are killed every year by cigarette fires, and 150 million Chinese alive today will die from cigarette smoking. Tens of thousands of acres of tropical forest are destroyed every year to grow the leaves required to forge the nicotine bond.

...[I]f we believe that smoking really is a kind of “freedom,” this is partly because the cigaretteers have spent billions to make us think this way. The propaganda machine is powerful and operates on so many levels—science, law, government, sports, entertainment—that it is hard to think outside the pack. Governments are entranced, hooked by the bounty of taxes brought in by selling cigarettes. (No single commodity brings in higher revenues.) The mainstream media are often inattentive, partly because the tobacco story is spun as “old news.” So we are brainwashed, nicotinized, confused into equating gummery with freedom.

Healthy people tend to forget how crucial health is for other kinds of freedom. The tobacco industry wants us to think about smoking as an inalienable right of all free people, but how free is the amputee suffering from Buerger’s disease, the cigarette-induced circulatory disorder expressed as gangrene of the feet? How free was my beloved grandmother, the once-lively South Texas flapper, rendered wheezing and immobile on her deathbed from the emphysema scarring her lungs? Health so deprived is surely a kind of violation, a slow robbery of the spirit to which the strong and healthy will never bear first-person witness. The industry sells this slow asphyxiation—and the unwary buy into it.

Getting them while they’re young: tiny cigarette packs, meant for children to incorporate into their play with dolls or toy soldiers

Cigarettes, observes Robert N. Proctor, Ph.D. ’84, “remain the world’s single largest preventable cause of death,” and following roughly 100 million tobacco-related deaths in the twentieth century, far more mortality “lies in the future”—an estimated billion deaths in the twenty-first. The author, now professor of the history of science at Stanford, has written a large, and hotly passionate, book on the subject, Golden Holocaust: Origins of the Cigarette Catastrophe and the Case for Abolition (University of California, $49.95). From the prologue:

Going into the five-week shoot, his greatest concern was endurance. “There are a thousand decisions you have to make every day and they all affect what you see on screen,” he explains. “You have to make it seem like things are going great when they are falling apart—and you can’t lose momentum. And I knew I had to bring it in on time and on budget so I could live to fight another day.” The film (www.rocksteadymovie.com), completed in 2010, has been on the festival circuit since last year, winning the Best Feature award at the Litchfield Hills Film Festival and a jury selection at the Jamaica Reggae Film Festival. It’s now available on iTunes, DVD, Netflix and on-demand; executive producer Hays isn’t concerned that it’s never appeared in general release. “Eight out of 10 independent features are never seen in theaters, but that doesn’t mean they aren’t artistically noteworthy or commercially successful,” he says, noting that films with modest production budgets can generate steady income streams for years.

Khan, like Rocksteady’s B.C., is the son of a Caribbean immigrant; his late father moved from Trinidad and became a physician in Camden, New Jersey, practicing on a street now named in his honor. The younger Khan’s life took an unusual turn at 13; he was ordained an evangelical minister and spent his high-school years as a preacher and faith healer in storefront churches in Philadelphia. He stopped preaching shortly before matriculating at Harvard. (“I consider myself spiritual, but not religious,” he says now.) In college he stud-
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Khan directing Rockssteady (clockwise from above): shooting a stock car; orienting star Cedric Sanders; advising Rastafarian musician David Hinds and Sanders

His work so impressed Bill Cosby that the star arranged for the 26-year-old to direct a large-budget commercial he was making for Coca-Cola. Khan then began making short films for Sesame Street; Dancing Shoes won a 1992 Daytime Emmy. He also received a Primetime Emmy nomination for
his work on Sesame Street’s 25th Anniversary Special: A Musical Celebration.

The essential sweetness of Rocksteady may reflect the sensibility of Khan’s continuing work for Sesame Street. It is a film without a villain; characters who seem threatening turn out to be good. B.C. arrives at the track as an outsider, but doesn’t encounter racism. No one dies or is even injured.

Khan acknowledges that Rocksteady’s world is not necessarily what audiences may anticipate. “I like to give people the unexpected,” he says. He admires Scottish writer-director Bill Forsyth, who in the 1980s made Gregory’s Girl and Local Hero, up-beat tales populated by quirky but fundamentally kind characters. “There’s enough darkness in the world,” Khan says. “I aspire to being a gentle filmmaker. It’s possible to be that and still be a serious one.”

Because they have no lyrics,” explains composer and musician Ben Cosgrove ’10, “the titles of my pieces are the only chance I have to give the listener a hint about where they come from.” Those titles, on his latest CD, Yankee Division, include “Prairie Fire,” “Oarlock,” “Nashua,” “Good Fences,” and “When You are a Road.” All resonate with places in Cosgrove’s native New England! In fact, the CD takes its name from the Yankee Division Highway, another appellation of the Route 128 beltway that rings Boston and separates it from the rest of Massachusetts. Although the links between sound and place are sometimes clear—“Good Fences” echoes the famous Robert Frost poem, and “Nashua” calls up the eponymous New Hampshire town—Cosgrove’s intent is more to evoke than to mirror. “I don’t think of my pieces as ‘rendering places in music,’” he says. “Writing music just happens to be the way I process the world.”

The 12 compositions on Yankee Division do things like combine plaintive guitar

Off the Shelf
Recent books with Harvard connections


Harvest the Wind, by Philip Warburg ’77, J.D. ’85 (Beacon, $27.95). The author, also an alumnus of the Environmental Law Institute and Conservation Law Foundation, tells the tale of “America’s journey to jobs, energy independence, and climate stability” (the subtitle) through visits with the people involved.

The Day in Its Color, by Eric Sandweiss ’81 (Oxford, $39.95). Quotidian America, captured in Kodachrome images taken during midcentury wanderings by casual photographer Charles Cushman, comprise an amateur visual history in the best sense of the word. Alongside the riveting images, Sandweiss, of Indiana University, offers superb, and suitably unacademic, commentary and context.

Dignity: Its History and Meaning, by Michael Rosen, professor of government (Harvard, $21.95). A succinct exploration in philosophy, political theory, and more, but without the dread difficulties of diving deep into, say, the thickets of Kant. The text begins, “Schopenhauer, the Ebenezer Scrooge of nineteenth-century philosophy…”

The Founder’s Dilemmas, by Noam Wasserman, associate professor, Harvard Business School (Princeton, $35). Channeling your inner Facebook? You might want to guard against the challenges that fell most startups. From examples in technology and life sciences, Wasserman offers evidence about family, teammates, investors, and other nettlesome, necessary people.

The Mansion of Happiness: A History of Life and Death, by Jill Lepore, Kemper professor of American history (Knopf, $27.95). Taking on three minor questions—

Charles Cushman’s America, in Kodachrome: Phillips Avenue, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, 1959 (left), and Newberry and Maxwell Streets, Chicago, 1950 (right)
and banjo picking with repeated piano phrases, cellos that mimic barges’ horns, and electronic accents made to sound like crying voices or amplified breath. Their melodies drift across haunting northern expanses amid polished arrangements, often gradually decomposing as chaos creeps in underneath. The music stirs intimate feelings of loneliness and homesickness, as well as taking on “bigger places, distance, and a greater sense of history,” Cosgrove says. His musical journeys evoke the melancholy and the frantic disorientation of departure, transit, and return.

Cosgrove’s work (www.bencosgrove.com) bears traces of stylistic influence from twentieth-century minimalists such as Philip Glass and from contemporary composers like Nico Muhly and the French musician Yann Tiersen, who

“How does life begin? What does it mean? What happens when you’re dead?”—the prolific historian/New Yorker writer explores the history of these ideas through stories, beginning with Milton Bradley, the game guru, and his “Checkered Game of Life.”


**The Ball**, by John Fox, Ph.D. ’94 (Harper Perennial, $14.99 paper). Pursuing “the object of the game,” the author draws on his anthropological training and journalistic skills, while traveling the world and history, to explore why we, universally, play ball.

**The Creation of Inequality**, by Kent Flannery and Joyce Marcus, Ph.D. ’74 (Harvard, $39.95). Who knew, when these two Distinguished University Professors at Michigan’s Museum of Anthropology began their enormous tome on the ancient origins of “monarchy, slavery, and empire” (from the subtitle), that it would turn out to be timely? A history of the origins of hierarchy won’t make the nightly news, but it is profound food for thought.

**Zoobiquity: What Animals Can Teach Us About Health and the Science of Healing**, by Barbara Natterson-Horowitz ’83, A.M. ’83, and Kathryn Bowers (Knopf, $27.95). The lead author, a UCLA cardiologist and medical adviser to the local zoo, and her colleague explore lessons from veterinary science—ranging from obesity to stallions’ libido issues.

**Alaskan Travels**, by Edward Hoagland ’54 (Arcade, $22.95). Hoagland, who managed to be usefully curmudgeonly even in his youth, here revisits sojourns from 30 years ago—involving, as always, the outdoors, lowlifes, himself, sex, and the farther reaches of North America as only he recorded it.

**American Gridlock**, by H. Woody Brock ’67, M.B.A. ’70, S.M. ’71 (Wiley, $27.95). Addressing economic and entitlements problems through an economic and consulting approach (for example, address healthcare access and cost crisis by increasing the supply of medical services). Although Brock analyzes errors made by the right and the left, will any politicians rally to his fixes?

**Blackhorse Riders**, by Philip Keith ’68 (St. Martin’s, $26.99). A you-were-there account of a hellish, heroic battle in Vietnam that went unrecognized for decades.
Cities for Games

Video-game designer Scott Duquette, a new kind of urban planner

by DANIEL BARBARISI

When he lays down cobblestone roads, spends hours on the windows of a home on a quiet alleyway, or puts the final architectural details on a towering church spire, Scott Duquette ’05 thinks of the visitors who will someday come to his city. They should remember his creation the way they look back fondly on a foreign city they once toured, with nostalgia for the buildings, the people, the feel of it all.

Why should it matter that the city isn’t real?

Duquette is a video-game artist, a designer who created worlds for 38 Studios, the Providence, Rhode Island, company founded by former Boston Red Sox pitcher Curt Schilling. (On June 7, the financially ailing firm filed for Chapter 7 bankruptcy, clearing the way for its liquidation.)

Video-game artist Scott Duquette at his home in Providence, Rhode Island
Duquette has spent the past five years using design software and his concentration in visual and environmental studies to realize the imaginary cities dreamt up by his fellow designers and writers—fantastic medieval towns and modern metropolises grounded in real-world architectural concepts.

As a child, he hoped to become an architect and made money sketching the houses of family friends in Hamilton, Massachusetts. But while working as a teenager in a few architectural offices, he “realized that actual architecture, out there in the world, was boring to me. A lot of time spent on the phone with subcontractors, looking through materials catalogs. I didn’t want to design hospital bathrooms—I wanted to build castles and grand cathedrals.”

At 38 Studios, Duquette did just that, working on a project code-named Copernicus, a multiplayer online game set in a Tolkien-esque fantasy world. As a senior environmental designer, his job was to envision and create its cities, working alongside other designers who created landscapes of pastoral farmland and craggy mountaintops. He is part of an industry that has grown dramatically in the last decade, to $65 billion in global revenue in 2011.

A game like Copernicus can easily cost more than $50 million to develop. Such projects employ teams of hundreds and may take five to 10 years to complete: Copernicus began development in 2006, and no release date had been announced.

In the lengthy process, writers and story editors first create the concept—a fantasy epic, a modern-day shooting game, a saga of exploration set in Roman times—and draft a main plotline. They decide whether the player is free to explore, or must hew...
Duquette and his fellow artists use a stylus to draw and paint on a large tablet monitor called a Cintiq that translates strokes into the computer-design software Adobe Photoshop. He does two-dimensional sketches in Photoshop, and then uses a program called Maya to expand those into three-dimensional, fully realized virtual buildings with working doors and staircases that players can walk around and live in.

The architecture-mad kid still comes through in his work. Duquette thinks that many other studios’ games have inelegant buildings that look as though they wouldn’t hold together. He therefore creates his fantasy structures with an obsessive level of detail, modeling them after real-world sites. “I think the fantasy really holds up better if you have realistic architecture,” he declares, noting that creating a video game requires “hundreds of people working in such intricate choreography to create this living, beautiful thing. When it’s finally a playable, finished piece, that absolutely is art.”

Charles Hayford writes, “One of the Beat poets, I think, perhaps Gary Snyder, wrote of walking in the mountains in late winter or early spring. He comes around a corner and spies a brave spot of red bud draw on their nightcaps of deep purple.”

“The real questions….” In response to a query about the source of “The real questions are the ones that intrude upon your consciousness whether you like it or not”—attributed to the writer Ingrid Bengis online—the author has identified the statement as the second sentence of her 1973 feminist classic, Combat in the Erogenous Zone: Writings on Love, Hate, and Sex.

Send inquiries and answers to “Chapter and Verse,” Harvard Magazine, 7 Ware Street, Cambridge 02138, or via e-mail to chapterandverse@harvardmag.com.
For a decade, Lawrence Lessig, a mild-seeming legal scholar, pursued the intricacies of updating American copyright law to reflect the rise of the digital era, the Internet, and new means of producing and disseminating texts, music, images, and software. Based first at Harvard, then Stanford, he co-founded organizations such as Creative Commons, a nonprofit that gives people legal tools to control use of their creative output, and argued that mashups (of songs or YouTube videos, for example) are culturally important products that (in some circumstances) can be legal under the principle of fair use.

He felt he was making progress: “The public was getting it. Businesses were getting it. Universities. Everybody had come to the recognition that ‘There is something wrong with the existing system,’ and that it needed to be updated—but we were making no progress in the context of policymakers.” At first, he was puzzled. But gradually he realized the problem lay in the sclerotic, gridlocked policymaking system itself—particularly in Congress. “We weren’t making any progress because money was so inherent and tied to decisions,” he says now. “The public domain had no lobbyists. The ideas of the public domain weren’t even on the table because there was no infrastructure for putting them there.”

As long as Congress remains in the thrall of “the economy of

A Radical Fix for the Republic

Lawrence Lessig thinks American democracy requires a constitutional overhaul to counter the “economy of influence.”

by JONATHAN SHAW

Lawrence Lessig

Photograph by Jim Harrison
influence”—its members dependent on money to fund reelection campaigns—“no progress would be made on copyright or any other public-policy question,” he explains. “It wasn’t just esoteric areas like copyright, it was also fundamental issues like global warming, healthcare, or any number of others.”

That set Lessig off in a new direction—including an exploratory, aborted run for Congress and, ultimately, in 2008, a return to Harvard. He now directs the Safra Center for Ethics, serves as Furman professor of law and leadership at Harvard Law School, and investigates the American government and what ails it. His findings, recently published in *Republic, Lost: How Money Corrupts Congress—and a Plan to Stop It*, have led him to conclude that nothing less than overhauling the way elections are funded—involving a tool never before invoked in American democracy—is required.

“A Republic, if You Can Keep It”

Lessig comes to his conviction that American democracy is dysfunctional as a lawyer and citizen who has migrated from Reagan Republican to concerned liberal. His apprehensions about Congress transcend partisanship. He has worked with Tea Party leaders and Occupiers alike because he sees grassroots intervention as the only way to fix a system that is broken. A host of issues threatens the nation, he points out, and every informed citizen knows it, yet Congress can’t achieve much. Elected representatives deadlock on key points such as reform of the financial system—after its failures nearly cause a global meltdown—even when solutions seem obvious and attainable.

When Lessig contemplates this impasse, he sees political polarization as merely a symptom of a much deeper sickness: Congress has been “corrupted” by its members’ dependence on money from lobbyists—and from the special interests hiring those lobbyists—to fund their reelection campaigns.

This “dependence corruption,” described in *Republic, Lost*, does not mean venal corruption: bribery or bags of cash for personal use. The Framers of the Constitution, he points out, sought to guard against that by explicitly outlawing the corrupting potential of gifts from foreign nations in Article 1.

A portrait set in diamonds (a gift to Benjamin Franklin) and other expensive gifts had been lavished on representatives of the emerging nation by European rulers, and “raised a reasonable concern,” Lessig writes. “Would agents of the republic keep their loyalties clear if in the background they had in view these expected gifts from foreign kings?” Likewise, “the Framers wanted to avoid...Parliament’s loss of independence from the Crown” resulting from royal gifts of “offices and perks” that pulled members “away from the view of the people they were intended to represent.” The Founders were aware of the fragility of the system they had fledged: when Franklin walked from Independence Hall as the Constitutional Convention ended, Lessig writes, a woman asked what he had wrought. “A republic, madam,” he replied, “if you can keep it.”

The Framers, Lessig says, had *just one* kind of dependence in mind for members of Congress: a dependence on the people. He quotes *The Federalist* (the then-anonymous essays by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay that are often used as a contemporary account of the Framers’ intentions) to make this point: number 52 describes the House of Representatives as that “branch of the federal government which ought to be dependent on the people alone” (emphasis added).

But in the last two decades, Lessig writes, members of Congress have developed a fearsome dependency: campaign cash. The total amount spent on campaigns by all candidates for Congress in 2010 was $1.8 billion. Fundraising has become a way of life, and extravagant giving has been institutionalized; only the diamonds are missing.

Lessig cites the example of Senator Max Baucus (D-Montana), chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, whose position gave him a critical role in the debate over President Obama’s healthcare proposal. Between 2003 and 2008, Baucus received $5 million in campaign contributions from the financial, insurance, and health industries. But Lessig also cites similar examples from both sides of the aisle, blaming neither political party in particular. The corruption, he says, is systemic and systemic: in 2009 alone, lobbyists spent $3.5 billion, or about $6.5 million per each elected member in Congress.

Do gifts of money really change recipients’ behavior? Studies have suggested that, on any particular issue, there is no apparent link between a legislator’s vote and lobbyist money—the data don’t show a pattern that can be discerned. “But certainly,” Lessig says in an interview, “money can affect what goes into the bills” before Congress on issue after issue. “Let’s say we are talking about healthcare: money guaranteed that single-payer health insurance was not on the table. There could be nothing more fundamental to that bill than that.”

Furthermore, Americans don’t believe all that money has no effect—and that is a problem in itself. If the 99.9 percent of Americans who don’t have enough money to buy access to Congress believe their participation in their democracy doesn’t count for much, they says, they will choose to do something else, such as make a rational choice to play with their children instead.

And the need for campaign cash does have one clear and important effect, Lessig argues. Members of Congress now spend between 30 and 70 percent of their time raising money rather than deliberating as they were elected to do. For example, even as fundraising has increased exponentially since 1994—the moment when control of Congress began shifting back and forth between Democrats and Republicans, intensifying the need for campaign funds to secure a majority—the amount of time members of Congress spend in committee meetings has dropped dramatically. “I don’t have enough data to say money is the driver,” Lessig admits, “but it is consistent with that proposition.”

When Lessig makes this case in speeches, he reports, reactions range from disbelief to rationalization. “Some say, ‘It can’t possibly be true.’ Others say, ‘They’re raising money; they are spending time connecting to people.’ That ignores the fact that they are connecting to 0.1 percent of the people, which is not connecting to people.” But “the vast majority” is stunned into recognizing “There is something really wrong here.” Lessig likens this dependency on money to cocaine addiction, in which users spend “70 percent of their time feeding their habit.”

The corrupting influence of money manifests itself in Washington culture in other ways as well. When Lessig interviewed convicted lobbyist Jack Abramoff as part of a series hosted by the Center for Ethics last December, for example, Abramoff described how offering a member of Congress or congressional staffer a high-paying job on K Street (home to big lobbying firms)
is, in effect, a way of hiring them on the spot. They may be two years from the end of their terms, Abramoff said, but from that moment—with no money down—they are, in the back of their minds, working for their future employer. Lessig therefore suggests extending the ban on moving from Congress to a lobbying job from the current one year for House members and two years for staffers and Senators to seven years.

**In the Hands of the People**

The problem of money in politics runs deep, with effects that are difficult to untangle, but Lessig cites a particularly dramatic instance to illustrate his point. Between 1995 and 2000, he reports, the government spent more than $70 billion subsidizing corn production. As a result, “Every $1 of profits earned by [food conglomerate Archer Daniels Midland’s] corn-sweetener operation costs consumers $10,” says Lessig, quoting from a Cato Institute study.

Some of the support was intended to aid family farms, but the benefits have accrued mainly to large companies. Meanwhile, the subsidies have made high-fructose corn syrup cheap and raw corn inexpensive that some farmers feed it to their cattle. Now the corn sweetener—present in 40 percent of the food on grocery shelves—has been implicated in the obesity and diabetes epidemics. And cattle—which don’t digest corn properly—develop gastrointestinal bacteria that must be treated with antibiotics, in turn facilitating the evolution of drug-resistant “super bugs” that can infect humans. “You begin to poison people through the food-production system,” Lessig says. “There’s nobody on the right who can say this is a good thing. And people on the left who might have supported this system originally, because it was going to support family farms—they don’t like this either. Yet think about the political will that would be necessary to turn this spigot off! I don’t think we have that political capacity.”

That conviction and the Supreme Court decision *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* (which allows corporations and unions unlimited spending on independent political communications) have led him to call for a constitutional convention—something that hasn’t happened since the Constitution was written—to propose amendments that would ensure Congress is truly dependent on the people alone. It seems an extreme approach, but Lessig discusses many other possible remedies and strategies for achieving them in his book, such as donor anonymity (to break the clear link between contributions and political favors) or one-issue candidates who vow to quit Congress once reformed. He follows those remedies down forking paths, seemingly to every possible outcome, and concludes that a convention has the best, albeit slight, chance of success.

The Constitution describes a mechanism for triggering such a gathering (two-thirds of state legislatures must call on Congress to convene a convention, and three-quarters of the states, 38 in all, must ratify any proposed change for it to be adopted), but every time the country has faced the prospect, Congress has acted first, “most famously in the context of the Seventeenth Amendment” mandating direct election of U.S. senators by popular vote, Lessig reports. “The states came within one vote of calling for a convention” and Congress responded to this reformist pressure.

Lessig does not say what, exactly, such a convention should propose. Elsewhere in *Republic, Lost*, he advances the idea of democracy vouchers, a publicly funded campaign-finance system that would give every citizen $50 to support his or her candidate of choice, and would limit total contributions from any single person to $100. But this system would apply only to candidates who “opt-in,” says the libertarian Lessig, leaving other candidates to take money from super PACs, corporations, or industry lobbyists.

A constitutional convention could make limiting that kind of contribution clearly legal, as he clearly hopes that it would, while leaving the specifics to the delegates themselves, who he believes should be ordinary citizens from across the country, “a random selection drawn from the voter rolls.” In fact, he writes: “I recognize that of all the insanity strewn throughout this book, this will strike readers as the most extreme. Ordinary citizens? Are you crazy? Proposing amendments to our Constitution? When two-thirds of Americans can’t even identify what the Bill of Rights is?”

**Measured against problems** such as fascism, institutionalized racism, and sexism that “our nation tackled throughout the course of the twentieth century,” this “narrow but profound flaw at the core of our Constitution…that has allowed our government to become captured” by moneyed special interests is “tiny by comparison.”

Yet it is a solution characteristic of Lessig, this former chairman of the Pennsylvania Teen Age Republicans who turned liberal while studying philosophy at the University of Cambridge in England—an unconventional, innovative, and radical thinker. His proposal in a single stroke does away with experts, politicians, and activists.

It also highlights Lessig’s idealism: a commitment to American democracy bordering on faith. In *One Way Forward: The Outsider’s Guide to Fixing the Republic*, an ebook he published in February as a follow-up to *Republic, Lost*, he describes the principles that ordinary citizens—perhaps including those named to a constitutional convention—might pledge to uphold: “To provide that public elections are publicly funded; to limit, and make transparent, contributions and independent political expenditures; and to reaffirm that when the Declaration of Independence spoke of entitles ‘endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights’ it was speaking of natural persons only.”

As principles go, simple. And in his e-book, Lessig concludes that, measured against problems such as fascism, institutionalized racism, and sexism that “our nation tackled throughout the course of the twentieth century,” this “narrow but profound flaw at the core of our Constitution…that has allowed our government to become captured” by moneyed special interests is “tiny by comparison.” What it will take to fix things, he says, is for Americans to recognize that “the corrupting influence of money is the first problem facing this nation. That unless we solve this problem, we won’t solve anything else.”

Jonathan Shaw ’89 is managing editor of this magazine.
American voters hold their elected officials, collectively, in low regard, even as they often indicate that they like their own representatives in Congress. They want their leaders to govern, but seem to regard the process of effecting compromises as unseemly—even unprincipled and dishonest. Now two eminent political theorists—Amy Gutmann ’71, Ph.D. ’76, president of the University of Pennsylvania, and Dennis Thompson, Ph.D. ’68, Whitehead professor of political philosophy—have combined forces to restate clearly the imperative of compromise (“the hardest way to govern, except all the others”), and the fierce problems posed by unending campaigns. This excerpt, an introduction to their new book, The Spirit of Compromise: Why Governing Demands It and Campaigning Undermines It, lays the groundwork for subsequent recommendations, ranging from open-enrollment primary elections to new incentives for the news media.
Compromise is difficult, but governing a democracy without compromise is impossible. Anyone who doubts either the difficulty or the necessity of compromise need only recall the heated politics of the summer of 2011 in Washington, D.C., when a sharply divided Congress confronted the need to raise the sovereign debt limit of the United States. Compromise appeared to be the only way to avoid further inflaming the financial crisis and risking an unprecedented governmental default on the debt. With the approach of the August 3 deadline (after which the government would no longer be able to pay all its bills), many observers doubted that any compromise could be reached in time.

The spirit of compromise was in short supply. Only at the last moment—on the evening of July 31—was President Barack Obama able to announce that leaders in both the House and the Senate had reached an agreement. Congress and the White House would now compromise. Yet criticism of the compromise abounded on all sides. The best that supporters could say for it was that its terms were less bad than the consequences of doing nothing. The episode stands as a dramatic reminder that compromise is the hardest way to govern, except all the others.

Why is compromise so hard in a democracy when it is undoubtedly necessary? Much of the resistance to compromise lies in another necessary part of the democratic process: campaigning for political office. Though valuable in its place, campaigning is increasingly intruding into governing. The effects of a continuous campaign—along with the distorting influence of media and money that it brings—encourage a mindset among politicians that makes compromise more difficult. Systematic rejection of compromise is a problem for any democracy because it biases the political process in favor of the status quo and stands in the way of desirable change.

Privileging the status quo does not mean that nothing changes. It just means that politicians let other forces control the change. The status quo includes not only a current state of affairs but also the state that results from political inaction. In the deeply divided politics of 2011, rejecting congressional compromise on raising the debt ceiling would not have left the economy unchanged. A status quo bias in politics can result in stasis, but it can also produce unintended and undesirable change.

The resistance to democratic compromise is anchored in what we call an uncompromising mindset, a cluster of attitudes and arguments that encourage standing on principle and mistrusting opponents. This mindset is conducive to campaigning but inimical to governing. Resistance to democratic compromise can be kept in check by a contrary cluster of attitudes and arguments—a compromising mindset—which favors adapting one’s principles and respecting one’s opponents. It is the mindset more appropriate for governing because it enables politicians more readily to recognize opportunities for desirable compromise. When enough politicians adopt it, enough of the time, the spirit of compromise prevails.

The influence of campaigning is not necessarily greater than other factors that interfere with compromise. Compromises are difficult for many reasons, including increased political polarization and the escalating influence of money in democratic politics. But the uncompromising mindset associated with campaigning deserves greater attention than it has received. First, it reinforces all the other factors. Even sharp ideological differences would present less of an obstacle to compromise in the absence of the continual pressures of campaigning that the uncompromising mindset supports. Second, for compromise to play its proper role in the process, politicians and citizens need to understand not only the partisan positions and political interests that influence compromise but also the attitudes and arguments that resist or support it. Third, unlike some of the other factors, such as ideological polarization, campaigning is an essential and desirable part of the democratic process. It becomes a problem only when it interferes with governing.

Our defense of compromise in democratic governance is consistent with—indeed requires—a vigorous and often contentious politics in which citizens press strongly held principles and mobilize in support of boldly proclaimed causes. Social movements, political demonstrations, and activist organizations are among the significant sites of this kind of politics. The citizens who participate in these activities play important roles in democratic pol-

**Systematic rejection of** compromise is a problem for any democracy because it biases the political process in favor of the status quo and stands in the way of desirable change.

**Two Compromises**


The Tax Reform Act was the most comprehensive tax-reform legislation in modern American history, achieved only after years of failed attempts. The historic effort began without much fanfare. In his State of the Union address in 1984, President Ronald Reagan called merely for a study of the problem, with a report to be submitted after the election. Congressional Democrats did not think he was serious about reform. Walter Mondale, his challenger in the election, showed no interest in making tax reform an issue.

The hard work on the bill began quietly, with experts meeting secretly in the Treasury Department. The proposals that came out of Treasury were turned into a bipartisan compromise, forged with the support of President Reagan, Democratic House Ways and Means Committee chairman Dan Rostenkowski, and later with the help of Republican chairman of the Senate Finance Committee Bob Packwood and Democratic Senator Bill Bradley.

All the supporters of the Tax Reform Act gained something they wanted, but they all also made concessions that flew in the face of their most principled reasons for supporting comprehensive tax reform in the first place. Democrats were glad to end loopholes for special interests and the wealthy, but they also had...
to agree to lower the top tax rate more than their strong commitment to progressive taxation would support (from 50 percent to 28 percent). Republicans won the lower marginal tax rates, but they also had to accept the elimination of some $30 billion annually in tax deductions, which would result in the wealthy contributing a higher percentage of income tax revenues than they had in the past.

Compromises—even the most successful ones, like the Tax Reform Act—never satisfy pure principles. After the act was passed, its supporters rallied to its defense, hailing it as landmark legislation. It was—if compared to previous or subsequent tax reform. But judged by the moral principles invoked even by its staunchest supporters—whether principles of progressive taxation or those of the free market—the Tax Reform Act fell far short.

Now fast-forward to the efforts to pass a healthcare reform bill in 2009–10. Healthcare was an important issue in the campaigns leading up to both the Democratic primary and to the general election in 2008. Most of the presidential candidates set forth proposals that were more detailed than is usual in a campaign. Barack Obama came late to this debate. But once in office, Obama made reform a priority. At first, he signaled that he was open to compromise on the details of his proposal and left the negotiations largely to congressional leaders—essentially the same strategy that President Reagan had followed with tax reform. But the political landscape had changed. Throughout the 1990s, Republicans had begun more often to unite in the manner of a parliamentary minority, a strategy that drastically reduced the possibilities for bipartisanship.

When Congress was unable to reach bipartisan agreement on healthcare reform by the August 2009 recess, the campaign in effect began again, with opponents taking advantage of the break to mobilize opinion against the pending proposals—often distorting them in the process. The upshot was to end whatever small hope there might have been for bipartisan compromise. Reformers then turned to the task of compromise within the Democratic Party, a challenge that turned out to be almost as formidable.

The first bill passed with only a five-vote majority in the House in November 2009. The Senate passed its own bill on the day before Christmas. As the leaders in the House and Senate were trying to hammer out a compromise between the two significantly different bills early in 2010, a special election in Massachusetts erased the Senate Democrats’ filibuster-proof majority and caused many moderate Democrats in both the Senate and the House to reconsider their support. The campaign mentality returned with a vengeance. The reform proposals had to be divided into separate bills, a rarely used legislative procedure (reconciliation) invoked to gain final passage, and the ultimate measures rendered less comprehensive than any of the original proposals.

Although the Affordable Care Act was not bipartisan, the process that produced it was just as much a compromise as was the Tax Reform Act. All those who voted for healthcare reform gave up something that they thought valuable, and they agreed to disagree about greater cost controls, the nature of the mandate for universal coverage, insurance coverage for abortion services, abortion funding, and the inclusion (or exclusion) of a public option (a government-run insurance agency that would compete with other companies). Although all who supported this compromise evidently believed the legislation would be better than the status quo, they also believed that the compromise bill could have been still better if only their opponents had been less obstinate.

Although nearly everyone agreed that tax reform was long overdue and healthcare in dire need of change, political leaders struggled to reach these agreements, and the agreements fell far short of what reformers had sought. For the healthcare reform bill to pass, it took an epic push by a president enjoying a majority in both houses and willing to
stake the success of his first year in office on passing the bill. And the majority supporting this compromise was—with the exception of one lone vote among 220—exclusively within one party. Both efforts addressed major problems that had proved resistant to reform for many years, but only the Tax Reform Act was widely considered to be a significant improvement over the status quo. Many critics of the Affordable Care Act thought it was worse than doing nothing, and many supporters thought that it was better only than doing nothing.

Not even a crisis can ease the way of compromise. Although the consequence of failing to reach a compromise to raise the debt ceiling in 2011 was high risk of governmental default and a further financial crisis, the process of reaching the compromise was also agonizingly difficult, and the agreement provided only a short-term fix. Achieving compromise on any of the many complex issues on the democratic agenda is always a challenge.

**Characteristics of Compromise**

A classic compromise is an agreement in which all sides sacrifice something in order to improve on the status quo from their perspective, and in which the sacrifices are at least partly determined by the other sides’ will. The sacrifice involves not merely getting less than you want, but also, thanks to your opponents, getting less than you think you deserve. The sacrifice typically involves trimming your principles. We call these defining characteristics of compromise *mutual sacrifice* and *willful opposition*.

Although many kinds of compromise share these characteristics, legislative compromises—agreements that produce laws—do not always function in the same way as compromises to avert a war or create a peace in international politics or compromises to conclude deals in commercial transactions. Unlike major international compromises, legislative bargains are not negotiated with an ultimate threat of force in the background (though sometimes legislators speak of nuclear options and act as if electoral death is the end of the world). Unlike common commercial deals, the bargains struck by legislators are not primarily financial. Legislative compromises usually implicate principles as well as material interests.

The character of legislative compromise is shaped by its distinctive democratic and institutional context. It takes place in an ongoing institution in which the members have responsibilities to constituents and their political parties, maintain continuing relationships with one another, and deal concurrently with a wide range of issues that have multiple parts and long-range effects. The dynamics of negotiation in these circumstances differ from the patterns found in the two-agent, one-time interactions that are more common in most discussions of compromise.

Conclusions about compromise—even more so than many other concepts in political theory and practice—depend heavily on context. To make progress in understanding legislative compromise, we need to focus on how it operates and the specific challenges it confronts in American democracy in our time. The U.S. Congress is a critical case in part because its performance in recent years has been so widely condemned as dysfunctional. If we can find greater scope for compromise in this hard case, we might reasonably hope to find it in other political institutions.

Within the arena of legislative compromises, we need to distinguish between what may be called classic compromises and consensual compromises. *Classic compromises* express an underlying and continuing conflict of values: the disagreements among the parties are embodied in the compromise itself. *Consensual compromises* are based on an underlying convergence of values or what is often called “common ground.” These compromises set aside the original disagreement and conclude in a consensus.

Consensus is a lofty goal, and politicians never tire of claiming that they are seeking it. President Lyndon Johnson declared: “The biggest danger to American stability is the politics of principle, which brings out the masses in irrational fights for unlimited goals. Thus it is for the sake of nothing less than stability that I consider myself a consensus man.” Some advocates of consensus see it as promoting the value of community. Still others believe that it is more likely to produce the best laws and policies. They all urge politicians to find consensus and to base legislation on common ground shared not only between ideologically opposed parties but also among most citizens who do not have highly developed, let alone extreme, political ideologies. All citizens want a better life for themselves and their children; all want security, decent healthcare, a good education, and the like. A consensual compromise would converge on this common ground.

Few doubt that consensus is desirable if it can be found, and most agree that it is usually preferable to a classic compromise, which leaves all parties dissatisfied. But the common ground is more barren, and the possibilities for basing legislation on it more limited, than the inspiring rhetoric in its favor might suggest. Yes, a consensus existed among legislators and citizens that the tax system should be made fairer and that health care should be made affordable for more people. But this general consensus on the need for reform did not translate into a common-ground agreement on the particular provisions of either a tax or a healthcare reform bill. To produce reform legislation, specific terms had to be negotiated, and as is usual at this level, the common ground became fractured terrain.

In the context of a polarized politics, an additional problem with counting on common-ground compromises is that trying to find the usually small points of agreement in the middle is likely to prove less effective than combining big ideas from the partisans. Describing how they managed to gather a majority on their politically diverse commission on fiscal responsibility, co-chairs Alan Simpson and Erskine Bowles emphasize the value of “shared sacrifice” that comes from “bold and big” compromises. “Commission members were willing to take on their sacred cows and fight special interests—but only if they..."
The 2012 election campaign—for Congress as well as the presidency—promises to be bitterly fought, even nasty. Leaders of both major parties, and their core constituents, believe that the stakes are exceptionally high; neither party has much trust in the goodwill or good intentions of the other; and, thanks in part to the Supreme Court, money will be flowing in torrents, some of it from undisclosed sources and much of it available for negative campaigning.

This also promises to be a close election—which is why a great deal of attention is being paid to an array of recently passed, and pending, state laws that could prevent hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of eligible voters from casting ballots. Several states, including Florida (once again, a battleground), have effectively closed down registration drives by organizations like the League of Women Voters, which have traditionally helped to register new voters; some states are short-
 Hungering early-voting periods or prohibiting voting on the Sunday before election day; several are insisting that registrants provide documentary proof of their citizenship. Most importantly—and most visibly—roughly two dozen states have significantly tightened their identification rules for voting since 2003, and the pace of change has accelerated rapidly in the last two years. Ten states have now passed laws demanding that voters possess a current government-issued photo ID, and several others have enacted measures slightly less strict. A few more may take similar steps before November—although legal challenges could keep some of the laws from taking effect.

The new ID laws have almost invariably been sponsored—and promoted—by Republicans, who claim that they are needed to prevent fraud. (In five states, Democratic governors vetoed ID laws passed by Republican legislatures.) Often working from a template provided by the conservative American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), Republican state legislators have insisted that the threat of election fraud is compelling and widespread; in December 2011, the Republican National Lawyers Association (RNLA) buttressed that claim by publishing a list of reported election crimes during the last 12 years. Republicans have also maintained that a photo ID requirement is not particularly burdensome in an era when such documents are routinely needed to board an airplane or enter an office building. Public opinion polls indicate that these arguments sound reasonable to the American people, a majority of whom support the concept of photo ID requirements. The Supreme Court has taken a similar view, although it left open the possibility of reconsidering that verdict if new evidence were to emerge.

Critics of these laws (myself included) have doubted both their necessity and their ability to keep elections honest. The only type of fraud that a strict photo ID rule would actually prevent is voter impersonation fraud (I go to the polls pretending to be you), and, in fact, voter impersonation fraud is exceedingly rare. In Indiana, where the Republican-dominated legislature passed one of the first new ID laws in 2005 (on a straight party-line vote), there had been no known instances of voter impersonation in the state’s history. In Texas, a strict ID law was enacted last year, although the 2008 and 2010 elections gave rise to only five formal complaints about voter impersonation (out of 13 million votes cast). “There are more UFO and Bigfoot sightings than documented cases of voter impersonation,” quipped one Texas Democrat. Close inspection of the RNLA’s inventory of election fraud, moreover, has found it to be flawed and misleading; most election experts believe that the greatest threat to election integrity comes from absentee ballots—a threat that would not be addressed by the current laws.

As importantly, the burdens placed on prospective voters by these ID requirements are not trivial. Men and women who already possess driver’s licenses or passports, of course, will be unaffected. (So too will those in Texas who have permits to carry concealed weapons—since those permits meet the ID requirement.) But citizens who lack such documents will now be obliged to assemble various other pieces of paper (birth certificates, naturalization forms, proof of residence, etc.) and make their way (presumably without a car) to a government office that can issue an official photo ID. Who are these men and women? Studies indicate that they are disproportionately young or elderly, poor, black, and Hispanic; demographically, they are more likely than not to vote Democratic. (In states covered by the Voting Rights Act, such as Texas and South Carolina, the photo ID laws are being challenged by the Department of Justice on the grounds that they disproportionately affect minorities.) The number of people potentially affected is...
considerable: the Texas secretary of state, for example, estimates that at least 600,000 already registered voters do not possess the documents to cast ballots in November. New York University’s respected Brennan Center for Justice has estimated that a total of more than five million people may lack the requisite identification documents in states that have passed new ID laws.

How many people will actually be prevented from casting ballots by these laws in November? What impact will these laws have on participation? The straightforward answer is that none of us (scholars, commentators, politicians) really know—because the laws are recent and measuring their impact is difficult. (We should know more after November, since several studies will be conducted during this election.) The number is unlikely to be huge, particularly since various pro-voting rights groups (as well as the Democratic party) will work hard to help people get their ID documents. But it could certainly be large enough to affect the outcome of close races for Congress and even for the presidency.

Whether they have a decisive impact on the election or not, the ID laws—as well as other measures designed to inhibit voting—are disturbing, particularly when located against the backdrop of our extended history of conflict over the right to vote and its exercise. Although the United States has long prided itself on being a paragon of democracy, we did not possess anything even approximating universal adult suffrage until the late 1960s—even though universal suffrage is commonly regarded as an essential ingredient of democracy. It took many decades of mobilization and struggle for voting rights in all states to be extended to African Americans, women, Native Americans, and those who lacked property; at different historical moments, some states (suffrage requirements were largely a matter of state law) also excluded “paupers,” the illiterate, the non-English speaking, and those whose jobs made them too transient to meet long residency requirements.

Moreover, our history has not been one of steady and inexorable progress toward a more inclusive polity. In the very long run, to be sure, we have become more democratic, but there have been numerous moments in our past when the pendulum swung in the opposite direction: men and women who were enfranchised found themselves losing that right. This happened to African Americans in several northern states before the Civil War and in all southern states in the late nineteenth century. It also happened to women in New Jersey in the early 1800s, to men who became “paupers” because of economic downturns, to citizens who could not pay poll taxes (or pass literacy tests), and to prison inmates in Massachusetts in 2000, just 12 years ago. Suffrage rights have contracted as well as expanded.

In addition to this mottled pattern of enfranchisement and disfranchisement, our nation has also witnessed periodic episodes of “voter suppression”—a label frequently invoked by critics to characterize the current wave of photo ID requirements. “Voter suppression” differs conceptually from outright disfranchisement because it does not involve formally disqualifying entire groups of people from the polls; instead, policies or acts of “suppression” seek to prevent, or deter, eligible citizens from exercising their right to vote. Historically, voter suppression seems to arise when organized political forces aim to restrain the political participation of particular groups but cannot, politically or constitutionally, disfranchise them outright. This occurred, of course, in the post-Reconstruction South when white Democratic “redeemers” utilized a variety of techniques (ranging from violence to complex ballot arrangements to poll taxes to orally administered “understanding” tests) to circumvent the Fifteenth Amendment and keep blacks from voting. (Eventually, the suppression of the black vote in the South shaded into, and became, disfranchisement through clever legal innovations such as the all-white Democratic primary.) The phrase “vote suppression” was first widely used in the United States in the 1880s.

Legal efforts to place obstacles in the path of legitimate voters also recurred in the North between the Civil War and World
the tension between election integrity and access to the ballot box. Requiring voters to present an ID need not be suppressive or dis-
 ironic. It may not be a coinci-
dence that the phrase “voter suppression”—like “vote suppression” in the 1880s—has become a prominent part of our political vocabulary during an era of large-scale immigration and in the wake of a dramatic ex-
tension of voting rights to African Americans.

This is not to say—the point is important—that there is anything intrinsically wrong with a system of elec-
tion administration that requires voters to present some type of ID card or photo ID at the polls. Many countries demand that voters present their na-
tional identification cards (or special voting cards) when they show up to cast their ballots. Preventing election fraud is a le-
gitimate state function, and, as Rhode Island’s independent gov-
ernor, Lincoln Chafee, recently observed while signing a new ID measure into law, asking for identification can be “a reasonable request to ensure the accuracy and integrity of our elections.” Requiring voters to present an ID need not be suppressive or dis-

The recent wave of ID laws (and their cousins) bears a close resemblance to past episodes of voter suppression, particularly those of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centu-
ries. The laws seem tai-
ored less to guarantee the integrity of elections than to achieve a parti-
san purpose; the targeted constituencies—those directly affected by the laws—tend, once again, to be the poor, the less advantaged, or members of minority groups. It may not be a coinci-
dence that the phrase “voter suppression”—like “vote suppression” in the 1880s—has become a prominent part of our political vocabulary during an era of large-scale immigration and in the wake of a dramatic ex-
tension of voting rights to African Americans.
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tion administration that requires voters to present some type of ID card or photo ID at the polls. Many countries demand that voters present their na-
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ernor, Lincoln Chafee, recently observed while signing a new ID measure into law, asking for identification can be “a reasonable request to ensure the accuracy and integrity of our elections.” Requiring voters to present an ID need not be suppressive or dis-

The devil is in the details—as is always true with laws that tap the tension between election integrity and access to the ballot box.

Like many critics of the recent legislation, I could welcome a photo ID requirement—if it were made clear that it was the responsi-
bility of the state (rather than of private citizens) to insure that every eligible man and woman possessed such documentation. Imagine, for example, a system in which any voter who arrived at the polls without an official ID could apply for one at the polling place (it could be mailed out in subsequent weeks) and then was permitted to cast a provisional ballot (which would be counted if she proved to be eligible). In time, ev-
everyone would become equipped with an appropriate ID, and meanwhile no one would be denied the opportunity to vote. (Rhode Island’s new law contains some of these elements.) Such a system would be costly, particularly at the outset, but the expense would be the price of keeping elections democratic while addressing the concerns of those worried about fraud. The state, in effect, would accept responsibility for solving the access problem that its anti-fraud measure had engendered.

Alas, that does not seem to be what the sponsors of the current measures have in mind. In 2008, for example, Indiana’s state government simply tossed the access prob-
lem into the laps of indi-
vidual citizens, leading to a widely publicized episode in which elderly nuns who had been voting for decades arrived at the polls but were not permit-
ted to vote because they lacked driver’s licenses. Other states have adopt-
ed the same posture: it is up to potential voters to figure out how to navigate around the new obstacle that the state has placed in their path. As a consequence, some of those voters—perhaps thousands, per-
haps hundreds of thousands—will end up being unable to cast ballots in a very important election. Whatever the numbers turn out to be, the laws themselves are unworthy of a mod-
ern, sophisticated nation that identifies itself as democratic. They are not effective policy instruments; they chip away at the core democratic value of inclusiveness; and they resonate with the worst, rather than the best, of our political traditions.

Owl, Pussycat
and superb artistry
AY 12, 2012, the bicentennial of the birth of the English artist, illustrator, and author Edward Lear, was celebrated in certain quarters as International Owl and the Pussycat Day. Lear began to create his nonsense verses, limericks, illustrated alphabets, and whimsical drawings early in life and didn’t imagine they would interest anyone beyond his family and friends. When he published the first of them, in 1846, he did so pseudonymously so as not to harm his reputation as a serious artist. He wrote and illustrated “The Owl and the Pussycat” in 1867 to cheer a sick child. Lear’s beloved poem may be read online today in more than 100 languages, although translating the nonsense word “runcible” into Hawaiian or Hebrew may have been a challenge.

The Natural History of Edward Lear, an exhibition at Harvard’s Houghton Library through August 18, celebrates a different aspect of Lear’s career to mark his bicentennial. The library holds the largest and most complete collection in the world of his original artwork and related material—more than 4,000 items—and this exhibition presents a selection of his sketches, studies, and finished paintings of parrots and other subjects of natural history. Robert McCracken Peck, senior fellow of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Drexel University, was guest curator for the exhibition and wrote a substantial essay, “The Natural History of Edward Lear,” for a double issue of the Harvard Library Bulletin (volume 22, numbers 2-3), which contains as well an essay by Hope Mayo, Hofer curator of printing and graphic arts, about the Lear collection, and a catalog of the exhibition.

“Although he is best remembered today as a whimsical nonsense poet, adventurous traveler, and painter of luminous landscapes,” Peck writes, “Edward Lear is revered in scientific circles as one of the greatest natural history painters of all time. During his relatively brief immersion in the world of science, he created a spectacular monograph on parrots and a body of other work that continues to inform, delight, and astonish us with its remarkable blend of scientific rigor and artistic finesse.” Lear (1812-1888) was the twentieth of 21 children born to Jeremiah Lear, a London stockbroker, and his wife, Ann. Most of the children did not survive infancy. The family lived in an elegant house just north of London, but in 1816 Jeremiah suffered a reversal in the stock market, they had to quit home, and most of the children were dispersed to separate households. Lear was raised by his oldest sister, Ann, from the age of four. At five or six he had his first epileptic seizure and a few years later his first acute depression, which he called “the Morbids.” He had most of his book learning from Ann, and she was a modestly talented artist who encouraged him in those tendencies. By his middle teenage years, he was making small change selling drawings to stagecoach passengers in inn yards and doing drawings of diseased flesh for hospitals and doctors.

He became an habitué of the new London Zoo. Soon, his subjects were
not dead people but parrots, who carried on at the zoo or in nearby private collections owned by patrons he met through the zoo. Now, writes Peck, he “was reveling in the company of beguiling birds.”

When in 1831 he published plate seven of his book *Illustrations of the Family of Psittacidae, or Parrots* (opposite), which appeared in parts, it was hailed as one of the finest bird pictures ever made. Houghton Library has several of Lear’s preliminary studies for this plate (see one of them at right).

Lear’s most generous patron was the thirteenth Earl of Derby. At his estate, Knowsley Hall, near Liverpool, he had a private menagerie and aviary more important than the London Zoo. Lear spent six or seven years there intermittently, portraying creatures. Peck writes that Lear “never enjoyed drawing mammals as much as birds, complaining...that mammals were ‘so much more trouble than birds & require so much more time,’[but]...he was equally skilled at both subjects.”

By 1836 Lear tired of drawing caged birds and mammals. He increasingly found the English weather detrimental to his always fragile health. His vision was becoming too weak for close detail work. He longed for new subjects, elsewhere. Lord Derby sent him to Rome to study landscape painting.

For the rest of his life he traveled constantly, perhaps restlessly, sometimes with friends; wrote playfully absurd nonsense; painted landscapes; and made only occasional visits to England. His biographer Vivien Noakes aptly subtitled her portrait of Lear *The Life of a Wanderer*. In 1888, a year after the death of his cat Foss, he died alone but for a servant at his villa in San Remo on the Italian Riviera. ~CHRISTOPHER REED


Left: Another study for that book, of a Salmon-crested Cockatoo (*Plyctolophus rosaceus*). Watercolor over graphite.


Visit www.harvardmag.com/extras to view additional photos from the Lear exhibit.
The class of 1910 dropout who designed the SS United States—the fastest, safest, most beautiful transatlantic liner ever built—had the diction of a Philadelphia aristocrat, the mind of an artist, and the mouth of a sailor (a trait picked up from years of working in shipyards).

William Francis Gibbs’s love affair with ships began when the eight-year-old and his father watched the ocean liner St. Louis roar down the ways at Philadelphia’s Cramp Shipyard. “[F]rom that day forward I dedicated my life to ships,” Gibbs recalled. But when he arrived in Cambridge in the fall of 1906, he had no apparent knack for engineering or leadership. Shy, sickly, and terrified of simple addition, he got into Harvard’s Lawrence Scientific School at 20, despite abysmal grades, most likely because of his family’s wealth. His self-made father, who earned millions manufacturing gas equipment with Peter Widener (grandfather of Harry, A.B. 1907), was not happy when his son chose to study engineering. “Most of the engineers he knew,” Gibbs said, “were pretty impractical people.”

The introverted Gibbs was not popular—his rambunctious peers often “filled him with alarm.” He was a prep-school-educated Protestant living in a “Gold Coast” dormitory, but no final club wanted him. Alone in his Claverly suite, he studied blueprints of the newest British naval vessels late into the night. Yet he carefully locked his desk when he left his room, fearing ridicule as “the eeriest of all the eccentrics in three centuries of Harvard life if it were known that he was busy improving British battleships.”

Meanwhile, he proved a bad engineering student, and withdrew from Harvard early in his sophomore year. After a round trip to Europe with his younger brother aboard Cunard’s new liners Lusitania and Mauretania, he returned to Cambridge the following fall, switched to economics in the College, and excelled. Yet he did not graduate: his father went bankrupt, and Gibbs left school. Eventually he enrolled at Columbia and worked his way through college and law school there. Yet he kept his passion for ship design. “I studied engineering at night out of books,” he recalled. “That’s the way to really learn things—by yourself.” In 1915, the unhappy

VITA

William Francis Gibbs

Brief life of America’s greatest naval architect: 1886-1967

by STEVEN UJIFUSA

(Far right) Wearing his trademark fedora, William Francis Gibbs stands in front of the SS United States at her Hudson River pier in 1955. (Above) For 15 years, he greeted the vessel every time she arrived in New York City.
lawyer finagled his way into an apprenticeship with the nation’s leading naval architect, Admiral David W. Taylor, who led the U.S. Navy’s expansion under Theodore Roosevelt, A.B. 1880.

Gibbs never looked back, steadily building up his own naval engineering firm and hiring talented subordinates. (“Take it away,” he was known to snarl when shown what he deemed inferior workmanship. “Bring me the best.”) He married the cultured Vera Cravath, whose father was one of the most powerful lawyers in New York. In the 1930s, encouraged by ship enthusiast Franklin Roosevelt, A.B. ’04, Gibbs designed the revolutionary Mahan-class destroyers, the first combat vessels to use high-pressure, high-temperature steam turbines. Their speed and maneuverability probably helped win the war in the Pacific. During World War II, Gibbs & Cox designed 70 percent of all navy ships, including the Normandy landing craft, and devised a means to mass-produce Liberty Ship cargo vessels faster than the enemy could sink them.

Gibbs came back to Harvard in 1946, accepting an honorary Phi Beta Kappa key for his war work. That same year, he started sketching plans for the American superliner he had dreamed of creating since his days in Cambridge. Completed in 1952, the SS United States was nearly three football fields long and 12 stories high from keel to funnel top. His “ideal ship” conveyed speed and power even at rest: a jet-black hull; knife-like prow; two finned, red, white, and blue funnels. She could carry 2,000 passengers in her sleek, modern, comfortable, and fireproof interiors. (Boasting a navy-grade hull, extra compartmentalization, and a lightweight aluminum superstructure, the United States was the anti-Titanic.) But in the event of war, she could quickly be transformed into a troopship for 14,000 soldiers—the reason why the Cold War military paid two-thirds of her $78-million cost. Her major design features and top speed (45 land miles per hour) were classified, but on her maiden voyage, in July 1952, she captured the commercial record between New York and Southampton, making the trip in three days, 10 hours, and 40 minutes at an average speed of 35.59 knots and slashing 10 hours off her rival Queen Mary’s best time.

For the next 15 years, Gibbs met the ship each time she arrived in New York. “You can’t set her on fire, you can’t sink her, and you can’t catch her,” he declared. (“Is it possible for a mature man, a member of the University, Century,...and New York Yacht Clubs, to fall in love with a ship?” asked The New Yorker.) She was the ship of choice for presidents, royalty, movie stars, and thousands of immigrants.

The day after Gibbs died in 1967, the United States whistled a melancholy salute as she passed his Lower Manhattan office. She sailed for another two years before being taken out of service, her speed and potential wartime use made irrelevant by jet aircraft. Since then, America’s greatest liner has been sold many times and stripped of her fittings, yet she miraculously endures, rusting at a pier in Philadelphia, where her latest owners, the SS United States Conservancy, hope to restore her as a waterfront attraction for all Americans to enjoy.

Steven B. Ujifusa ’01 is the author of the newly published A Man and His Ship: America’s Greatest Naval Architect and His Quest to Build the SS United States, a biography of William Francis Gibbs (Simon & Schuster). He also serves on the advisory council of the SS United States Conservancy.
Past, Present, Future

When commencement week dawned wetly, intervention seemed urgent. Memories remained painfully fresh of last October 14, when a near-monsoon gate-crashed the University’s 375th-anniversary bash. (Sodden revelry left Tercentenary Theatre looking like Woodstock, or the “cow yard” the newborn College fronted in 1636. Much of the slop had to be resodded.) As a damp Monday segued into a rainy Tuesday—moistened undergraduates trudged into the Phi Beta Kappa literary exercises and Baccalaureate service in limp, clinging gowns—forecast-
watching became obsessive. Too late to book an encore performance by last year’s guest speaker, who secured clement weather by invoking higher powers: before setting out for Cambridge, Liberian president Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, M.P.A. ’71, L.L.D. ’11, said she had consulted local witch doctors and told them to “send the African sun behind me.” Done. This year’s afternoon speaker, Fareed Zakaria, Ph.D. ’93—Mumbai-born but now a thoroughly Westernized foreign-affairs journalist and television host—seemed unlikely to have an open line to an equivalent shaman. But the advisory committee on honorary degrees had presciently selected atmospheric scientist Mario Molina, a Nobel laureate, to be among the honorands. His faculty escort was James G. Anderson, Weld professor of atmospheric chemistry, usually an anchor in the Commencement broadcast booth; and his substitute for the day was colleague Daniel P. Schrag, Hooper professor of geology and professor of environmental science and engineering, a climate-change researcher. With three weather-savvy guys on hand for the Morning Exercises, Harvard pulled it off again: the anniversary year that began soaked ended on a high note of New England spring perfection: brilliant blue, lush green, cottony cloud and sweet sun, a favoring breeze or two.

In a sense, Harvard tied up many loose ends during the year. ROTC (Navy and Army) returned to campus offices. Henry A. Kissinger ’50, Ph.D. ’54, L ’55 (absent seemingly longer than the military), returned to alma mater, at President Drew Faust’s invitation, for a Sanders Theatre forum and private dinner. In an explicit bit of symbolism, Faust asked her predecessors to join her in the morning’s procession into Tercentenary Theatre, and Derek C. Bok, Neil L. Rudenstine, and Lawrence H. Summers were then seated just in front of her.
on the dais alongside Memorial Church—a tableau of continuity as the University heads toward a capital campaign.

Faust, now concluding five years in office, employed this Janus-like theme most clearly in her afternoon speech, echoing ideas from her 2007 installation address, which outlined universities’ obligations to past, present, and future. History, she said, “shapes our institutional ideals as well as our individual ambitions. Having a history diminishes the grip of the myopic present, helping us to see beyond its bounds, to transcend the immediate in search of the enduring. It challenges us to place our aspirations and responsibilities within the broadest context of understanding.” On that basis, she looked forward, seeing a Harvard advancing from a firm anchor-age: “This means that in the sciences—and beyond—we support research that is driven by curiosity, by the sheer desire to understand—at the same time that we pursue discoveries that have immediate measurable impact. And it means that we support fields of study—of languages, literatures, cultures—that are intended to locate us within traditions of reflection about the larger purposes of human existence, enabling us to look beyond ourselves and our own experience, to ask where we are going—not just how we get there.” Faust referred to that future as well, mentioning a learning and teaching initiative; edX, an online-education venture with MIT (see page 46); and Harvard’s Innovation Lab. (A shortened version of her speech appears on page 63.)

Many of the week’s events had this back-and-forth quality. The menu at the honorands dinner, in Annenberg Hall on Wednesday night, featured historic items, concluding with “hasty pudding” from a 1747 recipe—but there were also video projections (a first), including a snappy 375th show. The Commencement exercises, and associated visual diversions, were projected onto five huge LED screens this year (up from three)—meaning that some attendees had a better televised view than a live one.

In keeping with a Faust-era tradition—Wynton Marsalis tooting his horn in 2009, Plácido Domingo serenading Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg last year—Nobel laureate Seamus Heaney, a former faculty member, returned to Harvard and read his stirring “Vil- lanelle for an Anniversary,” commissioned for the gala 350th. He was followed by the Commencement Choir, who performed a new musical version of the poem, composed by Richard Beaudoin, preceptor in music. The poem, with its refrain about “gates unbarred,” echoed an event that was not much mentioned in the formal rhetoric: the Occupy Harvard encampment, at John Harvard’s feet, from November into January—during which the Yard’s gates were barred, and security personnel controlled access.

Faust touched on some of the occupiers’ concerns during her address, though she did not mention the Occupy by name. She did refer to the “poem, with its refrain about ‘gates unbarred,’ echoing an event that was not much mentioned in the formal rhetoric: the Occupy Harvard encampment, at John Harvard’s feet, from November into January—during which the Yard’s gates were barred, and security personnel controlled access.
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concerns in her Baccalaureate address, on Tuesday. After the obligatory observation about the undergraduates’ extraordinariness, she reminded them of “another and parallel truth: which is that you—and I—are also supremely lucky. There are roughly 120 million 21-year-olds in the world. There are some 1,551 of you who will get degrees today. There is one of me who arrived here against similar odds. That is how we know the deck was stacked.” She cautioned them against allowing their opportunities to come “to seem like an entitlement, ours because we deserve it. We cease to recognize the role of serendipity, and we risk forgetting the sense of obligation that derivatives from understanding that things might have been otherwise.”

Other speakers were more explicit about graduates’ obligations in a challenging, contemporary world: Phi Beta Kappa orator Derek Bok warned against American’s neglect of their democracy; Donald Berwick painted a picture of new physicians’ enormous burden of care for their patients; and Radcliffe medallist Margaret H. Marshall presented an alarming view of the state of the judiciary (see pages 42 and 45 for excerpts from these and other speeches). The Harvard-Radcliffe fiftieth-reunion class of 1962—blessed with time and perspective—focused their symposiums on “compromised integrity” in business, government, and the professions, and how to respond. Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr. addressed the law students; Christine Lagarde, the International Monetary Fund’s managing director, spoke at the Kennedy School.

Faust’s talk of “inexplicable luck” (and its opposite) became sadly specific with the death of M.B.A. candidate Nathan Bihlmaier, who drowned just five days before graduation; he left his wife, pregnant with their first child. The Business School’s Class Day speaker, Facebook COO Sheryl Sandberg ’91, M.B.A. ‘95, adapted her remarks to observe the tragedy, and students wore black ribbons in his memory.

In the end, even little contingencies and coincidences knit the Harvard of May 24, 2012, together with its past and future. The tenth anniversary of 9/11, memorialized on campus last fall, found a resonance in the honorary degree conferred on John Adams ’69, A.M. ’72, winner of the 2003 Pulitzer Prize for his musical composition commemorating the victims of that attack. Seated near him on the stage was Neil Rudenstine, whom Adams had first encountered as a section leader in Humanities 2, an undergraduate course—the elemental, enduring student-teacher bond. And Fareed Zakaria, who came to the United States from India, was a reminder of Faust’s initial trip to the subcontinent last January, a sign of Harvard’s increasingly global aspirations in an interconnected world.

In the University’s progress from a rainy October anniversary party to a picture-perfect 361st Commencement, it seemed permissible to believe that however illustrious Harvard’s first 375 years had been, those to come would be brighter still.

Walter Kohn, Ph.D. ’48. Co-winner of the 1998 Nobel Prize in chemistry for fundamental contributions to understanding the structure of matter, now professor of physics emeritus and research professor at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Doctor of Science: Exploring the future of freedom, expanding the rise of the rest, an incisive intellectual of percipience and vision who shapes debate in the global public square.

Wendy Kopp. Founder and chief executive officer of Teach for America, famously conceived as the subject of her senior thesis at Princeton in 1989. Doctor of Laws: Moved by the plight of unprivileged children, relentless in quest of educational ascent, she has marshaled a legion of avid instructors, rousing a generation’s verve to serve.


The Honorable John R. Lewis. The son of sharecroppers, a leading figure in the civil-rights sit-ins, Freedom Rides, and the March on Washington; a victim of police violence at the Pettus Bridge, in Selma, Alabama; and member of Congress from Georgia since election in 1986. Doctor of Laws: His heart full of grace, his eyes on the prize, a heroic figure in a nation’s struggle, meeting fear with courage, animus with amity, violence with dignity and peace.

Fareed R. Zakaria, Ph.D. ’93. Author and journalist who covers and comments on contemporary international affairs, now host of CNN’s Fareed Zakaria GPS and editor at large of Time, and a trustee of Yale, his alma mater. Doctor of Laws: Exploring the future of freedom, expanding the rise of the rest, an incisive intellectual of percipience and vision who shapes debate in the global public square.
At the Mic
An oratorical omnium gatherum

The commencement afternoon speaker, journalist and author Fareed Zakaria, Ph.D. ’93, L.L.D. ’12, gave an upbeat assessment of world affairs. But Phi Beta Kappa orator Derek Bok and Radcliffe Medalist Margaret H. Marshall detailed serious concerns about American democracy. Medical and dental graduates heard a scaring call to service. And there were lighter moments, too. For reports on all the principal addresses (many with recordings and texts), visit harvardmagazine.com/commencement-2012.

“Profoundly” at Peace
Despite economic and other concerns (“The earth is getting hotter, we’re running out of water, and a billion people are trapped in terrible poverty”), Fareed Zakaria was an evangelist of optimism. Thus, “The average Chinese person, for example, is 10 times richer than he or she was 50 years ago, with 25 years more of life expectancy.” Worldwide life expectancy is rising to the extent that “We gain five hours of life expectancy every day,” he reported—“without even exercising!”

Physics, Poetry, Pedagogy
Pope professor of the Latin language and literature Richard J. Tarrant, conferring a Phi Beta Kappa teaching award on lecturer on physics David Morin, quoted a student on the teacher’s deftness in “enhancing physics with poetry,” illustrating lectures with pedagogical limericks, such as: “Your units are wrong,” cried the teacher. “Your church weighs six joules—what a feature! And the people inside are four hours wide, and eight gauss away from the preacher!”

“The Price of Democracy”
Harvard’s president sits on the Sanders Theatre stage for the Phi Beta Kappa literary exercises, but is not called upon to play any role in them. President emeritus Derek Bok, returning this year as orator, called his appointment “a sort of reward” for having attended 21 prior exercises “without ever being allowed to utter a single word”—and threatened to emulate nineteenth-century predecessors who sometimes spoke for hours on end. He then turned to the serious matter of Americans’ dissatisfaction with how their democracy functions. Rather than blaming politicians, he said, “I would respectfully suggest...that our anger is misdirected,” because: “In the United States, unlike virtually every other well-established democracy, poor people vote at only half the rate of their more prosperous fellow citizens. In a representative democracy, why should we expect politicians to pay much attention to those who do not vote? We grumble about gridlock and the failure of Congress to agree on ways to solve our problems—yet a clear majority of Americans prior to the election of 2010 said that they preferred politicians who stick to their positions without compromising.

Miseries That You Did Not Cause
Donald M. Berwick ’68, M.D.-M.P ’72—past president and CEO of the Institute for Healthcare Improvement, former administrator of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—has run huge and influential institutions. Now a lecturer in Harvard Medical School’s department of health care policy, he chose as the subject for the medical and dental schools’ Class Day speech his relationship with one patient, whom he called “Isaiah.”

“Meum est!”
Latin salutatorian Michael Kenneth Velchik ’12 seemed perfect for what is an old-fashioned ritual: lankey, Lincolnesque bow, how-tie equipped. He indulged in a 272-word final sentence (for the text and a translation, see http://harvardmag.com/latin-12.) As the degree candidates followed along with their in-program cheat sheets, and roared ever more lustily when he invoked their schools (“ali ut rem quaeant, ali ut rei publicae serviant, ali ut reis adsint, ali ut aedificia extollant, ali ut aegros medicent, ali ut fratres instituant, ali ignario...”) (“some of us to work in business, others to become involved in government, some to be lawyers, others doctors, some to raise up buildings, others praises to God, some to straighten out teeth, others petulant students...”), Velchik proved adept at improvisational Latin, too. “Tacete, tacete—meum est!” he told the M.B.A. candidates (“Be quiet, be quiet—this is my show!). And to others, “Satis est!” (“That’s enough!”)

“Isaiah appeared in 1984, from inner-city Boston, age 15, in pain; Berwick treated him for leukemia, with one patient, whom he called “Isaiah.”

Jamesian “moral equivalent of war” to “awaken us from our political lethargy,” concluding, “I have no wholly satisfactory answer to give you. But of one thing, I do feel certain. Education is the place where we must begin.”
Commencement Confetti

TECHNO-HUMAN INTERFACE
The Commencement exercises were broadcast this year on five huge LED screens (up from three) in Tercentenary Theatre and the Old Yard. Subtitles scroll across the bottom of each as speakers talk, but the captioning—keyed in by a stenographer in real time—still has an endearingly human character. Among the honorands, literary critic Gillian Beer was alleged to have written a “Seminole” rather than a “seminal” book; composer John Adams to have been influenced by John “Cull train”; and Wendy Kopp to have founded a “chachers corpse,” rather than the teachers’ corps Teach for America.

CONFERRING AND RECEIVING
Having bestowed eight honorary degrees, President Drew Faust was in line to get one—from the University of Oxford, on June 20. And as Harvard recognized one Yale College graduate (Fareed Zakaria), Yale conferred honorary degrees on Crimson faculty members Robert Darnoton, Pforzheimer University Professor, and William Julius Wilson, Geyser University Professor, this year’s Radcliffe Medalist, Margaret H. Marshall (who holds degrees from both schools, and was Harvard’s vice president and general counsel and a Yale trustee); and poet Richard Wilbur, A.M. ’47, JF ’50.

MARKETING MOMENTS
Families entering the Yard on Thursday morning found a final pre-graduation opportunity for insignia swag, at pop-up tent stores operated by the student-run Harvard Shop and the Harvard Coop. …At Harvard Business School’s class day, on Wednesday, Facebook COO Sheryl Sandberg ’91, M.B.A. ’95, speaking six days after her company’s multibillion-dollar public offering, urged the students to keep in touch via you-know-what website and to “click on an ad or two while you’re there.” …The official Harvard Gazette devoted its prime inside front cover to promoting Explore Harvard, the anniversary photo album created by Harvard Public Affairs and Communications. (The Gazette’s cover was a witty drawing by thirty-fifth reunioner and editorial cartoonist Kevin Kallaugher ’77—KAL—illustrating the John Harvard statue rising to walk the Yard: a wry nod to the refrain in Seamus Heaney’s “Villanelle for an Anniversary,” read by the poet during the Morning Exercises.) And the University also promoted itself with multiple showings of the peppy “Celebrate 375” slide show, at venues ranging from Wednesday night’s honorands dinner to the Commencement afternoon exercises in Tercentenary Theatre.

BY THE NUMBERS
The University conferred 6,787 degrees and 52 certificates at Commencement: 1,552 from the College, 881 from the Business School, 758 from the Law School, 680 from the Graduate School of Education, 652 from the Extension School, 596 from

COMMENCEMENT CHIEF. Harvard’s 361st graduation ceremony was the twentieth run by Commencement director Grace Scheibner, A.L.B. ’90, who deploys her studies in psychology, and hundreds of crimson folders arrayed in her Wadsworth House office, to organize everything from honorands’ travel to military-scale logistics for the exercises.
the Kennedy School...scaling on down to 85 from the School of Dental Medicine and 65 from the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.

**SPEAKERS, HUMBLED**

Phi Beta Kappa poet Kay Ryan—a two-term poet laureate of the United States—wove a “Graduation Garland” from a dozen of her short works, with a comment on each. She said she had chosen the first, “Counsel”—on the tendency to resist advice (it begins, “It is possible/that even the best counsel/cannot be processed/ by the body.”)—to “discourage me from thinking you would take any of this in.”

**THE NEW CASE METHOD**

At a Radcliffe Day panel on law and social change, Kathleen M. Sullivan, J.D. ‘81, past Stanford Law dean, attempted to elucidate the evolution in judicial thinking from 1986 (when Bowers v. Hardwick upheld laws banning “homosexual sodomy”) to 2003 (when Lawrence v. Texas ended state prohibitions on mutually consensual sexual relations between adults in their homes). What changed? She recalled a friend explaining that it was Will & Grace. Sullivan understood that to mean “the will of lawyers and the grace of judges.” No, her friend explained, she was hailed for its “fresh, original voice.”

**FAY PRIZES**

Radcliffe conferred the Captain Jonathan Fay Prize on two College seniors for their outstanding theses. Victoria Koski-Karell was honored for “Coping with Kolera: Encountering the Unknown in North Haiti,” cited for “originality of research” in anthropology, biology, and history. Justin Wymer’s poetry thesis, “Genius Locis,” was hailed for its “fresh, original voice.”

**THE BLUE CLASSES**

The Class of 2012 has revived the “class color” tradition (see “Curious Colors,” November–December 2009, page 72); theirs is blue. On Class Day, members of the class of 1955 displayed their class banner (also blue) to honor the graduating seniors and guest speaker Barney Frank, whose College class (1961) is blue, too.

**ORATORY, PART 1.** Having been selected to give the student “parts” at the Morning Exercises, the speakers are coached on how to get their words and gestures across in the large setting of Tercentenary Theatre. Shown preparing are Latin Salutatorian Michael Velchik ’12, Graduate English orator Jonathan Service, Ph.D. ’12, Pope professor of the Latin language and literature Richard J. Tarrant, Senior English orator Anthony Hernandez ’12, and University Marshal Jackie O’Neill, who emcees the day. For a history of the “parts,” visit http://harvardmag.com/speech-history.

**FAMILY REUNION**

Allan M. Brandt relinquished his post as dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in February to address a health issue requiring immediate treatment. Happily, although he remains under care, he and his wife, Shelly F. Greenfield (chief academic officer of McLean Hospital and professor of psychiatry), were able to attend the Mather House ceremony, after the Morning Exercises, where their son Daniel Brandt ’12 received his diploma. Quincy House resident Jacob Brandt ’14, Daniel’s brother, was also present.

**LAST CHANCE!**

In “Fifty Shades of Graduation,” published in The Crimson’s Commencement edition, Alexandra A. Petri ’10 (an Ivy Orator on her Class Day, now a Washington Post columnist) offered this advice, universally ignored later that morning: “You’re graduating. This is terrible news. Now you’ll never be Steve Jobs. You won’t even be Mark Zuckerberg. I know they want to hand you a diploma, but don’t let them! You still have time. Flee.” (Petri didn’t, either.)
a gun before age 10, and committing his first armed robbery by age 12; turning to crack two years later; cycling in and out of jobs, because of his own carelessness; seeing two brothers jailed and another murdered. As Berwick said, “He once told me that he thought his leukemia was a blessing, because at least while he was in the hospital, he couldn’t be on the streets.” But it was on the streets that he died, 20 years after his leukemia was cured, when “they found him on a...corner, breathing but brain-dead.”

But it was on the streets that he died, 20 years after his leukemia was cured, when “they found him on a...corner, breathing but brain-dead.”

As Berwick said, “He once told me that he thought his leukemia was a blessing, because at least while he was in the hospital, he couldn’t be on the streets.” But it was on the streets that he died, 20 years after his leukemia was cured, when “they found him on a...corner, breathing but brain-dead.”

In Newcastle, a small village in the foothills of the Drakensberg Mountains, that great mountain spine that runs north/south through one of God’s special gardens—South Africa.

I was born and spent my childhood in what Nobel Prize winner Nadine Gordimer has called the “rigidly racist and inhibited colonial society” of small-town, provincial South Africa. Apartheid was the law of the land, and while my childhood years were secure and comfortable, life was very different for the majority of South Africans, black South Africans, those who waited on and worked for us, whose ghettos (“townships”) lay beyond the confines of my comfortable home.

Education in the United States, at Yale Law School, opened her eyes, Marshall said, “to the ideal of equal justice under law. Here I saw the rule of law, the ‘rule of democratic law,’ in action. It opened school doors for black children. It dislodged a President for abuse of power. It gave women control over our bodies. What I learned at Yale gave voice, gave structure, to the ideals I had yearned for in South Africa: a just society, a society founded on the rule of law,” importantly including “fair and impartial courts.” Now, in the wake of partisan political attacks, recent Supreme Court rulings, and the flood of money into judicial campaigns, she asserted that the rule of democratic law, impartially administered, is in grave danger. She concluded by citing a retired Supreme Court justice (and prior Radcliffe Medalist):

Justice Sandra Day O’Connor voiced concern about “the efforts of those who would strong-arm the judiciary into adopting their preferred policies. It takes a lot of degeneration before a country falls into dictatorship,” she said, “but we should avoid these ends by avoiding these beginnings.” Justice O’Connor is not known for hyperbole.

I return to my beginnings. I grew up in a country where the government controlled the courts, where judges were powerless to declare a law passed by the apartheid parliament to be inhumane, oppressive, or discriminatory. Do we here in this great country really want the courts, where judges were powerless to declare a law passed by the apartheid parliament to be inhumane, oppressive, or discriminatory. Do we here in this great country really want a legal system where judges write for popularity and not for justice? The warning signs are there for all to see. The question is: have we the will to protect the structure of government that for so long has protected us?

“Where Judges Write for Popularity and Not for Justice”

Radcliffe Medalist Margaret H. Marshall, EdM. ’69, Ed ’77, L. ’78—a past Harvard vice president and general counsel, and retired Chief Justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court—wished to share “some concerns that I have about these United States.” To do so,

I turn first to my own beginnings,
Harvard, Extended

With edX, their new, nonprofit joint venture, Harvard and MIT will offer online courses to the general public while investigating technologies for improving distance learning and campus-based education. Presidents Drew Faust and Susan Hockfield unveiled the initiative on May 2, attracting broad news coverage reflecting heightened interest in online education and the scale of the Cambridge institutions’ ambitions. Harvard and MIT officials say edX makes it possible to address evolving education technologies more quickly, and with a broader research agenda, than either institution could alone. From Harvard’s perspective, using the MITx online course platform (which has 120,000 participants enrolled in its first course, 6.002x, “Circuits and Electronics”) markedly accelerates the University’s entry into large-scale distance learning.

Highlights of the edX venture include:

- A Cambridge-based nonprofit organization, owned and governed equally by Harvard and MIT; each is committing $30 million in institutional funds, grants, and philanthropic gifts to capitalize the venture.
- The MITx technology, initially designed to offer noncredit, online versions of MIT courses (incorporating video lessons, embedded quizzes, immediate feedback on student work, online laboratories, and student-paced learning); this platform will be “open-source” software, enabling other institutions to contribute to its development and to add features.
- Harvardx and MITx noncredit courses offered by each institution, beginning in the fall of 2012—with similar identification offered to other institutions that join the venture under the edX parent.
- “Certificates of mastery” for motivated students who wish to demonstrate their knowledge of course content.
- Hockfield called edX “a unique opportunity to improve education on our own campuses through online learning, while simultaneously creating a bold new educational path for millions of learners worldwide.” Faust focused on the “unprecedented opportunity to dramatically extend our collective reach by conducting groundbreaking research into effective education and by extending online access to higher quality education in a way that benefits our students, our peers, and people across the nation and the globe.”

But the collaboration also addresses pressures from peers. Coursera, a venture-capital-funded entity, hosts courses from Michigan, Penn, Princeton, Stanford, and Berkeley (now emphasizing computer science and technology, but looking to add the social sciences, business, and the humanities); and Udacity, spun out by Stanford scholars who taught an artificial-intelligence course last year—with 160,000 matriculants—is building a roster of computer-science courses.

In a briefing, Anant Agarwal, director of MIT’s computer science and artificial intelligence laboratory—who led development of the MITx system, and will serve as edX president—said Internet and mobile technologies had made possible online courses serving massive, diverse, distant student bodies—including applications such as “laboratories” where learners can build circuits as if assembling components like virtual Legos. Assessments (quizzes and grading) for straightforward, technical questions have become widespread, he said. The need to create more complex forms of assessment (open-ended questions requiring paragraph or essay answers) pointed to one of the basic rationales for edX: to foster research on learning, teaching, and evaluation, online and in the classroom.

At the same session, Michael D. Smith, the computer scientist who is dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), placed edX in the context of the Harvard Initiative on Learning and Teaching, announced last October; expanding interest among FAS professors in rethinking teaching and classrooms, in part by experimenting with technology; extensive online offerings in Harvard’s professional schools; and the sheer pace of change in such technologies. Research, Smith said, is a “big part of what we will be doing”—determining how education will occur in the future, online and on campus. Both institutions are driven by their interest in using new technology “to strengthen, enrich, and augment the residential, campus model,” said MIT provost L. Rafael Reif, who oversaw development...
of MITx. Reif, who was named Hockfield's successor as MIT's president on May 16, called the technology "a living platform," both delivering courses and driving extensive research on "how learners learn online."

Online courses and tools, said Harvard provost Alan Garber, who oversees the University's engagement with edX, offer "measurement capabilities that we've never had before." Educators can see how a student engages with a video, rewinds it, takes a test, and so on. With a large student population in the circuits course and online testing protocols, Reif said, MIT was already administering different versions of tests—making it possible to derive statistically significant data on, say, how well students mastered material and how accurately tests captured that learning.

Garber characterized as "a deep question" how such experiments might in turn inform and improve campus-based classes. Faculty groups at Harvard, he said, are working to determine how to measure learning and teaching effectiveness; the right criteria and tools will be determined by faculty members themselves. Similarly, Reif said, broader course offerings through edX would help faculty members determine what elements of online learning and technology work best in what disciplines, with what applications—if any—in residential education.
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courageous its online offerings. Harvard@ Home, begun in 2001, offered versions of lectures, occasional courses, and coverage of major University events, but was largely filled by cost pressures and the evolution toward cheaper, shorter videos. A test case of a full course, based on Bass professor of government Michael J. Sandel’s popular “Justice” (a large undergraduate Core and General Education class), proved popular worldwide when released in video form in 2007, but was expensive to produce and distribute. The Extension School, with more than 150 tuition-based online courses, spanning disciplines, is probably the University’s most extensive repository of distance-education teaching and learning. Certain professional-school courses are also available online.

During the height of the dot-com bubble at the turn of the century, several universities experimented with fee-based online courses, among them AllLearn (a partnership among Oxford, Yale, and Stanford, chartered in 2001, that closed for financial reasons in 2006)—and Fathom (also defunct, which involved Columbia, the London School of Economics, the universities of Chicago and Michigan, and several leading libraries and museums). Harvard joined neither.

Today, the foundation-funded Open Yale Courses provides 42 full introductory liberal-arts courses online for free, and that institution in May introduced nine faculty-taught summer-session courses online (each worth one Yale College course credit). A few days later, Washington University’s law school launched an online master’s degree in U.S. law aimed at overseas practitioners. MIT’s OpenCourseWare has logged 100 million users who have accessed materials from 2,000 courses in the past decade.

But the defining moment in the current online outreach was the Stanford-originated “Introduction to Artificial Intelligence.” It became a worldwide sensation last year—the model “massive open online course,” or MOOC, as these experiments are now known. Following that proof of concept, a for-profit enterprise, Udacity, Inc., aims to make such courses a regular enterprise; it offers six courses at present.

MITx, unveiled in December to experiment with courses designed specifically for online instruction, embedded that kind of approach in a major research in-}

**Faculty Finance Frustrations**

The last regular Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) meeting of the academic year, on May 1, docketed to focus on routine business (approving future courses, authorizing two new College engineering concentrations), instead veered in another direction entirely. The prior Friday, faculty members had received a message forwarded by Dean Michael D. Smith from the provost, Alan Garber, matter-of-factly advising of “The University’s recent decision to discontinue its relationship with the Financial Planning Group (FPG) at the end of the fiscal year,” because “[n]ew federal regulations...do not allow the University” to pay FPG directly for services provided to faculty, particularly any “investment advice.” In place of personal financial-planning sessions, the provost’s memo suggested, faculty members could use the 800 numbers of Fidelity, TIAA-CREF, and Vanguard (Harvard’s retirement- and thrift-plan investment managers), and those companies’ wealth-management units; or maintain their relationship with their FPG advisers (at their own expense). Similar notes went to the deans of other Harvard schools. With that, a financial-planning service available to all benefits-eligible Harvard faculty members was ended. Both the substance and manner of the announcement seemed to infuriate faculty members, who submitted multiple questions in advance and engaged in a contentious debate moderated by President Drew Faust (she presides at FAS meetings), who referred queries to Garber. Alexander Rehding, Peabody professor of music and chair of the department, presented a letter signed by 48 professors who noted the value of the planning services “in a great variety of situations” (including financial decisions after relocating from another university, purchasing a house, raising a family, and retirement). Some of those situations—figuring out how to live in a high-cost area like Boston, when to assume emeritus status—obviously bear on faculty recruitment and renewal. Others cut close to the bone personally: Rehding announced that he was on leave to care for infant twins—and needed to figure out how to cover more than $50,000 for Harvard-affiliated daycare. If the change was not a cost-cutting measure, he asked, why not adjust salaries to cover the fees faculty members would now have to pay to FPG advisers? He also inquired about the feasibility of a waiver, clarifying the faculty member-adviser relationship, that would resolve legal objections to continuing the FPG service.

Francè professor of German art and culture Jeffrey F. Hamburger, who signed the letter, expressed concern that ter-
dominating the advisory services without an adequate replacement would harm recruiting efforts. Professor of German Peter Burgard, another signer, began his statement by noting, playfully, “It is perhaps appropriate that today is May 1st, given that what we have here is something like a conflict between work force and management.” He sought clarification of the regulations Garber alluded to; questioned whether FPG actually provided the “investment advice” it was said to offer; challenged the withdrawal of a faculty benefit without consultation; recounted unsatisfactory, superficial prior interactions with the service representatives of the retirement-account vendors to whom faculty are now being directed; raised concern about the adverse effect on retirements of withdrawing advisory services; and asked for a delay in the termination of FPG so that faculty members could be consulted.

Garber answered the questions only in general terms—for example, without citing the regulations on which Harvard was relying, or addressing any alternatives to funding faculty use of FPG’s advisory services. President Faust tried to move the meeting along, but further questions were raised. Ultimately, during the new-business portion of the meeting, Burgard moved that the termination of FPG services be deferred six months and subjected to study by a committee including faculty members. Although his motion received strong majority support from those present and voting, it failed to reach the 80 percent threshold necessary for new business to be considered, so the motion was not taken up for discussion—and the faculty turned to its formal agenda.

On one hand, the faculty sentiments come as no surprise. FAS only recently introduced better planning for retirement, and incentives for some faculty members to set firm plans to retire. Salary growth was compressed in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis (and the faculty’s growth overall has essentially come to a halt). In 1994, during the administration of President Neil L. Rudenstine, when the University was running persistent deficits and imposed changes in benefits, the faculty’s reaction was swift and sharp, and relationships were strained in significant ways. Then, as now, faculty members like to be consulted— and consider a memo forwarded just before the last faculty meeting of the year far short of that standard.

On the other hand, the reaction may reflect other, underlying concerns. Garber directed the restructuring of the library system (a subject on which he reported briefly at the end of the May 1 meeting); many faculty members are dismayed by the late-January news of downsizing in library-staff ranks, and the early-retirement package offered to senior librarians on relatively short notice (see “The Libraries’ Rocky Transition,” May-June, page 50). About a month before the meeting, it became known that Faust would stand for election to the board of Staples, Inc., perhaps becoming the first sitting Harvard president to join a corporate board. (She would earn about $300,000 per year for her service; her 2010 Harvard salary totaled $714,000, plus $161,000 of other compensation, according to the University’s tax return.) And the faculty has not had any general report on either the University goals for the forthcoming capital campaign, nor FAS’s specific objectives, the sums involved, or when they might be realized.

The FPG dispute thus was doubly illuminating. It reminded all present of the eternal professor-administrator differences of perspective in a university. And it suggested how those tensions might be heightened and focused in the contemporary setting of unfamiliar financial constraint and concern (individual and institutional) and more emphatic administrative efforts to tighten procedures, control costs, and, generally, install managerial disciplines in ways unfamiliar in academia.

---

**Corporation Expansion**

Paul J. Finnegan ’75, M.B.A. ’82, has been elected a Fellow of the Harvard Corporation, the senior governing board, effective July 1, expanding its ranks to 11, en route to the 13 members planned for in reforms unveiled in December 2010; three new members were appointed in May 2011. (He will relinquish his current seat on the Board of Overseers, the junior governing board.)

Finnegan, a past president of the Harvard Alumni Association (2006-2007), served during the challenging transition from the presidency of Lawrence H. Summers through the interim return of Derek Bok to Massachusetts Hall and then the appointment of Drew Faust. He thus brings to the Corporation both deeper alumni ties and a closer connection to the Overseers, where he has chaired the committee on finance, administration, and management. He has also been a member of the Committee on University Resources, a group of leading Harvard donors (he is one of the planning committee co-chairs for the forthcoming Harvard capital campaign); reunion co-chair for his College class; and chair of the Harvard Business School Fund. His Harvard perspective is multigenerational: his father, J. Paul Finnegan (now deceased), graduated in the class of 1946. Paul and Mary Finnegan’s middle child, Paul M., graduated from the College last March.

Finnegan helped found and is co-CEO of Madison Dearborn Partners, a Chicago-based private-equity firm. He also chairs the Chicago advisory board of Teach for America, and serves on that organization’s national board of trustees.

For a full report, see http://harvardmag.com/finnegan-12.
Addressing Conflicts of Interest

As the academic year ended, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) adopted new standards and procedures for identifying and addressing professors’ possible financial conflicts of interest with their academic responsibilities as researchers or in the classroom.

The Corporation approved a new, university-wide policy in May 2010 (available at the provost’s website, www.provost.harvard.edu/research_policy_and_compliance). It established procedures for reporting and disclosure of possible conflicts, and set a framework for each school to follow in governing its faculty’s special circumstances. Particular attention focused on Harvard Medical School (HMS), given its most gifts from industry; and regulates faculty members’ participation in industry speakers’ bureaus and delimits industry involvement in continuing medical education (see “Conflicts of Interest, Revisited,” September-October 2010, page 46).

FAS presents different challenges, and changing ones, in identifying, avoiding, and mitigating conflicts. First, it encompasses disciplines ranging from bioengineering (where medical applications are clearly sought) and psychology (where human subjects and federal research funding often come into play), to classics, where such concerns are remote. Second, it increasingly involves faculty members whose work and appointments cross disciplines and even school boundaries (as in bioengineering or stem-cell science). Third, as Charles H. Ferguson's Academy Award-winning documentary film Inside Job (2010) seemed to suggest, the financial-services industry has become entwined with academic economists and government officials, offering large fees for opinions on regulation and other work drawing on research expertise that posed undisclosed potential conflicts of interest—a challenge that became a focus of wider discussion on such conflicts, given the financial crisis and recession.

The latter set off vigorous discussions about appropriate rules and disclosures within the academic economics profession. Olshan professor of economics John Y. Campbell (who chaired the department until June 30) agreed to be interviewed by Ferguson (others declined); the portion of their conversation that made it into the movie depicted Campbell as ambiguous on the subject of disclosing potential conflicts of interest. (His academic work and teaching focus on finance and investments; as his curriculum vitae and the “outside activities” tab on his webpage now disclose, he has applied that expertise on both a compensated basis, for example as founding partner since...)

PREACHER IN CHIEF. Jonathan L. Walton, who joined the Divinity School faculty in 2010 and is a resident scholar in Lowell House, has been appointed Pusey minister in the Memorial Church and Plummer professor of Christian morals, effective July 1. He succeeds the late Peter J. Gomes. A graduate of Morehouse College, Walton earned his master’s and Ph.D. degrees at Princeton Theological Seminary; he is an ordained Baptist minister. Walton, his wife, Cecily Cline, and their twins, Elijah Mays and Zora Neale, will move into Sparks House on campus. In the statement announcing his appointment, Walton said, “Sitting in the pews of Memorial Church, I have felt the special power of this place….I will do my utmost to continue the Church's tradition of intellectually challenging and spiritually nourishing preaching, its outreach to students of all faiths, and its impact well beyond Harvard Yard.” For a full report, see http://harvardmag.com/walton-12.

University People

Premier professors. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences has named five Harvard College Professors—a recognition, conferred annually and lasting five years, honoring distinguished undergraduate teaching and advising. The honorands, who receive extra research funding and a semester of paid leave or summer salary, are: Diana L. Eck, Wertham professor of law and psychiatry in society and mas-
1999 of Arrowstreet Capital, LP—an investment firm that manages some $53 billion for 94 institutional clients—and on a non-compensated basis, including service for seven years as a board member of Harvard Management Company, which invests the endowment and other funds.

Harvard’s economics department subsequently debated whether it could or should adopt standards on these issues, but deferred any action while they were being debated by the American Economic Association (AEA), the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER)—the leading professional organizations—and economists at peer institutions (and as FAS was refining its own policies, as part of the larger University exercise). There were sharp disagreements over the proper locus for setting and enforcing such policies: departmentally, within a school or institution, or at the level of the profession. (The AEA and NBER now require disclosure of authors’ potential financial conflicts of interest in journal articles and working papers, following the practice in the medical profession.)

The new FAS procedures encompass Harvard’s economists, and their faculty peers in other disciplines—a total of about 1,070 teaching professionals—in a way that is broader than past practices, but less revealing than the HMS policy. As explained in a March 27 FAS faculty meeting by professor of molecular and cellular biology Alexander Schier, chair of the faculty’s committee on research policy, and then put into effect in a May 9 memorandum from Dean Michael D. Smith, FAS faculty members by this June 30 must report annually all financial interests (income or equity) in excess of $5,000 (down from $10,000 previously) from outside entities that may be related to their Harvard responsibilities, including such interests accruing to a spouse and dependent children. (Any equity in a private, for-profit entity has to be reported.) This broadens reporting compared to past practice, when it was up to faculty members’ judgment whether a financial interest represented a potential conflict with their Harvard activities, and so had to be reported, comprehensive reporting is now the default.

Although the potential conflicts reported through a new online tool are more sweepingly defined, the disclosures go only to FAS’s “designated institutional official.” The DIO, in turn, evaluates whether there are in fact potential conflicts of interest and if so recommends appropriate mitigation measures. (Thus, unlike the HMS process, FAS’s does not intend wholesale disclosure of all pertinent faculty financial interests.) Should the DIO and faculty member disagree on whether there is a potential conflict, or on suitable mitigation, the policy sets out processes for appeal to the faculty research policy committee; to an expert panel it can convene, if necessary; and ultimately, to decanal resolution.

In a conversation, Patrick W. Fitzgerald, associate dean for research administration, and research integrity officer Gearoid P. Griffin, who is the DIO, explained that...
Yesterday’s News
From the pages of the Harvard Alumni Bulletin and Harvard Magazine

1932 The Harvard Hall bell is moved to the top of the just-completed spire of Memorial Church. “Nearly everyone who enters or leaves Sever these days walks with neck craned,” report the editors. “As yet no accidents have been reported, but unintentional embraces are sometimes narrowly averted.”

1942 The campus Radio Network conducts a survey of its summer-school undergraduate listeners. Besides learning that more than half the students listen to the station at least twice a week and prefer classical music, investigators also discover that “one-third of all undergraduates study without their trousers.”

1947 Bulldozers invade the Yard a day after Commencement and begin scooping out a hole, next to the soon-to-be-relocated Dana-Palmer House, for the foundations of the future Lamont Library. Estimated building cost: $1.5 million.

1957 In his Phi Beta Kappa oration, Nieman Fellow Louis M. Lyons calls the press “a very American institution. It has a large element of violence. The instinct of our press is against the government, unless the government happens to be Republican.”

1962 An “overzealous truckman” consigns 1,700 postal ballots from the Overseers’ and alumni directors’ elections to the city dump before they can be counted. After careful study of the 22,439 ballots remaining, the statistics department concludes that the chance of the highest defeated candidate overtaking the lowest winning candidate is less than one in a thousand, so the incomplete results are allowed to stand.

1977 More than 2,000 Cambridge “Golden Agers” enjoy the second annual Senior Picnic in Harvard Yard, jointly sponsored by the University and the city. President Derek Bok is the most popular dance partner.

1997 The mayor of Boston, Thomas M. Menino, is incensed by the University’s “total arrogance” when a Harvard official notifies the Boston Redevelopment Authority on June 10 that “Harvard has acquired options to purchase 14 Allston parcels, totaling 52 acres, and [is] in the process of taking ownership.”

FAS’s new policy does not change professors’ allowed activities. These are, as before, described in the so-called “Grey Book” (the compilation of principles and policies governing “research, instruction, and other professional activities,” which awaits updating to incorporate the new conflicts-of-interest language). For instance, a faculty member can be on a company’s advisory board, but cannot actively serve in management. With faculty members disclosing all their pertinent outside interests now, Fitzgerald and Griffin are in the middle of determining what kinds of potential conflicts may arise. Based on experiences at other schools, they said, 90 percent of covered faculty members will have no potential conflicts.

Griffin cited some quotidian, and perhaps surprising, examples of potential conflicts, compared to straightforward questions governing research grants or investments. What happens when a faculty member requires his own textbook for a course? Appropriate mitigation might include pointing that out to students clearly, early in the course; donating royalties to a charity; or having peers certify that it is the most appropriate book for the class. More subtly, what happens if a publisher discovers a faculty member’s lesson plan for another scholar’s text, and contracts with her to write a study guide to be published for the next edition? Or if a humanities teacher in a course with a long reading list assigns many titles from one publisher, boosting its sales and potentially affecting his future contracts or royalties?

As the reporting began, Griffin noted, faculty members seemed eager to check with peers, to identify issues, to solicit guidance, and to comply with the new policy. “There will be more disclosure” (to the DIO) under the new procedures, Fitzgerald said. “There will be a learning process for the faculty, who had lacked awareness of the old policy—and that’s a good thing.”
Niemans of Note
The seventy-fifth class of Nieman Fellows—24 journalists chosen to study at Harvard during the 2012-2013 academic year—will include two Nieman-Berkman Fellows in Journalism Innovation. The new partnership between the Nieman Foundation and the Berkman Center for Internet & Society aims to generate ideas to advance quality journalism in the digital era. The fellows are Laura Norton Amico, editor of Homicide Watch in Washington, D.C. (studying criminal justice journalism), and Borja Echevarría de la Gándara, deputy managing editor of El País, in Madrid (studying digital newsrooms).

Brazilian School(ing) Ties
During a campus visit in early April, Brazilian president Dilma Rousseff announced government funding to support the studies at Harvard of up to 40 doctoral students and a small number of undergraduates—all concentrating in science and engineering fields. The agreement also covers funding for 40 postdoctoral fellowships and for 75 Medical School and 25 School of Engineering and Applied Sciences one-year fellowships. "We are just now bringing to an end the efforts to eliminate extreme poverty in Brazil," Rousseff said, and thus preparing to devote more resources to education. Harvard has similar country-specific, student-support agreements with Australia, China, Cyprus, Egypt, India, Mexico, South Korea, Spain, and Taiwan.

Overseer Leaders
Richard A. Meserve, J.D. ’75, has been elected president of the Board of Overseers for the 2012-2013 academic year; Lucy Fisher ’71 will serve as vice chair of the board’s executive committee. They succeed Leila Fawaz, Ph.D. ’79, a professor at Tufts, and Robert N. Shapiro ’72, J.D. ’78, a partner at the Ropes & Gray law firm, respectively. Meserve is president of the Carnegie Institution for Science and former chairman of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (he earned a doctorate in applied physics at Stanford in 1976). Fisher, a film producer, has also worked extensively on funding stem-cell research.

Engineering Advances
At its May 1 meeting, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences approved two new undergraduate concentrations, electrical engineering and mechanical engineering—previously offered as study tracks within the engineering-sciences program. Both will require 20 half-courses, consistent with S.B. degrees—the model created 50 years ago for engineering sciences, and the requirement for accreditation and students’ subsequent professional licensure and practice. The programs are offered within the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, where enrollment has grown strongly since it was elevated from divisional status in 2007.

Information-Technology Investments
Following the designation last December of a Cornell-Technion partnership to develop an engineering and applied sciences campus on Roosevelt Island, New York City has doubled its bet on innovation: New York University (with Carnegie-Mellon, the Indian Institute of Technology-Bombay, and other partners) will create an applied-science research institute in Brooklyn. Steven Koonin, former provost of Caltech, is the director....Cornell has begun construction on the $60-million Bill & Melinda Gates Hall, the new home of its computer- and information-science faculties; the eponymous foundation made a $25-million naming gift for the facility. Bill Gates ’77, LL.D. ’07, and Microsoft colleague Steven Ballmer ’77 earlier underwrote Harvard’s Maxwell-Dworkin Laboratory (honoring their mothers’ maiden names), home to electrical engineering and computer sciences.

On Other Campuses
Brown inaugurated its Humanities Initiative, appointing Paul Guyer, a philosophy professor from the University of...
Pennsylvania, to the first of several new, interdepartmental chairs....Separately, Brown has agreed to help Providence, Rhode Island, close its budget gap by increasing its voluntary and tax payments to the city by $3.9 million annually for five years, and by $2 million for each of the next six years—a total of $31.5 million in added funds through 2022....Johns Hopkins calculates that, with his latest gift ($120 million for its children's hospital), New York City mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, M.B.A. '66, has increased his philanthropy to his alma mater to $800 million. At Harvard, he has supported renovation and expansion of the Business School's Baker Library/Bloomberg Center....Past Cornell president Jeffrey S. Lehman, most recently dean of a law school in Shenzhen, has been appointed vice chancellor (the academic leader) of NYU Shanghai, a new liberal-arts campus partnered with East China Normal University; it plans to enroll students in the fall of 2013.

Nota Bene

Presidental medalists. President Barack Obama, J.D. '91, in April conferred a baker's dozen Medals of Freedom (the nation's highest civilian award). The honorands included Madeleine Albright, I.L.D. '97, secretary of state in the Clinton administration; William Foege, M.P.H. '65, S.D. '97, a leader in the fight against smallpox and past director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Toni Morrison, Litt.D. '89, novelist, Nobel laureate, and Pulitzer Prize winner; and Shimon Peres, B. '51, president of Israel, past prime minister and foreign minister, and Nobel laureate.

Endowment managers' earnings. Harvard Management Company has reported the calendar-year 2010 compensation for its president and five most highly paid portfolio managers: president and CEO Jane Mendillo, $3.5 million; Andy Wiltshire, external platform, $5.5 million; Apoorva Koticha, fixed income, $4.4 million; Stephen Blyth, internal platform, $2.7 million; Graig Fantuzzi, fixed income, $2.1 million; Marc Barrozo, fixed income, $2.1 million. For complete details, see http://harvardmag.com/pay-12.

Elevated admissions yield. Harvard College reported an admissions yield (the percentage of those offered a place in the class of 2016 who accepted) of 81 percent—the highest level since 1971, and up from 76 percent last year. The elevated figure reflects the reinstatement of early-action admissions; those applicants, notified of their acceptance last December, are disproportionately inclined to enroll, since Harvard is their strong first choice.

Libraries' leave-takings. Of the 280 Harvard University Library employees offered early retirement this spring (those 55 and older, with 10 years of service), 65 have accepted. Before the retirements, the library system employed 930 people.

Arts and letters honors. The American Academy of Arts and Letters has conferred its Arts and Letters Award in Literature on poet Frederick Seidel ’57 and author Adam Hochschild ’63; its Award for Distinguished Service to the Arts on folk singer Pete Seeger ’40; and its Michael Braude Award for Light Verse on New Yorker staff member Roger Angell ’42.

Miscellany. Harvard Business School has opened a fully featured, 82-seat multimedia classroom—modeled on the teaching amphitheaters at its Allston campus—at the Taj Lands End, in Mumbai. It is a permanent center for the executive-education classes HBS initiated in that city and Hyderabad in 2008. A similar facility began operating in Shanghai in the spring of 2010....President Drew Faust has agreed to stand for election to the board of directors of Staples, Inc., the office-products retailer; she is apparently the first sitting Harvard president to serve on a corporate board....Brad Epps—professor of Romance languages and literatures and of studies of women, gender, and sexuality—is departing for the other Cambridge (where he will chair the department of Spanish and Portuguese) next year. He was instrumental in bringing lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered studies into the Harvard curriculum (see “Toward Gender and Sexuality Studies?” May-June 2002, page 57)....The U.S. Senate in May confirmed President Barack Obama's nomination of Safra professor of economics Jeremy C. Stein to the Federal Reserve's Board of Governors....Amy N. Finkelstein ’95, JF ’05—a government concentrator as an undergraduate, now a professor of economics at MIT—has been awarded the John Bates Clark Medal, the American Economic Association's preeminent recognition for younger scholars in the field, for her work in health economics and policy.

Radcliffe rejuvenated. Days before Commencement, the Radcliffe Institute moved its administrative offices back into the newly renovated Fay House (shown here, the first-floor hall and the Atkinson Room, on the third floor). With the renovation of its main buildings now complete, the institute planned to redo its campus landscaping this summer.
THE UNDERGRADUATE

“Effortless Perfection”

by Isabel W. Ruane ’14

This past winter, a class of ’73 graduate asked me whether students still spend hours lingering over meals. He recalled his Harvard as heady and carefree, a place for reading great books and whiling away days in conversation. He had been saddened by an article in this magazine that chronicled the over-programmed lives of Harvard undergraduates today; among other alarums, it had mourned the death of the two-hour lunch.

I looked up the piece (“Nonstop,” March-April 2010, page 34) and likewise found it upsetting. It painted Harvard undergraduates as so over-scheduled, they barely shower or sleep, let alone linger over lunch. But I knew it was not entirely accurate. At the very least, the article did not accurately reflect my Harvard experience. One of the greatest delights of my two years here has been dawdling in dining halls, listening, talking, and laughing with friends.

I now realize the article bothered me in the same way I’m bothered by people who talk too much. I see in their annoying behavior a shade of something I fear I also do. Likewise, reading about Harvard’s “superstars” who “do it all” reminded me of a role I’d once tried to fill, now consciously refused, feared falling back into, and also was terrified of abandoning.

I arrived at Harvard as a successful student who never slacked off. I liked to think my life well-balanced—I played sports, kept close friends, spent time with my family, and even slept. But as I outwardly checked off markers of a good, happy life, inside, I was all turmoil. That “carefree” lifestyle was a daily struggle, a purposeful act. I was terrified of “not doing everything right.” Schedule, schoolwork, social life, family, fitness, eating, clothes, even demeanor: everything had to be just so. Everyone believed I was happy-go-lucky (except maybe my parents, lone witnesses of biweekly meltdowns), and I was largely happy. But the harder I tried to be perfect, the more my perfectionism became torture.

Of course, in a sense it worked out. Affectation of effortless perfection got me into Harvard.

Harvard values “effortless perfection.” To be admitted, high-school students are supposed be smart and play sports, participate in clubs, lead groups, volunteer, and seem socially competent, too. All the evidence says one cannot be a high-school-cafeteria lingerer and be accepted by Harvard.

And, yet, somewhere I picked up the idea that lingering in the dining hall—and all that represents—was what I was supposed to do at Harvard. A nebulous idea floats around in the “liberal-arts education,” the “residential House,” and the “communal dining hall” that Harvard wants its undergraduates to explore, take risks, and learn from relationships with one another.

But there is a disconnect between the students Harvard admits and this life the College suggests we should lead. And there is a greater contradiction between the College’s implicit endorsement of exploration and its explicit honoring of “success.” Harvard honors its Phi Beta Kappas, its fellowship recipients, its grad-school admits, even its ranks of banking and consulting hires. And of course it should: these are wonderful achievements. But you cannot spend all your time exploring and lingering if you want to be thus recognized. You cannot slip.

And I guess I’m worried about those people who don’t let themselves slip. Because “slipping” a little was one of the best things that ever happened to me.

My struggle for the perfect balance of perfect happiness and perfect success worked in the controlled arena of getting into college. But I must have sensed the holes in this attitude by the fall of last year. I know because, once arrived in the Yard, I began making decisions that would have shocked my high-school self. I stayed out late and skipped assignments; I pursued new friendships rather than new subjects, took long walks instead of logging long library hours.

Eventually I decided to embrace this impulse to relax, reassess my priorities, and spend time getting to know people instead of burning the midnight oil.
My duty to the world isn’t to be perfect. It is to take care of myself.

fectionism. If I hadn’t done so, I could not have been a good friend to my friend at such a critical time. I would not have had the perspective to help. And I would not have been able to put school work on hold to do so.

Last winter, I had wondered how I could ever reconcile my guilt at having relaxed my work ethic with my certainty that doing so had allowed me to grow in other ways. I had worried about where my duty lay: to Harvard, for offering me an education and paying a great share of its cost; to my parents, for raising me, guiding me, and making sacrifices for me; or to myself, maybe more in need of reflection and friendship than a spotless transcript. Now I realize I was worrying about the wrong “duty.” My duty to the world isn’t to be perfect. It is to take care of myself as best I can so I can give back to the world the love and care it has given to me. If slacking off was what I needed to make myself happy and available to help others, then this decision reflected no disrespect for my parents, for Harvard, or for my own work ethic.

My friend is doing much better now.

And I’ve been thinking more about my other friends and classmates. I’m guessing that many of them, along with sharing my history of high-school perfectionism, have experienced similar crises of duty and unclear expectation. This uncertainty comes from our upbringings, from our personalities, and from the mixed messages about exploration and achievement that Harvard sends us. There are no easy answers. I just know that I found an answer for me. I suppose we all must find our answers ourselves.

Berta Greenwald Ledecky Undergraduate Fellow
Isabel W. Ruane ’14 is looking forward to spending another summer teaching and learning from Camp Onaway girls.

SPORTS

Kiwi Crewmen

The O’Connor brothers’ rowing careers span 9,000 miles.

T he lineup of the Harvard men’s heavyweight varsity eight this year represents much of the English-speaking world: a coxswain and two oarsmen (including captain Michael DiSanto ’12) from the United States; two English oarsmen (including stroke Patrick Lapage ’12), one Australian, one Scottish, and two brothers from New Zealand, Sam O’Connor ’12 and James O’Connor ’13. Why come halfway around the world to row for Harvard? “There’s a unique and pretty awesome system [in the United States] of college sports,” says James. “Back home, at some point you have to ask yourself, ‘Do I want to row really seriously, or do I want to go to university and study?’ Here, you don’t have to make that choice.”

For the brothers O’Connor, the 9,000-mile voyage seems to have been worthwhile. Sam received his S.B. in engineering sciences in May; James, a psychology concentrator with a secondary field in economics, expects his degree next spring. Sam rowed on the 2010 crew that went 7-1, were Eastern Sprints champions, came fourth at the Intercollegiate Rowing Association (IRA) regatta that decides the national champion, and won the Ladies’ Plate at England’s Henley Royal Regatta. He missed the 2011 season due to injury (he was hit by a car while home for Christ-
Lightweight Rowing

The men’s varsity eight won the national championship at the Intercollegiate Rowing Association (IRA) regatta in Camden, edging Dartmouth by just under a second and setting a course record of 5:33:059. The lights’ first national title since 2003 capped an undefeated season that also saw the Crimson win the Eastern Sprints regatta in Worcester, placing them atop Eastern collegiate rowing and the Ivy League for the second straight year.

The women’s varsity lights took bronze, behind Stanford and Bucknell, at the IRA regatta.

Softball

Harvard (35-15, 17-3 Ivy) repeated as Ivy champions, sweeping Penn, 1-0 and 5-2, in the Ivy Championship series. Star pitcher Rachel Brown ’12 spun a three-hit shutout in the first game. Fireballing Laura Ricciardone ’14 won the second, with Brown nailing down the save.

At the NCAA tournament in Seattle, Brown took a 2-0 loss to Washington in the regional opener, but bounced back to strike out 12 as the Crimson posted its first NCAA tournament win in 14 years, a 3-2 victory over Maryland in eight innings. She then shut out Texas Tech, 2-0, before Washington again defeated Brown and the Crimson, 4-0, in the final.

Sports Wrap
“They saw what the older O’Connor could do, and thought they’d take the little one as well.”

mother, Jill, a Pilates maven, coordinates programs at a YMCA; father Peter teaches physics and coaches rowing, soccer, and rugby at Christ’s College, a private school. Older sisters Kristi (who rowed on a national-championship eight in high school), and Becky (an accomplished triathlete) also play sports. Both boys rowed for successful crews during their high-school years and made the New Zealand national junior team. “They saw what the older O’Connor could do,” James explains, “and thought they’d take the little one as well.”

Both were on the New Zealand eight that won the World Junior Championships at Amsterdam in 2006. Some American coaches were there, though the New Zealand mentors discouraged their athletes from speaking to them—hoping, sensibly enough, to keep their best oarsmen at home. Nonetheless, a rowing coach at Cambridge University, a friend of the O’Connors’ father, put them in touch with then-Harvard freshman coach (now associate head coach) Bill Manning, and both brothers had successful careers rowing in Manning’s freshman boats.

For the most part, the brothers have spent their college summers stateside, going home at Christmas, when it is summer in New Zealand, rather than in the winter months of July and August. After graduation, Sam plans to work in Christchurch over the summer, then study for a master’s degree at Oxford—and, with luck, row in the Oxford-Cambridge Boat Race. James will teach English in Tanzania this summer. Already well traveled, the two young men don’t yet know where they will settle, although their homeland is a definite possibility. Both also have a liking for Australia, a nation that shares, they say, a sporting—if not sibling—rivalry with New Zealand.

—CRAIG LAMBERT

The Whistle

An entrepreneur’s multimedia ESPN for kids, “the next generation of sports fans”

JOHN WEST, M.B.A. ’95, golfs with his two young sons, Jack and Danny. “They love it, but they wouldn’t sit and watch a four-hour game on TV,” he reports. “Yet if you give them clips with the game’s highlights and interviews with players, then they will.” The same goes for football, West notes. “It’s a complicated game that many kids cannot sit through. But if you condense the content and make it fast-paced, with graphics and stats on the side of the screen, and interviews with players, and audio—more going on for kids, who are now wired to multitask—then they will be engaged.”

At least that’s what West and other co-founders of The Whistle are betting on. The new company promotes spectator sports to children from six to 14 through content that is reconstituted to make it more digestible, and then distributed through the media platforms that young people frequent far more than adults do, including YouTube, major gaming consoles, and apps. The Whistle’s own highly interactive website is being created by kids with input from adults; it is up in a beta version that will be fully available in September. The company is also preparing a half-hour cable show, scheduled to start in September, for the NBC Sports Network.

“Kids are not watching television in the traditional way,” notes West, an entrepreneur who has founded and sold two other companies, and was largely influenced by Grown Up Digital, by Don Tapscott (now on The Whistle’s advisory board). “To them, the media are like air: they want it when and how and where they are.” Kids between eight and 18 are spending more than seven hours a day on screens, often using more than one media platform at a time. Moreover, he says, the attention span of the average 10-year-old is only about seven minutes.

Those factors, he points out, prime those 42 million American children between six and 14—70 percent of whom are engaged in organized sports—for exactly what The Whistle has to offer: a mix of sports instruction, behind-the-scenes vignettes and kid interviews with pro and Olympic athletes, a bloopers segment, games and cartoons about sports, content, sports history, news, statistics, and user-created programming. Kids can send in their own sports videos, for example, as well as track and promote their real-world and online sports achievements through the website. “We are making authentic sports content widely accessible, customizable, and shareable, all of which kids want,” West says. “Ultimately, what we’re creating is a community for the next generation of sports fans”—one without the R-rated movie trailers and ads selling alcohol and prescription drugs typically seen with adult sports programs.

It’s potentially a lucrative proposition. Sports Illustrated has a popular magazine for the younger set, along with a website, but no other digital or cable programming. Nickelodeon’s Games and Sports for Kids cable network channel came and went. “ESPN is dipping into the high-school-sports scene with programming and they do televise the Little League World Series,” West adds. But nobody has captured this market before. What makes West think The Whistle will succeed now? “I’m an entrepreneur and can take
risks that big business can’t,” he answers.

More responsible, perhaps, is timing. The unprecedented ease and low cost of using media technology, creating content, and financing its distribution have changed things dramatically during the last few years. “Linear media are already out, and Xbox and YouTube are now ‘required’ by kids,” West says. “Our company boils down to two aspects: content and distribution. And within the last 18 months, technology has disrupted both. All of a sudden we have the ability to engage kids on multiple levels in a way we never could before. And allow them to actively participate in our media—that is the big difference between us and adult sports media.”

It costs less to produce and distribute such content now—and the costs are spread across more outlets, which decreases the investment risks. According to West, “Three years ago a linear cable network could not be launched for less than $100 million and took about five years to get to profitability.” The Whistle is being launched initially on six platforms for $20 million and expects to break even 18 months from now. Some $8 million has already been raised and the balance, West says, should be in place by the end of the year. Investors so far include Derek Jeter, Mia Hamm, Peyton Manning, Bob DuPuy (former president and COO of Major League Baseball), and Bob Pittman (founder of MTV and CEO of Clear Channel Communications). To create his team and advisory board, West spent six months living in airports, traveling to do research, and then another six months pulling together his core team. They came on board in 2009. His co-founders are Jeff Urban, a former senior vice president of sports marketing at Gatorade, and Kit Laybourne, former executive producer of Nickelodeon and Oxygen Media. (Laybourne’s wife, Gerry Laybourne, founder and former CEO of Oxygen Media and a former president of Disney-ABC Cable and Nickelodeon, is on the advisory board.)

Thriftily, The Whistle relies on kid-generated content for one-third of its content. “What used to require a large, $10,000 film camera, kids can now do with smart phones the size of their palms,” West notes. Given that information is available around the clock, “What kids really want is content that is authentic to them, that they can personalize—they want to find what is theirs out there and then they want to share it with friends. That is our content.” During Super Bowl season, for example, The Whistle asked kids to make a video about what happens at home during the game. “We got a lot of great stuff—moms and dads yelling at each other over plays,” West says, laughing. The Whistle also promotes do-it-yourself instant replays, in which kids re-create a great moment in sports history—the Immaculate Reception, for example, (the controversial 1972 catch that tipped the balance of an AFC divisional playoff game between the Pittsburgh Steelers and the Oakland Raiders, leading the Steelers to win for the first time in four decades). “This gets them out of the house and into the backyard,” West says. “They can add cool graphics and audio. And if the video is good enough, we’ll put it on the website.”

The “emerging distribution” includes high-speed broadband and television sets that function like another screen for computers to plug into. They come preloaded with Netflix, Hulu, and YouTube. West says, “so you can watch NBC prime-time shows, or your seven-year-old son, on the television. And depending on the platform, kids can interact with the monitor a lot more than they ever have been able to be-

Photograph by Rob Greer
Macs advertised on The Whistle.”

Products for kids. You will not see any Big that we are only promoting healthy prod-

ucts with snapshots of themselves

So far, The Whistle has content, distri-

bution, and promotion agreements with the National Football League, U.S. Olymp-

ic Committee, Google, YouTube, and Microsoft Xbox; it is in talks with other major sports leagues and expects to have similar partnerships with all of them, along with Sony PlayStation and other gaming consoles. No live, professional-game rights are included; The Whistle’s creative team is producing segments from thousands of hours of library sports mate-

rial held by the pro leagues.

Marketers will surely want to reach this audience as well. West says kids’ advertis-

ers fall into two groups: food/beverage, and everything else—including sports, toys, and movies. The Whistle is in the process of signing agreements with major sports brands, such as Nike and Gatorade, but nothing is definitive. He emphasizes that he and his colleagues “have decided that we are only promoting healthy products for kids. You will not see any Big Macs advertised on The Whistle.”

“Kids are already spending seven hours a day on screens.” One way to address that is “to put good content on the screen.”

On a personal note, West, a competitive collegiate rower at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, is bothered by the high obesity rate among kids and by how screen-orient-
ed they are: the correlation between the two does not elude him. Wouldn’t The Whistle only add to those problems? “We’re asked about that a lot,” he says. “Our perspective is that kids are already spending seven hours a day on screens, and there are two ways to address that. One is to limit screen time, which I think is a losing battle. Two is to put good content on the screen, which means our getting them outside to play sports and to move while they are watching.”

West was a U.S. Army brat, attending 13 schools in 13 years. He played Pop Warner football (he wasn’t very good, but he had fun), a couple of seasons of Little League baseball, and then soccer and tennis in high school. Employees at The Whistle, he notes, have business cards with snapshots of themselves as kids in their sports gear, “to help us remember the fun in sports, what we all loved about sports as kids.” He explains, “For me, growing up, sports taught three things: sportsmanship (don’t give up, be a good winner and loser, learn confidence and humility); math and science (I loved running the stats); and nutrition and health. But when I saw my kids and others watch-

ing sports on their screens eight hours a day, they weren’t getting any of those.”

At WPI he found his athletic niche: crew. “That was instrumental for me. I loved the competition and I learned a lot about teamwork and camaraderie: you rely completely on your teammates and they rely on you. If you are not pulling your weight or trying your hardest, you’re not going to win,” West says. “I was a late bloomer, and through rowing I learned what I was capable of.”

In 1988, West graduated with a degree in Astronomy from Harvard University, where he was a member of the ’88 Olympic rowing team. His fondest memory of his years at Harvard is as a varsity rower at WPI, he says, “That was instrumental for me. I loved the competition and I learned a lot about teamwork and camaraderie: you rely completely on your teammates and they rely on you. If you are not pulling your weight or trying your hardest, you’re not going to win.”

He spent two years in the Peace Corps in the Democratic Republic of Congo before returning to Harvard for a PhD in Astronomy. He is currently an associate professor at Harvard University and the lead scientist at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics.

Oldest Graduates

The oldest graduates of Harvard and Radcliffe present on Commencement Day were 90-year-old Frances Downing Vaughan ’44 of Cambridge, and 103-year-old Donald F. Brown ’30 of Stow, Massachusetts. The oldest class representative to attend was 103-year-old George Barner ’29 of Kennebunk, Maine. All were recognized at the after-
noon ceremony. Vaughan, a poet who was named First Poet Laureate at the Harvard Institute for Learning in Retirement, where she has taken classes and taught, said that she loved Cambridge and that the day had been won-
derful. “I do miss people I’ve seen here before who are not here now,” she said in an interview. “There is something about the continuity with the past that keeps us going.”

According to University records, the oldest alumni also include: Edith M. Van Saun ’29, 105, of Sykesville, Maryland; Ruth Leavitt Fergerson ’28, 104, of Rockville, Maryland; Rawson L. Wood ’30, 103, of Center Harbor, New Hampshire; Elliott C. Carter ’30, 103, of New York City; Bertha O. Fineberg ’31, 103, of Gloucester, Massachusetts; Sara White Goldberg ’29, 103, of Haverford, Pennsylvania; Frances Pass Adelson ’30, 103, of Brookline, Massachusetts; Evelyn Sigel Baer ’30, 102, of Montpe-
lver, Vermont; Mary Anglemeyer ’31, 102, of Medford, New Jersey; and Erhart R. Muller ’32, 102, of Harvard, Massachusetts.
in engineering and began paying off his college debt by working for an environmental engineering firm run by his crew coach. His rowing career peaked the following summer when he competed in the U.S. national championships. “I lost 30 pounds in three months” to row with the East Coast national lightweight training team, getting up at 4 a.m. to drive down to New London, Connecticut, where they were training, then up to Worcester for work, back down for the evening session, then to Cambridge, where he lived at the time. “It’s unbelievably fun, if you’re young—it’s a brutal, painful sport.” He hasn’t picked up an oar since. The noncompetitive, Zen-like meditative aspects that other rowers enjoy never appealed. “At the risk of offending the thousands of rowers on the Charles this morning,” he says, “I never got there. It’s more about pushing yourself.”

By that time, he had also seen ways to expand his boss’s business, “but he didn’t agree with me, so I went off and started my own company.” He ran that first start-up, Enstrat, an environmental-services company, throughout his years at Harvard Business School, selling it to a junior company, Silver Oak Solutions, in 1999. There, he carved out a niche helping governments save money in procurement, ultimately building a $23-million, 100-person business that he sold in 2005.

At Harvard, he had become close friends with classmates Mark W. Adams (now president of Micron Technology) and Dean Dorman (president and CEO at Silver Oak with West, and now an operations executive for TPG). It was in 2008, while vacationing with them and their wives (West is married to Danielle West, A.L.B. ’01) in the British Virgin Islands that the idea for The Whistle arose. “We were all talking about watching sports with our kids and having to turn down the volume or change channels when ads for Viagra came on, and Mark Adams said, ‘Someone should create an ESPN for kids,’” recalls West. “I was the only one not working at the time, so I was elected to get on it.” (He was recovering from burnout after the Silver Oak transition.) Adams and West put up the initial several hundred thousand dollars of seed capital, and both Adams and Dorman, also an investor, are advisory board members.

West has “zero interest” in working for a big company, or even in running daily operations. His passion is innovating; building on an idea through research and putting together a team of talented people who are excited about working together to launch the concept. It’s like being in an eight-man shell on the water, exerting himself to the fullest, until the finish line is crossed. He has spent seven years at each of his previous companies; he is three-and-a-half years into The Whistle. He loves that Gerry Laybourne has told him, “You’re ignorant enough about the challenges of starting a media company to actually do it.” Says West, laughing, “I think it’s the highest compliment I could have gotten.” —NELL PORTER BROWN

Voting Results

The names of the new members of the Board of Overseers and new elected directors of the Harvard Alumni Association (HAA) were announced during the HAA’s annual meeting on the afternoon of Commencement day.

As Overseers, serving six-year terms, voters chose:

Scott A. Abell ’72, Boston, Massachusetts. Retired chair and CEO, Abell & Associates, Inc.
James E. Johnson ’83, J.D. ’86, Montclair, New Jersey. Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP.

Michael M. Lynton ’82, M.B.A. ’87, Los Angeles. Chairman and CEO, Sony Pictures Entertainment.

Tracy P. Palandjian ’93, M.B.A. ’97, Belmont, Massachusetts. CEO and co-founder, Social Finance, Inc.


Kathryn A. Taylor ’80, San Francisco. Co-chair, One Pacific Coast Bank Board of Directors.

Note: The sixth-place finisher, Michael M. Lynton, will complete the two years remaining in the unexpired term of Paul J. Finnegan ’75, M.B.A. ’82, who stepped down from the Board of Overseers after being elected to the Harvard Corporation in May (see page 49).

Candidates selected as elected directors of the HAA, serving three-year terms, were:

John F. Bowman ’80, M.B.A. ’85, Santa Monica, California. Executive producer, Disney Company.

Yvonne E. Campos, J.D. ’88, San Diego, California. Superior Court Judge, State of California.


Brian Melendez ’86, J.D. ’90, M.T.S. ’91, Minneapolis. Partner, Faegre Baker Daniels LLP.

Cambridge Scholars

Four members of the class of 2012 have won Harvard Cambridge Scholarships to study at the University of Cambridge during the 2011-2012 academic year. Eva Gillis-Buck, of Leverett House and Pittsburgh, a joint concentrator in human developmental and regenerative biology and studies of women, gender, and sexuality, will be the Charles Henry Fiske III Scholar at Trinity College; social studies concentrator Abigail Modaff of Eliot House and Minneapolis will be the Lionel de Jersey Harvard Scholar at Emmanuel College; history and literature concentrator Mikael Schinazi, of Quincy House and Saint-Mandé, France, will be the John Eliot Scholar at Jesus College; and economics concentrator Chenzi Xu, of Lowell House and Watkinville, Georgia, will be the Governor William Shirley Scholar at Pembroke College.

Alumni Gifts

The thirty-fifth-reunion class of 1977 broke the all-time reunion-gift record by raising “an extraordinary $68.7 million” in contributions as of May 23, reported University Treasurer James F. Rothenberg ’68, M.B.A. ’70, during the HAA’s annual meeting. “That number even makes the president of Harvard smile a little bit,” he joked at the podium. “And, by the way, there are still five weeks remaining in their campaign.”

Other reunion classes also did well. The class of 1962, celebrating its fiftieth reunion, is poised to reach its class gifts and participation goals, and the class of 1987, celebrating its twenty-fifth reunion, “is on track to exceed three goals: total gift, immediate use, and participation,” Rothenberg said. The University declined to release exact figures for these classes, and for the senior class gift.

All alumni fundraisers were publicly thanked for their hard work, with a special nod to Paul Weissman ’52, who has chaired his class’s reunion-gift committee for 60 consecutive years—another Harvard all-time record.

GSAS Centennial Medalists

The graduate school of Arts and Sciences Centennial Medal, first awarded in 1989 on the occasion of the school’s hundredth anniversary, honors alumni who have made notable contributions to society that emerged from their graduate study at Harvard. It is the highest honor the Graduate School bestows, and awardees include some of Harvard’s most accomplished alumni. The 2012 recipients, announced at a ceremony on May 23, are: Daniel Aaron, Ph.D. ’43, Litt.D. ’07, founding president of the Library of America and Thomas professor of English and American literature emeritus at Harvard; East Asia expert Karl Eikenberry, A.M. ’81, a political and military leader who served as U.S. ambassador to Afghanistan from 2009 to 2011, Nancy Hopkins ’64, Ph.D. ’71, a professor of biology at MIT who has blazed a trail for women in science; and international-relations scholar Robert Keohane, Ph.D. ’66, professor of public and international affairs at Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School.

Clockwise from top left: Daniel Aaron, Karl Eikenberry, Nancy Hopkins, and Robert Keohane
In May, thousands of members of the University community gathered in Tercentenary Theatre to take part in Commencement and to mark the close of a yearlong celebration of Harvard’s 375th birthday. Established in 1636, Harvard was already 140 years old when the nation was founded. There are few institutions in this country or even the world that can claim such longevity. But what does such a claim mean? In an era distinguished by rapid change, what do we intend by our observance of the University’s singular and illustrious history? Why is our past an invaluable resource as we decide how to shape the future?

Harvard’s history instills in us both expectations and responsibilities. It connects us to a community of students, alumni, faculty and staff that extends across time as well as space, a community comprising predecessors both recent and remote. Those predecessors—from pioneering scholars and scientists to public servants who have attained the highest office in the land to luminaries in the arts, literature, music and theater—remind us of what is possible for us by their demonstration of what was possible for them. We want to contribute as they have contributed in every imaginable field; we want to improve the human condition, to make our lives matter. And we want Harvard to ask that of us, to expect that of us, and to equip us to accomplish it.

The past shapes our institutional ideals as well, diminishing the grip of the myopic present and compelling us to transcend the immediate in search of the enduring. Because we expect the future to be as long as the past, we must act in ways that are not only about tomorrow but also about decades and even centuries to come. We undertake research that is driven by curiosity even as we pursue discoveries that have immediate and measurable impact. We support fields of study that are intended to locate us within traditions of reflection about the larger purposes of human existence, traditions that enable us to ask where we are going—not just how we get there. At the same time, we teach undergraduate, graduate and professional students with the intention of instilling in them the perspective that derives from the critical eye and the questioning mind.

Harvard has survived and thrived by considering time and again how its unwavering dedication to knowledge and truth must be adapted to the demands of each new age—from its origins as a small, local college to its emergence as a research university in the late 19th century to its transformation into a national institution and its development after World War II as an engine of scientific discovery and economic growth, as well as a force for significantly broadening social opportunity. We are now in another moment of dramatic shift in higher education, with globalization and technology prominent among the forces challenging us to examine how we do our work and how we define our aims. This year alone we have launched a University-wide initiative to think in fresh ways about our methods of teaching and learning, an Innovation Lab to help our students bring their ideas to life, and edX, a partnership with MIT to embrace the promise of online learning for our students and to share our knowledge with others across the globe.

As we look to the future, history offers us the ability to imagine a different world. Think of how the University changed as we came to recognize that our commitment to fulfilling human potential required us to open our gates more broadly. The continuity of our deepest values led us to the transformation of our practices—and of the characteristics of the students, faculty and staff who inhabit and embody Harvard. What was once unimaginable came to seem necessary and even inevitable as we extended the circle of inclusion and belonging to welcome minorities and women, and in recent years to significantly enhance support for students of limited financial means.

Our history provides, in the words of Massachusetts Bay Governor John Winthrop, “a compass to steer by,” filling us with confidence in our purposes and in our ability to surmount the risks of uncharted seas. With the strength of our past, we welcome these unknowns and the opportunities they offer as we reimagine Harvard for its next 375 years. For nearly four centuries, Harvard has been inventing the future. History is where the future begins.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

The View From Mass Hall
THE CASE FOR COMPROMISE  (continued from page 27)

saw others doing the same and if what they were voting for solved the country’s problems."

Classic compromises are sometimes also distinguished from what are called “integrative agreements,” also known as “problem-solving,” “value-creating,” or “win-win” solutions. Long the favorite of many writers on negotiation, they offer the prospect of an agreement in which both sides gain over the status quo, and neither side sacrifices. (The lack of sacrifice is why it does not count as a classic compromise.) The much-cited example, devised by Mary Parker Follett, the pioneering scholar in this field, features two sisters who both want the same orange. The classic compromise solution is simply to split the orange. But it turns out that one sister wants only the juice and would throw out the peel. The other sister wants only the peel for a cake, and would discard the pulp. If they recognize that they have different interests in the orange, they could reach an integrative solution: one would take all of the pulp, the other all of the peel. Both would gain, and neither would sacrifice anything.

Like the consensus agreements they resemble, the opportunities for achieving integrative agreements are scarcer in legislative politics than some of their enthusiasts imply. Most of the examples of successful integrative agreements involve individuals or groups trying to resolve specific financial disputes rather than the kind usually faced in the ongoing negotiations that take place in legislatures. When legislators seek integrative solutions, they often use tactics of logrolling or expanding the pie. Logrolling typically requires the government to spend more money in order to satisfy the legislators’ favored causes. Special interests, then prevail over the public interest. By expanding the budgetary pie, older generations typically load more debt onto younger or future generations.

Healthcare reform shared a feature of this problem. It expanded the budgetary pie by universalizing health insurance, but it fell short of coming to clear and certain terms with the rapidly rising costs of healthcare. Only a classic compromise, which would include measures that more fully control costs and entail some sacrifice on all sides, could begin to deal with this problem.

Legislative opportunities to achieve win-win solutions that serve the public without any sacrifice are rarely available. Legislators are much more likely to find themselves confronting conflicts that cannot be resolved without sacrifice on all sides. If they want to make gains over the status quo, they will have to give up something of value. They will not have the luxury of hoping for the pure win-win solutions that some negotiation theorists promise. They will just have to compromise. We can cheer on politicians when they search for common ground, but we should not let their failure to find it cast doubt on the value of the classic compromise.

Compromise came about only because the principled positions that reformers espoused—a simple and transparent tax code or universal healthcare coverage, for example—did not survive intact in the tangled process that produced the final legislation.

Mindsets of Compromise

The compromising mindset displays what we call principled prudence (adapting one’s principles) and mutual respect (valuing one’s opponents). In contrast, the uncompromising mindset manifests principled tenacity (standing on principle) and mutual mistrust (suspecting opponents). Return now to the Tax Reform Act and Affordable Care Act, and notice how the defining characteristics of compromise—mutual sacrifice and willful opposition—map onto these mindsets.

To achieve these compromises, the mistrust so easily generated by willful opposition also had to be partially suspended. Enough of the legislators respected their opponents enough to make the
creased polarization among not only political elites but also engaged partisans, who spend most of their lives with like-minded peers. The uncompromising views of these engaged partisans, coupled with the “disappearing center” in American politics, create strong incentives against compromise.

Strong partisans may still chase the tantalizing dream that the next election will settle the matter, once and for all. My party will gain control and push through its agenda, undiluted. Yet in contemporary American politics it is highly unlikely that one party will gain complete control at the national level (securing the presidency, the House, and the reliable 60 votes needed to overcome a filibuster in the Senate). And if one party were to gain control, it would still face the daunting task of making compromises within its own ranks. Neither can we look for a single, strong leader to come to the rescue. No president can prevail as long as Congress remains recalcitrant.

There is no escape from compromise. Politicians are likely to continue to work in a strongly divided partisan environment, and they need to find ways to reach agreements if they expect to govern well. Looking more carefully at differences between the Tax Reform Act and the Affordable Care Act can help clarify what makes compromise more or less possible in polarized partisan contexts.

Tax reform was not an issue in the campaigns before or after the compromise. Healthcare reform was an issue in the 2008 and 2010 elections, and no doubt will be an issue in campaigns to come. Partly as a result, the process that led to the Tax Reform Act was more responsive to the compromising mindset, and the process that produced the Affordable Care Act was more susceptible to the uncompromising mindset. Furthermore, the permanent campaign that reinforces that mindset has been more conspicuous in recent years than it was in the mid 1980s.

Campaigning in an uncompromising style—making unconditional promises and discrediting rivals—plays a moral as well as a practical role in democratic politics. It enables candidates to communicate where they passionately stand on important issues and to differentiate themselves from their opponents. It is a necessary element of an electoral system with competitive elections and is therefore a legitimate part of the democratic process. But so is governing. To govern, elected leaders who want to get anything done have to adopt a compromising mindset. Rather than standing tenaciously on principle, they have to make concessions. They have to respect their opponents enough to collaborate on legislation.

Here is the internal tension in political compromise: the democratic process requires politicians both to resist compromise and to embrace it. The uncompromising mindset that characterizes campaigning cannot and should not be eliminated from democratic politics. But when it comes to dominate governing, it obstructs the search for desirable compromises. The uncompromising mindset is like an invasive species that spreads beyond its natural habitat as it roams from the campaign to the government.

Many observers blame Republicans for the uncompromising spirit that pervades current American politics, pointing out that they have become more extreme and intransigent in recent years. But it would be a mistake to dwell on who is most to blame at the moment. The uncompromising pressures are persistent in a democratic process in which campaigning dominates governing. If it so happens that one party is more responsible for the polarization at a particular time, this should not distract us from the broader problem that needs to be addressed to make room for responsible governing.

The problem of compromise in American democracy has always been challenging. It becomes harder still with the rise of the permanent campaign. The relentless pressures of campaigning—which call for an uncompromising mindset—are overtaking the demands of governing—which depend on a compromising mindset. Because legislating in the public interest is all but impossible without compromise, the domination of campaigning over governing has become a critical problem for American democracy, and increasingly for other democracies. By recognizing the pressures of the permanent campaign and the dynamics of the mindsets in play in democratic politics, politicians, the media, and, above all, the voting public would be more likely to find ways to address this problem.

Major institutional change in the public interest itself requires compromise, and the leaders who would bring it about will themselves have to set their minds to it. In an earlier uncompromising era, the Beatles got it just about right: “You tell me it’s the institution/ Well, you know/ You’d better free your mind instead.”
Wow. Huh?

A master palindromist (and stand-up comedian), Mark Saltveit ’83, of Portland, Oregon, moves backward as well as forward in life more than most of us. Constant readers will recognize him as the author of “No Smircog!,” a 1997 “interview” in this very space with Professor Osseforp about a Harvard-Yale football game, a piece full of “Eli bile” (November-December 1997, page 84). Now we learn that he has won the first World Palindrome Championship.

Saltveit defeated two professors, two computer programmers, a cartoonist, and a book clerk to win the championship contest, hosted by Will Shortz, The New York Times crossword-puzzle editor. According to the championship’s official news release: “600 word nerds filled the ballroom at the Marriott Hotel at the Brooklyn Bridge and watched seven prominent palindromists deliver new reversible verses written on the spot. Audience members voted by deploying signs that said “WOW” on one side (for their favorite) and “HUH?” on the other.

The seven finalists had 75 minutes to construct palindromes fitting any one of three constraints: use an X and a Z in your palindrome; write about someone prominent in the news in the past 12 months; or about the competition itself.

John Connett, professor of biostatistics, almost won with a political tale: “Not Newt! Ron’s snort went on.” But Saltveit got four more votes from the audience for his elliptical tale of kinky shenanigans: “Devil Kay fixes trapeze part; sex if yak lived.”

The trophy for the first-ever contest was made, Saltveit reports, by “artist and finalist Jon Agee out of cardboard. It is flat and was scored on the back and folded together, so that it looked like a regular trophy (i.e., the top half of what you see in the photograph).” At the triumphant moment, when a trumpet blared, Saltveit dropped the back half, and it unfolded into a symmetrical trophy.

“Sadly, at the reception after the awards,” says Saltveit, “I put the trophy against a wall, and it was stolen and is now undoubtably displayed in a private collection next to stolen Van Goghs and Picassos. Or a janitor may have thrown it away, but I prefer the first scenario.”

Memorable master: It is said that in his earlier years as a teacher, Leon Kirchner, D.Mus. ’01, Rosen professor of music, who died in 2009, was “ferocity personified.” But cellist Yo-Yo Ma ’76, D.Mus. ’91, of Cambridge, was one of his students who later became a friend. In a memorial minute adopted by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences earlier this year, Ma recalled the vibrancy of Kirchner’s urgings: “No, it must be mooooore beeeOOOtiful! Like this: ra papa peEEEmm!!! paPEEEmm, paPEEEmm, paPEEEMM!!!...Leon would exhort us to exceed our own capabilities by imagining, believing in, and creating a world that could transcend time and space, to go one on one with Beethoven, Schubert, Schoenberg, Bernstein. A charismatic raconteur, a man who enjoyed contradictions, who could be at once grandiose and vulnerable, endearing and prickly, Leon fired our young imaginations, sometimes leading us, other times deliberately becoming our ‘boulder in the road.’ Years later, we find he has left a permanent mark on us, having set our sights onto a universe both grand and wondrous, leaving us to find our way to reach for it.”

Ripe for murder. When Cambridge architect Susan Cory, M.Arch. ’78, was studying at the Graduate School of Design, she found “a setting—insecurity and ego riding a particle accelerator of Design Obsession—just ripe for murder. I couldn’t understand,” she writes, “why there were no mysteries about architects and architecture students doing each other in.”

Cory fixed that with Conundrum (Cory Publishing, 2012), the first in a planned series featuring Cambridge architect Iris Reid as an amateur sleuth. Here she tries to catch a murderer at her twentieth GSD reunion. Good luck to her; all the incriminating evidence points to Iris herself.

Saltveit displays for the first (and last?) time the World Palindrome Championship trophy.
Watch Out

Sea shells by the seashore can be desirable—or deadly.

As you stroll along a summer beach, you may be on the lookout for shells, among other sights. Many are beautiful, or intriguing, or associated with pearls or Tyrian purple dye, and the clam, scallop, and oyster shells on a Cape Cod beach may remind you of delectables to eat. You may pick up and pocket that pretty jingle (Anomia simplex); collecting shells can be a harmless passion. But if you grab for a certain cone shell on an Australian beach, and the snail who made it is still in residence, you could be dead by sundown.

An exhibition titled Mollusks: Shelled Masters of the Marine Realm, on display at the Harvard Museum of Natural History through February 2014, might keep you out of danger. With about 300 specimens from the more than 10 million in the museum, the show explores the amazing diversity of the collection and of snails, clams, squids, octopuses, and other invertebrates that together comprise almost a quarter of all known marine species.

A display case devoted to snails contains two shells of the same species of Indian sacred chank (Turbinella pyrum). One is coiled with an opening to the right, the usual thing; the other has its opening to the left. There are only three known examples of such a left-facing shell in the United States. Curatorial associate in the malacology department Adam Baldinger, who selected much of what is on display, feels that the opportunity to include this rarity, a recent donation, is fantastic. A local amateur shell collector has observed that the shell is so valuable in the marketplace that armed guards should be positioned on either side of the case 24/7.

Also in the case are seven shells of cone snails (inset). Remains of the three deadliest specimens are shown elsewhere, but all cone snails have toxin. These animals make their living by firing darts laced with stunning or paralyzing toxins at prey, and this procedure has led scientists to new tools to alleviate pain in humans. “When we injure ourselves and take morphine, or even Tylenol,” says Baldinger, “we’re blocking the nerve impulses to the part of the body that’s damaged, to prevent pain.” A powerful, nonaddictive, well-behaved painkiller derived from cone-snail toxin has been approved by the Federal Drug Administration, and more such will surely follow. Many species of cone snails exist and produce a vast range of potentially helpful toxins. But cone snails live on coral reefs, which are being destroyed. This is an argument in favor of quickly picking up cone snails, carefully.