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A warm welcome to the new academic year. The Class of 2007, whose members are now matriculating into the College, consists of 1,172 members. One hundred and two students (1%) were admitted to the College, numbers 1,172 first-year students. This represents the largest and most diverse entering class of students in the history of the College, and it is also the size at which we will remain in order to achieve and maintain our goal of a College of 4,500 students. The total population of the College is now 4,375 students, almost 1,000 more students than we had ten years ago, in the autumn of 1993. The challenges that we have success- fully addressed this academic year in teach- ing our first-year students are a reasonable measure of the challenges that our general education program will continue to face in years to come, as we sustain a College of 4,500 students.

The 1,172 members of the Class of 2007 were admitted from 8,100 applicants, of whom 400 were admitted. They join a College with a total enrollment of approximately 4,375 students. In compar-ison, the Class of 2006 was drawn from the top 5 percent of their high school class, and the Class of 2007 was drawn from the top 5 percent of their high school class, but also to the College faculty and staff, who continue to deliver on our promise of a rigorous education and a stimulating, engaging academic and cultural commu- nity.

Along with their numbers and their com- petitiveness, the academic preparedness of our students has also increased. In the fall of 1999, when the Class of 2003 entered the College, the middle 50 percent of our admitted students had SAT scores in the range from 1270 to 1440. For this year’s admitted students, the middle 50 percent of SAT scores is 1340 to 1510. Forty-three percent of the Class of 2003 was drawn from the top 5 percent of their high school class, but for the Class of 2007 that figure has risen to 58 percent. We should take pride in the quality of the students who have chosen to join our community, and equally we can take pride in the quality of education that we provide to them. Our goal in the years to come must be to maintain and to enhance that level of achievement in the context of the opportu- nities and the challenges presented to us by the increase in size and quality that our College is now enjoying.

One of the least predictable features of the first-year students is their ability to adjust to the academic and social life of the College. We have seen this adjustment process at work in our classes, and we have seen it at work in the College programming offices. The College Programming Office has created a Web-based system to help the first-year students focus on the essential elements of their academic lives. We have also seen an increase in the number of students who have chosen to take advantage of the opportunities for learning and growth that are available to them in the College.

The College Programming Office has also included in our calculations the Gradu- ate School of Business classrooms that will be available as a result of the GSB's move to the Woodward Court site in the fall of 2004 and possible other rooms that the College may be able to purchase or lease. We are also planning to add the additional classroom space on the first floor of Harper, made available by the move of the Art History Program (and Rosenwald). Our study will further examine the possible consequences of our re- turning the arts and sciences classrooms in Judd Hall to the control of the Laboratory Schools, an action which the Laboratory Schools’ leadership has eagerly requested.

The College Programming Office has completed another excellent academic year. This fall it mounted a very well received Orien- tation Week and an extremely successful Family Weekend, which saw over onethou- sand parents return to campus. Many par- ents and other family members have commented on how welcoming and sup- portive their experience appears to them, and I believe that such expressions of con- fidence and good will are vitally important to us as we look to the future and to our history. This year’s Orientation also in- volved a new diversity training experience, consisting of a compelling video presenta- tion, in which the College makes a conscious effort to address the issues of diversity and follow by small discussion ses- sions. The video can be seen by contacting Bil M. Chen, Assistant Vice Presi- dent for Enrollment Management and Admissions of the College.

We also held a new event for College seniors this fall, gathering the entire class of seniors in Alumni Hall to help them focus on the essential tasks before them in finishing their senior...
academic projects and course work in a timely way and getting a solid start on plans for after graduation.

Chicago Academic Support Services (CASS) initiated a comprehensive annual survey of graduating seniors and returning students in the spring of 2003. The results of this survey will be presented in a number of contexts for students, faculty, and administrators throughout the coming academic year. The College Council will hear a presentation on this survey at its November meeting. Over the next several years we hope to benefit from a growing body of longitudinal data about our students created by these surveys. For this year, it is interesting to learn from the survey’s preliminary results that as of May 2003, 22 percent of the graduating Class of 2003 was headed for graduate school in the fall, 34 percent had already secured full-time employment, and 44 percent had not yet known what they would be doing. Believe it or not, these are encouraging results given the poor job market, and we look forward to the follow-up results on the Class of 2004.

Student Life and Culture Reporting on a College housing development, generated by a committee chaired by Dennis Huttchinson, gave our housing system some positive strategic directions, and I am grateful to Dennis and the many other colleagues who contributed to that effort. This fall’s public discussion of the future of Shoreland Hall should clarify many significant issues, but for now I refer to what I said in extended remarks before the College Council last January, namely, that I believe that the University needs to develop a systematic plan for additional high-quality housing for our College students, that this housing should be constructed adjacent to (that is, within easy walking distance of) the campus, and that we should seek to increase our residential housing resources so that we can house at least 70 percent of our 4,500 College students. It is also worth noting, in anticipation of the outcome of the Shoreland discussion, that we are reinforcing comparable student living arrangements with our current policies regarding returning students who want to live in Palesky. The Palesky facility is extremely attractive, and it is a source of friction to forbear (even if for good programmatic reasons) so many of its residents to return.

This problem highlights the need to move aggressively forward with the modernization of campus housing and with the development of more attractive housing opportunities with an easy walking distance of the central quadrangles.

The College has raised $100 million to develop and modernize the overall goal of the current campaign, I remain very active in cultivating as many College alumni and alumnae as possible and working on the funding of our regular work on behalf of college fund raising, we hosted a College Retreat this fall for potential major donors, which featured a study of The University of Chicago finances and faculty teaching, and which elicited from most of those in attendance renewed interest in the University of Chicago education and very positive impressions about the current state of the College and about the incredible quality of our College students.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the superlative teaching that our faculty, offer to our students. In some cases we were able to acknowledge distinguished teaching in a traditionally formal and public way. This past year, for example, five colleagues received Ouannelli Awards: Edward M. Cook, jr.; Susan Goldin-Meadow; M unir Humayun; Christina von Nolcken; and Bernard Roszman. Russell Tuttle of the Department of Anthropology also received the African Anthropological Association/ M Graw-Hill Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching. But so much more excellent teaching occurs in quiet, often little-noticed ways as a part of our regular enterprise as teachers and scholars. Indeed, great teaching fills this university each day and each week, occurring in many and diverse places—in classrooms, laboratories, offices, in small groups, in large classes; in formal and in informal settings. All of this good work creates the intense, densely woven intellectual culture of our University, one that enshrines and strengthens the heart of the education we offer. The basic character of our University itself depends heavily on the renowned educational practices of the College for its core identity. Those who would ignore the importance of successful faculty teaching in the College for the future welfare of the University make a profound miscalculation about what it will take to sustain a great American research university in the twenty-first century. For all of your efforts I want to thank you, on behalf of our students.

Perhaps the most important event of this past academic year was the war in Iraq. Given the importance of the subject, I would like to comment briefly on some reflections on the role of the University of Chicago in war in the twentieth century.

The University and the War

This past academic year our nation went to war. For our campus the war broke out during spring break, and within two weeks of the start of the new quarter it was over. The run-up to the war took place over several months, and many on our campus had decided opinions about the actions of our government, pro and con. The peace that follows the war will be protracted and costly in human life and national wealth, but the war itself was mercifully brief. Wars are often important catalysts of social change, and big wars frequently produce big change. World War I and World War II profoundly influenced the basic institutions of American society, and this was no less the case for our University. Wars are rarely conducted in the ways their planners and commanders had imagined, and often take huge gambles, sorely tempting the unintended consequences of human action. Sometimes, the outcomes of war are worse than expected. For example, the First World War, sometimes referred to as the Peace that Ended All Wars, left Russia in a state of civil war, and yet our expectations about the future are never more fragile and subjective error in times of war.

When the European War broke out in August 1914, most American academics sided with Britain and France, especially in the name of free-market capitalism in Belgium. Yet having sympathy with the Entente powers did not necessarily mean advocating American intervention in the war. This involved a much more complicated set of assessments. On our campus, faculty members were divided over the war. Some faculty members supported Woodrow Wilson’s regime of neutrality, all the while hoping for a Franco-British victory. Others were eager that the United States join the conflict as soon as possible. For the small minority of faculty who were sympathetic to Germany, the war was both a horrible and a frustrating experience. In December 1916, classical William G. Hale circulated among his faculty colleagues a petition to Woodrow Wilson protesting German deportations of Belgian civilians from their hometowns. Starr Cutting, the Chairman of the German Department, refused to sign Hale’s petition because he considered it an action that “under the circumstances seems[s] to me a prostitution of the name of the institution to a mania of neutrality and partisanship.” Since it is unfortunately not the first attempt to coerce the universities of our country into partisan support of one of the warring parties in Europe, I strongly disapprove of the effort to take the name of our educational institutions in vain.

Cutting reminded Hale raised some fundamental questions. Is a university obligated to be “neutral” and “nonpartisan” in time of war? If so, does the rule of neutrality apply only in wars in which America is not involved, or does its efficacy cease when our nation itself becomes implicated in a war? If it does not, does the rule of neutrality apply both when we are neutral and when we are involved in a war? Hale further raised the question of a university in time of war? Are we the equivalent of an appliance factory or an automobile plant, to be mobilized for educational war production? Are we small? (a) What is the equivalent of the War Department in the university? (b) How is the President of the university in time of war? Who is the equivalent of an orthopedic surgeon? What is the equivalent of a hospital? What is the equivalent of the War Department?

In the context of the University of Chicago in the early 1910s, many of these questions became very relevant. The run-up to the war took place over several months, and many on our campus had decided opinions about the actions of our government, pro and con. The peace that follows the war will be protracted and costly in human life and national wealth, but the war itself was mercifully brief. Wars are often important catalysts of social change, and big wars frequently produce big change. World War I and World War II profoundly influenced the basic institutions of American society, and this was no less the case for our University. Wars are rarely conducted in the ways their planners and commanders had imagined, and often take huge gambles, sorely tempting the unintended consequences of human action. Sometimes, the outcomes of war are worse than expected. For example, the First World War, sometimes referred to as the Peace that Ended All Wars, left Russia in a state of civil war, and yet our expectations about the future are never more fragile and subjective error in times of war.
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Simultaneously, women students organized a nongovernmental Woman Student Training Corps that enrolled four hundred women at the University of Chicago in 1916 and seven hundred by mid-October. A Mass induction meeting was held on October 11. Women were given the option of wearing uniforms, and all wore a special armband that had the insignia of the organization. The group hoped to help win the war by having its members devote blocks of hourly work to defense causes each week. Women were also to drill, and nineteen women were commissioned as student officers to conduct the drills.67

Since the SATC was a national training program, the universities were forced to open admission to a wider cut of prospect usive students from their regions, in addition to regularly enrolled students. According to the Registrar’s statistics, 1,007 students joined the SATC program at the University of Chicago. Of this number, several hundred were not regular students but had been recruited via public advertisements in Chicago newspapers inviting high school graduates eighteen years and older to enroll in late September. The attrition rate for this group was high, and many of them returned in the Winter Quarter.70 In a confidential memo in January, Chairman Andrew MacLaughlin cautioned, “Please remember that these lectures are to be somewhat more simple than in an ordinary college course. You will have to cooperate but in the end became negative about the program. “The impossible charac- ter of the course, the policy of making groups wholly unsympathetic attitude of many of the younger officers—men in many cases of far more years than the women who had drawn upon, and lack of education—made it increasingly diffi- cult to preserve a satisfactory attitude on the part of the faculty.” He concluded that “[t]he outcome of this situation was the conviction on the part of many members of the faculty that a combination of military and academic work was impracticable.”66

When the issue of renewing the wartime ROTC program on a postwar basis came before the Board of Trustees in late 1918, James Angell was forced to admit that while President Judson was a steady enthalist, the faculty were “decidedly opposed” to renewing the program in pacifism.71 Judson was able to get his way, however, and an ROTC field artillery unit was created under the aegis of a Department of Military Science which was (after 1930) generally referred to as the Division of Military Sciences. The ROTC unit remained at the University of Chicago until the War Department transferred it to Michigan State University in 1936. “As early as 1924–25, the leaders of the ROTC program complained about “[t]he apparent attitude of indecision as to whether the Military De- partment has a place at the University” and “[t]he lack of active support by the faculty members.”72 Hutchins, successor, Ernest D. Witt Burton, felt conflicted about han- ming a military science unit on campus, but was not inclined to force the issue. To a correspondent who accused the unit of fostering militarism, Burton admitted, “Un- able as yet to reach a clear decision as to precisely what the course of the University should be, I felt it wise to maintain [the] status quo.”73

ROTC’s final years on campus were marked by falling student enrollments and increasingly inadequate facilities, as well as by the indifference of senior officials in the Hutchins administration who refused to encourage students to take military science courses over any of the many other elec- tives available under the New Plan curricu- lum of 1931.74 Harry Pratt Judson Leads the Way

The moral and logical leader of the University’s war efforts was Harry Pratt Judson. At first glance, Judson’s energetic involvement in the war was a surprising turn of events, given his campus-wide reputa- tion for caution and circumspection. Yet Judson was among the most partisan of those who before 1917 wished to pursue the war, and after 1917 he was the most eager to engineer a total mobilization of campus resources in its support. Harry Pratt Judson is one of our forget- ten heroes. When he (1856 to 1923) was longer than that of any of our Presidents except Robert H. Hutchins. Judson was born in 1856. He graduated from Williams College with a B.A. in 1870 (from which he also took an M.A. in 1883) and worked as a teacher and a high school principal for fifteen years in Troy, New York. As an immigrant, Judson was a constitutional historian with an interest in national history and international law. His books on modern European and American history were balanced and meticulously executed, manifesting such a phrase as ‘permanent retention’.”87 Judson’s own soft imperialism bore many similarities to the attitudes he would so openly criticize in his German opponents after 1916. When asked several months before America’s entrance into World War I if he favored the permanent retention of the Philippines, he replied, “It has always seemed to me advisable to keep the Philip- pine Islands until the people there are suffi- ciently developed to be able to administer their own affairs. That time in my opinion will not come for two or three generations. It seems to me hardly necessary to interpret such statements as indicating that he opposed the United States’ rights, opposing federal aid to educa- tion, and, logically, also opposing a na- tional prohibition of alcohol.89 As University President, Judson cultivated and flattered wealthy Chicagoans upon whom the University depended for support. According to Sten Diner, he was “so opposed to labor unions, had mixed feelings about women’s suffrage, was a strict construc- tionist in relation to the role of the federal government, and was proud of it. Judson’s views of race relations were also bewildered, almost the opposite of his fellow Chicago historian Hermann von Holst, although on this score he was probably no worse than Woodrow Wilson himself. He was also resentful of the toilfulness of faculty members who worked hard for the University. Von Holst, Diner calls him with considerable justice a “man of limited intellectual vi- sion.”90

In his presidential address for the first H. E. Professor of History, urged against the “slavish imitation of foreign ideas” and insisting that “American schol- arship” had “an intellectual atmosphere as a whole wasprisingly different from those of Germany. The motives, methods, and spirit of an Ameri- can department of history . . . would in many essentials be radically antagonistic to those of a German university.” But Judson also resisted the fact that a German na- tional department of history . . . would lead a department of which he, Judson, would be a member: I did not know of a foreigner at the head of such a department in an American University. It seems to me that departments involving Ameri- can history, American literature, and American politics should be in charge of Americans, if possible. Personally, I must confess that I don’t fancy having to work under a German. I doubt if many American professors would.91

Judson also opposed Hermann von Holst’s stance against the legitimacy of American imperialism in the late 1890s, and argued that the United States had a greater role for American power in the world.92 Ironically, Judson’s own soft imperialism bore many similarities to the attitudes he would so openly criticize in his German opponents after 1916. When asked several months before America’s entrance into World War I if he favored the permanent retention of the Philippines, he replied, “It has always seemed to me advisable to keep the Philip- pine Islands until the people there are suffi- ciently developed to be able to administer their own affairs. That time in my opinion will not come for two or three generations. It seems to me hardly necessary to interpret such statements as indicating that he opposed the United States’ rights, opposing federal aid to educa- tion, and, logically, also opposing a na- tional prohibition of alcohol.93 As University President, Judson cultivated and flattered wealthy Chicagoans upon whom the University depended for support. According to Sten Diner, he was “so opposed to labor unions, had mixed feelings about women’s suffrage, was a strict construc- tionist in relation to the role of the federal government, and was proud of it. Judson’s views of race relations were also bewildered, almost the opposite of his fellow Chicago historian Hermann von Holst, although on this score he was probably no worse than Woodrow Wilson himself. He was also resentful of the toilfulness of faculty members who worked hard for the University. Von Holst, Diner calls him with considerable justice a “man of limited intellectual vi- sion.”94

Yet his friends and supporters inter- preted his phlegmatic personality in a more positive light. James Tufts remembered him as “reflective, cautious, taking few risks, and having a genial, kindly manner with ‘sound practical judgment . . . [who] was neverest forward, most conservative. He preferred to be seen as a member of that genera-
tion of older American educational and cultural leaders in 1914 about whom Henry Mayer has suggested, "The earliest and most consistent didacticists who expressed this particular brand of national defense were the失败ed defenders of nineteenth-century tradition, and particularly the professional custodians of culture... Nearly all the leading men of letters, the college presidents, the old-line publishers, the editors of standard magazines, and their friends knew where they stood from the start." On matters of national security, Judson proved to be extremely aggressive. Judson had a lifelong interest in military affairs. Too young to fight in the Civil War, Judson tried to enlist as a drummer boy in the Union Army. The Civil War was a living war for him, and it affected his thinking. The American businessman wrote to him in December 1916, Judson wrote to Harvard Professor Albert Mathews, "[T]here is a move- ment on foot in which I am interested to register all members of the faculty who are interested in the success of the peace movement (in vain) a war loan for Germany and its submarine warfare, in which Berlin offered to the University of Chicago, namely, one of the most partisan decisions ever made by Bernstorff's embassy staff. Bernstorff was in fact opposed both to the establishment of a democratic Germany.110 Yet, given that the Zimmermann Affair had occurred a full year before, what explains Judson's timing in rescinding Bernstorff's honorary degree in 1917? There are two possible explanations. First, in late February 1918 the Senate Judiciary Committee began holding wet-publicized hear- ings into the activities of the National German-American Alliance in which one super-patriotic senator, Joseph Woolcott of Connecticut, urged the committee to resubmit the decision of March 1918 to revoke the degree, arguing that "[S]ince Count von Bernstorff was given his passports by the Government of the United States it has been made public that the said Imperial German Ambassador was long before that time engaged in transactions intrinsic to the rights of this country as a neutral and in violation of the laws and the peace of the order of the Republic of which he was a guest." Judson further insisted, lest his proposal be seen as ven- geance against Germany as a result of the declaration of war in April 1917, that the revocation was not a retaliation against Germany in time of war, but came about because Bernstorff's actions before April 1917 were "contrary to peace and order of the Republic, and inimical to the rights of the United States as a neutral nation."112 Bernstorff's role in the Zimmermann Tele- gram affair of February and March 1917, the Zimmermann Telegram by Alfred Zimmermann himself, who, unwilling to admit that Germany's secret telegraphic codes had been compromised, continued to blame the United States for the fault in the disclosure of the secret telegram because of a security compromise perpetuated by Bernstorff's embassy staff. Judson also believed that the story of man has no epoch in which war has not existed. The history of war is the history of the development of the human and the military, and Judson embraced the Great War. His early public statements about the war were carefully neutral, but privately his sympath- ies were with the Allies, and he became a leader of the pro-peace and pro-peace movement. Judson joined the pro-preparedness National Security League in 1915, and became a member of the executive committee of its Chicago branch. He believed that "lawlessness and lack of national defense are so interwoven as to be serious dangers. Effort to prevent each aids to secure the other. The National Security League in my opinion is a defense league.... We are already in a state of emergency. The time to take our stand is at hand, and not to leave me behind them."
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in every nation. . . . The relations of men will have to be reaj usted and the differences between capital and labor will have to be smoothed out. And great changes will occur in our conceptions of government, even in our own nation. . . . Our universities will also change. There will be new fields to study, new fields to conquer, and new fields to glory in. Our attitude toward each other will change, we will be more altruistic, more unselfish, more capable.111

The war did bring about enormous de
graphic changes, as former students clamor ed to return to the University's de
g degree programs and new students sought admission to colleges and graduate schools. University of Chicago enrollments took a decisive upward turn during and after the 1918-19 academic year. In 1913-14, the University had 1,766 undergraduate stu
dents, whereas by 1918-19 the number had increased to 1,996 and in 1919-20 to 2,112. By 1920, and the undergraduate population stood at 2,970, an increase over
terials of about 60 percent. Graduate
eelations followed the same pattern of
g robust growth, increasing from 500 stu
dents in 1913-14 to 696 in 1919-20 and 1,513 in 1929-30.122 Many of these stu
dents were aided by grants from a new
Noyes Scholarships, 316 undergraduates
ships. By 1921, 525 students were receiving
inviting them to apply for these scholar
ships.123

The University having resumed its
admission to colleges and graduate schools.

Responding to an invitation of the curricu
lum committee for the arts and sciences
in 1923 to comment about the future struc
ture of undergraduate instruction, the fac
ulty of the Department of History listed as
their first choice “the elimination of the
Junior College, either by a gradual process,
their first choice "the elimination of the
Senior college, and within six
ations in Persia for the Armenian and Syrian
finding commission to survey social condi
tions.124

On learning of the University’s action, one of
Judson’s local political friends con
gratulated him on a “fitting and patriotic
act, suggesting that the decision was indeed
taken for publicistic purposes.119

In addition to his advocacy of the war on
campus, Judson was appointed to be a
member of the committee on labor of the
National Council on Defense, and other war
time service groups, including service on
the调剂ment of the campus, and within six

in the 1920s and 1930s cannot

The Tenth of the War
The sudden armistice and the collapse of the
SALT Tascio prevented the total milita
rization of the University’s life. The long
months life began to return to normal. But
the war did have long-term consequences,
both for the University and for Harry Pratt
Judson.

In May 1917, a student writing in the
Maroon had predicted that the war would
transform local and national society:

but cannot be content with a policy of
shift, but must take a long look ahead.131

Having sanctioned the idea of these insti
tutes, Judson did little or nothing to find
the money to create them, however, and this
sense of inertia caused frustration among
many senior faculty members. When Robert
M. Illikkan resigned from Chicago in June
1921 to go to the new California Institute of
Technology because of Judson’s dithering
and refusal to match the latter institution’s
offer, the writer was on the wall.132

These heightened ambitions and expec
tations on the part of faculty researchers
came at the same moment that financial
and demographic challenges appeared on
the postwar horizon. The inflation of the
war led to a reduction of the value of
education, and competition from other uni
versities displaced the University’s domi
nant prewar position on senior faculty salaries. By 1923, Chicago had seriously
lost its second place to Harvard and Columbia in the
world of higher education. Between 1918 and
1923, the University fell below
in the number of employees
and applications for admission to the University’s de
The University having resumed its
admission to colleges and graduate schools.

In May 1917, a student writing in the
Maroon had predicted that the war would
transform local and national society:

"Great changes must occur in the
social and economic life of the people"
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...under Harker's brilliant superstructure, permitted him to stay on for five or six years too long. Burton had been 63 when he left, but he had made it to what he called his "fifteen year in office," beginning, as had Judson. He was a great scholar, had a scholar's point of view, and knew how the scholars of the University had suffered for five years (i.e., since 1918). Therefore he was on fire to get the faculty back to research and scholarship.

When Harry Pratt Judson died in 1927, he was mourned by old friends and colleagues, but on campus he was already a forgotten figure. Although the University announced a memorial service in his honor, it was never held.

Hutchins and the Second World War

The young radical Louis Wirth was right about the flawed pieces: Versailles in 1919, if for the wrong reasons. Whatever one thinks about Woodrow Wilson's signalius (Paris in 1918−19 or about the peace at the end of the final peace settlement, Versailles ushered in neither an era of stable democracy nor an epoch of lasting peace. Indeed, Europe in the 1920s and early 1930s became the scene of enormous social turmoil and dangerous political extremism, and out of this squall mixture of class and racial hatred erupted renewed international violence in the mid-1930s. This failed heritage of the Great War led, on the part of many Americans, to a revulsion against mass killing and to an ardent desire to avoid entrapment in another major conflict. Yet the rise of fascism and National Socialism created the preconditions for a second, even more deadly round of international conflict which was to draw America into its vortex of horror in late 1941.

World War II was, however, a different kind of war, and the University of Chicago had a different kind of war President. Whereas Harry Pratt Judson embraced isolationism as a precondition for the future, Robert Maynard Hutchins advanced the proposition of peace. The two themes played off well against each other, as had Judson. He was a great scholar, had a scholar's point of view, and knew how the scholars of the University had suffered for five years (i.e., since 1918). Therefore he was on fire to get the faculty back to research and scholarship.

When Harry Pratt Judson died in 1927, he was mourned by old friends and colleagues, but on campus he was already a forgotten figure. Although the University announced a memorial service in his honor, it was never held.
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The young radical Louis Wirth was right about the flawed pieces: Versailles in 1919, if for the wrong reasons. Whatever one thinks about Woodrow Wilson's signalius (Paris in 1918−19 or about the peace at the end of the final peace settlement, Versailles ushered in neither an era of stable democracy nor an epoch of lasting peace. Indeed, Europe in the 1920s and early 1930s became the scene of enormous social turmoil and dangerous political extremism, and out of this squall mixture of class and racial hatred erupted renewed international violence in the mid-1930s. This failed heritage of the Great War led, on the part of many Americans, to a revulsion against mass killing and to an ardent desire to avoid entrapment in another major conflict. Yet the rise of fascism and National Socialism created the preconditions for a second, even more deadly round of international conflict which was to draw America into its vortex of horror in late 1941.

World War II was, however, a different kind of war, and the University of Chicago had a different kind of war President. Whereas Harry Pratt Judson embraced isolationism as a precondition for the future, Robert Maynard Hutchins advanced the proposition of peace. The two themes played off well against each other, as had Judson. He was a great scholar, had a scholar's point of view, and knew how the scholars of the University had suffered for five years (i.e., since 1918). Therefore he was on fire to get the faculty back to research and scholarship.

When Harry Pratt Judson died in 1927, he was mourned by old friends and colleagues, but on campus he was already a forgotten figure. Although the University announced a memorial service in his honor, it was never held.

Hutchins and the Second World War

The young radical Louis Wirth was right about the flawed pieces: Versailles in 1919, if for the wrong reasons. Whatever one thinks about Woodrow Wilson's signalius (Paris in 1918−19 or about the peace at the end of the final peace settlement, Versailles ushered in neither an era of stable democracy nor an epoch of lasting peace. Indeed, Europe in the 1920s and early 1930s became the scene of enormous social turmoil and dangerous political extremism, and out of this squall mixture of class and racial hatred erupted renewed international violence in the mid-1930s. This failed heritage of the Great War led, on the part of many Americans, to a revulsion against mass killing and to an ardent desire to avoid entrapment in another major conflict. Yet the rise of fascism and National Socialism created the preconditions for a second, even more deadly round of international conflict which was to draw America into its vortex of horror in late 1941.

World War II was, however, a different kind of war, and the University of Chicago had a different kind of war President. Whereas Harry Pratt Judson embraced isolationism as a precondition for the future, Robert Maynard Hutchins took the exact opposite approach, becoming an eloquent spokesman for nonintervention in the European and Asian wars of the late 1930s.

In the 1930s, the American college campuses were marked by strong antiwar and pacifist movements, and the University of Chicago was no exception, with Chicago students organizing peace strikes, rallies, and parades from 1934 through 1941. Reacting against the horrors and disasters of the first war, many college-age students rejected the prospect of fighting in what they felt to be another round of futile and about the flawed pieces: Versailles in 1919, if for the wrong reasons. Whatever one thinks about Woodrow Wilson's signalius (Paris in 1918−19 or about the peace at the end of the final peace settlement, Versailles ushered in neither an era of stable democracy nor an epoch of lasting peace. Indeed, Europe in the 1920s and early 1930s became the scene of enormous social turmoil and dangerous political extremism, and out of this squall mixture of class and racial hatred erupted renewed international violence in the mid-1930s. This failed heritage of the Great War led, on the part of many Americans, to a revulsion against mass killing and to an ardent desire to avoid entrapment in another major conflict. Yet the rise of fascism and National Socialism created the preconditions for a second, even more deadly round of international conflict which was to draw America into its vortex of horror in late 1941.

World War II was, however, a different kind of war, and the University of Chicago had a different kind of war President. Whereas Harry Pratt Judson embraced isolationism as a precondition for the future, Robert Maynard Hutchins took the exact opposite approach, becoming an eloquent spokesman for nonintervention in the European and Asian wars of the late 1930s.

In the 1930s, the American college campuses were marked by strong antiwar and pacifist movements, and the University of Chicago was no exception, with Chicago students organizing peace strikes, rallies, and parades from 1934 through 1941. Reacting against the horrors and disasters of the first war, many college-age students rejected the prospect of fighting in what they felt to be another round of futile and
tional defense, but at the same time that it would “attempt to avoid doing a lot of the foolish things we undertook to do at the beginning of the First World War” and that the “best interests of defense would be served if, among other activities, the University undertook to maintain the integrity of its teaching and research programs, and that this in itself was no mean contribution to national defense.” Hutchins himself had insisted as early as 1936, when the War Department closed down its ROTC program for want of student interest, that the University might best serve the national defense by focusing on its capacities for “advanced training and research.”モン

Hutchins tried to enforce these propositions, and programs like the Civil Affairs Training School for the Far East, launched in August 1943, and the Institute for Metrology, started in October 1940, could be seen as examples of this model of wartime support. Of the Civil Affairs program that was expressly organized for over four hundred army and navy civilians in the field of anthropology, Hutchins’s second-in-command Ernest C. Willett would write September 8, 1943, that “the men have felt that the work done in this particular war training program came closest to the ideals of the University and its legitimate function.” The University hosted other military training programs as well, including a naval radio and signal training school that began in the fall of 1940 as a special training program for civilian sailors. These programs did not involve the University in the kind of total war.”

Hutchins also allowed the establishment of a special training program for civilian students which would blunt the danger of an SAT-C-like militarization of the curriculum. This was the Institute for Military Studies, organized in fall of 1940 as a preemptive response to the reactivation of a peacetime draft via the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. This institute provided voluntary, after-hours, and weekend training in military subjects to over ten thousand civilian students before it was closed down at the end of 1944, and in so doing helped to shield the core academic programs of the University.

Along with these voluntary programs, regular instruction continued at the University for civilian students enrolled in degree programs. Hutchins insisted that the special training programs for civilian students to cultivate liberal education and to undertake basic research were “centrally relevant to the war effort, and the timing of Pearl Harbor was a spur to us to immediately carry forward what we had proposed in 1942, in the aftermath of the declarations of war on Japan and Germany.”

Hutchins suddenly and with considerable drama proposed to the faculty that the A.B. degree be transferred from the jurisdiction of the undergraduate division into that of the graduate division. This would confer upon completion of a four-year program in general education beginning with grade eleven, thus making it possible for Chicago to graduate eighteen- or nineteen-year-olds with an A.B. degree. After protracted discussion, the University Senate approved this proposal on January 22, 1942, creating the opportunity for Hutchins’s supporters, led by the dean of the College of Liberal Arts, to formulate a new, wholly mandated general education curriculum that excluded any departmental specialization. A last-ditch effort in early April 1942 by senior faculty led by Berndette Schmitt, Ernst W. Puttkammer, George Bogert, and several others to reverse the Senate’s earlier approval of the changes met with little success. The divisions to the College deadlocked in a fifty-eight-to-fifty-eight vote, with H Hutchins then ruling that the motion for rescission had failed. He acknowledged that the war meant that the time was ripe for this kind of activity, but it also helped to reaffirm the proposition that the University retained a civil educational mission in a time of total war. In the short term, Hutchins’s strategy of launching the new general-education College under the umbrella of the Graduate School seemed now to come true. In the long run, however, once the war was over, it was inevitable that the powerful departmental and divisional interests that had been excluded from undergraduate education by virtue of the reforms of 1942 would seek redress, if not outright vengeance.

Perhaps the most notable wartime development in Institutional Defense was one in which few students and faculty knew anything—the atomic research project led by Arthur H. Compton, Enrico Fermi, and other major scientists. At its zenith, the Metallurgical Laboratory employed two thousand scientists, and it signaled a new pattern of cooperation between the government and the University that would extend far beyond the conclusion of the war. In accepting the plutonium research project that Arthur Compton organized in early 1942, H Hutchins found himself caught between his own negative feelings about the military and his suspicions about government involvement in University affairs on the one hand and his responsibilities as the chief executive officer of the University on the other. Given the secrecy with which the Met Lab was organized, it is difficult to reconstruct exactly what H Hutchins knew about it at the time and how he felt about it at the time. It does seem likely that H Hutchins was given general briefings on the project, and it is instructive that the question of civilian training to be administered by Compton was invited by Compton to tour the Clinton Laboratories in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in December 1943. Filby is also reported to have visited the project in September 1942 that “[w]e will turn the University inside out if necessary to help win this war. Victory is much more important than survival in the nuclear era.”

H Hutchins was reported to have said that he would not have been said without backing by H Hutchins. Nor was H Hutchins sheeplish about exploiting the considerable human resources that the Manhattan Project had assembled in Chicago and elsewhere for the purpose of the pursuit of scientific research at the University, since on August 9, 1945, he announced his decision that the ten laboratories that would be founded at Chicago for postwar research in nuclear physics and in the study of the atom. Still, Leo Szilard reported in his memoirs that, as late as April 1945, H Hutchins was not aware of how close the scientists had come to producing an atomic bomb. Many years later, in May 1973, George Deli described to Harry A. Dore a conversation he had with H Hutchins on the atomic bomb project: “He said that he didn’t feel guilty. . . . about his role as a representative of the University, but as a human being and [in his] private role, he did feel guilty.” To which Ashmore responded:

That’s right, and that’s fairly characteristic. You see, again, that’s the old soul.” And so sensitive was the scientist to the country, to the institution, [the] decision was made to do this so then he had to do it, and it did extraordinarily well. Since it had to do with mass destruction he dreaded the fact that it had to be done, had serious doubts about whether it should be done. One time he gets into this when he talks about the effort to keep Truman from dropping the bomb, in which he was highly engaged.

With the atomic attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki as its finalite, the end of World War II left the campus in an uneasy mood. Many of the Metallurgical Laboratory scientists involved in this project were profoundly disturbed by the terms on which the war had ended. A report authored by James Franck, Eugene Rabinowitch, and other leading nuclear scientists at Chicago in early June 1945, urging the United States not to use the atomic bomb against Japan without first organizing a demonstration of the new weapon “on the desert or a barren island,” probably represented the opinion of the majority of Chicago scientists then working at the Met Lab.

Athur Compton’s poll of the attitudes of the Met Lab scientists on July 12, 1945, and Leo Szilard’s petition of July 17 signed by sixty-nine scientists urging a delay in the use of the bomb confirmed that a significant number of the project researchers at Chicago had serious doubts about an immediate deployment of the weapon against a civilian population center. Alice Kimball Smith has suggested that H Hiroshima was in fact “a shattering blow” to the scientists of the Met Lab who hoped that the bomb would not be used against Japan without first organizing a demonstration of the new weapon “on the desert or a barren island,” probably represented the opinion of the majority of Chicago scientists then working at the Met Lab.

To the end of his life H Hutchins insisted that Truman’s use of the bomb had been “incorrect and improper.” The war as the world ended it, and the peace the world obtained in the aftermath of the atom bomb, that brought to the world the four freedoms of human beings, and the four freedoms that we the courage and the wisdom to establish the four freedoms everywhere. . . .

If we go to war, and preserve the British Empire, and crush Germany, our fundamental problems will remain. We do not face our fundamental problems, by going to war, we evade them. We do not make a just and lasting peace by writing into another treaty the fear, ignorance and confusion that have marred our efforts to build a democratic community at home.

For those haunted by memories of 1918-19 who, in the summer of 1945, now opposed the use of atomic weapons, the talks were particularly ironic. Historian Robert Hutchins feared in the winter and spring of 1941—that a new war would end in peace—did not come true.

World Government and a Final Peace

Within days of the bombing of Hiroshima, H Hutchins participated in a University of Chicago Round Table discussion on NBC radio, entitled “Atomic Force: Its Meaning for the United States.” He filled the role of “world peacemaker,” setting it in the new democratic context of world peace after world war. He said that he didn’t feel guilty. . . . about his role as a representative of the University, but as a human being and [in his] private role, he did feel guilty.” To which Ashmore responded:

That’s right, and that’s fairly characteristic. You see, again, that’s the old soul.” And so sensitive was the scientist to the country, to the institution, [the] decision was made to do this so then he had to do it, and it did extraordinarily well. Since it had to do with mass destruction he dreaded the fact that it had to be done, had serious doubts about whether it should be done. One time he gets into this when he talks about the effort to keep Truman from dropping the bomb, in which he was highly engaged.

With the atomic attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki as its finalite, the end of World War II left the campus in an uneasy mood. Many of the Metallurgical Laboratory scientists involved in this project were profoundly disturbed by the terms on which the war had ended. A report authored by James Franck, Eugene Rabinowitch, and other leading nuclear scientists at Chicago in early June 1945, urging the United States not to use the atomic bomb against Japan without first organizing a demonstration of the new weapon “on the desert or a barren island,” probably represented the opinion of the majority of Chicago scientists then working at the Met Lab.

Athur Compton’s poll of the attitudes of the Met Lab scientists on July 12, 1945, and Leo Szilard’s petition of July 17 signed by sixty-nine scientists urging a delay in the use of the bomb confirmed that a significant number of the project researchers at Chicago had serious doubts about an immediate deployment of the weapon against a civilian population center. Alice Kimball Smith has suggested that H Hiroshima was in fact “a shattering blow” to the scientists of the Met Lab who hoped that the bomb would not be used against Japan without first organizing a demonstration of the new weapon “on the desert or a barren island,” probably represented the opinion of the majority of Chicago scientists then working at the Met Lab.

To the end of his life H Hutchins insisted that Truman’s use of the bomb had been “incorrect and improper.” The war as the world ended it, and the peace the world obtained in the aftermath of the atom bomb, that brought to the world the four freedoms of human beings, and the four freedoms that we the courage and the wisdom to establish the four freedoms everywhere. . . .

If we go to war, and preserve the British Empire, and crush Germany, our fundamental problems will remain. We do not face our fundamental problems, by going to war, we evade them. We do not make a just and lasting peace by writing into another treaty the fear, ignorance and confusion that have marred our efforts to build a democratic community at home.

For those haunted by memories of 1918-19 who, in the summer of 1945, now opposed the use of atomic weapons, the talks were particularly ironic. Historian Robert Hutchins feared in the winter and spring of 1941—that a new war would end in peace—did not come true.
reality what Hutchins had advocated in theory—to write a constitution for world government. They argued that the atomic bomb had ushered in a new era in human history: "The names and dates of Alamogordo and Hiroshima, July 16 and August 6, 1945, lost all meaning in whatever lyrical or controversial overphase they may have carried at first. The statement that there and then started a new era, was accepted almost unanimously as an obvious truth." For McKeon and Borgese, the future of this new era involved a stark choice: "few if any have questioned the validity of a dilemma whose alternatives are: a world supreme authority vested in a global organism—or world ruin." The solution to the dilemma of atomic terror was the formulation of "a world state which in your and our thought is the only alternative to world destruction." The University of Chicago was a particularly appropriate place to launch a movement for global rule, since it played a decisive role in ushering in the atomic age, whose birthplace and datemark well befit in Stagg Field, December 2, 1942 rather than in New M EXico or Honshu two and a half years later. There is no manifest destiny, but there is more than a symbolic value in the suggestion that the intelectual courage that split the atom should be called, on this very campus, to unite the world. An Institute of Nuclear Physics has been founded. We propose an Institute for World Government.117

Hutches agreed to sponsor such an effort, and a committee of distinguished University of Chicago faculty members—Robert McKeon, Philip L. Hall, John T. McKeon, Rexford Tugwell, Giuseppe Borgese, and others—joined with leading academics from elsewhere to craft the outlines of a government for the world. The committee met monthly at the Shoreland Hotel and in two locations in New York City between February and October 1945 and again from February to July 1947, and assessed a variety of political and legal issues, such as those involving federalism and centralism, human rights, electoral representation, and executive power. The debates were heady and sometimes acerbic, and intellectual disagreements between Borgese—who favored a unitarist world regime that might suppress state-based nationalism—and McKeon—who favored a more federalist structure that would have preserved more authority for the nation—were almost as acrimonious in the United Nations as they are now in NATO.118

The Draft was translated into forty different languages, including Chinese, Arabic, Hindi, and Russian, and it is estimated that its final circulation ran to over a million copies. Reactions to the Chicago world government proposal came from all over the world, and they were so diverse that it is difficult to justify the University of Chicago Press in publishing the Draft. The reaction of the United Nations was triumphant. The Draft was still forward looking in that it sought to displace the electoral power of individual national states with regional federations which, the authors hoped, would experience and profit from shared economic and cultural interests over time. The Draft was also translated into forty different languages, including Chinese, Arabic, Hindi, and Russian, and it is estimated that its final circulation ran to over a million copies. Reactions to the Chicago world government proposal came from all over the world, and they were so diverse that it is difficult to justify the University of Chicago Press in publishing the Draft. The reaction of the United Nations was triumphant. The Draft was still forward looking in that it sought to displace the electoral power of individual national states with regional federations which, the authors hoped, would experience and profit from shared economic and cultural interests over time.

The Draft was translated into forty different languages, including Chinese, Arabic, Hindi, and Russian, and it is estimated that its final circulation ran to over a million copies. Reactions to the Chicago world government proposal came from all over the world, and they were so diverse that it is difficult to justify the University of Chicago Press in publishing the Draft. The reaction of the United Nations was triumphant. The Draft was still forward looking in that it sought to displace the electoral power of individual national states with regional federations which, the authors hoped, would experience and profit from shared economic and cultural interests over time. The Draft was also translated into forty different languages, including Chinese, Arabic, Hindi, and Russian, and it is estimated that its final circulation ran to over a million copies. Reactions to the Chicago world government proposal came from all over the world, and they were so diverse that it is difficult to justify the University of Chicago Press in publishing the Draft. The reaction of the United Nations was triumphant. The Draft was still forward looking in that it sought to displace the electoral power of individual national states with regional federations which, the authors hoped, would experience and profit from shared economic and cultural interests over time.
students were only a temporary phenomenon, virtually disappearing by 1931. Their loss, coupled with the severe recruitment problems of the war years, left Chicago with a faculty of just 381, a number that would remain excruciatingly, but very unorthodox curricula, led to a severe decline in enrollments in the College after 1919, with the total undergraduate enrollment reaching a nadir of 1,318 students in 1933–34.

The record of the Hutchins administration on the community front was mixed, to say the least. We know from the research of Arnold Hirsch and others that the University was sanctioned and helped to enforce race- and class-specific restrictive covenants in the 1930s and 1940s.14 Hutchins’s admirers like Milton M. Ayer and Harry Ashmore have argued that Hutchins was personally opposed to such practices, and there is considerable evidence to support the view that he was simply enforcing a policy set by the Trustees that he found personally abhorrent.15 But the fact of the matter remains that the University under his stewardship continued to rely on such policies. The University’s tolerance of race- and class-specific restrictive covenants contributed to a woeful lack of flexible and forward-looking policy planning about the neighborhood that could meet the challenges we faced in the 1940s and early 1950s. Hutchins has often been accused of indifference toward the emerging crisis in Hyde Park—Kenwood. The subject is complex and merits more research, since much may depend on when one begins to consider the crisis as actually having begun.16 Even so, if Hutchins did have concerns about the future of the neighborhood, he undertook few concrete actions to address those concerns. In fact, he subsequently admitted to George Del in 1977 that he had not devoted much time or effort to this problem.17

It is also important to frame the references of concern that preoccupied Robert Hutchins in the aftermath of World War II that he would support the writing of a new constitution for the world, designed to open discussions about ways to secure international peace in a world of potential atomic warfare, and, further, Hutchins and his colleagues would write that constitution in a way that gave world governmental authorities the power to fight against racist practices; but that at the same time he was unable to imagine a “constitution” for Hyde Park that would have addressed the serious social problems facing both the neighborhood and the University in a politically effective way and thus secure local (peace in his own time. It was left to Hutchins’s successor, Lawrence K. J. P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College, n.s., 2 (1953), p. 56.


17. See Judson to Stanley Hall, May 18, 1917, p. 2.

18. Robert Herrick, Chimes (New York, 1926), pp. 260–261. The novel was published two years after Herring’s resignation from the faculty. Blake Nexus in his Robert Herrick: “The evolution of a Novelist” (Berkley, 1962), p. 35, rightly characterized “as one of the many who have said that, as seen through the glasses of a rather dis- granted former employee.”
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Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called children of God. Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness’ sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for so did their fathers do to the prophets. Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for so persecuted the prophets who went before you. (Matt 5:1-12)

We who gather here today repre- sent many communities of faith and none, and myriad walks of life. We gather in hope and in ambivalence and in despair; in courage and in fear; in sadness and in anger and in joy; in anxiety and in relief. More than a few of us are here today due to the death of a loved one. For some it was forced upon us abruptly. For others it was and even may remain an ongoing trial that dulls the senses with an insipid ache, or that gathers out of the felt need to recognize the perennial fact that death is very much a part of our lives at this University.

It is of course the recognizing rather than the death that makes the difference. Death is the fact. What we do with it is what is crucial. We gather in this chapel in the conviction that the way to respond to this most decisive marker of time is through ritual. (It may actually be the case that we are not capable of mourning for love or love very much every believes, or believed in and practiced, this recourse to ritual.) But this, if the truth be told, amounts to the inactivity that crystallizes both the felt need and the reality much the same as it would have existed, or believed it oneself.) Each of us brings here the felt need to repeat and to remem- ber. We do so in the midst of, perhaps even in resistance to, a larger world that does a superior job of celebrating the momentary in a way that makes the ongoing happen to us from beyond their destruction; but they are also at peace. For though in the sight of people they were punished, their hope is full of immortality. Having been disciplined a little, they will receive great good. Because God tested them and found them worthy of himself, not in the fire he tried them but in the sacrifice of the fire, they offered a sweet savor; and the Lord will reign over them forever. Those who trust in him will understand truth, and the faithful will abide with him in peace, because grace and mercy are upon his elect, and he watches over his holy ones. (Wis- dom of Solomon 3:1-9)

Seeing the crowds, he went up on the moun- tain, and when he sat down his disciples came to him. And he opened his mouth and taught them, saying: Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteous- ness, for they shall be satisfied. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called children of God. Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness’ sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for so did their fathers do to the prophets. Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for so persecuted the prophets who went before you. (Matt 5:1-12)

†Mark R. Krupnick

University Memorial Service
Address

By Richard A. Rosengarten

November 2, 2003

The counsel of this particular occasion is that in gathering today we acknowledge the event of life beyond death, both in our commu- nity and, perhaps, beyond. Just as work- ers who lost colleagues today are really and deeply saddened, so too are we. The last words properly include hope, recon- ciliation, expectation. Both facts—finality and eternity—desirably shape this memo- rial service. We need to understand death as we go forward in life.

The University whose chapel we inhabit has for a long time valued memory. Memory is a communal act: we are in memory of others when we remember our own. Memory is a communal act: we are in memory of others when we remember our own. The University of Chicago's saints, as befits a community devoted to open inquiry, are those who have died and labored here, whether students, staff, or faculty, and their beloved ones who are, by extension, a part of us. In this reading we affirm, in the most literal way, the work that comprises this University, while also acknowledging that the work of this Uni- versity relies on a much wider network of connected, shared activity. In lis- tening we will be reminded that no particularity of station—from level of ap- pointment to age—can exempt us from the fact that death will be our end. And, at the same time, in listening we will be reminded that in our end will be a new beginning, at least in this community and—for what can we fully know of such things?—in a king- dom beyond this world.

William Shakespeare puts at this matter with maximal poetic force in his greatest tragedy, King Lear. Some of you will recall Edgar's pronouncement upon learning that the aged and mercurial Lear has finally died: “The wonder is he hath endured so long, but us'd up his'd life.” Usage of life, whether in the Bard’s dramatic world or our community, is not an option for the individual, even when that individual is someone “every inch a king” like Lear. But usurpation is emphati- cally, indeed necessarily, the option of choice for the community that surrounds that person. Not to take over that life, not to claim it for the common memory, can only in the end lead to the death of that community.

That is because community needs to live as it were near death’s door, need always to be mindful that there is an end to individual life and that the ongoing good of the com- community will depend upon its capacity to pay attention to the way tradition is handed on. In doing so we can understand that the finality of death and the need to live with an aware- ness of its inevitability and a lively hope that memory and ritual will give us genuine enhance our lives. Only then will our actions be in accord with the reality that each of us will die and that this recog- nition must shape fundamentally our living. To do this means that our remembrance of the events of September 11, 2001, must be appropriately urgent and appro- priately chastened. We need to be in the condition of the same Edgar quoted above, whose summary of the events in King Lear closes Shakespeare’s tragedy:

The weight of this sad time we must obey, Speak what we feel, not what we ought to say. The holiest hath bourn the most; wethat are young Shall never see so much, nor live so long.

Today we memorialize the sadness of loss, and recognize in that sadness the com- mon elements of our humanity; the reality of death, and the reality that through memory we can usurp death and find hope for the future. Like Edgar we are all young until we die, for in this world we will never live long enough to see as much as we need to see. To heed the spirit of the time we must speak feelingly from the heart rather than programatically from duty. In doing so we shall truly memorialize what is most central to our common humanity under God. In that and only that our morn- ing find comfort, and our memorialized peace.

Richard A. Rosengarten is Associate Pro- fessor in the Divinity School and the Col- lege, and Dean of the Divinity School.
Memorial Roll 2003
The following list contains the names of those whose deaths have been recorded with Rockefeller Memorial Chapel between September 15, 2002, and September 15, 2003. Please direct any comments regarding the names of those whose deaths have been recorded with Rockefeller Memorial Chapel between those whose deaths have been recorded with Rockefeller Memorial Chapel.

The following list contains the names of those whose deaths have been recorded with Rockefeller Memorial Chapel between September 15, 2002, and September 15, 2003. Please direct any comments regarding the names of those whose deaths have been recorded with Rockefeller Memorial Chapel.

Staff
Susan Elizabeth Abrams J. Robert Ball
Patrick Burke Laura Campbell Matt N eason
Walter Rast Artie M. Scott Helen Smith
Adolf Sprudzs Joyce C. Weil Raymond F. Whitcomb

Retired Staff
Henry O. Alkerhaugen Grace R. Baird Grace K. Bechtle
Huelt Buford Doris Lee Burton Edwin Ciciora
Charles L. Cole Ruth Courts John George Dudas
Billie A. Dyer Thomas Earp Josephine Edwards Helen Flint
Mabel Frazier Mildred Grant
Gertrud H Artmann Shirley B. Harvey
Elliot Johnson M attie Jones Robert Francis Kahl
Russell Karask Robert Kirschner Anne Langendo Berndt Gordon A. Lentz
Robertta J. McCowan Ruth M artin-Courts Kenneth James M cCormick
Ada M. Miller
John Ralph M orse Regina M rkonich M argaret N.bohn
M ary D. N eely
Ruby N ewsum Leonard Olson Donald Reynolds
DeForest Robinson Fannie M. Rogers

Harriet E. Schnoor Anna Scipio
William Henry Streeter M ary T. Mullins
Nola P. Taylor Anthony Urbonas
Albert W. Will
G. Else Will

Students
Gabriel A. Almond Sandra Elaine Barnett
Amy M. Brozman Robert Gaumond
Karl Jonske James Koen
Carlos M. artino Sita Ramasarma
Kyle Swanson
Henry John Tischera

Faculty
Kan Agarwal M alcolm Cooper Dave Fultz
Kostas Kazaris M ark K rupnick
Karen Landahl Charles W. Wegener

Faculty Emeriti
Odn Waldermar Anderson Linda B raidwood Robert B raidwood
Erica Fromm Robert Goep M ark Inghram
David Gale Johnson

Friends and Family of the Rockefeller Chapel
William Bartdeili Bu Chon Chon
Dorothy O. Florine Dorothy Allison Olson
Jesse A. Reed, Jr.

Alumni
Marjorie B. Adee Gaylord P. Albough
Robert Dean Allison M. David Allweis
Gabriel A. Almond Pauline Altman
Themis John Anagnost Willard C. Ancker
C. Arne Arenberg Harold V. Argo
Warren S. Askew
Janet A spel
Robert C. Ausland John A. Bachus
William D. Baker Josephine Babat
Morro John Barnard Rebecca Barr
Samara B. Barth Edwin A. Bashkin
Theodore A. Basset Lawrence J. Bates
Peter S. Bauchwitz Walton H. Essex Beatty
Charles A. Beck
Hunter Beckley
Ellen J. Benware Elizabeth C. Bell
Alice R. Bensen
Dorothea R. Berg
Ralph E. Bergstrom
Bertha H. Bernstein
Robert W. Bertram
Dorothy L. Bay
Albert G. Edman
Dorothea M. Binder
Raymond L. Birndorf

Ilsabel Bishop
Joseph W. Bishop
Irena Jane Bland
Glados H. Blankenstein
Bernward Block
Charles W. Boand
Sergios M. Boikan
L. Vercavel Booth
Elli Borkon
David C. Botting, Jr.
Earl R. Bowman
Bruce B. Boyd
Robert M. Boyer
Arthur E. Bragg
Linda Braidwood
Robert J. Braidwood
Ruth C. Braver
Pierce Bray
William B. Bremer
Janet J. Brittian
Leo R. Brown
Leen J. Bruner
William C. Buchanan, Jr.
Sean Thomas Buckley
Jeanette Buckman
Lois M. Buenger
Richard C. Bueter
Sidney A. Burnell
James G. Burt
Wellington R. Burt, Jr.
Cynthia Busby
Virginia Butts
George Dewey Buzard, Jr.
Arthur R. Cahill
George L. Canelis
William F. Carr
William M. Lodwicke
Cathleen
Beaverly D. Causey
Barbara A. Chandler
Lloyd V. Channels
Bruce C. Chapman
Donald H. Chill
Randall Louis Chuck, Jr.
Bessie G. Church
Peter J. Ciavarella
James G. Clague
Helen Clark
M arjory Cleary
William D. Clement
M aurice C. Clifford, Jr.
Harold M. Cobb
Eloise S. Cofe
Thelma J. Cohen
Dorothy E. Collins
Richard S. Cook
M arjorie F. Cooombs
Ivan L. Corbridge
Ruth M. Cowan
Florence Cox
Harmon Craig
William W. Cramer
George H. Crandell
Benjamin H. Crockett, Jr.
Joseph T. Crockett
Dorothea E. Cunningham
R. Keith Currier
Elizabeth H. Dales
C. Sally Daly
J eremiah D. Alston
Harriet E. Schnoor

Zipporah Dobyns
William E. Doscher
J. Luther Dougain
Charles F. Downings
M arguerite M. Ducker
Ruth B. Dutz
Allen M. Dyer, Jr.
Henry F. Eaton
Sherwood B. Eck
John Eidelberg
Esther M uskin Edelman
Gertrude M. Eichelstadt
Patrick F. Elliott
Robert L. Emans
Helmut M. Engelmann
Wallace A. Erickson
Louise T. Erskine
Frank Fraser Evans
Donald L. Fabian
Barbara Fajardo
Mary W. Fajardo
George W. Farwell
Burton Edward Feldman
Claire S. Feldman
John M. Felzner
Ellis Kirby Fields
Harry Findstone
M ark J. Fitzgerald
Esther Fleseman
Roy Forrey
Philip G. Forsgren
Jane Easton Fowler
Eugene N. Fox
Howard F. Frazier
Edna M. Freeling
M ax E. Freeman
Carl T. Frick
Burton D. Fried
Louis H. Fritzemeier
Alvin Fross
Allan Frumkin
Mi rie E. Gallagher
Kathleen Robert Galloway
M ary G. Garfield
William R. Garr
Jane L. Garrettson
Theodore Alan Gavalis
Gertrude Gendel
John Christian Gerber
Walter M. Gibb
M iadala W. Giese
Jerome H. Gilbert
William J. Gillstain
Clarence W. Gilmore
John L. Glenn
James S. Gold
Joan Levin Good
Glenn A. Goodfriend
Elliot R. Gordon
Helen J. Hare
Judith Victor Grabiner
M ary Gramer
John A. Granath
R glo W. Greer
David M. Grayson
Barbara Swift Greenfield
Walter E. Greweyt, Jr.
John P. Greg
Ernest L. Grillin, Jr.
W. Stuart Grout
Arthur Anderson Grubb
G racy C. Gunnin
Les S. Guthman
Ernst B. Haas
Hildegarde Vogel Haas
Robert J. Hadler
Virginia L. Hall
Louise H. Hanson

Suzanne Dobkins
Zipporah Dobyns
William E. Doscher
J. Luther Dougain
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M arguerite M. Ducker
Ruth B. Dutz
Allen M. Dyer, Jr.
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Sherwood B. Eck
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Walter E. Greweyt, Jr.
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G racy C. Gunnin
Les S. Guthman
Ernst B. Haas
Hildegarde Vogel Haas
Robert J. Hadler
Virginia L. Hall
Louise H. Hanson
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University Disciplinary Actions: 2002–03

By Stephen P. Klass, Vice-President and Dean of Students in the University

October 8, 2003

The Office of the Vice-President and Dean of Students in the University has been asked by the Council of the University Senate to report each year on matters pertaining to the University disciplinary legislation enacted by the council on May 23, 1970, and amended on June 8, 1976.

For another year, we can report that no University Disciplinary Committee was required to meet during the 2002–03 academic year.

This office also reports to the council on disciplinary matters that have occurred in the various academic units during the year. In 2002–03, disciplinary committees in five academic areas were convened on fifteen occasions.

The College called six disciplinary hearings. One hearing involved a student who falsified experimental data. The student was given a suspension of three quarters. There were three cases of plagiarism. Two students were given suspensions of four quarters and the third student was placed on probation. There was one case that involved a repeat violation of the Eligibility and Acceptable Use computer policy. The student was placed on probation. Last but not least, there was one case of a student who physically attacked another student. For this incident, the sanction of a three-quarter suspension was decreased to a one-quarter suspension by the Board of Review to which the student appealed.

There were five hearings convened by the Graduate School of Business. There were two cases of plagiarism. In one case of plagiarism, the case was dismissed and the student was not sanctioned. The other student charged with plagiarism was suspended for three quarters. Another GSB student was found to have sent an inappropriate amount of e-mail to a government office of another country through the University’s computing system. This student was placed on probation for the remainder of his matriculation.

Finally in the Division of Humanities, a student was accused of sexual abuse and harassment of another student. The disciplinary committee decided not to sanction the student.

Students sent before disciplinary committees, 1992–2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>College/ Academic</th>
<th>College/ Other</th>
<th>Graduate/ Academic</th>
<th>Graduate/ Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92–93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93–94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94–95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95–96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96–97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97–98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98–99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99–00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00–01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01–02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02–03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both cases, the students were accused of misrepresentation of credentials. One student was placed on probation, and the other student was suspended for nine quarters.

The Law School also had one hearing for the academic year. A student accused of plagiarism was suspended for one day.

Finally in the Division of Humanities, a student was accused of sexual abuse and harassment of another student. The disciplinary committee decided not to sanction the student.
Report of the Student Ombudsperson for 2002-03

By Kyle Lakin

O

ver the last year, the O Office of the Student Ombudsperson has been in a mode of transition. I have served several terms at the University of Chicago Student Ombudsperson, N.oor-Aiman Khan, through trial periods. This report will do three things: it will reflect upon and evaluate changes at the office to look for ways to improve its services, it will report the cases which the office encountered this year, and it will discuss three issues that came out of the cases on which we worked. I hope that this discussion will encourage the University to confront these problems and solve them with the help of our office in the coming year.

Changes

This year, the office experienced several changes. First, it moved locations for the first time in at least two decades. It is now located in Ida Noyes Hall, Room 214. This move provides us with more space, and although the office is not at the center of student activities, we have not seen a decrease in visits. This is due to the more confidential nature of the new area that re- ceives so much student traffic.

This move, however, does put more pressure on the Ombudsperson to make certain that the office continues to be present in the student's mind. The move also provides more confidentiality for students seeking our help since we are in an area that is distinct from the areas that re- ceived the most student traffic.

The office also obtained funding for the Ombudsperson to make certain that the office is present in the student's mind. The move also provides more confidentiality for students seeking our help since we are in an area that is distinct from the areas that re- ceived the most student traffic.

The office also obtained funding for the Ombudsperson to make certain that the office is present in the student's mind. The move also provides more confidentiality for students seeking our help since we are in an area that is distinct from the areas that re- ceived the most student traffic.

Another change came in the form of continuity in the office by changing the location of the office. This placed enormous pressure on the Ombudsperson to make certain that the office is present in the student's mind. The move also provides more confidentiality for students seeking our help since we are in an area that is distinct from the areas that re- ceived the most student traffic.

The move also provides more confidentiality for students seeking our help since we are in an area that is distinct from the areas that re- ceived the most student traffic.

Changes in the office include the move to a new location, which has provided more space and improved confidentiality. The office also obtained funding for programs that improve our services, such as training programs and advertising campaigns.

The office also saw a decrease in undergraduate students in relation to graduate students. We also helped two faculty mem- bers work through issues that are unusual but not unprecedented. I hope that this reflects an increased awareness of the office among our student body. Although only two postdoctoral researchers/teachers asked us for help, these were two of the most diffi- cult cases for our office. I will discuss this issue in the next section.

Finally, the cases are typical of past years except for the breakdown within the housing concerns and the drop in grade issues. Fewer Ombudspersons have shown a breakdown between graduate and undergraduate housing systems in their final report, but in-house data from previ- ous years show that more cases typically come out of the undergraduate housing system. This year, there were more con- cerns than normal from graduate students regarding housing. The office should con- tinue to monitor this in case we are begin- ning to see growing problems with the increasing number of graduate students at the University or the way graduatehousing is administered. Finally, I am encouraged by the drop in grade-related issues this year. Last year the office printed newslet- ters that were available for students outside our office door all year about how to handle grade disputes. I hope that this contributes to the decline in grade concerns and the office continues to educate both students and faculty about how to mini- mize grade disputes.

Concerns

I have noticed a decrease in the number of cases that come from the cases that were most difficul- t to solve, these cases point to areas that must be better defined by University policy in the future. The “other” category under academic re- fers to cases ranging from shifting require- ments in undergraduate concentrations to academic dishonesty. Administrative con- cerns are various as registration or grade change issues with the Registrar or parking ticket problems. Graduate housing cases concern graduate students at the Interna- tional House, Neighborhood Student Apartments, or the New Graduate Resi- dence Hall. General housing issues usually refer to students living in off-campus hous- ing. Health cases include both problems with health insurance and also problems with the University Hospitals. Employment also addressed issues about setting class expectations to minimize classroom confu- sion. I hope that these steps have contrib- uted to the decline in grade concerns and the office continues to educate both students and faculty about how to mini- mize grade disputes.

Graduate Housing

Our office has seen an increase this year in problems that arise from the various forms of graduate student housing. One case in particular challenged the way that the Uni- versity informs incoming graduate students about housing options. In this case, a stu- dent had decided to live in the International House and had filled the appropriate paper- work in the Spring Quarter before arriving for class in the Autumn Quarter. The stu- dent subsequently decided that a graduate student apartment would suit him better. He filled out the International Student Housing Application and filled out the appropriate paper- work for an apartment, thinking that the I-House and Neighborhood Student Apartments were parts of one system that would transfer deposits and void other contracts. When he arrived, he was asked to pay two rents, one for the I-House contract and the apartment he had received. He contacted our office to medi- ate his case.

In response to the student, it became obvious that the information provided to graduate students was confusing for those coming from other universities with cen- tralized housing offices. The University
 marketed its three housing options (N-neighborhood Student Apartments, New Graduate Residence Hall, and International House) together in one pamphlet and included a form that asked the student to choose from these three options. The form was returned to the N-neighborhood Student Apartments office, and all H-house requests were forwarded to I-House. But the student was never notified that I-House and N-neighborhood Student Apartments were not part of one office that ran graduate housing for the university. In fact, the current literature suggested they were part of one “system” with three housing options.

In marketing housing options, literature that is provided to graduate students must be clear that the University does not centralize its housing options into one “system.” Many of the problems that were contained in this year’s literature have been fixed by Dean Klass in conjunction with the International House staff, Neighborhood Student Apartments, and the legal department. Still, incoming graduate students from schools with more centralized housing administrations will expect the University to have a similar system. I recommend that I-House and Neighborhood Student Apartments share and check lists of students who have not yet arrived on campus. Their files are kept with the Deans of Students in the divisions of postdocs who arrive on campus. Their files are kept with the Deans of Students, but the problems these individuals face are not the same as those of students. Their support system must be geared toward a different set of problems.

President Randel has told me that this is a larger problem for universities nationally. I hope that the University of Chicago can take the lead in solving it. A good first step would be for an administrative office to assume responsibility for the experience of postdocs at the University. At a minimum, some office should have a few regularly scheduled meetings with these community members to discuss issues that lie beyond the responsibility of the department. This would also give the Office of the Student Ombudsperson an administrator who can be contacted when cases involve postdoctoral scholars.

Interoffice Communication

The lack of communication between University administrative offices is by far the greatest source of student frustration encountered in my two years with the Office of the Student Ombudsperson. This is because, I believe, few staff who interact with students know where students go to solve problems outside their purview. Worse yet, perhaps they know but do not feel comfortable contacting or feel compelled to contact the office the student needs. I have seen firsthand how this fragmented approach to student service makes students feel that they are alone in solving their problems. It fuels the student-versus-administration mindset that inhibits problem compromise and problem solutions. It ultimately breaks down the bonds that the University is trying so hard to create as it seeks stronger support from alumni and more active University community members.

I would like to offer a suggestion that would ease the problem for current students while laying the groundwork for the future. This will spur thought about how administrative offices can offer better student service.

Ideally, the University would found a student help center in which representatives from all student-focused administrative offices would be located. These representatives would not only know how to help students within the frame of their own office but they would also be cross-trained by the other representatives. When a student came to the help center, he or she would be directed to the appropriate person who would know how to solve the problem and with which other representatives to speak. This “stop shop” for students would solve problems completely and efficiently, providing service that fits into our rigorous, hectic environment.

Such a plan would not come quickly, but it should be the aspiration of the University community with regard to student service. While the physical infrastructure would take time to develop, the future representatives of such a center should be organized and trained now. This would foster better communication, which would ease the problem for current students and also speed improvements once the University creates the help center.

This ends my time as the Student Ombudsperson at the University of Chicago. I welcome Urmi Sengupta as my successor and wish her the best of luck in the upcoming year. I also welcome Phil Venticinque as the Assistant Ombudsperson. I know that they will improve upon the office in innumerable ways, and I hope that their tenures will be as fulfilling for them as mine was for me. Thank you to President Randel, Laura Grillo, Steve Klass, Bill Michel, Roberta Cohen, and the other administrators who survive my year in this position; I hope that my Missouri stubbornness was seen as an asset and not a frustration. You have each provided me with lessons and examples to draw upon as I face challenges ahead.

Kyle Lakin was the Student Ombudsperson for the 2002–03 academic year.
When I graduated, the late Nobel laureate George Stigler gave us the pitch to get involved and contribute. It went something like this: "You're your class," he said, "is among the best the GSB has ever seen. Unfortunately for you and your children, there is something called supply and demand in the real world. That suggests that while you are exceptional, your children will be closer to average. Therefore, if you want to add something to the world, you need to become a major benefactor—they won't make it on their own—and you better begin now." I have thought this was the right thing to do for almost twenty years.

I hope my pitch is more subtle. It is in your personal interest to get involved and contribute to the GSB. Involvement provides an immediate return in the form of an amazing network of alumni and interesting and informative programs. Support also provides a long-term personal benefit. The future reputational value of the GSB will be a function of how it is perceived in the future, not how it is perceived today. When I was at the GSB, the Kellogg School of Management was considered a second-tier school. Over the last twenty years, Kellogg has improved its standing and is now considered one of the top business schools in the country. When employers see the resumes of my peers who attended Kellogg in the early eighties, they don't think the person attended a second-tier school; they say, "Wow, you attended Kellogg." It is up to all of us to maintain and improve the GSB's wow factor on our resumes.

There are many ways to give back to the GSB. Get involved in your local alumni club. Interview applicants and help sell the school. Be an advocate within your company to help us improve our corporate relationships. Support your peers and other alumni. Talk up your experience at the GSB and, yes, be generous with your financial support.

There is a career path to involvement. I started out by being responsive when development officers called. I think I contributed the thought was my first job at Goldman Sachs; they say, "If you really like doing something, you should get involved and do it well. Take ownership. Your goal should be to consistently surprise and delight people with your work. Assume everything you do is important—especially the little things. People expect the little things. Field promotions—when someone senior details on the small things that people take notice. One of my first bosses gave me simple and valuable advice. He said to waste valuable energy, plotting and plan- ning. For them, career strategy becomes an unsatisfying end in itself. In my experience, the best opportunities find you when you are minding your own business. They find people who are passionate about what they are doing, not what they are doing next year.
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is a strong and inspiring vote of confidence in the GSB and its leadership. I encourage you to stay involved and keep giving back to the GSB.

I also encourage you to find ways to give back to your communities. The skills and relationships you have developed here and will hone over the coming years can make a huge and necessary impact in the charitable and civic world. I have personally never worked harder or had more fun than I am today—working to rebuild New York City’s economy. Like most great opportunities, this one found me while I was minding my own business. I wasn’t considering leaving Goldman Sachs or Wall Street. I got the call to duty from my GSB roommate’s business partner, who is now deputy mayor of New York. We got to know each other negotiating deals on opposite sides of the table. Our mutual respect grew into friendship, and when Dan became deputy mayor he asked me to join him.

I guess this brings me full circle. If you play to your strengths, have fun, build relationships, and invest in your human and reputational capital, I guarantee your future will be bright, exciting, and rewarding.

With that, let me congratulate you and welcome you to the family of Chicago GSB alumni. I look forward to following your successes and contributions in the years ahead. Thank you for inviting me to share this exciting day with you and your loved ones, and good luck.

Andrew Alper, A.B. ’80, M.B.A. ’81, is president of the New York City Economic Development Corporation and a Trustee of the University.

Other proceedings of the 473rd convocation appeared in The University of Chicago Record, Volume 38, Number 1, November 6, 2003.
T hroughout our lives we are continu-
ously asked to confront an uncertain
future. Your decision to come to
the University of Chicago was not based
on full knowledge of what opportunities
would be available to you upon graduation
or later in life. As you go forward you will
make guesses as to beneficial investments
in your own development and you will
experience surprises. Thus an important
purpose of a good education is to provide
you with the ability to respond to unantici-
pated events. Expanding your knowledge
and refining your analytic skill will al-
levate in economic environments. These investments
that have surprised us in the past useful in
thinking through the surprises of the fu-
ture? How do people make guesses about coin
 tossing or the performance of baseball play-
ers? An uncertain future might look very similar
to the replication of many coin tosses or
simple events like the outcomes of coin
tosses? If you see more heads than tails in
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investors makes for fascinating reading, but the useful by-products are the ones that can be incorporated formally into decision theory and the ones that survive the competitive pressures of market discipline.

To conclude, let me return to what we are all here for. Today is a celebration of the completion of one of the major investments you will make in your life. Although I have talked about uncertainty, one thing is for certain: You will graduate today. Support of your family and friends has no doubt been critical to your success. You are to be commended for your efforts. The value of this accomplishment is very real and one for which you should take great pride. Yet the real value of your degree can only be imputed by looking forward. It will unfold as you make choices about the options and uncertainty life will give you. Good luck!

In preparing this talk, I received many valuable suggestions from James Heckman, Richard P. Saller, and Grace Tsiang.
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Summary
The 474th convocation was held on Friday, August 29, 2003, in Rockefeller Memorial Chapel. Don Michael Randel, President of the University, presided.
A total of 443 degrees were awarded: 37 Bachelor of Arts in the College, 1 Bachelor of Science in the College and the Division of the Physical Sciences, 3 Master of Science in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 16 Master of Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 57 Master of Science in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 115 Master of Arts in the Division of the Social Sciences, 97 Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 2 International Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 1 Master of Divinity in the Divinity School, 5 Master of Liberal Arts in the William B. and Catherine V. Graham School of General Studies, 7 Master of Arts in the School of Social Service Administration, 1 Master of Arts in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 11 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 16 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Humanities, 19 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 39 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Social Sciences, 4 Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Business, 10 Doctor of Philosophy in the Divinity School, and 2 Doctor of Jurisprudence in the Law School.

Lars Peter Hansen, the Homer J. Livingston Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Economics and the College, delivered the convocation address, “Value in an Uncertain Economy.”