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F or this lecture I thought it might be interesting to go back over the study of force fields prior to the space age. With spacecraft journeying in all directions through the solar system, we now have extensive maps of the dynamical state of interplanetary space, and we are inclined to forget that the general picture of conditions in “empty” space was worked out from ground level prior to the direct exploration of space. For the fact is that the violent weather in space is felt here at the surface of Earth, so that measurements carried out on your porch and celestial pheno-
omena observed from your porch allow you to deduce the state of things in space. That is to say, the effects of the weather out in space are all around us if we care to notice them. It makes an interesting detective story, and the general “porch” picture of space conditions is impressed upon us, not only by direct studies with spacecraft. Needless to say, the direct studies in space have turned up a host of details that could not have been anticipated from the porch. But we are concerned here with establishing the broad picture of things, and for that pur-
pose some careful observation and hard thinking on the porch do very nicely. Front porch or back porch makes little difference. Let us imagine the back porch because of its great privacy. No need for explanations to the neighbors for our bizarre behavior, peering at magnetic needles or watching the sky for comets.

In this lecture I will emphasize the dy-
namical role of force-fields in space and on your porch. You have all heard of gravita-
tional fields, magnetic fields, and electric fields, but probably have had no particular reason to give them much thought. The magnetic field is especially interesting to you during stormy weather, as it generates the surface of Earth and extends outward with-
out limit into space. We spend our lives walking around at what we might call the bottom of the gravitational field. Then there is the magnetic field. I remind you that magnetic fields latch your refrigerator door closed and stick messages to that same door. The magnetic field of Earth forcibly orients the hiker’s compass needle, and we spend our lives walking around in it. The magnetic field of Earth one clear day, we would see the dark sky. The corona is the vast million-
fold extension of the Sun’s atmosphere, an extension that we cannot see, but sense through it. The corona is the standard reference on solar phenomena.

I suspect the selection of the word shov-
ing was not a casual one—given Gene’s great interest in the Sun. Gene is probably best known predicting and naming the solar wind (in the 1950s)—the supersonic stream of electrically charged particles emitted by the Sun’s corona—before its discovery by observation. The discipline of space physics has developed around the cornerstones Gene Parker has laid down. His 1979 book Cosmical Magnetic Fields: Their Origin and Their Activity is the standard reference on the subject. Gene’s scientific work is marked by the highest standards of originality and excel-
lence, and, as a result, over the course of his long career he has been the recipient of many accolades and honors. He was elected to the National Academy of Sciences in 1967. He accepted the nation’s highest award for scientific achievement, the Na-
tional Medal of Science from President George Bush in 1989. He received the Royal Astronomical Society’s highest award, the Gold Medal in 1992. In fact, today, I am delighted to announce yet another award for Gene Parker.

I hold a letter from the Astronomical Society of the Pacific in my hand dated March 28, 1997, to Dr. Riccardo Levi-Sert, Director of the Enrico Fermi Institute. It reads, “I am happy to inform you that the Board of Directors of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific at its recent meeting selected your colleague Eugene N. Parker to be the recipient of the 1997 Catherine Wolfe Bruce Gold Medal.” The letter also states that an official announcement of the award will not be made public until May 1 and to keep this information confidential until then.

THUS, Thursday, May 1, is a fortunate choice of date for honoring Eugene Parker and for the Ryerson Lecture. Past winners of the medal include Eddington in 1924, Hubble in 1930, and Chandra in 1952. This medal is awarded for distinguished contributions to the field of astronomy over a lifetime.

I am honored to turn this podium over to the twenty-fourth Nora and Edward Ryerson Lecturer, the S. Chandrasekhar Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus, Eugene Parker. His lecture is titled “Probing Space through Measurements and Meditations on Your Porch.”

By Eugene N. Parker
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“Probing Space through Measurements and Meditations on Your Porch”
of human fantasy. Accordingly, space has been populated by spirits and gods, each cultural group constructing its own pantheon and mythology, passing those of everyone else. Some cultures would place the origins of the heavens in the stars. In every society, the predominant view would be to communicate directly with the spiritual denizens of the heavens. Some cultures view the heavens as the ultimate abode of their individual immortal souls. So space has been densely populated by the human imagination.

The heavens appear at night as an in-
vited star-spangled bowl. The bowl rou-
tates westward with the hours, turning about half a revolution from sunset to sunrise, so that nearly the whole starry celestial sphere can be seen on a single cloudless night. The stars, together with the Moon and Sun and the five planets visible to the naked eye, were imagined in ancient times to control the destiny of nations and kings, as well as the personal fortune and fate of the indi-
vidual citizen. Comets were given special emphasis and their hallucinations vari-
ously declared. The general idea around the world has been that the positions and mo-
tions of the heavenly bodies form a celestial semaphore system signaling future happen-
ings here on Earth. This view is widely accepted today. We cannot help noting that the specific interpretation of the celestial semaphore varies greatly from one culture to the next. The application to individual cultures is usually explored by an electronic computer. One can now choose from a variety of historical astrological sys-
tems to obtain most any desired prediction for the future, resolving the ambiguities within each system in whatever way seems most congenial.

I remind you that astronomy began as the search for knowledge of how to measure the motions of the planets more accurately so as to predict their future positions and the associated consequences for the heavenly bodies. In the ancient world, we con-
ceived of a nonspinning spherical body around which the heavens revolved once each day. Consequent, the sphere forms a celestial semaphore system imagined to carry the Moon and Sun and the five planets, and one might have concluded that space was partitioned off with sheets of glass or quartz or whatever divine crystal that might be imagined, out to the outer-
most sphere on which the stars were fixed. So the ancient Mediterranean world, after millenia of observations, developed a cos-
mology based on moderately precise (better than a degree) determination of the posi-
tions of the celestial bodies. By the time of Claudius Ptolemy (100–200 A.D.), the ob-
served nonuniform motions of the five plan-
ets against the background stars had been reduced to epicyclic motion around a small circle whose center moved in a circle around Earth. The power of established sophistry and the ob-
ts of the celestial bodies. By the time of the famous geographer Ptolemy (circa 100–178 A.D.), we can now give a diameter of 25,500 miles, which is a signifi-
cant overestimation of the true value.

Eratosthenes understood the enormous dis-
tance between the earth and the Sun and was the first to measure the distance of the Sun by triangulation. He measured the Sun’s apparent diameter from the diameter of the shadow cast by the Sun’s rays at its point of intersection with the Earth’s surface. Eratosthenes was the first to use the term “solar eclipse.”

Consider, then, what is out there in space besides the Sun and Moon, the planets, and the occasional comet. Obviously there is sunlight and starlight, already mentioned. In keeping with the emphasis on force fields, it must be appreciated that light is a form of force field, consisting of a combination of electric and magnetic fields. Light transmits energy and momentum, exerting pressure on anything that reflects or absorbs it. The fact that you can see me because of the light reflected from me and impinging on the retina of your eye demonstrates that electric and magnetic fields are not merely math-
ematical abstractions. You may recall that in our high school physics, we studied the Seebeck effect, which is the conversion of heat into electrical energy. We also studied the Peltier effect, which is the conversion of electrical energy into heat. These two effects are related by the fact that a generator is a device that can convert one type of energy into another type of energy. In this case, the generator converts mechanical energy into electrical energy.
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hold here in my hand. The space around it is under stress. The field around the magnet is easily mapped with a small compass (magnetic needle) and has the same form shown in the figure. That is to say, the field extends out one end of the magnet and curves around to end at the other end. The magnetic field thus constitutes a stress system around the magnet.

Note that the magnetic field is a continuum, whereas I draw only a few discrete lines for the purpose of sketching the geometry of the field. Please do not get the idea that the magnetic field is itself made up of separate lines. There are no gaps in the field.

Note that the field of this magnet declines rapidly with distance from the magnet, but the field falls to zero only in a limit of large distance from the magnet. That means that the magnetic field where each of you is sitting is very slightly altered by the field of this small magnet. So as I turn this small magnet around, I am altering the magnetic field through your bodies.

I have referred to the magnetic field as a stress field. The nature of the stress is tension. The direction along the field and pressure across the field with the tension and pressure holding each other in balance. So think of the field lines as vast rubber bands stretched out around the magnet in the pattern shown in the figure. The rubber bands would like to collapse in against the magnet so as to take the shortest path from one end of the magnet to the other. They are prevented from doing so by the fact that the magnetic field exerts pressure. Each rubber band repels its neighbors so that the field is inflated outward from the magnet. The pressure and the tension balance when the pattern is as you see it. This stress field is no abstraction. It will rip the magnet apart if the field were strong enough or if the magnet were composed of some relatively weak materials.

The fact that the magnetic fields are associated with electric currents, i.e., moving electric charges, the electric field, in contrast, is associated directly with the electric charges themselves, both positive and negative. The electric field extends out from positive charges and across the intervening space to the nearby negative charges.

Thus, for instance, there are enormous intense electric fields within the individual atom as a consequence of the negatively charged electrons circling the positively charged nucleus. The electric fields are confined mainly to the space within the atom because the total electric charge in the atom is zero. This is in contrast to the electric fields within each atom in our bodies, the electric fields extending across our bodies are relatively weak. Now suppose that a particle moving with nearly the speed of light is thrown on an electric field that is strong and is moving relative to the electric field. That is to say, it is moving relative to our electric field, but it is at rest relative to the magnetic field. As you move, we, of course, experience the electric field moving with us. The electric field causes the magnetic field in which we live to be altered, and conversely if I were to move my head in the strong field of a powerful electrostatic charge, a thousand times stronger than the magnetic field of Earth, the motion of my head produces a mildly acid taste in my mouth and I experience flashes of light in my eyes, both direct consequences of the electric field produced in my head. You can verify this by Composer a comet, an electric charge, as distinct from the magnetic field, which exerts force on magnetic needles and other magnetic objects.

Having emphasized that electric and magnetic fields are two entirely distinct stress systems, with entirely different origins, I now point out that if I move relative to a magnetic field, I experience an electric field even if no electric charges are present. Conversely, if there are no electric currents present, and hence no magnetic fields, nonetheless I experience a magnetic field if I move relative to an electric field. That is to say, whenever I walk about on my back porch, moving through the ambient magnetic field, I experience an electric field because it is only the relative motion of field and body that matters. Similarly, if I hold still but the magnetic field moves, I experience an electric field because it is only the relative motion of field and body that matters. It is that, so far as you are concerned, there is, or is not, an electric field depending upon whether you happen to be moving. Whenever I turn my head, an electric field appears momentarily in my head as a consequence of the motion relative to the fixed magnetic field of Earth. The electric field is too weak to have any physiological consequences because the magnetic field in which we live is too strong, but it is evident that, whenever the magnetic field of Earth is buffeted by the activity far out in space, the slight motion of the magnetic field creates electric fields within my motionless body.

With the foregoing properties of magnetic and electric fields in mind, let us return to Gilbert’s extended geomagnetic field. By the nineteenth century, careful scrutiny of free magnetic needles brought to light the fact that the magnetic field of Earth occasionally fluctuates slightly over periods of days to weeks. That is to say, the elastic magnetic stress field of Earth is sometimes shaken, evidently by some external force. The phenomenon is called geomagnetic storms, and it is accompanied by enhanced aurora. Sudden outbursts of aurora, I hope you will agree, are something to be wary of, and we should know something about the geomagnetic field.

Careful study of the fluctuations in the late nineteenth century discovered that the geomagnetic activity was related to a sudden outburst of activity on the Sun, e.g., a flare. The next figure shows a modern photograph of ionized gas and magnetic field lines for the Sun’s corona at the time of a solar magnetic storm. The Sun is mostly hydrogen, so we know that the eruption of matter from the Sun consists mainly of electrons and protons, the pieces of which the hydrogen atom is composed. Such an ejection of particles from the Sun impacts the magnetic field of Earth a day or two later, from which one readily deduces that the particles travel not more than one day through space. It is the impact of these protons and electrons that shapes the geomagnetic field.

Do the electrons and protons zip through the magnetic field without effect? The answer is that they do not, because they are moving relative to the magnetic field. Hence they experience an electric field, and, as a consequence of their motion across the magnetic field, they experience a rather strong electric field, pushing sidewise on them. The electrons and protons make a tight U-turn and are thrown back out into space. It is that they are moving relative to the magnetic field that shapes and compresses the magnetic field from time to time.

When the Sun is particularly active, we see extraordinary geomagnetic storms, in the course of which the geomagnetic field is reduced to a mere shadow of its normal strength. At such times, the magnetic field is reduced to a mere shadow of its normal strength. In some instances, the field is reduced to the point where the field lines extend across our entire continental power grid, at great economic cost to the natives of the region. The weather in space can hit hard. The porch light may be off for several hours.

Now, suppose that the Sun is relatively quiet. The Earth’s magnetic field is normal, and the electric and magnetic fields often take similar characteristics. But when the Sun is quiet and we are sitting in a chair on the porch, moving through the ambient geomagnetic field. The space around us is under stress, and we experience the geomagnetic field. While someone sitting in a chair on the porch, moving through the ambient magnetic field, we experience a weak electric field. We can see then that, so far as you are concerned, there is, or is not, an electric field depending upon whether you happen to be moving. Whenever we turn our head, an electric field appears momentarily in our head as a consequence of the motion relative to the fixed magnetic field of Earth. The electric field is too weak to have any physiological consequences because the magnetic field in which we live is too strong, but it is evident that, whenever the magnetic field of Earth is buffeted by the activity far out in space, the slight motion of the magnetic field creates electric fields within our motionless bodies.

Careful study of the fluctuations in the late nineteenth century discovered that the geomagnetic activity was related to a sudden outburst of activity on the Sun, e.g., a flare. The next figure shows a modern photograph of ionized gas and magnetic field lines for the Sun’s corona at the time of a solar magnetic storm. The Sun is mostly hydrogen, so we know that the eruption of matter from the Sun
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Then on 23 February 1956 an enormous
flare on the Sun produced an intense burst
of solar cosmic rays whose prompt arrival
at Earth indicated little or no magnetic field
laying across the Sun-Earth path. The subse-
quent slow decline indicated magnetic fields
somewhere closing off not far beyond Earth
so that the solar cosmic rays did not escape
entirely freely. The point is that cosmic ray
particles pass freely along magnetic fields,
but do not move freely across them as a
consequence of the electric fields they expe-
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intense above the atmosphere of Earth as to
produce an ionization density 10^5 times what
one had been in space in those years. The
electrons in present day communications sat-
ellites are sometimes seriously degraded by the
bombardment of intense cosmic rays from
flares on the Sun.
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About 1950, Ludwig Biermann called
attention to the well-known—and generally
ignored—fact that the tenuous gaseous tails
of comets invariably point straight away from
the Sun regardless of whether the comet is moving toward or away from the
Sun or whether the comet passes over the
poles of the Sun or around the equator. This
anti-solar tail-pointing phenomenon was
first noted by Chinese astronomers in the
ninth century. The essential point is that by
1950 physics had advanced to where one
could make some statements as to why
the tails point away from the Sun. The standard
explanation for the anti-solar comet tail was
the pressure of sunlight. Biermann showed from the known properties of at-
omes that the pressure of light on the
atoms in the comet tail is entirely inade-
quate. He pointed out, then, that the only alternative was that pressure of solar
corpuscular radiation accomplished what
sunlight could not. It was generally
accepted at the time that occasional violent
outbursts on the Sun produce bursts of
intense corpuscular radiation, but little
more, so Biermann’s universal solar corpus-
lar radiation was not taken seriously.
However there was really no other possibil-
ity. With close scrutiny of the moving ir-
regularities in comet tails, Biermann could
see the more vigorous anti-solar acceler-
ation of comet tails when the Sun was active,
just as he could see the weaker acceleration
when the Sun was relatively quiet. He could
demonstrate, in fact, that the tail was
located over the poles of the Sun, far from
any active region, and at sunspot minimum
where there were no active regions anywhere on
the Sun. The conclusion was that the
Sun emitted solar corpuscular radiation in
directions at all times. The implication of
continual corpuscular radiation in all direc-
tions at all times was supported by the fact
that at high latitudes there are always to
be found aurorae and small magnetic fluctua-
tions, indicating that Earth is always bel-
fed, if only weakly, by solar corpuscular
radiation. The comet tails are the wind sock
that shows that space is always filled with
solar corpuscular radiation, i.e., electrons
and protons moving outward at something
of the order of 500 miles/sec, sometimes
faster and probably sometimes slower.
Leverett Davis pointed out that the pressure
of the solar corpuscular radiation is suffi-
cient to sweep the interstellar gas out of
the solar system. Just how and why the Sun
sent solar emitted corpuscular radiation was
not known. Most of our entertaimed dark ideas
of the solar corona are solutions of the
varying magnetic fields on the Sun, so the
idea of corpuscular radiation from the quiet
Sun was puzzling, to say the least.
So how could this happen, this mass of
debris out into space? The answer is:
To develop. In 1956 Sydney Chapman showed
from simple considerations on the balance
of gas pressure versus gravitational attrac-
tion how a gas bubble could be blown up
into a sphere of the Sun—the corona that is
so spectacular during an eclipse of the Sun
extends far out into space, beyond the orbit
of Earth. The gas density is greatly dimin-
ished at Earth, of course, but it is another
contribution to our otherwise empty space.
I was young back in those days, just
getting started on my professional career
as a theoretical astrophysicist. I had
already begun to associate with John Simpson, so I was famil-
 iar with his conclusion that there is large-
scale magnetic and particle activity in space.
I was fortunate to have conversations with
both Biermann and Chapman, who left
me impressed with the extended static co-
rona of the Sun, computed by Chapman,
and with the universal solar corpuscular
radiation, inferred by Biermann. Both
the static corona and the corpuscular radiation
seemingly filled interplanetary space. How-
ever, it soon occurred to me that Biermann
and Chapman were mutually exclusive, be-
cause a stream of electrons and protons
cannot pass freely through a static corona
of electrons and protons. There is a strong
electrostatic interaction between the charged
particles of the moving and the stationary
gas, essentially preventing any charged
atmospheric interactions. This locks the two
together. So the corpuscular radiation could not possibly penetrate through the extended static co-
rona. Yet neither could be rejected. The
reasonings that led to the corpuscular radia-
tion and to the static corona were insepa-
 rable. Then it occurred to me that reconcili-
ation was possible if Biermann and
Chapman were talking about the same thing,
but that the answer was highly static in nature.
This led me to consider the Sun as a
laboratory.
the orbit of Earth varies between about two and twenty atoms per cubic centimeter, depending upon a variety of things at the Sun. Thus, the solar wind pushes in the sunward side of the magnetic field of Earth to distances that vary in the vicinity of about ten Earth’s radii, while catching up bundles of the magnetic field and stretching them out behind Earth to form a long comet-like magnetic tail.

The mapping of the varied conditions in space through the solar system is not fully complete to this day. The Ulysses mission over the poles of the Sun has made its first pass, at a time of minimum solar activity, and NASA has a commitment to follow the spacecraft over the poles again in about four more years when the Sun is active. Then it is to be hoped that the Voyager spacecraft will survive enough more years to find the distant termination of the solar wind.

Now the cause of the million-degree temperature of the corona, that sets the whole operation in motion, has yet to be identified. There is the varying brightness of the Sun and its effects on terrestrial climate, about which I have said nothing. There is the question of precisely how the Sun goes about generating the magnetic fields responsible for its activity. And the question of why those magnetic fields appear at the surface of the Sun in an intensely fibril state, rather than as a continuum as we find them everywhere else. Precisely how is it that these magnetic fields produce the immense eruptions of gas and field that buffet Earth in the outward passage? Then there is the question of the low neutrino emission from the Sun. So there is plenty left to do. I do not want to leave you with the idea that there are no mysteries remaining. Rather my goal is to give you an awareness of the force fields in which we live and work, as well as the intimate connection of those force fields to the activity out in space.

Eugene N. Parker is the S. Chandrasekhar Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus in the Departments of Physics and Astronomy & Astrophysics, the Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College.

The Nora and Edward Ryerson Lectures
The Nora and Edward Ryerson Lectures were established by the Trustees of the University in December 1972. They are intended to give a member of the faculty the opportunity each year to lecture to an audience from the entire University on a significant aspect of his or her research or study. The President of the University appoints the lecturer on the recommendation of a faculty committee, which solicits individual nominations from each member of the faculty during the Winter Quarter preceding the academic year for which the appointment is made.
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The Policy and Procedures concerning Sexual Harassment (adopted by the Council of the University Senate, May 8, 1990) require that an annual report be made to the council (1) describing the University’s program to prevent sexual harassment and (2) reviewing the incidents brought to the attention of the Sexual Harassment Complaint Advisors or the Panel on Sexual Harassment. This is the report for the year 1995–96.

Prevention and Education

The Sexual Harassment Complaint Advisors made eighteen presentations on the subject of sexual harassment. Of the eighteen presentations, one was to a group of faculty; two were to groups with a mixture of faculty and students; thirteen were to groups of students, and two were to groups of student services administrators. While interest in this topic continues and many orientation programs for entering graduate students, tutors, and teaching assistants have established a permanent place in their annual schedule for a presentation from the Complaint Advisors, it has proven difficult to reach faculty and academic staff effectively on this topic except through the pamphlet distribution. The Complaint Advisors invite suggestions about how better to reach this important segment of the University community.

After six years of successful operation, a sizable group of individuals who have completed a term as Complaint Advisors exists, translating into additional presentations, primarily to students, courtesy of these vet erans. One goal of rotating individuals through a two-year appointment as a Complaint Advisor is to develop expertise and awareness among a growing number of individuals who will continue to benefit the University community long after the two-year term has expired.

Two years ago, the Complaint Advisors noticed an increase in the number of matters taking place through electronic means. In response, one of the new Complaint Advisors brings considerable technical expertise to the group and has been extremely helpful in addressing computer-related problems.

As in past years, the pamphlet, Sexual Harassment: What We Can Do, revised in 1995, was distributed in the fall to all students and faculty with a memo from the Provost: “This process has already been repeated for 1996.”

A couple of student groups contacted the Complaint Advisors about confusion they fear a student may experience in (1) identifying a particular problem as harassment, sexual harassment, assault, or sexual assault; and (2) determining which University resources are appropriate for dealing with particular problems. Students have been advised that area Deans of Students serve as general, all-purpose resources and can refer a student, if necessary, to a specialized resource person. The student groups have continued to work with the central Dean of Students Office to clarify policies and procedures and to help ensure smooth referrals.

Monthly meetings remain central to the Complaint Advisors’ efforts. By sharing strategies that have helped resolve problematic situations, they benefit from each other’s experiences. Again this year, invited speakers from the Office of Legal Counsel and the Student Counseling and Resource Service shared their perspectives and expertise with the Complaint Advisors. Complaint Advisors also viewed and discussed a United Educators training videotape of three case studies of campus sexual harassment incidents.

Quarterly round table discussion with representatives of the various campus offices that work on and around the subject of sexual harassment continues to provide a valuable forum in which to share ideas, promote collaborative projects, and eliminate duplication of efforts. These offices include the Sexual Violence Prevention Resource Center, the Student Counseling and Resource Service, the Peer Health Educators, the College Orientation Office, the Dean of Students Office—which coordinates the Sexual Assault Dean-on-Call Program for students—and the Housing Office.

Formal and Informal “Cases”

Formal

No internal formal complaints against faculty members were brought before the Sexual Harassment Panel nor were any internal formal complaints against staff members or students brought forward to their respective formal investigatory and disciplinary committees. Two complaints made official sexual harassment complaints to the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights. The federal government promptly investigated both matters, found no merit in any of the claims, and dismissed the charges. One complaint involved allegations against a member of the academic staff; the other involved allegations against several faculty members.

Informal

Sexual Harassment Complaints about Faculty and Other Academic Employees. A female staff member complained that a male member of the academic staff made unwanted and inappropriate sexual advances towards her. The department chair and administrator promptly investigated the matter and determined that the allegations were accurate. The individual was promptly reprimanded in writing and given no salary increase for the following year.

Another female staff member sought advice because her faculty supervisor had made sexually directed remarks on several occasions. She decided to speak to the faculty member herself, reporting back that the faculty member had apologized for his misbehavior and that a cordial and productive working relationship had resumed.

A female graduate student reported that a member of the academic staff who had made sexual advances during the time she was his student had retaliated against her subsequently when he believed she had reported his misconduct to the department.

An investigation solidly confirmed what the student reported. A letter of reprimand and warning was sent to the academic staff member and his appointment, shortly due to expire, was not renewed as a result.

Another student inquired on behalf of a female graduate student friend whose dissertation advisor was reluctant to disengage from their previously consensual relationship. Although she was asked, the inquiring student did not wish to disclose the names of the individuals involved. She was urged to encourage her friend to talk with one of the Complaint Advisors and to remind her friend that she should not let the faculty member pressure her into continuing a relationship that she did not wish to continue. The status of this situation remains unknown.

Questions about Related Matters. Students, faculty, and staff consulted with Complaint Advisors on another sixteen matters. Typically, advice rather than intervention was sought and provided, helping the individual to bring the problem into focus and to a successful conclusion. About one-third of these matters involved a student concerned about the conduct of a peer, primarily regarding ambiguous, possibly sexual, remarks. Another four individuals sought advice on how to deal with troubling situations with people not affiliated with the University, ranging from inappropriate electronic mail transmissions to odd telephone calls. No patterns characterized the remaining matters, which included such varied concerns as a female staff member’s perception of being excluded from departmental business, a female student’s report that a faculty member was allegedly viewing pornography in his office during his office hours, and a student’s concern that her employer’s conservative dress requirements were too restrictive.

Members of the Panel on Sexual Harassment

Jeanne Marsh, Chair
Charles Cohen
Kathleen Conzen
James Marquardt, Student Ombudsperson, ex officio
Ingrid Gould, Assistant Provost, ex officio

Report of the Panel on Sexual Harassment

May 29, 1997

December 10, 1996
T
he primary job of the Ombudsperson is to help students over- come barriers which stand between them and a fair resolution to their problems. These barriers consist only in a student’s lack of knowledge about the Ombudsperson’s role, fear of getting involved in solving conflicts and complaints. The student simply may not know how to appeal a library fine, raise questions about a hospital bill, or deal with another concern about student life. In situations like these, the Ombudsperson’s Office serves primarily as a referral center. We tell students where they can turn for help and advice.

However, at times, the hurdles which a student faces are more difficult to over- come. At times, students go to the appropriate office or authority but find their questions are answered not with helpful expla- nations, but with silence, evasiveness, or a requirement that the student file his or her complaint. More commonly, students find that administrators or instructors are genu- inely interested in helping them, but that their response to their request for sympa- thy conflict with the legitimate interests of other students—or with the interests of the University community. For example, a stu- dent might justifiably claim that he or she has been misinformed about the academic requirements of the College, yet be told by administrators that they can do nothing because the academic requirement in question with- out sacrificing its standards.

Whether the obstacles seem to be an unfair administrative action or an irrecon- cilable conflict between legitimate interests, the Ombudsperson’s Office can help stu- dents overcome such obstacles by acting as a mediator, an impartial investigator, and a creative problem-solver. And apart from helping to solve difficult problems after they arise, the Ombudsperson’s Office also has a preventive task: it is asked to publish regu- lar reports describing some of the problems it has encountered—in part, so that Universi- ty members can take precautions to avoid similar problems.

I and last year’s Assistant Ombudsperson, Abby Markle, have already discussed some typical problems in two official reports and a series of short newspaper columns. In this report, I would like to add a few thoughts about the 1995-96 year. More specifically, I wish to briefly discuss two kinds of prob- lems encountered by some of the students who came to us. First, some students com- plained that they were not given explaina- tions for poor grades or for other academic decisions which had an impact on their career plans. At times, students were left confused by complex or opaque poli- cies or procedures regarding academic mat- terst and disciplinary issues. In illustrating these problems, I will alert some of the details in my accounts in order to protect the confidentiality of the students I write about.

Before going on, I should also point out that, for those who are interested, there are also other sources of information about the role of the Ombudsperson. Com- pleted a number of questionnaires with students in the Reynolds Club, Room 8, or at (773) 702-8422 and can answer e-mail messages addressed to ombudsperson@uchicago.edu. One can also learn more about the office from its World Wide Web page (http://www.uchicago.edu/ uoccc/student.html) and from previous re- ports published by this office in the Univer- sity Record, available in Regenstein Library.

Unexplained (or Poorly Explained) Academic Decisions: Grades and Termination from Ph.D. Programs

As has been true in past years, many stu- dents came to the Ombudsperson’s Office to complain about grades or academic deci- sions. This office is interested in addressing- ered to evaluate student papers or exams. In fact, neither this office nor any other adminis- trative office has the power to overrule the judgments of the relevant academic depart- ment. In all but the most unusual cases, an instructor’s judgment regarding a course or an exam grade is final.

However, even when an instructor has made a final decision about a grade or an academic matter, such a final decision will not necessarily resolve the matter at hand. Many students justifiably expect more than a student’s exam or make available any comments written on the paper, but insisted that the reasoning behind the grade had not been sacrificed its standards.

In one case I wrote about in the Autumn Quarter Report, the instructor to intervened) takes on the role of an adminis- trator and dispenser of punishment. This prob- lem is not an easy one to address. Many University officials play more than one role in the University and a change of roles can understandably confuse and worry students. Indeed, a similar confusion can even arise in the Ombudsperson’s Office: The Ombuds- person often acts first as a guide to the complexities of University policy and proce- dures and (after being asked by the stu- dent to intervene) takes on the role of an impartial investigator who may or may not ultimately agree with the student’s claim. While such confusion is hard to elim- inate, it needs to be squarely addressed, because when students remain confused about administrators’ roles, their confusion can significantly undermine their confidence in the University and its procedures. This prob- lem understandably insists upon “an obli- gation of candor on the part of any student who is involved in a disciplinary proced- ure and of any administrator who is responsible for an alleged violation of the discipline’s rules” (and from where one signs up).

The lab director showed flexibility in dealing with these cases and ultimately man- aged to find new lab spaces for the students who were left with no lab to take. Yet it would be helpful if instructors and adminis- trators could find ways to use standard proce- dures which (like the one above) invite a great deal of confusion and are likely to make students feel that they have been treated unfairly.

Another confusing situation described to us by students also deserves serious atten- tion. Some students suspected of miscon- duct were left with no lab space, even though instructors said the students, first pre- sumptive, second mediators, and third ad- visors and dispensers of punishment. This prob- lem is not an easy one to address. Many University officials play more than one role in the University and a change of roles can understandably confuse and worry students. Indeed, a similar confusion can even arise in the Ombudsperson’s Office: The Ombuds- person often acts first as a guide to the complexities of University policy and proce- dures and (after being asked by the stu- dent to intervene) takes on the role of an impartial investigator who may or may not ultimately agree with the student’s claim. While such confusion is hard to elim- inate, it needs to be squarely addressed, because when students remain confused about administrators’ roles, their confusion can significantly undermine their confidence in the University and its procedures. This prob-lem understandably insists upon “an obli- gation of candor on the part of any student who is involved in a disciplinary proced-ure and of any administrator who is responsible for an alleged violation of the discipline’s rules” (and from where one signs up).

The lab director showed flexibility in dealing with these cases and ultimately man- aged to find new lab spaces for the students who were left with no lab to take. Yet it would be helpful if instructors and adminis- trators could find ways to use standard proce- dures which (like the one above) invite a great deal of confusion and are likely to make students feel that they have been treated unfairly.

Another confusing situation described to us by students also deserves serious atten- tion. Some students suspected of miscon- duct were left with no lab space, even though instructors said the students, first pre- sumptive, second mediators, and third ad- visors and dispensers of punishment. This prob- lem is not an easy one to address. Many University officials play more than one role in the University and a change of roles can understandably confuse and worry students. Indeed, a similar confusion can even arise in the Ombudsperson’s Office: The Ombuds- person often acts first as a guide to the complexities of University policy and proce- dures and (after being asked by the stu- dent to intervene) takes on the role of an impartial investigator who may or may not ultimately agree with the student’s claim. While such confusion is hard to elim- inate, it needs to be squarely addressed, because when students remain confused about administrators’ roles, their confusion can significantly undermine their confidence in the University and its procedures. This prob- lem understandably insists upon “an obli- gation of candor on the part of any student who is involved in a disciplinary proced-ure and of any administrator who is responsible for an alleged violation of the discipline’s rules” (and from where one signs up).

The lab director showed flexibility in dealing with these cases and ultimately man- aged to find new lab spaces for the students who were left with no lab to take. Yet it would be helpful if instructors and adminis- trators could find ways to use standard proce- dures which (like the one above) invite a great deal of confusion and are likely to make students feel that they have been treated unfairly. Another confusing situation described to us by students also deserves serious atten- tion. Some students suspected of miscon- duct were left with no lab space, even though instructors said the students, first pre- sumptive, second mediators, and third ad- visors and dispensers of punishment. This prob-lem is not an easy one to address. Many University officials play more than one role in the University and a change of roles can understandably confuse and worry students. Indeed, a similar confusion can even arise in the Ombudsperson’s Office: The Ombuds- person often acts first as a guide to the complexities of University policy and proce- dures and (after being asked by the stu- dent to intervene) takes on the role of an impartial investigator who may or may not ultimately agree with the student’s claim. While such confusion is hard to elim- inate, it needs to be squarely addressed, because when students remain confused about administrators’ roles, their confusion can significantly undermine their confidence in the University and its procedures. This prob-lem understandably insists upon “an obli- gation of candor on the part of any student who is involved in a disciplinary proced-ure and of any administrator who is responsible for an alleged violation of the discipline’s rules” (and from where one signs up).
similar confusion in part by distinguishing carefully between our role as advice-giver and our role as investigator, by taking on the latter of these two roles only when a student explicitly requests that we do so (and we agree to do so).3 Many other University offices cannot adopt the same approach because they cannot give to a student accused of misconduct a veto over the University’s decision to investigate and take disciplinary action. However, the University might try to establish a clearer division of labor between those who provide guidance to students involved in disciplinary procedures and those who engage in fact-finding or judgment. Where this is not feasible, administrators should take time to educate students before a disciplinary hearing about how the disciplinary process will work and to warn them that some officials may act both as advice-providers and judges. They might also let students know about confidential sources of information and advice which are independent of all or most administrative structures (e.g., the Ombudsperson’s Office or Niteline).

A Note about the Ombudsperson’s Role at the University

Before ending this report, I want to say a few more words about the role of the Ombudsperson at the University. As I noted in an earlier report, many people (both students and administrators) assume that the Ombudsperson acts as a kind of unofficial appeals judge whose job it is to allocate blame for institutional failings. While it is necessarily a part of this office’s mission to hold University authorities accountable for their decisions, the major function of this office is not to allocate blame, but to try to assure that students are treated fairly and in ways consistent with the University’s fundamental norms. As was noted by John Markle, and the Office Secretary, Yvette Roche in an earlier report, many people (both students and administrators) assume that the Ombudsperson acts as a kind of unofficial appeals judge whose job it is to allocate blame for institutional failings. While it is necessarily a part of this office’s mission to hold University authorities accountable for their decisions, the major function of this office is not to allocate blame, but to try to assure that students are treated fairly and in ways consistent with the University’s fundamental norms. As was noted by John Markle, and the Office Secretary, Yvette Roche, it is not an “institutional boogieman,” but rather that of a “trouble-shooter” and “walking solution to everyone’s problems.”

In most cases, he or she should offer criticisms or recommendations not as harsh reprimands, but as thoughts and proposals about how to improve student life at the University—and especially about how to address aspects of student life which give rise to confusion or concerns about unfair treatment.

It was heartening to see that many administrative offices this past year responded thoughtfully and positively to such proposals and that most of the administrators with whom we had contact provided thoughtful answers to our questions and concerns. I am grateful to such administrators for helping our office to serve its mission at the University, and I am especially grateful to the other members of the 1995–96 Ombudsperson’s Office—the Assistant Ombudsperson, Abby Markle, and the Office Secretary, Yvette Roche—for using their considerable talents and energies to make the office an effective troubleshooting center and advocate for fairness.

Notes

1. I would also like to make available complaint statistics for the 1996 Spring Quarter and for the entire 1995–96 year. They can be found at the end of this report.
2. The University of Chicago Student Information Manual 1996–97, p. 82.
3. I should note that the Ombudsperson’s Office plays virtually no role in formal disciplinary proceedings. Neither the Ombudsperson nor his/her Assistant ever serve on disciplinary committees called to hear cases on possible student misconduct (at least not during the year they work in the Ombudsperson’s Office). The Ombudsperson’s only official contract with disciplinary proceedings is (1) as a non-voting member of the panel that hears cases of faculty members accused of sexual harassment and (2) as the official charged with randomly drawing the names of Resident Heads who will serve on the House Disciplinary committees.

Marc Jonathan Blitz was the Student Ombudsperson for 1995–96.

---

### Statistics

#### Spring Quarter 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Appeals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Inquiries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Commons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Affairs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1995–1996 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Appeals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Inquiries</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Commons</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Affairs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and Security</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

MAY 29, 1997
The Prospects of the University of Chicago

What are the prospects of this university in the face of these two trends: increasing numbers going on for higher education, yet greater world competition for students and faculty? United States' universities have so far benefited from these two trends because overall it is the best system of higher education in the world; the evidence for this is the bottom line: many foreign students come here, few American students go abroad. In effect, the United States is a major “exporter” of higher education.

I believe, and this shows my training as an economist, that the primary factor behind the United States' superiority is the enormous competition for students and faculty among hundreds and even thousands of colleges and universities. These include private and public institutions, large and small ones, and secular and denominational institutions.

Competition usually is good because it forces individuals and organizations to perform better, and encourages the expansion and adoption of more innovative organizations. Of course, it is hard for administrators and faculty at Chicago (or elsewhere) to like strong competition when Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, or whoever is trying to pick off your top colleagues and compete for the best students. That is why universities often join together to collude in going after students, athletes, and sometimes faculty. What Adam Smith said about businessmen applies to university administrators. As people of the trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some other contrivance to raise prices.

But we and other institutions in the United States are much better because of that competition. Indeed, the main defect of higher education in most countries is the weak competition among their universities. As a result, faculties and administrators sometimes view their institutions as “country clubs” that show preference for congenial, undisturbing, well-mannered faculty and students. In the competitive environment of the United States, however, a research university declines rapidly if it stresses these country-club types of traits and does not go out to win students, even when they are ill-mannered, bumbling, opinionated, and critical of colleagues.

Let me now apply this discussion of the increased demand for human capital and globalization of higher education to the prospects of the University of Chicago. This institution has a number of stable advantages that continue to improve its eminence in the face of these trends:

1. Chicago is a private university that is under-endowed relative to Stanford, Harvard, Princeton, Berkeley, and other competitors.

2. We are located in the Midwest, whereas many students and faculty, including American and foreign, believe most of the action in the United States is on either coast.

But Chicago has many other advantages, and has turned these apparent disadvantages to its favor. Being under-endowed has forced Chicago to work harder and become more efficient; it is the Avis of top universities. I am not saying to this audience that you don’t need our future fund because you would either kill me or eat my salary if I said that. Of course, Chicago does need more, since there is a saying in boxing: the good big man usually beats the good small man. In university performance, this implies that it gets harder and harder to offset growing funding gaps. This is why the success of the recently concluded fund-raising drive is so important.

But I do believe Chicago’s under-endowment has forced it to be leaner—I hope not meaner—than Harvard, Yale, or the others. If we maintain that efficiency, greater funds can be put to excellent use, better than at other institutions. In economists’ jargon, the rate of return on additional endowment funds to the University of Chicago is unusually high.

Being in the Midwest, away from Washington, New York, and Los Angeles, has many advantages too, as well as some disadvantages. In the University of Chicago, I less likely to follow intellectual fads such as trendy views like political correctness. Chicago has pursued independent, often highly innovative and controversial, ideas. As a result, Chicago has had many “schools of thought” that have fought the dominant paradigms in their fields.

Of course, you know all about the Chicago School of Economics and its collection of Nobel Prizes. But you may not know that most of these were ridiculed by professional economists when they first developed. There are also other highly distinguished “schools,” including the Chicago School of Urbanology, the Chicago School of Literary Criticism, the Chicago School of Law and Economics, the Chicago School of Biology, and others as well.

At the University of Chicago ideas are taken seriously, and open discussion of ideas is often blunt and fierce. Statements are not accepted simply because they are made by a distinguished faculty member who has won many prizes. Authorities are to be heard and questioned, not slavishly followed. They have to justify what they claim with argument and proof, not assertion or reputation. As a result, the University of Chicago is not an attractive environment for faculty who want to retire intellectually—the younger faculty and the students are unmerciful, and that is the way it should be.

This is precisely what I love about this university and why I consider the University of Chicago the intellectually most satisfying university in the world. It is also why I feel Chicago’s future is bright in the next century. The competition is hard, and world competition among universities is getting harder.

But with the support of friends of the University and the continuing commitment of the excellent faculty, students, and administrators, Delbert Olds, president, I believe the University of Chicago is well poised to meet this stiffer competition. It will prosper along with the growing importance in the modern world of information, knowledge, and scholarship.
The University of Chicago Medal was established in 1946 by John D. Rockefeller. The University of Chicago Medal was the highest honor the University could bestow. It was entirely fresh. It was a revelation! I was like a monk coming out onto Broadway.

George Steiner

Reader 1

From more to more.

Reader 4

Not the best university going. The only university going.

President Edward Hirsch Levi

Reader 1

And so be human life enriched.

Reader 2

January 1, 1893

President William Rainey Harper

Our first Convocation has come, and now is gone. Will not the students of the University receive from it new inspiration for that which lies before them? Will not the Faculty of the University take up again their work no longer new, but already old, a work the magnitude of which no one can estimate; will not our friends carry home with them clearer conceptions of what the University is, what it is trying to do, and what it needs to make the effort successful; and will not those men and women to whose [generosity] the University owes its existence recognize still more clearly than before, the greatness of the work undertaken, the divine guidance in it all, the fact that what they have done has been done for all eternity.
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Susan Goldin-Meadow, Professor in the Departments of Psychology and Education and in the College; Chair of the Committee on Human Development

Ralph W. Nicholas, William Rainey Harper Professor in the Department of Anthropology and the College

James M. Redfield, the Howard L. Willett Professor in the Committees on Social Thought and in the Department of Classical Languages & Literatures; Chair of the Committee on the Ancient Mediterranean World

Martha T. Roth, Associate Professor in the Oriental Institute, the Department of Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations, and the Committee on the Ancient Mediterranean World

Abigail Sher, A.B.'95, is an actress.

The University of Chicago Medals

The University of Chicago Medal was established in 1976 by President John T. Wilson to recognize distinguished service of the highest order to the University by an individual or individuals over an extended period of time. The award is made by the Trustees of the University and is among the highest honors the University can bestow. In the twenty years since its creation, it has been awarded to only nine individuals, including those who received the medal at this Convocation.

Reader 3

I assure you that nothing could give me greater pleasure than to look into your faces and contemplate what you have done. I believe in the work. It is the best investment I ever made in my life. I am profoundly, profoundly thankful that I had anything to do with this affair.

John D. Rockefeller

Reader 1
Lindy Bergman, Laboratory Schools ’35, A.B.’39
Presentation by Andrew M. Rosenfield, J.D. ’78, Trustee of the University

Mrs. Edwin A. Bergman—better known to her many friends and family as Lindy—has woven her life in and around the University of Chicago. She and her husband, the late Edwin Bergman, have enriched the University and its Hospitals through their dedication, generosity, and hard work. The legacy she and Ed created, and that she continues to create, will last for many generations.

Lindy’s commitment to the University began when she entered the Lab School as a grade school student, continued through her college years here, and included an uninterupted sixty years of volunteer service to the University. Her volunteerism began when she was sixteen and worked in the Hospitals gift shop, and has grown over the years to leadership within the Hospitals as a Life Trustee and as a member of advisory boards and visiting committees across the University. She has integrated her love of the visual arts with her love of the University—with wonderful results. It was Lindy who launched the program to decorate the Hospitals with artwork, making it a more interesting and more humane place at one stroke.

Lindy and Ed together founded the Berg- man Gallery in Cobb Hall where the Re-naissance Society regularly holds some of the nation’s most avant-garde—and highly regarded—exhibitions by modern artists. She continues to share her expertise in art as a member of the Boards of the Renaissance Society and the University’s Smart Mu- seum. And to help others continue to see the world and the beauty around them, Lindy has recently endowed the Bergman Eye Clinic, which will be housed in the new Duchossois Center for Advanced Medicine.

The Distinguished Service Professorship and the College Scholarship Fund she and Ed endowed clearly speak to their belief in the excellence of the University’s faculty and the importance of helping bright young people come here to learn. Finally, I con- clude by saying that I can tell you first hand of Lindy’s great generosity and deep and enduring love of the University because, as some of you know, my wife, Betty, is Lindy’s daughter.

For these reasons and many more, Mr. President, I am honored and proud to present Lindy Bergman for the University of Chicago. 

Max Palevsky, Ph.B.’48, S.B.’48
Presentation by William B. Graham, S.B. ’32, J.D. ’36, Life Trustee of the University

Max Palevsky has said that his whole life has been shaped by the time he spent as a College student at the University of Chi- cago. His love of learning and his commit- ment to the student experience at Chicago have in turn shaped his service to Chicago, professionally affecting the University he loves so deeply.

Max Palevsky came to the University as a young Army officer during World War II to study economics at the University of Chi- cago. His love of learning and his commit- ment to the student experience at Chicago have in turn shaped his service to Chicago, professionally affecting the University he loves so deeply.

Learning as Discovery—The Chicago Experience

Remarks by Michael J. Klingensmith, A.B.’75, M.A.B.A.’76, President of the University of Chicago Alumni Association Board of Governors, and President of Entertainment Weekly magazine

As you will be reminded over the next few minutes, discoveries made at the University of Chicago have not only helped to shape the larger course of history, but they have also influenced the individual histories—the personal stories—of thousands of indi- vidual lives.

My own U of C story began twenty-five years ago, when I came to the University of Chicago from a suburb of Minneapolis, where I had proudly finished third in my class of three hundred. I came to the Univer- sity of Chicago not knowing how much I didn’t know. But five years, and two degrees later, I left the University with a very clear understanding of how much I didn’t know.

As much as this is a difficult admission for me to make, I was not the most distin- guished scholar in the history of the Univer- sity of Chicago. For me the most defining moments of my experience at the University were extracurricular. My pinnacle experi- ence, in fact, was being drafted by my good friend Ken Krauss to be the sports editor of the Chicago Maroon. A job which Jim War- ren of the Chicago Tribune would later write, “must have been akin to being the toll keeper in the Ozark Mountains.” Little did I know, that that experience, coupled with much of what I learned in the classroom, would start me down the road to where I am today—a journalist living and working in the fascinating world of New York’s magazine publishing industry. The fact that it did so is illustrative of the reality that while the University is so well known for affording wonderful oppor- tunities for academic pursuits, it is truly under-appreciated for the opportunities it affords outside the classroom. In pursuits as varied as film, music, theater and journalism, you, by your own choosing, rich and rewarding experience is readily available at the University of Chicago.

And it’s because of what the University of Chicago has meant to me that I’m so grateful to have been given the opportunity to contribute to the leadership of its Alumni Association and to have been afforded the opportunity to be one of those chosen today to tell their U of C stories.

Remarks by Jacqueline Stewart, A.M. ’93, graduate student in the Department of En- glish Language & Literature, Benjamin Mays Fellow, and CIC Pre-Doctoral Fellow

When I arrived at the University of Chicago four years ago to begin my graduate studies, I felt I had a very difficult decision to make. I was attracted to Chicago because the English Department here had recently hired faculty members who specialized in two fields I had always wanted to study: African American literature and cinema studies. I wondered which of these areas would become my primary focus. As an undergraduate at Stanford, I had attempted to combine my interests in film and literature many times, but found myself always shuffled back to my studies in the Communications and English departments, as if no one understood the connections I wanted to make. The fact that two film scholars, Miriam Hansen and Jim Lastra, were appointed to the English Department here suggested to me that at Chicago I might have less difficulty bridging my interests. Still, I figured that at some point I would have to decide once and for all for which field I would call my own.

Fortunately, during my very first quarter here, I experienced a moment of discovery that helped me to resolve my academic identity crisis. In the fall of 1992, I took a superb course on turn-of-the-century Afri- can-American literature with Professors Ken Warren and Elizabeth Alexander, who as- signed the class to read Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells. Wells had long been a hero of mine; her legacy of writing and speaking against racial and gender discrimination had inspired me ever since my mother had told me stories about her courageousness when I was a child. Reading Ida B. Wells’s memoir proved to be even more rewarding than I had first imag- ined, though, because in it she describes her participation in protests against Chicago screenings of D. W. Griffith’s landmark and controver- sial film, The Birth of a Nation, in 1915. Wells angrily relates her disappoint- ment with Griffith’s “unequal and unworthy portrayal of Negroes.”

Upon reading Wells’s account of this film, I recognized a remarkable moment in which African-American literature and film faced each other and both were changed in a quite unexpected way. It occurred to me that I could structure my course of study around such moments, and four years later I’m here today, as a film spectator and critic at the turn of the twentieth century. I am deeply indebted to those faculty members who have demon- strated Chicago’s unique appreciation for interdisciplinary. They have encouraged me to develop the moment of discovery into a sustained exploration into two irresistible fields of inquiry.

Remarks by Jennifer Costello, third-year student in the College and Lillian Gertrude Selz Scholar

Did you ever have a moment where, even for just a second, everything comes together and makes perfect sense? You see where you are, you need to go, and finally you make the realization of what you need to do to get there. This happened to me about two years ago.

I remember it like it was yesterday. It was beautiful, fall Saturday afternoon—Octo- ber 16, 1994, to be exact—and I had just finished my first month of classes, survived my first midterm, had my very first col- lege basketball practice, and could make it from Shoreland to Cobb Hall, to Foeze, to the Reg, to the gym, and back again all without getting lost. I was at home, alone, in my first-year double at Shoreland, looking out the window of the twelfth floor at the Point and beautiful Lake Michigan. The discovery I made that day is one which I will carry with me for a lifetime. Perhaps the best way to explain it is to read you a passage from my diary.

Dear Diary,

Well, I made it to college! It’s now the very beginning of my fourth week here at the U of C, and I love it! As I sit here and look at this spectacular view I have from my room, I feel as if I can accomplish anything. . . . I just have this great feeling of inner peace and calm, but also an inner voice and feeling of inspiration telling me to go for my dreams because I will catch them. I know that things will not always be as “beautiful” here as they are today, and I also know I have some BCG challenges ahead of me this year in and out of the classroom, but also I know I look out there today that I will meet those challenges face-to-face, I will not step back, but instead pass through them with flying colors. I love college at the U of C, and I know I will make my dreams come true here!

That day I made the discovery of some thing that I had known within my heart all along, but that finally became clear to me. I realized that I could be anything that I wanted, and that I, Jenny Costello, could make a difference. That day I also, made the discovery that the University of Chicago was just the place I needed to harvest and grow the seed of a young first-year student into a mature, successful, and well-rounded graduate who had the opportunity to make a difference in this world, while pursuing her dreams in both academics and athletics, and while growing spiritually, emotionally, physically, and intellectually. The University of Chicago was just the place I needed to harvest and grow the seed of a young first-year student into a mature, successful, and well-rounded graduate who had the opportunity to make a difference in this world, while pursuing her dreams in both academics and athletics, and while growing spiritually, emotionally, physically, and intellectually. The University of Chicago was just the place I needed to harvest and grow the seed of a young first-year student into a mature, successful, and well-rounded graduate who had the opportunity to make a difference in this world, while pursuing her dreams in both academics and athletics, and while growing spiritually, emotionally, physically, and intellectually.

The Distinguished Service Professorship and the College Scholarship Fund she and Ed endowed clearly speak to their belief in the excellence of the University’s faculty and the importance of helping bright young people come here to learn. Finally, I con- clude by saying that I can tell you first hand of Lindy’s great generosity and deep and enduring love of the University because, as some of you know, my wife, Betty, is Lindy’s daughter.

For these reasons and many more, Mr. President, I am honored and proud to present Lindy Bergman for the University of Chicago Medal.

Max Palevsky, Ph.B.’48, S.B.’48
Presentation by William B. Graham, S.B. ’32, J.D. ’36, Life Trustee of the University

Max Palevsky has said that his whole life has been shaped by the time he spent as a College student at the University of Chi- cago. His love of learning and his commit- ment to the student experience at Chicago have in turn shaped his service to Chicago, professionally affecting the University he loves so deeply.

Max Palevsky came to the University as a young Army officer during World War II to study economics at the University of Chi- cago. His love of learning and his commit- ment to the student experience at Chicago have in turn shaped his service to Chicago, professionally affecting the University he loves so deeply.

Max Palevsky came to the University as a young Army officer during World War II to study economics at the University of Chi- cago. His love of learning and his commit- ment to the student experience at Chicago have in turn shaped his service to Chicago, professionally affecting the University he loves so deeply.
years, every time I work in the Psychology Lab with Professor Duncan, I learn how exciting and rewarding it is. I am also re-
miniscent of the difference that I am able to make in others' lives, as I see the smiling faces of the disabled children and adults that we sponsored in the Special Olympics every year in the spring.

There is something about the University of Chicago that I cannot explain, but I know that I have noticed the very first day that I stepped foot here, on campus. It is something that makes one expand one's horizons, press one's limits, and reach out for sights beyond one's wildest dreams. At no other time in my life have I ever felt so ready to meet the chal-
lenge that the world cares to deal as right now. And that is exactly why I cherish the many discoveries I have made here at the University of Chicago in my first two years and look forward to the many more to come.

I am, and will always be grateful for what this University has taught me and helped me discover about myself and will never forget that it has done and continues to do for me.

Remarks by Harvey B. Plotnick, A.B. '63, Trustee of the University, Chairman of the Campaign for the Next Century, and Chief Executive Officer, Paradigm Holdings, Inc.

As I listened to Jenny, I couldn’t help recall-
ing my first few weeks in the College here one hundred years ago. Those were head-
days for me: days of excitement—I was ec-
statically happy—days of discovery. It was
wonderful. Unlike Jenny, I didn’t keep a
diary, but I do recall very vividly writing the
very first letter from school to my parents.
And in it, I said, and I recall this perfectly well,
“this must be the most exciting university anyone could be lucky enough to be at.”

You have heard very personal stories
from Mike Klingermann, Jackie Stewart, and Jenny Costello, who have preceded me.
Each learned something during their experi-
ence at Chicago which changed the courses
of their lives. What most of us know is that such discoveries happen every day at the
University of Chicago. There are discover-
ies of many kinds: they win Nobel prizes; they cure diseases; and there are of course
private discoveries that change one indi-
vidual’s life, such as affecting the lives of every-
one that person touches. Each discovery is
momentous in its own way.

The community of students, scholars, al-
umni, and friends and parents—repre-
sented here by each and every one of you—is integral to sustaining this place in a way
that will enable discovery to continue. One
reason we are gathered on campus today is
to mark the achievements of the University’s Campaign for the Next Century. Our cam-
paign was a success because so many people believe so deeply in the value of this univer-
sity that they both gave and gave in the hope of seeing the world change as a result
of their efforts. I am grateful to everyone who participated.
lifet ime to the service of these values: schol- 
arrowship, teaching, learning. She has talked 
the talk, powerfully conveying the impor-
tance of our mission to presidents, cabinet 
members, senators, and CEOs, while amply 
illustrating the scope of her erudition by 
invoking great thinkers such as Machiavelli and 
Yogi Berra. Most characteristically and 
importantly though, she has also walked the walk. 
Witness her receipt this past spring of the 
Quinnell Award for Excellence in Under-
graduate Teaching. Hanna Gray immensur-
ably strengthened the quality of the 
University’s faculty and student body. And, 
because she recognized that bold steps were 
necessary to preserve and nourish that which 
made the University unique and vital during 
its first one hundred years, she launched the 
Campaign for the Next Century.

John D. Rockefeller once said: “It is far 
better that the University be supported and 
engaged by the gifts of many, than of a 
single donor. This I have recognized from 
the beginning and, accordingly have sought, 
to assist . . . in enlisting the interest, and 
securing the contributions, of many others.”

In this campaign we have realized 
Rockefeller’s dream of broad-based sup-
port for the university he founded. Last 
year, 54 percent of College alumni contrib-
uted to the campaign. This was a higher 
participation rate than Harvard, and sub-
stantially higher than Dartmouth, Yale, and 
Stanford. Rockefeller would also have been 
pleased by the fact that 43% of individual 
gifts were from non-alumni friends of the 
University.

Equally noteworthy for understanding 
the magnitude of our success:

—The $676 million raised during the 
campaign was approximately twice as much 
as had ever been raised in any previous five-
year period.

—Through the campaign, we have cre-
ated forty-five new endowed faculty chairs 
and nearly two hundred new scholarships 
and fellowships.

—1996 was the first year fund-raising 
cash receipts exceeded $100 million, and 
they exceeded it by $26 million.

But the argument I most wish to put 
forward this afternoon concerns why I be-
thought the success of the campaign enables 
us to see. These investments must be made in 
a manner that is true to our mission. They 
must support what we wish to be in the long 
run. It is right that our extraordinary faculty 
and students—all of whom have demon-
strated by coming here that they place schol-
arship, teaching, and learning first—are pro-
vided with the resources they need to achieve 
their goals.

My colleague Gary Becker is of course 
correct in his remarks. Our character, our 
mission, our values give us a leg up on the 
competition. We can lick them all with one 
arm behind our back, but the other arm 
must be strong. It must be nourished.

Competition for faculty, and for the stu-
dents we most want to bring here, who wish 
to be here, is extremely keen. What we have 
shown, together, through the enormous suc-
cess of this campaign, is that, from the point 
of view of external resource support, we 
have nothing to fear. We can dream Harper-
size dreams—as we must.

Let me conclude by again thanking each 
one of you. We have raised not just $676 
million, but because of the 
meaning of this success, we have now before us the prospect 
of a future more glorious than even our 
remarkable past.

Thank you.

Summary

The 445th convocation was held on Satur-
day, October 26, 1996, in Rockefeller Me-
orial Chapel, during Celebrate Chicago! 
The Next Century, a celebration of the 
successful conclusion of the Campaign for 
the Next Century. Hugo F. Sonnenschein, 
President of the University, presided.

Two University of Chicago Medals were 
conferred, on Lindy Bergman, Laboratory 
Schools ’35, A.B.’39, and Max Palevsky, 
Ph.B.’48, S.B.’48.

The honorary degree of Doctor of Hu-
man Letters was conferred on Hanna 
Holborn Gray, President Emeritus of the 
University and the Harry Pratt Judson 
Distinguished Service Professor in the Depart-
ment of History and the College.

Gary S. Becker, A.M.’53, Ph.D. ’55, Uni-
versity Professor in the Departments of Eco-
nomics and Sociology, delivered the convo-
ocation address, “The Production of Human 
Capital at Universities.”

Additional remarks were delivered by 
Michael J. Klingensmith, A.B.’75, 
M.B.A. ’76, President of the University 
of Chicago Alumni Association Board of Gov-
ernors, and President of Entertainment 
Weekly magazine; Jacqueline Stewart, 
A.M. ’93, graduate student in the Depart-
ment of English Language & Literature, 
Benjamin Mays Fellow, and CIC Pre-Doc-
toral Fellow; Jennifer Costello, third-year 
student in the College and Lillian Gertrude 
Selt Scholar; Harvey B. Plotnick, A.B. ’63, 
Trustee of the University, Chairman of the 
Campaign for the Next Century, and Chief 
Executive Officer of Paradigm Holdings, Inc.; and Hugo F. Sonnenschein, President 
of the University.

The convocation was preceded by a pro-
logue, “Voices of the University, Past and 
Present,” a compilation of quotations by 
noteable figures associated with the Univer-
sity throughout its history. Abigail Sher, 
A.B.’95, wrote the script.
I am deeply honored to address you on this worthy occasion, especially so because I am a relative newcomer to the field of law. I have graduated with you, and your talents and contributions are much more intimate than mine. I have spent more time at the university than you, and you have been exposed to the rigors of academic study that I have not. But I intend to focus our attention instead on our dangerous world.

We know that the world is dangerous, do we not? Each time we pick up a newspaper or turn on the television, we learn of yet another disaster, or cover-up, or peril, or inexplicable tragedy. Indeed, the rough rule of thumb around television news rooms is not, “If your story is true, it’s not good news.” Lament the focus on violence, mayhem, and madness we may have, but we also watch and read about the myriad transformed as scenes of distress and horror move across our screens. We read the headlines and turn first, by all accounts, to the terrible stories, not the reports of the story of the historic district from demolition, or how tenants organized to kick drug dealers and make their hallways and streets safer. It is easier, safer, or how a politician did something honest and worthy, or perhaps that a lawyer actually refused the blandishments of a very rich but very corrupt client. This isn’t as newsworthy in our eyes, apparently, as are those stories that touch on the extremes of human behavior, deeds that chill our bones or sear our conscience. It is not the level in tales of goodness if these come to us in the form of life-threatening heroism—the person who leaps into an icy over to yank a person out of its icy arms and back into a burning building because he has learned that not all the occupants have been evacuated; the mother who forgoes her life to save that of her child; the soldier who falls on the grenade and, in so doing, spares his comrades.

In such scenarios, fear is the common denominator, heroism the extraordinary manner only that serves to emphasize the largely moral government of our everyday existences. And it is this meaning—low, don’t expose yourself to the world overmuch as you will be exposed to you if you do, honest to God of course, but don’t let them put pressure on you to do anything rash or foolish—it is this that holds us in its grip. Was Thomas Hobbes, that most master of English prose who decried the human propensity to fight and grow rich by his words, “If we need, it leads.” The circumstances but we also hope, deep in our hearts, that perhaps in extremity there is only extremity rather than the dark, secret human condition. Knowing as we do that brutal and dangerous things grip the imagination of our culture, we should resist. For politically upping the ante of what is required in order to change the world is to lead to utopian fantasies and extreme answers. For Hobbes, the world is so rotten and dangerous and treacherous that the only answer to it is to start seizing the world’s perils and our own inclinations to evil-doing, nevertheless called the world a “compressed pile of belligerencies,” filled with marvels, and wonders, and the terrors of all sorts but also renewed each day by the making of peace on a small scale through acts of neighborliness and reciprocity given that affection that binds us one to another.

Congratulations to you all. Be not afraid!
Maurice F. X. Donohue, 1911–1995

By George Anastaplo

In silence, in steadiness, in severe abstraction, let him boldly by himself; add observation to observation, patient of neglect, patient of reproach, and bide his own time—tentious and unencumbered life. His habits sometimes outrageous comments became a towering personality, and his incisive and method and mood, but they also included some of the same texts. These imitations of the Basic Program have been abandoned in recent decades. But Dean Donohue’s pioneering efforts bore unexpected fruit for which we can all be indebted. Two of our Basic Program students were Edwin and Lindly Bergman, whose celebrated modern art collection was originally inspired by their studies in University of Chicago adult education classes. One consequence of all this—which the ancient tragedians would have appreciated and made even more of than I am making—was that the Basic Program acquired an invincible champion when Mr. Bergman became the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago. This happened to be at a time when the Basic Program had been slated for abortion by a budget-conscious academic administration somewhat confused as to educational priorities. Mr. Bergman soon straightened out the University authorities about the Basic Program. His timely elevation to the Board chairmanship could even have been considered providential by a Greek playwright. In any event, we are still here, poised for our next half-century of dedication to examining the enduring questions, questions to which Dean Donohue, with the insatiable curiosity he retained from his youth as a journalist, was always open. (This curiosity was also reflected perhaps in the series of marriages in which he, a man of considerable charm, enlisted both himself and one fine woman after another, with whom he managed to remain on good terms after they had had to go their separate ways.)

It is sometimes tempting, especially for the jaundiced if not the jaded among former staff members, to recall the Basic Program classes as the refuge of “bored and unhappy housewives . . . [and other] embodiments of ordinary human unhappiness.” (See, for example, Political Philosophy and the Human Being, ed. Alasdair Ma.-... [and other] embodiments of ordinary human unhappiness.” (See, for example, Political Philosophy and the Human Being, ed. Alasdair Macha, Pangle, eds., p. 4 ([1995]). Maurice Donohue knew better: he, as a generous soul, could recognize human aspiration as he saluted “the hundreds of thoughtful men and women who have been saved, in some meaningful sense, by the Basic Program” (Law and Philosophy, L 608). Certainly, our better students are anything but “bored and unhappy” when they happen to come to us. Certainly, also, “housewives” as such do not figure much in our student body. Dean Donohue’s contribution to the Basic Program cause—the cause of serious reading as essential to a truly human existence—distinguishes him as one of the most important leaders in American adult education in this century, following as he did in the footsteps of two of his heroes, William Rainey Harper and Robert M. Hutchins, illustrious Presidents of the University of Chicago who were also champions of lifelong learning in the United States.

George Anastaplo is Lecturer in the Liberal Arts in the William B. and Catherine V. Graham School of General Studies (for- merly the Center for Continuing Studies). This remembrance was delivered on April 21, 1996, as part of the Works of the Mind lecture series in the Basic Program of Lib- eral Education for Adults.
These were his crowning achievements. But perhaps the many letters he received from grateful patients around the world touched him most deeply. Given to discarding unnecessary correspondence, he saved these letters in an uncharacteristic act of sentiment. “We travel light,” he used to say. Yet, I remember one letter in particular, from a professor at the University of Michigan who, on recovering from being bedridden and in constant pain from metastatic cancer of the prostate, wrote: “I feel like Lazarus, arisen from the dead.” Few indeed are privileged to experience such awe-inspiring gratitude.

But his many (not-so-minor) minor discoveries have also left their deep mark on medical science. He introduced colored products to follow enzymatic reactions and coined the now commonplace term “chromogenic substrates.” He developed the most widely used animal model for the study of mammary cancer. He devised methods for the quantitation of prostatic function. He contributed to the understanding of how chemicals cause cancer and devised methods for preventing cancer. His work on the transformation of soft tissues to bone paved the way to the production of artificial bone, potentially an enormous benefit to medicine.

**Philosophy of Science and Training of Young Scientists**

What was it then that drove this remarkable man to devote his life’s work to pure exploration of the unknown in business of scientific discovery? He often characterized science as an artistic pursuit, likening its most glorious moments to the inspired creative acts of a Mozart or a Michelangelo. He was fond of the phrase “Science is the Art of the Twentieth Century.” He maintained that “the art of science is an art of self-discipline and rational explanation. Indeed, he saw a divine quality in scientific creativity.

Although he did not believe that there were rules for success in science, he thought that there were guidelines. He adhered to these himself and taught them by example to his students.

Indeed, his highly successful students are scattered around the world. I cannot count how many of them became professors and departmental chairmen. But most remarkably, they are prominent in many different disciplines: he has his family of urologists, oncologists, and cancer researchers. How was it then that Charles Huggins trained so many successful scientists? How did he transmit his own restless spirit of inquiry? What was the secret of his Midas touch?

He believed in the essential simplicity of Nature. Indeed, simplicity and clarity of thought, expressed through a wonderful economy of written words, were the secrets of his genius. He wrote: “In science one always strives for simplicity, which is the elegance of proof. *Simplicissimus* is the hallmark of truth.”

He insisted that encouragement of younger colleagues was essential to their success. “Always use the carrot, never the stick,” he insisted. I must confess that there were times when the carrot had a strong resemblance to the stick. Nevertheless, his constant encouragement and support of the example raised our sights and uncovered unrecognized potential, thereby permitting us to achieve more than we thought we could. He claimed: “I never hire anyone who is not smarter than myself.” But even elemental considerations throw doubt on this claim.

He did all his own experiments demonstrating extraordinary discipline and personal involvement, constantly reminding us that “the laboratory bench is the scientist’s best friend.” “With blood on my hands, I have the chance to discover; at my desk, I do not.”

He always advised: “Work on a single scientific problem with a small group of students. Do not permit distractions. Nothing can be accomplished when too many pigeons are flying about the room.”

He had uncanny powers of observation, and often saw in the laboratory or at the bedside clues to the secrets of nature that escaped others.

He taught us to appreciate the basics of the scientific process. “The goal of science is not the acquisition of data, necessary though it may be; the analysis is penetrating, then science becomes elegant.”

He advised against spending too much time in the library. “You can be a reader or a writer, not both.”

Sometimes his comments bordered on the outrageous. He would say: “Avoid administration, it attracts only inferior minds.” This did not exactly endear him to his Deans and Presidents. When he heard that I was going to assume the chairmanship of a department, he simply said: “I am sorry that you insist on ruining your life.”

He dissected problems into their essentials. He thought clearly. He quickly identified the heart of the problem.

He considered wasting time the greatest of sins that robbed us of our most precious asset. In this vein I well remember how he dealt with a visitor, a medical corps colonel in full dress uniform who marched into the lab while Huggins was attempting to revive an experimental rat that had received an overdose of anesthesia. “Have you seen Dr. Huggins?” the colonel asked. Huggins paused briefly from mouth-to-mouth resuscitation of the rat. “Not recently,” he said.

**Lectures, Teaching, and Administration**

His gift for economy of thought was also epitomized in his lecture. Among the few formal lectures to the medical students, his lectures on urology became classics. Some would justifiably claim that they were the only sessions that they remembered from medical school. His most widely remem- bered aphorism was: “There are five causes of hematuria,—that is, blood in the urine, if you will forgive my mentioning such matters here. I still remember them with the utmost clarity. Of course there were dozens of causes of hematuria, but the problems that students learn a few important ones well, rather then forgetting them all.

Yet, except for the odd lab emergency, he always had time for his friends and colleagues and students. Appointments were not needed—but the discussions were brief and definitive, rarely more than fifteen minutes. His typical response to a request might well be: “Let’s think about it”—and that meant a resounding no. He never, to my knowledge, sat on any committees, commenting that he could sleep better in his office than in committee meetings.

Although he received honors and prizes too numerous to recall here, his crowning achievement was the award in 1966 of the Nobel Prize for devising the hormonal treatment of cancer of the prostate.

In accepting this singular honor, Professor Huggins’s remarks eloquently epitomize his own life:

First in my thoughts on this happy occasion is gratitude to my wife who has endured much as a Science-Woman. She shares her time with the self-discipline which is necessary to create and which is lit by the passion for discovery. It is possible that the wife of a lab worker is never quite sure whether she or Science comes first in her husband’s affections.

Secondly, is gratitude to the wonderful colleagues “with satchel and shining morning face.” They keep the pot stirred. There is plenty of emotion in our business of discovery when the bread is in the head and in the head. Inevitably one develops affection for all of the colleagues united in the common purpose.

Thirdly, there is gratitude for the wonderful advantage I have enjoyed of a medical education. The doctor is blessed above all men in possessing the right and privilege to care for sick folks. The University provided me with a clinic where one could minister unto the cancer patients for whom little could be done. It is wonderful. It is inspiring. The agony of cancer was expressed by Sir Thomas Browne: “The long habit of living makes mere men the more hardly to part with life and all to be nothing but what is to come.”

A cancer sufferer utters the mariner’s prayer: “Oh, Lord, Thy sea is so vast and my bark is so small.”

Charles and Margaret were devoted to each other and led a happy home life with their daughter, Emily, and their son, Charlie, who followed in his footsteps and became a clinician scientist, and was credited with developing a radically new method for preserving blood for transfusion. They made the most of simple pleasures such as their walks around Hyde Park, reading and re-reading the classics (Shakespeare, Chaucer, and Dickens were favorites), listening to music (especially Mozart), and playing cribbage. When they were not traveling, they enjoyed the Michigan dunes and spend part of each summer there.

The Huggines had multitudes of scientific friends worldwide and were extremely generous in sharing these acquaintances with their young colleagues. An invitation to a scientific dinner at their home was much prized. Even daughter Emily was touched by these occasions. Soon after arriving at boarding school, she wrote home: “I am terribly homesick already. I miss those wonderful dinners at home where Daddy and his visitors talk about cancer all evening.”

The last few years were not easy ones for Charles Huggins. In 1983, we were gathered at a memorial service in this very chapel for his dear Margaret—whom we charac- terized as a “woman of valor.” She took care of everything for her husband—except science and surgery. In 1990, his son, Charlie, succumbed to cancer. By a cruel and ironic twist of fate, Charles Huggins was unable to save his only son from the very disease that had been the central focus of his life-long scientific passion. But I am sure that he derived some measure of plea- sure and serenity from the time spent with his daughter, Emily, with his daughter-in- law, Nancy, and with his seven wonderful grandchildren and eight great-grandchil- dren. Sadly, in the last few years he was house-bound but cared for with extraordin- ary devotion by Tommy and Lucy Almanner.

At the age of seventy-eight, when he was still working full time in his laboratory, Charles Huggins described his philosophy of science in the preface of his book *Experimental Leukemia and Mammary Cancer* as follows:

One works along at the lab bench without haste and without rest. Time has no meaning; every day something will be done, something will be found out. It is total commitment to the task at hand. It requires Spartan self-discipline. These are happy days, one fol- lowing another, hopefully without end, so great is the delight of discov- eriy.

Let us say farewell here to Charles Huggins: grateful for his towering discoveries; grateful for teaching us all so much about the delights of the business of discover- y; and grateful for the shining example of a life that touched so many of us so deeply.

Paul Talalay is the John Jacob Abel Distingui- shed Service Professor at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.
By Jonathan Kleinbard

Julian Levi elicited a strong reaction from everyone who knew of him, those who understood what he was doing and those who didn’t. In those days, and perhaps even today, you either hated him or, like those of us here this morning, loved him. I can tell you something about this. On a Saturday twenty-five years ago, I had returned to the University to work and was walking home for lunch. I had crossed 57th Street when a red station wagon pulled in front of me on the sidewalk and a member of the faculty jumped out. I knew from my first stint at Chicago. He was a distinguished scholar in his field and a social activist. He didn’t say hello. Instead he said, “You wouldn’t be living on 55th Place in that nice house if it wasn’t for Julian.” He didn’t say goodbye, but instead jumped back into his car and drove off in a fury.

Julian brought about those reactions because he did things. There are visible results. You can see it in the legacy of accomplishment everywhere you go (step out of the Chapel and look around)—the presence of the Union for African American Students, the Blackstone Center and the city of Chicago, a stable, integrated neighborhood where whites sell their homes to blacks and blacks sell their homes to whites without panic. Julian’s legacy is a treasure—not only the present of this great university in the city of Chicago, but the demonstration to an unaccepting world that such a society can exist.

But what would you expect? Probably not much if you went to see him in his South East Chicago Commission office in the old YMCA building on 53rd Street (now of not-so-blessed memory with its population of ex-cons and pre-release felons). You would walk through the dingy entrance past the reception desk, up the dirty staircase, into his office. On the walls were pictures of Hyde Park before urban renewal and after, pictures of Mayor Richard J. Daley breaking ground for new housing, and maps showing criminality in the area, prepared by Don Blackiston, the tough wiry criminologist whom Julian recruited with Jack Meltzer, the planner, to help him. From Julian’s window, you could look down on 53rd Street. When you looked over his desk, you couldn’t miss the sign behind his chair. It said: “When you are up to your ass in alligators, it is difficult to remind yourself that your initial objective was to drain the swamp.”

Julian was surrounded by alligators, but he drained the swamp.

I can see Julian today, with his bulldog jaws and hamfisted fists, and sense the creative energy and brilliance that enabled him to see this neighborhood and university from oblivion. It is true that his ideas often were the most difficult to implement. But in most cases they were the only ones that were effective. He had to walk through a mine field to get them done. He never claimed he did it alone. He credited the University’s leadership—Chancellor Lawrence Kimpton and Trustees led by Glen Lloyd, Laeld Bell, Gaylord Donnelley—residents who helped together in the SECC, and other neighborhood groups that at first supported him and later often attacked him, and most of all a committed, courageous Mayor Daley.

Julian would tell us over and over again that to be successful that the stability of the neighborhood has to be linked to the aca-
demic mission of the institution. There is a real university here, unlike other universi-
ties that are a lot of parts and pieces without cohesion. Our neighborhood is the glue that makes this cohesion possible because, again unlike other places, the faculty live here in large numbers. They share more than work; they share living.

When Edward Levi asked me to return to the University in 1971, he said one of my tasks was to do the same thing with Julian. Julian understood that people would not think that the two brothers were engaged in fraternal pillaging to get things together behind the scenes. Of course everyone did. How could you think otherwise about these clever descen-
dants of rabbis—both their father and grand-
father—these two intellectually acute, intel-
lectually honest leaders? Edward, the younger, was more subtle in his ways than his older brother who was ferociously visible. Edward saw things in shades of gray, Julian, sharply defined. Both in different ways had saved the University they loved. Julian planned and implemented the neighbor-
hood strategy that enabled the institution to survive in its physical environment. Edward recreated its standing as one of the nation’s premier research universities and steered it steadily and calmly through the years of the student troubles while his colleague presi-
dents were calling in the civil police and rending their campuses by these and other
impulsive acts.

Julian was the older brother in many ways to Edward and Harry. He was the older brother who arranged for the young professor Edward and his bride, Kate, to honeymoon at the Mexican home of his father-in-law, Milton Reynolds. Many years later he asked the mayor to line up the Illinois delegation for his brother’s confer-
eration hearings as attorney general. Through his life he was the concerned uncle to his nieces and nephews, much as he was devoted to his own children and grandchil-
dren. I mention it here, because most of us had little opportunity to observe or experi-
ence this side of Julian. We knew only the angry Prophet Isaiah and not the private Julian who felt deeply about his loved ones and friends, like A. N. Pritzker (with whom he and Marjee traveled the world). Janet and Andrew Davie, David and Mary Von Hoffman, John Davie, Abe Heflin, the Daley family, and many, many others. He was always willing to help, to think through our problems and find
solutions.

For those who accused Julian of racism and still speak about those years as though Julian rode through them in a white shoe, I say that their disdain and disappointment is misplaced. And class and race are and remain the major issues affecting the great American research uni-
versities like Yale, Columbia, Penn, Chi-
cago, and others located in urban settings. But you won’t find any really integrated communities in this country, other than Hyde Park around the University of Chi-
cago. None of them had a Julian Levi.

The ideal of a society in which race and class are not the issues that overpower our relationships concerned Julian throughout his life. He was the co-author of the White House Task Force Report on the Cities submitted to Lyndon Johnson in 1967, a report which formed the basis of the Kerner Commission Report that followed the 1968 riots. The task force report had one major theme—the “overriding problem of our cit-
ties is segregation by race and income,” and it called for solutions based on the tenets of economic and racial integration. Its propos-
als to President Johnson have been repeated in sociology and neighborhood change, but those on jobs showed up recently again in a book entitled The Disappearance of Work. Not new stuff, Julian said on the telephone only two weeks before he died. He gave us an agenda to accomplish what we call “fair-
ness,” an agenda yet to be used.

Remember that the Hyde Park of Julian’s birth and education was different than the Hyde Park he found in 1932. He mar-
ted the changes. He returned to Hyde Park in the 1960s and 1970s to see the change
in-law大纲s and keep the patent for ballpoint pens, and engaged, as only Julian could, in dozens of other hard-fought legal successes. The courts must have been inter-
ted with the carcasses of those engage-
ments. But he was bored and craved a larger challenge. He got one. He wasn’t educated in sociology and neighborhood change, but he wasn’t blind. He had an overpowering intellect. As some of you know, when he grasped a problem, he ate it whole, and then spat out solutions that ranged from new federal and state legislation that enabled cities to take properties by eminent domain to suing landlords who violated building and zoning codes. In 1959, he drafted Sec-
tion 112 of the Federal Housing Act, a key to the success of urban renewal here and in communities around the country and also to some of the crowning public works achievements of Mayor Daley. The section enabled the city to receive federal credits for dollars that institutions like the University expended on the neighborhood and related capital projects. Thus, the $36 million the University spent from its endowment on the neighborhood resulted in millions of dollars in federal credits to Chicago. (And, by the way, the $36 million was 10 percent of the University’s endowment in those days.)

The sociologist Edward Shils used to say that you knew Julian had been there by the doors. He meant the old double apartments like Towers, as we call it, the double apartment building in the middle of 55th Street; the failure to do something creative with the

Midway Plazaissance as the architect Eero Saarinen had proposed; the lack of follow-
through by the universities to create a Na-
tional Periodical Lending Library on our

Campus. But overall, Hyde Park A and B were successful. They were not accomplished without controversy, but Julian was un-
flinching and so were Chancellor Kimpton and the Trustees who stood with him.

Among those who fought him, in addi-
tion to those within the neighborhood, were Monsignor John Egan, then working in the Back of the Yards community, and Nicho-
las Von Hoffman, a community organizer working with Egan. They met privately with Julian to demand an assurance that poor blacks relocated from Hyde Park would not move into the white parishes. Julian sent them off in disgust, saying relocation if and when it occurred would go to the poor and the Asian—would have to be handled by the city and not by him or the University. It was too late in any event. Change already was occurring in South Shore. St. Philip Neri quickly turned into an all-black parish even before the Hyde Park program began. In Hyde Park, middle-class blacks were as concerned as the white population about the high crime rate and the conversions of apartments into sweatshops. They were angry at what they perceived as their color, wanted as they do today good schools for their kids, a gang-free environ-
ment, good shopping, and parks. You name it. Your race does not change your needs or the standards you demand for your family. For all of his rough demeanor, Julian under-
stood this, and he worked to make it hap-
pen. Julian took a lot of heat when he led the planning and implementation of urban re-
newal in the 1950s and 1960s. I have never heard Marjee complain, know Bill and Kay, his children, were taunted and occasionally threatened when they walked to school. He had courage. He was a risk taker. For him, not taking risks was accepting failure.

At the height of the controversy before the urban renewal program was approved by the Trustees, Julian brought in the demog-
ographer Phil Hauser, former head of the U.S. Census Bureau, to meet with the Trustee Executive Committee. Hauser said if you did nothing the trends would be irrevers-
able. What guarantees if you intervened? he was asked. No guarantees, Julian inter-
rupped. Hauser agreed. The Trustees voted to proceed. (And months later, after weeks of demonstrations and debate, Mayor Daley led the City Council in a 43 to 0 vote in favor of the program. It was a risk he also was convinced you had to.)

Of course Julian had influence beyond Hyde Park. He was a teacher, and many of his students, friends, and colleagues in Chicago and the country followed his disciplines in the way they approach pub-
lic policy issues. In his seminars, his students became his colleagues in drafting some of the most important municipal and state legislation and regulations, including, with Bernard Meltzer, a new landlord-tenant law. He developed changes in the tax code that led to the creation of tax credits. Julian crafted an amendment to the National De-
fense Act that removed the requirement that universities administer a loyalty oath to
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students who apply for government loans. He became a special consultant to the American Association of Universities and the American Council on Education on federal policy as it affected higher education. Julian served as Chairman of the Chicago Plan Commission, and then the Mayor also asked him to head a special commission to protect low-income citizens suckered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to purchase foreclosed homes throughout the city. Speculators purchased the better units. But homes selling for anywhere from $2,000 to $10,000 were being advertised by the government and sold to lower-middle-class families who then were unable to afford to fix them up or keep them up. The families would be ruined financially, wiped out. Julian not only ran the City’s Home Rehabilitation Office, but also insisted on paying rent for the space it occupied in City Hall.

He was not a free market man in the Chicago tradition. He forged a unique partnership between public and private sectors, a hallmark of our city’s success in dealing with its problems. In his last years, Julian thought again that as a nation “we are afflicted with the problem of race, which is a national failure in our history that we’ve never really faced. People’s willingness or unwillingness to accept others of different race and culture are a reflection of their social values.” He went on, “It’s a matter of trying to reach for whatever the prevailing economic and social forces are that will bring you to where you want to be, and that is something that you constantly, constantly have to work at. If you don’t, then market forces take your destiny away from you. That’s the challenge that anybody who is looking at the long term future of an institution has to worry about. It’s both a challenge, threat, and an opportunity.” He was talking about public schools. He was excited about what he had heard about the changes Mayor Richard M. Daley is making. He was also talking about colleges and universities and the role they must play in their communities. He was talking about neighborhoods and cities.

Princeton University presented the Rockefeller Public Service Award to Julian and Arthur Brazier in 1977. These two outstanding leaders became colleagues, partners in trying to improve the public schools in Woodlawn and revitalize the Woodlawn community. Dr. Brazier, with Mayor Richard M. Daley’s help, is carrying on these projects successfully in our time. Princeton cited Julian for his “energy, sensitivity, and know-how” leading to “one of the finest examples of an integrated residential and commercial district in a major U.S. metropolitan city.”

Well, I guess I would challenge them to find another such district and all of us to find another Julian Levi.

Julian Levi lived a full and purposeful life. We benefited from it. Generations will. We should and I personally thank Marje, Bill, and Kay for all the time with him they sacrificed for us, for our university, its neighborhood, and its magnificent city.

Jonathan Kleinbard worked closely with Julian Levi for nearly thirty years, during twenty-one of those years as vice-president of the University of Chicago.