

# THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO RECORD



Volume 37, Number 2

November 21, 2002

## CONTENTS

- 2 Statement on the University's Policies on Free Speech and Intellectual Discourse**—*Don Michael Randel*
- 2 Annual Report of the Provost for 2001–02**—*Richard P. Saller*
- 4 The Aims of Education Address**—*Andrew Abbott*
- 9 University Memorial Service**  
Address—*Alison L. Boden*  
Memorial Roll 2002
- 13 The 468th Convocation**  
Address: "Understanding Perspectives"—*John A. Lucy*  
Honorary Degree  
Summary
- 15 The 469th Convocation**  
Address: "Sexuality, Intimacy, and History"—*George Chauncey*  
Address: "Possibility and Responsibility"—*Ann L. McGill*  
Remarks: "Leadership: Lost or Found?"—*Fred G. Steingraber*  
The Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards  
Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching  
Honorary Degrees  
Summary

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CHICAGO RECORD  
5710 South Woodlawn Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Nonprofit  
Organization  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Chicago, Illinois  
Permit No. 8070

# Statement on the University's Policies on Free Speech and Intellectual Discourse

By Don Michael Randel

October 15, 2002

We take our right to vigorous debate as an article of faith on this campus. But the world's troubles in the last year compel us, once again, to reflect on what we are prepared to tolerate, if not encourage, under that heading. The Kalven Report clearly articulates the central principle: "A university, if it is to be true to its faith in intellectual inquiry, must embrace, be hospitable to, and encourage the widest diversity of views within its own community." From this it follows that the University does not take collective positions on social and political issues, for to do so would be to intrude on the right of individual members of the University community to hold divergent views. "In brief, it is a community that cannot resort to majority vote to reach positions on public issues."

Simultaneously, in order to protect that right for individuals, as the Student Manual states, "Acts of violence, and explicit threats of violence directed at a particular individual that compromise that individual's safety or ability to function within the University setting are direct affronts to the University's values and warrant intervention by University officials." This is the University's blanket policy. And it applies to any and all individuals, without regard to their membership in any religious, ethnic, or other group. Thus, despite some

recent assertions to the contrary, neither I nor the University has issued such a statement with respect to any particular group. Nor will I, as President, lend the University's name to the support of any particular group, institution, or cause.

But we must guard against more than physical violence. We are a community, and this entails a decent respect for one another and even a degree of trust. No set of rules or codes of behavior can ever fully capture everything that respect and trust require. Maintaining this community is hard work, and each of us must assume some personal responsibility for it. In a world of increasing tensions and heated differences, we will sometimes be accused of bias or even rank prejudice for tolerating a wide spectrum of views. But the response to views that one finds distasteful is not in the first instance to attempt to suppress them but instead to answer them with the force of argument. The University exists to make possible this kind of exchange and not to take sides in it. Even when accusations against the University are rooted in outright distortions and misinformation, our response must assert the facts and encourage reasoned debate rather than descend to words and actions that might weaken the fabric of a community in which debate is essential to what we are.

We are intolerant of intolerance. We

oppose vigorously anything that smacks of prejudice, which by its nature is unsustainable by argument. We will especially combat prejudice that is rooted in race, religion, and gender, but not only that prejudice. Thus, we simultaneously commit ourselves to a discourse that both allows and respects difference.

Arguably, the three most powerful forces in human society are race, religion, and gender. Yet universities in the main devote little intellectual energy to understanding them as forces. This university, however, regards these as subjects of the most serious study. The most recent, though by no means the only, embodiment of this seriousness is the Center for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture. Here we aim to break out of the binary formulations of the matter of race, particularly the opposition of black and white, in order to consider the deeper forces and tensions that characterize the phenomenon of race and its expression in society. Similar aims could be described in relation to gender and religion.

To the intellectual energy that we devote to matters of race, religion, and gender, we must add our commitment to appropriate behavior in everyday life. We must be sure in our own community to redress the grievances that may have been suffered as a function of race, religion, and gender and to ensure that such grievances are not suf-

fered again. We must ensure the diversity of this community by ensuring that everyone is prepared to subscribe to the principles for which the University stands and is prepared to embrace diversity, whether of race, religion, gender, or, yes, even academic discipline. No part of the University community can think of itself as immune from this concern for diversity. An unprecedented number of programs is in place to increase diversity in the functioning of our academic programs and in the ways in which we carry on our business affairs and our relations with the neighborhood and city of which we are a part. Each of us must believe that embracing—not merely tolerating—diversity is a personal obligation.

A community gifted in argument can readily produce the hypotheticals that make the embrace of diversity without elaborate qualification seem dangerous if not absurd. But we really do know what we mean here. Prejudice is an ugly word because it describes an ugly phenomenon. We must know it and reject it when we see it. Nor, however, must we allow the mere assertion of it to deter us from our most fundamental pursuits.

*Don Michael Randel is President of the University of Chicago.*

## Annual Report of the Provost for 2001–02

By Richard P. Saller

October 11, 2002

The past year, 2001–02, has been one of transition and renewal at the University. With four years and three months to go in my term as Provost, I write to you to report on some of the achievements, changes, challenges, and aspirations for the future.

The University of Chicago has had an extraordinary tradition of sharp focus on the basic mission of a leading university, research and teaching. It will be essential to continue that tradition as we crystallize our ambitions in the Chicago Initiative. In April, President Randel publicly opened the new campaign with a goal of \$2 billion, about three times the goal of our last campaign. By the end of June, in spite of difficult financial conditions, \$723 million had been raised for the support of faculty research, students, programs, facilities, and other needs of the University. The early success is to be credited to the work of the President and the Development staff, and to the generosity of the Trustees, who as a group have already given more than in the last campaign.

Since the beginning of the last academic year, half of the Deans and officers of the University have started in their new positions. Saul Levmore in the Law School, Ted Snyder in the Graduate School of Business, James Madara in the Division of the Biological Sciences, Susan Mayer in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy

Studies, and Mark Hansen in the Division of the Social Sciences have accepted decanal responsibilities, on which the success of the University depends. In the central administration, Tom Rosenbaum has taken the office of Vice-President for Research and Argonne National Laboratory; Donald Reaves began as Vice-President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer; Margo Marshak held the position of Vice-President and Dean of Students for a year and readied her successor, Steve Klass, who took the job on October 1; Anne Robertson and Keith Moffat moved into the positions of Deputy Provost; Bob Rosner became Chief Scientist at Argonne; and Mike Riordan took over leadership of the University of Chicago Hospitals. I believe that we are all aware of the extent to which we are building on the achievements of our predecessors and will need to cooperate to make the most of the current opportunities.

To guide policy in the sciences, Tom Rosenbaum and I have created a new Science Council, including the Deans of BSD and PSD, the Deputy Provost in the sciences, and the Director and the Chief Scientist of Argonne National Laboratory. The charge of the council is to develop more fruitful collaborations between the University and Argonne, and to oversee the major cross-divisional projects on campus. As we start construction on one of the most ambitious laboratory facilities ever built by a

university, the Interdivisional Research Building, it is essential that we plan for the success of the Institute for Biophysical Dynamics, at the heart of the new facility. The council will also attend to the broader issues affecting science across the campus and, in particular, support the work to develop the Computation Institute and the Nanoscience Consortium.

Support for research and infrastructure elsewhere in the University is no less important; I call attention here to only a few of the many projects. The Centers for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture and for Gender Studies are moving into a newly remodeled house at 5733 South University Avenue. Under the leadership of its new Director, Cathy Cohen (Political Science), the Center for the Study of Race, Politics, and Culture will offer an expanded program in the coming years as part of a set of initiatives to weave into the intellectual and social fabric of the University more faculty, students, and staff of underrepresented minorities. The Graduate School of Business started construction on its state-of-the-art facility on the site of Woodward Court, where previously dispersed activities of the GSB will be brought together. Planning has begun for a new center for the creative and performing arts, as well as for the renovation of Mandel Hall—both priorities of the Future of the Arts study group. The Economics Research Center, directed by James

Heckman, opened with the mission of supporting research in empirical economics. To improve the quality of life on campus, the new Palevsky residence hall was opened last year, and a year from now we can expect the Gerald Ratner Athletics Center to provide attractive fitness and training facilities and an Olympic-size swimming pool.

It goes without saying that the infrastructure and programs can fulfill their potential only if the schools and departments have outstanding faculties. This letter is an occasion to celebrate some of the major achievements and awards. Since a full list would require pages, here is just a sample. *John Cacioppo* received the American Psychological Association's Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award. *John Carlstrom* was elected to the National Academy of Sciences. *James Cronin* received the Légion d'Honneur. *Jean Bethke Elshtain* won the Goodenough Prize for lifetime achievement from the American Political Science Association. *Carlos Kenig*, *Susan Kidwell*, *Edward Kolb*, *Steve Levitt*, *Peter McCullagh*, *Bernard McGinn*, *David Strauss*, *William Tait*, *Robert Vishny*, and *Thomas Witten* were elected as Fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. *Robert Michael* was elected as a Corresponding member of the British Academy. *Robert Morrissey* was selected for the Ordre National du Mérite of the République

Française. *Martha Nussbaum* received the Grawemeyer Award in Education. *Robert Pippin* was awarded the Mellon Foundation's Distinguished Achievement Award.

To continue this distinction, the departments and schools seek to renew the faculty at the highest level. To that end, we welcome the following new, tenured faculty.

#### **In the Biological and Physical Sciences:**

*Albert Bendelac* (Pathology), from Princeton University, whose discovery and subsequent elucidation of the role of NK/T cells place him at the forefront of immunological science.

*Bruce Buffett* (Geophysical Sciences), from the University of British Columbia, a geophysicist whose research offers fundamental insights into the dynamical processes in the earth's interior from both theoretical and experimental perspectives.

*Shohei Koide* (Biochemistry & Molecular Biology), from the University of Rochester, a biochemist and engineer whose creative use of techniques such as NMR spectroscopy is revealing the structure, folding, and function of proteins.

*James Madara* (Pathology), from Emory University, who has made numerous, seminal contributions to the understanding of the cell biology/cell physiology of the intestinal epithelial barrier and who joins us as Vice-President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the Division of the Biological Sciences and Pritzker School of Medicine.

*Brian Popko* (Neurology), from the University of North Carolina, whose studies of the role of myelinating glial cells in the development and function of the mammalian nervous system have brought him world recognition.

*Trevor Price* (Ecology & Evolution), from the University of California–San Diego, whose creative application of quantitative genetic theory to the analysis of speciation in birds is supplying penetrating answers to some of the fundamental questions of evolutionary biology.

*John Reppy* (Computer Science), from Bell Labs–Lucent Technologies, a leader in the field of programming languages, who has made major contributions to functional, concurrent, and object-oriented programming.

*Anne Rogers* (Computer Science), from AT&T Labs, an applied computer scientist whose recent work in domain-specific languages for data mining has culminated in her design of the Hancock programming language.

*Hisashi Yamamoto* (Chemistry), from Nagoya University, an eminent synthetic organic chemist who has addressed a central problem in biological chemistry, the development of new methodologies for asymmetric catalysis.

#### **In the Humanities and Social Sciences:**

*Susan Burns* (History), from the University of Texas, known for her reinterpretation of the intellectual history of the *Kokugaku* tradition, she is now engaged in a study of disease, medicine, and the body in nineteenth-century Japan.

*Elizabeth Clemens* (Sociology), from the University of Arizona, whose study of the transformation of American political institutions, *The People's Lobby*, has had a major impact on the understanding of political and social change at the turn of the twentieth century.

*Cathy Cohen* (Political Science), from Yale University, a leading thinker on questions of political resistance and mobilization of groups marginalized by race, gender, or sexuality, especially gay/lesbian and black communities.

*John Mark Hansen* (Political Science), from Harvard, one of the nation's leading scholars of American politics, particularly public opinion, public budgeting, and elections, who joins us as Dean of the Division of the Social Sciences.

*Michael Kremer* (Philosophy), from the University of Notre Dame, a distinguished analytic philosopher and historian of ana-

lytic philosophy, currently completing a book on Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*.

*Derek Neal* (Economics), from the University of Wisconsin, a labor economist whose research has focused especially on "pre-market" factors affecting minority youth such as family background, schooling quality, and social environment.

*Eric Oliver* (Political Science), from Princeton University, who is best known for his research on the effects of segregation and suburbanization on political participation and civic engagement.

*Stephan Palmié* (Anthropology), from the University of Maryland, a Caribbeanist whose work (e.g., *Wizards and Scientists: Explorations in Afro-Cuban Modernity and Tradition*) is reconceptualizing the cultural history of the Atlantic world.

*Philippe Schyns* (Psychology), from the University of Glasgow, a cognitive scientist whose work on perception and categorization is both challenging theoretical dogma and introducing innovative techniques such as "Bubbles" which will shape the future of research in this area.

*Gil Stein* (Oriental Institute), from Northwestern University, archaeologist and anthropologist, he is a leading authority on the evolution of complex societies and joins us as Director of the Oriental Institute.

#### **In the Professional Schools:**

*Philip Berger* (GSB), from the University of Pennsylvania, whose research at the intersection of accounting and corporate finance is perhaps best known for his analysis of the effects of diversification on firm value.

*Bernard Harcourt* (Law), from the University of Arizona, a scholar of criminal law and procedure offering challenging arguments in debates on criminal enforcement mechanisms, the role of harm, and the burden of proof.

The well-being of the faculty, students, and staff is linked to the health of the

community, which has continued to improve over the past years. Since the mid-1970s, crime has declined dramatically in Hyde Park and South Kenwood (burglaries by 76 percent over 25 years, robberies by 56 percent, sexual assaults by 92 percent). Last year the University extended its police protection to Woodlawn, a neighborhood revitalizing at a rapid pace. In May 2002, the University's North Kenwood/Oakland Charter School at 46th Street and Greenwood Avenue was reviewed and received a glowing report that suggested it could become a national model for urban education of underprivileged children. (And I can't resist noting that a bowling alley is scheduled to open in November in the parking garage at 55th Street and Ellis Avenue, built and operated by Steve Soble of Spare Time Incorporated.)

Finally, a brief word about the financial health of the University. As you know, the endowment of the University grew much faster than the rate of inflation in the 1990s, but over the past two years it has declined along with the stock markets. In this regard we are no different from most other universities and colleges. In the coming months we will be analyzing the consequences for our budget and considering the appropriate responses. We do not expect that the impact of the endowment decline will change our academic priorities and aspirations, though it may well require adjustments in the pace of implementation.

Please accept my best wishes for a productive year.

*Richard P. Saller is the Edward L. Ryerson Distinguished Service Professor in the Departments of History, Classical Languages & Literatures, and New Testament & Early Christian Literature, Committee on the Ancient Mediterranean World, and the College, and Provost of the University.*

# The Aims of Education Address

By Andrew Abbott

September 26, 2002

Welcome to the University of Chicago.”

Of the dozens of persons who will say that to you during this orientation week, I am the only one who will keep on talking for another sixty minutes after saying it. I imagine that you have heard few such orations before and that will you will hear few hereafter. A full-length, formal talk on a set topic is a rather nineteenth-century kind of thing to do. Even at the University of Chicago, this is the only such oration you will get. You will be glad to know that when you graduate four years hence, the speaker is asked to speak for exactly thirteen and one-half minutes.

It's no easier for me. This is only the third or fourth such oration that I've given in my life. And you're not an easy audience. You're preoccupied with new roommates, placement tests, and “Chicago Life meetings” numbers one through five. Your minds are weary with the endless junk we've given you to read. Your bodies are aglow with adrenalin, serotonin, and the various endorphins, not to mention the more urgent excitements of estrogen and testosterone. And you are in a very diverse set of moods. Some of you are eager to hear what I have to say. Some of you can't wait till it's over. Some of you are watching the noisy dude whisper loudly two rows in front of you. Some of you are sensing the aspiration and grandeur expressed by this Gothic building. Some of you are thinking that I, the speaker, have a very big nose. In short, you're a diverse lot and I'm a beginning orator and we have an hour together to think about the aims of education. Let's do it.

It is important that you develop some personal aims of education because there is quite a strong case to be made that, given who you are and where you are, there is no particular necessity for you to study anything for the next four years. There are three basic reasons for that. They are reasons that I think a growing number of students at elite American colleges suspect, at least from what I am seeing in my own classroom. So let's be frank about them.

First, as far as worldly success is concerned, you've already got it. That your future income will be huge and your future work prestigious and honored can easily be predicted from the simple fact that you got into an elite college. About 2.8 million people graduate from high school every year; 1.8 million of them start college; forty to sixty thousand of them will go to elite colleges and universities like this one. So, basically, you and your peers at similar places represent the top 2 percent of an eighteen-year-old cohort. Obviously you're going to do very well indeed.

Now of course the real work predicting your future success is done not by prestige of college but by other factors—mainly the things for which you were admitted to that selective college in the first place—personal talents, past work, and parental resources both social and intellectual. The estimate of your future worldly success that we can make on the basis of knowing those things already will not be improved much by knowing what you actually do here. Moreover, admission itself sets up a self-fulfilling prophecy; since you got in here, people in

the future will assume you're good, no matter what you do or how you do while you are here. And of course we know, pretty certainly, that having gotten in you will graduate. Colleges compete in part by having high retention rates, and so it is in the college's very strong interest to make sure you graduate, whether you learn anything or not.

All of this tells me that nearly everyone in this room will end up, twenty years from now, in the top quarter of the American income distribution. I have surveyed those who graduated from this school in 1975—a group considerably less privileged by ancestry than yourselves—and can tell you that their median personal income is about five times the national median, and their median household income is at about the ninety-third percentile of the nation's income distribution. That's where you are headed. And let me tell you that in the eyes of the students starting college this fall at Chicago State University five miles south of here or in the eyes of the adults going to endless night classes at DePaul University downtown, that expectation is an expectation of extravagant success. As far as the nationwide success game is concerned, there's no reason for you to study here. The game is already over. You've already won.

Now many of you, of course, don't give a damn about those other students—young people and adults struggling to move up a few notches in the middle class. You're interested in living in Winnetka rather than Downers Grove. You may want to summer in the Hamptons rather than on Fire Island. Your idea of a good vacation may be a hotel in Paris and visits to the Musée d'Orsay instead of a resort in Orlando and visits to Disney World. “Surely,” you tell me, “my studies at the University of Chicago will have a big impact on those kinds of things. Surely they will determine whether I'm in the ninety-fourth or the ninety-ninth percentile of income. Getting a fine higher education may not affect my gross chances of worldly success, but surely they affect my detailed ones.”

On the contrary. I have to tell you that there's no real evidence in favor of this second reason to get an education, and there's a good deal of evidence *against* it. In the first place, all serious studies show that while college-level factors like prestige and selectivity have some independent effect on people's later incomes, most variation in income happens *within* colleges—that is, between the graduates of a given college. That internal variation is produced by individual factors like talent, resources, performance, and major rather than by college-level factors like prestige and selectivity. But even those individual factors do not in fact determine much about your future income. For example, the best nationwide figures I have seen suggest that a one-full-point increment in college GPA—from 2.8 to 3.8, for example—is worth about an additional 9 percent in income four years after college. Now that's not much result for a huge amount of work.

I'm sorry to bore you with this income story but I want to kill the idea that hard work in higher education produces worldly success. The one college experience variable that actually does have some connection with later worldly success is major. But

in the big nationwide studies, most of that effect comes through the connection between major and occupation. For the real variable driving worldly success—as all of you know perfectly well—the one that shapes income more than anything else, is occupation. Occupation and major are fairly strongly associated within the broad categories of nationwide data. But within the narrow range of occupation and achievement that we have at the University of Chicago, there is really no strong relation between what you study and your occupation in later life.

Here is some data on a 10 percent random sample of Chicago alumni from the last twenty years. Take the mathematics concentrators: 20 percent software development and support, 14 percent college professors, 10 percent in banking and finance, 7 percent secondary or elementary teachers, and 7 percent in nonacademic research; the rest are scattered. Physics concentrators are similar, but more of them are engineers and fewer are bankers. Biology produces 40 percent doctors, 16 percent professors, 11 percent nonacademic researchers, and the other third scattered. Obviously, there are a number of seeming pathways here. All the science concentrations lead to professorships and nonacademic research. And biology and chemistry often lead to medicine. But there are also many diversions from those pathways. We've got a biology concentrator who is now a writer, another who is now a musician. We've got two mathematicians who are now lawyers, and a physics concentrator who is now a psychotherapist.

Take the social sciences. Economics concentrators—this is today identified as overwhelmingly the most careerist major—are 24 percent in banking and finance, 15 percent in business consulting, 14 percent lawyers, 10 percent in business administration or sales, 7 percent in computers, and the other 30 percent scattered. Historians are often lawyers (24 percent) and secondary teachers (15 percent), but the other 60 percent are all over the map. Political scientists have 24 percent lawyers, 7 percent each professors and government administrators, and perhaps 20 percent in the various business occupations; the rest are scattered. Psychologists, surprisingly, are also about 20 percent in the various business occupations, 11 percent lawyers, and 10 percent professors; the rest are scattered. Thus in the social sciences, the news is that there are lots of ways to go to law school and to get into business. And there are the usual unusals: the sociology major who is an actuary, the two psychologists in government administration, the political science concentrator now in computers.

As for the humanities, the English majors have scattered to the four winds: 11 percent of them to elementary and secondary teaching, 10 percent to various business occupations, 9 percent to communications, 9 percent to lawyering, 5 percent to advertising; the rest scattered. Of the philosophers, 30 percent are lawyers and 18 percent are software people. I defy anybody to make sense out of that. Again, the connections include some obvious things and some non-obvious things. We have two English majors who are now artists and one who is an architect. We have a philosophy major

who is a farmer and two who are doctors.

So overall there is some slight evidence of tracks towards particular occupations from particular concentrations, but really the news is the reverse. The glass is not so much one-third full as two-thirds empty. Remember that only 40 percent of the biology majors became doctors. And, more important, remember that our alumni's experience shows very plainly that no pathway from major to occupation is ruled out.

The looseness of the connection between curriculum and career is even more obvious when seen the other way, from the point of view of the occupations. Our largest group was lawyers—12 percent of my survey respondents. Of the lawyers, 16 percent came from economics; 15 percent from political science; 12 percent from history; 7 percent each from philosophy, English, and psychology; and 5 percent from public policy. There was at least one lawyer from each of the following: anthropology, art and design, art history, biology, chemistry, East Asian languages and civilizations, fundamentals, general studies in the humanities, geography, geophysical sciences, Germanic languages and literatures, mathematics, physics, religion and humanities, Romance languages and literatures, Russian and other Slavic languages and literatures, and sociology. You get the point. There is absolutely *no* concentration from which you cannot become a lawyer.

What about doctors, 9 percent of the sample? These are much more concentrated, because of the prerequisites of medical schools. Sixty percent of the doctors came from the biology concentration and 17 percent from chemistry. However, there was at least one doctor each from anthropology, classics, English (four of them, in fact), history and philosophy of science, ideas and methods, mathematics, music, philosophy, psychology, public policy, and Romance languages and literatures. While the main pathway to medicine is obvious, it is by no means the only way in.

The other large group among alumni is in banking and finance (also about 10 percent). Of these, 40 percent came from economics, 8 percent from psychology, 7 percent from political science, 7 percent from English, 6 percent from mathematics, 5 percent from public policy, and 4 percent from history. Again there is a dominant route in, but there are many routes beside the dominant one.

I am sorry to list all these things for you, but I want to eradicate in your minds the notion that there is much of a connection between your college curriculum and your eventual career. There is, to be sure, what social scientists are fond of calling an elective affinity; there are concentrations whose graduates are slightly more likely to end up in certain careers than others. But there are no concentration/career connections that are ruled out, and there are no obligatory tracks of any kind.

So the second basic reason for working hard in some particular form of study is wrong as well, at least in this college. With the exception of those planning to become professors in the natural sciences, there is absolutely *no* career that is ruled out for *any* undergraduate major at the University of Chicago. What you do here does not determine your occupation in any way.

You are free to make whatever worldly or otherworldly occupational choice you want once you leave, and you do not sacrifice any possibilities because you majored in something that seems irrelevant to that choice.

As far as performance in college is concerned, there is not, as I said, any national evidence that level of performance in college has more than a minor effect on later things like income. And in my alumni data, there is absolutely no correlation whatever between GPA at the University of Chicago and current income. Get it straight. Whether you end up on Fire Island or in the Hamptons depends largely on things that are unrelated to what you do as an undergraduate at Chicago.

I hope then to have disposed of the notion that what you do here or how well you do it has any connection with your worldly success either in general or in detail. The general level of that worldly success is already guaranteed by your admission here and by the factors that made it happen. The detailed level of your worldly success depends largely on occupational choices that are unrelated to what or how you do here.

Now the third reason for getting a college education is that it will give you foundational cognitive skills for later life. Since this is the argument I have myself made most strongly in the past, I shall take special care to demolish it.

The argument is that college teaches you not so much particular subject matters as it does general skills that can be applied throughout your future life—in graduate training, at work, and in recreation. That the actual material learned in college doesn't matter much is well known. Everyone over thirty knows that, as far as content is concerned, you forget the vast majority of what you learned in college in five years or so. But, so the argument goes, the skills endure. They may be difficult to measure and their effect hard to demonstrate. But they are the core of what you take from college.

Now what people have in mind here in the first instance are simple verbal and quantitative skills: things like advanced reading and speaking abilities that will help you deal with a knowledge economy, and quantitative training that will enable you to make reasonable financial choices and that will prove useful in area after area of professional endeavor. Beyond these lie more advanced skills: critical reading ability to see through the lies of newspapers and stock prospectuses, analytic ability to formulate complex programs of action at work, writing ability to make your ideas clear to your peers, independence of mind to free you from others' views, and capacity for lifelong learning to enable you to deal with the changing needs of work and enjoyment over the years.

There is much evidence that our own alumni, alumni of equivalent schools, and national alumni samples all believe deeply that such general skills constitute the crucial learning in their college experience. Alumni always note the *loss* of detailed knowledge from college, while they always emphasize their *retention* of general skills that they use in all walks of life.

But the evidence that college learning per se actually produced these skills is pretty

flimsy. While we do know that people acquire these skills over the four years they are in college, we are not at all clear that it is the experience of college instruction that produces them. First, the kinds of young people who go on to college, and certainly to elite colleges like this one, are quite different from those who do not. If in our analyses we do not have perfect statistical control for all those differences, college may appear to have effects that in fact really originate in the differences between those who go to college and those who don't.

To this selection bias effect (as it is called), we can add the equally difficult problem of unmeasured variables. Changes that we might attribute to college instruction could actually derive from other things. College students are likely to have more challenging jobs, for example, than students who don't go to college. They spend more time hanging out with smart people. They live in an environment where cognitive skills are explicitly valued. The differences of skill could be produced by *these* things rather than by the actual educational experience of the college classroom. Moreover, since many cognitive skills *cannot* be shown to differ seriously between those who have experienced college and those who have not, much of the skill increase could come from simple maturation. You could get more skilled just because you've lived a few more years.

Our belief that college education has cognitive importance rests pretty completely on our belief that we can statistically solve these problems of selection bias and unmeasured variables, because the only nonstatistical way of handling them is controlled experiment. And no one has ever taken a thousand bright, ambitious young people like yourselves and sent them not to college but instead to some other, equally challenging, intellectual environment that did not involve classroom instruction, courses, curricula, and so on. Suppose you could spend the next four years going through a structured rotation of working internships in businesses, not-for-profits, and government agencies, where you would not be instructed in classrooms but would simply be left to pick up skills the same way everybody else there does: by asking friends and coworkers what to do, by reading a manual here and there, or by going to some organizationally sponsored classes on particular necessary techniques. You might still live in dormitories of some type. You might still have an extracurricular life. But there would be no classroom instruction. Now I submit to you that in all but a few areas—the hard sciences and perhaps engineering—you would be every bit as ready for law school or business school or management consultancy or social work training as you will be after your four years in classrooms here.

That this is likely to be true seems pretty clear from the statistical evidence that we *do* have about the net effects of college study. Let me summarize it as follows. First, there is no consistent evidence for a substantial *net* effect (say a 20 percent or more positive effect) of college instruction on oral communication skills, written communication skills, general reflective judgment, or intellectual flexibility, although

there is moderate evidence for some kind of minor effect in all these areas. Second, there does seem to be consistent evidence that college instruction has a medium-sized effect (a difference of about 10 to 15 percentage points) on general verbal skills and general quantitative skills. But this seems to be a matter of “use it or lose it” rather than of learning new skills. College simply makes you keep using the skills you learned in high school, whereas many forms of employment don't. So people who go to college maintain their skills, while those who do not go to college regress. Finally, college does seem to have a substantial net effect in the area of critical thinking. However, the research on that topic has often not been controlled for age, which makes it difficult to separate out the effect of college attendance from that of sheer maturation.

Now these findings are not all from elite colleges but from various samples at various levels throughout higher education. But we can still infer from them that there is not much evidence for a large net effect of college on cognitive functioning. That boils down to saying that you were smart people when you got in here and you're going to be smart people when you get out, as long as you use that intelligence for something—it doesn't really matter what—while you are here.

All of these statistically observed effects are effects of college versus not attending college, which means effects of college versus low-level, unchallenging employment or even unemployment. There is, as I noted earlier, no *explicit* comparison whatever of college with some other intellectually challenging activity. *Implicitly*, of course, we have experiments going on about this all the time. Data on the forty or so elite colleges in the United States (the so-called COFHE schools) tell us that there is wide variation between those colleges in the amount of time typically devoted to studying. There are places like Brown where it is possible to be a full-time newspaper writer for one's entire undergraduate career—treating class work as a more or less irrelevant aside—and there are places like the University of Chicago where it is not possible to do that. And, of course, within a school some will work extremely hard on studies while others may put equally huge amounts of intellectual effort into other things like orchestra or creative writing or comedy or whatever. But nobody has yet measured those alternative intellectual endeavors in a way that could test their net effect on cognitive development as opposed to that of classroom-related work. Nor has anybody tested the probably erroneous prediction that students at colleges where large amounts of class- and homework are done actually do better later on in some worldly sense or even in measures of cognitive achievement.

So the first pieces of evidence against the argument that “college education will teach you general skills that are centrally important in your later life” are (1) it isn't really evident that these skills arrive independent of natural maturation; (2) if they do it is not clear that college education per se produces them; and (3) there is no evidence that there are not other kinds of intellectual challenges that would produce the same skills.

Now the second broad class of evidence

on this “cognitive skills” argument has to do with whether these skills actually are of central importance in later life. You probably already suspect that you will learn most of what you need to know to be a lawyer, doctor, or businessperson in the professional schools for those occupations, not in college. And those of you who become doctors will find out soon enough that biochemistry and other such elaborate scientific prerequisites are of very little interest or use to practicing physicians. Indeed, it was not until well into the twentieth century that medical schools universally required heavy-science B.A.'s of their matriculants. Moreover, elsewhere in the world, medicine, law, and business are quite commonly undergraduate, not graduate, degrees. So there is quite a variety of suggestive evidence implying that college-based skills are not crucial to later professional life, the opinion of alumni notwithstanding.

But let us push further. Take the standard list of undergraduate skills and run them by the occupations most of you are headed for, and let's see whether the professions really employ those skills. Recall that the skills concerned are critical thinking, analytic reasoning, lifetime learning, independence of thought, and skill at writing; these are the big five that showed up in my alumni data, that were also dominant in the equivalent COFHE data, and that feature prominently in national studies—not to mention in college viewbooks. Are these things in fact necessary in law, medicine, business, and—let's get to the real dirt—academics?

Lawyers. The real activity of elite lawyers is to find business, to make contacts, to lead legal teams, and to oversee young associates. The young *associates* need to know how to write and to have analytic skills. But too much critical thinking will get them in trouble, and independence is likewise problematic. As for nonelite lawyers, the vast majority of what they do is conveyancing, divorces, wills, companies, and the occasional personal injury case—virtually all of which they learn on the job after law school, taught in many cases by their clerical staff. That the tactics of great litigators are not learned in the classroom any one of those litigators can tell you; a background in drama is more useful than one in law. And having a deep and critical command of law itself is not useful to anybody but law professors and perhaps a few judges. So it is hard to make a case that the big five cognitive skills matter anywhere near as much for lawyers as do skills for getting along with people, for working in coordinated groups, and for clarifying and simplifying problems and selling those clear simplifications to various audiences.

In business, it is more or less the same. Those of you who go into business will never have to write well in the sense that I or some other professor uses the term. You will have to reduce things to bullets well; you too will be in the business of simplification and clarification. And you will have to work well with others and indeed will need to shelve a large part of your independence. You will have to put your critical thinking under very strict control, as Bob Jackall has so brilliantly shown. General analytic skills will be very important to you, but, again as

Jackall and other students of management have shown, the crucial analytic skills for business managers lie mainly in interpreting people and in decoding the kaleidoscopically biased types of information that flow through large organizations. These are not things we teach you a damn thing about in college. Our texts are not written by people who are trying to deceive you into doing what they want.

What about medicine? The vast majority of medical work, like legal work, is in fact routine—everyday application of a standard repertoire. More than business people and lawyers, however, doctors do have to engage in lifelong learning. Senior lawyers can leave new law to the associates under them, but doctors have to keep up. Like businessmen, however, they have no need to write, unless they are academic physicians. Nor is really complex analytical thinking often necessary. The medical division of labor handles that need by concentrating those skills in a few places and referring perplexing patients to them. By contrast, critical *listening* skills—those are essential. Ability to understand what another person is trying to tell you is a foundational skill for a working physician. But we don't give any formal instruction in it at all (and indeed there is little enough formal instruction in it in medical school).

Finally, what about professors? Do they need these skills? Well, by now you've probably seen that what's really going on is that the list of "major cognitive skills" everyone talks about is in fact the stock in trade of elite academics themselves. (I should of course say "ourselves.") Critique is rewarded, analytic skills prized, writing necessary, independence and self-learning essential. To a considerable extent it is indeed true that the famous skill list is really the academics' list. Now I could make a case against the centrality of these values even in academia; most college professors work at nonelite universities with heavy teaching loads of unmotivated students and find little enough use for those skills. But even without this demonstration, it remains true that most of you will *not* in future occupational life need the specific kinds of cognitive skills that are emphasized in higher education. The most obvious example is writing. We at the University of Chicago will obsess about good writing. But the blunt fact is that most of you will do very little writing over the rest of your lives; the major reports and legal opinions and company prospectuses and so on that you do will all be produced by committee and will be designed to tell an audience what it wants to hear or what it will find persuasive, *not* what is analytically correct.

So we have good reason to doubt not only the first part of the statement "College education will teach you general cognitive skills that are centrally important in your later life," but also the second. College instruction cannot be proved to be the source of the skills thought to be important, and, moreover, they probably aren't that important.

Let me, finally, dispose of yet another variant of the cognitive argument for college education—the notion that there is a particular body of material that constitutes cultural literacy and that it is the duty of liberal education to teach you some large

fraction of that material. I call this the *lingua franca* argument, for the canon so taught is meant to be a kind of *lingua franca* between "educated" people no matter what they currently do. The *lingua franca* argument goes back to the great elite institutions of Europe—nineteenth-century Oxford and Cambridge, the Ecole Normale Supérieure in Paris, and similar institutions throughout the continent. As social elites passed through these places, they learned huge quantities of Greek and Latin prose and poetry by heart. Later in life, they quoted these phrases to each other in parliamentary speeches and casual club conversations and so on. The quotes functioned as a kind of secret code that labelled elites and also made a useful common cultural vocabulary. One didn't have to puzzle out anger abstractly. One could rather talk about Achilles sulking in his tent. Indeed, I can remember quite a few people envisioning the Vietnam War as America's equivalent of the Athenian expedition to Sicily where, in Thucydides' immortal sentences,

κατὰ πάντα γὰρ πάντως  
νικηθέντες καὶ οὐδὲν ὀλίγον  
ἔς οὐδὲν κακοπαθήσαντες  
πανωλεθρία δὴ τὸ  
λεγόμενον καὶ πεζὸς καὶ  
νήες καὶ οὐδὲν ὅτι οὐκ  
ἀπώλετο, καὶ ὀλίγοι ἀπὸ  
πολλῶν ἐπ' οἴκου  
ἀπενόστησαν. ταῦτα μὲν  
τὰ περὶ Σικελίαν  
γενόμενα.

Thucydides 7.87.6

Yes, that's right. It doesn't mean anything if you don't know Greek. A canon works only if everybody who is supposed to have it agrees on what it is. A hundred years ago, half of you would have known what I was saying. (Maybe I would, too.) But the situation of our current educational system is that since nobody in fact agrees on what the canon is—even in the broadest terms—the system definitionally does not have a canon. In fact, there *is* a common culture of examples and rhetorical figures in America today. But most of it comes from sports, entertainment, and current events. In short, there is not an academic or high cultural canon, and to the extent that there is a canon of another kind, professors aren't especially expert in it.

Perhaps the one thing we can save from this wreck is what I shall call the gymnastics argument. This is the argument implicit in my discussion of replacing college with a rotation through large-scale internships, as well as in my noting that writing full time for a newspaper may be as intellectually challenging as doing work in classrooms. On the gymnastics argument, it doesn't really matter what you do intellectually in the next four years as long as it is intellectually challenging. Any kind of strong intellectual exercise will develop or at least maintain your intellectual skills. Since it happens that the type of exercise most easily available is college instruction itself, you might as well take advantage of it and get your exercise there. It's like going to the intellectual health club on the next block rather than bothering to drive downtown to the Chicago Intellectual Athletics Club.

The gymnastics argument was in fact at the heart of the reform of nineteenth-century Oxford and Cambridge. Nobody thought that learning Greek was going to directly help you rule India. But a person who could truly master Greek or vector calculus could be trusted to learn whatever was necessary to govern India, so they thought. Having once had the experience of extended and difficult study, such a person could master anything. At its extreme, this argument led to an absolute ignorance of the real issues at hand; many a British colonial administrator was far more comfortable with aorist middle subjunctives than with subaltern populations. But as a pure intellectual discipline it was a great idea. Unfortunately, as this example and my previous discussion of professions make clear, maybe later work is not mainly about intellectual matters at all, so maybe the intellectual gymnastics exercises are truly irrelevant.

Let me pull my argument together about what are not the aims of education before turning, in the time remaining, to the question of what those aims are. I have shown first that your general level of worldly success does not depend on your study here—indeed that success is already pretty much guaranteed. I have shown second that your detailed level of worldly success is a function of occupational choices that will come after your time here and that will be largely unrelated to it. I have shown third that there is no strong evidence that college instruction gives you cognitive skills not available elsewhere and fourth that the much-vaunted basic intellectual skills may not in fact be the most important skills either in professional school or professional life. Nor finally is there any reason to believe in a canon, since said canon is manifestly absent in actual American life. The sole thing I am willing to grant out of this whole discussion is that college instruction may be justifiable as a form of mental gymnastics. But lots of other things might serve that purpose just as well.

So the long and the short of it is that there is no instrumental reason to get an education, to study in your courses, or to pick a concentration and lose yourself in it. It won't get you anything you won't get anyway or get some other way. So forget everything you ever thought about all these instrumental reasons for getting an education.

The reason for getting an education here—or anywhere else—is that it is better to be educated than not to be. It is better in and of itself. Not because it gets you something. Not because it is a means to some other end. It is better because it is better. Note that this statement implies that the phrase "aims of education" is nonsensical; education is not a thing of which aims can be predicated. It has no aim other than itself.

There are two parts to this denial that education has aims. The first concerns the future. By saying that education does not have aims I mean that we should not want education now in order to get something later, whether that something is further education or something else entirely. The second argument concerns the present. By saying that education does not have aims I also mean that we should not want educa-

tion in order to use it for something besides itself in the present.

Let me begin with the first of these. I have already shown at some length that if there are extrinsic aims of education, they do not lie in the future. Insofar as we can measure, education in the sense of college class instruction seems to have little to do with your future worldly success or even with your future cognitive functioning. But even setting aside my earlier social-scientific approach and thinking theoretically for a moment, the central problem with thinking that education has aims in the future is that the world and our knowledge of it and our ways of thinking about it will all change fundamentally by the time that future arrives. No matter what area of endeavor we consider, the facts concerning that area and the very theories and concepts by which we understand it change perpetually. Medicine, law, business, physics, architecture, farming, social work, you name it—its knowledge basis will have changed in important ways between your graduation from college and the time of your tenth reunion. Not only the facts and materials, but even the deep skills involved in these areas change with remarkable speed.

The situation becomes clearer when I state this change not in passive but in active terms. Changes in knowledge happen not just automatically, in some disembodied way, but because people *envision* them. Thus, people find new facts and materials because they look for them. They make new theories and methods because they want to replace older ones they now find unsatisfactory. But whoever we are—doctors or lawyers or farmers or accountants—we have to be able to envision these new ways of thinking about the world and of doing things in it if we are going to bring them about. So our education cannot consist of mastering disciplinary or professional material or even general skills. To the extent that you master and then reify those things—turn them into fixed, concrete rigidities—you will be unable to imagine the things that will replace them. No, to be able to transform and change and renew the ideas you work with you have to master something that enables you to see them from outside. That something is education.

This argument rejects the common idea that the aim of education is to give you the skills to survive the rapid changes in the first-level materials of knowledge. That is because the skills change, too. Writing was a far more important skill a century or even half a century ago than it is today. Now we could move up yet another step by talking about formal education at a third level—education in skills of envisioning how to change skills. But every time we move up a level in this way, we are thinking less and less about the future and more and more about a kind of constant of intellectuality—a set of mental habits that are enduring qualities of a mind. To the extent that we escape the trap that historical change presents for concepts of education, we escape it by moving to a less and less temporally directed concept of education. We move from thinking about the future to thinking about an enduring quality of the present. In short, even when we argue in this theoretical style, we do not find that

education has aims in the future. Any serious concept of education seems inevitably to root itself in a state of being that endures—one based in the perpetual present of the self.

Note, incidentally, that in the process of denying aims of education in the future I have also disposed of the notion that education means learning a bunch of particular contents. I have already given a down-market rejection of that argument in its *lingua franca* guise. But the problem of the steady change of ideas (or viewed from the more active side, the problem of the perpetual need to imagine new ideas) demolishes the notion that the essence of education consists in mastering certain contents or materials. You are not little birdies sitting in the nest with your mouths open to receive half-digested worms of knowledge regurgitated by the faculty. Education is not about content. It is not even about skills. It is a habit or stance of mind. It is not something you have. It is something you are.

But now, having disposed (yet again) of the notion that education has aims in the future, I turn to my assertion that education does not have any aim in the present other than itself. I shall not argue this negatively, as I have argued so far, but rather positively, by showing that education in the sense I shall define it is a good in itself. If it is good in itself, we don't have to care much about whether it has other uses. They are mere by-products and hence of no substantive interest.

By education I am going to mean the ability to make more and more complex, more and more profound and extensive, the meanings that we attach to events and phenomena. When we are reading a text, we call this adducing of new meanings *interpretation*. When we are doing mathematics, we call this giving of meaning *intuition* and *proof*. When we are reading history, we call it *a sense of historical context*. When we are doing social science, we call it *the sociological imagination*. In all these areas, to be educated is to have the habit of finding many and diverse new meanings to attach to whatever events or phenomena we examine. We have lots of standard routines for doing this—interpretive paradigms, heuristic methods, theoretical schemes, investigative disciplines, and so on. But education is not these paradigms and methods and disciplines. Rather it is the instinctive habit of looking for new meanings, of questioning old ones, of perpetually playing with and fighting about the meanings we assign to events and texts and phenomena. We can teach you the paradigms and the methods, but we can't teach you the habit of playing with them. That's something you must find within yourself.

Now after all this buildup, that may seem like saying education is not much. "I can already do this," you say. "Meanings," you say, "I can give you ten meanings for your last paragraph. Not a problem. Moreover," you say, "why should that be a good thing? Who gives a damn about all this new meaning? It's just blowing smoke. Let's cut to the chase."

Well, in the first place, I'm not at all sure that most of you can play with meaning all that much. Because plenty of you are fidget-

ing in your seats wondering when the hell I'm going to finish. You are having trouble sitting still and thinking about one of the most important qualities of your life even for as long as fifty-five minutes. But if you've thought up all the new thoughts and imaginings you can generate about education in the forty minutes that have so far elapsed, maybe we had better dismiss the argument that you are—at least in this sense—fully educated already.

But the more important issue is the question of why attaching endless new meanings to things should be in itself a good thing? The answer is this: By attaching more meanings to things, by bringing more of experience under our current range of meaning and extending our range to embrace more things in more complex and abstract or sometimes ambiguous ways, we in effect enable ourselves to experience more of life in a given present, a given now. An educated person experiences more in a given period than does a noneducated person. This is not to say that there is something inherently bad or damaged about lives that lack education. An uneducated human life commands the same dignity as any other. But given the opportunity, you are a fool not to avail yourself of every means to extend your experience in the now. The quality of education is our central means for doing that.

"Bor-ing," you say. "This argument is too abstract. It's not *about* anything. What does he mean education is a way of having more experience in a given period?" Well, let's talk about something that *will* get your attention. Sex. The argument I am making is essentially the following. Any animal can take off its clothes, rub and fondle a bit, arrange its sexual organs properly, and hump away till it's done. But the experience of sex will literally be better, in the sense that it will seem to take much more time (and of course you can make it seem *interesting* much longer) if you break up the preliminaries into foreplay and relaxation, if you turn aside from the straight path a bit and graze elsewhere, if you make the thing a complex conversation of bodies referring to dozens of different imaginations in your brains, rather than just bashing away as any animal can do. That's my argument. By increasing the density of meanings in an experience, you expand that experience. You make it more extensive and more enduring all within the same social and temporal space. Education is a way of expanding experience.

If you don't like that example, consider looking at a painting in a museum. Yes, it's easy enough to look at the painting and to come up with things to think about it. But how much richer they are when you know already the many different traditions of imagining the visual world, when you can understand the detailed references the painter made to those traditions, when your immediate knowledge of the painting's social and cultural context makes you literally see dozens of things that aren't there if you don't know those contexts. It's the same argument. The experience becomes "bigger" because you are educated. Not merely in the sense that you can look at the painting longer without being bored, but also in that within a single look you will see more. And note that education doesn't lie

simply in knowing the whole of the dead list of facts and contexts of who taught whom and which style was which, but rather in taking such facts as you do know and playing with them and the painting.

Now note that in arguing that "educated sex" is better sex or that educated museum-going is better museum-going, I'm not arguing that you should, as it were, miss the main point, either of the sex or of the painting. That is, because you have made the event more complex doesn't mean you have to lose the overarching sense of the simpler version. But it *is* true that you can't fill your brain endlessly—it has finite power. And so one of the crucial decisions you make about your education is how to balance breadth and depth. Because breadth too constitutes a way of expanding your experience. Complexifying is not the only way of making meaning.

Thus, I argue that education is good in itself because it expands the range of your experience, both temporally and spatially. Education means figuring out how to arrange the finite things you can know, their varying levels of abstraction and detail, their mix of skill and data, fact and theory, so as to maximize the potential array of meaning that you can experience in the now. Whatever your temporal and spatial present, education lets you live more within it, by bringing more meanings into play, by creating a dialogue of complexity and simplification, of distinction and analogy, that transforms your immediate world and reaches beyond it. To be sure, we are all bound to a reality that is local in a million ways—by language, location, race, gender, age, occupation, body type, religion, and so on. Just because you know a lot of abstract stuff doesn't mean you can escape that locality. After all being located somewhere is, paradoxically, one of the universal human attributes, and there is a provinciality of abstraction that is just as inane as that of detail. But in the mind of a thoughtful person, education is a habit that expands experience so as to overcome that provinciality by increasing ties between your locality and other human meanings. Sometimes abstraction is the mechanism for this, sometimes identification, sometimes grand simplification, sometimes the link goes through the tiniest of similar factual details, such as a similar eye color or a shared hometown.

Bear in mind too that this localism, this provinciality, is not only in space—geographical and social—but also in time. All of *you* live in a local temporality—one in which the future is your twenties and mid-life is light-years away. To you I am a fixed object who doesn't live in a now, a "professor," who was and is and always will be. But I too live a contingent life, in which things might be radically different in a very short time. To me, you are the fixed ones, who will wander probabilistically through the chances of life as I did, with just as varied results. But just as education enables overcoming impoverished localism in terms of social and cultural space, so also it means overcoming this mutual and provincial illusion of temporal fixedness so that together we can simultaneously experience the contingencies of both mid-life and youth.

As teachers, we try to entice you into this habit of education by a variety of exercises,

just as a Zen monk tries to get a novice to achieve enlightenment by giving him a koan to meditate on. Note that the Zen koan is *not* enlightenment but rather is a means to enlightenment. So too there is, as I have said, nothing special about the exercises we teach—analytic reasoning, good writing, critical thinking, and so on. All the stuff of the core. They are exercises we give you hoping that they will somehow help you find the flash of enlightenment that is education. In that sense, the phrase "aims of education" is exactly backward. Education doesn't have aims. It is the aim of other things.

This "education," this flash of enlightenment, is the emergence of the habit of looking for new meanings, of seeking out new connections, of investing experience with complexity or extension that makes it richer and longer, even though it remains anchored in some local bit of both social space and social time. Everything else we teach is an exercise to achieve that.

At the same time, one should not despise these exercises. Just because I have argued that the materials and skills we try to teach in class are not themselves the thing that is education does not mean one can easily find education without them. Indeed, to invoke another, more famous, metaphor, you can think of the curriculum as the shadows cast on a wall by the light of education itself as it shines over, under, around, and through the myriad phases of our experience. It is a mistake to be sure to take these shadows for the reality, but they are something that helps us find or grasp or intuit that reality. The false notions that there *is* a fixed curriculum, that there *is* a list of things that an educated person ought to know, and that the shadow-exercises on the wall themselves *are* the content of education—these false notions all come from taking too seriously what was originally a wise recognition—the recognition that the shadows do in fact provide a starting point in our attempt to fully envision reality.

But note that in this metaphor it is not just the shadows on the wall that are not education. Knowing reality isn't education either. Education is the light, the shining thing that assigns meanings. If you have it, all the rest—the core skills and the *lingua franca* and the basic materials, all those shadows on the wall—suddenly becomes obvious. That is why so many happy alumni who found the spark of education mistake in retrospect the exercises for the reality. Once the spark is found it makes the pathway to it seem unproblematic, self-evident. For education is an invisible creativity that radiates from within. It is not something you have. It is something you are.

In summary, from a practical point of view there is no evidence that undertaking the particular intellectual exercises we set for you here at college has any exclusive connection with your worldly success or your cognitive development. Nor is there really an effective theoretical argument for aims of education going forward into the future. The reality is that education is a present quality of self, a way of being in the moment. And that quality is its own aim, because it expands our present experience and hence is worthwhile in itself.

Three important matters in closing: First a word about the future. I have in a way

deceived you with my argument that education has nothing to do with the future. I have argued that education is a quality of one's self in the present. But of course we will always live "in the present," even though from where we are now, future presents look like fixed things. "I'll be a doctor" or "I'm going to write a great novel," we say—as if these future presents were simple and fixed states of being. When you get to the future—when you become the doctor or write the novel—you'll find that your future nows are just as contingent, just as uneasy, just as "present-like," as is your present today. So it turns out that cultivating education—a sense of a self that perpetually, restlessly looks for new meanings in situations and facts and ideas—is a crucial resource for the future, because the future is a series of contingent moments just like the present.

As a result it is in an odd way true that education is your best way to "plan" for the future. (Odd because "education" in that sentence does not mean what you used to think it did.) The one thing we know of the future is that although we cannot predict it, it will happen anyway. Look at the person to your right. Now look at the person to your left. In twenty years, all three of you will have married and one of you will have divorced. You don't imagine that now. Nobody in this room, I would imagine, is planning to get divorced. But over 40 percent of you eventually will. History happens.

And these personal happenings are only one type of chance. The events of a year ago will have persuaded you that there is no escaping history. But believe it or not those events will seem quite minor in fifty years—harbingers perhaps, but not by any means the great events of the next half century. After all, nearly ten times as many people died *every single day for six years* in World War II as died in the one day of the World Trade Center attacks. The society in which most of you will die fifty or so years hence will not look at all like this society now. Widespread, everyday biological terrorism could be a fact of life, as could comprehensive economic globalization, worldwide religious war, genetic registration, disappearance of national boundaries, rationing of procreation, implanted personal locator chips—who knows what is coming?

Now you cannot *plan* for these things, overwhelming as they are. But you can be prepared to comprehend them by becoming a person who can find meaning in events, a person of education. Indeed, if you are educated you will be able not simply to experience these events, but to shape their meanings for yourself and others. You will not just experience the future, but also make it. In that sense, being educated is your best plan for an uncertain future.

Second concluding remark: I have throughout this talk considered matters of cognition. I have not talked about emotional and moral education, even though both social science studies and theories of education recognize the importance of emotional and moral growth in the college years. We do know that intellectual study will be only one of three basic activities you do here. The second is paid work. The majority of you will work on and off

through college and, indeed, many of you will work nearly half time by the standards of the labor force. And the third activity is that vast body of other things—sports and clubs and love affairs and cruising blues bars and eating at restaurants and so on—that we so aptly call the extracurriculum.

Now people who think about formal education have focused on cognition and have paid remarkably little attention to what we might call the moral and emotional curricula of college, which are "taught"—for the most part—in your work life and your extracurricular life. This is not because the emotional and moral curricula lack importance. Recall that in my earlier remarks about the professions I said that professional elites often require moral and emotional skills like leadership, understanding, and organization far more than they do cognitive skills like analytic thinking and clear writing. So these are important skills indeed. But in practice our moral curriculum boils down to some brief discussions about getting along in dormitories and some politicized and often phony class discussions about race, class, gender, and so on. My friend John Mearsheimer had the guts to stand where I am standing four years ago and argue forcefully that college education is not moral education. Theoretically, Professor Mearsheimer may have been right—he argued from a strong libertarian and cognitivist viewpoint—but empirically he was dead wrong. Willy-nilly, moral learning will be central in your college experience. You will do a lot of moral learning even in the classroom, much of it learning to dissemble your real views in discussions that are more apparent than real. Sad to say, you will find this skill extremely useful in later life.

Our emotional curriculum is in an even worse state. Basically, we bring all of you here, brim full of needs and desires and hormones, let you loose on each other like so many animals in a wildlife sanctuary, and hope for the best. Why we should have arranged cognitive learning so that intergenerational transmission is highly effective but emotional learning so that every generation has to start over from the beginning is beyond me.

Now my point is that for you as individuals, your responsibility to yourselves for finding education is not limited to the cognitive matters to which the University—following Mearsheimer's argument—largely restricts itself. You need to become educated in morals and emotion as well. And in those areas, I am sad to say, we do not really provide you with anything like the systematic set of exercises in self-development that we provide on the cognitive side. So you are on your own.

Third and finally, this talk may seem to have given you an extraordinary charter of freedom. I have said—and the studies show—that what you do here has few clearly evident consequences for your future. To many of you, this may seem like a license to do whatever you damn well please for the next four years. In a sense, you do indeed have that license. Education is here to look for, but nobody can actually force you to find it. And nobody here can deny that the world is full of very successful people, at the highest places in our society, who have college degrees from eminent

places and who yet lack even the most rudimentary forms of education.

To put it simply, the system as it currently exists trusts you with the whole store. Education is the most valuable, the most human, and the most humane basis around which a person can build him- or herself. And you are here offered an unparalleled set of resources for finding the flash of enlightenment that kindles education within you. But it is in practice completely your decision whether you seek that flash. You can go through here and do nothing. Or you can go through here like a tourist, listening to lectures here and there, consulting your college *Fodor's* for "important intellectual attractions" that "should not be missed during your stay." Or you can go through here mechanically, stuffing yourself with materials and skills till you're gorged with them. And whichever of these three you choose, you'll do just fine in the world after you leave. You will be happy and you will be successful.

Or on the other hand you can seek education. It will not be easy. We have only helpful exercises for you. We can't give you the thing itself. And there will be extraordinary temptations—to spend whole months wallowing in a concentration that doesn't work for you because you have some myth about your future, to blow off intellectual effort in all but one area because you are too lazy to challenge yourself, to wander off to Europe for a year of enlightenment that rapidly turns into touristic self-indulgence. There will be the temptations of timidity, too, temptations to forgo all experimentation, to miss the glorious randomness of college, to give up the prodigious possibilities that—let me tell you—you will never find again; temptations to go rigidly through the motions and then wonder why education has eluded you.

There are no aims of education. The aim is education. If—and only if—you seek it . . . education will find you.

Welcome to the University of Chicago.

*Andrew Abbott is the Gustavus F. and Ann M. Swift Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Sociology and the College.*

# University Memorial Service Address

By Alison L. Boden

November 3, 2002

First there is the phone call. Then the heart drops out its holster; the straps that have held it in place give way; they dangle, the heart plummets to the floor. A pause, then a sob, then tears, perhaps tears that seem to have no end. The hand won't stop shaking, breathing seems to cease, the body crumples into a chair while the mind and heart struggle to comprehend that while one minute ago there was *someone*, someone deeply present and sewn into every seam of one's life, that now the presence is erased and every seam torn open.

Perhaps there is no phone call, no surprise, or not now. Perhaps when death came to a loved one you were at the bedside, accompanying. Perhaps you held your loved one's hand like an escort, like dropping someone off at an engagement or at school, steadying them as they made their way through the doorway, letting go of the hand with a request and a prayer to whoever might be on the other side to care for them well. Then they passed through the door and were gone. Perhaps death came as a moment of grace, after troubled breathing, after much pain, after loss of awareness or self. Perhaps death came after reconciliation was reached with people and histories and deeds. Perhaps death came after peace was made with God and the world and all the things done and left undone, things said and left unsaid. Perhaps as your loved one went through the door to the arms of welcome on the other side a peace descended upon him or her, and you sensed that the soul was uncaged, set free, free now to be present in love at so many places at once, from now on to accompany *you*.

We grieve no matter what, however the news comes to us, and it is hard. I know from my own experience and from pastoral conversations with many that the process of grieving takes a variety of forms. For some it brings depression. For some it brings anger. For some it brings a hopelessness that makes us question the real value of work or relationships or pleasures or goals. Our world seems barren; desolation tinges every part of our life. There is a hollowness at our core, a profound sadness. Death defeats our spirit, smothers it, surrounding our heads and faces like a blanket, permitting no fresh air. What faith we have may wither. Temporarily or irreconcilably, the death of a loved one may dim the joy we get from being alive.

Another way of experiencing it—and I honestly don't know if it's something we can *choose* to do—is to experience small moments of ultimacy. Having been knocked to our knees by grief we come to our senses—all our senses are revived. If our world suddenly stops, it also quietly starts over, and starts afresh. On our knees we notice for the first time that there are others on their knees. We see a *world* on its knees. We hear a world on its knees; we taste, smell, and touch a world on its knees. Our grief makes every scale fall from our eyes and we see every aspect of our lives with more clarity than we ever have before. In the depths of our sadness we are also indescribably glad—glad for family and friends that we recognize afresh as the greatest gifts in our lives; glad for work that is a calling

and rest that revives us; glad for communities of faith that hold us up, for neighbors and colleagues whose questions challenge us to be and do better than we have. Profoundly sad and glad at the same time—no, we don't have a disorder, we're just living at the highest pitch. All the distractions that prevent us from appreciating the gifts in our lives—all that is most important—these distractions are finally banished by the intrusion of death. We see so clearly the difference between what is distraction and what is ultimate. On our knees we have moments of ultimacy, the heart quietly on fire, touching the eternal, the everlasting.

For some of us, God is at the heart of our experience. We realize that in landing on our knees we've landed in true prayer, perhaps for the first time. Then we realize that prayer is not made up of words but of simple connectedness to the divine. Prayer at the office, prayer on the El, prayer at the grocery store—whenever our souls feel connected to God we are at true prayer. George Herbert called prayer, "God's breath in man returning to his birth/The soul in paraphrase, heart in pilgrimage . . . Church-bells beyond the stars heard, the soul's blood, / The land of spices, something understood." Something understood there on our knees—perhaps the goodness of God, or the presence of God (and maybe God alone) in the center of our grief. Perhaps we understand God's redeeming purpose for the whole of our lives—the glorious and the despairing. Perhaps we simply understand that God *is*. Perhaps we understand that our hearts are truly in pilgrimage, that our souls are in divine paraphrase.

If we are lucky, after the death of a loved one, we are more fully alive than we've ever been. You may be thinking, is there anything lucky about grief, something every person hopes to avoid, one of the most painful of human experiences? I believe there is something very lucky about the grief that deepens and extends the quality of our living, even if the process hurts very badly. It needn't happen that way—that growth. We may be unlucky: the end of all our grieving may be a small death inside our spirit, and not new life. We are lucky also, I think, if our experience of grieving teaches us the fact that we, too, happen to be dying, as we have been since our birth. That fact is not morbid or unfair or cruel, but something with the power to transform our living/dying into a much more profound act. In a sermon preached at Whitehall in 1621, John Donne said,

Doth not man die even in his birth?  
The breaking of prison is death, and  
what is our birth but a breaking of  
prison. As soon as we were clothed  
by God, our very apparel was an  
emblem of death. In the skins of  
dead beasts, he covered the skins of  
dying men. As soon as God set us on  
work, our very occupation was an  
emblem of death; it was to dig the  
earth; not to dig pitfalls for other  
men, but graves for ourselves. Hath  
any man here forgot today, that  
yesterday is dead? And the bell tolls  
out for today, and will ring out  
anon, and for as much of every one  
of us, as appertains to this day.  
Quotidiè morimur, et tamen nos

esse aeternos putamus, say St. Hierome; we die every day, and we die all day long.

I think that if we can let this fact transform us we will find small moments of ultimacy even when we are not grieving. "Something understood," as George Herbert said, moments here and there where the whole of our lives makes sense, sense in their details and sense in the divine economy of human living. The ancient Babylonians and Canaanites understood death as a divinity. It had such enormous power, such mystery, and such transformative potential not only for those who died but those who went on living. Dying and living—they are so extraordinary, so ultimate, that they *must* be holy.

Perhaps the best known of John Donne's sonnets is also on the topic of death. Holy Sonnet X begins "Death not be proud," and it concludes,

Thou art slave to fate, chance, kings,  
and desperate men.  
And dost with poison, war, and  
sickness dwell;  
And poppy or charms can make us  
sleep as well,  
And better than thy stroke; why  
swell'st thou then?  
One short sleep past we wake  
eternally,  
And death shall be no more; death,  
thou shalt die.

In the teaching of Donne's religion, the eternal life of the soul means that death is vanquished—killed even—every time it takes another life. I think that Donne's point is true for the living—that we who live also conquer death, we cause death to die, when we refuse to let a part of ourselves die along with the one we love. And how much more is death made to die if another's death only causes us to live more fully? Death dies and dies again, because even as we die each day we never let death have any piece of our spirit, whether we grieve or whether we rejoice, whether we fear or whether we discover. Death can deconstruct us. It can quietly take us apart piece by little piece. It can worm its way into the vulnerability of our sadness and make its home there for the rest of our days. Or death can give us the tools to make the most meaning of our own lives, to help us discover or enfold a purpose behind all that we do, to set it in holy context. In this way, the death of a loved one does not take our lives away from us, as obsessively demanding, distracting, and painful as the throes of grief might be. The death of someone we love gives our life back to us, unchained now from anything that had made our lives inauthentic, pale, cowardly, inattentive, or oblique. We may be grieving a death but we become further removed from death than at any time in our lives. It is ironic, it is gift, it is blessing.

I hope that you have had around you the people, the resources of spirit to help you come to life even as you have grieved. I hope that moments of ultimacy have come to you, "something understood." And I hope that you are making your way forward grateful ever to have had the one you lost, confident in the goodness of life, filled

with wonder at the loveliness of human being and of all that is left unknown. Abraham Joshua Heschel was right, "Just to be is blessing, just to live is holy."

Amen.

*Alison L. Boden is Dean of Rockefeller Memorial Chapel and Senior Lecturer in the Divinity School and the College.*

## Memorial Roll 2002

The following list contains the names of those whose deaths have been recorded with Rockefeller Memorial Chapel between September 15, 2001, and September 15, 2002. Please direct any comments regarding the names listed here to Lorraine Brochu, Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, 773-702-7059, [lbrochu@uchicago.edu](mailto:lbrochu@uchicago.edu).

### Faculty

Arnita Young Boswell  
Michael Camille  
Norman J. Cutler  
Jarl Dyrud  
Robert H. Kirschner  
David Mingay

### Faculty Emeriti

Mary Jean Bowman Anderson  
Donald E. Charleston  
Gosta Franzen  
Sumiko Fujita  
Dave Fultz  
Roger Gould  
David Grene  
Robert Hopkins  
Ira A. Kipnis  
Leonard Kmak  
Claire Landau  
Lawrence Lanzl  
Martin B. Matthews  
Peter Meyer  
Bernice L. Neugarten  
Charles D. O'Connell  
Ruth Rhines  
Ralph Shapey  
Theodore Silverstein  
Robert Streeter  
Zena Sutherland  
Anthony Turkevich

### Staff

Loretta Armstead  
Frances A. Aube  
Dennis Barrick  
Diane Beck  
Gobin Biessar  
Patricia A. Caudill  
William Mark Coward  
Charles Helzer  
Nkemdi Jackson  
Carole A. Kieltyka  
Charles Kurns  
Christof Litwin  
Allen O. Lockridge  
Jeffery A. Nelson  
Anna Pope  
Therese Reczek  
Robert Schnoor  
Hamish Shaba  
Brian Shannon  
Gregory Steele  
Jane Strable  
Kathy Visak  
Franklin Williamson  
Claire Wright

**Retired Staff**

Louise Alexander  
 Leroy Anderson  
 Woodrow Armstrong  
 Julia Baker  
 Ralph Bargaen  
 James Barnett  
 Donald Elton Bartlett  
 Hulet Buford  
 George A. Doyle  
 Henrietta Dreyfus  
 Harold Dyme  
 Sue Fisher  
 Fern E. Fister  
 Kathryn Ginther  
 Lydia Hermann  
 Barbara A. Hillbrant  
 Betty Hollander  
 Dorothy Huegel  
 Velma Johnson  
 Elliot Johnson, Sr.  
 Elaine K. Karrison  
 George Kreisheimer  
 Marie Lukacek  
 Margaret Matchett  
 Martin Matthews  
 Nancy Meredith  
 Dennis Metcalfe  
 Alfred D. Meyer  
 Idabel Miller  
 Evelyn L. O'Farrell  
 Margaret Perry Olson  
 Agnes Orr  
 Joseph Perry  
 Rosalee Phillips  
 Ethel Radford  
 Priscilla Rayford  
 Carolyn Marietta Riedle  
 Alex J. Sabo  
 Robert Schnoor  
 Artie Scott  
 Mary Joan Shiu  
 Elizabeth Short  
 Marion Siwy  
 Robert J. Slehofer  
 Helen Smith  
 Mildred N. South  
 Hodgie J. St. Clair  
 Hollis G. Stafford  
 Jane Strable  
 Goldie Sugarman  
 Mitchell J. Szwedo  
 Allen Thompson  
 Albert G. Viernes  
 Agnes Witmarsh

**Students**

Rafael Luis Chabran  
 Peter Anthony Gonzalez  
 Ndudim Michael Madubuko  
 Shahzad Zaigham Najmuddin  
 Kristina Ann Nielsen  
 Ilana Schaffer

**Family of University Members**

Jean Bryk  
 Dorothy Ranney Donnelley  
 Sumiko Fujita  
 Sean Gilbert  
 Ruven Greenberg  
 Henry Hines IV  
 Robert Hopkins  
 Leonard Kmak  
 Claire Landau  
 Grace Lyles  
 James Rufus Norris  
 Anthony Resch  
 Cassandra Suggs

**Trustees**

James Button  
 Coralyn Eleanor Ingersoll  
 Harvey Kapnick  
 Ferdinand Kramer  
 George A. Ranney, Sr.  
 Carl Strome  
 Mary Ward Wolkonsky  
 Joseph Wright

**Related Board**

Betty Reneker  
 Brian Shannon

**Friends and Family of the Rockefeller Chapel Worshipping Community**

Andrew Crawford  
 Helen V. Ellefson  
 Jack Epping  
 Irene Moll  
 Charles Chirmato Rubuka  
 William Shleicher

**Alumni**

Louis W. Abood  
 Philip W. Abrams  
 Charles T. R. Adams  
 Mathew H. Ahmann  
 Barbara S. Albrecht  
 Saul Alford  
 Don A. Allen  
 Katherine B. Allen  
 Victor A. Altman  
 Peter Sebastian Amenta  
 Jeannette Anderson  
 Lolita Maria Anderson  
 Robert L. Andresen  
 Albino N. Angonese  
 Fred Calbert Ash  
 Samuel J. Aurelius, Jr.  
 Carl T. Bahner  
 Orrin J. Bargerhuff  
 Max Barth  
 Glenn C. Bartoo  
 Edward G. Bastian  
 Hugo C. Baum  
 Carl H. H. Baumann  
 Robert W. Beart  
 George E. Beauchamp  
 Ronald E. Becht  
 Donald K. Beckley  
 Joan Lyding Bell  
 Donald E. Bellstrom  
 Seth Benardete  
 Lawrence Paul Benson  
 Conrad L. Bergendoff  
 Ralph Bergstrom  
 Richard V. Bernhart  
 William R. Berthel  
 John Jay Berwanger  
 Thomas J. Bevan  
 John E. Bex  
 Roberta J. Biery  
 George A. Binder  
 Margaret F. Bird  
 Mary H. Johnson Bixby  
 Lloyd J. Blakeman, Jr.  
 Harvey Blank  
 George I. Blanksten  
 Mary Block  
 Gladys N. Bonine  
 Roslyn Strauss Bornstein  
 Lyle B. Borst  
 Arnita Y. Boswell  
 Rudolph Bouie  
 Edwin C. Bowers  
 Louise R. Bowler  
 Mary Jean Bowman Anderson  
 Sally Boxser

James D. Boyack  
 Bruce B. Boyd  
 Richard H. Breaker  
 James Brodsky  
 Dwight M. Brookens  
 Dorothy K. Brooks, Sr.  
 Harold E. Brooks  
 John S. Brown  
 Roger M. Brown  
 Verne W. Brownell  
 Ralph Buchsbaum  
 Denison K. Bullens, Jr.  
 Ellen Louhi Burton  
 George Joseph Busiel  
 James W. Button  
 George Dewey Buzard, Jr.  
 Clement C. Caditz  
 Stewart D. Cain  
 John Thomas Carey  
 Richard R. Carlson  
 Diana Lee Carpenter  
 John J. Carroll  
 Robert L. Chaffin  
 Oscar O. Christianson  
 John C. Clark  
 Philip W. Clark  
 Alfred Clebsch, Jr.  
 Bernice Cohen  
 Gerald B. Cole  
 Dorothy E. Collins  
 Norton J. Come  
 Louise Conn  
 James A. Conner  
 Thomas E. Connolly  
 Thomas O. Cook  
 L. Knowles Cooke  
 Beverly A. Cope  
 James G. Costakis  
 Catherine Coughlan  
 Gloria Count-Van Manen  
 Alexander Coutts  
 Berkley N. Coventry  
 Richard H. Cox  
 Ward H. Cramer  
 Lee J. Cronbach  
 Frank M. Cunat  
 Miles E. Cunat, Jr.  
 Margaret G. Darland  
 Margaret B. Dauer  
 Alvin M. David  
 Norman R. Davidson  
 Benjamin O. Davis, Jr.  
 Carl B. Davis, Jr.  
 Hilda A. Davis  
 Paul S. Davis  
 Henry W. De Leeuw  
 Frederic A. de Peyster  
 James S. De Silva  
 Betty Dean  
 John R. Deering  
 Kathryn Defenbaugh  
 Faburn E. DeFrantz, Jr.  
 Margaret Deitz  
 Philip A. Delaney  
 Frances H. Delisle  
 Kenneth Demb  
 Carl H. Denoms  
 Lily E. Detchen  
 Jo H. Deutsch  
 Donald J. Dewey  
 Alfred Aron Diamond  
 Darrel Keith Diamond  
 Edward A. Dixon  
 Rudiger Dornbusch  
 Allan M. Douglass  
 Arthur M. Doyle  
 Richard N. Doyle  
 Edwin H. Draine  
 Boyce A. Drummond, Jr.

Marguerite M. Ducker  
 Elizabeth Durchslag  
 Alfred S. Edler  
 Mary Eheart  
 Josephine M. Elliott  
 Roy Elliott  
 Elizabeth M. Ellis  
 Nancy Emory  
 Joseph Elliot Engel  
 Shirley Galewitz Epstein  
 Huberta Barton Erickson  
 Vincent W. Erickson  
 F. Elizabeth Eslick  
 William S. Evans  
 Jerome J. Ex  
 Alan J. Farber  
 Theodora Cogley Farrell  
 Chalmer Ernest Faw  
 Mildred Venger Fechter  
 Alvan R. Feinstein  
 Rose L. Fiedler  
 Eleanor A. Finn  
 Gladys Fischer  
 Verrill John Fischer  
 Marian W. Fischman  
 Leslie P. Fisher  
 Mark J. Fitzgerald  
 Arthur E. Flint  
 Robert W. Floyd  
 Eugene O. Forman  
 Alice E. Foster  
 Edith M. Foster  
 Emily W. Fouts  
 Erhard R. W. Fox  
 Gould Fox  
 Jacob L. Fox  
 Jacob Logan Fox  
 James R. Frakes  
 Edna Freehling  
 Ethel L. Freel  
 Adele M. Fricke  
 Herbert B. Fried  
 Morris S. Friedman  
 Alvin Fross  
 Gerarda Marie Fulham  
 Dave Fultz  
 Steve Furimsky, Jr.  
 Estelle R. Gabriel  
 Gerald P. Gaffney  
 Gloria Grace Gagola  
 Sherman Rodricus Galbreath  
 Joseph J. Gasior  
 Kenneth P. Geis  
 Ely M. Gelbard  
 Claudia Gesner  
 Paul A. Gia Russo  
 Camilla H. W. Gibby  
 James T. Gibson  
 Margaret C. Gilbert  
 Clarence W. Gilmore  
 Michael B. Girsdanský  
 Keith Thomas Gleeson  
 Margaret L. Glossinger  
 Robert J. Gnaedinger, Jr.  
 James S. Gold  
 Jane Goldberg  
 Robert B. Gordon  
 Thomas Gordon  
 Dale Gould  
 Yuji Goya  
 Stephen G. Graham  
 Alexander Graubart  
 Alan P. Graves  
 Frances M. Gray  
 Paul Gray  
 Seymour J. Gray  
 Georgia Greenspan  
 William T. Greenwood  
 Margaret Mary Gregg

Earl J. Grimm, Jr.  
Lewis G. Groebe  
Richard G. Guilford  
Robert L. Gutreuter  
A. William Haarlow III  
Wayne B. Hadley  
Charles A. Hagen, Jr.  
Arnold Calvin Hahn  
Dorothea A. Hain  
Richard B. Hall  
William A. Hall  
George T. Hanna  
Dorothy M. Harbin  
Frank Harding  
Shirley Pearllove Hardis  
Dale G. Hardman  
Bertrand Fereday Harrison  
Betty Hawk Hartwell  
Crane C. Hauser  
David Bixby Hawk  
James H. Hayner  
Jean Reed Haynes  
Zelda R. Heffer  
Charlotte K. Henkle  
Virginia Henkle  
Warren E. Henry  
Harry James Henwood  
Kate Meyer Herman  
Susan Herman  
Norman Herstein  
Lorton G. Heuse  
Stefan Heym  
Hamlin L. Hill, Jr.  
M. Anne Hill  
Robert S. Hinds  
Otto E. Hintz  
Jane Hockwalt  
John M. Hoffmann  
Ben D. Holt  
John Raymond Hope  
Penelope K. Hope  
Arthur C. Hoppenstedt  
Charles M. Horton  
Helen Littig Hunt  
Mary Irons  
Rose Isaacson  
Thomas H. Jacobsen  
Karl R. Janitzky  
Paul C. Jarvis  
Clarke Leslie Johnson  
Eugene M. Johnson  
Milton G. Johnson  
Aaron M. Johnston  
Robert M. Jones  
Earnest K. Jordan  
Martin D. Kamen  
Burton W. Kanter  
Hoda Jane Kaplan  
Verna Anna Kattapong  
Erwin Kaufman  
Keith Kavanaugh  
Peter A. Kechik  
Hilda Keely  
Bruce D. Kellner  
Robert Francis Kemp  
Paul B. Kennedy  
Garth S. Kennington  
Shirley K. Kessel  
Guy N. Kieckhefer  
Irene Minter Kilgore  
J. Stanton King, Jr.  
Jack A. Kinney  
Philip J. Kinsler  
Ira A. Kipnis  
Philipine A. Klaus  
William Klevs  
Draza B. Kline  
Marion Quinn Kluge  
Janet Kluz

Walter J. Kobos  
Margaret F. Kohl  
Kate H. Kohn  
Rankin D. Kothmann  
Louis Edward Kovacs  
Arthur G. Kowalsky  
M. Robert Krag  
Ferdinand Kramer  
Harry G. Kroll  
Mary B. Krueger  
Irving Kupfermann  
Estelle J. Kurek  
Dorothy Antoinette La Selle  
Robert G. Lake  
Richard T. Lamey  
Pearl Landon  
Paul R. Lauritzen  
Milton G. Lawless  
George R. Le Sauvage, Jr.  
Laurence E. Leamer  
D. William Lecos  
Harry Dean Leinenweber  
Moses Lennon  
Deborah D. Levin  
Iris Leviton  
John M. Lewin  
H. Ralph Lewis  
Lawrence E. Lewy  
James F. Light  
Shelby J. Light  
Joseph A. Limprecht  
Helen Line  
Richard A. Lippold  
Mai-Shian Liu  
John F. Locke  
Frank A. Loftus  
Alice Lohrer  
John P. Lombardi  
Arthur E. Long  
Walter R. Louis  
Jeanne M. Lynch  
Richard E. Lynch  
James E. MacMahon  
Ndudim Michael Madubuko  
Genevieve Mallory  
Marcella C. Malloy  
Isabel Malone  
William L. Maloney  
Marian Mann  
Paul J. Marino  
George M. Marro  
Robert C. Marsh  
Gary Steven Marshak  
George W. Martin  
John B. Martin  
Harold A. Mason  
Norman W. Masterson  
Martin B. Mathews  
Joseph L. Matthews  
William Randolph Maxwell, Jr.  
Stanley L. Mayo  
Rosamond Martin McClain  
Charles Henry McElroy, Jr.  
William J. McGonagil  
J. Nanette McLain  
Elizabeth A. Meek  
Dennis B. Metcalfe  
Charles A. Meyer  
Charles O. Meyer  
Dorothea S. Miller  
Florence Miller  
Florence Mink  
Patsy T. Mink  
Rachel Minkus  
Esther D. Missner  
D. Scott Mitchell  
Paul Lee Moeller  
J. Robert Moffett  
Dorothy B. Moll

Julia H. Mond  
Walter L. Montgomery  
Hastings Moore  
Gilbert G. Morehouse  
Alice Morgan  
Leon Morgan  
Robert D. Morgan  
Wolfe Mostow  
James A. Moyer  
Florian Mueller  
Edward A. Muir  
Martin F. Mulhall  
Donald F. Mulvihill  
Ann M. K. Munch  
Violet B. Munns  
Patrick Jude Murphy  
Grace A. Musselman  
Paul David Myatt  
Harry M. Nacey, Jr.  
Rosalind Nachman  
August T. Nakagawa  
Morton Namrow  
Charlotte Ruth Nathenson  
Evelyn Nelson  
Genevieve Nelson  
Robert A. Nelson  
Ruth Netherton  
Richard Newhouse, Jr.  
Edgar Leon Newman  
Melvin M. Newman  
Jay T. Nichols  
Myra A. Nichols  
Elizabeth H. Nicol  
Harold L. Nieburg  
Elizabeth Nissen  
Betty Niven  
Daniel C. Noel  
Frank E. Norton, Jr.  
George H. Norton, Jr.  
Charles D. O'Connell  
James Carneal O'Flaherty  
Gary K. Oleson  
Ruth E. Olson  
Mark A. Orloff  
Benjamin J. Ostrar  
Charles Mathieson Otstot  
Marcelle V. Owen  
Robert R. Palmer  
Thomas Hyonsu Park  
Marjorie Parr  
David Parson  
Robert F. Peck  
Jerald P. Peel  
Mildred G. Peirce  
Janet Pence  
Charles Eric Peterson  
Florence E. Phillips  
George W. Pickering  
Morton A. Pierce  
David J. Pittman  
Richard James Podolsky  
Jacques C. Poirier  
Alice Polanyi  
Helen May Pomerance  
John Uldis Poruk  
Vincent F. Prada  
Hazeldeane Pritchard  
Elizabeth Quantrell  
Richard P. Radcliffe  
Natalie Rogoff Ramsoy  
Ferris S. Randall  
Edna E. Raphael  
Charlotte Read  
Lionel I. Rebhun  
Dolores Recht  
Philip P. Rector  
Bernice Joy Regaldo  
Arnold B. Rhodes  
C. Harker Rhodes, Jr.

Doris Jean Rhodes  
J. Gordon Rich  
Jerome Richard  
Jerri Lynette Richardson  
Thomas N. Riley  
Alexander M. Riskin  
Elinor Roach  
Anita Weisbrod Robinson  
Jack A. Robinson  
Rodric L. Robinson  
Walter James Rockler  
Maris Monitz Rodgon  
Bernard J. Rogers  
Lisa Rogers  
Michael P. Rogin  
Ruth C. Rosenbaum  
Victoria H. Rosenthal  
Thomas A. Ross  
Arthur J. Rubel  
Lee A. Rubens  
Dorothy Rule  
Carol F. Russell  
Anthony M. Ryerson  
S. M. Salvino  
Timothy J. Sampson  
Gordon E. Samson  
William M. Sanford  
Bernard Sang  
Robert Arnold Satten  
Marvie D. Satterlee, Jr.  
Kirk Sattley  
Michael G. Savoy  
Theodore B. Schaefer  
Bernard N. Schilling  
H. Alan Schlesinger  
Barbara Quinn Schmidt  
Ellen Schmidt  
Robert A. Schommer  
Avery L. Schreiber  
Madeline Schroeder  
Elliott W. Schryver  
Marjorie L. Schuster  
Walter W. Schwider  
Charles E. Scott  
Elwin P. Scott  
Reuben H. Segel  
Louis Seliger  
Emily Wolff Sereno  
Robert L. Shallenberg  
Roger L. Shapiro  
Alan M. Shefner  
Norman B. Sher  
Howard A. Shlay  
John Myronides Shlien  
Ethel Fratkin Shulman  
Melvyn H. Siegel  
Karl Siewers  
Sol R. Silverman  
Dorothea Pye Simon  
Ralph R. Sjoberg  
Rex B. Skinner  
Robert E. Slayton  
John H. Smith  
S. Wayne Smith  
W. H. Roger Smith  
Donovan E. Smucker  
Ethelyn Towner Snell  
Brooke Shannon Snyder  
Robert H. Snyder  
Helen Sonderby  
Zona B. Sparks  
Judson H. Spencer  
Mary Spencer  
Clement F. Springer  
Lois H. Stallknecht  
William H. Stapleton  
Fredrick J. Stare  
Oliver H. Statler  
Helaine Staver

---

Lotte Wolf Stein  
George Steinbrecher  
Harold R. Steinhauser  
Edward M. Stempel  
James C. Stephenson  
Mary B. Stephenson  
Marion K. Stevens  
Richard James Stevens  
Alice McLean Stewart  
Maurice Stock  
Mark F. Stratton  
Carl G. Strome  
Wayman L. Strother  
Robert Allen Stump  
Louise M. Stutsman  
Milton J. Surkin  
Edward Sutherland  
Zena Sutherland  
Charles F. Sykes  
James A. Talvitie  
John R. Tambone  
Earl F. Tanner  
Robert John Tausz

George W. Taylor  
Dorothy P. Tayrien  
Zelda Teplitz  
William R. Terbeek  
Robert A. Tetu  
Charles J. Thiebeault  
Don F. Thomann  
Miriam Thomas  
Nadine Thomas  
Julian L. Thompson  
Mildred R. Thomson  
Marshall Steven Tokson  
Forrest L. Tozer  
Georgia M. Travis  
Paul M. Tricou  
W. Wallace Tudor  
Eleanor Wilkins Turner  
Eleanor R. Turner  
A. Douglas Tushingham  
Janet Ullmann  
Helen S. Van Mell  
Wilbur H. Vance, Jr.  
Myron I. Varon

Birgit Vennesland  
Howard A. Vernon  
Idabel Waddy  
Durrett Wagner  
Raymond B. Walters  
Fritz W. Wanzenberg  
Azuba Ruth Ward  
Irma Frantz Watson  
Todd Christopher Weaver  
William M. Weaver, Jr.  
Emelyn B. Webster  
Louis F. Weichbrodt  
Irving L. Wein  
Meyer Weinberg  
Frederic D. Weinstein  
Walter W. Welkom  
Gideon R. Wells  
Jeanne F. Westheimer  
David A. Wexler  
Elsa A. Whalley  
Douglas H. White  
Agnes Whitmarsh  
Paul O. Whittle, Jr.

Martha Wilbur, Jr.  
Tudor Wilder  
Richard B. Wilson  
Martha B. Winch  
Gibson Winter  
Dorothy Witt  
Carl Wolz  
Harry D. Wood  
Herbert N. Woodward  
Isaac Wright, Jr.  
Arthur V. Wynne, Jr.  
Marianne G. Yampolsky  
Adeline Yates  
Robert N. Yetter  
Miriam Alexander Zahler  
Edward V. Zegarelli  
Anna Rose Zellick  
Charles P. A. Zerfas  
Bernard G. Ziv, Jr.  
Betty Hurwich Zoss

# The 468th Convocation

## Address: "Understanding Perspectives"

By John A. Lucy

March 15, 2002

You will, I hope, excuse me as I take a moment to look out over the chapel and all of you gathered here today. I have, of course, sat many times on the benches you occupy, attending various opening day ceremonies, memorial events, and indeed my own Ph.D. graduation one August day some fifteen years ago. But this is the first time I've had the opportunity to take just this perspective on things, to see the whole arrangement as it spreads out from this crow's nest of a vantage point. And, since one never knows whether one will ever be invited back, I had better seize the opportunity while I can.

Well, the hardheaded realists among you will perhaps be comforted to know that I find it all looks pretty much as I imagined it would. No surprising revelation quite yet. Doors and windows, faculty, students, and parents—all are more or less where I expected them to be. Though it is a bit of a miracle, don't you think, that one can even imagine such a scene beforehand. How is it, actually, that never having stood here before I can predict relatively well just how the scene will appear? From developmental research on children we know that we begin to acquire this capacity to recognize the same object from different, novel perspectives in the first year of life. And some few years later we can recognize complex arrangements of objects from different angles and predict where things should be, or recognize where there has been a misalignment, or notice that an item is missing. This imaginative capacity is truly a wonderful power, one we depend on routinely and unconsciously as we go about our daily life. Notice that in this sort of spatial perspective taking, we ultimately commit to the notion that reality itself (including the observer) is stable and that as we move around and take different perspectives, scenes really ought to align with our expectations. And when these expectations are occasionally violated, as in a visual illusion, a hallucination, a magician's trick, or a work of art, we have strong reactions, whether of confusion, consternation, surprise, or delight.

But from another perspective, the scene here is not at all how I imagined it some fifteen years ago. Everything is different, really. Some of the differences are straightforward, largely temporal ones: the chapel has been refurbished (to good effect I might add) and the characters have mostly all changed (in some cases also to good effect). And there are more subtle differences. I am not the same person who sat out there so many years back doing all this imagining, so how can I see now what I would have seen then? And I am certainly not seeing what whoever-it-was-who-stood-up-here-then saw. And are any of you really like I was when whoever-it-was-who-stood-up-here-then with me-out-there imagining what-he-saw-when-he-looked-at-us? Well, you get the idea. I don't mean this to be one of those can-you-step-in-the-same-river-twice sort of predicaments, but there is a genuine puzzle here when we start thinking about how perspectives shift as part of people's actual changing lives.

What sort of perspectives are we talking about now? Certainly not the same kind as in our spatial case. As we saw, the spatial case assumes that reality, including the

observer, is somewhat stable, that you down there can imagine the view up here and then, at least in principle, directly come up here and check out your surmise and it will check out because you are still you and the scene is still the scene. But now we are using the same term *perspective* to talk about situations in which you, the inquiring subject, and the scene, the object of inquiry, can change between the time of imagining and the time of verification, sometimes in fundamental ways. Use of the same term *perspective* in this way with its attendant implication of a stable reality has led to no end of trouble. For example, we assume that as stable subjects, what we want now as young people is what we will want when we are older; that what we wanted as young people, our children will now want. But we are not the same in those two developmental phases and, perhaps more crucially, we likely have faced quite different worlds. You can see the same stable reality logic at work when we look back on a failed love affair and think "I must have been crazy." What we are really saying here is that rather than judge our *current* reality as unstable, or our perspective on it as contingent, we would rather regard ourselves as having been slightly out of our minds before—in other words, assigning experiences that seemed real and compelling enough at the time to the status of some sort of hallucination. Logically, it is as likely that we are out of our minds now. Or better, that there were, and therefore are, two quite different realities rather than two perspectives on the one, though this too can lead to bewilderment about which "me" is the real "me." I think that age often brings the welcome wisdom that both are real in their own way and form parts of the complex whole of who and what we are in our life. But until then, we are rather prone to be hard on our past selves and on others whose current views of reality don't quite square with ours, because, after all, the assumption of this model is that there is only one reality and we trust that our current self has got hold of it.

Our use of the term *perspective* extends still further. Consider the cases where someone asks, "Why can't you just take my perspective?" or "It depends entirely on how you look at the situation" or, most tellingly these days, "You just don't get it." In these cases, people are challenging our interpretation of the situation even as we stand in the same place, at the same time, looking at the same facts. This sense of the term *perspective* may, of course, overlap with our previous sense, we may just have differing past experiences. But this usage captures a broader array of possibilities, such as when we speak to people who simply do not share our fundamental assumptions and values. The subtext of our efforts at discussion is often that the other is willfully avoiding seeing the obvious. Again, the reality is taken as stable; it is the other subject who seems incapable of seeing it. How many potent examples there are here. Just think of some of the jarringly painful contemporary discussions we have had over what constitutes sexual harassment, over the reasonableness of the Clinton impeachment or the FBI attack on Waco, and over the morality of abortion. People can have very similar experiences and confront more

or less exactly the same facts and yet differ profoundly in their conclusions because of very general interpretive frameworks they bring to the situation. To take the most prominent current example: some believe the events of September 11 were an Israeli conspiracy; others believe they were a Republican plot to manipulate the electorate; others believe they were acts in a holy war; others believe they were acts of disheartened European immigrants; others believe they were the acts of a politically motivated terrorist organization; and so on. To be sure, deciding among these views depends in part on getting the facts straight; but the plausibility of these interpretations to those who embrace them has much to do with whole ways of seeing the world that seem profoundly compelling to those who hold them and profoundly misguided to those who do not. But we need not focus solely on the dramatic: there are heated disagreements everyday between different scientific schools of thought, between various religions, between cultural outlooks—all these are kindred cases. Often, rather than challenge our model of a stable (hence singular) reality, we prefer to confine our discussions to those who think as we do and simply avoid those who disagree.

Understanding these sorts of contrasting perspectives cannot be accomplished simply by walking to a new location, or getting a bit older, or even sharing certain experiences; rather, it involves an act of imagination that yields an understanding of a whole worldview, a system of meaning within which events are interpreted one to another. Young children cannot perform this act of imagination; most adults do not come by the capacity easily and it usually requires some training. Indeed, a large part of your education here has been directly addressed to this skill. Let me explain. As usually conceived, education involves a sort of paradox: you are to be liberated from your ignorance by exposing you to knowledge. But of course, you must acquire our knowledge and our way of knowing, that is, you must conform to the received wisdom. Not surprisingly, we have in our culture a long tradition of skepticism about education since it liberates only by enslavement. If you really want to think freely, one might argue, you should never go to school. The usual liberal arts answer to this anxiety is that we are going to teach you to think critically so you won't be slave to our ideas. This is fine so far as it goes, but it is not always so clear what critical thinking means; often it means something like learning how to question assumptions and ferret out inconsistencies. But this sort of answer offers little or no constructive suggestion about what you are supposed to do in a positive sense. The alternative I am articulating here is that the fundamental core of a liberal education is learning to grasp other ways of thinking, other perspectives, by learning to see the ways that knowledge about reality depends on systems of meaning. All education at this University, whether collegiate, graduate, or professional, engages in this process both in terms of the specific approach to bodies of knowledge and in terms of a general cast of mind. The liberation in a liberal arts education lies not in knowing facts or in being a sharp or clever critic, but being able to get inside

systems of ideas and grasp their inner logic and, thus positioned, undertake the process of exploring how the different logics might be reconciled or translated one to another in some fruitful way.

Communication through natural language lies at the heart of this process of understanding. And in language we encounter the last type of perspective we need to discuss. For language, the medium through which we grasp other systems of meaning, other systems of understanding, is itself an exquisitely structured network of meanings. In this sense, each language, through the categories it selects and the ways it organizes and deploys them, provides us with a perspective on the world, a perspective that inevitably shapes all the messages conveyed through it. The perspective embodied in our language, and in the specialized professional jargons built up on it, presents the greatest challenge to our understanding of experience. Rapid, automatic, pervasive, and nearly invisible, our use of language constantly shapes our understanding in manifold ways. Coming to terms with these effects represents the ultimate challenge in nearly every field of study. The scientific study of these issues has hardly begun and, not surprisingly, this is also where our contemporary system of education remains most deficient. True understanding, I would argue, requires some minimal understanding the very medium of understanding. Instead, many would deny there is even a problem. Some, sitting snugly (even smugly) within their English borders, remain confident that there are no significant differences in how people talk. Others venture forth, bringing their English perspective to bear on the interpretation of individual elements in other codes and find, not surprisingly and to their great comfort, that the differences among languages are not so great after all. But others have taken up the task of getting inside the inner logic of other languages, the systematic arrangements of meaning, and have been astonished by the range of differences among codes and sobered as to the possibility of genuine translation. There are languages, for instance, that would radically alter my characterization of spatial perspective by requiring me to mark every verb for the direction of the action in terms of north, south, east, and west; other languages that would confound my efforts to describe my past experience by ignoring our distinction between present and past tense; and still other languages that would transform my efforts to discuss others people's ideas by requiring me to indicate constantly whether my statement was due to personal knowledge or to hearsay. Note finally that the entire discussion here provides a further example of language effects as we see the confusions that arise when we project assumptions about a stable reality drawn from the spatial meaning of *perspective* onto other uses of the term. In short, efforts to communicate about other perspectives must pass through this elaborate category system with inevitable effects of its own.

Within a language community, the shared code allows us to understand each other, to share perspectives effortlessly—we hardly notice the grooves we are forced into. Conversation provides the surest route

to understanding each other's perspectives in all the other senses I've outlined. Most of you, I trust, are learning something of my perspective on the world through this talk. But were we not to share a code, this whole process would be derailed. We would be left without the possibility of direct conversation and have to rely on those who can translate for us the ideas of others. Such translation presents enormous difficulties but is absolutely essential to bridging significant cultural differences. I imagine that some in this audience cannot in fact understand my words and will learn about my ideas if, and only if, some friend or member of the family recounts them afterward. Just be sure to indicate that it is all hearsay so they don't attribute these ideas to you.

What I hope you will convey to them on my behalf is that our simple way of thinking about all perspectives on analogy with spatial perception obscures some very important distinctions. It leads us to imagine a stable reality that ignores the effects of time and experience on both subject and object. It leads us to imagine a simple relationship between subject and object that ignores the constitutive role of frames of interpretation. And it leads us to imagine that the coordination of these frames of interpretation is a transparent process rather than itself mediated by a meaning-laden code. The upshot of these misrecognitions and confusions is that we continue to regard our differences from other people as either wholly trivial (that is, "they are really just like us") or as the product of their failure to see or refusal to acknowledge facts obvious to any observer if they would only look. The reality is that our vision of the world stems from a complex and multilayered web of experiences, systems of interpretation, and conventions of communication in which the reconciliation of perspectives is a daunting task.

We have endeavored in your time here at this University to give you the tools to navigate such differences in perspective by being skillful and sensitive interpreters of

your fields of knowledge and, we hope, of diverse viewpoints more generally. We have not only tried to give you some understanding of these diverse perspectives, but also to give you some perspective on the process of genuine understanding—that most important achievement of the human imagination. I congratulate you on the completion of your training and wish you well as you go forth to confront the complex and difficult world we face today. We trust that you will put your skills to work establishing meaningful dialogue with those whose perspectives may differ from your own so as to build a better world for us all.

*John A. Lucy is Professor in the Committee on Human Development, Department of Psychology, and the College. In March 2002, he was also Interim Dean and Deputy Dean of the Division of the Social Sciences; Master, Social Sciences Collegiate Division; and Associate Dean of the College.*

### Honorary Degree

#### Doctor of Humane Letters

##### Hugo F. Sonnenschein

President Emeritus and Honorary Trustee of the University; the Charles L. Hutchinson Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Economics and the College

*The candidate was presented by Pierre-André Chiappori, Professor in the Department of Economics and the College.*

Hugo F. Sonnenschein served from 1993 to 2001 as the eleventh President of the University of Chicago. During his presidency, the University initiated a large and ambitious campus master plan, dramatically enhanced College admissions, made important strides in improving the overall quality of student life, and strengthened student and faculty support. Under his leadership, a broad range of new interdisciplinary programs came into being, including

the Institute for Biophysical Dynamics, the Institute for Mind & Biology, the Computation Institute, the Human Rights Program, and the Committee on Cinema & Media Studies. During his tenure, Hugo Sonnenschein increased annual fund raising in the University by more than 60 percent and its endowment grew by more than 125 percent. Throughout his presidency, Hugo Sonnenschein was dedicated to nurturing the University's academic excellence for the long term.

Hugo Sonnenschein's superb teaching is legendary, and many of his former graduate students are now professors in major universities, including the University of Chicago. As an economist, his work in the fields of game theory, social choice, demand theory, industrial organization, and above all general equilibrium theory has had a profound and lasting impact on the profession. His analysis of the testable implications of individual rationality on aggregate economic behavior, as synthesized in the famous "Sonnenschein problems," deeply influenced modern mathematical economics; many recent works have found their inspiration in his initial insights. Here as in other circumstances, Hugo Sonnenschein's contributions embody the conceptual depth, intellectual courage and long-range vision that we at Chicago value so highly.

*Citation:* Distinguished teacher and researcher, you nurtured the most fundamental values of the University and strengthened it for the future. Both as scholar and as President of the University, your work embodies the conceptual depth, intellectual courage, and long-range vision that we so value.

#### Summary

The 468th convocation was held on Friday, March 15, 2002, in the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel. Don Michael Randel, President of the University, presided.

A total of 527 degrees were awarded: 30

Bachelor of Arts in the College, 13 Master of Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 20 Master of Science in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 3 Master of Science in the Division of the Biological Sciences, 26 Master of Arts in the Division of the Social Sciences, 363 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 Arts in the Divinity School, 1 Master of Divinity in the Divinity School, 6 Master of Liberal Arts in the William B. and Catherine V. Graham School of General Studies, 2 Master of Arts the School of Social Service Administration, 2 Master of Public Policy in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 10 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 13 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Humanities, 11 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 12 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Social Sciences, 2 Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Business, 7 Doctor of Philosophy in the Divinity School, 2 Doctor of Philosophy in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, and 1 Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Social Service Administration.

One honorary degree was conferred during the 468th convocation. The recipient of the Doctor of Humane Letters was Hugo F. Sonnenschein, President Emeritus and Honorary Trustee of the University; the Charles L. Hutchinson Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Economics and the College.

John A. Lucy, Professor in the Committee on Human Development, Department of Psychology, and the College; Interim Dean and Deputy Dean of the Division of the Social Sciences; Master, Social Sciences Collegiate Division; and Associate Dean of the College, delivered the convocation address, "Understanding Perspectives."

# The 469th Convocation

## Address: "Sexuality, Intimacy, and History"

By George Chauncey

June 7 and 8, 2002

Congratulations! This is a joyous moment not just for you, but also for those who raised you and those who taught you, for your loved ones and for your university. As a member of the faculty, I want to tell you how rewarding it has been to work with you and how much we value you. Nowhere else have I found so many students so earnestly engaged with the life of the mind, so many who relish being challenged and taking risks to think seriously and critically about their world. Your intellectual curiosity, openness, and rigor make this one of the most exciting places in America to teach, and I thank you for that.

I am honored to play a small role in your graduation ceremonies, which mark such a momentous transition in your lives. And I feel the burden of the moment, as we all must, since this is also such a momentous and dangerous time in the world. My greatest aspiration for you is that you will take up the challenge this presents by becoming engaged with the great moral and political debates before us, bringing to bear on them the skills and habits of critical thought you have honed here. It has never been more urgent that you do so.

In that spirit, I ask you to think with me today about an issue now pressing for our attention: the growing concern over sexual abuse in the Catholic Church. This is a morally complex and emotionally charged issue, one that has been a source of special heartbreak and anguish for people of faith, and one therefore all the more deserving of thoughtful attention.

As a historian of gender and sexuality in the twentieth century, I want to place this issue in a historical context that might illuminate it. In our relentlessly antihistorical culture, we tend to view this unfolding tragedy as we view most problems—as outside of history, unique, and unprecedented. But I have been struck by two historical antecedents to the current crisis, which, it seems to me, both shape and inform it, and might give us a broader perspective on its significance.

The first and most direct antecedent is the movement over the last several decades to curtail sexual abuse of power in a host of institutional settings—from the work place to the university. Numerous institutions, including this one, have struggled to combat such abuse and to establish grievance procedures that encourage people who have been subjected to unwanted attentions to seek relief. All such institutions have had to wrestle with the complex problem of determining the boundaries between appropriate and inappropriate intimacies between unequal parties.

This movement had its origins in feminist critiques of the way men used their greater institutional power to force unwanted sexual attentions on the women who were their subordinates. It gained impetus from the broader movement of our time to undermine social hierarchies based on race, ethnicity, religion, and other axes of social difference.

But it has also been inspired by the movement of sexuality into discourse, that is to say, by the historical process through which sexuality became a more explicit subject of representation and discussion, and came to be seen and experienced as a fundamental and uniquely revelatory ele-

ment of the self and society. We may react variously to the disparate manifestations of this trend. They include the growing sexual explicitness of television and film, the spectacle of a Supreme Court nominee and a sitting president having their sexual lives scrutinized by the press and Congress, and the narrowing of the boundaries of acceptable emotional and physical intimacy between friends of the same sex because of the growing fear that such intimacies will be seen as sexual. And they include the identification of people and denial of their rights on the basis of their sexual orientation, and the growth of political movements such as the gay movement in response. Whatever you think of each of these manifestations, they are related to one another in complex ways and together help characterize our historical moment.

Greater explicitness about sex—naming it, speaking of it, identifying people on the basis of it—does not simply produce sexual liberation and health, as some of its advocates hoped, or sexual license and degeneration, as some of its opponents feared. Whatever else, this visibility produces the conditions and often the impetus for the greater policing of sexual behavior. Intimate relationships between faculty and students were much more common at universities in years past, when it was easier for such affairs to remain shrouded in secrecy and ambiguity. It is harder to engage in a minor indiscretion when no one anymore is very discreet about sex.

The Catholic Church has had a complex relationship to this trend. In some contexts the church has been quite explicit about sexual matters. It has condemned abortion, erotica, and homosexuality. It has enjoined the faithful to confess their sinful sexual behavior and thoughts, a practice that some historians argue provided a powerful early impetus to sexual discourse. At the same time, it has long fought the explicit representation and discussion of sexual matters and, as recent revelations have shown, it has suppressed knowledge of and even ignored its own internal sexual problems. But now it, too, has suddenly been engulfed by this tide of history, so that, like other major institutions, it can no longer hide the sexual abuse of power within its ranks.

A second antecedent to the current crisis is the history of the sexual demonization of outsiders, especially when that demonization was produced by moral panics over sexuality. For make no mistake about it, the current outburst of revelation, revulsion, and outrage about sexual predators, which suddenly seems on the verge of reshaping the popular image of the clergy, has many precedents. For all its peculiarities, it follows the familiar pattern of moral panics, in which an incident, group, or social problem becomes the subject of popular anxiety and of incessant press coverage that forges powerful new frameworks for viewing the world and stereotypes of outsiders, whose dangerous effects linger long after the panic has subsided.

The Catholic Church itself has often been the object of such campaigns of demonization. In 1930s Germany, for instance, the new Nazi regime regarded the autonomy of the church as an impediment to the consolidation of its authority. When it tried to place Catholic schools under

Nazi control and dissolved Catholic youth groups so that only Nazis would organize the social lives and indoctrination of German youth, it justified these controversial steps by claiming they were necessary to save young people from the sexual predation of Catholic priests and monks. The regime went on to denigrate the men in monastic orders as effeminate. They did not adopt the steely masculine style celebrated by Nazi militarism, after all. And their vows of celibacy, the Nazis charged, kept them from producing children for the race and turned them instead to immoral practices, especially pedophilia. To emphasize its point and to intimidate the church, in 1937 the Nazis charged a thousand monks with sexual immorality, and convicted and imprisoned many of them on these charges.

The Nazi demonization of Catholic priests and brothers was part of a deliberate campaign to achieve specific political objectives. Most moral panics are more diffuse in their origins and authorship, involving newspaper reporters, local police, and experts of various stripes rather than a single state authority, and most are therefore less predictable in their outcome. But in making such charges, the Nazis followed a well-established pattern, for the demonization of outsiders as sexually aberrant and dangerous has long been a feature of cultural struggle. Perhaps the most pernicious and enduring example of this in American history is provided by the defenders of white supremacy, who for generations justified segregation and lynching alike by alleging that African Americans had voracious sexual appetites that threatened white women and racial purity. Attributing immoral or abnormal sexual practices exclusively to outsiders has often allowed the dominant culture at once to distinguish itself from those outsiders, to assert its own purity, and to police its own ranks.

Moral panics often give birth to new forms of demonization. A series of panics just before and after the Second World War, for instance, reshaped the dominant image of gay men. Several brutal but isolated sexual attacks on children prompted a series of nationwide police and press campaigns that depicted the country as overrun by murderous sex deviates. Most of the children attacked by men were girls, and many knew their assailants. But the press campaigns ignored this, and claimed instead that strangers and above all homosexuals were the primary threats to children, asserting that their apparently benign nonconformity betrayed more dangerous impulses. As an article in a popular magazine asserted in 1950, "once a man assumes the role of homosexual, he often throws off all moral restraints. . . . Some male sex deviants do not stop with infecting their often-innocent partners: they descend through perversions to other forms of depravity, such as drug addiction, burglary, sadism, and even murder." The male homosexual had long been regarded as a sissy-man, whom one might ridicule but had no reason to fear. Now he came to be seen as an inveterate child molester and predator.

The familiar stereotype of the gay man as a child molester is not a timeless image,

then, but a product of the moral panics of the 1930s and 1940s. It remains powerful enough today to incite and justify widespread opposition to gay rights, and particularly the rights of gay teachers and gay parents. It also has clearly influenced the way many people understand the current problems besetting the church, even prompting some to call for a purge of homosexuals, as if they all endangered children and as if their absence would end that danger.

How else might we respond to this tragedy?

It is imperative that we recognize and try to repair the terrible harm done to so many individuals that is now coming to light. At the same time, our society depends on people like you, with your critical skills and sensitivity to complexity, to prevent this moral tragedy from turning into a moral panic. For in a panic, distinctive devotional practices, such as the discipline of celibacy, will be interpreted for the worst. Dangerous new stereotypes of the clergy, gay men, and others will wreak their damage.

If this tragedy forces us to ponder how we can respond to the harm done to so many innocents without harming still more innocents, it also raises questions about how we can encourage intimacy while discouraging abuse, and how we can resist conflating intimacy with abuse. Such questions are shaped by our history, and they reflect the complexity of the moral dilemmas you will face throughout your lives.

My hope is that you will engage such questions—and all those to follow—with the same compassion, commitment, and intellectual integrity you have brought to your studies here.

*George Chauncey is Professor in the Department of History and the College.*

# Address: “Possibility and Responsibility”

By Ann L. McGill

June 9, 2002

At the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business, like all the University of Chicago, we pride ourselves on discovering and teaching the fundamentals. By “fundamentals” I do not mean the basic or rudimentary—the sort of material you might find in the first chapter of a textbook. No, the fundamentals are the underlying cause and effect linkages that make the world work. Finding out what these linkages are is the stuff of theory and research. But their understanding is also central to your work as business professionals, because effecting change—making things happen—requires a keen understanding of cause and effect. You need to know what levers to pull to make good things happen and what levers not to pull, indeed to lock down, to make sure bad things don’t happen.

At the heart of reasoning about causation is a process called counterfactual thinking. Counterfactual thinking may be an unfamiliar term but the process is day-to-day familiar. It involves looking at a set of circumstances, a set of facts, and imagining them to be different—at least in some aspects. We are engaged in counterfactual thinking when we experience regret—at those times that we think “if only,” as in: “If only something had been different, then it would have been okay.” It follows the car accident: “If only I had taken a different route home. . . .” The family squabble: “If only I had remembered just how tired we all were. . . .” The failed business venture: “If only the economy had held strong. . . .” You may be engaged in counterfactual thinking just now as you lament: “If only I had sat on the aisle, I could have slipped out during this speech. . . .”

The link between counterfactual thinking and causal judgment seems straightforward: the factor that we imagine to be different is the one that plays the role of cause, the factor that takes the blame, the one that we attempt to control. Despite this seemingly straightforward link between counterfactual thinking and causal assertions, however, psychologists have noted a difference between the factors we seem inclined to undo in our minds (our targets for seeing the world counter to the facts) and a more scientific approach to causation.

For example, a scientist sees fires as being caused by a combination of factors all working together—a sparking agent, flammable material, and oxygen. No one of these factors is more the cause than the others. But for most of us, statements of causation involve selecting one of these components and giving it special status as the “real” cause, relegating the other factors to background conditions. Yes, we will concede if pressed, these factors need to be there but they just don’t seem quite as pertinent. A fire inspector would not last long by saying that an apartment fire was caused only by that pesky oxygen. A statement that the fire was due to a failed circuit breaker in the basement seems a more

sensible choice.

But this example may not be a good one for illustrating an important element of counterfactual and causal reasoning. In this case, it seems sensible to point to the electrical problem as the cause and not to oxygen or even to the presence of—oh—too many newspapers piled in the basement. The electrical problem is more intrusive and more readily changed than the presence of oxygen or people’s basement storage habits. Here “undoing” in our minds, here reasoning counterfactually about the electrical problem, seems the right focus for our thoughts and, later, for our resources. It seems practical.

Study of people’s reasoning, however, suggests a less practical-minded approach to counterfactual reasoning. In looking over a state of affairs, our mind finds it comfortable, natural, “right” to undo some factors and uncomfortable, unnatural, and “wrong” to undo others. And the psychological rules for undoing and for leaving the same in our imagined other states of the world appear to be more a function of social and cultural beliefs than about our practical ability to change things. Social psychologists have been the first to study this type of reasoning. Their focus has been to learn how counterfactual thinking plays out in our beliefs about others. They are interested in our social beliefs.

For example, they have found that people look at circumstances and events and typically find it “natural” to undo the presence of women in their minds and to replace them with men—but not vice versa—and to change in their minds people of color into white people—but again not vice versa. Reasons for this ease of imaging change in one direction and not another are just now being learned but appear traceable to expectations about what a normal state of the world should look like—more so than to any practical considerations. This finding raises important questions and challenges for managers as you allocate resources and attempt to make changes. Determining what factors should be treated as changeable, first in our minds and ultimately in practice, and which ones should be treated as immutable norms will be for all of you day-to-day puzzles. And how you solve these puzzles will define your impact on the world and the essence of your managerial legacy.

Consider, for example, an employee in a manufacturing plant who is injured while operating a machine. Let’s say that the machine is known to be tricky to operate. It requires close attention. At the time of the injury, the employee was suffering from a head cold and probably not thinking all that well. Let’s now return to science versus psychology. Our scientist from our earlier fire example would probably point to a combination of factors as having produced the accident—the touchy machine and the groggy employee together. In practice, no one will debate that both factors were present. Nevertheless there will be lengthy,

heated arguments about which of these factors is the “true” cause—the one that should take the blame, that should lose the lawsuit, that should take up resources to change. Should we buy new machines or develop different employee training and safety practices? And these arguments will swing on beliefs about what should be taken as given and what can be imagined to be different.

Coming down on one side or another in this debate has profound implications beyond just this one plant and its resource allocation and legal battles. The decision reflects deep values and will reinforce—or change—status and norms. On one side we can take as given that people are imperfect, that they get tired, headachy, sniffly, emotionally distracted, even hung over. Holding human frailty as given, we obligate ourselves to design machines to be safe for people when they are at both their best and not their best. Otherwise, dangerous machines sit in wait for the inevitable bad day as accidents about to happen.

But taking this side has a cost. We may find fewer accidents, but lost in this decision is the notion that people should be responsible for themselves, for looking out for dangers, and for acting accordingly. Go too far with this view and our streets will be bordered with rubber bumpers. No one will ever be at fault for anything. So, we may come down on the other side and take as given that indeed the world has dangers. Some machines are trickier than others to operate. Holding the presence of dangers in the world as the immutable norm, therefore, pushes the obligation for action in another direction—to individuals. We obligate all individuals to pay attention and to look after themselves. On this side of the debate, we maintain respect for individual responsibility but we may be holding people to blame for simply being human.

These debates are not restricted to machines and employees. Americans debated the role of design versus individual responsibility at length after the last presidential election—should we blame the voting confusion on the hard-to-read ballots or on the voters who didn’t seem to try very hard to read them? Product liability commonly turns on similar arguments—again with none of the participants in the debates in disagreement about how the event came about.

I noticed a debate of this sort and a shift in values early in my business career. I graduated in 1979 from college with a degree in accounting. As I started work, I read a book that was popular at the time called *Games Mother Never Taught You*. Its main idea was that the business environment being entered by young women had cultural norms built around men. It was our job as young women, interlopers, to figure out how we should change to fit in. In this view, had I not done well the attribution would surely have been to my inability to adjust to the existing business culture.

By the time I was a young business professor in the late 1980s, talk had changed. Now people spoke of diversity and the need to accept everyone. My job was now to be just exactly who I was, and it was the job of the business culture to change to welcome me. Were I not to succeed the attribution might now be to how unwelcoming the business or aca-

demical world can be.

Such are the types of questions that you will face throughout your career. The uncertainty and passions that you will find will at first seem to be debates about cause and effect, but you will soon recognize them to be far from objective, scientific disagreements. And it is here that your ability to function globally will be most challenged. It will be an easy chore to gain agreement in a scientific sense about the factors that come together to produce good things and bad things. What will be far harder will be to agree about which factors should be tampered with to reach for success or to prevent failure, because these decisions will hinge on values that differ across the diverse set of managers with whom you interact—ranging broadly in age, social class, ethnicity, culture, and sex.

I offer here no easy solution but only the advice to know that the debate at hand is probably not one of science but one of the sacred and the profane. I also have faith that you, the Class of 2002, will do it well because I have seen you do just this.

We speak of this Class of 2002—candidates for the Ph.D., M.B.A., and I.M.B.A., full time and part time—as running unusually deep with leaders. True enough, but what makes this class a storied class that leaves both an impressive legacy and a deep cultural shift is that you approached your time here as much as stewards as you did as leaders.

Leadership for all its force and value is incomplete. Its focus is on the leader and on the direction of change. It is about possibility. Stewardship is about a moment in time. It is about responsibility. It has at its heart letting go and handing something on. It measures its success by what was received, how it was handled, how it was bettered, how it was left. Stewardship was your chore here.

In part, circumstances asked it of you. The world shifted monumentally during your years at the GSB: in small local ways—a dean’s transition; and larger but ultimately familiar ways—a downturn in the economy; and in a profoundly tragic way—the attacks on September 11. These events defined your time here and changed your role.

But you also had it in you. The changes called from you a wisdom, the recognition that destruction only looks big. Tearing down can be done in an instant with little skill. Building up is done in small steps—quietly with slow, daily effort. And keeping something the same may sometimes be the hardest work of all. And so in your time you looked as leaders at the possibilities for change but with that steward’s eye to responsibility.

As leaders, you built community so well that I believe it is now a strength of the GSB. As stewards, you did so by preserving the GSB’s deepest cultural value of debate and questioning. We have community, yes, but not at the expense of the relentless pursuit of the truth.

As leaders, you called forth involvement from everyone. As stewards, you did so by retaining the GSB’s love of the individual contribution. We have a team, yes, but not at the expense of the dissenting view.

As leaders, you became the chief marketing officers for the GSB. As stewards, you did so by promoting the central truths

of the GSB—of challenge and stimulation, of demanding the very best of each one of us, of questioning every last assumption. We have popularity of an institution, sure, but not at the expense of its standing for something.

And for that I am very proud and grateful. I am also deeply comforted because I know that when the GSB turns to its alumni for help, guidance, and support, we are turning to the likes of you. My hope for you is that you run your businesses just as you have acted here—with the possibility of leaders and the responsibility of stewards. My hope is that you imagine the world to be different with an eye to science but also to values. My hope is that you have the ability to know the difference between the mutable and the immutable and how those differ in practice—to work toward what can be changed while keeping in your mind what should be.

*Ann L. McGill is the Sears, Roebuck & Co. Professor of General Management, Marketing, and Behavioral Science in the Graduate School of Business and Deputy Dean of the Graduate School of Business.*

## Remarks

### “Leadership: Lost or Found?”

By Fred G. Steingraber  
June 9, 2002

This is a day of remarkable achievement. It's also a day for congratulations—to the six hundred members of the graduating class, to your families and friends, and to your parents and loved ones.

An M.B.A. from the Graduate School of Business of the University of Chicago: In the face of what has become a collective academic rush to create more business schools, to pursue the latest management fads, and to mint more and more ersatz degrees, you've got the gold—no, the platinum—standard. Your University of Chicago M.B.A. signifies something of lasting value: the mastery of the *fundamental* business disciplines of economics, accounting, finance, and business strategy.

There's a story I like to tell—and maybe you know it—about a professor on the first day of class.

He walked into class and said, “Okay, before we get started, it's time for a little quiz.” Then he pulled out a one-gallon, wide-mouth glass jar and set it on the table in front of him. He produced about a dozen fist-sized rocks and carefully placed them, one after the other, into the jar. When the jar was filled to the top and no more rocks would fit inside, he asked the class, “Is the jar full?”

Everyone in the class replied, “Yes.” Then he said, “Really?”

He reached under the table and pulled out a bucket of gravel. Then he dumped some gravel in and shook the jar, causing pieces of gravel to work themselves down into the spaces between the big rocks. Then he asked the group once more, “Is the jar full?”

By this time, the class was on to him and one of the students answered, “Probably not.”

“Good!” replied the professor. He reached under the table and brought out a bucket of sand and poured it into the jar. It

went into all the spaces left between the rocks and the gravel. Once more he asked the question, “Is the jar full?”

“No!” the class shouted. Once again the professor said, “Good.”

Then he reached for a pitcher of water and began to pour it into the jar until the jar was filled to the brim. He looked at the class and asked, “So, what is the point of my demonstration?”

One eager student raised her hand and said, “The point is, no matter how full your schedule is, if you try really hard you can always fit in some more things!”

“No,” the professor replied, “that's not the point. The truth of this illustration is this: If you don't put the big rocks in first, you'll never get them in at all.”

That's what happens to you at the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business. Your professors and your studies put the “big rocks” into your mind—the fundamental business skills and even instincts you'll use throughout your career.

Yes, times will change and so will technology and other matters, and none of us here can accurately predict the business environment of ten or fifteen or twenty years down the road. But whatever those circumstances may be, the work you've done here these last two years—the lessons learned, the disciplines mastered, and the degree you receive today—will stand you in good stead.

E. B. White once said, “The future will be just like today, only with different appliances.” That aphorism is good advice—appliances change, technology evolves, and the world never ceases in its surprises. But amid all that change and variability, the basic formula for excellence in business remains the same: you need the analytical tools and framework necessary for problem solving; you need to know the importance of empirical study, of data and analysis versus mere anecdotal impressions; and you need both the mental flexibility and intellectual acumen to be open to new ideas and to be able to evaluate them at the same time.

And that's what you've been studying for these last two years—that's the *enduring* value of an education at the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Business.

So, it's a day for congratulations. But it's also a day for looking ahead. That's part of the job for commencement speakers—to offer a little perspective for the future leaders to take along as you leave academia and go out into the world.

And what a world it is. How very different it is from only two years ago when you began your studies.

The roaring dot.coms? Boom—then bust.

The new economy? Once all the new economy cheerleaders discovered the importance of cash flow—well, now it's the good-old economy again.

The so-called “death of the business cycle?” Reports of its demise were woefully premature.

And above all, the scars of September 11.

Yes, it is a very different world. I'm sorry to say it is a sadder, harsher world, with a tight job market, even for talented M.B.A.s like you. And it's no surprise that many of us here are focused on the significant obstacles of these challenging times.

But here's my piece of advice to you, both as individuals and as future business leaders. Don't worry about the bad times; bad times take care of themselves. In bad times, we all focus on what needs to be done to make them good again.

It's the *good times* that you have to keep your eye on, because that's when the mistakes get made. You just find out about them later.

Case in point: We are in the midst of a severe leadership crisis in many walks of life: politics, religion, business. Just think about how the controversy swirling around corporate governance has taken over the headlines from the war on terrorism.

At A. T. Kearney, we've recently completed a study of corporate governance and business leadership. We've found that Enron is, unfortunately, only one *colossal* example, the most obvious example, of a more widespread phenomenon—namely, a severe deterioration in our business culture and leadership—brought on, in part, by the many temptations offered by the long boom of the 1990s.

Over the course of the last four years in the United States, we have seen more than 235 public companies restate their earnings—too often as the result of carefree, careless, or even corrupt practices on the part of business leaders.

This problem is compounded by the high turnover in leadership in many of our largest companies. Two-thirds of major corporations have replaced their CEOs in the four years between 1997 and 2001. Today, the average tenure for a *Fortune* 500 CEO is under five years—and dropping.

The severe leadership crisis we have in business is one that goes beyond the Ponzi schemes and crude larceny of the malefactors at Enron. Think of recent examples, including the hasty departures of CEOs of such notable companies as Compaq, Proctor & Gamble, AT&T, Mattel, Humana, Cendant, Rite Aid, Sunbeam, Waste Management, Xerox, Lucent, MCI WorldCom, and Tyco. And unfortunately others loom on the horizon.

Forget the dot.coms—the biggest names in business are facing a crisis in leadership and in corporate governance. In fact, according to the *Chicago Tribune*, investors have lost \$4 trillion in market value in scandal-related stock drops.

Why? A. T. Kearney's study found several reasons. Supine boards of directors either unable or unwilling to probe and provide informed, independent oversight. Internal control processes that permit sweeping problems under the rug rather than exposing them to the harsh light of day. Excessive executive incentives driven almost solely by stock price, at the expense of long-term shareholder interests. Complicit external auditors, who abandoned their professional codes. And a lack of transparency in the complex external relationships in the banking, rating agency, and analyst communities.

This is a long and dismal list, and it requires sustained, serious attention. But, it is also incomplete because each of those items arose due to a lack of leadership. The men and women who were supposed to be responsible for their own actions and the actions of others *abdicated* that responsibility.

Why am I telling you this?

Because we need you.

Because, at a time when the demand for leadership is growing, the supply is running short. Historically, the so-called leadership pool in the United States (that is, people between the ages of thirty-five and fifty) has grown at about the rate of the GNP. But that's not the case anymore.

Projections show that in this decade, there will be a 22 percent increase in the demand for leaders, but a 5 or 6 percent decline in the supply. And remember, those figures say *nothing* about the qualifications of those potential leaders, just that there will be fewer of them in this age group.

So, at a time when we need *more* good leadership, we expect to have far less of it.

Which is where you come in.

We need you—certainly your intelligence, your energy, your creativity, and your commitment. But that's not all we need.

Leadership isn't just about being smart, having an M.B.A., having a title or a position of authority. It's certainly not about who gets paid the most.

Effective leadership requires a unique combination of capabilities that must complement the analytical skills you've honed here at the University of Chicago GSB.

Now, leadership is a broad topic and everyone has his or her own definition. If you were to search the Internet for the word leadership you would find there are 4.4 million pages on the topic. And, as much as I'd like to read them all to you now, this afternoon I'll settle for saying just a few things about it.

What I want to tell you is this. First, I want to echo the words of Warren Bennis, who has probably done the best job defining the key characteristics of good leadership: *ambition, competence, and integrity*. What's more, too much of one characteristic and too little of another is often a fatal formula: you have to have all three characteristics and in the right proportions. We all know what happens when this isn't present.

Second, real leaders have the staying power to take organizations through both the good and bad times. They are committed to a long-term vision and long-term success. They also provide the continuity of purpose necessary to weather significant change and transformation.

Third, being smart isn't enough to succeed as a leader. For the last two years you've relied on your intellect—on your smarts. And that has served you well. But the truth is that IQ alone isn't enough to achieve success in work or in life. When you correlate university admission scores (a surrogate for IQ) with how well people perform in their careers, the highest estimates of the impact of intelligence is around 25 percent (and, in fact, more thorough studies suggest that the number may be no higher than 10 percent or as low as 4 percent). In fact, in many fields today, including my own of management consulting, the intelligence threshold for entry is already so high that high IQs offer no competitive advantage.

I know this is a cruel sort of thing to tell you on the day you are celebrating your intellectual achievement. But the truth is that the business world isn't lacking leaders with high IQs or cleverness. What we don't

have enough of are people with high integrity and *emotional* intelligence. The so-called “soft” skills matter more than ever for success in the tough environments we operate in. Integrity and high emotional intelligence are what distinguish great leaders.

What do I mean by emotional intelligence? I think there are several key abilities: self-awareness—the ability to recognize and understand your own moods; emotions—and their effect on others; self-regulation—the ability to control or direct your impulses and moods; motivation—a passion to work and pursue goals with energy and persistence; empathy—the ability to understand the feelings and perspectives of others; and social skills—the ability to build and maintain relationships.

Leaders with high emotional intelligence have an appreciation of their own strengths and weaknesses. They are comfortable with the ambiguities of life and open to change. They are optimistic (*even* in the face of failure). They are sensitive to their colleagues and clients. And, they are effective in building teams. In short, they are *far more likely to succeed*.

Read the newspapers. Look at the headlines. Listen to the stories. What’s behind our current leadership crisis? What explains the rash of failures? Isn’t it all too often leaders who failed to keep up with competitors because of arrogance? Because of an over-reliance on brainpower or analytics? Because of an inability to adapt? An autocratic leadership style? A disdain for collaboration or teamwork? Didn’t they fail because of low “EQs”? The kind of EQ that would allow you to permit the destruction of pension plans of thousands of workers and still go home and sleep at night?

Today more than ever—in the bad times, uncertainty, and change we face—organizations need integrity and emotional intelligence, yet have people with far too little of it. We all know that businesses, technologies, and markets change, and the skills necessary to navigate them change, too. But people don’t change—or, at least, not easily—even when the need is obvious. But they certainly do not change without good leadership.

Members of the graduating class of 2002, we need your intelligence and your analytical firepower. But in addition, we also need your leadership. We need leaders with vision, integrity, and strong emotional intelligence skills.

In beginning my remarks I told you about a quiz, and provided the answer. Now, for your final quiz, there is a question that you must answer: Leadership lost? Or leadership found?

Your answer to this question will make an enormous difference not only in your life, but also in the lives of many others.

Good luck. I wish you a long, happy, healthy, and successful journey in finding and reclaiming our lost leadership.

*Fred G. Steingraber, M.B.A. ’64, is Chairman Emeritus, A. T. Kearney, Inc.*

### **The Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching**

The University’s Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching were presented during the 469th convocation on June 8, 2002.

Upon the recommendation of John W. Boyer, Dean of the College, and Richard P. Saller, Provost, Don Michael Randel, President, designated the following winners.

#### **Jean Comaroff**

The Bernard E. and Ellen C. Sunny Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Anthropology, Committee on African & African-American Studies, and the College

*The candidate was presented by John Kelly, Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology and the College; Deputy Dean of the Division of the Social Sciences; and Associate Dean of the College.*

Jean Comaroff’s research has systematically reoriented African ethnography toward recognition of the depth of relationships between African and colonizing European society and culture. Her early work helped define the anthropology of the body, connecting medical anthropology and anthropology of religion, connecting the management of affliction to rituals of resistance to colonialism. More recently, together with John Comaroff, she has researched and written a multi-volume study *Of Revelation and Revolution*, a wide-ranging reconstruction of the history of religion, of education, of capitalism, and of colonial, anticolonial, and postcolonial politics across two centuries in Southern Africa.

In her research, in the classroom, and among her colleagues at the University, Jean Comaroff is a leader. A large network of devoted and highly accomplished doctoral students testifies to her dedication and charisma in graduate education. She has been highly successful as department chair, much respected and admired among her colleagues. But the College has a special place in her commitments, and has been an important site of her enduring influence at the University of Chicago. Jean has challenged students in the College to think, bringing to her teaching a dynamic energy, respect, and seriousness of purpose. In return, she would no doubt say, they have challenged her toward new, basic, and contemporary questions.

Most recently, together with John Comaroff, Jean Comaroff organized and taught in Cape Town, South Africa, the first version of our core course on African civilization ever taught in Africa. It is a testament to the success of that venture that the twenty-four students in this inaugural version of the course have unanimously nominated her, and John, for the Quantrell Award, citing in particular Jean Comaroff’s “passion for telescoping the contradictions of South Africa back onto our lives in Chicago.”

*Citation:* Ground-breaking and politically astute scholar of African anthropology and civilization, you bring intensity of engage-

ment and extraordinary erudition to your teaching.

#### **John L. Comaroff**

The Harold H. Swift Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Anthropology, Committee on African & African-American Studies, and the College

*The candidate was presented by Michael Dietler, Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology, Committee on the Ancient Mediterranean World, and the College.*

John Comaroff is without question one of the world’s most distinguished and influential anthropologists. His several decades of ethnographic and historical research among the Tswana in South Africa, conducted with co-Quantrell-winner Jean Comaroff, have resulted in a series of landmark publications and path-breaking contributions to the analysis of colonialism, to the anthropology of law, to the study of emerging postcolonial societies and forms of modernity, and to the practice of historical anthropology, to name but a few of the domains in which his work defines the standard. Moreover, from his engagement with the liberation struggle in South Africa to his work with the American Bar Foundation, he has been tirelessly committed to public service. His deep commitment to the University of Chicago and his enthusiastic dedication to undergraduate students have been equally evident, most recently in his efforts to establish the enormously successful program in African civilization in Cape Town.

Throughout his exceptional career, John Comaroff has found himself at the juncture of an impressive cluster of adjectives: brilliant, charismatic, original, dedicated, passionate, and utterly inexhaustible are a few of the most commonly heard descriptors uttered with a certain awe by other scholars. Indeed, his legendary energy and productivity are enough to make even his most workaholic colleagues feel like pathetic slackers. But perhaps the word that trumps all others in describing John is inspirational. He has that rare capacity to not only teach others, but to profoundly inspire them (and this is as true of his colleagues as it is of his students). He is both a riveting writer and a spellbinding speaker, but his success as a teacher stems from more than these rare gifts. Clearly, his humor and dazzling erudition are infectious. But more than this, statements by his students testify to the fact that their lives have been dramatically enriched by his intellectual passion, his iconoclastic challenges to their implicit assumptions and cultural presuppositions, and his relentless analytical rigor. John knows how to get students to think critically, to question the things they have taken for granted, and to relish the exciting transformative experience of opening their intellectual horizons. These are the qualities that make John Comaroff not only an extraordinary scholar, but also an inspirational teacher and colleague.

*Citation:* Renowned anthropologist and legal scholar, committed citizen of the world, and inspirational teacher, you have worked tirelessly to awaken the desire and

instill the capacity for rigorous thinking in your students and thereby to profoundly enrich their lives.

#### **Benjamin Glick**

Associate Professor in the Department of Molecular Genetics & Cell Biology, Committee on Genetics, and the College

*The candidate was presented by Laurens Mets, Associate Professor in the Department of Molecular Genetics & Cell Biology, Committee on Genetics, and the College.*

Benjamin Glick is a rising star in the field of cell biology who is fascinated with the processes that generate the intricate structures present within cells. While still a postdoctoral student, his incisive experiments and lucid papers helped to unravel a web of apparently contradictory theories concerning the translocation of proteins into mitochondria. In his research program at the University of Chicago, he has taken on an even more complex problem: that of determining how the intriguing structure of the Golgi apparatus, the cell’s material-processing center, is formed. Ben’s experimental attack on this problem is no-holds-barred, encompassing genetic, biochemical, comparative, and cell biological methods in just the right combination as dictated by insightful and critical theoretical analysis. Ben’s experiments generate, by design, clear, step-by-step progress in dissecting and understanding cellular processes.

As a teacher, Ben brings into the classroom the same thoughtful and patient approach that makes him a leading researcher. He has a knack, born of talent as well as hard work, for communicating with astonishing clarity and grace. He is able to take otherwise prosaic topics, draw students deeply into an appreciation of their wonder and beauty, and deliver both information and understanding with an unassuming, easy-to-understand style. Ben’s students particularly praise his seemingly effortless presentation of complex life processes without oversimplification. Some even like his “Hawaiian Punch” analysis of cellular compartmentation. Ben has designed challenging and engaging laboratory exercises that bring beginning students directly into the milieu of the research laboratory and provide them with a sense that they belong there, sharing the investigative adventure. The standards that Ben sets are high, but he is always accessible and eager to assist his students in meeting them. The students gain true education and also some of Ben’s enthusiasm for cell biology.

*Citation:* Clear and profound thinker and experimental cell biologist, your exceptional success in transmitting your understanding of biology to your students is a true mark of your accomplishment as a scholar.

#### **Gary Herrigel**

Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science and the College

*The candidate was presented by John Brehm, Professor in the Department of Political Science and the College; Chairman of the Department of Political Science.*

Gary Herrigel is a specialist in the political economy of industrial society. He has written widely on such core problems for modern governance as the problems of industrial restructuring in Germany, industrial competition between European states, trade union politics, and the socialization of risk. His book, *Industrial Constructions*, argues that there is a rampant misconception of post-war Germany as a highly centralized economy dominated by large firms, a misconception that misses a parallel, decentralized, system of highly specialized small and medium producers. Professor Herrigel's work masterfully combines multiple research modes and has drawn the attention of scholars throughout the social sciences. Professor Herrigel's students comment on his extraordinary intelligence and commitment to learning for the sake of learning. While his students may comment on a cynical sense of humor and report Professor Herrigel's self-conception as "boogeying in a different realm," they always also attest to his ability to instill confidence and encourage learning and communication in all its forms.

*Citation:* Creative interdisciplinary scholar and teacher, dedicated to the ideals of the University and a common core of intellectual life.

#### Douglas R. MacAyeal

Professor in the Department of Geophysical Sciences and the College

*The candidate was presented by David B. Rowley, Associate Professor in the Department of Geophysical Sciences and the College; Chairman of the Department of Geophysical Sciences.*

Earth is unique in our solar system for its abundance of water at the surface. Water on Earth exists in three states—liquid, vapor, and solid. Doug MacAyeal is a leading expert in one of these states—ice. How do ice sheets the size of Antarctica and Greenland grow and decay? What is the physics that governs ice sheet evolution? Doug has made significant contributions to this area of research through remarkable physical insight backed by rigorous analysis. His studies range from ice streams and their potential role in the rapid modulation of ice sheets, to the complex behavior resulting from the interplay of the Earth's heat flow, ice dynamics, and a little mud that can give rise to a binge-purge dynamic of large continental ice sheets unleashing vast armadas of icebergs to the oceans. Most recently his investigations of iceberg calving and dispersal have landed him on the front page of the paper, not to mention floating off the Antarctic coast.

Doug MacAyeal is being honored today not only for his outstanding research but also for his outstanding undergraduate teaching. Although our colleagues in the Department of Geophysical Sciences value the core highly, none are more dedicated, more enthusiastic, or more inspired than Doug MacAyeal. His core course, "Ice Age Earth," uses the Earth as a natural laboratory within which the complete spectrum of the physical and natural sciences are brought to the class to understand how the Earth's surface environment responds to subtle, yet dynamic, changes. Among other

things, atmospheric chemistry, orbital variations, ocean circulation, and the dynamics of ice can conspire to build and modulate the large continental ice sheets that once covered Canada and the northern United States under kilometers of ice, and a bit of mud at the base can control their collapse. Add to this the interactions of the environment with human history and the biosphere, and one immediately appreciates that Doug's approach to teaching is one of inclusion and integration. Inspired teaching inspires students to search out new connections in the world. Doug MacAyeal's teaching inspires students to think more clearly and more insightfully about the Earth, and about how the Earth's past can provide powerful insights into its present and future state.

*Citation:* Dedicated and demanding teacher, creative and integrative lecturer, outstanding researcher; you inspire students by making what is complex simple, intuitive, and understandable.

#### Mario Santana

Associate Professor in the Department of Romance Languages & Literatures, Center for Latin American Studies, and the College

*The candidate was presented by Thomas Pavel, Professor in the Department of Romance Languages & Literatures and the College; Chairman of the Department of Romance Languages & Literatures.*

Mario Santana is a great presence at Chicago for several reasons. First, he is a creative scholar who wrote important contributions to the history of twentieth-century Spanish literature. He is a recognized authority on the topic of the interaction between Peninsular Spanish and Latin American literature and culture. He is known and admired for his bold ideas and compelling interpretations.

Second, Mario selflessly struggled to keep the teaching of Spanish literature and culture alive at Chicago at a time when the resources in this area were dangerously depleted. He did whatever was in his power to steer both graduates and undergraduates through the program. A wise and dedicated adviser, he always gave freely of his time and energy to his students.

Third, in the classroom, he is a dedicated teacher who is much admired and cherished. His students praise the high intellectual level of his classes, their sensitivity to historical knowledge, their clarity, and their depth. They talk about his ability to create an open forum for ideas and to facilitate comments from students at all levels. One of his students testifies that she leaves Mario's classes with a much better understanding of her own ideas. To use a Socratic term, Mario is a "maieutician," someone who knows how to help people give birth to their own ideas. This is the greatest talent a teacher can have.

*Citation:* Distinguished scholar of Spanish and Latin American literature, great teacher, inspiring mentor, you have worked selflessly to give a new life to Spanish studies at Chicago.

## Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching

Three Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching were presented during the 469th convocation on June 7, 2002. These awards, established in 1986, recognize and honor faculty members for their effective graduate teaching, including leadership in the development of programs and a special ability to encourage, influence, and work with graduate students.

Nominations and recommendations for the Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching are made by faculty and graduate students; selection is by a faculty committee appointed by the Provost.

#### Daniel Garber

The Lawrence A. Kimpton Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Philosophy, Committee on the Conceptual & Historical Studies of Science, and the College

*The candidate was presented by Michael Forster, Professor in the Department of Philosophy and the College; Chairman of the Department of Philosophy.*

Daniel Garber is both a first-rate scholar of seventeenth-century philosophy and a classroom-teacher and adviser of graduate students with few if any equals. His extraordinary conscientiousness and skill as an educator of graduate students are reflected in a long list of former students who have since gone on to successful careers in philosophy, and who, to a person, warmly credit their careers to him. One hallmark of his contribution to graduate education has been his constant willingness to go far beyond a faculty member's normal responsibilities (which, it should be noted, have in his case been unusually onerous, included such important administrative functions as associate provost and several terms as departmental chair). A few examples of this trait are his abundant provision of additional courses in response to student demand; the special care with which he trains and mentors graduate students who serve as assistants in his undergraduate courses; his thoughtful, generous inclusion of advanced graduate students in international conferences that he organizes and attends; his untiring and very successful efforts to place graduate students in positions; and his alert, stalwart defense of graduate student interests in departmental decision making. I can think of no one who has contributed more to graduate student education at this university than Daniel Garber and only very few who have contributed even nearly as much.

*Citation:* Through both his first-rate scholarship and his extraordinary skill and conscientiousness as a classroom-teacher and adviser, Daniel Garber has made a truly outstanding contribution to graduate education at this university.

#### Michael E. Geyer

Professor, Department of History and the College

Michael Geyer is legendary alike for the numbers of aspiring historians whom he has trained, and for the intellectual nurtur-

ing and attention that he lavishes on each. Tough yet personable and compassionate, respecting the personality and distinctive voice of each young scholar, he challenges his students to move beyond safe and predictable claims in a constant process of discovery, creativity, and moral responsibility. History, he teaches them, is not just about telling a story, but about exploring the intricacies of the human condition and the broadest complexities of life. In his courses, seminars, and workshops, as in the mentoring that continues into their postdoctoral careers, students see his provocative mind at work and recognize a teaching example that they seek to follow. His own wide-ranging scholarship has established him as a seminal interpreter of the modern German experience. Along with his students—"the Geyerites," they call themselves—he has helped shape an entire generation of scholarship.

*Citation:* Challenging, caring, and inexhaustible teacher of doctoral students, Michael Geyer's wide-ranging scholarly inquiries and legendary mentoring have molded an entire generation of interpreters of modern European history.

#### Benson Farb

Professor, Department of Mathematics and the College

*The candidate was presented by Kevin Corlette, Professor in the Department of Mathematics and the College; Chairman of the Department of Mathematics.*

Benson Farb is a devoted and energetic teacher who has been remarkably inventive in finding ways to point students in the right direction. He is exceptionally generous with both his ideas and his understanding of a broad range of work in geometry and topology, and he has been exceptionally successful in drawing graduate students into a mathematical community sharing a common fund of questions and insights. He works hard to find questions that suit the abilities and interests of his students, and at the same time spares no effort to ensure that they see mathematical horizons far beyond the boundaries of the specific problems they work on. He finds innumerable ways to support students as they take the steps necessary to become independent mathematicians, while never forgetting that they must take some of those steps themselves.

*Citation:* A devoted and energetic teacher, Benson Farb has initiated students at many levels into the excitement of discovering original mathematics.

## Honorary Degrees

### Doctor of Humane Letters

#### François Dolbeau

Directeur d'Études, Section des sciences historiques et philologiques, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, France

*The candidate was presented by Michael I. Allen, Assistant Professor, Department of Classical Languages & Literatures.*

François Dolbeau has known, many times over, the exceptional experience of discerning a lost, but somehow familiar, voice from the past. In the early 1990s, in the wake of contrary, but hasty judgments by other experts, Mr. Dolbeau seized upon the literary style and preoccupations of a collection of twenty-four Latin sermons preserved in a manuscript from the 1400s, and he knew to credit them to the mind of St. Augustine as they were dictated by him in the early 400s. The discovery was a sensation retailed in headlines the world over. It was also, in terms of the mass and importance of the recovered late ancient Latin thought, virtually unequalled in the twentieth century. For Mr. Dolbeau, this particular instance of recognition and then careful interpretation is just one of many. As in other cases, Mr. Dolbeau's work has prompted here a major reassessment of the pastoral and social concerns of Augustine, whose writings from fifth-century North Africa often set terms of discourse for subsequent Western tradition.

In a still unfolding career, Mr. Dolbeau towers as a leading figure in the interpretation of the manuscript sources that so eloquently convey both the ideas and material shape of learning in the age before print. He has rewritten whole chapters on the end of the ancient world and on the new Christian literary sensibilities of the medieval world. He has helped to redefine the dynamic of text-based authority, procured or lost by real or invented attributions. He has resurrected the workings of key medieval libraries as vectors of texts and intellectual tradition.

Not least, Mr. Dolbeau lives out the highest scholarly and collegial ideals. His achievements show real philological tradition in its full vigor as a guide and challenge for today.

*Citation:* Whose recognition, publication, and interpretive study of twenty-four "lost" sermons by St. Augustine stand as the most visible example of a transforming engagement with the history of texts and ideas. Mr. Dolbeau has restored identity, context, and meaning to important late antique and medieval sources, often by understanding what others had not seen. His philological fluency integrates humanistic skills and sensibilities with the technical means of today. His energy, generosity, and harvest of new discovery shine as a beacon of humanistic achievement.

#### Salvatore Silvano Nigro

Professor of Italian Literature, Università degli Studi di Catania, Italy

*The candidate was presented by Elissa B. Weaver, Professor in the Department of Romance Languages & Literatures and the College.*

Salvatore Silvano Nigro is currently a professor of Italian literature at the University of Catania, and he has been a visiting professor at many prestigious institutions in the United States and in Europe. Professor Nigro has emerged as a cultural leader in a period when the waning of ideological and formalist criticism has left a vacuum and a sense of disorientation; Professor Nigro appeals to new generations of literary scholars with a model of pluralist criti-

cism that always allows the nature of the individual texts to determine the approach. The imposing quality of his work derives from his superb learning, his critical imagination, and his sharp historical vision. He has written articles and books dealing with Renaissance, baroque, romantic, and contemporary Italian literature, always with great originality and important discoveries that have shaped the field—one need only consider his work on the Italian short story of the fifteenth century, on dissimulation in the baroque, or on the interrelationship of text and illustration in Alessandro Manzoni's *I promessi sposi*. As an editor he has produced exemplary texts, the most recent being a three-volume edition of Manzoni's masterpiece, the first great Italian novel. Professor Nigro is also a distinguished art historian, having written on the Sicilian baroque and on the Florentine mannerist Jacopo Pontormo, works that have been widely translated in Europe. Professor Nigro's cultural influence is felt in many areas: he is a consultant for the most important presses in Italy, for whom he is also a series director; and he is a regular contributor to several literary reviews. He is a towering figure on the cultural scene of Italy today.

*Citation:* Salvatore Silvano Nigro, leading literary and art critic, essayist, insightful historian of Italian literature, exemplary textual editor, influential teacher, whose work has reshaped important fields of Italian literature and art of the Renaissance, of the baroque, and of the romantic period, and has inspired a new generation of scholars.

#### Orlando Patterson

John Cowles Professor of Sociology, Harvard University

*The candidate was presented by Andrew Abbott, the Gustavus F. and Ann M. Swift Professor in the Department of Sociology and the College; Chairman of the Department of Sociology.*

Orlando Patterson has been a pioneer in conceptualizing and analyzing the phenomenon of slavery in many different societies. Overturning standard analyses from Marxist and racist positions, he identified the core of slavery as relations of domination, showing how the transitional state of manumission and the freed status that resulted from it were used to provide necessary justifications for the institution itself. In work of extraordinary historical breadth, Patterson has traced the common patterns of slavery in societies from ancient Greece and Rome to the American South.

Patterson went on to find the roots of the Western concept of freedom in the different dynamics of ancient slaveholding societies. While the African slaveholding societies lacked critical masses of individuals committed to freedom, in Greece and Rome a combination of large freed populations with a slaveholding elite privately interested in manumission led to steady pressures for freedom. Tracing the impact of these forces not only on ancient societies but also on classical thought, Patterson provides a revolutionary account of the rise of ideas of freedom. Of extraordinary breadth and subtlety, his work is one of the

major achievements of comparative and historical social science in our time.

*Citation:* Whose work has transformed our understanding of both slavery and freedom. In his historical work ranging over many societies and in his reinterpretations of familiar and canonical texts, he has provided a profoundly original view of the problem of domination in social life. By showing not only the forces that support domination but also those that undercut it, he has provided ways to envision a society in which domination can be diminished. Profound scholar and courageous social critic, he is an ornament to our intellectual life.

#### Summary

The 469th convocation was held on Friday, June 7, Saturday, June 8, and Sunday, June 9, 2002, in the Harper Quadrangle. Don Michael Randel, President of the University, presided.

A total of 2,814 degrees were awarded: 800 Bachelor of Arts in the College, 46 Bachelor of Science in the College and the Division of the Physical Sciences, 7 Master of Science in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 129 Master of Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 98 Master of Science in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 85 Master of Arts in the Division of the Social Sciences, 1 Master of Arts in Teaching in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 6 Master of Fine Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 5 Master of Arts in Teaching in the Division of the Humanities, 650 Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 60 International Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 26 Master of Arts in the Divinity School, 6 Master of Divinity in the Divinity School, 8 Master of Liberal Arts in the William B. and Catherine V. Graham School of General Studies, 151 Master of Arts the School of Social Service Administration, 8 Master of Arts in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 80 Master of Public Policy in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 2 Master of Science in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 51 Master of Laws in the Law School, 1 Master of Comparative Law in the Law School, 110 Doctor of Medicine in the Pritzker School of Medicine, 9 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 11 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Humanities, 17 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 30 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Social Sciences, 2 Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Business, 14 Doctor of Philosophy in the Divinity School, 188 Doctor of Law in the Law School, 2 Doctor of Philosophy in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, and 3 Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Social Service Administration.

Three honorary degrees were conferred during the 469th convocation. The recipients of the Doctor of Humane Letters were François Dolbeau, Directeur d'Etudes, Section des sciences historiques et philologiques, Ecole Pratique des Hautes

Etudes, Paris, France; Salvatore Silvano Nigro, Professor of Italian Literature, Università degli Studi di Catania, Italy; and Orlando Patterson, John Cowles Professor of Sociology, Harvard University.

Six Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching were given, to Jean Comaroff, the Bernard E. and Ellen C. Sunny Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Anthropology, Committee on African & African-American Studies, and the College; John L. Comaroff, the Harold H. Swift Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Anthropology, Committee on African & African-American Studies, and the College; Benjamin Glick, Associate Professor in the Department of Molecular Genetics & Cell Biology, Committee on Genetics, and the College; Gary Herrigel, Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science and the College; Douglas R. MacAyeal, Professor in the Department of Geophysical Sciences and the College; and Mario Santana, Associate Professor in the Department of Romance Languages & Literatures, Center for Latin American Studies, and the College.

Three Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching were given, to Daniel Garber, the Lawrence A. Kimpton Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Philosophy, Committee on the Conceptual & Historical Studies of Science, and the College; Michael E. Geyer, Professor, Department of History and the College; and Benson Farb, Professor, Department of Mathematics and the College.

George Chauncey, Professor in the Department of History and the College, delivered the principal convocation address at the first, second, and third sessions, "Sexuality, Intimacy, and History."

Ann L. McGill, the Sears, Roebuck & Co. Professor of General Management, Marketing, and Behavioral Science in the Graduate School of Business and Deputy Dean of the Graduate School of Business, delivered the principal convocation address at the fourth session, "Possibility and Responsibility."

Fred G. Steingraber, M.B.A.'64, Chairman Emeritus, A. T. Kearney, Inc., delivered remarks at the fourth session, "Leadership: Lost or Found?"

© 2002 The University of Chicago  
ISSN 0362-4706

The University of Chicago Record  
5710 South Woodlawn Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60637  
773/702-8352

[www.uchicago.edu/docs/education/record](http://www.uchicago.edu/docs/education/record)